UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01266683 0

THE HISTORY

OF

MY OWN TIME

VOL. I.

London

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE

AMEN CORNER, E.C.

New York

THE MACMILLAN CO., 66 FIFTH AVENUE

B 964hA.2 Burnet, Gilbert, Bp.

(BURNET'S)
HISTORY OF MY OWN TIME

A NEW EDITION BASED ON THAT OF M. J. ROUTH, D.D.

PART I

THE REIGN OF

CHARLES THE SECOND

EDITED BY

OSMUND AIRY, M.A.

IN TWO VOLUMES: VOL. I

307044
5. 12. 34

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

M.DCCC.XCVII

1897

DA
430
B87
1897
Pt. 1
v. 1
c. 2

Oxford
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART, M.A.
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PREFACE

In the preparation of a new Edition of Burnet's *History* several points have especially demanded attention. Errors, positive or probable, required correction or suggested emendation, and omissions supplement; many statements invited illustration; it was desirable to indicate as far as possible the probable sources of Burnet's information upon matters which did not come under his personal observation; the notes of the earlier editions obviously needed revision. Finally it was necessary to provide a trustworthy text.

Probably no historian of Burnet's rank and importance has ever been so vigorously or continuously challenged on the ground of prejudice and inaccuracy. The task of meeting this challenge in any satisfactory manner is one which cannot be undertaken in a Preface, unless it is to extend to a wearisome length. But I do not hesitate to say briefly that, when it is remembered that Burnet was the first to exhibit on a large scale the picture of his time—though Clarendon's *Life* and *Continuation* were composed earlier—and that his narrative was drawn up almost without the aid of documentary evidence; and when it is further borne in mind that he himself played an active part in that time, that his temper was impulsive, and that the passions aroused in the varied drama which was

acted under his eyes were strong, it will be recognized by any careful and competent investigator that his comparative freedom from grave error—certainly from wilful misrepresentation—is remarkable. This observation is not extended to the later portion of his work, respecting which I do not feel qualified to speak; but I am satisfied that as regards the age of Charles II, with which alone I am concerned, he is, with but few exceptions, both as to events and persons, conspicuously and honourably fair in tone, even though frequently inaccurate in detail; especially—and here I speak with still more confidence—is this the case when Scotland and Scotsmen are his theme. It is true that he was an eager and credulous listener; that he often, as indeed must be the case with any one who writes of his own time, speaks from hearsay, sometimes, as he tells us, from hearsay twice or thrice, so to speak, removed; that his information obviously takes its colour at times from his own feeling; that his character-sketches are frequently overdrawn on the bad side, and that they bear evidence of the repeated alteration mentioned by Dartmouth in his last note to Burnet's Preface—generally however by gentler strokes—according to the tone of his mind at the moment of revision or according to some fresh piece of gossip or information. There is little in all this to detract from the value of Burnet's great work, or to cause surprise. That a man should actively concern himself with public affairs in that feverish and immoral time, and should be able to hold the scales evenly, however much he might desire to do so, was absolutely impossible. But that he did desire to do so, and that—through sheer honesty of purpose—he has succeeded in a remarkable degree, is the opinion which prolonged attention to the subject has fixed upon my mind. Stories belonging to one set of persons or events are indeed now and then

transferred to others; provisions of one Act of Parliament are occasionally credited to another. There are ample opportunities for corrective or illustrative criticism, but—I again limit my remark to the reign of Charles II—for destructive criticism very few; while the tone of the whole is vindicated by the results of all late research.

It is noticeable that the impression of consistency and unity in Burnet's narrative is created in spite of the fact that, except perhaps in the case of Scotland, that narrative is neither continuous nor always correct as regards chronological sequence. There is moreover no conscious artistic arrangement, or sense of proportion, or grace; the language is often inelegant and even obscure; the literary gait is often clumsy. The lacunae are numerous, and the order of events is sometimes confused. The work is a commentary upon history, a series of notes, some very detailed, some very jejune, rather than a history itself. The addition of marginal dates where necessary will, it is hoped, remove the chronological difficulties. But it has been found impossible, even where desirable, to bridge over in any satisfactory manner the wide gaps in the narrative.

As regards the insertion of notes which are merely illustrative rather than corrective or supplementary, the chief source of embarrassment, almost of despair, has been —not unnaturally, when the date of the last edition, 1833, is remembered—the overwhelming wealth of material now available. I trust that this part of the work has been kept within due limits; but even where I myself am sensible of a barrenness of illustration I fear that the opposite impression may occasionally be left on the minds of others.

The treatment of the notes to Dr. Routh's edition was the subject of much consideration. In the end it was determined to retain, as nearly as possible in the shape in which they appear there, all which seemed to possess real

value; such are the majority of the Onslow and Dartmouth notes, dealing mainly with matters of which their authors were personally cognizant, and a considerable number of those of Dr. Routh himself. Some of the more pertinent of the contemptuous snarls of Swift have also been preserved, though I have thought it unadvisable to encumber the pages with simple terms of abuse which tend neither to edification nor to knowledge, such as 'Dunce,' 'Puppy,' 'Scotch dog,' and the like. All these earlier notes are indicated by the initial of the annotator; my own—with which a few of the others are incorporated—have no initial. It has occasionally been found necessary to insert a few explanatory words in the body of one of the original notes; these are indicated by square brackets.

It has been thought well to append two sets of paginal references, one to the MS. in the Bodleian Library (e. g. MS. 29), the other, in simple figures, to the folio edition. The latter are necessary, since in all works previously written on the subject, and in all quotations, the folio edition has been the common standard of reference.

One innovation, in addition to the substitution of the modern form in the spelling of all proper names, has been made in dealing with the text, which will, I hope, add to the convenience of the reader; I refer to the division into Chapters. Wherever possible this has taken place at obvious pauses in the narrative; but the absence of any intentional arrangement of the sort in Burnet's plan has made the matter one of some difficulty.

As regards the Text itself the reader is referred to the note by Mr. Macray upon his collation with the Bodleian MS., which follows this Preface.

It remains for me to express my thanks to all those who have aided me with information upon special points. The task, undertaken—perhaps presumptuously

—in the intervals of official work, has been heavy and prolonged, and could scarcely have been performed thus far without their active and generous help. That any one who attempts to deal seriously with the history of this portion of the seventeenth century should be under deep obligations to Dr. S. R. Gardiner and Mr. C. H. Firth will be taken as a matter of course. To myself their assistance and encouragement have been lavish to a degree which makes the only fitting words of gratitude too personal for expression in this place.

To the Delegates of the Clarendon Press I desire to offer my acknowledgements of their courtesy and of their forbearance with delay.

OSMUND AIRY.

Jan. 1, 1897.

THE collation of the original MS. (undoubtedly the MS. promised by the original editors to be deposited in some public library, a promise never fulfilled by them) which has been made for the present edition has shown that but few noticeable variations from the text of Dr. Routh's last edition were required. But it has also shown the care with which Burnet, according to his own avowed intention in his Preface, 'over and over again retouched' his work, often softening some harsh expressions, or altering the form of sentences, or changing single words, with a view to improvement of style. All changes involving real alteration are now pointed out, but the mere substitution of one conjunction or particle for another, and the omission or insertion of small unimportant words, have been passed over.

The autograph of *The History* is contained in two folio volumes, now shelf-marked as 'Bodl. Add. D. 18, 19.' The text is written on one side of the leaf, and the marginal notes on the opposite blank page, where also Burnet places the numeration of the leaves: thus, 'page 1' is written on the blank page opposite the first page of the MS. and so on consecutively. This is worth pointing out, in order to obviate any possible difficulty in verification of a passage. The volumes when purchased by the Library in 1835 for £210, were entrusted to Dr. Routh for his use; and a letter from him on returning them to the Library, dated March 13, 1840, is inserted in the first volume. Unfortunately the particulars of the purchase do not appear to be now recoverable, and all that is known is that, as stated by Dr. Routh (*Hist. of James II*, 1852, p. 474), they had belonged 'to a family descended from the bishop.'

W. D. M.

PREFACE[1]

TO THE EDITION OF 1823

THE History of his Own Time by Bishop Burnet lays claim to our regard as an original work containing a relation of public transactions, in which either the author or his connexions were engaged. It will therefore never lose its importance; but still continue to furnish materials for other historians, and to be read by those, who wish to derive their knowledge of facts from the first sources of information.

The accuracy indeed of the author's narrative has been attacked with vehemence, and often, it must be confessed, with success; but not so often, as to overthrow the general credit of his work. On the contrary, it has in many instances been satisfactorily defended, and time has already evinced the truth of certain accounts, which rested on this single authority. It has also had the rare fortune of being illustrated by the notes of three persons of high rank, possessing in consequence of their situations means of information open to few others. That their observations on this history are now at length submitted to the public eye, is owing to the following fortunate incident.

1. A resolution having been taken by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to reprint the work, the present Lord

[1] Revised in 1833.

Bishop of Oxford[1] expressed his readiness to communicate to them a copy of it, in which his lordship had transcribed the marginal notes written by his ancestor the first Earl of Dartmouth. The offer was gratefully accepted, and the notes ordered to be printed with the text.

Afterwards, on an application to the Earl of Onslow, made through the late James Boswell, Esq., of the Inner Temple, his lordship was pleased to confide to the Delegates Speaker Onslow's copy of Burnet's History; in which are contained the Speaker's observations on this work, written in his own hand. Besides these remarks, there appear in the Onslow copy, in consequence of the permission of the second Earl of Hardwicke, not only the notes written by this nobleman on the second folio volume, but also the numerous passages, which were omitted in the first volume by the original editors. The notes likewise of Dean Swift are there transcribed, taken from his own copy of the history, which had come into the possession of the first Marquis of Lansdowne[2]. We shall now lay before the reader, for his greater satisfaction, a note prefixed to the Onslow copy by George, late Earl of Onslow, the son of the Speaker.

'The notes in these two volumes marked H. were the notes in the present Earl of Hardwicke's copy of this work written by himself, and which he permitted me to copy into this. The earl is the son and heir of that great man the chancellor[3]. The others in the same handwriting I had also from him, and they are what are left out in the

[1] [Edward Legge, seventh son of William, second Earl of Dartmouth; died 1827.] Since the publication of the former edition we have been indulged by the present lord marquis with the use of this copy, and been enabled by it signally to correct some of these notes. The copy formerly stated by us [ed. 1823: Preface, vii] to have been burnt, contained only a transcript of Swift's autograph. R. This note was added in 1833.

[2] Better known as Lord Shelburne.

[3] Philip Yorke, first Earl of Hardwicke; died 1764.

printed history, but are in the manuscript. All the rest of the notes are my father's own. *Geo. Onslow*, 1775. There are many errors of the copyist. The notes in red ink are by Dean Swift, and are copied (from an edition of this work in the Marquiss of Lansdown's library, in the margin of which they are written in the dean's own hand) by his lordship's order for myself. *O.* 1788.'

With respect to the notes written by the Earl of Dartmouth, it appears from Sir John Dalrymple's *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland*, and from Mr. Rose's *Observations* on Fox's History of the early part of the reign of James II, that both these writers had been favoured with the sight as well of these notes, as of a collection of letters which were sent by King James, when Duke of York, and residing in Scotland, to the first Lord of Dartmouth, the earl's father, and from which the earl has frequently inserted extracts [1]. Seven or eight only of the notes have been communicated to the public by the above-mentioned authors, and are pointed out as they occur in the following pages. All of them are now printed, with the exception of three, which contained reflections on the private character of as many individuals irrelevant to their public conduct. They have been omitted, with the approbation of the descendants of the noble writer [2].

As the Earl of Dartmouth has often treated his author with great severity, it should be remarked, that he was of a party in the state opposed to that which Bishop Burnet uniformly espoused. He appears also to have entertained a great personal dislike to the bishop. At the same time this nobleman, who was secretary of state, and afterwards

[1] See the *Dartmouth Papers*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xi. App. Part v.

[2] In this second edition of Burnet's work with notes, those by Lord Dartmouth have been corrected in several places in consequence of a collation of them with the original copy preserved at Sandwell, the seat of the Dartmouth family. R.

Lord Privy Seal in the latter end of Queen Anne's reign, never embraced, as may be collected from his notes, the absurd doctrine of non-resistance to government in all supposable cases; but was, what some have called, a moderate Tory; and like most of the leading Tories in the reign of the queen, was attached to the Hanover succession. The wiser members of this party held, that the right of the people to govern depends on the different laws and constitutions of different countries; but that their right to be well governed is indefeasible. To which should be added, that the tyranny of the many may as justly be resisted as the misgovernment of the few, or of the individual. The following character of his lordship has been transmitted to us by Swift, whilst eulogizing the chiefs of Queen Anne's last ministry, in the twenty-sixth number of the *Examiner*. 'My Lord Dartmouth,' he says, 'is a man of letters, full of good sense, good nature, and honour, of strict virtue and regularity in his life; but labours under one great defect, that he treats his clerks with more civility and good manners, than others in his station have done the queen.' See also Macky's *Characters*, p. 89. His lordship's notes on this work of Burnet abound in curious and well told anecdotes.

The observations of Speaker Onslow and the Earl of Hardwicke have likewise been hitherto unpublished, except twenty of the former, printed in the twenty-seventh volume of the *European Magazine*. But more than half of Swift's short and cursory remarks have been already given to the public in that and the two following volumes of the same work by the person who communicated the others, yet often altered in the expression[1]. They are shrewd, caustic,

[1] The notes by Swift which appear in the *Magazine* were afterwards affixed, in the year 1808, to Dr. Barrett's *Essay on the Earlier Part of the Life of Swift*. R.

and apposite, but not written with the requisite decorum; of six notes omitted by us, three are worded in so light a way, that even modesty forbad their admission. The Speaker's notes, addressed more particularly to his son, contain many incidental discussions on political subjects, and are sensible and instructive. Those of the Earl of Hardwicke are so candid and judicious, that one cannot but wish them to have been more numerous. Earl Spencer, we are eager to acknowledge, condescendingly and most obligingly endeavoured to procure the copy of Burnet's History for our use, in the margin of which the notes were originally written by Lord Hardwicke, it being desirable that some doubtful passages of the transcript in the Onslow copy should have been compared with it; but unfortunately the book could nowhere be found.

The Earl of Dartmouth and Dean Swift, who although younger than Bishop Burnet, may be considered as his contemporaries, were, as we have already observed in the case of the Lord Dartmouth, opposed to him in politics: but Arthur Onslow, Speaker in five successive parliaments in the reign of George II, enjoyed the confidence of the Whigs, and with it a high reputation for integrity and moderation. The remaining annotator, Lord Hardwicke, son of the Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, and one of the authors of those elegant compositions, the *Athenian Letters*, always adhered to the same party. Lord Dartmouth uses strong, and Swift much ill language, on Burnet's supposed want of veracity; and the excellent Latin verses of Dean Moss on the same subject are now, we understand, in print. Yet the bishop's friends need not be apprehensive of a verdict of wilful falsehood against him in consequence of the corrections of his narrative in the subsequent annotations. Lord Dartmouth indeed, a man of honour, asserts that this author has published many things which he knew

to be untrue. See his note at the beginning of vol. iv. His lordship, it must be allowed, had better opportunities than we have for determining what Burnet knew; but, as he has adduced little or nothing in support of this charge, we may be permitted to think, that strong prejudice, not wilful falsehood, occasioned the bishop's erroneous statements. It ought to be recollected in his favour, that he never professed a belief, either in the discoveries of Oates, or in the alleged murder of the Earl of Essex, although articles of his party's creed. And notwithstanding the idle stories told by him, on the authority of others, concerning the birth of the Prince of Wales, he nowhere, in the present work at least, explicitly avows an opinion of his illegitimacy. Nor, although an active and zealous opposer of King James's measures, does he appear to have been concerned in the other infamous falsehood imposed at the same time on the credulity of the nation; the intended massacre of the Protestants in this country by the Irish soldiery. There is a story indeed, which used to be told on the authority of the Dowager Countess of Nottingham, that Burnet, in a conversation with her lord, accused him of having professed different sentiments in the House of Peers on some subject from what he then did; and on Lord Nottingham's denying that he had so expressed himself, the bishop, as it was stated, rejoined, if his lordship had not, he ought to have done so: and that, notwithstanding this in Burnet's History of his Own Time, Lord Nottingham is represented to have said that which he denied he had said. All this may be true, and yet the bishop might not believe himself to have been mistaken. It must however be confessed, that where either party-zeal or personal resentment was concerned, this author too frequently appears to have been no patient investigator of the truth, but to have written under the influence of those

feelings, even whilst he was delineating the characters of some of the most virtuous persons of the age in which he lived. Amongst these are the Archbishops Sheldon and Sancroft, of whom he frequently speaks with unpardonable severity. He has also directed much indiscriminate censure against public bodies of men. In fact it appears by the preface to his work, that he himself suspected he had treated the clergy in particular with excessive harshness, irritated, he says, 'perhaps too much against them, in consequence of the peevishness, ill-nature, and ambition of many of them.' Nay, from some particulars, which will hereafter be mentioned, it may be collected, that the author actually omitted many passages of his history still more highly reflecting on his brethren.

That he was by no means acceptable to those prelates, who governed the Church of England in the reign of Charles II, seems extremely probable, when we consider that, according to his own account, he was an active opponent and open censurer of the bishops in Scotland, and a great meddler in English politics. Besides this, he professed to regard episcopacy itself as not necessary, although a preferable form of church government; and, however averse from republicanism, appears to have approved of the settlement made by the Scottish Covenanters in 1641 as the best system of civil polity for Scotland. See vol. i. pp. 396, 397, folio edit. The author also, during the reigns of William and Anne, was on very ill terms with the majority of the English clergy, whom he often accuses of inactivity, faction, and ambition. It may be urged on the other hand, in favour of his impartiality, that he does by no means spare the characters of those on his own side in politics; so little indeed, that for the credit of human nature we would hope, that he knew less of men and of business than he himself supposed.

But whether his censures were just or unjust, Burnet himself, as it must be acknowledged even by his enemies, was an active and meritorious bishop, and, to the extent of his opportunities, a rewarder of merit in others. He was orthodox in points of faith, possessed superior talents, as well as very considerable learning; was an instructive and entertaining writer, in a style negligent indeed and inelegant, but almost always perspicuous; generous, open-hearted, and, in his actions, a good-natured man; and although busy and intrusive, at least as honest as the generality of partisans. It is true, that his conduct to the Duke of Lauderdale after the breach between them was, even in his own apprehension of it, objectionable; and he forfeited by it the favour of the royal brothers, Charles and James; who had before this time paid particular attention to him. His spleen and resentment against both these princes are apparent in every part of this history; except that his final portrait of the latter is less darkly shaded, than the harsh and hideous one which he has drawn of the former. It may be here observed, in contradiction to the report of Burnet and of several other writers, respecting the early reconciliation of Charles to the Church of Rome, that this event, as it appears from authentic accounts of the king's last moments, did not take place till a short time before his death.

2. Thus much concerning the notes on this work; and the accusation of wilful and deliberate falsehood brought against its author by the Lord Dartmouth and others. We proceed to give an account of the numerous passages omitted in the first folio volume by the original editors, and now restored to their proper places.

It is known to the readers of English history, that the editors of this posthumous work, on the publication of the first volume in 1724, promised to deposit the copy from

which it was printed in some public library; and they are apprised, that in the beginning of the second volume, printed in 1734, there appears the following declaration with the signature of the bishop's youngest son, who was afterwards Sir Thomas Burnet, and a judge. 'The original manuscript of both volumes of this history will be deposited in the Cotton library by T. Burnett.' The advertisement in the former volume, which was the only one prefixed by the editors to the work, is conceived in these terms. 'The editors of the following history intend, for the satisfaction of the public, to deposite the copy from which it is printed (corrected and interlined in many places with the author's own hand) in some public library, as soon as the second volume shall be published.'

Suspicions had very early arisen, nay, positive testimony had been adduced, that many passages of the original work were omitted by the editors in both the volumes (see note in vol. iv. p. 566); when at length, in the year 1795, the same person, who, according to our preceding statement, inserted the greater part of Swift's and a few of Speaker Onslow's notes, in the twenty-seventh volume of the *European Magazine*, communicated together with them twelve passages of the text of Burnet, which, amongst numerous others, had been omitted by the editors of the first volume. They were, in all probability, published by him from either the Onslow or the Hardwicke copy of Burnet. He mentions the Hardwicke notes, although he has extracted none of them. It has been already stated, that the Hardwicke copy is missing, without hope it should seem of its recovery, and into this copy the Onslow notes had been transcribed, as those by the Earl of Hardwicke had been into the Onslow copy. Now apart from actual testimony, that the omissions were not confined to the first volume, it appeared extremely probable to us, that in

proportion as the history drew nearer to their own times, the caution which dictated these omissions to the editors would acquire additional motives, and that as many, if not more, instances of suppression would be found to occur in the second volume.

We had therefore recourse to that noble repository of literature and science, the British Museum, of which the Cotton Library, as is generally known, forms a constituent part. Henry Ellis, Esq., one of the librarians of that institution, very obligingly complied with our request to make the requisite search for this MS. and he subsequently reported, that, after the most accurate examination, it did not appear that it had ever been deposited in the library. He added, that 'several collections of folio papers, written in various hands, and at different times, contained an imperfect copy of Bishop Burnet's History of his Own Times, with many variations from the printed editions. That some memorandums on a single sheet at the beginning of this book, dated July 1699, are probably in the bishop's hand, as are also many corrections in the history. Finally, that Dr. Gifford has written several useful remarks in the volume; among which is one, that "from many particulars it appears, that the printed editions are not taken from these loose papers: yet that though there is great variety of expression, the substance is generally the same."' This is the account with which we were favoured by Mr. Ellis. It should be further observed, that the well-known fire, by which the Cotton Library suffered considerable injury, happened in 1731, three years before the promise was publicly given of depositing the original MS. in that library.

These circumstances considered, it is probable, that the same reasons which induced the editor or editors to omit certain passages in both volumes of the work, finally

determined them, although pointedly expostulated with on the subject, to relinquish their purpose of placing the original MS. in an accessible library. It deserves notice, that in page 8 of the second letter addressed by Mr. Beach to Thomas Burnet, Esq., the writer asserts, that he had in his own possession an authentic and complete collection of the castrations. See Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes*, vol. i. p. 285. It is added by Beach, as we have been informed by a gentleman who inspected this second letter to the younger Burnet, as well as Sinclair's Remarks on the first letter, that these passages were also in the hands of several persons of distinction[1]. After all, we are induced by our recollection of the restored passages to think, that although they were unjustifiably omitted, because against the author's express injunctions in his last will, yet that it was not done by the editors through party considerations, but from a desire of abating the displeasure certain to be conceived against their father, by the friends or relations of those who suffered by the severity of his censure. The editors appear to have consulted their own feelings, in the omission of several traits in the character given by him of his uncle Warriston.

But it must not be omitted, that previously to the first publication of this work in 1724, some extracts from the former part of it, confessed to have been surreptitiously obtained during the author's life, were actually printed; none of which appear either in the edited work, or amongst the suppressed, and now restored passages of the first

---

[1] In Beach's first Letter, as we have found since the first publication of this Preface, are inserted between twenty and thirty of the omitted passages, all of them the same as those in the Onslow copy of Burnet, and all likewise confined to the first volume in folio, although the Letter was published in the year 1736 after the appearance of the second volume. The same is the case with Bowyer's copy of the omitted passages, now in the Bodleian Library. R.

volume[1]. In a tract found in the British Museum by a gentleman, who has done much for the literary history of this country, Dr. Philip Bliss, Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, four passages are brought forward by the author of it, purporting to be extracts from Burnet's history. The title of the pamphlet is, *A specimen of the Bishop of Sarum's Posthumous History of the Affairs of the Church and State of Great Britain during his life.* By Robert Elliot, M.A., 3rd ed. London. 8vo, without date[2]. The publisher in his Preface says that he received the contents, consisting of extracts from Burnet's history, and copious remarks upon them, from Mr. Elliot, a deprived episcopal clergyman of Scotland. The extracts are asserted to have been privately made by Elliot, whilst employed together with others in transcribing a manuscript of the work lent by the author to Lord W. P. (perhaps Lord William Paulett). In support of the credibility of the account, it may be observed, that Lord Dartmouth, in a note at page 6, vol. i, mentions an offer made to himself by the author, of inspecting his history; a favour, his lordship adds, which the bishop had conferred on several others. Of these four extracts, the first is a relation of the murder of Archbishop Sharp, and although it agrees in substance with that in the edited copy, yet is much altered in point of expression. The three others contain very severe and acrimonious reflections on the English clergy.

It is observable, that in the Preface by Dr. Hickes to Three Treatises republished by him in 1709—some years before the death of Bishop Burnet—a part of the fourth

[1] Cockburn, *Specimen of Remarks*, 64, says that nine or ten years before 1724 portions of the History were in various hands; and that the Preface was written in 1705. From *infra*, 53, it would appear that the early portion of the work was written about or shortly after the publication of Clarendon's first volume, 1702.

[2] The first edition of this pamphlet appeared in the year 1715. R.

and last of these extracts is given in the very words produced by Elliot; and that Hickes says, he had seen a short specimen of the bishop's *anecdot*, perhaps communicated to him by this clergyman [1].

Dr. Bliss is of opinion, in case these extracts are authentic, that they were taken from a copy of Burnet's work in its first state, and before he altered, revised, and softened it. That they are genuine, many internal marks of authenticity lead us to suppose; over and above the circumstance, that, when Elliot, after finishing his extracts, proceeds to set down what he recollects of the substance of nine or ten other passages of the work, all that he produces has a perfect agreement with what was afterwards published as the bishop's. It is proper to remark in this place, that no additional charge of suppression or alteration can fairly be brought against the editors of Burnet's history in consequence of these extracts produced by Elliot, as they were made during the author's life, whilst he had the power of altering and revising his own work. On the other hand, against any suggestion, that the passages restored by us to the text had been in a similar way expunged or altered by the author himself, may be adduced the express testimony above referred to, that many things in the copy from which his work was printed, were omitted by the editors in both the volumes [2].

Before this account of the suppressed passages is entirely concluded, we shall take notice, that amongst those which are restored, there is one, in vol. i. p. 544, containing a

---

[1] This part of the last extract appears also in a tract entitled, *Speculum Sarisburianum*, printed in 1714, the last year of the bishop's life. It should seem too, that the celebrated Leslie had previously in one of his publications taken notice of some of Elliot's extracts, shown him perhaps in MS. R.

[2] Compare Beach's *Second Letter to Thomas Burnet, Esq.*, p. 13. R.

severe attack on the character of King Charles I, chiefly founded on that Prince's letters to the first Duke of Hamilton, and on Bishop Burnet's acquaintance with the Hamilton papers, the basis of his Memoirs of the two dukes of that family. In favour of the king it ought first to be stated, that the series of letters addressed to him by the marquis, afterwards duke, of Hamilton, appears to have formed no part of that collection of papers, Burnet having in his Memoirs inserted few or none of them. Again, that this nobleman so conducted himself in those unhappy times, that he was always suspected by the Royalists of treachery and treason against his benefactor and sovereign; and was even charged upon oath 'with having agents to raise vile reports to the dishonour of the king and queen, and their whole court, as if it was a sink of iniquity.' See, besides the histories of the times, two tracts, one entitled *Digitus Dei*, p. 6, and the other the *Practices of the Hamiltons*, p. 15, together with a note at page 60 [ed. 1896] of this first volume of Burnet. From this source apparently originated a report unfavourable to the character of the queen, whether true or untrue, which is mentioned in a note by the Earl of Dartmouth, vol. i. p. 66. Neither is any additional credit reflected on the Hamilton papers themselves, in case they contained, according to the assertion of some persons, the following incredible story. That in the year 1640 the king sent a warrant to Sir William Balfour, Lieutenant of the Tower of London, to execute immediately the Earl of Loudon for the crime of high treason, although, as it is well known it had formerly been pardoned in consequence of a general act of grace; which illegal warrant was to take effect without any previous trial; and that Charles was diverted from insisting on Balfour's obedience to the order, solely by the interference of the Marquis of Hamilton. See the Conclusion of Birch's

Inquiry into King Charles the First's Transactions with the Earl of Glamorgan, Second Edition, where this tale is brought forward against the king[1]. Let the Duke of Hamilton however be heard in his own defence, and at the same time in behalf of his royal master. In his speech before his execution, this nobleman has the following expressions. 'I take God to witness, that I have constantly been a faithful subject and servant to his late majesty, in spite of all malice and calumny. I have had the honour since my childhood to attend and be near him, till now of late, and during all that time I observed in him as eminent virtues and as little vice, as in any man I ever knew.' Burnet's *Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton*, p. 398.

3. Thus much concerning the restored passages. To the notes of the Earls of Dartmouth and Hardwicke, Speaker Onslow, and Dean Swift, several others have been added, for the purpose of correction, and of fuller illustration. They are drawn principally from the professed answerers of Burnet, from the historians of particular

---

[1] Since the former edition of this Preface, it has been found, that the above relation had previously appeared in Oldmixon's *History of the Stuarts*, and that Brodie, in his *History of the British Empire*, vol. ii. p. 516, professes his belief in its authenticity, although he originally thought it untrue; grounding, he says, his opinion, as Birch had done before him, on Scott's *Staggering State of the Scotch Statesmen*, which was first published in the year 1754, but written by one, as Brodie remarks, employed by King Charles I and his father. It appears, indeed, that the author of this tract, a favourer of the covenanters, had heard of and credited the report; but had it been true, all England in those days would have rung with it, as Sir William Balfour, to whom the warrant is said to have been sent, was afterwards a distinguished commander in the parliament army. Consult also a work lately published, abounding in curious investigation, D'Israeli's *Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles the First*, vol. iv, ch. xi, p. 357–361. It is however possible, that the Marquis of Hamilton might himself add terror to allurement, when he brought over the Earl of Loudon to the king's interests. We have just seen, with some surprise, a learned and sagacious writer expressing very lately his opinion in favour of the truth of this narration. R.

periods of our history, writers of memoirs and of scarce tracts, and occasionally from manuscript authorities. They were selected and appended to the text, whilst the press was going on, in the course of the last year; and will, it is hoped, as well as the strictures on some doctrines and opinions in the other annotations, appear to owe their situation in the following pages to a zeal for truth, sincere, at least, however mistaken. All these notes are interspersed with the others, and included within a parenthesis [1].

It is proper to apprise the reader, that Ralph's History of the three first reigns contained in Bishop Burnet's work, namely, those of Charles II, James II, and King William, was not procured for consultation before some part of the reign of James II was already printed. But this circumstance appeared afterwards to be of less consequence than the perusal of the latter part of the same history caused us to apprehend. This historian has obtained from Mr. Fox the praise of impartiality; which he well deserves [2].

It should also be here acknowledged, that a statement in Bishop Burnet's work at pp. 31, 32 of the first volume, ought to have been corrected from the Earl of Cromarty's *Account of the Conspiracies of the Earls of Gowry*, published before Burnet's death in the year 1713. The bishop affirms, that the last Earl of Gowry was descended through a daughter of Lord Methuen, from Margaret, daughter of

[1] The number of these notes has been considerably increased in consequence of the perusal of additional authorities, many of them contemporary works lately brought to light, and of the still inedited letters of the Archbishops Sharp, Burnett, and Boyle, addressed to Archbishop Sheldon. These letters were not long since in the possession of Sir John English Dolben, baronet, a descendant from a brother of the last mentioned prelate, but are now deposited in the Bodleian Library. Some notes also, illustrative of historical facts, have been selected from the vituperative remarks written by Cole the antiquary in a copy of Burnet's History preserved in the same library. R.

[2] Some references to the former part of Ralph's History have now been added. R.

King Henry the Seventh, although this king's daughter had in reality no issue, but what died in infancy, by her third husband, Henry, Lord Methuen, whom our author erroneously calls Francis Steward, father of a Lord Methuen. Gowry's grandmother was daughter of Henry, Lord Methuen, by his second wife, a daughter of the Earl of Athol, married to him after Margaret the Queen Dowager of Scotland's death. See the Earl of Cromarty's *Account*, pp. 8–12. As in this case the Earl of Gowry had no well-founded claim to the succession of the crown of England, if King James of Scotland were removed out of the way, he could scarcely be influenced by any such claim to attempt the assassination of that prince, according to the bishop's surmize, not sanctioned, as he himself owns, by any other historian.

On the other hand a confirmation of our author's testimony has lately occurred, and the question, so ably discussed by sergeant Heywood in his Vindication of Fox's Historical Work, as to the conduct of General Monck during the pending trial of the Marquis of Argyle, has been finally set at rest. It now appears, on the authority of Sir George Mackenzie, one of the assigned defenders of the marquis, that Monck, when 'advertised of the scantiness of the probation,' did actually transmit to Scotland several official letters formerly received by him from the marquis for the purpose of procuring that nobleman's condemnation. See vol. i. p. 225, and Sir George Mackenzie's *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland*, just published [1821], p. 4.

In printing the text of Burnet, the first edition has been followed, and the alterations of his style in those subsequent have been neglected. It is true, that in the title-page of the octavo edition printed in 1755, the whole work is said to have been revised and corrected by the editor, the bishop's son; but allowing this, the original MS. was still

further departed from, than even in the folio edition. The few alterations which occur in the editor's Life of his father have been adopted.

The Index to the text of Burnet has been improved by Dr. Bliss, whose name we have already had occasion to mention; the other Index to the principal contents of the notes was entirely prepared by that gentleman[1].

The author finished his history of the reigns of Charles II and James II about the beginning of the eighteenth century; that of the reign of William, and of the former part of Queen Anne's reign in 1710. The continuation of the work to the conclusion of peace in 1713 was completed by him in that year; less than two years before his death. The present year 1823 is nearly the hundredth since the publication of the first volume in folio, comprising the two first reigns above mentioned, together with a summary of public affairs before the restoration. It appears to have excited more interest than the second volume, which followed in 1734, after an interval of ten years. But this is by no means to be wondered at, if besides taking into account the author's frequent relations in the subsequent volume of military and foreign affairs, amusive indeed, but brief and perfunctory, we consider the diminished influence of the good or ill qualities of individuals on the public events and transactions of this latter period.

The great influence which personal character had formerly on events, together with other causes, occasions the reign of Charles the First, in which the contest for political power commenced, to form the most interesting period of English history, whether we are disposed to triumph with the conquering party, or to espouse and commiserate the cause of high honour and suffering loyalty. The frequent

[1] It has now been augmented on account of the additional matter. R. The Text Index is often incorrect, and in many respects is quite inadequate.

and remarkable changes of government during the interregnum, as well as the singular and energetic character of the protector Cromwell, secure the attention of every reader. The disputes, which afterwards arose between an unprincipled, but good-humoured monarch, regardless alike of his own honour and the national interest, and a restless, violent, and merciless faction, are subjects of deep concern, on account of their melancholy results. At the same time, the mind feels consolation in the virtues of Ormond, Clarendon, and Southampton. And, notwithstanding the enormities of courtiers and anticourtiers, we reflect with pleasure on the freedom then first securely enjoyed, from every species of arbitrary taxation, and from extrajudicial imprisonment; on the provision made for the meeting of parliament once in three years at the least; in a word, on the possession of a constitution, which King William admired so much, that he professed himself afraid to improve it. The gloom of the next reign, ruined as its prospects were by folly and oppression, and finally closed by means of intrigue, falsehood, and intimidation, is in part enlivened by a view of the courageous and disinterested conduct of Sancroft, Hough, Dundee, Craven, and several others. Some of these persons, desirous of a parliamentary redress of grievances, thought, that instead of the force put upon the person of the king, an accommodation might and ought to have been effected with him; as he had a little before, when threatened with the just and open hostility of his subjects for his perversion of the law, and maintenance of a standing army, made very important concessions. Yet it may reasonably be doubted, whether a composition with a prince of his disposition and feeble judgement, whatever good qualities he was otherwise possessed of, would eventually have been lasting, or even reducible to practice. It was remarked, that the appeal made by him to his subjects

immediately after his retreat to another country, was signed by a secretary of state employed contrary to the intent at least of law.

Times had now passed, which were chequered with great virtues and great vices: but the reigns of William and Anne exhibit to the reader one uniform scene of venality and corruption; and the mind, instead of being interested, is disgusted with the contests of two parties for the government of the country, assuming, as it best suited their selfish purposes, each other's principles. The long contemplated change in the executive government was at length effected; its power being virtually transferred to combinations of persons possessed of great influence in parliamentary elections, and in parliament itself. Hence what has been called the practice of the constitution differed widely from its theory; and to this depression of the crown and of its direct power, occasioned by the almost constant sitting of parliament, were added maxims annihilating the will of the single person, and, in conjunction with other causes, finally subversive of all dutiful and affectionate attachment to authority. These maxims, not recognized as constitutional by Clarendon, Hale, or Locke, were advanced in order to colour and justify the alteration. A wider and more extensive field was now opened for the exertion of talents, contributing to the advancement of the individual, but often more hurtful than useful to the public. In these reigns also, contrary to every principle of justice, were laid the deep and broad foundations of a debt, which no other than the political system then adopted could have entailed on a nation. It ought still however to be remembered, that at, or soon after the revolution, a solemn recognition was made of the liberties of Englishmen; the power of dispensing with the laws was abrogated in all cases; the judges ceased to be dismissed at the sole

pleasure of the crown; a provision was made against the long continuance of parliaments; freedom of religious worship was secured to the great body of protestant dissenters; the important and necessary measure of a union with Scotland was effected; the liberty of the press established; trials for treason better regulated; and a more exact and impartial administration of justice generally introduced in the kingdom. These blessings, and all our constitutional rights, may God's providence, and a virtuous and independent spirit, preserve. Let us venerate the source of our freedom and happiness, the legal monarchy of England, supporting it, when outraged by venal and prodigal factions, or threatened with subversion by reckless and usurping demagogues.

M. J. R.

1702 MS. 1.

THE HISTORY OF MY OWN TIME

THE PREFACE.

I AM now beginning to review and write over again the History of my own time, which I first undertook twenty years ago[1], and have been continuing it from year to year ever since: and [a] I see some reason to review it all. I had while I was very young a greater knowledge of affairs than is usual at that age; for my father, who had been engaged in great friendships with men of both sides, living then retired from all business, as he took my education wholly into his own hands, so he took a sort of pleasure to relate to me the series of all public affairs. And as he was a man so eminent for probity and true piety that I had all reason to believe him, so I saw such an impartial sense of things in him, that I had as little reason to doubt his judgment as his sincerity. For though he adhered so firmly to the king and his side that he was the singular instance in Scotland of a man of some note, who, from the beginning to the end of the war, never once owned or submitted to the new forms of government set up all that

[a] *now* struck out.

[1] This history he writ some time before the year 1705, but how long, he has not any where told; only it appears it was then finished, because in the beginning of the reign of King William and Queen Mary he dates the continuation of his history on the first day of May, 1705. ORIGINAL EDITORS. See Preface to the 1823 edition.

while, yet he did very freely complain of the errors of the king's government, and of the bishops of Scotland. So that upon this foundation I set out first to look into the secret conduct of affairs among us.

I fell into great acquaintance and friendships with several persons who either were or had been ministers of state, from whom, when the secret of affairs was over, I studied to know as many particulars as I could draw from them [1]. I saw a great deal more among the papers of the dukes of Hamilton than was properly a part of their Memoirs, or fit to be told at that time: for when a licence was to be obtained, and a work was to be published fit for that family to own, things foreign to their ministry, or hurtful to any other families, were not to be intermixed with the account I then gave of the late wars. And now for above thirty years I have lived in such intimacy with all who have had the chief conduct of affairs, and have been so much trusted [a] and on so many important occasions employed by them, that I have been able to penetrate far into the true secrets of [b] counsels and designs.

This made me twenty years ago write down a relation of all that I had known to that time: where I was in the dark, I past over all, and only opened those transactions that I had particular occasions to know. My chief design in writing was to give a true view of men and of [c] counsels, leaving public transactions [d] to gazettes and the public historians of the times [d]. I writ with a design to make both my self and my readers wiser and better, and to lay open the good and the bad of all sides and parties, as clearly and impartially as I my self understood it, concealing nothing that I thought fit to be known, and representing things in their natural colours without art or disguise, without any regard to kindred or friends, to parties or interests.

[a] *by them* struck out. [b] councills. [c] councills.
[d] originally, *to be found in Gazettes and the common historians.*

[1] See Cockburn, *Specimen of Remarks, &c.*, p. 66, for Burnet's industry in acquiring information; and *infra*, 358.

For I do solemnly say this to the world, and make my humble appeal upon it to the great God of truth, that I tell the truth on all occasions, as fully and freely as I upon my best inquiry have been able to find it out; [a] where things appear doubtful, I deliver them with the same incertainty to the world.

Some may perhaps think, that, instead of favouring my own profession, I have been more severe upon them than was needful. But my zeal for the true interests of religion and of the clergy made me more careful to undeceive good and well meaning men of my own order and profession for the future, and to deliver them from common prejudices and mistaken notions, than to hide or excuse the faults of those who will be perhaps gone off the stage before this work appears on it. I have given the characters of men very [b] impartially and copiously [b]; for nothing guides one's judgment more truly in a [c] relation of matters of fact than the knowing the tempers and principles of the chief actors [1].

If I have dwelt too long on the affairs of Scotland, some allowance is to be made to the affection all men bear to their native country [2]. I alter nothing of what I wrote in

[a] *and* struck out. [b] originally, *fully and freely.* [c] *copious* struck out.

---

[1] Bishop Burnet was a man of the most extensive knowledge I ever met with; had read and seen a great deal, with a prodigious memory, and a very indifferent judgment: he was extremely partial, and readily took every thing for granted that he heard to the prejudice of those he did not like: which made him pass for a man of less truth than he really was. I do not think he designedly published any thing he believed to be false. He had a boisterous vehement manner of expressing himself, which often made him ridiculous, especially in the house of lords, when what he said would not have been thought so, delivered in a lower voice, and a calmer behaviour. His vast knowledge occasioned his frequent rambling from the point he was speaking to, which ran him into discourses of so universal a nature, that there was no end to be expected but from a failure of his strength and spirits, of both which he had a larger share than most men; which were accompanied with a most invincible assurance. DARTMOUTH.

[2] Swift's criticism was to call Burnet's book the 'History of (Scotland in) my Own Time.' See Cockburn, 68.

the first draught of this work, only I have left out a great deal that was personal to my self, and to those I am descended from: so that this is upon the matter the same work, with very little change made in it.

I [a] look on the perfecting of this work, and the carrying it on through the remaining part of my life, as the greatest service I can do both to God and to the world; and there-
MS. 2. fore I set about it | with great care and caution. For I reckon a lie in history to be as much a greater sin than a lie in common discourse, as the one is like to be more lasting and more generally known than the other. I find that the long experience I have had of the baseness, the malice, and the falsehood of mankind, has inclined me to be apt to think generally the worst both of men and of parties: and indeed the peevishness, [b] the ill nature, and the ambition of many hot clergymen, has sharpened my spirit perhaps too much against them: so I warn my reader to take all that I say on these heads with some grains of allowance, though I have watched over my self and my pen so carefully that I hope there is no great occasion for this apology.

I have shewed this [c] history to several of my friends [1], who were either very partial to me, or they esteemed that this work (chiefly when it should be over and over again retouched and polished [2] by me [3], which very probably

[a] *reckon* struck out. [b] *the meanness* struck out. [c] originally *work*.

[1] He offered to shew it to me, which I avoided, knowing it was a favour he had granted to several others, and if any part of it had been published before its time, he might have thought it came from me: though he was so civil as to tell me I would be the last he should suspect; and whenever I did read it, I should find accounts both of persons and things, that I did not expect from him; but truth, he said, must be followed by an historian, wherever it led him. D.

[2] Rarely polished; I never read so ill a style. S. See Editor's Preface (ed. 1823). 'Perfect, requiring no mending' is the verdict of C. J. Fox. The 'vain solemnity' of Burnet's Preface is commented upon in an anonymous *Review of Burnet's History*, 1724, p. 3.

[3] I do not know who his friends were, or how partial they might be, but I believe generally people will be of opinion that this is the worst of his performances; in most others that are of any value, the materials

I shall be doing as long as I live[1]) might prove of some use to the world. I have on design avoided all laboured periods or artificial strains, and have writ in as clear and plain a style as was possible, choosing rather a copious enlargement than a dark conciseness.

And now, O my God, the God of my life and of all my mercies, I offer up this work to Thee, to whose honour it is chiefly intended; that thereby I may awaken the world to just reflections on their own errors and follies, and call on them to acknowledge thy providence, to adore it, and ever to depend on it.

were ready furnished, and he had only the putting of them together; in this, which is entirely his own, he has exposed his excessive partiality, and great want of judgment. D.

[1] Mr. Secretary Johnston, who was his intimate friend and near relation, told me, that after a debate in the house of lords he usually went home, and altered every body's character, as they had pleased or displeased him that day. D.

THE HISTORY

OF

MY OWN TIME

THE

HISTORY OF MY OWN TIME

BOOK I.

A summary recapitulation of the state of affairs in Scotland, both in Church and State, from the beginning of the troubles to the restoration of K. Charles the second, 1660[1].

CHAPTER I.

TO THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I.

THE mischiefs of civil wars are so great and lasting, and the effects of ours branching [a] themselves out by many accidents that were not thought on at first, much less intended, into such mischievous consequences, [that] I have thought it an enquiry that might be of great use both to prince and people, to look carefully into the first beginnings and occasions of them, to observe their progress, and the errors of both hands, the provocations that were given, and the jealousies that were raised by these, together with the excesses into which both sides have run by turns. And though the wars be over long ago, yet [b] since they have left among us so many seeds [b] of lasting feuds and animosities, which upon every turn are apt to ferment and to break out [c] anew, it will be an useful as well as a pleasant enquiry

CHAP. I.

6

[a] *them* struck out; *themselves* interlined. [b] substituted for *so many scars still remain, which as they are the remembrances of what is past, so they the seeds.* [c] *of* struck out.

[1] The last part of this Book—chapter v in the present arrangement—which deals with Cromwell in England, would appear from this heading to have been an afterthought.

CHAP. I. to look back to the first original of them, and to observe by what degrees and accidents they gathered strength, and at last broke forth into such a flame.

The Reformation of Scotland was popular and parliamentary: the crown was during that time either on the head of a queen that was absent, or of a king that was an infant. During his minority matters were carried on by the several regents, so as was most agreeable to the prevailing humour of the nation. But when king James grew
1587. to be of age, he found two parties in the kingdom: the one was of those who wished well to the interests of the queen his mother, then a prisoner in England; these were either professed papists, or men believed to be indifferent as to all religions: the rest were her inveterate enemies, zealous for the Reformation, and fixed in a dependence on the crown of England [a] and a jealousy of France [a]. When that king saw that those who were most in his interests were likewise jealous of his authority, [b] and apt to encroach upon it [b], he hearkened first to the insinuations of his mother's party, who were always infusing in him a jealousy of these his friends, and saying, that by ruining his mother and setting him in her room while a year old, they had ruined monarchy, and made the crown subject and precarious, and had put him in a very unnatural posture of being seised of his mother's crown while she was in exile and a prisoner; adding, that he was but a king in name, the power being in the hands of those who were under the management of the queen of England.

Their insinuations would have been of less force if the House of Guise [1], who were his cosin-germans, had not been then engaged in great designs, of transferring the crown of France from the House of Bourbon to themselves; in order to which it was necessary to embroil England, and to draw the king of Scotland into their interests. So under the pretence of keeping up the old alliances between

[a] interlined. [b] interlined.

[1] His grandmother, Mary, the wife of James V, was the sister of Francis, Duke of Guise, and of Charles, cardinal of Lorraine.

France and Scotland, they sent creatures of their own to be ambassadors there; and they also sent a graceful young man[1], who, as he was the king's nearest kinsman by his father, was of so agreeable a temper that he became his favourite, and was made by him duke of Lennox. He was known to be a papist, though he pretended he changed his religion, and became in profession a protestant. CHAP. I. 1579. 7

| The court of England discovered all these artifices of the Guisians, who were then the most implacable enemies of the Reformation, and were managing all that train of plots against queen Elizabeth that in conclusion proved fatal to the queen of Scots. And when the English ministers saw the inclinations of the young king lay so strongly that way that all their applications to gain him were ineffectual, they infused such a jealousy of him into all their party in Scotland, that both nobility and clergy were much alarmed at it. MS. 3.

But king James learnt early that piece of kingcraft[2],

[1] Esmé Stuart, third son of John, Sieur d'Aubigny. John was brother to Matthew, fourth Earl of Lennox, who was the husband of Margaret Douglas, daughter of the Earl of Angus and Margaret Tudor. Esmé was thus first cousin of Darnley, James's father. He arrived in Scotland in 1579, and acted under the direction of the Duke of Guise. Although a Catholic, he was allowed to pretend to be a Protestant, and this he did successfully to his death, actually subscribing the Confession of Faith in August 1580, and March $158\frac{8}{1}$. He was created Earl of Lennox in March $157\frac{7}{8}$; and, after the death of Morton, of which he was the author, Duke of Lennox. Driven from Scotland in Dec. 1583, he died in Paris in the following year. See Spottiswoode (1851 ed.), 324, from which it appears that James believed, or wished it thought that he believed, in Lennox's protestantism at his death, and Bevill Higgons, *Remarks on Bishop Burnet's History*, 315–320. The danger of his influence over James was fully recognized by the English ministers. *Hatfield MSS.*, parts ii, iii, in the *H. M. C. Reports*.

[2] A mean expression, often made use of by King James the First, though little to the reputation of his integrity or understanding, but suitable to the pedantic education they had given him in his youth; which the Earl of Marr told me was done designedly, to make him contemptible both at home and abroad: and that George Buchanan said, he would take care to make him the lively image of his mother. D. A similar charge was made regarding Mazarin and Louis XIV, and regarding John de Witt and William of Orange; and it was doubtless no more true in this case than in those. Dartmouth, in his note above, imports into the word 'Kingcraft' a suggestion of trickery, which it does not properly imply; cf. *infra* 9, note.

CHAP. I. of disguising, or at least denying, every thing that was observed in his behaviour that gave offence.

The main instance in which the French management appeared was, that he could not be prevailed on to enter into any treaty of marriage. It was not safe to talk of marrying a papist; and as long as the duke of Guise lived, the king, though then three and twenty, and the only person of his family, would hearken to no proposition for marrying a protestant.

1588. But when the duke of Guise was killed at Blois, and that
1589. Henry the third was murdered soon after, so that Henry the fourth came in his room, king James was no more in a French management: so presently after he married a
Nov. 23, 1589. daughter of Denmark, and ever after that he was wholly managed by queen Elizabeth and her ministers[1]. I have seen many letters among Walsingham's papers that discover the commerce between the House of Guise and him [king James]; but the most valuable of these is a long paper of instructions to one sir Richard Wigmore[2], a great man for hunting and for all such sports, to which king James was out of measure addicted[3]. The queen affronted him publicly, upon which he pretended he could live no

[1] Not before 1601. *Correspondence of James VI with Sir R. Cecil* (ed. Bruce, Camden Soc.), Introd. James's wife was Anne, daughter of Frederick II of Denmark. Upon the importance of this marriage, see Ranke, *Hist. Engl.* i. 367.

[2] This is doubtless the paper of instructions 'in his secret employment into Scotland upon the execution of the Queen of Scots, the ... of May, A.D. 1588.' *Harley MSS.* 290 ff. 248–256; *Cotton MSS. Caligula D.* i. f. 160; *Titus C.* vii, f. 149. Welwood had also seen the paper. See his *Memoirs* (1700), 9, 'Sir F. Walsingham gives him above ten sheets of paper of instructions, all writ with his own hand, which I have read in the Cotton Library.' Wigmore lived in close companionship with James for nine or ten years without raising any suspicion that he was a spy. There are letters from Wigmore to Cecil in the *Hatfield MSS.* part iii, 434, 435, 460, and in the *Salisbury MSS.*, *H. M. C. Report*, iii.

[3] See many amusing instances of this in the *Hamilton MSS.*, *H. M. C. Report*, xi, App. part vi; especially 67. Welwood, 35, asserts that 'his standish, his bottle, and his hunting, were all he cared for.' There is a long and brilliant character-sketch of James in a letter from Fontenay, an agent of Mary in James's court, to Nau, her secretary. *Hatfield MSS.* part iii. 47, August 15, 1584. Froude, *Hist. Engl.* xi. 457 (sm. ed.).

longer in England, and therefore withdrew to Scotland. But all this was a contrivance of Walsingham's, who thought him a fit person to get into that king's favour: so that affront was designed to give him the more credit. He was very particularly instructed in all the proper methods to gain upon the king's confidence, and to observe and give an account of all he saw in him: which he did very faithfully. By these instructions it appears that Walsingham thought that king was either inclined to turn papist or to be of no religion. And when the court of England saw that they could not depend on him, they raised all possible opposition to him in Scotland, infusing strong jealousies into those who were enough inclined to receive them. CHAP. I.

This is the great defect that runs through archbishop Spotswood's history[1], where much of the rude opposition that king met with, particularly from the assemblies of the Kirk, is set forth; but the true ground of all the jealousies they were possessed with is suppressed by him. After his marriage the king studied to remove these suspicions all that was possible; and he granted the Kirk all the laws they desired, and got his temporal authority to be better established than it was before: yet as the jealousies of his fickleness in religion were never quite removed, so [a]the party gave him[a] many new disgusts: this wrought in him a most inveterate hatred of presbytery and of the power of the Kirk; and he, fearing an opposition in his succeeding to the crown of England from the popish party, which, though it had little strength in the House of Commons, yet was very great in the House of Lords, and was very considerable in all the northern parts, and among the body of the people, employed several persons who were known to 8

[a] altered from, *so they raised.*

[1] '*The History of the Church of Scotland, beginning the year of our Lord, 203, and continued to the end of the reign of King James VI of ever blessed memory*, &c., written by that grave and reverend prelate and wise counsellor, John Spotswood, Lord Archbishop of St. Andrews and Privy Councillor to King Charles the First.' London, 1665. Spottiswoode died in 1639. The work has since been republished by the Spottiswoode Society, 1851, edited by Dr. Russell, Bishop of Glasgow.

CHAP. I. be papists, though they complied outwardly. The chief of these were Elphinstone, secretary of state, whom he made lord Balmerino, and Seaton, afterwards chancellor and earl of Dunfermline; by their means he studied to assure the papists that he would connive at them. A letter was also writ to the pope by him, giving him assurance of this, which when it came to be published by Bellarmine, upon the prosecution of the recusants after the discovery of the gunpowder plot, Balmerino did affirm that he out of zeal to the king's service got his hand to it, having put it in [a]the bundle[a] of papers that were signed in course, without the king's knowing any thing of it[1]. Yet when that discovery drew no other severity on the secretary, but the turning him
1609. out of office, and the passing a sentence condemning him to die for it (which was presently pardoned, and he was after a short confinement restored to his liberty), all men believed that the king knew of the letter, and that the pretended confession of the secretary was only collusion to lay the jealousies of the king's favouring popery, which still hung upon him, notwithstanding his writing on the Revelation, and his affecting to enter on all occasions into controversy, asserting in particular that the pope was antichrist.

[b]As he took these methods to manage the popish party, he was much more careful to secure to himself the body of the English nation. Cecil, afterwards earl of Salisbury, secretary to queen Elizabeth, entered into a particular con-
1601-1603. fidence with him: and this was managed by his ambassador
9 Bruce[2], a younger brother of a noble family in Scotland,

[a] altered from, *a croud* and *a company*. [b] *But* struck out.

[1] Mr. S. R. Gardiner has convinced himself of the truth of Balmerino's statement, *Hist. of Engl.* i. 81 note, ii. 32. See especially *H. M. C. Rep.* iii. 55.

[2] Edward Bruce, titular abbot of Kinloss, an eminent Scotch lawyer, second son of Sir Edward Bruce, and grandson of Sir David Bruce of Clackmannan, was lineally descended from Robert de Bruce, cousin of David II; he was born about 1549. In 1601 he went with the Earl of Mar on an embassy to Elizabeth. He then became Cecil's correspondent with James, 1602. In 1603 he was made Master of the Rolls and Baron Bruce of Kinloss; and died in 1611. *Corresp. of James VI with Sir R. Cecil*, Introd. I am not aware of any evidence supporting Burnet's statement regarding an 'engage-

who carried | the matter with such address and secrecy, that all the great men of England, without knowing of one another's doing it, and without the queen's suspecting any thing concerning it, signed in writing an engagement to assert and stand by the king of Scots right of succession. This great service was rewarded by making him Master of the Rolls, and a peer of Scotland: and as the king did raise Cecil and his friends to the greatest posts and dignities, so he [a] raised Bruce's family here in England [1].

When that king came to the crown of England he discovered his inveterate hatred to the Scottish Kirk on many occasions, in which he gratified his resentment without consulting his interests [2]. He ought to have put his utmost strength to the finishing what he did but faintly begin for [b] the union of both kingdoms, which was lost by his unreasonable partiality in pretending that Scotland ought to be considered in this union as the third part of the isle of Great Britain, if not more [3]: so high a demand ruined the design. 1603.

[a] *very much* struck out. [b] substituted for, *in order to.*

ment.' See Salmon's *Examination*, 306. It should be remembered that by an arrangement made at Berwick on July 2, 1586, James received a pension of £4,000 a year, and there was a tacit engagement that, so long as he was loyal to England, his claims to the succession would be recognized. Froude, xii. 133.

[1] Robert Cecil, great-grandson to the first Earl of Salisbury, told me that his ancestor inquiring into the character of King James, Bruce's answer was, 'Ken ye a John Ape? en I's have him, he'l bite *you*: en you's have him, he'l bite *me*.' D. Compare Ralph, i. 499, note [quoted from Ferguson's 'Second Letter to a person of honour,' which was written at the time of Charles II's declaration that he had not been married to Monmouth's mother; see Ferguson's *Robert Ferguson the Plotter*, 51] where Lord Burleigh's name instead of that of his son the Earl of Salisbury is brought forward on this occasion. R.

[2] The Earl of Seafield told me that King James frequently declared that he never looked upon himself to be more than King of Scotland in name, till he came to be King of England; but now, he said, one kingdom would help him to govern the other, or he had studied kingcraft [cf. *supra* 6, note] to very little purpose from his cradle to that time. D. He congratulated himself upon having exchanged the 'wild and unruly colt' for a 'towardly riding horse.' *Corresp. of James VI with Sir R. Cecil*, Introd. xlv. In Scotland he was 'a king without state, without honour, without order; where beardless boys (the Presbyterian ministers) would brave me to the face.'

[3] Gardiner, *Hist. of Engl.* i. 176, 328. There is no evidence for the statement in the text. The title of

CHAP. I. But when that failed him, he should then have studied to keep the affections of that nation firm to him: and certainly his being secured of that kingdom might have been so managed as to have prevented that disjointing which happened afterwards both in his own reign, and more tragically in his son's. He thought to effect this by his profuse bounty to many of the nobility of that kingdom, and to his domestic servants: but as most of these settling in England were of no further use to him in that design, so his setting up episcopacy in Scotland, and his constant aversion to the Kirk, how right soever it might be in itself, was a great error in policy; for the poorer that kingdom was, it was both the more easy to gain them, and the more dangerous to offend them. So the terror which the affections of the Scotch nation might have justly given the English was soon lost, by his engaging his whole government to support that which was then very contrary to the bent and genius of the nation.

But though he set up bishops, he had no revenues to give them but what he was to purchase for them. [a] During his minority, all the tithes and the church lands were vested in the crown: but this was only in order to the granting them away to the men that bore the chief sway[1]. It is true,
1587. when he came of age, he, according to the law of Scotland, past a general revocation of all that had been done in his infancy: and by this he could have resumed all those grants. He, and after him his son, succeeded in one part of his design: for by Act of Parliament[2] a court was erected that was to examine the state of the tithes in every parish, and to make a competent provision out of a third part to
10 those who served [b] the cure [b]; which had been reserved in the great alienation for the service of the church. This

[a] *for* struck out. [b] *them* interlined.

'King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c.' was assumed by James by proclamation on Oct. 20, 1604. Prothero, *Select Statutes and Documents of Elizabeth and James I*, 393.

[1] In 1587 all church lands not already inalienably in the hands of the nobles were annexed to the Crown. James gave them away lavishly.

[2] *Acts of Parliament of Scotland*, iii. 24, 90, 303, 546. The last of these, June 5, 1592, is a ratification of the Act made in February, 1587.

was carried at first to a proportion of about thirty pound a year, and was afterwards in his son's time raised to about fifty pound a year; which, considering the plenty, and way of living in that country, is a very liberal provision, and is equal in value to thrice that sum in the southern parts of England. [a] In this he had both the clergy and the body of the people on his side; but he could not so easily provide for the bishops. They were at first forced to hold their former cures, with some small addition.

But as they assumed at their first setting out little more authority than that of a constant president of the presbyters, so they met with much rough opposition. The king intended to carry on a conformity in matters of religion with England, and he began to buy in from the grantees many of the estates that belonged to the bishoprics. It was also enacted that a form of prayer should be drawn for Scotland: and the king was authorized to appoint the habits in which the divine offices were to be performed. Some of the chief holydays were ordered to be observed; the sacrament was to be received kneeling, and to be given to the sick. Confirmation was enacted; as also the use of the cross in baptism. These things [1] were first past [b] in General Assemblies, which were composed of bishops and the deputies chosen by the clergy, who sat all in one house: and in it they reckoned the bishops only as single votes. Great opposition was made to all these steps: and the whole force [c] of the government was strained to carry elections to those meetings, or to take off those who were chosen; in which it was thought that no sort of practice was omitted. It was pretended that some were frighted, and others were corrupted.

The bishops themselves did their part very ill [2]. They generally grew haughty [d]: they neglected their functions, and

[a] *but* struck out. [b] substituted for *enacted.* [c] substituted for *business.* [d] *and disdainful, vain and luxurious* struck out.

[1] *Articles of Perth*, accepted by the Assembly, August 27, 1618; ratified by Parliament on Black Saturday, August 4, 1621.

[2] The use of the cross in baptism was not enacted. See Gardiner, i. 222–236.

CHAP. I. were often at court, and [a] lost all esteem [a] with the people. Some few that were stricter and more learned did lean so grossly to popery, that the [b] heat and violence of the Reformation became the main subject of their sermons and discourses. King James grew weary of this opposition, or was so apre-
MS. 5. hensive | of the ill effects that it might have, that, what through sloth or fear, and what by reason of the great disorder into which his ill conduct brought his affairs in England in his latter years, he went no further in his designs on Scotland.

He had three children. His eldest, prince Henry, was a prince of great hopes; but so very little like his father,
11 that he was rather feared than loved by him. He was so zealous a protestant, that, when his father was entertaining
1611. propositions of marrying him to popish princesses [1], once [c] to the archduchess, and at another time to a daughter of Savoy, he in a letter that he wrote to the king on the twenty-
1612. second of that October in which he died (the original of which sir William Cook shewed me), desired that if his father married him that way, it might be with the youngest person of the two, of whose conversion he might have hope, and that any liberty she might be allowed for her religion might be in the privatest manner possible. Whether this aversion to popery hastened his death or not, I cannot tell. [d] Colonel Titus [2] assured me that he had it from

[a] altered from *they lost all sort of esteem.* [b] *unjust* struck out.
[c] substituted for *sometimes.* [d] *but* struck out.

[1] Viz. the Infanta Anne and her sister Maria: the daughter of the Duke of Savoy; the two daughters of the Queen Regent of France; and one of the sisters of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Gardiner, *Hist. of Engl.* ii. 137, 153. Possibly the last was the 'Archduchess' of whom Burnet speaks. The only person who really bore that title in James's reign was the Infanta Isabella, married to the Archduke Charles Albert, in conjunction with whom she ruled the Netherlands. Cf. *infra* 83, note.

[2] There was really no mystery as to his death; he died of typhoid, Nov. 6, 1612, in his nineteenth year. See *The Illness and Death of Henry Prince of Wales—a historical case of typhoid fever;* by Norman Moore, M.D.; reprinted from the St. Bartholomew Hospital Reports, vol. xvii. For his character, see Gardiner, ii. 159, 347. The report of the doctors who were present at the post-mortem examination is in Birch's *Life of Henry Prince of Wales*, 1760, 359, and in Welwood, *Memoirs*, App. 233. Welwood was Physician to William III. Upon Titus, see *infra* 76, note.

king Charles the first's own mouth, that he was well assured of it that he was poisoned by the earl of Somerset's means. It is certain that from the time of the gunpowder plot king James was so struck with the terror of that danger he was then so near, that ever after he had no mind to provoke the Jesuits; for he saw what they were capable of.

And since I name that conspiracy which the papists in our days have had the impudence to deny[1], and to pretend it was an artifice of Cecil's to engage some desperate men into a plot, which he managed so that he could discover it when he pleased, I will mention what I my self saw, and had for some time in my possession. Sir Everard Digby [a] suffered for [a] that conspiracy: he was 1605. the father of the famous sir Kenelm Digby. [b] The family being ruined upon the death of sir Kenelm's son, [c] when the executors were looking out for writings to make out the title of the estates they were to sell[2], [d] and were directed by an old servant to a cupboard that was very artificially hid, in which some papers lay, that she had observed sir Kenelm was oft reading, they, looking into it, found a velvet bag, within which there were two other silk bags: (so carefully were those relics kept:) and there was within these a collection of all the letters that sir Everard writ during his imprisonment. In these he expresses great trouble, because he heard some of their friends blamed their undertaking: he highly magnifies it; and says, if he had many lives, he would willingly have sacrificed them all in carrying it on. [e] In one paper he says, they had taken that care that there

[a] *suffered for* (altered). [b] *and when* struck out. [c] substituted for *while*. [d] *they* struck out. [e] *and* struck out.

[1] See what Lord Stafford says of this plot, in his trial. O. Cobbett's *State Trials*, vol. vii. 1357.

[2] At Gothurst, near Newport Pagnell, in Bucks. *Cole's MS. note.* Everard Digby's *Letters and Poems* were first published in the appendix to *The Gunpowder Treason, reprinted in* 1679 *with a Preface by Thomas* [*Barlow*] *Lord Bishop of Lincoln.* They were found 'by us, Sir Rice Rudd, Bart., and William Wogan of Gray's Inn, about the month of September, 1675, at the house of Charles Cornwallis, Esq., executor of Sir Kenelm Digby, son and heir of the said Sir Everard, tied up in two silk bags;' *id.* 239. See also Jardine, *Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot*, 153.

CHAP. I. were not above two or three worth saving to whom they had not given notice to keep out of the way: and in none of those papers does he express any sort of remorse for that which he had been engaged in, and for which he suffered.

Upon the discovery of that plot, there was a general prosecution of all papists set on foot: but king James was very uneasy at it: which was much increased by what sir
12 Dudley Carleton told him upon his return from Spain, where he had been ambassador[1]; which I had from the lord Holles, who said to me that Carleton told it to himself, and was much troubled when he saw it had an effect contrary to what he had intended. When he came home, he found the king at Theobald's hunting in a very careless and unguarded manner: and upon that, [a] in order to the putting him [a] on a more careful looking to himself, he told the king he must either give over that way of hunting, or stop another hunting that he was engaged in, which was priest hunting: for he had intelligence in Spain that the priests were comforting themselves with this, that if he went on

[a] altered from *to put him.*

[1] Carleton was born 1573 and died 1632. There is no trace of his having been employed officially in Spain. In June, 1602, he accompanied Sir T. Parry, ambassador to France, as secretary; in 1603 he became private secretary to Henry, Earl of Northumberland, and in 1605 went with Lord Norris on a tour in Spain. In May, 1610, he was named ambassador to Brussels, but succeeded Sir H. Wootton instead at Venice between August and December; Winwood, *Memorials of State Affairs* (1725), iii. 213, 236. He was knighted in Sept. 1610, returned in 1615 after being instrumental in concluding the treaty of Asti, and in Jan. 161⅘ succeeded Winwood at the Hague, remaining there for five years; *Eglinton MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* x. 520–606. In 1625 he was again at the Hague with Buckingham. Upon his return he was made Vice-Chamberlain, and was placed on the Privy Council. He then went on a joint embassy with the Earl of Holland to France, returning March 162⅘. In May he was created Lord Carleton of Imbercourt. He again went to the Hague, remaining there for two years. On July 25, 1628, he became Viscount Dorchester, and, in December, Chief Secretary of State. Many of his Letters during the Venice embassy are in Winwood, iii. Those during his first embassy at the Hague were published in 1755 by the second Earl of Hardwicke; and those relating to the 1627 embassy by Sir T. Phillipps in 1841. See also *Cabala, sive Scrinia Sacra* (1654); Birch, *Court and Times of James I and Charles I*; Clarendon, *Rebellion* (ed. Macray, 1888), i. 141, 143; Carleton's *Negotiations* (ed. Sawyer, 1725).

against them they would soon get rid of him. Queen Elizabeth was a woman of form, and was always so well attended[a], that all their plots against her failed, and were never brought to any effect: but[b] a prince who was always in woods or forests would be easily overtaken. The king sent for him in private to inquire more particularly into this: and he saw it had made a great impression on him, but wrought otherwise than as he intended. For the king, resolving to gratify his humour in hunting, and in a careless and irregular way of life, did immediately order all that prosecution to be let fall. I have the minutes of the council books of the year 1606, which are full of orders to discharge and transport priests, sometimes ten in a day. From thence to his dying day he continued always writing and talking against popery, but acting for it. He married his only daughter to a protestant prince, one of the most zealous and sincerest, but one of the weakest, of them all, the elector palatine; upon which a great revolution happened in the affairs of Germany. The eldest branch of the house of Austria retained some of the impressions that their father Maximilian the second studied to infuse into them, who, as he was certainly one of the best and wisest princes of these latter ages, so he was unalterably fixed in his opinion against persecution for matters of conscience: his own sentiments were so very favourable to the protestant doctrine that he was thought inwardly theirs. His brother Charles of Gratz was on the other hand wholly managed by the Jesuits, was a zealous patron of theirs, and as zealously supported by them. Rodolph and Matthias[1] reigned one after another, but without issue; their brother Albert was then dying in Flanders: so Spain with the whole popish interest joined to advance Ferdinand, the son of Charles of Gratz: and he forced Matthias to resign the crown of Bohemia to him, and got himself to be elected king. But his government became quickly severe: he resolved to extirpate the protestants, and began to

CHAP. I.

1613.

MS. 6.

1617

[a] *on* struck out. [b] substituted for *one.*

[1] Rodolph and Matthias were the two elder sons of Maximilian.

CHAP. I. break through[a] the privileges that were secured to them by the laws of that kingdom.

13 This occasioned a general insurrection, which was followed
1618. by an assembly of the states, who, together with those of Silesia, Moravia, and Lusatia, joined in deposing Ferdinand: and they offered their crown first to the duke of
1619. Saxony, who refused it, and then to the elector palatine, who accepted of it, being encouraged to it by his two uncles, Maurice prince of Orange, and the duke of Bouillon. But he did not ask the advice of king James: he only gave him notice of it when he had accepted the offer. Here was the probablest occasion that has been offered since the Reformation for its full establishment.

The English nation was much inclined to support it: and it was expected that so near a conjunction might have prevailed on the king: but he had an invincible aversion to war; and was so possessed of the opinion of a divine right in all kings that he could not bear that even an elective and limited king should be called in question by his subjects: so he would never acknowledge his son-in-law king, nor give him any assistance for the support of his new dignity[1]. And though it was also reckoned on, that France would enter into any design that should bring down the house of Austria, and Spain by consequence, yet even
1621. that was diverted by the means of De Luines[2]; a worthless but absolute favourite, whom the archduchess Isabella, princess of the Spanish Netherlands, gained to oblige the king [of France] into a neutrality by giving him the richest heiress then in Flanders, the daughter of Pecquigny, left to her disposal, whom he married to his brother.

[a] altered from *invade*.

[1] The want of money and the desire to satisfy Spain were additional, and powerful, motives. Welwood, 28, quotes a saying of Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador: 'He had willed King James so fast asleep that he hoped neither the cries of his daughter nor her children, nor the repeated solicitations of his Parliament in their behalf would be able to awaken him.'

[2] It was the revolt of the Huguenots in Béarn which prevented the intended interference. Charles d'Albert, Sieur de Luines, Constable of France, died whilst suppressing it, Dec. 14, 1621. Martin, *Hist. de France*, xi. 112–180.

Thus poor Frederick was left without any assistance. The jealousy that the Lutherans had of the ascendant that the Calvinists might gain by this accession had an unhappy share in the coldness which all the princes of that confession shewed [a] towards him [a]. Saxony only declared for Ferdinand, who likewise engaged the duke of Bavaria [1] at the head of a catholic league to maintain his interests. Maurice prince of Orange had embroiled Holland by the espousing the controversy about the decrees of God in opposition to the Arminian party, and by erecting a new and illegal court by the authority of the States General to judge of the affairs of the province of Holland; which was plainly contrary to their constitution, by which every province is an entire sovereignty within itself, not at all subordinate to the States General, who act only as the plenipotentiaries of the several provinces to maintain their union and their common concerns by that assembly [b]. Barneveldt was condemned and executed: Grotius and others were condemned to perpetual imprisonment: and an assembly of the ministers of the several provinces met at Dort by the same authority, and condemned and deprived the Arminians [2]. Maurice his enemies gave out that he managed all this on design to make himself master of the provinces, and to put those who were like to oppose him out of the way. But though this seems a wild and groundless imagination, and not possible to be compassed, yet it is certain that he looked on Barneveldt and his party as men who were so jealous of him and of a military power, that as they had forced the truce with Spain, so they would be very unwilling to begin [c] a new war; though the dispute about

CHAP. I.

1619. 14

[a] substituted for *on this occasion.* [b] substituted for *court*, and the full stop is after that word. [c] substituted for *engage in.*

[1] Sc. Maximilian II.

[2] James sent commissioners to the Assembly of Dort both for England and for Scotland. Upon the many causes of quarrel between Maurice and Barneveldt, and between Holland and the other States, see Motley's *United Netherlands*, iv. *passim*. In another aspect the conflict was one of the commercial and professional oligarchy against central government. Cf. D'Estrades, *Ambassades et Négotiations* (1718), 155. On Maurice's espousal of Calvinism

CHAP. I. Juliers and Cleves had almost engaged them, and the truce was now near expiring; at the end of which he hoped, if delivered from the opposition that he might look [for] from that party, to begin the war anew. By these means there was a great fermentation over all the provinces, so that Maurice was not then in condition to give the elected king any considerable assistance; though[a] indeed he needed it much, for his conduct was very weak. He affected the grandeur of a regal court and the magnificence of a crowned head too early: and his queen set up some of the gay diversions that she had been accustomed to in her father's court, such as balls and masks, which very much disgusted the good Bohemians, who thought that a revolution made on the account of religion ought to have put on
MS. 7. a greater appearance of seriousness and simplicity. | These particulars I had from the children of some who belonged to that court. The elected king was quickly overthrown,
1622. and driven not only out of those his new dominions but likewise out of his hereditary countries. He fled to Holland,
1631. where he ended his days. I will go no further in a matter so well known as king James's ill conduct in the whole series of that war, and that unheard-of practice of send-
1623. ing his only son through France into Spain, of which the relations we have are so full that I can add nothing to them.

I will only here tell some particulars with relation to Germany that Fabricius, the wisest divine I [b] knew [c] among them [c], told me he had from Charles Lewis[1] the elector palatine's own mouth. He said, Frederic the 2d. who first reformed the palatinate, whose life is so curiously writ by Thomas Hubert of Liège[2], was resolved to shake off popery, and to set up Lutheranism in his country: but

[a] substituted for *and*. [b] *ever* crossed out. [c] substituted for *in Germany*.

and Barneveldt's of Arminianism against their own convictions, for political reasons, compare f. 316; and Motley, *United Netherlands*, iv. 546.

[1] Son of Frederick of Bohemia and Elizabeth, daughter of James I.

[2] Hubert Thomas, of Liège, was a Belgian historian who in 1622 became Secretary to the Elector Palatine Frederick II. He wrote *Annalium de vitâ et rebus gestis Frederici II Comitis Palatini libri xiv*

a counsellor of his laid before him, that the Lutherans would always depend chiefly on the house of Saxony: so it would not become him who was the first elector to be only the second in the party. [a] It was more for his dignity to become Calvinist: he would be the head of that party: it would give him a great interest in Switzerland, and make the Huguenots of France and in the Netherlands depend on him. [b] He was by that determined to declare for the Helvetian confession. But upon the ruin of their family the 1609. duke of Neuburg had an interview with the elector of Brandenburg about their concerns in Juliers and Cleves: and he persuaded that elector to turn Calvinist; for since their family was fallen, nothing would more contribute to raise the other than the espousing that side, which would naturally come under his protection: but he added, that for himself he [c] had turned [c] papist, since his little principality lay so near both Austria and Bavaria [1]. This that elector told with a sort of pleasure, when he made it appear that other princes had no more[d] sense of religion than he himself had.

Other circumstances concurred to make king James's reign so inglorious. The States having borrowed great sums of money of queen Elizabeth, they gave her the Brill and Flushing, with some other places of less note, as pawns, till the money should be repaid. Soon after his coming to the crown of England he entered into secret treaties with Spain[2], in order to the forcing the States to a peace: one article was, that if they were obstinate he would deliver up

[a] *But* struck out. [b] *and* struck out. [c] altered from *would turn*. [d] substituted for *other*.

(1604); *De Palatinorum origine*; *Historia Belli rusticani in Germania* (1609); and other works. Zedler, *Universal Lexicon*, vol. 43, 1528.

[1] The facts are here given very incorrectly; see Gardiner, *Thirty Years War* (Epochs of Modern History), 21.

[2] The treaty was public in July, 1604. The States refused to be included in it. All that was said about the cautionary towns was 'unmeaning verbiage,' explained to the States. Gardiner, *Hist. of Engl.* i. 209. Barneveldt came to England in 1603, not about the cautionary towns, but to get help for Ostend against Spain. *Id.* 105. The debt was £600,000, of which £215,000 only was paid in 1616. Elizabeth appears to have lent, in 1576, another sum of £40,000, for which

CHAP. I. these places to the Spaniards. When the truce was made, Barneveldt, though he had promoted it, yet knowing this secret article, he saw they were very unsafe while the keys of Holland and Zealand were in the hands of a prince who might perhaps sell them or make an ill use of them: so he persuaded the States to redeem the mortgage by repaying the money that England had lent, for which these places
1616. were put in their hands: and he came over himself to treat about it. King James, who was profuse upon his favourites and servants, was delighted with the prospect of so much money; and immediately, without calling a parliament to advise with them about it, he did yield to the proposition. So the money was paid, and the places were evacuated; an action more to be commended for its honesty than wisdom. But his profuseness drew two other things upon him, which broke the whole authority of the crown, and the dependence of the nation upon it. The crown had a great estate over all England, which was all let out upon leases for years, and a small rent was reserved. So most of the great families of the nation were the tenants of the crown, and a great many boroughs were depending on the estates so held. The renewal of these leases brought in fines both to the crown and to the great officers: besides that the fear of being denied a renewal kept all in a dependence [a] on the court [a]. King James obtained of his parliament a power of granting, [a] that is selling [a], those estates for ever, with the reserve of the old quit-rent [1]: and all [a] the money raised by [a] this was profusely squandered away. Another main part of the regal authority was the wards,
16 which anciently the crown took into their own management. [b] Our kings were, according to the first institution, the

[a] interlined. [b] *and* struck out.

Antwerp, Bruges, Ghent, and Ypres became bound. About 1657 Charles II tried in vain to get these towns to advance him money upon condition of release from this debt. *H. M. C. Rep.* viii. 30.

[1] There is nothing in the Statutes to show that James ever obtained this power. In 1609 he entailed upon the Crown all lands in his possession, which enabled him to limit the effects of his own profusion.

guardians of these wards[1]: they bred them up in their court, and disposed of them in marriage as they thought fit. Afterwards they compounded or forgave them, or gave them to some branches of the family, or to provide the younger children. But they proceeded in this very gently: and the chief care after the reformation was to breed the wards protestants. Still all[a] were under a great dependence by this means; much money was not raised this way, but families were often at mercy, and were used according to their behaviour. | King James granted these MS. 8.
generally to his servants and favourites, and they made the most of them. So that what was before a dependence on the crown, and was moderately compounded for, became then a most exacting oppression, by which several families were ruined. [b]This went on in king Charles's time in the same method. Our kings thought they gave little [c]when they disposed of a ward[c], because they made little of these. All this raised such an outcry, that Mr. Pierpoint at the Restoration gathered so many instances of these, and represented them so effectually to that house of commons that called home king Charles the second, that he persuaded them to redeem themselves by an offer of excise, 1661.
which produces indeed a much greater revenue, but took away the dependence in which all families were held by the dread of leaving their heirs exposed to so great a danger. Pierpoint valued himself to me upon this service he did his country, at a time when the thing was so little considered on either hand, that the court did not seem to apprehend the value of that they parted with, nor the country the value of that they purchased[2].

CHAP. I.

[a] *families* struck out. [b] *and* struck out. [c] interlined.

[1] See the case of the young Duke of Ormond in Carte's *Ormond*, i. 7–10 (Clarendon Press). For the revenue raised from the Court of Wards by Cottington, and for the discontent thus caused, see Clarendon, *Rebellion*, ii. 102. The abolition of wardships was one of the objects of the conspirators of the Gunpowder Plot; *Gunpowder Treason, with Preface by Thomas, Lord Bishop of Lincoln* (1679), 250.

[2] The right of wardship accrued when a tenant by knight service

CHAP. I.

Besides these public [a] actings, king James [a] suffered much in the opinion of all people [b] by his strange way of using one of the greatest men of that age, sir Walter Raleigh; 1618. against whom the proceeding at first was much censured, but the last part of them was thought both barbarous and illegal [b]. The whole business of Somerset's rise and fall, the matter of the countess of Essex and Overbury, the putting the inferior persons to death for that infamous poisoning and the sparing the principals, both Somerset and his lady, were so odious and inhuman, that it quite sunk the reputation of a reign that on many other accounts was already much exposed to contempt and censure, which was the more sensible because it succeeded such a glorious and 17 happy one [1]. In the end of James's reign he was become

[a] substituted for *proceedings, the king.* [b] These four lines are struck out.

happened to be a minor, and consisted in an absolute control over the revenue of his lands during his minority, without the necessity of rendering any account on his coming of age. Wardship was abolished by an order of the Long Parliament on February 24, 1645, and again by Act of Parliament in 1656, the abolition to count from the former date. Scobell, *Acts and Ordinances of the Long Parliament*, 375. Purveyance and composition for purveyance were abolished May, 1657. *Id.* 383. Clarendon had made up his mind, before the Restoration, that the Court of Wards could not continue. The Act of 1661 turned all military tenures into 'free and common soccage,' from Feb. 24, 1645, and was probably a leading cause of English agricultural prosperity. Brodrick, *English Land and English Landlords*, 44. Half of the Excise, reckoned at £100,000, was given to the Crown in perpetuity, half to the king for life. Hansard's *Parl. Hist.*, iv. 146–151, 159, 162. The latter provision was rejected on Nov. 21 by 151 to 149 (Hansard's *Parl. Hist.* is incorrect on this point), but carried on Nov. 27. *C. J.* Nov. 21, 27. The original proposal had been to lay the burden on the land. *Andrew Marvell to the Corporation of Hull;* Grosart's Edn. of *Marvell's Works*, ii. 19–38. Hallam, *Hist. of Engl.* sm. ed. ii. 312, 313. See the *Statutes at large*, iii. 192. There is an important paper of reasons against abolishing the Court of Wards in the *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 361.

[1] See the curious work *The None-Such Charles, his Character, extracted out of divers Originall Transactions, &c. published by authority*, 1651, anon., 96. According to a statement of Balthasar Gerbier, who was accused of the authorship upon internal evidence, and who had already disclaimed it in 1652 (*Clarendon MSS.*), it was written by Hugh Peters. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 79. But Peters was dead and could not deny the fact; while there is no reason to suppose that he should have published anonymously words about Charles I far less severe than those

[a] weary of the duke of Buckingham, who treated him with such an air of insolent contempt that he seemed at last resolved to throw it off, but could not think of taking the load of government on himself, and so resolved to bring in the earl of Somerset again into favour, as that lord himself reported it to some from whom I had it. He met him in the night in the gardens at Theobald's: two bed-chamber men were only in the secret. The king embraced him tenderly, and with many tears[1] complained how ill he was used. [b] The earl of Somerset [b] believed the secret was not well kept; for soon after the king was taken with some fits of an ague, and died [c] of it [c]. My father was then in London, and did very much suspect an ill practice in the matter: but perhaps doctor Craig, my mother's uncle, [d] who was one of the king's physicians [d], possessed him with these apprehensions; for he was disgraced for saying he believed the king was poisoned. It is certain no king could die less lamented or less esteemed than he was. This sunk the credit of the bishops of Scotland, who, as they were his creatures, so they were obliged to a great dependence on him, and were thought guilty of gross [e] and abject flattery towards him [f]. His reign in England was a continued course of mean [g] practices. The first condemnation of sir W. Raleigh, one of the greatest men of the age, was [h] very black [h]: but the executing him after so many years, and after an employment that had been given him, was counted a barbarous sacrificing him to the Spaniards. The rise and fall of the earl of Somerset [i], and the swift progress

CHAP. I.

[a] *so* struck out. [b] substituted for *He.* [c] substituted for *quickly after.* [d] interlined. [e] substituted for *great.* [f] The passage from here to the end of the paragraph, '*corruption of Spain,*' is added on the reverse side of the opposite leaf *f.* 7[b]. [g] substituted for *base and infamous.* [h] substituted for *a piece of black villainy.* [i] *and the pardoning him and his lady for the poisoning of Sir Tho. Overbury, when their agents suffered but they who were the principals were pardoned, and the unaccountable rise* struck out.

---

which he owned. Gerbier had, of course, in 1661 good reason for his disclaimer. See Wheatley's edition of Pepys, iii. 148 *note.*

[1] This story of a reconciliation appears to be absolutely groundless. Somerset was pardoned a few months before the death of James. Craig

CHAP. I. of the duke of Buckingham's greatness, were things that exposed him to the censures[a] of all the world. I have seen the originals of about twenty letters that he wrote to the prince and that duke while they were in Spain, which shew a meanness as well as a fondness that render him very contemptible. [b] The great figure the crown of England had made in queen Elizabeth's time, who had rendered[c] herself the arbiter of Christendom and the wonder of the age, was so much eclipsed, if not quite darkened, during this reign, that king James was become the scorn of the age; and while hungry writers flattered him out of measure at home, he was despised by all abroad as a pedant without true judgment, courage, or steadiness, subject to his favourites, and delivered up to the counsels, or rather the corruption, of Spain [1].

The puritans gained credit as the king and the bishops lost it [2]. They put on external appearance of great strictness and gravity: they took more pains in their parishes than those who adhered to the bishops, and were often preaching against the vices of the court; for which they were sometimes punished, though very gently, which raised
18 their reputation, and drew presents [d] to them [d] that made up their sufferings abundantly. They began some particular methods of getting their people to meet privately with them: and in these meetings they gave great vent to extemporary prayer, which was looked on as a sort of inspiration: and by these means they grew very popular. They were very factious and insolent; and both in their sermons and prayers were always mixing severe reflections on their enemies. Some of them boldly gave out very many predictions; particularly two of them who were held

[a] substituted for *contempt*. [b] *and* struck out. [c] substituted for *made*, struck out. [d] interlined.

was one of the regular physicians in attendance upon the king, and was jealous on the score of remedies being applied by Buckingham's mother, which were suggested by a country doctor at Dunmow. Gardiner, v. 313.

[1] On this passage see *Remarks on Bishop Burnet's History by a True Briton* (London, *n.d.*)

[2] Sc. in Scotland.

prophets, Davison and Bruce[1]. Some of the things that they foretold came to pass: but my father, who knew them both, told me of many of their predictions that he himself heard them throw out, which had no effect: but all these were forgot, and if some more probable guessings which they delivered as prophecies were accomplished, these were much magnified. They were very spiteful against all those who differed from them; and were wanting in no methods that could procure them either good usage or good presents. Of this my father had great occasion to see many instances: for my great grandmother, | who was a very rich woman, and much engaged to them, was most obsequiously courted by them. Bruce lived concealed in her house for some years: and they all found such advantages in their submissions to her, that she was counted for many years the chief support of the party: her name was Rachel Arnot. She was daughter to sir John Arnot, a man in great favour, and lord treasurer depute. Her husband Johnston was the greatest merchant at that time; and left her an estate of 2000*l.* a year, to be disposed of among his children as she pleased: and my father marrying her eldest grandchild saw a great way [a] into all the methods of the puritans.

CHAP. I.

MS. 9.

Gowrie's conspiracy was by them charged on the king, as a contrivance of his to get rid of that earl, who was then held in great esteem: but my father, who had taken great pains to inquire into all the particulars of that matter, did always believe it was a real conspiracy[2]. [b] One thing,

1601.

[a] substituted for *deal.*

[b] *and* struck out.

[1] Davison was minister of Libberton. Bruce, the most popular presbyterian minister of his day, officiated at the coronation of James's queen; withstood James to the face when the catholic earl of Huntly returned in 1596; and was banished for refusing to answer as was desired about Gowrie. He gave way, and was allowed to return in 1602; but incurred the displeasure of the Kirk and was discharged in consequence. Spottiswoode, iii. 90, 103.

[2] There is no valid reason for doubting its genuineness. Burton's *History of Scotland,* vi. 86–135; Cromarty's *History of the Conspiracies of the Earl of Gowrie.* Upon Gowrie and his descendants see Bruce, *Papers relating to William, 1st Earl of Gowrie, and Patrick Ruthven his 5th and last surviving son,* privately printed, London, 1867.

CHAP. I. which none of the historians have taken any notice of, might have induced [a] the earl of Gowrie [a] to put king James out of the way, but in such a disguised manner that he should seem rather to have escaped out of a snare than to have laid one for the king. [b] Upon the king's death he stood next to the succession to the crown of England[1]; for king Henry the seventh's daughter that was married to king James the fourth did after his death marry Douglas earl of Angus: but they could not agree: so a precontract was proved against him, upon which, by a sentence from
19 Rome, the marriage was voided, with a clause in favour of the issue, since born under a marriage *de facto* and *bona fide*. Lady Margaret Douglas was the child so provided for. I [c] did peruse [c] the original bull confirming the divorce. After that, the queen dowager married one Francis Stewart, and had by him a son made lord Methven by king James the fifth. In the patent he is called *frater noster uterinus*. He had only a daughter, who was mother [d] or grandmother [d] to this earl of Gowrie: so that by this he might be glad to put the king out of the way, that so he might stand next to the succession of the crown of England. He had a brother then a child, who when he grew up and found he could not carry the name of Ruthven, which by an act of parliament made after this conspiracy none might carry, he went and lived beyond sea; and it was given out that he had the philosopher's stone. He had two sons, who died without issue; and one daughter, married to

[a] substituted for *him to have wished.* [b] *was that* struck out.
[c] substituted for *read.* [d] interlined.

[1] See Preface to the 1823 edition. Burnet has been completely misled. 'Francis Stewart' should be Henry Stewart, 1st Earl of Methven, who married and had heirs as follows:—

(1) Margaret Tudor, widow of the Earl of Angus. She had one child who died in infancy.

Henry Stewart, 1st Earl of Methven = (2) Janet Stewart, eldest daughter of John 2nd Earl of Athol.

Henry, 2nd Earl of Methven. | Joanna | Dorothea = William, Master of Ruthven, 1st Earl of Gowrie.

James, 2nd Earl of Gowrie. | John, 3rd Earl of Gowrie.

From which it is clear that Gowrie had absolutely no claim.

sir Anthony Vandyke the famous picture drawer[1], [a] who according to this pedigree stood very near the succession of the crown [a]. It was not easy to persuade the nation of the truth of that conspiracy: for eight years before that time king James, on a secret jealousy of the earl of Murray, then esteemed the handsomest man of Scotland, set on the marquis of Huntly, who was his mortal enemy, to murder him; and by a writing[2], all in his own hand, he promised to save him harmless for it. He set the house in which he was on fire: and the earl flying away was followed and murdered, and Huntly sent Gordon of Buckey with the news to the king. [b] All [c] who were [c] concerned in that vile fact were pardoned, which laid the king open to much censure. And this made the matter of Gowrie [c] to be [c] the less believed. CHAP. I. 1592.

CHAPTER II.

CHARLES I.

To the outbreak of the Civil War.

WHEN king Charles succeeded to the crown, he was at first thought favourable to the puritans; for his tutor and all his court were of that way[3]: and Dr. Preston, then 1625.

[a] interlined. [b] struck out. [c] interlined.

[1] William and Patrick Ruthven were the 4th and 5th sons of the 1st Earl of Gowrie. At the accession of James to the English throne, William escaped from the country; but Patrick was arrested, and remained in the Tower from 1603 to 1624, dying in 1652. He, like his brother, was a noted chemist, and practised medicine for a livelihood in London after his release. It was his daughter Mary who married Vandyke in 1640. Bruce, *Papers relating &c.* 57. *Supra* 25, note.

[2] The writ, 'letters of fire and sword,' was against Francis Stewart, Earl of Bothwell, son of an illegitimate son of James V; he married Jane Hepburn, sister of Bothwell, husband of Mary Queen of Scots; and was created Earl of Bothwell in 1587. For his turbulence see Spottiswoode and Burton. The writ was issued after his raid upon Holyrood in 1592. Huntly treated Murray, the 'bonnie Earl of Murray,' as an accomplice; he was son-in-law to the great Earl of Murray who had oppressed Huntly's clan, the Gordons. As Huntly was a papist, this commission caused great anger among the ministers.

[3] He was always very partial to the Scottish nation. Dr. Heylin, in his history of the Presbyterians, says, that a little before their break-

CHAP. II. the head of the party, came up in the coach [a] from Theobald's to London [a] with the king and the duke of Buckingham; which being against the rules of the court gave great offence: but it was said, the king was so overcharged with grief that he wanted the comfort of so wise and so great a man. It was also given out that the duke of Buckingham offered Preston the great seal: but he was wiser than to accept of it[1]. I will go no further into the beginning of that reign with relation to English affairs, which are fully opened by others; only I will tell one particular which I had from the earl of Lothian[2], who was bred up in this court, and whose father, the earl of Ancram, was gentleman [b] of the bedchamber, though he himself was ever much hated by the king. He told me, that king Charles was much offended with king James's light and familiar way, which was the effect of hunting and drinking, on which occasions he was very apt to forget his dignity, and to break out into great indecencies: on the other hand the solemn gravity of the court of Spain was more suited to his own temper, which was sullen even to a morose-

[a] interlined. [b] interlined.

ing out into rebellion the court might well be called an academy of that nation; most of the officers of the household, and seven out of eight of the grooms of the bedchamber, which proved of very great use to them in being constantly informed of his majesty's most private transactions during the civil war. D. Cp. f. 244 for the case of William Murray, afterwards Earl of Dysart, upon whom see also *infra*, 106.

[1] Preston, chaplain to Prince Charles, was made master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1622, through Buckingham's influence. In 1626 he published an attack upon Montagu's 'Appello Caesarem.' There does not appear to be any good evidence upon this point; but it is asserted that he 'was nominated to be Lord Keeper' in the *Life of the renowned Dr. Preston, writ by his pupil, Master Thomas Ball, D.D.*, 1628, ed. E. W. Harcourt, 1885, 117. Preston was the author of a large number of devotional and controversial works. He died in 1628 at the age of 41. In Fuller's *Worthies* he is described as a successful private tutor, 'the greatest pupil monger in England.' On Preston's influence with Buckingham see Hackett, *Life of Archbishop Williams*, i. 203–206 (1692).

[2] See the *Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr, 1st Earl of Ancrum* (d. 1654), *and his son William, 3rd Earl of Lothian* (d. 1675), ed. David Laing, 1875. Cf. *infra*, 87.

ness. This led him to a grave reserved deportment, in which he forgot the civilities and the affability that the nation naturally loved, and to which they had been long accustomed: nor did he in his outward deportment take any pains to oblige any | persons whatsoever: so far from MS. 10. that, he had such an ungracious way of shewing favour that the manner of bestowing it was almost as mortifying as the favour was obliging. [a] I turn now to the affairs of Scotland, which are but little known [1]. CHAP. II.

The king resolved to carry on the two designs that his father had set on foot, but had let the prosecution of them fall in the last years of his reign. The first [b] of these [b] was about the recovery of the tithes and church lands. He resolved to prosecute his father's revocation, and to void all the grants made in his minority [2]; and to create titular 1625. abbots as lords of parliament, [c] but lords as bishops only for life [c]. And that the two great families of Hamilton and Lennox might be good examples to the rest of the nation, he, by a secret purchase and with English money, bought the abbey of Aberbroth of the former, and the lordship of Glasgow of the latter, and gave these to the two archbishoprics. These lords made a shew of zeal [d] after a good bargain [d], and surrendered them to the king [3]. He also

[a] *But* struck out. [b] interlined. [c] interlined. [d] interlined.

[1] Nor worth knowing. S. By way of censure on the author's diffusiveness when mentioning the affairs of Scotland Swift has thus interlined the title of the work: The History of (Scotland in) his own Times. R.

[2] In 1625 Charles I revoked all the acts of his father prejudicial to the Crown, as a first step towards the resumption of the Church lands whether granted away before or after the annexation of 1587; *supra*, 10.

[3] Lord Clarendon says [i. 182], that the Duke of Lennox sold his estate much the cheaper, that it might be consecrated to so pious an end. Besides, according to Lord Clarendon, the lands purchased of the Duke of Lennox were not to be settled on either of the archbishoprics, but on the bishopric of Edinburgh, which was at this time erected. To the same purpose Collier's *Eccles. Hist.* ii. 756. *Dr. Bliss's MS. note on this history.* Lockhart of Carnwark, in his Letters written in the year 1724 respecting Burnet's History, asserts that the original deeds are still extant in the register of public records at Edinburgh, by which the abbey of Arbroath, or Aberbroth, was resigned to the king by the Marquis of Hamilton for the abbey lands of

CHAP. II. purchased several estates of less value to the several sees; and all men who pretended to favour at court offered their church lands [a] to sale at low rates [a].

In the third year of his reign the earl of Nithisdale[1], then believed a papist, which he afterwards professed, having
1626. married a niece of the duke of Buckingham's, was sent down with a power to take the surrenders of all church lands, and to assure all who did readily surrender that the king would take it kindly, and use them all very well, but that he would proceed with all rigour against those who would not submit their rights to his disposal. Upon his coming down, those [b] who were most concerned in those grants met at Edinburgh, and agreed that when they were called together, if [c] no other argument did prevail [c] to make the earl of Nithisdale desist, they would [d] fall upon him and all his party in the old Scotch manner, and knock them on the head. [e] Primrose[2] told me one of these lords, Belhaven,
21 of the name of Douglas, who was blind, bid them set him by one of the party, and he should make sure of one[3]. So

[a] substituted for *at easy pennyworths.* [b] substituted for *all.* [c] altered from *if other arguments did not prevail.* [d] substituted for *resolved to.* [e] *and* struck out.

Lasmahago, and that Arbroath was given, not to the archbishopric of St. Andrews, but to William Murray, afterwards created Earl of Dysart, who sold it to the Earl of Panmure, in whose family it long continued. See *Lockhart Papers*, i. 598. R. Compare Gardiner, vii. 278, *note.*

[1] Nithisdale's mission was in 1626.

[2] Sir Archibald Primrose, Clerk Register under Charles II, see *infra*, 190.

[3] This brings to my remembrance a story I heard the first Duke of Bolton tell of himself before a great deal of company: that when the bill of exclusion was debating in the house of lords, the old Earl of Peterborough said that was a cause in which every man in England was obliged to draw his sword, and laid his hand upon his own, as if he designed to draw it immediately, which created a great disorder, and everybody seemed preparing to do the like: upon which the Duke of Bolton said he got as near to the Marquis of Halifax as he could, being resolved to make sure of him, in case any violence had been offered: and that there were more who had taken the same resolution, though he did not name them. D. There is good reason for thinking the story in the text untrue, though well reflecting the spirit of the time. Mr. Gardiner points out (vii. 278, *note*)—though this is not conclusive, as Burnet sometimes speaks of men by their later styles – that the titles of Belhaven and Dumfries did not exist until 1633. Sir Robert Douglas of

he was set next the earl of Dumfries: he was all the while holding him fast: and when the other asked him what he meant by that, he said, ever since the blindness was come on him he was in such fear of falling, that he could not help the holding fast to those who were next him: he had all the while a poinard in his other hand, with which he had certainly stabbed Dumfries, if any disorder had happened. The appearance at that time was so great, and so much heat was raised upon it, that the earl of Nithisdale would not open all his instructions, but came back to court, looking on the service as desperate. So a stop was put to it for some time.

In the year 1633 the king came down in person to be crowned. In some conventions of the states that had been held before that, all the money that the king had asked was given; and some petitions were offered setting forth grievances, which those whom the king employed had assured them should be redressed: but nothing was done, and all was put off till the king should come down in person. His entry and coronation were managed with such magnificence, that the country suffered much by it: all was entertainment and shew[1]. When the parliament sat, the lords of the articles[2] prepared an act declaring the royal prerogative as it had been asserted by law in the year 1606; to which an addition was made of another act passed in the year 1609, by which king James was impowered to prescribe apparel to churchmen with their own consent. This was a personal thing to king James, in consideration of his great learning and experience, of which he had made no use during the rest of his reign. And in the year 1617, when he held a parliament there in person, an act was 1633.

Spott, and William, seventh Lord Crichton of Sanquhar, were created respectively Viscount Belhaven and Earl of Dumfries in that year.

[1] Clarendon, *Rebellion*, i. 170, goes so far as to say that the impoverishment of the nobles through their extravagant expenditure on this occasion had much to do with the rebellion. The coronation, moreover, was conducted so as to wound presbyterian feeling to the utmost.

[2] A committee of the estates, which settled the details of measures before they were submitted to Parliament. The estates themselves voted on a measure as a whole. See *infra*, 209, and note thereto.

CHAP. II. prepared by the lords of the articles, authorizing all things that should thereafter be determined in ecclesiastical affairs by his majesty, with consent of a competent number of the clergy, to have the strength and power of a law. But the king either apprehended that great opposition would be made to the passing the act, or that great trouble would follow on the execution of it: so when the rubric of the act was read, he ordered it to be suppressed, though passed in the articles. In this act of 1633 these acts of 1606 and 1609 were drawn into one. To this great opposition was made by the earl of Rothes, who desired the acts might be divided: but the king said it was now one act, and he must either vote for it or against it. He said he was for the prerogative as much as any man, but that addition was contrary to the liberties of the church, and he thought no
22 determination ought to be made in such matters without the consent of the clergy, at least without their being heard. The king bid him argue no more, but give his vote: so he voted not content. Some few lords offered to argue: but the king stopped them[1], and commanded them to vote. [a]Almost the whole commons voted in the negative: so that the act was indeed rejected by the majority: which the
MS. 11. king knew, | for he had called for a list of the numbers, and with his own pen had marked every man's vote: yet the clerk of register, who gathers and declares the votes, said it was carried in the affirmative. Rothes affirmed it went for the negative: so the king said, the clerk of register's declaration must be held good, unless Rothes would go to the bar, and accuse him of falsifying the record of parliament, [b]which was capital[b]: and in that case, if he should fail in the proof, he was liable to the same punishment. [c]But the earl of Rothes[c] would not venture on that. Thus the act was published, though in truth it was rejected.

[a] *but* struck out. [b] interlined. [c] altered from *so he.*

[1] Napier (*Montrose and the Covenanters*, i. 521) disposes of this story. It is not mentioned in the supplication for which Balmerino was prosecuted.

The king expressed a high displeasure at all who had concurred in that opposition. Upon that the lords had many meetings: they reckoned that now all their liberties were gone, and a parliament was but a piece of pageantry, if the clerk of register might declare as he pleased how the vote went, and that no scrutiny were allowed. Upon that, Haig[1], the king's solicitor, a zealous man of that party, drew a petition to be signed by the lords, and to be offered by them to the king, setting forth all their grievances, and praying redress: he shewed this to some of them, and among others to the lord Balmerino[2], who liked the main of it, but was for altering it in some particulars: he spoke of it to Rothes [a] in the presence of the earl of Cassillis and some others: none of them approved of it. Rothes carried it to the king; and told him, that [a] there was a design to offer a petition in order to the explaining and justifying their proceedings, [b] and that he had a copy to shew him [b]: but the king [c] would not look upon it, and [c] ordered him to put a stop to it, for he would receive no such petition. Rothes told this to Balmerino: so the thing was laid aside: only he kept a copy of it, and [d] interlined it in some places [d] with his own hand. While the king was in Scotland he erected a new bishopric at Edinburgh, and made one Forbes bishop, who was a very learned and pious man: he had a strange faculty of preaching five or six hours at a time: his way of life and devotion was thought monastic, and his learning lay in antiquity: he studied to be a reconciler between papist and protestant, leaning rather to the first, as appears by his *Considerationes modestæ:* he was a very simple man, and knew little of the world: so he fell 23 into several errors in conduct, but died soon after suspected

CHAP. II.

[a] substituted for *who told the king.* [b] interlined. [c] interlined.
[d] substituted for *titled it on the back.*

[1] William Haig of Bemerside; Burton, vi. 379. See *The Haigs of Bemerside*, by John Russell (1881), 194, &c.; Masson, *Drummond of Hawthornden*, 233, 235; *State Trials*, iii. 605-607, 699-702; *Memoirs of the Maxwells of Pollock*, i. 20.

[2] Son of the Balmerino mentioned *supra*, 8. For the whole story see Gardiner, vii. 294, and *H. M. C. Rep.* ix. part ii. 262.

CHAP. II. of popery[1], which suspicion was increased by his son's turning papist. The king left Scotland much discontented, but resolved to prosecute the design of recovering the church lands: and sir Thomas Hope, a subtle lawyer, who was believed to understand that matter beyond all the men of his profession, though in all respects he was a zealous puritan, was made king's advocate, upon his undertaking to bring all the church lands back to the crown[2]: yet he proceeded in that matter so slowly that it was believed he acted in concert with the party [a] that opposed it [a]. Enough was already [a] done to alarm all that were possessed of the church lands: and they, to engage the whole country in their quarrel, took care to infuse it into all people, but chiefly into the preachers, that all was done to make way for popery. The winter after the king was in Scotland, [b] Balmerino was thinking how to make the petition more acceptable: and in order to that he shewed it to one Dunmoor, a lawyer in whom he trusted and desired his opinion of it, and suffered him to carry it home with him, but charged him to shew it to no person, and to take no copy of it: yet he took a copy of it, and shewed it under a promise of secrecy to one Hay of Naughton, and told him from whom he had it. Hay looking on [b] the paper, and

[a] interlined. [b] The words '*Balmerino*' to '*Hay looking on*' are substituted for the following, which are crossed out: *a gentleman came to visit Balmerinoch, Hay of Nachton, who was kindly received by him, and was brought by him into his closet. While they were there one came to speak to Balmerinoch, who went to the door, not suspecting any foul dealing from his neighbour, but he fell immediately to look into the papers that lay on his table, and seeing one marked on the back* The Petition of those that voted against the Act, *he put it in his pocket, and the other misdoubting nothing they parted very fair. He looking into.*

[1] Quam insigniter reverendo viro (Guil. Forbesio) injurii sint, qui eum Catholicum Rom. praedicant, inter alia perspicuum est concione publica ab eo habita Edinburgi coram rege Carolo I. an. 1633. *Vit. Joh. Forbesii à Corse.* p. 10. R. William Forbes was appointed in January, 163$\frac{3}{4}$, and died in the April or May following. See Burnet's Preface to the *Life of Bishop Bedell.* The *Considerationes Modestae* was a posthumous work, edited by Sydserfe, and published in 1658 (Brit. Mus. E. 1772 (1)).

[2] Hope, one of the most noted of Scotch lawyers and statesmen, drew the Act of Revocation of 1625, and was made Advocate-General in May, 1626, and Baronet of Nova Scotia in 1628. He died in 1646. See the

seeing it a matter of some consequence, carried it to Spottis- CHAP. II.
woode, archbishop of St. Andrews; who, apprehending it was going about for hands, was alarmed at it, and went immediately to London, beginning his journey, as he often [a] did, on a Sunday, which was a very odious thing in that country. There are laws in Scotland very loosely worded, that make it capital [b] to spread lies of the king or his government, or to alienate his subjects from him [1]. It was [c] also made capital to know of any that do it, and not discover them: but this last [d] was never once put in execution. The petition was thought within this act: so an order was sent down for committing Balmerino, the reason of it being for some time kept secret; so it was thought done 1634.
because of his vote in parliament. But after some consultation, a special commission was sent down for his trial. In Scotland there is a court for the trial of peers distinct from the jury, who are to be fifteen, and the majority determine the verdict, the fact being only | referred to the jury MS. 12.
or assize, as they call it, and the law is judged by the court: and if the majority [e] of the jury [e] are peers, the rest may be gentlemen. At this time a private gentleman of the name of Stewart was become so considerable that he was raised by several degrees to be made earl of Traquair and lord treasurer, and was in high favour [2]; but suffered afterwards such [f] a reverse of fortune that I saw him so low that he 24
wanted bread, and was forced to beg, and it was believed he died of hunger. He was a man of great parts, but [g] of too [g] much craft: he was thought the capablest man for business, and the best speaker in that kingdom. So he was

[a] substituted for *usually*. [b] substituted for *criminal*. [c] substituted for *is*. [d] *part* struck out. [e] interlined. [f] substituted for *so great*. [g] interlined.

Diary of the Public Correspondence of Sir Thomas Hope of Craighall (Bannatyne Club, 1843); and, upon his whole career, Omond, *Lord Advocates of Scotland*, i.

[1] Rushworth, ii. 281, mentions the belief at court that the petitioners intended to make the paper public.

[2] Sir J. Stewart of Traquair, created Lord Stewart of Traquair in 1628, taken prisoner at Preston, 1648; died 1659. 'The only counsellor or layman relied upon by the archbishop of Canterbury in that business [sc. of the Liturgy].' Clarendon, *Rebellion*, ii. 12.

CHAP. II. charged with the care of [a]the lord[a] Balmerino's trial: but when the ground of the prosecution was known, Haig, who drew the petition, writ a letter to [b]the lord[b] Balmerino, in which he owned that he drew the petition without any direction or assistance from him[c]: and upon that he went over to Holland. The court was created by a special commission: in the naming of judges there appeared too visibly a design to have that lord's life, for they were either very weak or very poor[1]. Much pains was taken to have a jury; in which so great partiality appeared that when [d]the lord[d] Balmerino was upon his challenges, and excepted to the earl of Dumfries for his having said, that if he were of his jury though he were as innocent as St. Paul he would find him guilty, some of the judges said that was only a rash word: yet the king's advocate allowed the challenge if proved, which [e]could not be[e] done. The next called on was the earl of Lauderdale, father to the duke of that title: with him [f]the lord[f] Balmerino had been long in enmity: yet instead of challenging him, he said he was *omni exceptione major*. It was long considered upon what the prisoner should be tried: for his hand interlining[g] the paper, [h]which did plainly soften it[h], was not thought evidence that he drew it, or that he was accessory to it: and they had no other proof against him: nor could they from that infer that he was the divulger, since it appeared it was [i]only shewed by him to a lawyer for counsel[i]. So it was settled on to insist only on this, that the paper tended to alienate the subjects from their duty to the king, and that he, knowing who was the author of it, did not discover him; which by law was capital. The court judged the paper to be seditious, and to be a lie of the king and of his government: the other point was clear, that he knowing the author did not discover him. He

[a] interlined. [b] interlined. [c] substituted for *that lord*. [d] interlined. [e] substituted for *was*. [f] interlined. [g] substituted for *on the back of*. [h] interlined. [i] substituted for *stole from him*.

[1] This also is disproved by Napier, *Montrose and the Covenanters*, i. 526.

pleaded for himself, that the statute [a] for discovery [a] had never been put in execution; that it could never be meant but of matters that were notoriously seditious; that till the court judged so of this, he did not take [b] this paper [b] to be of that nature, but considered it [c] as a paper full of duty, designed to set himself and some others right in the king's opinion; that upon the first sight of it, though he approved of the main yet he disliked some expressions in it; that he communicated the matter to [d] the earl of [d] Rothes, who told the king of the design; and that upon the king's saying he would receive no such petition it was quite laid aside. This was attested by [e] the earl of [e] Rothes. A long debate had been [f] much insisted on [f], whether [g] the earl of [g] Traquair or the king's ministers might be of the jury [h] or not [h]: but the court gave it in their favour. When the jury was shut up, Gordon of Buckey, who was one of them, being then very ancient, who forty-three years before had assisted in the murder of the earl of Murray, and was thought upon this occasion a sure man, spoke first of all, excusing his presumption in being the first that broke the silence. He desired they would all consider what they were about: it was a matter of blood, and they would feel the weight of that as long as they lived: he had in his youth been drawn in to shed blood, for which he had the king's pardon, but it cost him more to obtain God's pardon: it had given him many sorrowful hours both day and night: and as he spoke [i] this, [i] the tears run over his face [l]. This struck a damp on them all. But [k] the earl of [k] Traquair took up the argument; and said they had it not before them whether the law was a hard law or not, nor had they the nature of the paper [l] before them [l], which was judged [m] by the court to be [m] leasing-making; they were only to consider whether the prisoner had discovered the contriver of the paper or not.

[a] interlined. [b] for *it*. [c] *only* struck out. [d] interlined.
[e] interlined. [f] interlined. [g] interlined. [h] interlined.
[i] interlined. [k] interlined. [l] interlined. [m] interlined.

[1] *Haigs of Bemerside*, 212, 213.

CHAP. II. Upon this [a]the earl of[a] Lauderdale took up the argument against him, and urged that severe laws never executed were looked on as made only to terrify [b]people[b]; that though now, the court having judged the paper to be seditious, after that it [c]would be capital to conceal[c] the author, yet before such judgment the thing could not be thought so evident that he was bound to reveal it. Upon these heads those lords argued the matter many hours: but when it
1635. went to the vote, seven acquitted, but eight cast him: so sentence was given. Upon this many[d] meetings were held: and it was resolved either to force the prison and to set him at liberty, or, if that failed, to revenge his death both on the court and on the eight jurors; some undertaking to kill
MS. 13. them, and others to burn their houses. When | [e]the earl of Traquair[e] understood this, he went to court, and told the king that [f]the lord[f] Balmerino's life was now in his hands, but the execution was in no sort advisable: so he procured his pardon, with which he[g] was often reproached for his ingratitude: but he thought he had been so much wronged in the prosecution, and so little regarded in the pardon, that he never looked on himself as under any obligation on that account[1]. My father knew the whole steps of this matter, having been [h]the earl of[h] Lauderdale's most particular friend: he[i] often told me that the ruin of the king's affairs in Scotland was in a great measure owing to that prosecution; and he carefully preserved the petition
26 itself, and the papers relating to the trial, of which I never saw any copy besides that which I have. [k]And that raised in me a desire of seeing the whole record, which was copied out for me, and is now in my hands. It is a little volume, and contains, according to the Scotch method, the whole abstract

[a] interlined. [b] interlined. [c] for *it had been capital to have concealed.*
[d] for *great.* [e] interlined. [f] interlined. [g] *he* for *the party.*
[h] interlined. [i] for *and.* [k] added on opposite page.

[1] See the letter from Warriston to Balmerino of Feb. 27, 1641, in *Memorials and Letters relating to the History of Great Britain in the reign of Charles I*, ed. by David Dalrymple (1766), 107.

of all the pleadings and all the evidence that was given; and is indeed a very noble piece, full of curious matter [k]. CHAP. II.

While the design of recovering the tithes went on, though but slowly, another design made a greater progress. The bishops of Scotland fell on the framing a liturgy and a body of canons for the worship and government of that church [1]. 1636. These were never examined in any public assembly of the clergy: all was managed by three or four aspiring bishops, Maxwell, Sydserfe, Whitford, and Banantyne, the bishops of Ross, Galloway, Dumblane, and Aberdeen [2]. Maxwell did also accuse [a] the earl of [a] Traquair, as cold in the king's service, and as managing the treasury deceitfully; and he was aspiring to that office. Spottiswoode, archbishop of St. Andrews, being then lord chancellor, was a prudent and mild man, but of no [b] great [b] decency in his course of life; for he was a frequent player at cards, and used to eat often in taverns [3]: besides that, all his livings were scandalously exposed to sale by his servants. [c] The earl of [c]

[a] interlined. [b] interlined. [c] interlined.

[1] Issued in 1636 on the sole authority of the king. Compare Clarendon, *Rebellion*, i. 177, 183, and ii. 1, 4. The draft of the liturgy, prepared by the Scotch prelates, was revised by Laud, Juxon, and Wren of Norwich; and Clarendon notes the national jealousy caused by the attempt to enforce an *English* liturgy, as well as the feeling aroused among the nobility by the placing of Spottiswoode and several bishops, for the first time, on the Privy Council. He also emphasizes the mistake of the issuing of the canons, which were, as Burnet points out, never submitted to any assembly of the clergy, previous to the introduction of the liturgy. Juxon at least had no doubt of the immediate effect. 'The new canons will,' he says, 'at first make as much noise as the cannons in Edinburgh castle.' *Memorials and Letters*, &c., 18.

[2] Bellenden—often spelt as in the text—had been passed over for promotion for failing to read the English prayer book in the Chapel Royal, the deanery of which was attached to the bishopric of Dumblane, then held by him. Upon his acquiescence he was made Bishop of Aberdeen in May, 1635. See Laud's severe letters in *Memorials and Letters*, &c. See also the letter of Burnet's father in praise of Sydserfe, written about 1639. *Id.* ii. 72.

[3] John Livingstone relates that Spottiswoode and Law were on one occasion censured by the provincial synod of Lothian for playing football on the Sabbath. *Wodrow Society: Select Biographies, Livingstone*, 296. This adds point to his description of Archbishop Usher, 'ane godly man although ane Bishop.' *Id.* 145.

CHAP. II. Traquair, seeing himself so pushed at, was more earnest than the bishops themselves in promoting the new models of worship and discipline; and by that he recovered the ground he had lost with the king, and with archbishop Laud. He also assisted the bishops in obtaining commissions, subaltern to the high commission court, in their several dioceses, which were thought little different from the courts of inquisition. Sydserfe set this up in Galloway: and a complaint being made in council of his proceedings, he gave [a] the earl of [a] Argyll the lie in full council. He was after all a very learned and good man. but strangely heated in those matters. And they all were so lifted up with the king's zeal, and so encouraged by [b] archbishop [b] Laud, that they lost all temper [1]; of which I knew Sydserfe make great acknowledgments in his old age.

[c] The [d] most [d] unaccountable part of the king's proceedings was, that all this while, when he was endeavouring to recover so great a part of the property of Scotland as the church lands and tithes were from men that were not like to part with them willingly, and [e] was going [e] to change the whole constitution of that church and kingdom, he raised no force to maintain what he was about to do, but trusted the whole management to the civil execution. By this means all people saw the weakness of the government, at the same time that they complained of its rigour. [f] All that came [g] down [g] from court complained of the king's inexorable stiffness, and of the progress popery was making,
27 of the queen's power with [h] the king, of the favour shewed the pope's nuntios, and of the many proselytes [i] who were daily falling off to the church of Rome [i]. Traquair infused this more effectually, though more covertly, than any other [k] man [k] could do: and when the country formed the first opposition they made to the king's proclamations, and

[a] interlined. [b] interlined. [c] *But* struck out. [d] interlined.
[e] interlined. [f] *And* struck out. [g] interlined. [h] for *over*.
[i] interlined. [k] interlined.

[1] Of this 'encouragement' there are some curious instances in Burton, vi. 388.

protested against them, he drew the first protestation, as Primerose assured me[1]; though he designed no more than to put a stop to the credit the bishops had, and to the fury of their proceedings: but the matter went much further than he seemed to intend: and he himself was fatally caught in the snare he laid for others. A troop of horse and a regiment of foot had prevented all that followed, or, rather, had by all appearance established an arbitrary government in that kingdom[2]: but, to speak in the language of a great man, those who conducted matters at that time had as little of the prudence of the serpent as of the innocence of the dove: and, as my father often told me, he and many others, who adhered in the sequel firmly to the king's interest, were then much troubled at the whole conduct of affairs, as being neither wise, legal, nor just. I will go no further in opening the beginnings of the troubles of Scotland: of [a]these[a] a full account will be found in the memoirs of the dukes of Hamilton[3]: of which I will take the boldness to set down the character which sir Robert Moray[4], who had a great share in the affairs of that time, and knew the whole secret of them, gave, after he read it in manuscript, that he did not think there was a truer history writ since the apostles' days[5]. [b]The violence with which that kingdom did almost unanimously engage against the administration, may easily convince one that the provocation must | have been very MS. 14. great, to draw in such an entire and vehement concurrence against it[6].

CHAP. II.

[a] for *which*. [b] *And indeed* struck out.

[1] That Traquair drew the first protestation is clearly erroneous. Burton, vi. 480. See, however, John Lockhart's letter to Traquair, Nov. 28, 1639. Dalrymple, *Memorials and Letters*, ii. 76.

[2] 'Sending down good ships would do more than sending proclamations.' Juan de Maria (a feigned name) to an unknown correspondent, April 17, 1638. *Id.* i. 25.

[3] Published in 1677. See f. 298.

[4] See *infra* 104, note.

[5] Compare Napier, *Montrose and the Covenanters*, Introd. 20.

[6] The plans above mentioned for recovering the bishops' lands, and purchasing the tithes for the better maintenance of the clergy, were, in the opinion of the Earl of Clarendon, the real grounds of the Scottish rebellion ['by lessening the authority and dependence of the nobility and great men'], *Rebellion*, i. 174. 'These

CHAP. II. After the first pacification, upon the new disputes that arose, when [a] the earls of [a] Loudoun and Dunfermline [1] were sent up with the petition from the Covenanters, the lord Savile came to them, and informed them of many particulars, by which they saw the king was highly irritated against them: [b] he took great pains to persuade them to come with their army into England. They very unwillingly hearkened to that proposition, and looked on it as a design from the court to ensnare them by making the Scots invade England, by which this nation might have been provoked to assist the king to conquer Scotland. It is true, [c] he hated [d] the earl of [d] Strafford so much, that they saw no
1639. cause to suspect him [2]: so they entered into a treaty with him about it. The lord Savile assured them, he spake to them in the name of the most considerable men in England: and he shewed them an engagement under their hands to join with them, if they would come into England, and refuse any treaty but what should be confirmed by a parliament of England. They desired leave to send this paper to Scotland; to which, after much seeming difficulty, he con-
28 sented: so a cane was hollowed, and this was put within it; and one Frost, afterwards secretary to the committee of both kingdoms, was sent down with it as a poor traveller. It was to be communicated only to three persons, the earls of Rothes and Argyll and to Warriston, the three chief confidents of the covenanters. The earl of Rothes was

[a] interlined. [b] *and* struck out. [c] *they saw* struck out. [d] interlined.

---

were the concealed and private grounds,' says a contemporary writer; 'the open and avowed causes were the introduction of our liturgy, the book of canons, ordination, and consecration, with the high commission court, among them; and it hath been found since, that those things were introduced by the cunning of those discontented spirits, that thereby there might be some ground to suscitate the people to rise, which plot of theirs took effect.' Tract entitled *Bella Scot-Anglica*, printed in 1648, 14. R.

[1] See *infra*, 47, 73, 224.

[2] November, 1639. Savile was the son of a former rival of Strafford, and shared his father's hatred. He was made a Privy Councillor in 1641, having been won over by the queen. Compare Gardiner, ix. 179. He was created Earl of Sussex, May 25, 1644.

a man of pleasure, but of a most obliging temper: his affairs were low. [a] Spottiswoode had once made the bargain between the king and him before the troubles, but the earl of Traquair broke it, seeing he was to be raised above himself. The earl of Rothes had all the arts of [b] making himself popular; only there was too much levity in his temper, and too much liberty in his course of life. The earl of Argyll was a more solemn sort of a man, grave and sober, free of all scandalous vices [1], of an invincible calmness of temper, and a pretender to high degrees of piety: [c] [but he was a deep dissembler, and great oppressor in all his private dealings, and he was noted for [d] a defect in his courage [d] on all occasions where danger met him. [e] This had one of its usual effects on him, for he was cruel in cold blood:] [c] he was much set on raising his own family to be a sort of king in the Highlands.

Warriston was my own uncle [2]: [f] [but I will not be more tender in giving his character, for all that nearness in blood.] [f] He was a man of great application, could seldom sleep above three hours in the twenty-four. He had studied the law carefully, and had a great quickness of thought, with an extraordinary memory. He went into very high notions of lengthened devotions, in which he continued many hours a day. He would often pray in his family two hours at a time, and had an unexhausted copiousness that way. [g] [He was a deep enthusiast, for] [g] what thought soever struck his fancy during those effusions, he looked on it as an answer of prayer, and was wholly determined by it. He looked on the Covenant as the setting of Christ on his throne, and so was out of measure zealous in it; [h] [and he had [i] an unrelenting severity of temper [i] against all that opposed it.] [h] He had no regard to the raising himself

[a] *And* struck out. [b] *obliging* struck out. [c] the bracketed passage is struck out. [d] substituted for *cowardice*. [e] *and* struck out. [f] struck out. [g] struck out. [h] struck out. [i] substituted for *the fury of an inquisitor*.

[1] As a man is free of a corporation, he means. S.

[2] Warriston and Burnet's father married respectively the second and third daughters of Sir Thomas Craig.

CHAP. II. or his family, though he had thirteen children: but presbytery was to him more than all the world. He had a readiness and vehemence of speaking, that made him very considerable in public assemblies; [a][but he had no clear nor settled judgment, yet that was supplied by][a] And he had a fruitful invention, so that he was at all times furnished with expedients. [b][And though he was a very honest man in his private dealings, yet he could make great stretches, when the cause seemed to require it.][b] To these three only this paper was to be shewed upon an oath of secrecy[1]: and it was to be deposited in Warriston's hands. They were only allowed to publish to the nation that they were sure of a very great and unexpected assistance, which, though it was then to be kept secret, would appear in due time. This they published: and it was looked on as an artifice to draw in the nation: but it was afterwards found to be a cheat indeed, but a cheat of Savile's, who had forged all these subscriptions.

[a] struck out. [b] struck out.

[1] See my note in my printed copy of Oldmixon's *History of the Stuarts*, 145. O. Mr. Gardiner's note (ix. 179) on Oldmixon's trustworthiness in this particular matter makes a transcription of Onslow's MS. note (which occurs in his handwriting in the copy in the Birmingham Free Library) advisable. 'The author had these letters, as I have reason to believe, from Mr. Johnston of Twittenham (Secretary of State for Scotland to William), who was son of the Lord Warriston now mentioned. Mr. Johnston once showed me some letters that seemed to be of the handwriting of that age which he told me related to the subject that these are upon. A. O. I have now (Nov. 7, 1742) these letters in my custody, and had them from the son of Secretary Johnston. What authority the writer of these letters had for the names of the seven lords now printed I do not know, unless he took them from an endorsement in Secretary Johnston's handwriting on the copy of that letter which I also have, and the endorsement does mention these names, and only them. In the original the subscription is cut out, as this author says. A. O.' The names in Oldmixon are the same as those in Gardiner, except that the name of Lord Saye and Sele is substituted for that of Scrope. Mr. Gardiner, it will be observed (ix. 179 note), thinks that Burnet's story refers to earlier negotiations. See also Welwood's *Memoirs*, 81, for an account somewhat different from that in the text. Welwood had seen Burnet's previous narrative in the *Lives of the Dukes of Hamilton* (1677).

The Scots marched with a very sorry equipage[1]: every soldier carried a week's provision of oatmeal; and they had a drove of cattle with them for their food. They had also 29
an invention of guns of white iron, tinned and done about with leather, and corded: so that they could serve for two or three discharges. These were light, and were carried on horses: and when they came to Newburn, the English army August 28, 1640.
that defended the ford was surprised with a discharge of artillery: some thought it magic, and all | were put in such MS. 15.
disorder, that the whole army did run with [a]so great[a] precipitation, that sir Thomas Fairfax, who had a command in it, did not stick to own that till he passed the Tees his legs trembled under him[2]. This struck many of the enthusiasts of the king's side as much as it exalted the Scots; who were next day possessed of Newcastle, and so were masters, [b]not only[b] of Northumberland and the bishopric of Durham, [c]but of the coaleries; by which, if they had not been in a good understanding with the city of London, they could have distressed them extremely: but all the use the city made of this was, to raise a great outcry, and to complain of the war, since it was now in the power of the Scots to starve them. Upon that, petitions were sent from the city and from some counties, to the king, [d]praying a treaty with the Scots. The lord Wharton and the lord Howard of Escrick undertook to deliver some of these; which they did, and were clapt up [e]upon it[e][3]. [f]A council

[a] substituted for *such*. [b] substituted for *both*. [c] substituted for *and so were masters*. [d] substituted for *for*. [e] interlined. [f] *And* struck out.

[1] Livingstone states (*Wodrow Soc. Sel. Biog.* i. 162) that while lying at Dunse, before the march into England, the Scotch army was in the utmost need.

[2] Clarendon notes with satisfaction (ii. 90) that 'from this infamous defeat at Newburn to the last entire conquest of Scotland by Cromwell, the Scots army never performed one signal action against the English.' On the skirmish see *Hardwicke St. Papers*, ii. 183; and Lord Conway's *Relation concerning the passages in the late Northern Expedition*, 1640; *Memorials and Letters relating*, &c., i. 81.

[3] Dignity of expression. S. There is no evidence for this. Upon Howard of Escrick, see Clarendon, v. 17. He was expelled from Parliament and fined £10,000 in

CHAP II. of war was held[a]; and it was resolved on, as the lord Wharton told me, to shoot them at the head of the army, as movers of sedition. This was chiefly pressed by the earl of Strafford. Duke Hamilton spoke nothing till the council rose; and then he asked Strafford, if he was sure of the army, who seemed surprised at the question: but he upon inquiry understood that very probably a general mutiny, if not a total revolt, would have followed, if any such execution had been attempted. This success of the Scots ruined the king's affairs. And by[b] it the necessity of the union of the two kingdoms may appear[c] very[c] evident: for nothing but a superior army able to beat the Scots can hinder their doing this at any time: and the seizing the coaleries must immediately bring the city of London into great distress. Two armies were now in the north as a load on the king, besides all the other grievances. The lord Savile's forgery came to be discovered. The king knew it; and yet he was brought afterwards to trust him, and
May 25, 1644. to advance him to be earl of Sussex. The king pressed my uncle to deliver him the letter, who excused himself upon his oath; and not knowing what use might be made of it, he cut out every[d] subscription, and sent it to the person for whom it was forged. The imitation was so exact, that every man, as soon as he saw his hand simply by itself, acknowledged that he could not have denied it.

30 The king was now in great straits: he had laid up seven hundred thousand pounds before the troubles in Scotland began; and yet had raised no guards nor force in England, but trusted a very illegal administration[e] to a legal execution. His treasure was now exhausted; his subjects were highly irritated; the ministry were all frighted, being[f] exposed to the anger and justice of the parliament: so

[a] *upon it* struck out. [b] substituted for *this*. [c] interlined. [d] substituted for *man's hand*. [e] substituted for *with*. [f] *all* struck out.

1650 for taking a bribe from a delinquent, upon the information of Harrison the regicide. Firth's *Life of Harrison*, 30, *American Antiquarian Society*, April 26, 1893; Ludlow, *Memoirs*, ed. Firth, i. 259.

that he had brought himself into great distress, but had not the dexterity to extricate himself out of it. He loved high and rough methods, but had neither the skill to conduct them, nor the height of genius necessary to manage them. He hated all that offered prudent and moderate counsels: he thought it flowed from a meanness of spirit, and a care to preserve themselves by sacrificing his authority, or from republican principles: and even when he saw it was necessary to follow such advices, yet he hated those that gave them. His heart was wholly turned to the gaining the two armies. [a] In order to that, he gained Rothes entirely[1], who hoped by the king's mediation to have married the countess of Devonshire, a rich and magnificent lady, that lived long in the greatest state of any[b] in that age. He also gained the earl of Montrose, who was a young man well learned, [c] who had travelled[d], but had taken upon him the port of a hero too much, [e] [and lived as in a romance;] [e] for his whole manner was stately to affectation. When he was beyond seas, he travelled with the earl of Denbigh, and they consulted all the astrologers they could hear of[2]. I plainly saw the earl of Denbigh relied on what had then been told him, to his dying day; and the rather because the earl of Montrose was promised a glorious fortune for some time, but all was to be overthrown in conclusion. When the earl of Montrose returned from his travels, he was not considered by the king as he thought he deserved: so he studied to render himself popular in Scotland; and being [f] [vain and] [f] forward, he was the first and fiercest man in the opposition they made during the first war. [g] He both advised and drew the letter to the king of France, for which the lord Loudoun, who signed it, was imprisoned in the tower of London[3]. But the earl of

[a] *and* struck out. [b] *lady* struck out. [c] substituted for *and*.
[d] *much* struck out. [e] struck out. [f] struck out. [g] *and* struck out.

[1] John, fifth earl. He died this same year, 1641. See Clarendon, iii. 38, 251; iv. 23.

[2] Compare *infra*, 63, 163, and f. 196.

[3] This letter, drawn up in the early part of 1640, addressed 'au

CHAP. II. Lauderdale, as he himself told me, when it came to his turn to sign that letter, found false French in it; for instead of *rayon de soleil*, he had writ *raye de soleil*, which in French signifies a sort of fish; and so the matter went no further at that time; and the treaty came on so soon after that [a]it was never again taken up. The earl of Montrose was gained by the king at Berwick, and undertook to do great services: [b]he made the king fancy, that he could turn the whole kingdom: yet indeed he could do nothing. He was again trying to make a new party: and he kept a correspondence with the king when he lay
MS. 16. at Newcastle; | and was pretending he had a great interest
31 among the covenanters, whereas he had none at all [c]at that time.[c] All these little plottings came to be either known or at least suspected. The queen was a woman of great vivacity in conversation, and loved all her life long to be in intrigues of all sorts, but was not so secret in them as such times and such affairs required. She was a woman of no manner of judgment: [d]she was bad at contrivance, but much worse in the execution: but by the liveliness of her discourse she made always a great impression on the king: and to her little practices, as well as to the king's own temper, the sequel of all his misfortunes was owing. I know it was a maxim infused into

[a] substituted for *this matter*. [b] *for he rather fancied it himself, and had* struck out. [c] interlined. [d] substituted for *and*.

Roy,' and signed by Rothes, Montrose, Mar, Loudoun, &c., was intercepted by Traquair and handed to Charles, who sent it through the Earl of Leicester, English ambassador to France, for Louis XIII to see and disavow. Loudoun and James Colvill were committed to the Tower in April. The reasons of Loudoun's discharge in June, and of the favour into which he was received (he was made chancellor and an earl, Sept 30, 1641) are obscure, though Clarendon (ii. 87) says that it was supposed that Charles wished thereby to disarm opposition in Scotland (*infra*, 224). A second letter, dated February 19, 164$\frac{0}{1}$, and signed by Argyll, Montrose, Lothian, &c., but not by Loudoun, reached Louis safely by the hands of William Colvill, and is in the *Bibliothèque Nationale Fr.* 15,915, fol. 410. See Hamilton's *Pref. to Cal. of S. P.* 1639–40, xii; Clarendon, ii. 60 note; Gardiner, ix. 97; Burnet, *Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton*, 160, 161. See also William Colvill's letter to Balmerino, *Memorials and Letters*, &c., ed. David Dalrymple, i. 57, 60.

his sons, which I have often heard from king James, that he was undone by his concessions. This is true in some respect: for his passing the act that the parliament should sit during pleasure, was indeed his ruin, which he was drawn to by the queen [1]. But if he had not made great concessions [a], he had sunk without being able to make a struggle for it [2]; and could not have divided the nation, or engaged so many to have stood by him: since by the concessions that he made, especially that of the triennial parliament, the honest and quiet part of the nation was satisfied, and thought their religion and liberties were secured: so they broke off from those violenter propositions that occasioned the war. CHAP. II.

[b] The truth was, the king did not come into those concessions seasonably, nor with a good grace: [c] all appeared to be extorted from him. There were also grounds, whether true or plausible, to make it to be believed that he intended not to stand to them longer than as he lay under that force that visibly drew them from him contrary to his own inclinations. [d] The proofs that appeared of some particulars, [e] that made this seem true [e], made other things that were only whispered to be more readily believed: for in all critical times there are deceitful people of both sides, that pretend to merit by making discoveries, on condition that no use shall be made of them as witnesses; which is one of the most pestiferous ways of calumny possible. Almost the [f] whole [f] court had been concerned in one illegal grant or another: so these courtiers, to get their faults passed over, were as so many

[a] *in other matters* struck out. [b] *But* struck out. [c] *so that* struck out. [d] *and* struck out. [e] interlined. [f] interlined.

[1] There is no evidence to sustain this.

[2] In a letter of the Earl of Northumberland (printed among the Sydney papers, ii. 663) to the Earl of Leicester, and dated Nov. 13, 1640, he says, 'the king is in such a strait, that I do not know how he will possibly avoid (without endangering the loss of the whole kingdom) the giving way to the remove of divers persons, as well as other things, that will be demanded by the parliament.' O.

CHAP. II. spies upon the king and queen: they [a] told all they heard, and perhaps not without large additions, to the leading men in the house of commons. This inflamed the jealousy, and put them on to the making still new demands. One eminent passage was told me by the lord Holles:

The earl of Strafford had married his sister [1]: so, though [b] in that parliament [b] he was one of the hottest men of the party, yet when that matter was before them he always
32 withdrew. When the bill of attainder was passed, the king sent for him to know what he could do to save the earl of Strafford. Holles answered, that if the king pleased, since the execution of the law was in him [c], he might legally grant him a reprieve, which must be good in law; but he would not advise it. That which he proposed was, that Strafford should send him a petition for a short respite, to settle his affairs, and to prepare for death; upon which he [2] advised the king to come next day with the petition [d] in his hand [d], and lay it before the two houses, with a speech which he drew [e] for the king [e]; and [f] Holles said [g] to him [g], he would try his interest among his friends to get them to consent to it. He prepared a great many by assuring them, that if they would save lord Strafford, he would become wholly theirs, in consequence of his first principles: and that he might do them much more service by being preserved, than he could do, if made an example of upon such new and doubtful points. In this he had wrought on so many, that he believed [h] if the king's party had struck into it, he might have saved him. It [i] was carried to the queen, as if Holles had engaged that the earl of Strafford would accuse her, and discover all he

[a] substituted for *and*. [b] substituted for *at first*. [c] substituted for *the king*. [d] interlined. [e] interlined. [f] *then* struck out. [g] interlined. [h] *that* struck out. [i] substituted for *this*.

---

[1] Strafford married, as his second wife, Arabella Holles, younger daughter of Lord Clare, in Feb. 1624. His first wife was Margaret Clifford, eldest daughter of Francis, Earl of Cumberland. She died in 1622.

[2] Sc. Strafford.

knew: so the queen not only diverted the king from going to the parliament, changing the speech into a message all writ with the king's own hand, and sent to the house of lords by the prince of Wales: which Holles said, would have perhaps done as well, the king being apt to spoil things by an unacceptable manner: but to the wonder of the whole world, the queen prevailed with him to add that mean postscript, *If he must die, it were charity to reprieve him to Saturday:* which was a very unhandsome giving up of the whole message[1]. [a] When it was communicated to both houses, the whole court party were plainly against it: and so he fell, truly by the queen's means[2]. CHAP. II. May, 1641.

[a] *and* struck out.

[1] Burnet's story is opposed to every other authority. That Holles tried to save Strafford is confirmed by Laud. But Laud states the nature of the proposed arrangement differently, and says that the scheme was frustrated by Strafford's refusal to listen to it. *Laud's Works*, *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, iii. 442. Laud further says, that after the passing of the Attainder Bill, Strafford made by his friends two suits to the king (*ibid.*). One was that his death might be respited till the Saturday, that he might have a little time to settle his estate. This evidently suggested the postscript. In the explanation of the letter which the king gave to the Lords he says that he asked for a respite 'on certain information that his estate was so distracted that it necessarily required a few days for settlement' (*Lords' Journals*, iv. 245). On the other hand, there is no trace of a petition for reprieve in the Journals, with which indeed the king's postscript and explanation would have been incompatible, though the fact of there being no such petition is consistent with Laud's statement, and with that of Burnet that such a petition was proposed to be made to the king. If this explanation be true, Burnet's statement that the postscript was added at the queen's suggestion—which is unconfirmed by other evidence—cannot be correct. Perhaps Burnet has mixed up some of the various expedients put forward to save Strafford's life. It is very likely that Holles misrepresented the queen's attitude. Strafford's suggestions to the king for his behaviour 'when the Bill of Attainder is presented to him for the Royal assent' may be read in the *Camden Miscellany* for 1894, with an introduction by Mr. Firth (to whom the substance of this note is due). The letter of the king to the Lords (sent, as Burnet says, by the Prince of Wales), with its numerous erasures, seems to have been an expedient adopted at the last moment, not in pursuance of a scheme deliberately selected at the first. See the letter in the *H. M. C. Report*, i. 10.

[2] Carte (*Bodleian MSS.*) says, that when Cardinal Richelieu heard of the king's consenting to Lord Strafford's death, he observed that the king had cut off the only head

CHAP. II.

The mentioning this makes me add one particular concerning archbishop Laud: when his impeachment was brought to the lords' bar, he, apprehending how it would end, sent over Warner, bishop of Rochester, with the keys of his closet and cabinets, that he might destroy, or put out of the way, all papers that might either hurt himself or any body else. He was at that work for three hours, MS. 17. till, upon | Laud's being committed to the black rod, a messenger went over to seal up his closet, who came after all was withdrawn. Among the writings [a] which he took away, it is believed the original Magna Carta [1], passed by king John in the mead near Staines, was one. [b] This was 33 found among his papers by his executor, Dr. Lee: and that descended to his son and executor, colonel Lee, who gave it to me. So it is now in my hands; and it came very fairly to me [2]. [c] For this conveyance of it we have nothing but conjecture.

[a] substituted for *papers*. [b] *but* struck out. [c] *and* struck out.

in the nation that could secure his own from the like fate. R. Mazarin also pointed to this as a fatal concession to popular demands.

[1] The term 'the original Magna Carta' is misleading, unless indeed Burnet means to distinguish between John's charter and later ones. The document was not signed by King John, but copies were prepared and sealed in the Chancery in the usual way, and one was sent to every cathedral town. There are at present five extant, of which that mentioned in the text, and now in the British Museum (*Add. MSS.* 4838), is one. It has been printed by the authorities with the following note: 'The document was formerly in the possession of Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, and had previously been in the hands of John Warner, Bishop of Rochester, who is supposed to have taken charge of it, together with Archbishop Laud's papers, at the impeachment of the latter in 1640. When Blackstone published his work *The Great Charter and Charter of the Forest*, Oxford, 1759, it was in the possession of David Mitchell, the executor of Sir Thomas Burnet, the bishop's son; and, ten years later, in 1769, it was presented by Philip, second Earl Stanhope, to the British Museum.'

[2] There was reason enough for the bishop's giving an account how he came by this most valuable piece of antiquity: his having been trusted (especially after his publication of the *History of the Reformation*) in searching all records, private and public, gave good grounds to suspect he had obtained it in a less justifiable manner. D. The following remarkable article in relation to our Magna Carta is in the remarks of M. des Maizeaux upon the *Colo-*

CHAPTER III.

TO THE DEATH OF CHARLES I.

I DO not intend to prosecute the history of the wars. I have told a great deal relating to them in the Memoirs of the dukes of Hamilton. Rushworth's collections contain many excellent materials: and now the first volume of the earl of Clarendon's history gives a faithful representation of the beginnings of the troubles, [a] though writ in favour of the court, and full of the best excuses that such ill things were capable of [b]. I shall therefore only set out what I had particular reason to know, and that is not to be met with in books. 1702.

The kirk was now settled in Scotland with a new mixture of ruling elders, which, though they were taken from the Geneva pattern, to assist, or rather to be a check on, the minister in the managing the parochial discipline, yet [c] these [c] never came to their assemblies till the year 1638, that they thought it necessary to make them first go and carry all the elections of the ministers [d] at the several presbyteries, and next come themselves and sit in the assembly [d]. [e] The nobility and chief gentry offered themselves upon that occasion: and the ministers, [f] since they saw they [g] were like to [g] act in opposition to the king's orders, were glad to have so great a support. But the elders that now came to assist them, beginning to take, as the ministers thought, too much on them, they grew weary

[a] *which* struck out. [b] *yet is indeed a noble work* struck out. [c] interlined. [d] interlined. [e] *and* struck out. [f] *finding that* struck out. [g] substituted for *would*.

---

mesiana of Monsieur du Colomies, p. 538 of the Amsterdam edition in 1740: 'J'ai oui dire que le chevalier Robert Cotton étant allé chez un tailleur, trouva qu'il alloit faire des mesures de la Grande Chartre d'Angleterre en original avec les seings et tous les sceaux. Il eut pour quatre sous cette rare piece, qu'on avoit cru si long tems perdue, et qu'on n'espéroit pas de pouvoir jamais retrouver.' *Cole.*

CHAP. III. of such imperious masters: so they studied to work up the [a] inferior [a] people to much zeal: and as they wrought any up to some measure of heat [b] and knowledge, they brought them into their eldership; and so got a majority of hot zealots who depended on them. [c] One out of these was deputed to attend on the judicatories. They had synods of all the clergy, in one or more counties, who met twice a year: and a general assembly that met once a year: and [d] at parting [e] that body [e] named some, called the Commission of the Kirk, who were to sit in the intervals, to prepare matters for the next assembly, and to look to all the concerns of the church, to give warning of dangers, and to inspect all the proceedings of the state, as far as they related to the matters of religion: [f] by these means they became terrible to all their enemies. In their sermons, and chiefly in their prayers, all that passed in the state was canvassed: men were as good as named, and either recommended or complained of to God as they were acceptable or odious to them. This grew [g] up in time [g] to an insufferable degree of boldness. [h] The way that was given to it, when the king and the bishops were their com-
34 mon themes, made that afterwards the humour could not be restrained when it grew so petulant that the pulpit was a scene of noise and passion. [i] For some years this was managed with [k] great appearances of fervour by men of age and some authority: but when the younger and hotter zealots took it up, it became odious to almost all sorts of people, except some sour enthusiasts, who thought all [l] their impertinence [l] was zeal, and an effect of inspiration; which flowed naturally from the conceit of extemporary prayers being praying by the Spirit[1].

[a] interlined. [b] substituted for *zeal.* [c] *and* struck out. [d] *these* struck out. [e] interlined [f] *and* struck out. [g] interlined. [h] *and* struck out. [i] *Yet* struck out. [k] *such* struck out. [l] interlined.

---

[1] Compare with this account the impressions of an observant and well-educated soldier in Cromwell's army written just after the battle of Dunbar: 'Instead of having no God but one, the generality of people do

Henderson, a minister of Edinburgh, was by much the wisest and gravest of them all: but as all his performances that I have seen are flat and heavy, so he found it was an easier thing to raise a flame than to quench it. [a] He studied to keep his party to him, yet he found he could not moderate the heat of some fiery spirits: so when he saw he could follow them no more, but that they had got the people out of his hands, he sunk both in body and mind, and died soon after the papers had passed between the king and him at Newcastle [1]. The person next him was Douglas, believed to be descended from the royal family, though the wrong way: for he was, [b] as was said [b], the bastard of a bastard of queen Mary of Scotland, by a child that she secretly bare to Douglas, who was half brother to the earl of Murray, the regent, and had the keeping of her in the castle of Lochleven trusted to him; from whence he helped to make her escape on that consideration. There was an air of greatness in Douglas, that made all that saw him inclined enough to believe he was of no ordinary descent. He was a reserved man: he had the Scriptures by heart, to the exactness of a Jew; for he was as a concordance: he was too calm and grave for the furious men,

[a] *But tho* struck out. [b] interlined.

idolize and set up their ministers, believing what they say, though never so contrary to religion and reason, and they stand more in awe of them than a school boy does of his master:' and again, 'The Presbyteriall government with the several formes, rights, and practices of it is the graven image which they have set up.' *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, ed. Gardiner, Scottish Hist. Soc. 137. See also, for another impression of Scotland and the Scotch (in 1672), the *Portland MSS.*, vol. iii. *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 327.

[1] 'The fairest ornament, after John Knox of incomparable memory, that ever the Church of Scotland did enjoy.' Baillie, iii. 12. He died at Edinburgh, August 19, 1646. Royalists like Clarendon ascribe his death to remorse for the evil he had caused, or, like Barwick, to shame at his defeat in argument at Newcastle by Charles I; while earnest Presbyterians lay it to his 'displeasure at the king's ways' and to vexation at the failure of the Westminster Assembly to establish Presbyterianism in the full Scotch sense. See Baillie, ii. 398, 399; Hetherington's *Hist. of the Westminster Assembly*; and, for the Newcastle controversy, *H. M. C. Report*, iii. 88.

CHAP. III. but yet he was much depended on for his prudence. I knew him in his old age: and saw plainly he was a slave to his popularity, and durst not own the free thoughts he had of some things for fear of offending the people [1].

I will not run out in giving the characters of the other
MS. 18. leading preachers among them, such | as Dickson, Blair, Rutherford, Baillie, Cant, and the two Gillespies [2]. They were men all of a sort: affected great sublimities in devotion: they poured themselves out in their prayers with a loud [a] voice, and often with many tears. They had but an ordinary proportion of learning among them; something of Hebrew, very little Greek: books of controversy with the Papists, but above all with the Arminians, was the height of their study. A dull way of preaching by doctrine, reason, and use, was that they set up on: and some of them affected a strain of stating cases of conscience, not with relation to moral actions, but to some reflexions on their condition [b] and temper, [c] that was occasioned chiefly by their conceit of praying by the Spirit, which every one could not attain to, or keep up to the same heat in it at all

[a] substituted for *roaring*. [b] substituted for *state*.
[c] substituted for *which*.

---

[1] The father of Robert Douglas was an illegitimate son of Sir George Douglas of Lochleven, who aided Mary in her escape, the brother of William Douglas, sixth Earl of Morton. This descent of Douglas is denied, in a note to the Introd. to Crookshank's *Hist. Church of Scotland*, but no authority is given. That Mary was his father's mother is impossible. She could not have borne a child after her escape without the fact being well known. Douglas had been chaplain of the Scots troop in the service of Gustavus Adolphus. Burton, vii. 286. He was a leader of the Resolutioners; refused the bishopric of Edinburgh in 1660; was 'deprived' in 1662; 'indulged' in 1669; and died in 1674. As commissioner, with James Sharp, to Charles II at the Restoration, he was completely hoodwinked by his colleague. *Lauderdale Papers* (Camden Soc.), vol. i. 36, &c.

[2] Dickson, minister of Ruthergen; Blair, minister of St. Andrews; Rutherford, author of *Lex Rex* (*Scottish Divines, St. Giles's Lectures*, 3rd series; Howie's *Scots Worthies*, ed. Carslaw, 233); Baillie, of the *Letters and Journals*; Cant, minister of Aberdeen. See *Life of Livingstone*, i. 305, 311 (Wodrow Soc., *Sel. Biog.*). Patrick Gillespie was principal of Glasgow College; George Gillespie, minister of Wemyss and Edinburgh.

times. [a] The learning they recommended to their young divines was some German systems, some commentators on the Scripture, books of controversy, and practical books. [b] They were so careful to oblige them to make their round in these, that if they had no men of great learning among them, yet none were very ignorant: as if they had thought an equality in learning was necessary to keep up the parity of their government. None could be suffered to preach as expectants, as they called them [c], but after a trial or two in private before the ministers alone: then two or three sermons were to be preached in public, some more learnedly, some more practically: then a head in divinity was to be commonplaced in Latin, and the person was to maintain theses upon it: he was to be also tried in Greek and Hebrew, and in Scripture chronology. [d] The questionary trial came last; every minister asking such questions as he pleased. When any [e] had passed through all these with approbation, which was done in a course of three or four months, he was allowed to preach when invited, and if he was presented or called to a church, he was to pass through [f] a new set of the same trials [1]. This made that there was a small circle of knowledge in which they were generally well instructed. True morality was little studied or esteemed by them. They were generally proud and passionate, insolent and covetous; yet they took much pains among their people to maintain their authority [g]. They affected all the ways of familiarity [h] that were like to gain on them [h]: even in sacred matters they got into a set of very indecent phrases. 35

[a] *All* struck out. [b] *Yet* struck out. [c] *that is, proposants*, interlined. [d] *and* struck out. [e] *the person* struck out. [f] substituted for *over*. [g] *among them* struck out. [h] interlined.

[1] See especially, for a good instance, the account of the trials of James Sharp, when presented by Crawford to the Sand Kirk of Craill, before the Presbytery of St. Andrews, Nov. 3, 1647—June 27, 1648. *Abbotsford Club*. Burnet himself passed his trials for Saltoun in Nov. and Dec. 1664; was inducted Jan. 29, 1665; instituted June 15, 1665; approved July 5, 1666.

CHAP. III. They forced all people to sign the covenant[1]: and the greatest part of the episcopal clergy, among whom there were two [a] bishops, came to them, and renounced their former principles, and desired to be received into their body. At first they received all that offered themselves: but afterwards they repented of this, and the violent men among them were ever pressing the purging the Kirk, as they called it, that is, the ejecting all the episcopal clergy. Then they took up the wicked term of *malignants*, by which all who differed from them were distinguished: but [b] the strictness of piety and good life, which had gained them so much reputation before the war, began to wear off; and instead of that, a fierceness of temper, and a copiousness of many long sermons, and much longer prayers, came to be the distinction of the party. This they carried even to the saying grace before and after meat sometimes to the length of a whole hour. But [c] as every new war broke out [c], there was a visible abatement of even the outward shews of piety. Thus the war corrupted both sides. When the war broke out in England, the Scots had a great mind to go into it. The decayed nobility, the military men, and the ministers, were violently set on it. They saw what good quarters they had in the north of England; and they hoped the umpirage of the war would fall into their hands. The division appearing so near an equality in England, they
36 reckoned they should [d] turn the scales, and so be courted of both sides: and they did not doubt to draw great advantages from it, both for the nation in general and

[a] *or three* struck out.
[b] *all* struck out.
[c] altered from *at every new opening*.
[d] altered from *would*.

[1] See the striking letter of remonstrance against the intolerance of the Covenanters from Burnet's father (who had himself taken the Covenant, *Lockhart Papers*, i. 597) to his brother-in-law Warriston, written about 1639, in *Memorials and Letters relating, &c.*, ii. 72: 'Who will rather have all the three kingdoms destroyed, and every-one weltering in another's blood, before you get not your will. God forgive your bloody and cruel preachers who have not known, nor will not know, the way of peace.' See also Drummond's *Irene*; Masson, *Drummond of Hawthornden*, 273 *et seq.*

themselves in particular. Duke Hamilton was trusted by the king with the management of his affairs in that kingdom[1], and had powers to offer, (but so secretly that if discovered it could not be proved, for fear of disgusting the English), that if they would engage in the king's side he [a] would consent to [a] the uniting Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland, to Scotland[2], and that Newcastle should be the seat of the government; that the prince of Wales should hold his court always among them; that every third year the king should go among them; and every office in the king's household should in the third turn be given to a Scotchman. This I found not among duke Hamilton's papers, but the earl of Lauderdale assured me of it, and that at the Isle of Wight they had all the engagements from the king to make it good upon their success that he could then give[3]. Duke Hamilton quickly saw it was a vain imagination to hope that kingdom could be brought to espouse the king's quarrel; the inclination ran [b] strong the other way: [c] all | he hoped to succeed in was MS. 19. to keep them neuter for some time: and this he saw could not hold long: so after he had kept off their engaging

[a] substituted for *might offer*. [b] *so* struck out. [c] *so* struck out.

---

[1] He was a kinsman of the king, being descended from a daughter of James II of Scotland.

[2] See *Ludlow's Memoirs*, i. 19: 'The Scots army [in 1641] was also tried, and the four northern counties offered to be given to them in case they will undertake the same design [the dissolution of the Parliament].' The charge of offering the northern counties to the Scots was made also against the Parliament by the Royalists. *Lives of the Duke and Duchess of Newcastle*, Preface, lxii (ed. Firth): 'A very considerable thing I have heard . . . that the rebellious Parliament did call the Scots to their assistance with a promise to reward so great a service with the four northern counties,' &c.

[3] See this document, dated Carisbrooke, Dec. 26, 1647 (erased), and sealed with Charles's signet, printed in the *Lauderdale Papers*, Camden Soc. i. 2. There is, however, of course nothing in it about uniting the northern counties to Scotland. It was drawn up solely in favour of the Scotch nobles, and contains not a word upon Church matters. Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, iii. 272–275, and especially *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, 264, and 265 *note*.

CHAP. III. with England all the year 1643, he and his friends saw it was in vain to struggle any longer. The course they all resolved on was, that the nobility should fall in [a] heartily with the inclinations of the nation to join with England, that they might [b] procure to themselves and their friends the chief commands in the army: and then when they were in England, and that their army was as a distinct body separated from the rest of the kingdom, it might be much easier to gain them to the king's service than it was at that time to work on the whole nation [1].

This was not a very sincere way of proceeding, but it was intended for the king's service, and would very probably have had the effect designed by it if some accidents had not happened that changed the face of affairs, which are not rightly understood: and therefore I will open them

[a] *so* struck out. [b] substituted for *should*.

[1] Compare Clarendon, *Rebellion*, vii. 379–387; and Dr. Hickes's declaration attested in Carte's *MSS.*, that he had read a copy, shown him by the Duke of Lauderdale, of Burnet's *Memoirs of the two Dukes of Hamilton*, all in the bishop's handwriting, in which he imputes to them and their counsels all the miseries of Scotland, and the ruin of the king's affairs in that country. [No such statement appears in the published work, 1677. But in the Preface Burnet refers to the fact that there *was* an earlier copy, unprinted, and that the book was rewritten by Sir R. Moray's advice.] As to the dark affair named the *Incident*, professedly left unexplained by Burnet, and which has occasioned reflections to be thrown on the king by some writers, because Hamilton, with his brother and the Earl of Argyll, quitted the king's court at Edinburgh in the year 1641, the several parties concerned seem at the time to have agreed not to disclose to the public all the circumstances relating to it. And it now appears, from one of Sir Edward Nicholas's letters to the king, Evelyn's *Memoirs*, [Bray's ed. ii. 59], that the lords of the privy-council in England, having read the examinations concerning this affair, 'as they had received no command to publish them, contented themselves with declaring to such, as should converse with them about them, that they found nothing in all those examinations that in any sort reflected on his majesty's honour.' The king in the margin of the letter has written, that 'they neede to doe no more, but as they have, and resolve to doe.' R. Compare Burton, vii. 151, and Gardiner, x. 26, where the 'Incident' is detailed as minutely as the evidence will allow. See also *Hardwicke State Papers*, ii. 299; Rushworth, v. 421; Baillie, i. 392.

clearly. The earl of Montrose and a party of high royalists were for entering into an open breach with the country in the beginning of the year 1643, but offered no probable methods of managing it; nor could they reckon themselves assured of any considerable party[1]. They were full of big words and bold undertakings: but when they were pressed to shew what concurrence might be depended on, nothing was offered but from the Highlanders: and on this wise men could not rely: so duke Hamilton would not expose the king's affairs by such a desperate way of proceeding. Upon this they went to Oxford, and filled all people there with complaints of the treachery of the Hamiltons; and they pretended they could have secured Scotland if their propositions had been entertained. This was [a]but too[a] suitable to the king's own inclinations, and to the humour that was then prevailing at Oxford. So when the two Hamiltons came up, they were not admitted to speak with the king: and it was believed if the younger brother had not made his escape that both would have suffered; for when the queen heard of his escape, she with great commotion said, 'Abercorn has missed a dukedom'; for that earl was a papist, and next to the two brothers[2]. They could have demonstrated, [b]if heard[b], that they were sure of above two parts in three of the officers of the army; and

37 1643.

[a] substituted for *more*. [b] *to the king* struck out, and *if heard* interlined.

[1] See Mr. Gardiner's comparison of the two policies, *Great Civil War*, i. 147, where he distinctly favours that of Montrose under the circumstances. Cf. Evelyn's *Memoirs*, App. 82, note.

[2] Before the civil war the queen had a very particular aversion to Duke Hamilton, which he perceiving, prevailed with Mrs. Seymour, who attended upon her in her bedchamber, to let him into the queen's private apartment at Somerset House, (the usual place for her retirement,) where he surprised the queen in great familiarities with Harry Jermyn; after which she never durst refuse the duke any thing he desired of her. This, Sir Francis Compton told me, he had from his mother, the Countess of Northampton, who was very intimately acquainted with Mrs. Seymour, that was afterwards drowned in shooting London Bridge. D. See the frank expression of the queen's relations with Jermyn in *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 179.

CHAP. III. did not doubt to have engaged the army into the king's cause. But the failing in this was not all. The earl, then made marquis of Montrose, had powers given him such as he desired, and was sent down with them: but he could do nothing [a] till [b] the end of the year. A great body of the Macdonalds, commanded by one Collkitoch [i.e. Colquhitto][1] came over from Ireland to recover Cantyre, the best country of all the Highlands, out of which they had been driven by Argyll's family, who had possessed their country about fifty years. The head of these was the earl of Antrim[2], who had married the duke of Buckingham's widow: and being a papist, and having a great command in Ulster, was much relied on by the queen. He was the main person in the first rebellion [c], and was the most engaged in the bloodshed [d] of any in the north: yet he continued to correspond with the queen to the great prejudice of the [e] king's affairs[3]. When the marquis of Montrose heard they were in Argyllshire, he went to them, and told them, if they would let him lead them he would carry them into the heart of the kingdom, and procure them [f] better quarters and good pay: so he led them down into Perthshire. The Scots had at that time an army in England, and another in Ireland: yet they did not think it necessary to call home any part of either; but, despising the Irish and the Highlanders, they raised a tumultuary army, and put it under the command of some lords noted for want of courage[4], and of others who

May 6, 1644 (?).

[a] *at first* struck out. [b] *in* struck out. [c] *there* struck out.
[d] *there* struck out. [e] substituted for *queen's*. [f] substituted for *good*.

---

[1] Coll Keitache, or Colkitto, 'the man who could fight with either hand,' was *father* of Alexander Macdonald, who commanded the Irish Macdonalds. Napier, *Montrose and the Covenanters*, ii. 289, *note*.

[2] See 67. Upon the character of Randal Macdonell (or Macdonald), Earl and Marquis of Antrim, his career, and negotiations with Montrose, see Clarendon, viii. 264-278, and Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 154.

[3] Carte states (*Ormond*, iv. 155-185) that during the negotiation with the Marquis of Antrim for sending troops to serve the king in Scotland, he had several letters from the queen encouraging him to proceed in the affair, and urging despatch. R.

[4] sc. Argyll and Elcho.

wished well to the other side. The marquis of Montrose's men were desperate, and met with a feeble resistance: so that small body of the covenanters' army was routed[1]. And here Montrose got horses and ammunition, having but three horses before, and powder only for one charge. [a] Then he became considerable: [b] and he marched through the northern parts by Aberdeen. The marquis of Huntly was in the king's interests; but he would not join with him, though his sons did[2]. [c] Astrology ruined him: he believed the 38
stars, and they deceived him[3]: he said often, that neither the king, nor the Hamiltons, nor Montrose would prosper: he believed he should outlive them all, and escape at last; [d] as it happened in conclusion as to his outliving the others[d]. He was naturally a gallant man: but the stars had so subdued him, that he made a poor figure during the whole course of the wars[4].

1644-5.

[a] substituted for *And now.* [b] *he broke into Dundee, but was beaten out;* struck out. [c] *But* struck out. [d] interlined.

---

[1] This refers to the first victory, that over Elcho at Tippermuir, Sept. 1, 1644. Five more battles were won by Montrose before the overthrow at Philiphaugh, Sept. 13, 1645.

[2] For the great power possessed by Huntly, see Burton, vi. 512, &c.

[3] Cf. 47, 172, and f. 196.

[4] 'For my own part, I am in your power, and resolved not to leave that foul title of traitor as an inheritance to my posterity. You may take my head from my shoulders, but not my heart from my sovereign.' *The Marquess of Huntley his Reply* (to the Covenanters) &c., Lond. 1640. It is but justice to the Romanists of this country to add, that this chief of the house of Gordon was a Roman Catholic; the laity of which communion was for the most part more loyally affected to the crown, than appears to have been agreeable to the then policy of the court of Rome. For it is well known, that in the beginning of the Scottish rebellion, when the Roman-Catholic gentry contributed money in aid of the king's necessities, they were reprehended for their conduct by the papal nuntio. A copy of the Admonition, in which this reprehension is contained, may be seen amongst the Sheldon MSS. (Bodl.). R. By the 'nuntio' mentioned in this note must be meant the Pope's agent at the English Court, a Scotchman named Con, usually known by the Italianized name Cuneo, who remained in England from the summer of 1636 to the autumn of 1639. His immediate mission was to obtain a modification of the oath of allegiance imposed by James I. Ranke, ii. 40, 41, 150; v. 450; Gardiner, viii. 138, 236–244; ix. 87. Lingard, x. 6–9.

CHAP. III. The marquis of Montrose's success was very mischievous, and proved the ruin of the king's affairs: on which I should not have depended entirely if I had had this only from the earl of Lauderdale[1], who was indeed my first author, but it was fully confirmed by the lord Holles[2] [a], who had gone in with great heat into the beginnings of the war: but he soon saw the ill consequences it already had, and the worse that were like to grow with the progress of the war. He had in the beginning of the year 43, when he was sent to Oxford with the propositions, taken great pains on all about the king to convince them of the necessity of their yielding in time, since the longer they stood out the conditions would be harder: and when he was sent by the parliament, in the end of the year 44, with other propositions, he and Whitelocke
Dec. 1644. entered into secret conferences with the king, of which some account is given by Whitelocke in his Memoirs[3]. They, with other commissioners that were sent to Oxford, possessed the king, and all that were in [b] great credit with him, with this, that it was absolutely necessary the king should put an end to the war by a treaty: a new party [c] of hot men [c] was springing up, that were plainly for changing the government: they were growing much in the army, but
MS. 20. were yet far from carrying any thing in the House: | they had gained much strength this summer, and they might make a great progress by the accidents that another year might produce: the Scottish army was entirely in the interests of those who wished for a peace. They confessed there were many things hard to be digested, that must be done in order to a peace: they asked things that were

[a] the following lines are here struck out: *and further by what I find in Whitlock's Memoirs. In the end of the year* 1644 *Hollis and Whitlock* [*with other commissioners*, &c. as 14 lines lower down, the intervening passage being added on the opposite page]. [b] substituted for *most*. [c] interlined.

[1] i. e. the second earl, a bitter enemy of Montrose.

[2] Also a bad authority, as a strong Presbyterian.

[3] This was in December, 1644. See Mr. Firth's article on Holles in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, and Whitelocke, i. 336.

unreasonable: but they were forced to consent to those demands, otherwise they would have lost their credit with the city and the people; the absence of the courts and the progress of the war had inflamed the people, who could not be satisfied without a very entire security and a full satisfaction: but the extremity to which matters might be carried otherwise made it necessary to come to a peace on any terms whatsoever, since no terms could be so bad as the continuance of the war: the king must trust them, though they were not at that time disposed to trust him so much as were to be wished. They said farther, that if a peace should follow, it would be a much easier thing to get any hard laws now moved for to be repealed, than it was now to hinder their being insisted on. With these things Holles told me that the king and many of his counsellors, who saw how his affairs declined, and with what difficulty they could hope to continue the war another year, were satisfied. The king more particularly began to feel the insolence of the military men, and of those who were daily reproaching him with their services; so that [a] they were become as uneasy to him as those of Westminster had been formerly. Holles told me he left Oxford not doubting but a peace would have followed [b]. But [c] some came up in the interval from Montrose with such an account of what he had done, of the strength he had, and of his hopes next summer, that the king was by that prevailed on to [d] believe his affairs would mend, and that he might afterwards treat on better terms. This unhappily wrought so far, that the limitations he put on those whom he sent to treat at Uxbridge made the whole design miscarry. That raised the spirits of those that were already but too much exasperated. The marquis of Montrose made a great progress the next year: but he laid no lasting foundation, for he did not make himself master of the strong places or passes of the kingdom. After his last and greatest victory at Kilsyth, he

Chap. III.

39

Jan. 164$\frac{4}{5}$.

Aug. 15, 1645.

[a] *he thought* struck out. [b] *at the treaty then agreed to be held at Uxbridge* struck out. [c] *unhappily* struck out. [d] substituted for *hope*.

CHAP. III. was lifted up out of measure. The Macdonalds were every where fierce masters and ravenous plunderers: and the other Highlanders, who did not such military execution, yet were good at robbing: and when they had got as much as they could carry home on their backs, they deserted. The Macdonalds also left him to go and execute their revenge on Argyll's country. Montrose thought he was now master, but had no scheme how to fix his conquests: he wasted the estates of his enemies, chiefly the Hamiltons[1]; and went towards the borders of England, though he had but a small force left about him: but he thought his name carried terror with it. So he writ to the king, that he had
Feb. 3, 1645. gone over the land from Dan to Beersheba: he prayed the king to come down in these words, *Come thou, and take the city, lest I take it, and it be called by my name.* This letter was writ, but never sent; for he was routed, and his papers taken, before he had despatched the courier[2]. [[a] In his defeat, he took too much care of himself; for he was never willing to expose himself much [a].] When his papers were taken, many letters of the king, and of others at Oxford, to him were found, as the earl of Crawford, one appointed to read them, told me; which increased the disgust: but these were not published. [b] Upon this occasion the marquis of Argyll and the preachers shewed a very bloody temper; many prisoners that had quarters given them were murdered in cold blood[3]: and as they sent them to some towns that

[a] struck out. [b] *Only* struck out.

[1] Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, ii. 327, &c. There appears to be no evidence for the wasting of the Hamilton's lands mentioned in the text.

[2] This letter is given at length in Welwood's *Memoirs*, 65, which Burnet had probably read (cf. f. 613, note). It was written on Feb. 3, 1645, the day after the battle of Inverlochy. Between that date and the defeat at Philiphaugh, Montrose won the victories of Auldearn, Alford, and Kilsyth. The letter apparently reached the king; Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, ii. 105; Napier, *Montrose and the Covenanters*, ii. 395, and note. The suggestion which occurs in the 1823 edition, but which Burnet struck out in his own copy for the Press, that Montrose showed a lack of personal courage at Philiphaugh, is absolutely unsupported by evidence.

[3] Especially the Irish, for whom neither age nor sex was a protection. Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, ii. 337.

had been ill used by Montrose's army, the people in revenge fell on them, and knocked them in the head. Several persons of quality were condemned for being with him: and these were proceeded against both with severity and with many indignities. The preachers thundered in their pulpits against all that did the work of the Lord deceitfully, and cried out against all that were for moderate proceedings, as guilty of the blood that had been shed. *Thine eye shall not pity, and thou shalt not spare*, were often inculcated; and after every execution they triumphed with so little decency, that it gave all people very ill impressions of them. But this was not the worst effect of Montrose's expedition. It lost the opportunity at Uxbridge: it alienated the Scots much from the king: it exalted all that were enemies to peace. For now they seemed to have some colour for all those aspersions they had cast on the king, as if he had been in a correspondence with the Irish rebels, when the worst tribe of them was thus employed by him [1]. [a] His affairs declined totally in England that summer, [b]and[b] Holles said to me, all was owing to Montrose's unhappy successes. CHAP. III.

Upon this occasion I will relate somewhat concerning Antrim [2]. I had in my hand several of his letters to the king in the year 1646, writ in a very confident style: for he was a very arrogant, as well as a very weak, man. One was somewhat particular: he in a postscript desired the king to send the inclosed to the good woman, without making any excuse for the presumption; by which, as follows in the postscript, he meant his wife, the duchess of Buckingham. This made me more easy to believe a story

[a] *And as* struck out. [b] substituted for *so.*

[1] This opinion is expressed by Welwood, 63. But Mr. Gardiner has made it abundantly clear that although the receipt of the letter on Feb. 19 probably affected Charles's tone during the following days, all hope of accommodation had departed, and that the treaty was practically at an end by Feb. 15; *Great Civil War*, ii. 75. Montrose's 'worst tribe' of Irish, were, it should be noticed, Macdonell's men, of Scottish descent.

[2] See *supra* 62; Clarendon's *Continuation*, i. 510 (Clar. Press); Pepys, Feb. 22, 1664; and the detailed account in Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 153–185.

CHAP. III. MS. 21. that the earl of Essex told me he had from the earl of Northumberland: | upon the restoration, in the year 1660, Antrim was thought guilty of so much bloodshed, that it was taken for granted he could not be included in the indemnity that was to pass in Ireland. Upon this he seeing the duke of Ormond set against him, came over to London, and was lodged at Somerset House: and it was believed that, having no children, he settled his estate on Jermyn, then earl of St. Albans: but before he came over, he had made a prior settlement in favour of his brother[1]. He petitioned the king to order a committee of council to examine the warrants that he had acted upon. The earl of Clarendon was for rejecting the petition, as containing a high indignity to the memory of king Charles the first: and said plainly at council table, that if any person had pretended to affirm such a thing while they were at Oxford, he would either have been very severely punished for it, or the king would soon have had a very thin court. But [a] it seemed just to see what he had to say for himself: so a committee was named, of which the earl of Northumberland was the chief. He produced to them some of the king's letters: but they did not come to a full proof. [b] In 41 one of them the king wrote that he had not then leisure, but referred himself to the queen's letter; and said, that was all one as if he writ himself. Upon this foundation he produced a series of letters writ by himself to the queen, in which he gave her an account of every one of the particulars that were laid to his charge, and shewed the grounds he went on, and desired her directions; and to every one of these he had answers ordering him to do as he did. This

[a] *the king said that* interlined. [b] *But* struck out.

[1] His estate had been allotted to Sir John Clotworthy (created Viscount Massereene, Nov. 1660) and other 'adventurers.' On the settlement upon his brother Alexander Macdonell, and the subsequent settlement upon St. Albans, with the connexion between this and the queen-mother's great interest in the restitution of the estate to Antrim, see Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 188. Jermyn was created Earl of St. Albans in 1660; died 1683.

the queen-mother espoused with great zeal, and said she was bound in honour to save him. I saw a great deal of that management, for I was then at court[1]. But it was generally believed, that this train of letters was made up at that time in a collusion between the queen and him. So a report was prepared to be signed by the committee, setting forth that he had so fully justified himself in every thing that had been objected to him, that he ought not to be excepted out of the indemnity. This was brought first to the earl of Northumberland to be signed by him: but he refused it, and said he was sorry he had produced such warrants, but he did not think they could serve his turn; for he did not believe any warrant from the king or queen could justify so much bloodshed in so many black instances as were laid against him. Upon his refusal, the rest of the committee did not think fit to sign the report: so it was let fall: and the king was prevailed on to write to the duke of Ormond, telling him that he had so vindicated himself, that he must endeavour to get him included in the indemnity. That was done; and was no small reproach to the king, that did thus sacrifice his father's honour to his mother's importunity. Upon this the earl of Essex told me, he had taken all the pains he could to inquire into the original of the Irish massacre, but could never see any [a]reason[a] to believe the king had any accession to it[2]. He did indeed believe that the queen hearkened to propositions made by the Irish, who undertook to take the government of Ireland into their hands, which they thought they could easily perform: and then, they said, they would assist the king to

[a] substituted for *so* . . . . (?).

[1] Burnet was born on September 18, 1643, and was therefore less than 17 years old at the Restoration. Bevill Higgons, x. 72, remarks on the incredibility of his being admitted into such confidence as to enable him to speak with authority on these points. The Committee of Council mentioned *supra* 68, was named in the beginning of 1663, in which year Burnet made his first visit to England, staying but six months.

[2] And who but a beast ever believed it? S. For the explanation why people other than 'beasts' believed this, see Gardiner, x. 7, 92 and note.

CHAP. III. subdue the hot spirits at Westminster. With this the plot of the insurrection began: and all the Irish believed the queen encouraged it. But in the first design there was no thought of a massacre: that came in head as they were laying the methods of executing it, which, as they were managed by the priests, so they were the chief men that set on the Irish to all the blood and cruelty that followed.

I know nothing particular of the sequel of the war, nor of all the confusions that happened till the murder of king Charles the first: only one passage I had from lieutenant
42 general Drummond, afterwards lord Strathallan[1]. He served on the king's side, but had many friends among those who were for the covenant: so, [a]the king's affairs being now ruined[a], he was recommended to Cromwell, being then in a treaty with the Spanish ambassador, who was negociating for some regiments to be levied and sent over from Scotland to Flanders. He happened to be with Cromwell when the commissioners, sent from Scotland to protest against the putting the king to death, came to argue the matter with him. Cromwell bade Drummond stay and hear their conference, which he did. They began in a heavy languid way to lay indeed great load on the king: but they still insisted on that clause in the covenant, by which they swore they would be faithful in the preservation of his Majesty's person: and with this they shewed upon what terms Scotland, as well as the two Houses, had engaged in the war, and what solemn declarations [b]of their zeal and duty to the king[b] they all along published; which would now appear, to the scandal and reproach of the Christian name, to have been false pretences, if when the king was in their power they should[c] proceed to extremities. Upon this, Cromwell entered into a long

[a] interlined. [b] interlined. [c] *now* struck out.

[1] William Drummond was created Viscount of Strathallan and Baron Drummond of Cromlix in Sept. 1686; died 1688. He was a man of high cultivation, and compiled the '*Genealogie of the most ancient House of Drummond*,' cf. *infra* 107.

[a] discourse [a] of the nature of the regal power, according to the principles of Mariana and Buchanan: he thought[1] [b] a breach of trust in a king ought to be punished more than any other crime whatsoever. He said, as to their covenant, they | swore to the preservation of the king's person in the defence of the true religion: if then it appeared that the settlement of the true religion was obstructed only by the king, so that they could not come at it but by putting him out of the way, then their oath could not bind them to the preserving him any longer. He said also, their covenant did bind them to bring all malignants, incendiaries, and enemies to the cause, to condign punishment: and was not this to be executed impartially? What were all those on whom public justice had been done, especially those who suffered for joining with Montrose, but small offenders acting by commission from the king, who was therefore the principal, and so the most guilty? Drummond said Cromwell had plainly the better of them at their own weapon, [c] and upon their own principles [c][2]. At this time presbytery was in its height in Scotland. CHAP. III. MS. 22.

[a] substituted for *speech*. [b] *such* struck out. [c] interlined.

[1] Juan de Mariana (1536–1623), a Jesuit, author of a work entitled *De Rege et Regis Institutione*, defending regicide under certain circumstances. He also wrote a *History of Spain*. George Buchanan published his tract *De Jure Regni* in 1579. It is 'a defence of legitimate or limited monarchy, a statement of the duty of monarchs and subjects to each other, in which he lays stress chiefly on the former, a plea for the right of popular election of kings and maintaining the reponsibility of bad kings, in treating which he does not shrink from upholding tyrannicide in cases of extreme wickedness'; Dr. Mackay in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* The tract was suppressed in 1584, but was a standard work in the time of the Long Parliament, and was reprinted in 1688.

[2] 'I give to the wife of Oliver Cromwell for his keeping the covenant *in the right sense*, by murdering the king, a groat a day.' This item the author of *Manes Presbyteriani*, a tract so entitled, makes the Marquis of Argyll add to his supposed last will and testament. And according to principal Baillie's account, his friends the covenanters, when in the year 1646 they despaired of prevailing with the king to establish the Covenant, were little disposed to prevent that sense of the clause for the preservation of his person being acted on. See Baillie's *Letters*, vol. ii. 371, 373, 381, and especially 383, 407. The suggestions of Herle the

CHAP. III. In summer 1648, when the parliament [a] declared they would engage to rescue the king from his imprisonment, and the parliament of England from the force it was put under by the army, the nobility went into the design, all except six or eight. [b] The king had signed an engagement to make good his offers to the nation of the northern counties, with the other conditions formerly mentioned:
43 and particular favours were promised to every one that concurred in it[1]. The marquis of Argyll gave it out that the Hamiltons, let them pretend what they would, had no sincere intentions to their cause, but had engaged to serve the king on his own terms: he filled the preachers with such jealousies of this, that though all the demands that they made for the security of their cause, and in declaring the grounds of the war, were complied with, yet they could not be satisfied, but still said the Hamiltons were in a confederacy with the malignants in England, and did not intend to stand to what was then promised. The general assembly declared against it, as an unlawful confederacy with the enemies of God; and called it the unlawful Engagement, which came to be the name commonly given to it in all their pulpits. They every where preached against it, and opposed the levies all they could, by solemn denunciations of the wrath and curse of God on all concerned in them. This was a strange piece of opposition to the state, little inferior to what was pretended or put in practice by the church of Rome.

The south-west counties of Scotland have seldom corn enough to serve them round the year: and the northern parts producing more than they need, these of the west usually came in the summer to buy at Leith the stores that come from the north: and from a word *whiggam*, used in driving their horses, all that drove was called the *whiggamors*, and

[a] *had* struck out. [b] *For* struck out.

prolocutor, in a sermon preached before the House of Commons on Nov. 5, 1644, may be found at page 16 of the discourse. R. It is needless to say that Baillie nowhere makes any suggestion of murder.

[1] See *supra* 59 and note.

shorter the *whiggs*[1]. Now in that year, after the news came down of duke Hamilton's defeat, the ministers animated their people to rise, and march to Edinburgh: and they came up marching on the head of the parishes, with an unheard-of fury, praying and preaching all the way as they came. The marquis of Argyll and his party came and headed them, they being about 6000. And this was called the *whiggamors'* inroad: and ever after that all that opposed the court came in contempt to be called *whiggs:* and from Scotland the word was brought into England, where it is now one of our unhappy terms of distinction[2]. CHAP. III. August, 1648.

The Committee of Estates, with the force that they had in their hands, could easily have dissipated this undisciplined herd; but they, knowing their own weakness, had sent to Cromwell, desiring his assistance. Upon that, the committee saw they could not stand before him: so they came to a treaty, and delivered up the government to this new body; and upon their assuming it, they declared all who had served or assisted towards the Engagement incapable of any employment, till they had first satisfied the kirk of the truth of their repentance, and made public profession of it. All churches were upon that full of mock penitents, some[a] making their acknowledgments all in tears, to gain more credit with the new party. The earl of Loudoun, that was chancellor[3], had entered into solemn promises both to the king and the Hamiltons: but when 44

[a] *that they might recover their credit* struck out.

[1] It seems doubtful whether the shortened term 'Whig' was in vogue before the fight at the Pentland Hills in 1666, when Burnet himself intimates (f. 234) that it was first used. There is certainly no trace that 'ever after' 1648 it was the name given to opponents of the court. Halton, Lauderdale's brother, entitles his account of the Pentland rebellion, 'The Historie off the Whiggamor Road,' *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 252.

[2] Which unhappy distinctions no man living was more ready to foment than the good bishop himself; and the first inquiry he made into any body's character was, whether he were a whig or a tory: if the latter, he made it his business to rake all the spiteful stories he could collect together, in order to lessen their esteem in the world, which he was very free to publish, without any regard to decency or modesty. D.

[3] See *supra* 42, 47 note, and *infra* 224.

CHAP. III. he came to Scotland, his wife [1], a fierce covenanter, and an heiress by whom he had both honour and estate, threatened him, if he went on that way, with a process of adultery, in which it was believed she could have had very copious proofs: he durst not stand against this, and so compounded the matter by deserting his friends, and turning over to the other side: of which he made public profession in the church of Edinburgh with many tears, confessing his weakness in yielding to the temptation of what had a shew of honour and loyalty, for which he expressed a hearty sorrow. Those that came in early, with great shews of compunction, got easier off: but those who stood out long found it a harder matter to make their peace. Cromwell came down to Scotland, and saw the new model fully settled.

During his absence from the scene, the treaty of the isle of Wight was set on foot by the parliament, that, seeing the army at such a distance, took this occasion of
1648. treating with the king. Sir Harry Vane, and others who were for a change of government, had no mind to treat any more; but both city and country were so desirous of a personal treaty, that it could not be resisted [2]. Vane, Pierpoint, and some others, went to the treaty on purpose to delay matters till the army could be brought up to London. All that wished well to the treaty prayed the
MS. 23. king, at their first coming, | to dispatch the business with all possible haste, and to grant the first day all that he could bring himself to grant on the last [3]. Holles and Grimston told me, they both on their knees begged this

[1] Margaret, daughter of Sir John Gordon of Lochinvar. *Cole.*

[2] See Cromwell's letter to Hammond, Nov. 1648, *Clarke Papers* (Camd. Soc.), ed. Firth, ii. 49.

[3] See Grimston's letter of Oct. 21, 1648, to Sir R. Harley, *Portland MSS.* vol. iii. *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii, urging the acceptance of the king's answer. 'Pray desyre all our freinds to attend the house diligently, and lett not a ship richly laden after a long voyage full of hazards, be cast away within sight of land.' The letters of John Crewe, M.P., one of the Commissioners at the Isle of Wight, giving a detailed account of the progress of the treaty, are in the *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1648–9. See also Ludlow, i. 177, 207.

of the king. They said, they knew Vane would study to draw out the treaty to a great length: and he, who declared for an unbounded liberty of conscience, would try to gain on the king s party by the offer of a toleration for the common prayer and the episcopal clergy[1]. [a] His design in that was to gain time, till Cromwell should settle Scotland and the north. But they said, if the king would frankly come in, without the formality of papers backward and forward, and send them back next day with the concessions that were absolutely necessary, they did not doubt but he should in a very few days be brought up with honour, freedom, and safety to the parliament, and that matters should be brought to a present settlement[2]. Titus, who was then much trusted by the king,

[a] *But* struck out.

[1] e. g. Ogle's plot, 1644. Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, i. 310. See also, with reference to Vane and the King, *id.* ii. 442.

[2] Let the concessions here referred to be viewed, and then let it be answered, how the king could consent to them in honour and conscience, or consistently with the following solemn declaration sent by him in the year 1645, to Sir Edward Nicholas, for the purpose of its being communicated to his friends: 'And now methinks I were to blame, if I did not justify the truth of your opinions concerning me by my own declaration, which is this, That let my condition be never so low, my successes never so ill, I resolve, by the grace of God, never to yield up this church to the government of papists, presbyterians, or independents; nor to injure my successors, by lessening the crown of that ecclesiastical and military power, which my predecessors left me; nor forsake my friends, much less to let them suffer, when I do not, for their faithfulness to me, resolving sooner to live as miserable as the violent rage of successful insulting rebells can make me, which I esteem far worse than death, rather than not to be exactly constant to these grounds; from which, whosoever, upon whatsoever occasion, shall persuade me to recede in the least tittle, I shall esteem him either a fool or a knave.' The king's Letters to Sir Edward Nicholas published by Bray in the Appendix to Evelyn's *Memoirs* (1818), [see *Nicholas Papers* (Camd. Soc.), Pref. ii. ed. Warner, p. 104.] R. As to the concessions here referred to by Burnet, the king was required previously to his treating on certain propositions to assent to four bills already passed by both houses, by the first of which the whole power of the state was vested in the parliament during twenty years. Amongst the propositions to be treated on, one was for the prosecution of the king's friends, another for the abolition of episcopacy, and a third for the education of the children of Romanists by protestants. It had been agreed with the Scotch in the

CHAP. III. and employed in a negociation with the presbyterian
45 party, told me that he had spoke often and earnestly to him in the same strain[1]: but the [a]king could not come to a resolution: and he still fancied that in the struggle between the house of commons and the army, both saw they needed him so much to give them the superior strength, therefore he imagined that by balancing them he would bring both sides into a greater dependence on himself, and force them to better terms. In this Vane flattered the episcopal party, to the king's ruin as well as their own. But they still hated the presbyterians as the first authors of the war; and seemed unwilling to think well of them, or to be beholding to them. Thus the

[a] *unhappy* struck out.

preceding year, to exclude from pardon twenty-six noblemen, three bishops, twenty-nine knights, and thirteen gentlemen of quality, in all seventy-one persons then named, besides all Romanists who had served the king, and all such who having been proceeded against by the English or Scottish parliament for what they termed treason, should be condemned before an act of oblivion passed. See the *List of Divers Persons, whose names are to be presented to the king's majestie to die without mercy by the agreement of both Kingdoms*, Lond. 1647. R.

[1] Silas Titus; he fought for the Parliament, but was opposed to Cromwell, and transferred his allegiance to Charles I, in whose service he was at Carisbrooke. In 1649 he was employed as agent between the English Presbyterians in Holland and the queen-mother. In August 1650, he was voted to be of the king's bedchamber in Scotland by the Parliament at Edinburgh (Walker's *Narrative*, 177). He was sent thence to carry to Henrietta Maria in France the proposals of Charles and Argyll for the marriage of the king to Argyll's daughter (Hillier, *Charles I in the Isle of Wight*, 325-331, and note *infra* 101), and he continued as a trusted royalist agent after the battle of Worcester. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, June 1652, *et passim*. He afterwards claimed to be the author of 'Killing No Murder,' which appeared in May, 1657, *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 297, 344, 397; and as late as April 2, 1669, Evelyn names him as such without reserve. In Thurloe, vi. 560, however, there is a deposition that Sexby, while a prisoner in the Tower, 'owned it as his own work.' See on this point the note to Lingard, xi. 321. Titus certainly co-operated eagerly in the design for Cromwell's assassination (*Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. *passim*). He was largely rewarded at the Restoration and afterwards (*Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661-2, 172 and 284). He sat in all the parliaments of Charles II, though in the convention and Pensionary Parliaments he appears, according to the lists of members in the *Parl. Hist.* iv, to have come in at bye-elections. He was a strong advocate of the Exclusion Bill. See especially *H. M. C. Rep.* x. App. vi. 196.

treaty went on with a fatal slowness: and by the time it was come to some maturity, Cromwell came up with his army, and overturned all.

Upon this I will set down what sir Harbottle Grimston told me a few weeks before his death: but whether it was done at this time, or the year before, I cannot tell: I rather believe the latter. When the house of commons and the army were a quarrelling, at a meeting of the officers it was proposed to purge the army better, that they might know whom to depend on[1]. Cromwell upon that said, he was sure of the army; but there was another body that had more need of purging, naming the house of commons, and he thought the army only could do that. Two officers that were present brought an account of this to Grimston, who carried them with him to the lobby of the house of commons, they being resolved to justify it to the house. There was another debate then on foot: but Grimston diverted it, and said he had a matter of privilege of the highest sort to lay before them: it was about the being and freedom of the house itself. So he charged Cromwell with the design of putting a force on the house: he had his witnesses at the door, and desired they might be examined. They were brought to the bar, and justified all that they had said, and gave a full relation of all that had passed at their meetings. When they withdrew, Cromwell fell down on his knees, and made a solemn prayer to God, attesting his innocence, and his zeal for the service of the house: he submitted himself to the providence of God, who it seems thought fit to exercise him with calumny and slander, but he committed his cause to him. This he did with great vehemence, and with many tears. After this strange and bold preamble, he made so long a speech, justifying both himself and the rest of the officers, except a few that seemed inclined to return back to Egypt, that he wearied out the house, and wrought so much on his party, that what the wit-

[1] Carlyle, *Cromwell*, June to September, 1647. Rushworth, 1070.

CHAP. III. nesses had said was so little believed, that, had it been moved, Grimstone thought that both he and they would 46 have been sent to the Tower[1]. But whether their guilt made them modest, or that they had no mind to have the matter much talked of, they let it fall: and there was no strength in the other side to carry it farther. To complete this scene, as soon as ever Cromwell got out of the house, he resolved to trust himself no more among them; but June, 1647. went[a] to the army, and in a few days he brought them up, and forced a great many from the house[2].

I had much discourse with one who knew Cromwell well, and all that set of men, on this head, and asked him how they could excuse all the prevarications, and other ill things, of which they were visibly guilty in the conduct of their affairs. He told me, they believed there were great occasions in which some men were called to great services, in the doing of which they were excused from the common rules of morality: such were the practices of Ehud and Jael, Samson and David: and by this they fancied they had a privilege from observing the standing rules[b]. It is very obvious how far this principle may be carried, and how all justice and mercy may be laid aside on this pretence by every bold enthusiast. Ludlow, in his Memoirs, justifies this force put on the parliament, as much as he condemns the force that Cromwell and the army afterwards put on the house: and he seems to lay this down for a maxim, that the military power ought MS. 24. always to be subject to the civil: | and yet, without any sort of resentment for what he had done, he owns the share he had in the force put on the parliament at this time[3]. The plain reconciling of this is, that he thought

[a] *straight* struck out. [b] *of morality* struck out.

[1] This story is entirely uncorroborated, though probably true so far as Cromwell's justifying himself is concerned. Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, iii. 43.

[2] After Holmby House. But it was Fairfax, not Cromwell, who brought the army to London; though Cromwell was probably the adviser of this action.

[3] The soldiers demanded a voice in the settlement of the kingdom on

when the army judged the parliament was in the wrong, they might use violence, but not otherwise: which gives the army a superior authority, and inspection into the proceedings of the parliament. This shews how impossible it is to set up a commonwealth in England: for that cannot be brought about but by a military force: and they will ever keep the parliament in subjection to them, and so keep up their own authority[1].

I leave all that relates to the king's trial and death to common historians, knowing nothing that is particular [a] of [a] Jan. 1649. that great transaction, which was certainly one of the most amazing scenes in history. Ireton was the person that drove it on: for Cromwell was all the while in some suspense about it. Ireton had the principles and the temper of a Cassius in him: he stuck at nothing that might have turned England to a commonwealth: and he found out Cook[2] and Bradshaw, two bold lawyers, as proper instruments for managing it. Fairfax was much distracted in his mind, and changed purpose often every day. The presbyterians and the body of the city were much against it, [b] and were every where fasting and praying for the king's preservation [b]. There were not above 8000 of the army about the town: but these were selected out of the whole army, as the most engaged in enthusiasm: and they were kept at prayer in their way almost day and night, except when they were upon duty: so that they

[a] substituted for *that related to.* [b] interlined.

the ground 'that we are not a meer mercenary Army hired to serve any Arbitrary power of a State, but called forth and conjured by the several Declarations of Parliament to the defence of our owne and the people's just Rights and Liberties; and so we took up armes in judgement and conscience to those ends, and are resolved according to . . . our own common sense concerning those our fundamental rights and liberties, to assert and vindicate the just power or rights of this kingdom in Parliament, &c.' Declaration of the Army. *Clarke Papers*, ed. Firth (Camd. Soc)., Introd. xxxv.

[1] 'Some of the soldiers doe not sticke to call the parliament men, tyrants. Lilborne's books are quoted by them as statute law.' *Portland MSS.* vol. iii. p. 156; *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. Part ii.

[2] Author of *King Charles his Case* (1649); see the reply by Butler, *Genuine Remains*, i. 326.

CHAP. III. were wrought up to a pitch of fury, that struck a terror into all people. On the other hand, the king's party were without spirit: and, as many of themselves have said to me, they could never believe his death was really intended till it was too late. They thought all was a pageantry to strike a terror, and to force the king to such concessions as they had a mind to extort from him.

[a]The king himself shewed a calm and a composed firmness which amazed all people: and that so much the more, because that was not natural to him[1]. It was imputed to a very extraordinary measure of supernatural assistance. Bishop Juxon did the duty of his function honestly, but with a dry coldness that could not much raise the king's thoughts: so it was owing wholly to somewhat within himself that he went through so many indignities with so much true greatness, without disorder or any sort of affectation. Thus he died greater than he had lived; and shewed that which has been often observed of the whole race of the Stewarts, that they bore misfortunes much better than prosperity. His reign, both in peace and war, was a continued series of errors: so that it does not appear that he had a true judgment of things. He was out of measure [b]set on[b] following his humour, but unreasonably feeble to those whom he trusted, chiefly to the queen. He had too high a notion of the regal power, and thought that every opposition to it was rebellion. He minded little things too much, and was more concerned in the drawing

[a] *On the other hand* struck out. [b] substitued for *obstinate in.*

[1] Sir Philip Meadows told me he was at Newmarket when the army brought the king thither, and observed that the king's was the only cheerful face in the place; which put me in mind of the night King James returned to Whitehall, where I stood by him during his supper; and he told all that had happened to him at Feversham with as much unconcernedness as if they had been the adventures of some other person, and directed a great deal of his discourse to me, though I was but a boy. D. Welwood and Sir Philip Warwick both speak in high terms of Charles's personal courage, while Alexander Henderson, on his deathbed, paid full tribute to his intellectual and moral virtues, as he learned them in his conferences with the king at Newcastle. Kennet 190; Salmon's *Examination*, 373.

of a paper than in fighting a battle. He had a firm aversion to popery, but was much inclined to a middle way between protestants and papists, by which he lost the one without gaining the other[1]. His engaging the duke of Rohan in the war of the Rochelle, and then assisting him so poorly, and forsaking him at last, gave[a] an ill character of him to all the protestants abroad. The earl of Lauderdale told me, the duke of Rohan was at Geneva, where he himself was, when he received a very long letter, or rather a little book, from my father, which gave him a copious account of the beginning of the troubles in Scotland: he translated it to the duke of Rohan, who expressed a vehement indignation at the court of England for their usage of him: of which this was the account he then gave[2]. CHAP. III.

The duke of Buckingham had a secret conversation with 48
the queen of France, of which the queen-mother was very

[a] *a mean and* struck out.

[1] It was the same middle and right way, however calumniated, which the king's father so well described in his speech to his first parliament. 'If they (the papists) would be ashamed of such new and gross corruptions of theirs, as they themselves cannot maintain, nor deny to be worthy of reformation, I would for mine own part be content to meet them in the midway, so that all novelties might be renounced on either side. For as my faith is the true, ancient, catholic and apostolic faith, grounded upon the scriptures and express word of God; so I will ever yield all reverence to antiquity in points of ecclesiastical polity, and by that means shall I ever, with God's grace, keep myself from either being a heretic in faith, or schismatic in matters of polity.' R.

[2] See Rohan's *Mémoires* (*Collection du Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France*, Paris, 1877, Petitot, vol. 18), 320–330, 363–366, 372, 390–394, 408–410. At the last-mentioned page, Rohan says that, while still encouraging him to persevere, after the fall of Rochelle, Charles made a secret arrangement with Louis XIII. D'Israeli's *Commentaries*, i. 315 (1851). See 'Cabala,' 1654, part ii. 204, 208, for the letters from the French Protestants and from Rohan to Charles, praying for help after the fall of Rochelle; and '*King Charles his case.*' Mr. S. R. Gardiner points out that Rohan is probably mistaken as to a *secret* arrangement. The treaty with France was negotiated after the fall of Rochelle, and the messengers from England might be long in reaching Rohan, whom Charles could have no object in deceiving.

CHAP. III. 1625. jealous, and possessed the king with such a sense of it, that[a] he was ordered immediately to leave the court. Upon his return to England under this affront, he possessed the king with such a hatred of that court, that the queen was ill used on her coming over, and all her servants were sent back[1]. He also told him the protestants were so ill used, and yet so strong, that if he would protect them, they would involve that kingdom into new wars; which he represented as so glorious a beginning of his reign, that the king, without weighing the consequence of it, sent one to treat with the duke of Rohan about it[2]. Great assistance was promised by sea: so a war was resolved on, in which the share that our court had is well enough known. But the infamous part was, that Richelieu got the king of France to make his queen write an obliging letter to the duke of Buckingham, assuring him that, if he would let the Rochelle fall without assisting it, he should have leave to come over, and should settle the whole matter of the religion according
MS 25. to their | edicts. This was a strange proceeding: but cardinal Richelieu could turn that weak king as he pleased.
July, 1627. Upon this the duke made that shameful campaign of the isle of Rhé. But finding next winter that he was not to be suffered to go over into France, and that he was abused into a false hope, he resolved to have followed that matter with more vigour, when he was stabbed by Felton[3].

There is another story told of the king's conduct during

[a] *upon his return* struck out.

[1] The love-making was in June, 1625. The disagreement between Charles and the queen, in September, was caused by the king's breach of faith in placing the Catholics again under the penal laws. The expulsion of her French attendants was not until July, 1626.

[2] See Rohan's account of Buckingham (*Mémoires*, 309): 'Le duc de Buckingham, qui n'agissait en toutes ces affaires ni par affection de religion, ni pour l'honneur de son maître, mais seulement pour satisfaire à la passion de quelques folles amours qu'il avait en France, prend ces deux sujets pour vouloir venir en ambassade.' Charles's emissary was Sir Henry de Vic.

[3] Rohan, *Mémoires*, 390–394, says that Charles was bent on the expedition, but that Buckingham was doing all in his power to prevent it.

the peaceable part of his reign, which I had from Halewyn of Dort [1], who was one of the judges in the court of Holland, and was the wisest and greatest man I knew among them. He told me he had it from his father, who, being then the chief man of Dort, was of the states, and had the secret communicated to him. When Isabella Clara Eugenia [2] grew old, and began to decline, a great many of her council, apprehending what miseries they would fall under when they should be again in the hands of the Spaniards, formed a design of making themselves a free commonwealth, that, in imitation of the union among the cantons of Switzerland that were of both religions, should be in a perpetual confederacy with the states of the seven provinces. This they communicated to Henry Frederick prince of Orange, and to some of the states, who approved of it, but thought it necessary to engage the king of England into it. The prince of Orange told the English ambassador, that there was a matter of great consequence that was fit to be laid before the king; but it was of such a nature, and such persons were concerned in it, that it could not be communicated, unless the king would be pleased to promise absolute secrecy for the present. This the king did: and then the prince of Orange sent him the whole scheme. The secret was ill kept: either the king trusted it to some who discovered it, or the paper was stolen from him; for it was sent over to the court at Brussells: one of the ministry lost his head for it: and some took the alarm so quick that they got to Holland and out of danger. After this the prince of Orange had no more commerce with our court, and often lamented that so great a design was so unhappily lost [3]. He had as ill an opinion of the king's

1633.

49

[1] See f. 328. Burnet no doubt made his acquaintance and that of other leading men in Holland when he visited that country in 1664; f. 207.

[2] Daughter of Philip II of Spain, appointed by him joint governor of the Netherlands with her future husband the Cardinal Archduke Albert, May 6, 1598; born 1566, died 1633, *supra*, 12. Motley, *United Netherlands*, iii. 588.

[3] If it be true that King Charles occasioned the miscarriage of this attempt, whether just or unjust, useful for England, or otherwise, by which the independence of Flanders

CHAP. III. conduct of the war; for when the queen came over, and brought some of the generals with her, the prince said, after he had talked with them, (as the late king told me,) he did not wonder to see the affairs of England decline as they did, since he had talked with the king's generals.

I will not enter farther into the military part: for I remember an advice of the Marshal Schomberg; never to meddle in the relation of military matters[1]. He said, some affected[a] to relate those affairs in all the terms of war, in which they committed errors that exposed them to the scorn of all commanders, who must despise relations that pretend to an exactness when there were great errors in every part of them.

In the king's death the very ill effect of extreme violent counsels discovered itself. Ireton hoped that by this all men concerned in it would become irreconcileable to monarchy, and would act as desperate men, and destroy all that might revenge that blood. But this had a very different effect. Something of the same nature had happened in lower instances before: but they were not the

[a] *to a niceness* struck out.

on Spain was to be effected; yet as Sir William Temple relates, in his *Memoirs from the Peace* in 1679, the king peremptorily refused his consent to the subjugation of that country by France; for which Cardinal Richelieu, according to his express threat, made him pay dear, by immediately negotiating with some discontented nobles of Scotland then at Paris, and sending over two hundred thousand pistoles to others in that kingdom, for the purpose of exciting the troubles which took place. See *Temple's Works*, vol. ii. p. 545. R. Temple only says that he knew it 'by tradition from a noble family.' The whole of this curious episode is fully detailed by Mr. Gardiner, *Hist. of England*, vii. 344–347. The secret was betrayed to the Infanta—who, however, died immediately afterwards, Nov. 22, 1633—by the king's agent at Brussels, Balthasar Gerbier, for 20,000 crowns. See also *The None Such Charles his character*, 137-147, 154, upon which work see *supra*, 22 note. Gerbier's journals are preserved in the Paper Room at Whitehall; and he was examined before the lords on the whole matter in 1642; *id.* 43, 135. See the *Hardwicke State Papers*, ii. 54–92. He seems to have been in considerable favour after the Restoration; *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 79, 455. The secretary who was executed was John de Vivaldo.

[1] Very foolish advice, for soldiers cannot write. S. Upon Schomberg see *infra* f. 172.

wiser for it. The earl of Strafford's death made all his former errors be forgot: it raised his character, and cast a lasting odium on that way of proceeding; whereas he had sunk in his credit by any censure lower than death, and had been little pitied, if not thought justly punished. The like effect followed upon archbishop Laud's death. He was a learned, a sincere, and zealous man, regular in his own life, and humble [a] in his private deportment; but was a hot, indiscreet man, eagerly pursuing some matters that were either very inconsiderable or mischievous; such as setting the communion table by the east wall of churches, bowing to it, and calling it the altar; the suppressing the Walloons' privileges, the breaking of lectures, the encouraging sports on the Lord's day, with some other things that were of no value: and yet all the heat and zeal of that time was laid out on these [1]. His severity in the Star-chamber and in the high commission court, but above all his violence, and indeed inexcusable injustice, in the prosecution of bishop Williams, were such visible blemishes, that nothing but the putting him to death in so unjust a manner could have raised his character; which indeed it did to a degree of setting him up as a pattern, and the establishing all his notions as standards by which judgments are to be made of men, whether they are true to the church or not. His diary, though it was a base thing to publish it [2], represents him as an abject fawner on the duke of Buckingham, and

CHAP. III

50

[a] *but very rough and ungracious* not in the MS. at all.

[1] By no means. It was to introduce by degrees a spirit of decency and regularity in church matters, totally neglected by Archbishop Abbot; to depress the growing spirit of faction and sectarism; and to oppose a milder and more moderate mode of Christianity, by Arminianism, to the heats and fury of wild Calvinism. Cole. 'What clamours and slanders I have endured for the labouring to keep an uniformity in the external service of God according to the doctrine and discipline of the church all men know, and I have abundantly felt.' *Laud's last speech.* See also Mr. Gardiner's comment upon Laud's work; *Great Civil War,* ii. 51.

[2] A garbled edition was published by Prynne in 1644; and a complete edition by Wharton in 1695. The MS. is in the library of St. John's College, Oxford.

CHAP. III. as a superstitious regarder of dreams: [a] his defence of himself, writ with so much care when he was in the Tower, is a very mean performance. [b] He intended in that to make an appeal to the world. In most particulars he excuses himself by this, that he was but one of many, who either
MS. 26. in | council, star-chamber, or high commission, voted illegal things. Now though this was true, yet a chief minister, and one in high favour, determines the rest so much, that they are generally little better than machines acted by him. On other occasions he says, the thing was proved but by one witness. Now, how strong soever this defence may be in law, it is of no force in an appeal to the world; for if a thing is true, it is no matter how full or how defective the proof is. The thing that gave me the strongest prejudice against him in that book is, that after he had seen the ill effects of his violent counsels, and had been so long shut up, and so long at leisure to reflect on what had passed in the hurry of passion, or the exaltation of his prosperity, he does not, in any one part of that great work, acknowledge his own errors, nor mix in it any wise or pious reflections, on the ill usage he met with, or on the unhappy steps he had made: so that while his enemies did really magnify him by their inhuman prosecution, his friends Heylin and Wharton have as much lessened him, the one by writing his life, and the other by publishing his vindication of himself[1].

But the recoiling of cruel counsels on the authors of them never appeared more eminently than in the death of king Charles the first, whose serious and Christian deportment in it made all his former errors be entirely forgot, and raised a compassionate regard to him, that drew a lasting hatred on the actors, and was the true occasion of the great turn

[a] *and* struck out. [b] *since* struck out.

[1] Heylin's work is entitled *Cyprianus Anglicus, or the History of the Life and Death of William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury*, first published in 1668. It is a defence of Laud against Prynne's *Canterburie's Doom*. 'A shrewd book, but that which I believe will do the Bishops no great good, but hurt, it pleads so much for Popery.' Pepys, Sept. 16, 1668.

of the nation in the year 1660. This was much heightened by the publishing of his Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ, which was universally believed to be his: and that coming out soon after his death had the greatest run in many impressions that any book has had in our age. There was in it a nobleness and a justness of thought, with a greatness of style, that made it to be looked on as the best writ book in the English language: and the piety of the prayers made all people cry out against the murder of a prince, who thought so seriously of all his affairs in his secret meditations before God. I was bred up with a high veneration of this book: and I remember that, when I heard how some denied it to be his, I asked the earl of Lothian about it, who both knew that king very well, and loved him little: he seemed confident it was his own work; for he said, he had heard him say a great many of those very periods that he found in that book. Being thus confirmed in that persuasion, I was not a little surprised, when in the year 1673, in which I had a great share of favour and free conversation with the then duke of York, afterwards king James the second, he suffered me to talk very freely to him about matters of religion; and when I was urging him with somewhat out of his father's book, he told me that book was not of his writing, and that the letter to the prince of Wales was never brought to him[1]. He said Dr. Gauden writ it: and after the restoration he brought the duke of Somerset and the earl of Southampton both to the king and to himself, who affirmed that they knew it was his writing; and that it was carried down by Southampton, and shewed the king during the treaty of Newport, who read it, and approved of it, as containing his sense of things. Upon this he told me, that though Sheldon and the other bishops opposed Gauden's promotion, because he had taken the covenant, yet the merit of that service carried it for him, notwithstanding the opposition made to it. There has been a great deal of disputing

CHAP. III.

51

[1] For the king's letter to the Prince of Wales see Clarendon, *Rebellion*, xi. 189.

CHAP. III. about this book: some are so zealous for maintaining it to be the king's, that they think a man false to the church that doubts it to be his: yet the evidence since that time brought to the contrary [a] has been so strong that I must leave it under the same uncertainty under which I found it [a]: only this is certain, that Gauden never writ any thing with that force, his other writings being such that no man, from a likeness of style, would think him capable of writing so extraordinary a book as that is [1].

CHAPTER IV.

SCOTLAND UNDER THE COMMONWEALTH.

UPON the king's death the Scots proclaimed his son king, and sent over sir George Winram, that married my great aunt, to treat with him while he was in the isle of Jersey [2].

[a] substituted for *is so clear that it is a sign of an incurable obstinacy to stick so to an indefensible opinion.*

[1] Notwithstanding all that has been said or wrote upon this subject, whoever reads the book will plainly perceive that nobody but the king himself could write it: that Gauden might transcribe, and put it into the order it is in at present, and Lord Southampton carry it to the king for his perusal and correction, is more than likely: but that Gauden should furnish the matter is utterly impossible. That King Charles the Second or King James ever (never) approved of the contents, or had much veneration for their father's conduct or sentiments, is not to be disputed: but the Duke of Somerset would readily join in promoting Gauden for the share they knew he had in publishing a book so much to the honour of their old master, for whom they always professed the highest respect and duty. This I know, that my grandfather, who was many years of his bedchamber, and well known to have been much trusted by him, always looked upon it to be authentic, and prized it accordingly. D. I think it a poor treatise, and that the king did not write it. S. In his anniversary sermon upon the king's death, delivered in 1681, Burnet speaks of it as by Charles, without reserve. See *Warwick's Memoirs*, 68, 69; *Remarks on Bishop Burnet's History, by a True Briton*, n. d., 28, and *Impartial Reflections upon Burnet's History by Philalethes*, London, 1724, where it is stated that Major Huntingdon saw the king write several parts with his own hand. But Mr. C. E. Doble's letters in the *Academy* for May 12, 26, and June 9, 30, 1883, and the article on Gauden in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* finally place the authorship upon Gauden, who was nominally a presbyterian.

[2] This statement needs some cor-

The king entered into a negociation with him, and sent him back with general assurances of consenting to every reasonable proposition that they should send him. He named the Hague for the place of treaty, he being to go thither in a few days. So the Scots sent over commissioners, the chief of whom were the earls of Cassillis[1] and Lothian, the former of these was my first wife's father, a man of great virtue and of a considerable degree of good understanding, had he not spoiled it with many affectations, [a]and an obstinate stiffness[a] in almost every thing that he did. He was so sincere that he would suffer no man to take his words in any other sense than as he meant them. He adhered firmly to his instructions, but with so much candour, | that king Charles retained very kind impressions of it to his life's end. The man then in the greatest favour with the king was the duke of Buckingham: he was [b]wholly

CHAP. IV. 52 1650. MS. 27.

[a] interlined. [b] *a man of noble appearance, and of a most lovely wit* struck out.

rection. On Feb. 7, 164$\frac{8}{9}$, Sir Joseph Douglas was sent to carry to Charles at the Hague the news of his proclamation. Four commissioners, Cassillis, Winram (not *Sir* G. Winram), Baillie and Wood were sent in March, 164$\frac{8}{9}$. In August, 1649, Winram was again despatched, having been substituted, through jealousy of Argyll, for Lothian, the husband of Argyll's niece (*Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, ed. Gardiner, Introd. xvi. Scot. Hist. Soc.). He did not however sail until October 11, when Cromwell's victories in Ireland had become known, and it was thought that Charles would therefore be more likely to give way to the demands of the Scotch. He went first to Holland, to consult with the English presbyterians, Bunce, Titus, and others, who were collected there; and reached Jersey about the third week in November, see *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 3. Finally he went a third time, with Cassillis, Lothian, Alexander Brodie of that Ilk, John Smith, Alexander Jaffray, James Wood, John Livingstone and George Hutcheson; James Dalrymple being secretary to the commission, *id.* 39, 87, 88; Baillie, iii. 458, 460, 510, 521, 524. *Life of John Livingstone, Wodrow Select Biographies*, i. 172; Gardiner, *Hist. of Commonwealth*, i. 204. Winram, who was an extraordinary lord of Session with the title of Lord Libberton, fought at Dunbar and died of wounds received there.

[1] Upon this staunch and picturesque representative of presbyterianism, see the *Lauderdale Papers*, and *Miscellany* for 1883 (Camd. Soc.), and *infra* 256. Margaret Kennedy, his daughter, was Burnet's first wife, *infra* 193. Lauderdale was his nephew. For Lothian see *supra* 28, note.

CHAP. IV. turned to mirth and pleasure: he had the art of treating persons or things in a ridiculous manner beyond any man of the age: he possessed the young king with very ill principles, both as to religion and morality, [a] and with a very mean opinion of his father [a], whose stiffness was a frequent subject of his raillery. He prevailed with the king to enter into a treaty with the Scots, though that was vehemently opposed by almost all the rest that were about him, who pressed him to adhere steadily to his father's maxims and example [1].

When the king came to the Hague, William duke of Hamilton, and the earl of Lauderdale, who had left Scotland, entered into a great measure of favour and confidence
July, 1649. with him [2]. The marquis of Montrose came likewise to him,

[a] interlined.

[1] This unprincipled nobleman [*infra* 182] is said to have betrayed the king in Scotland, and to have given Cromwell information of his counsels; which though it came to the king's knowledge, was excused in this companion of his debauches. See Pepys, March 3, 166$\frac{9}{10}$. R. It is difficult to convict Buckingham of actual treachery to Charles. But there is no question as to the opinion of the king's best counsellors before the Restoration, who roundly accuse him of private dealings with Cromwell. See *Nicholas Papers*, ii. 206, 219, 253, 262, 345, and Pref. xiii. It was he who betrayed, and thereby rendered abortive, the king's intended escape from the Presbyterians to the Scottish Royalists (cf. *infra* 100) in 1650, *id.* 201. In July and August, 1652, he was in close consultation with Lilburne; *Cal. Clar. St. P.* ii. 141, 146. There are frequent expressions in these papers of Hyde's suspicion of and contempt for Buckingham. In one place (*id.* 214) he declares that Buckingham 'would be Cromwell's groom to save his estate.' In 1652 he made a 'wild pretence' to the hand of the widowed Princess of Orange (*id.* 124); and previously to his marriage with Fairfax's daughter—to secure which it was felt that he must have gained Cromwell's goodwill (*id.* iii. 372)—he had aspired to an alliance with the daughter of the Protector himself, for which he was willing to 'renounce the king his master.' 'But that usurper had at least so much of honour in him as to say he would never give his daughter to one who could be so very ungrateful to his king.' Clarke, *Life of James II*, i. 435. Buckingham himself says that his marriage with Fairfax's daughter was a principal reason for Cromwell's enmity, and that, had Cromwell lived three days more, he would have been executed. *Fairfax Correspondence, Civil Wars*, ii. 253.

[2] For this visit, see the *Hamilton Papers* (Camd. Soc.), 237, &c.,

and undertook, if he would follow his counsels, to restore him to his kingdoms by main force: but when the king desired the prince of Orange to examine the methods which he proposed, he entertained him with [a] a recital of his own performances, and of the credit he was in among the people, [b] and said, the whole nation would rise, if he went over though accompanied only with a page. The queen-mother hated him mortally[1]; for when he came over from Scotland to Paris, upon the king's requiring him to lay down arms, she received him with such extraordinary favour as his services [c] did [c] deserve, and gave him a large supply in money and in jewels, considering the straits to which she was then reduced. But she heard that he had talked very indecently of her favours to him; which she herself told to lady Susanna Hamilton, a daughter of duke Hamilton's[2], from whom I had it. So she sent him word to leave Paris, and would see him no more. He had wandered about the courts of Germany, but was not so much esteemed as he thought he deserved. He desired of the king nothing but power to act in his name, with a supply in money, and a letter recommending him to the king of Denmark for a ship to carry him over, and for such arms as he could spare him. With that the king gave him the garter. He got first to Orkney, and from thence into the Highlands of Scotland; but could perform nothing of what he had

CHAP. IV.

(Jan. $16\frac{4}{5}\frac{9}{9}$)

[a] *such a vain* struck out. [b] substituted for *that he.*
[c] *did* substituted for *seemed to.*

Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton, and the article on Lauderdale in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

[1] Upon the queen's attitude throughout the negotiations with the Scotch Commissioners, see *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 19, 25, 30, 69, and especially her own letter, 107, in which she states that so long as Charles had refused to take the covenant (against which she still protested) or any engagement affecting the loyal party in Ireland, and to give up his friends, she had always urged upon him an agreement with the Scots.

[2] James, Duke of Hamilton. There are frequent references to Lady Susanna in the *Lauderdale Papers.* The scandal about Montrose and the queen-mother is completely refuted by Napier, *Memoirs of Montrose,* ed. 1856, ii. 697–699.

CHAP. IV. undertaken. At last he was betrayed by one of those to
May 8, 1650. whom he trusted himself, Macleod of Assynt, and was brought over a prisoner to Edinburgh [1]. He was carried through the streets with all the infamy that brutal malice
May 20, 1650. could contrive, and in a few days he was hanged on a very high gibbet, and his head and quarters were set up in divers places of the kingdom. [a] His behaviour under all that barbarous usage was as great and firm to the last, looking on all that was done to him with a noble scorn, as the fury of his enemies was black and universally detested [a]. This raised a horror in all sober people against those who could
53 insult over such a man in misfortune. The triumph that the preachers made on this occasion rendered them odious, and made lord Montrose to be both much pitied and lamented [b]. This happened while the Scots commissioners were treating with the king at the Hague. The violent
Feb. 22, $16\frac{4\,9}{5\,0}$. party in Scotland were for breaking off the treaty upon it, though by the date of Montrose's commission it appeared to have been granted before the treaty was begun [2]: but it was carried not to recall their commissioners. Nor could the king on the other hand be prevailed on by his own court to send them away upon this [c] cruelty to [c] a man who had acted by his commission, and yet was so used. The

[a] added on opposite page. [b] *than otherwise he could have been* struck out. [c] altered from *usage of.*

[1] The charge of 'betrayal' cannot be sustained. Neil Macleod of Assynt had followed Seaforth under Montrose's banner in 1645, but, thinking himself badly treated by Seaforth, had gone over to the Earl of Sutherland, a covenanter, who made him Sheriff Depute of Assynt. In delivering up Montrose, who surrendered himself in the belief that he would be friendly, Macleod therefore was doing his duty to Sutherland. See *Edinburgh Review*, Jan. 1894, '*The last Campaign of Montrose*,' 194, and Murdoch and Simpson's Ed. (1893) of Wishart's *Memoirs of James, Marquis of Montrose*, App. xiii. See also *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 139, for a full account of Macleod's trial, Feb. 1674, on other matters, when the charge about Montrose was thrown in as a makeweight, but was apparently waived by the prosecution.

[2] The treaty was begun in March and concluded in May. Montrose's defeat in Carbisdale, at the head of the Kyle of Sutherland, was on April 17. Upon the whole of this episode see *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650.

treaty was quickly concluded. The king was in no condition to struggle with them, but yielded to all their demands, of taking the covenant, and suffering none to be about him but such as took it[1]. He sailed home to Scotland in some Dutch men of war with which the prince of Orange furnished him, with all the stock of money and arms that his credit could raise. That indeed would not have been very great if the prince of Orange had not joined his own to it. The duke of Hamilton and the earl of Lauderdale were suffered to go home with him: but soon after his landing an order came to put them from him. The king complained of this: but duke Hamilton at parting told him, he must prepare himself for things of a harder digestion: he said, at present he could do him no service: the marquis of Argyll was then in absolute credit: therefore he desired that he would study to gain him entirely, and give him no cause of jealousy on his account. This king Charles told myself, as a part of duke Hamilton's character. The duke of Buckingham took all the ways possible to gain Argyll and the ministers[2]: only his dissolute course of life was excessive scandalous; which to their great reproach they connived at, because he advised the king to put himself wholly in their hands. The king wrought himself into as grave a deportment as he could: he heard many prayers and sermons, some of a great length. I remember on one fast day there were six sermons preached without intermission. I was there my self, and not a little weary of so tedious a service[3]. The king was not allowed so much as to walk abroad on | Sundays: and if at any

June 24, July 4, 1650.

MS. 28.

[1] Hyde characterized this as a 'wild designe,' and maintained that nothing could justify the king's concessions in Scotland, 'be the success what it will.' *Cal. Clar. St. P.* ii. 72. See the analysis of these events in Ranke, iii. 42. Charles signed the two covenants on Sunday, June 23, / July 3, on board ship at the mouth of the Spey, before landing. See note *infra* 200.

[2] See Walker's *Journal* for all this. Buckingham alone of his English royalist friends was allowed to stay with the king Cf. *supra* 90, note. He was, according to a letter in Carte's *Collection of Original Letters*, 1739, 25, 'a fast friend of Argyll.'

[3] Burnet was not then eight years old. S.

CHAP. IV. time there had been any gaiety at court, such as dancing or playing at cards, he was severely reproved for it. This was managed with so much rigour and so little discretion, that it contributed not a little to beget in him an aversion to all sort of strictness in religion. All that had acted on his father's side were ordered to keep at a great distance from him: and because the common people shewed such affection to the king, the crowds that pressed to see him
54 were also kept off from coming about him. Cromwell was not idle: but seeing the Scots were calling home their king, and knowing that from thence he might expect an invasion into England, he resolved to prevent them, and so marched into Scotland with his army. The Scots brought together a very good army. The king was suffered to come once and see it, but not to stay in it; for they were afraid he might gain too much upon the soldiers: so he was sent away [1].

The army was indeed one of the best that ever Scotland had brought together, but it was ill commanded: for all that had made defection from their cause, or that were thought indifferent as to either side, which they called detestable neutrality, were put out of commission. The preachers thought it an army of saints, and seemed well assured of success [2]. They drew near Cromwell, who being pressed by them retired towards Dunbar, where his ships and provisions lay. The Scots followed him, and were posted on a hill about a mile from thence, where there was no attacking them. Cromwell was then in great distress, and looked on himself as undone. There was no marching towards Berwick, the ground was too narrow: nor could he come back into the country without being separated from his ships, and starving his army. The least evil seemed to be to kill his horses, and put his army on board,

[1] He joined the army on July 27, 1650, while Cromwell was at Musselburgh, and was sent away to Dunfermline on August 2. Walker, 163. Here he was watched by a guard of honour under the command of Lorn.

[2] From a letter of Loudoun to Charles II (*Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 134) it seems that scarcity of supplies and the difficulty of keeping the army together hastened the Scottish march.

and sail back to Newcastle; which, in the disposition that England was in at that time, would have been all their destruction, for it would have occasioned an universal insurrection for the king. They had not above three days' forage for their horses. So Cromwell called his officers to a day of seeking the Lord, in their style. He loved to talk much of that matter [a] all his life long afterwards [a]: he said, he felt such an enlargement of heart in prayer, and such quiet upon it, that he bade all about him take heart, for God had certainly heard them, and would appear for them. After prayer they walked in the earl of Roxburgh's gardens, that lie under the hill: and by prospective glasses they discerned a great motion in the Scotish camp: upon which Cromwell said, God is delivering them into our hands, they are coming down to us[1]. Leslie was in the chief command: but he had a committee of the states with him to give him his orders, among whom Warriston was one[2].

[a] interlined.

[1] Burnet is the only authority—the 'watery source,' as Carlyle calls him—for this story. Brodie, *History of the British Empire*, iv. 292, maintains that Cromwell's despatch to Lenthall, Speaker of the House of Commons, on Sept. 4, the day after the battle (Carlyle, *Cromwell*, cxl), is inconsistent with the account of his observing the Scots coming down the hill, and uttering this exclamation. He relies upon the following passage. Speaking of the evening before the battle, Cromwell writes, 'The major-gen. and myself, coming to the Earl of Roxburgh's house, and observing this posture, I told him I thought it did give us an opportunity and advantage to attempt upon the enemy,' &c. But there is no inconsistency, for Burnet also ascribes the incident to the day before the battle. See Gardiner, *Commonwealth*, i. 319–323.

[2] See Ranke's pertinent observation on this. 'In the Independent camp too these spiritual impulses ruled supreme, but with this difference, that the generals themselves performed spiritual functions, and were the most zealous believers.' iii. 49. Burnet is the chief authority for this statement regarding the interference of the Committee of Estates; but it is fully supported by Baillie, iii. 111. Major White, in his Report to Parliament, Sept. 10, says that Leslie wanted to let part of Cromwell's army retreat on board ship, and then to fall on the rest; while the ministers wished to attack and capture the whole force. Leslie himself, in his letter to Argyll (*Lothian Papers*, ii. 298), does not ascribe his defeat directly to the interference of the ministers, but to the ill conduct of his own officers. He had expected a complete success. He

CHAP. IV. These were weary of lying in the fields, and thought that Leslie made not haste enough [a] to destroy those sectaries; for so they loved to call them [a]. He told them, by lying there all was sure, but that by engaging into action with gallant and desperate men all might be lost: yet they still called on him to fall on. Many have thought that all this was treachery, done on design to deliver up our army to Cromwell; some laying it upon Leslie, and others upon my uncle. I am persuaded there was no treachery in it: only Warriston was too hot, and Leslie was too cold, [b] and yielded too easily to their humours, which he ought not to have done [b]. They were all the night employed in coming down the hill: and in the morning, before they were put in order, Cromwell fell upon them. Two regiments stood their ground, and were almost all killed in their ranks: the rest did run in a most shameful manner: so that both their artillery and baggage, and with these a great many prisoners, were taken, some thousands in all. Cromwell upon this advanced to Edinburgh, where he was received without any opposition; and the castle, that might have made a long resistance, did capitulate. So all the southern part of Scotland came under contribution to Cromwell. Stirling was the advanced garrison on the king's side; he himself retired to St. Johnston [1]. A parliament was called [c] that sat for some time at Stirling, and for some time at St. Johnston [c], in which a full indemnity was passed, not in the language of a pardon, but of an act of approbation: [d] all that joined with Cromwell were declared traitors. But now the ways of raising a new army were to be thought on.

55 Sept 3, 1650. Sept. 7. 1651.

[a] interlined. [b] interlined. [c] interlined. [d] *and* struck out.

was formally exonerated from blame —Warriston, Guthrie, Strachan, and others dissenting—on Dec. 23, 1650. See Balfour's *Annals*, iv. 214; Cadwell's *Narrative* (Carte's *Collection of Original Letters*, i. 382, 384); Hodgson's *Original Memoirs written during the Great Civil War*, Edinb. 1806.

[1] He went to St. Johnston on August 16, after signing the Declaration mentioned on 99. Walker, 169.

A question had been proposed both to the committee of states and to the commissioners of the kirk, whether in this extremity those who had made defection, or had been hitherto backward in the work, might not upon the profession of their repentance be received into public trusts, and admitted to serve in the defence of their country [1]. To this, answers were distinctly given by two resolutions: the one was, that they ought to be admitted to make profession of their repentance: and the other was, that after such profession made they might be received to defend and serve their country. CHAP. IV.

Upon this, a great division followed in the kirk: those who adhered to these resolutions were called the Public Resolutioners: but against these some of those bodies protested, and they, together with those who adhered to them, were called the Protesters. On the one hand it was said, that every government might call out all that were under its protection to its defence: this seemed founded on the law of nature and of nations: and if men had been misled, it was a strange cruelty to deny room for repentance: this was contrary to the nature of God and the gospel, and was a likely mean to drive them to despair: therefore, after two years' time, it seemed reasonable to | allow them to MS. 29. serve according to their birthright in parliament, or in other hereditary offices, or in the army; from all which 56 they had been excluded by an act made in the year 1649, that ranged them in different classes, and was from thence called the Act of Classes. But the Protesters objected against all this, that to take in men of known enmity to the cause was a sort of betraying it, because it was the

[1] The Act of Classes, January 23, 1649, excluded from public office all who had been concerned in the 'Engagement,' for various periods according to their offences, as well as all 'Malignants,' or enemies of the Covenant, and all persons 'openly profane and grossly scandalous in their conversation.' According to Walker, i. 165, 4,000 experienced soldiers were driven from the army in obedience to this Act shortly before Dunbar. This was now repealed. Burton, chaps. 74, 75, and Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, iii. 80 *et seq.*

CHAP. IV. putting it in their power to betray it; that to admit them to a profession of repentance was a profanation, and a mocking of God [1]: it was visible they were willing to comply with these terms, though against their conscience, only to get into the army: nor could they expect a blessing from God on an army so constituted. And as to this particular they had great advantage; for this mock penitence was indeed matter of great scandal. When these resolu-

1650. tions were passed with this protestation, a great many of the five western counties, Clydesdale, Renfrew, Ayr, Galloway, and Nithisdale, met, and formed an association apart, both against the army of sectaries, and against this new defection in the kirk party [2]. They drew a remonstrance against all the proceedings in the treaty with the king, when, as they said, it was visible by the commission that he granted to Montrose that his heart was not sincere: and they were also against the tendering him the covenant, when they had reason to believe he took it not with a resolution to maintain it, since his whole deportment and private conversation shewed a secret enmity to the work of God: and, after an invidious enumeration of many

[1] See Sir J. Turner's *Memoirs*, 95, on this 'mock penitence,' and the story in Cockburn's *Remarks*, 52. In the *Records of the Presbytery of St. Andrews* (Abbotsford Club) there is the following entry for Dec. 23, 1650: 'The quhilk day the Presbytery received an Act of the commission of the General Assembly dated Perth, Dec. 14, 1650, referring to them John, Earl of Lauderdale, that they may try the evidence of his repentance for his accession to the late unlawful engadgement against the Kingdom of England, and that thereafter they may receive him to public satisfaction for that offence.' Crawford had to do the same before the Presbytery of Cupar. They had also to disavow all complicity in the 'Start;' 100 note.

[2] 'Lambert has lately fallen upon the western forces and routed them, which next to Cromwell were the greatest enemies we had in the world. I hope now we shall agree, and joyne to make a considerable army, since they are defeated that were the greatest hindrance to it.' *Duke of Buckingham to the Marquis of Newcastle*, 1650, Dec. 5. *Portland MSS., H. M. C. Report*, xiii. App. ii. 137. These western protestors were the 'Remonstrants.' See the account of the state of parties in Scotland in the *Weekly Intelligencer*, Oct. 22–29 (Brit. Mus. E. 615, 8), quoted in the note to *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 149.

particulars, they imputed the shameful defeat at Dunbar to their prevaricating in [a]these things[a]; and concluded with a desire, that the king might be excluded from any share in the administration of the government, and that his cause might be put out of the state of the quarrel with the army of the sectaries. This was brought to the committee of estates at St. Johnston, and was severely inveighed against by sir Thomas Nicolson, the king's advocate or attorney general there, who had been till then a zealous man of their party: but he had lately married my sister, and my father had great influence on him. He prevailed, and the remonstrance was condemned as divisive, factious, and scandalous[1]: but that the people might not be too much moved with these things, a declaration was prepared to be set out by the king for the satisfying of them. In it there were many hard things[2]. The king owned the sin of his father's marrying into an idolatrous family: he acknowledged the bloodshed in the late wars lay at his father's door: he expressed a deep sense of his own ill education, and the prejudices he had drunk in against the cause, of which he was now very sensible: he confessed all the former part of 57

CHAP. IV.

Aug. 16, 1650.

[a] substituted for *the work of God.*

[1] 'Besides these there is also a 3 party in Scotland, rigid for the kirk, if not halfe independant, one Car and Strawhan as cheefe, with about 4000 men in the west of the country. These have lately had some treatys with Cromwell, and remonstrated something (which sounds ugly) about the last king, as if he deserved death, and only the manner of inflicting it was not justifiable. The assembly at St. Johnston cry out upon this doctrine, and would call the authors to account or threaten excommunication.' *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 152.

[2] This is wrongly placed. It was on August 16, 1650, at Dunfermline, before Dunbar. Walker's *Historical Discourse*, 170, where the Declaration may be read in full; *Clarendon St. P.* vol. 40, f. 80. See especially Loudoun's letter urging Charles to make this declaration, with the threat in case of non-compliance; *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 131. Privately Charles expressed his view that, so far at least as Ireland was concerned, he did not feel bound by the Declaration. *Id.* 143. Another document, still more explicit, to which Charles gave way without dispute, was prepared between the signing of the one mentioned and the battle of Dunbar. Walker, 178.

CHAP. IV. his life to have been a course of enmity to the work of God: he repented of his commission to Montrose, and of every thing he had done that gave offence: and with solemn protestations he affirmed, that he was now sincere in his declaration, and that he would adhere to it to the end of his life both in Scotland, England, and Ireland.

The king was very uneasy when this was brought to him. He said, he could never look his mother in [a] the face if he passed it. But when he was told it was necessary for his affairs, he resolved to swallow the pill without farther chewing it. So it was published, but had no good effect: for neither side believed him sincere in it[1]. It was thought a strange imposition to make him load his father's memory in such a manner. But, while the king was thus beset with the high and more moderate kirk parties, the old cavaliers sent to him, offering that if he would cast himself into their hands they would meet him near Dundee with a great body. Upon this the king, growing weary of
Oct. 1650. the sad life he led, made his escape in the night, and came to the place appointed: but it was a vain undertaking, for he was met by a very inconsiderable body at Clova, the place of rendezvous. Those at St. Johnston being troubled at this, sent colonel Montgomery after him, who came up, and pressed him to return very rudely: so the king came back[2]. But this had a very good effect. The government saw now the danger of using him ill, which might provoke him to desperate courses: after that, he was used as well

[a] *his* in MS.

[1] After Dunbar, at St. Johnston's, he 'was daily told both in Prayers and Sermons of the sins of His Father's House, His Mother's Idolatry, and their fears of his Reality.' Walker, 187.

[2] Oct. 3, 4, 1650. This incident was known as 'The Start.' Clova is at the head of Glen Esk in the north of Forfarshire. Walker stated that Charles's intention was betrayed by Buckingham and Wilmot. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. 201. Walker's own account of the whole incident (*Journal*, 196), differs from that in the text in some respects, and should be compared with the report given by Henry Nash, *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 149. See the epigrammatic remark upon him, *id.* 45, 'rather obedient to the impulse of his genius than to the necessity and love of his subjects.'

as that kingdom, in so ill a state, was capable of. He saw the necessity of courting the marquis of Argyll, and therefore he made him great offers: at last he talked of marrying his daughter[1]. Argyll was cold and backward: he saw the king's heart lay not to him: so he looked on all offers but as so many snares. His son, the lord Lorn, was captain of the guards: and he made his court more dexterously; for he brought all persons that the king had a mind to speak with at all hours to him, and was in all

[1] When the king came to Scotland, the Marquis of Argyll made great professions of duty to him, but said he could not serve him as he desired, unless he gave some undeniable proof of a fixed resolution to support the presbyterian party, which he thought would be best done by marrying into some family of quality, that was known to be entirely attached to that interest; which would in great measure take off the prejudice both kingdoms had to him upon his mother's account, who was extremely odious to all good protestants; and thought his own daughter would be the properest match for him, not without some threats, if he did not accept the offer; which the king told colonel Legge, who was the only person about him that he could trust with the secret. The colonel said it was plain the marquis looked upon his majesty to be absolutely in his power, or he durst not have made such a proposal; therefore it would be necessary to gain time, till he could get out of his hands, by telling him, in common decency he could come to no conclusion in an affair of that nature before he had acquainted the queen his mother, who was always known to have a very particular esteem for the marquis and his family, but would never forgive such an omission. But that was an answer far from satisfying the marquis, who suspected colonel Legge had been the adviser, and committed him next day to the castle of Edinburgh, where he continued till the king made his escape from St. Johnston, upon which he was released; the marquis finding it necessary to give the king more satisfaction than he had done before that time. D. Dartmouth's story is impossible. Legge was in prison in England from July 1649 to May 1651, and probably later. *Dict Nat. Biog.* xxxii. 415, and authorities there referred to. 'William Murray and Sir Robert Murray were negotiators [with Argyll] for the king, who, it is thought, put him in hopes that the king might marry his daughter.' *Life of Livingstone*, Wodrow Soc., *Select Biog.* 170. Titus (*supra* 76 note) acted as the agent between Charles, Argyll, the queen-mother, and Jermyn. See especially the instructions to him from the king and Argyll, and Henrietta-Maria's clear and clever reply to Charles, dissuading him from thinking of the match at present in Hillier's *King Charles in the Isle of Wight*, 325-331. The words of the text, that Argyll was cold and backward, require modification from these documents.

CHAP. IV. respects not only faithful but zealous. Yet this was suspected as a collusion between the father and the son [1]. The
1651. king was crowned on the first of January [2]: and there he again renewed the covenant: and now all people were admitted to come to him, and to serve in the army. The two armies lay peaceably in their winter quarters; but when the summer came on, a body of the English passed the Frith, and landed in Fife. So the king, having got up all the force he had expected, resolved on a march into England. Scotland could not maintain another year's war. This was a desperate resolution: but there was nothing else to be done [3].

58 I will not pursue the | relation of the march to Wor-
MS. 30. cester, nor the total defeat given the king's army on the
Sept. 3, 1651. same day in which Dunbar fight had been fought the year before, on the 3rd of September. These things are so well known, as is also the king's escape, that I can add nothing to the common relations that have been over and over again made of them. At the same time that Cromwell followed the king into England, he left Monk in Scotland, with an army sufficient to reduce the rest of the kingdom.
Sept. 1, 1651. The town of Dundee made a rash and ill considered resistance: it was after a few days' siege taken by storm: much blood was shed, and the town was severely plundered. No other place made any resistance [4]. I remember well of

[1] The practice of father and eldest son taking opposite sides, in order that in any event the estates might remain in the family, was common among the Scotch nobility at this time, as in the '1715' and '1745.' Cf. *infra* 232. But see Firth's *Scotland and the Commonwealth* (Scottish Hist. Soc.), Introd. and 134–275. This work is of the utmost importance for Scottish affairs from August, 1651, to 1664.

[2] See *supra* 93 and *infra* 196, where the present existence of the two copies signed by Charles, the one at the mouth of the Spey on June 23, 1650, the other at his coronation, Jan. 1, 1651, is practically proved.

[3] Upon the hopes of support in England itself, as well as from Holland and the Duke of Lorraine, see Ranke, iii. 54.

[4] Monk had between 5,000 and 6,000 men. Stirling capitulated on August 14, and the Scotch committee of estates was captured on August 27. The storming of Dundee was on Sept. 1, 1651. About 500 of the garrison were killed, and, as Monk

the coming of three regiments to Aberdeen. There was an order and discipline, and a face of gravity and piety among them, that amazed all people. Most of them were independents and anabaptists: they were all gifted men, and preached as they were moved; but they never disturbed the public assemblies in the churches but once. They came and reproached the preachers for laying things to their charge that were false. I was then present: the debate grew very fierce: at last they drew their swords, but there was no hurt done: yet Cromwell displaced the governor for not punishing this.

When the low countries in Scotland were thus reduced, some of the more zealous of the nobility went to the Highlands in the year 1653. The earl of Glencairn, a grave and sober man, but vain and haughty, got the tribe of the Macdonalds to declare for the king[1]. To these the lord Lorn came with about a thousand men: but the jealousy of the father made the son be suspected. The marquis of Argyll had retired into his country when the king marched into England, and did not submit to Monk till the year '52[2]. Then he received a garrison: but lord Lorn surprised a ship that was sent about with provisions to it, which helped to support their little ill-formed army. Many gentlemen came to them: and almost all the good horses of the kingdom were stolen, and carried up to them. They made a body of about 3,000: of these they had about 500 horse. They endured great hardships; for those parts were not fit to entertain men that had been accustomed to live softly. The earl of Glencairn's pride had almost spoiled all: for he took much upon him, and [a]upon some

1653.

[a] interlined.

wrote to Cromwell, 'the stubbornness of the people enforced the soldiers to plunder the town.' See Mr. Firth's article on Monk in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* and Ludlow's *Memoirs*, i. 282, and *Scotland and the Commonwealth* Introd. i. and 1–13.

[1] He had a commission from Charles to command any force which he might gather.

[2] Monk was absent from Scotland from Feb. 165$\frac{4}{5}$ to the spring of 1654. During the interval he was one of the three 'generals' in command of the fleet against the Dutch, being Admiral of the White.

CHAP. IV. suspicion he[a] ordered lord Lorn to be clapt up, who had notice of it, and prevented it by an escape: otherwise they had fallen to cut one another's throats, instead of marching against the enemy [1]. The earl of Balcarres, [a]a virtuous and knowing man but somewhat morose in his humour[a], went
59 also among them [2]. They differed in their counsels: Glencairn was for falling into the low country, and he began to fancy he should be another Montrose. Balcarres, on the other hand, was for their keeping in their fastnesses, that made a shew of a body for the king, which they were to keep up in some reputation as long as they could, till they could see what assistance the king might be able to procure them from beyond sea, of men, money, and arms: whereas if they went out of those fast grounds, they could not hope to stand long before such a veteran and well disciplined army as Monk had; and if they met with the least check, their tumultuary body would soon melt away.

Among others, one sir Robert Moray, that had married the earl of Balcarres's sister [3], came among them. He had served in France, where he had got into such a degree of favour with cardinal Richelieu, that few strangers were ever so much considered by him as he was [4]. He was raised to

[a] interlined.

[1] See the account of all this in Baillie, iii. 251–255.

[2] Balcarres was a man of the highest personal character, in great repute with both Charles and Hyde. *Clar. St. P., passim.* He was an intimate friend of Robert Moray, and the correspondence between them while in exile is of extreme interest and beauty. *Scottish Review*, Jan. 1885. He died at Breda, August 30, 1659, of grief, Baillie hints (iii. 437), at the defeat of Sir George Booth. His wife, Lady Anna Mackenzie, second daughter of the Earl of Seaforth, whose second husband was the Duke of Argyll executed by James II, was even more noted for ability, refinement, and courage. See her *Life*, by the late Earl of Crawford and Lindesay (1868). Cf. the *Balcarres Memoirs* (Bannatyne Club).

[3] i.e. Sophia, daughter of David Lindsay, first Lord Balcarres.

[4] And with Mazarin, from whom in 1658 he claimed a debt of 130,000 livres. For the varied career of this most remarkable and attractive man (whose name is invariably spelt 'Moray' by himself and his correspondents) previous to the Restoration, see the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* and the authorities there cited; and for the post-Restoration period the *Lauder-*

be a colonel there, and came over for recruits when the king was with the Scots' army at Newcastle. There he grew into high favour with the king, and had laid a design for his escape, of which I have given an account in duke Hamilton's memoirs: he was the most universally beloved and esteemed by men of all sides and sorts, of any man I have ever known in my whole life. He was a pious man, and in the midst of armies and courts he spent many hours a day in a devotion which was of a most elevating strain. He had gone through the easy parts of mathematics, and knew the history of nature beyond any man I ever yet knew. He had a genius much like Peiresk's, as he is described by Gassendi [1]. He was afterwards the first former of the Royal Society, and its first president; and while he lived, he was the life and soul of that body [2]. He had an equality of temper in him that nothing could alter, and was in practice the only stoic I ever knew. He had a great tincture of one of their principles, for he was much for absolute decrees. He had a most diffused love to all man-

dale Papers (Camd. Soc.), i and ii *passim*, where the character given him by Burnet is fully borne out. See also the many notices of him in Pepys and Evelyn, and the article upon his correspondence with Kincardin in *Scottish Review*, Jan. 1885. He will often occur later in the *History*. Every known incident in his career bears out his own words to Kincardin in 1658. 'It hath been my study now thirty-one years to understand and regulate my passions; the whole story of my progress is this.' He had 'no stomach for publick employments,' though extremely able in them; and his independence of character was well put by Charles II, 'he is head of his own church.'

[1] 'The Mirrour of true nobility and gentility, being the life of the renowned Nicolaus Claudius Fabricius, Lord of Peiresk, senator of the parliament at Aix, written by the learned Petrus Gassendus, englished by W. Rand, Doctor of Physick, 1657' (dedicated to John Evelyn), 8vo. Gassendi was Professor of Mathematics to the King of France, and was born in 1580, or 1592 (Larousse, *Dict. du xix^me^ siècle*, viii. 1057), d. 1695. See the list of his MSS. in the English translation. The original work (not included in Larousse's article) was published 1641.

[2] Sir R. Moray was the President before the incorporation, having been elected for the first time March 6, 1661; but William, second Lord Brouncker, was the first President under the Charter, dated July 15, 1662, and was confirmed by election April 22, 1663. Birch, *Hist Roy. Soc.* (1756), 17 and *Records of the Royal Society*. See notes *infra* 342–344.

CHAP. IV. kind, and he delighted in every occasion of doing good, which he managed with great discretion and zeal. He had a superiority of genius and comprehension to most men: and had the plainest, but withal the softest, way of reproving, chiefly young people, for their faults, that I ever met with. And upon this account, as well as upon all the care and affection he expressed to me, I have ever reckoned that, next to my father, I owed more to him, than to any other man. Therefore I have enlarged upon his character; and yet I am sure I have rather said too little than too much.

MS. 31. Sir Robert Moray was in such credit in that little army, that lord Glencairn took a strange course to break it, and to ruin him. A letter was pretended to be found at Antwerp, as writ by him to William Murray of the bedchamber, that had been whipping-boy to king Charles the first, and upon that had grown up to a degree of favour and confidence that was very particular, and, as many thought, was as ill used, as it was little deserved[1]. He had a lewd creature there, whom he turned off: and she, to be revenged on him, framed this plot against him. This ill-forged letter gave an account of a bargain sir Robert had made with Monk for killing the king, which was to be executed by [a] Mr. Murray [a]: so he [b] prayed him [b] in his letter to make haste and dispatch it. This was brought to the earl of Glencairn: so sir Robert was severely questioned upon it, and put in arrest: and it was spread about through a rude army that he intended to kill the king, hoping, it seems, that upon that some of these wild people, believing it, would have fallen upon him without using any forms. But upon this occasion sir Robert practised in a very eminent manner his true Christian philosophy, without shewing so much as a cloud in his whole behaviour.

[a] substituted for *sir Robert*, erased. [b] altered from *was prayed*.

[1] Created Earl of Dysart, father of the second wife of the Duke of Lauderdale; see *supra* 30, note, and f. 244. On the subject of the forged letter there is a good deal in the *Clar. St. P.* for 1654. See also the *Nicholas Papers*, ii. 27, 56.

The earl of Balcarres left the Highlands, and went to the king, and shewed him the necessity of sending a military man to command that body, to whom they would submit more willingly than to any of the nobility. Middleton was sent over, who was a gallant man, and a good officer. He had first served on the parliament side: but he turned over to the king, and was taken at Worcester fight, but he made his escape out of the Tower[1]. He, upon his coming over, did for some time lay the heats that were among the Highlanders, and made as much of that face of an army for another year as was possible. CHAP. IV. 1653.

Drummond[2] was sent by him to Paris with an invitation to the king to come among them: for they had assurances sent them that the whole nation was in a disposition to rise with them: and England was beginning to grow weary of their new government, the army and the parliament being

[1] Middleton was originally a pikeman in Hepburn's regiment in France. He served in the Thirty Years' War, and afterwards for the Parliament under the Earl of Essex until 1644; he subsequently fought with David Leslie against Montrose, by whose soldiers his father had been murdered. (Wishart's *Deeds of Montrose*, ed. Murdoch and Simpson, Pref. lvi. *postscript.*) He was one of the 'engagers,' commanded the cavalry in Hamilton's army in 1648, and was taken prisoner at the battle of Preston. He duly 'repented' of the engagement, but in 1650 was at the head of a royalist force in the Highlands, and was excommunicated by James Guthrie, an affront which he did not forget (*infra* 205, 227). On Jan. 12, 1651, he did public penance at Dundee. In the Worcester campaign he commanded the cavalry, and was taken prisoner in the battle; escaped in his wife's clothes, and joined Charles II in Paris. According to Clarendon (*Clar. St. P.*, March 28, 1653) the king had thought of joining him when, as mentioned in the text, he again went over to command in the Highlands. His commission from Charles as Lieutenant-General of the king in Scotland is dated June 25, 1652, but he did not arrive until early in 1654, Glencairn being meanwhile in command. For an account of this expedition see *Cal. Clar. St. P.* ii. 371. He was created an earl in 1656, and at the Restoration came back in the same ship with Charles. Laing's *Hist. Scotl.* ii. 9 (ed. 1800); Burton, vii. 416. From Sir James Turner's *Memoirs*, 131, we find that in 16$\frac{52}{53}$ Turner was sent by the loyal lords of Scotland to pray that the king would name some other general for them than Middleton.

[2] See *supra* 70, and ff. 214, 240, 288, 375. He was sent by Charles to Scotland with instructions for Glencairn and Balcarres in November, 1653. *Scotland and the Commonwealth*, 247.

CHAP. IV. 1651–54. on ill terms. The English were also engaged in a war with the States, who upon that account might be inclined to assist the king to give a diversion to their enemies' forces. Drummond told me, that upon his coming to Paris he was called to the little council that was then about the king: and when he had delivered his message, [a] chancellor Hyde [a 1] asked him how the king would be accommodated if he came among them? He answered, not so well as was fitting, but they would all take care of him to furnish him with every thing that was necessary [2]. He wondered that the king did not check the chancellor in this demand: for he said, it looked strange to him, that when they were all hazarding their lives to help him to a crown, he should be concerned for accommodation. He was sent back with good words and a few kind letters. In the end of the year 1654 Morgan marched into the Highlands, and had a small engagement with Middleton [3], which broke that whole matter, of which all people were grown weary; for they had no prospect of success, and the low countries were so overrun with robberies on the pretence of going to assist the Highlanders, that there was an universal joy at the dispersing of that little unruly army. After this the country was kept in great order: some castles in the Highlands had garrisons put in them, that were so careful in their discipline, and so exact as to their rules, that in no time the Highlands were kept in better order than during the usurpation. There was a considerable force of about seven or eight thousand men kept in Scotland: these were paid exactly, and strictly disciplined. The pay of the army brought so much money

July (?), 1654.

61

[a] substituted for *Clarendon.*

[1] Hyde was not created Lord Chancellor until Jan. 1658.

[2] Clarendon *Rebellion*, xiv. 108, 109.

[3] Burton, vii. 328. Burton relies upon the *Military Memoirs of the Great Civil War, being the Military Memoirs of John Gwynne, and an account of the Earl of Glencairne's expedition, &c*, 4to., 1822. Ed. by Sir W. Scott. Middleton returned to the exiled court about Feb. 1655 after the defeat at Lochgarry in July (?), 1654, leaving Glencairn to make terms with Monk.

into the kingdom, that it continued all that while in a very flourishing state. Cromwell built three [a] citadels, at Leith, Ayr, and Inverness, besides many lesser forts. There was good justice done, and vice was suppressed and punished [1]; so that we always reckon those eight years of usurpation a time of great peace and prosperity [2]. There was also a sort of union of the three kingdoms in one parliament, 1654.

[a] *great* struck out.

[1] 'A man,' boasted one of the Council, 'may ride all Scotland over with a switch in his hand and £100 in his pocket, which he could not have done these 500 years.' Burton's *Diary*, iv. 168.

[2] Baillie, iii. 249, gives the following account of the condition of Scotland in the year 1654. 'As for our state, this is its case. Our nobility are well near all wracked. Dukes Hamilton, the one executed, the other slain; their estate forfeited; one part of it gifted to English soldiers; the rest will not pay the debt; little left to the heretrix; almost the whole name undone with debt. Huntly executed; his sons all dead but the youngest: there is more debt on the house than the land can pay. Lennox is living as a man buried in his house of Cobham. Douglas and his son Angus are quiet men, of no respect. Argyll, almost drowned in debt, in friendship with the English, but in hatred with the country. He courts the remonstrants, who were and are averse from him. Chancellor Loudoun lives like an outlaw about Athol; his lands comprised for debt, under a general very great disgrace. Marischal, Rothes, Eglinton and his three sons, Crawford, Lauderdale, and others, prisoners in England; and their lands all either sequestrated or forfaulted, and gifted to English soldiers. Balmerino suddenly dead, and his son, for publick debt, comprisings, and captions, keeps not the causey. Warriston, having refunded much of what he got for places, lives privily in a hard enough condition, much hated by the most, and neglected by all, except the remonstrants, to whom he is guide. Our criminal judicatories are all in the hands of the English; our civil courts also; only some of the remonstrants are adjoined with them.' At the same reference see a list of Cromwell's garrisons, with a description of the 'lethargick fear and despaire' which hung over the land. Again, in a letter dated November 1658 (*id.* 387), two months after the death of Cromwell, he writes thus: 'The country lies very quiet; it is exceeding poor; trade is nought: the English have all the money. Our noble families are almost gone: Lennox has little in Scotland unsold; Hamilton's estate, except Arran and the barony of Hamilton, is sold; Argyll can pay little annual rent for 700,000 or 800,000 merks; and he is no more drowned in debt than in publick hatred, almost of all, both Scots and English; the Gordons are gone; the Douglasses are little better; Eglinton and Glencairn on the brink of breaking; many of our chief families estates are cracking, nor is there any appearance of any human relief for the time.'

CHAP. IV. where Scotland had its representatives. The marquis of Argyll went up one of our commissioners [1].

The next scene I must open relates to the church, and the heats raised in it by the Public Resolutions and the Protestation made against them. New occasions of dispute
MS. 32. arose. A general assembly was in course to | meet, and
1653. sit at St. Andrews: so the Commission of the Kirk writ a circular letter to all the presbyteries, setting forth all the grounds of their Resolutions, and complaining of those who had protested against them; upon which they desired that they would choose none of those who adhered to that Protestation to represent them in the next Assembly. This was only an advice, and had been frequently practised in the former years: but now it was highly complained of, as a limitation on the freedom of elections, which inferred a nullity on all their proceedings: so the Protesters renewed their protestation against this meeting upon a higher point, disowning that authority which hitherto they had magnified as the highest tribunal in the church, in which they thought Christ was on his throne. Upon this a great debate followed, and many books were written in the course of several years. The public men said, this was the destroying of presbytery, if the lesser number did not submit to the greater: it was a sort of prelacy, if it was pretended that votes ought rather to be weighed than counted: parity was the essence of their constitution: and in this all people saw they had clearly the better of the argument. The Protesters urged for themselves, that, since all protestants rejected the pretence of infallibility, the major part of the
62 church might fall into error, in which case the lesser number could not be bound to submit to them: they complained of the many corrupt clergymen who were yet among them, who were leavened with the old leaven, and did on all occasions shew what was still at heart, notwithstanding all

[1] In 1654 Scotland sent thirty members—twenty for the counties, and ten for the burghs—to the parliament dissolved by Cromwell Jan. 22, 1655. See *Scotland and the Commonwealth*, 208 n.

their outward compliance: for the episcopal clergy, that had gone into the covenant and presbytery to hold their livings, struck in with great heat to inflame the controversy: and it appeared very visibly, that presbytery, if not held in order by the civil power, could not be long kept in quiet. If in the supreme court of judicature the majority did not conclude the matter, it was not possible to keep up their beloved parity. It was confessed that in doctrinal points the lesser number was not bound to submit to the greater: but in the matters of mere government it was impossible to maintain the presbyterian form on any other bottom. CHAP. IV.

As this debate grew hot, and they were ready to break out into censures on both sides, some were sent down from the commonwealth of England to settle Scotland: of these sir Henry Vane was one[1]. The Resolutioners were known to have been more in the king's interests: so they were not so kindly looked on as the Protesters. Some of the English junto moved, that pains should be taken to unite the two parties, but Vane opposed this with much zeal: he said, would they heal the wound that they had given themselves, which weakened them so much? The setting them at quiet could have no other effect but to heal and unite them in their opposition to their authority. He therefore moved that they might be left at liberty to fight out their own quarrels, and thereby be kept in a greater dependence on the temporal authority, when both sides were forced to make their appeal to it. So it was resolved to suffer them to meet still in their presbyteries and synods, but not in general assemblies, which had a greater face of union and authority[2]. Oct. 1651.

This advice was followed: so the division went on. Both sides studied, when any church became vacant, to get a man of their own party to be chosen to succeed in the election: and upon these occasions many tumults happened. In some of them stones were thrown, and many were

[1] October, 1651. Ludlow's *Memoirs*, i. 298; Whitelocke, 487.

[2] The last meeting of the General Assembly was in July 1653.

CHAP. IV. wounded, to the great scandal of religion. In all these disputes the Protesters were the fiercer side: for being less in number, they studied to make that up with their fury. In one point they had the others at a great advantage, with relation to their new masters, who required them to give over praying for the king. The Protesters were weary of doing it, and submitted very readily: but the others
63 stood out longer, and said, it was a duty lying on them by the covenant, so they could not let it fall. Upon that the English council set out an order, that such as should continue to pray for the king should be denied the help of law to recover their tithes, or, as they are called there, their stipends. This touched them in a sensible point; but, that they might seem to act upon their own authority, they did enact it in their presbyteries, that since all duties did not oblige at all times, therefore considering the present juncture, in which the king could not protect them, they
MS. 33. resolved to discontinue that |[a] piece of duty[a]. This exposed them to much censure, since such a carnal consideration as the force of law for their benefices, (which all regard at too much, though few will own it) seemed to be that which determined them.

This great breach among them being rather encouraged than suppressed by those who were in power, all the methods imaginable were used by the Protesters to raise their credit among the people. They preached often and very long, and seemed to carry their devotions to a greater sublimity than others did [1]. Their constant topic was the sad defection and corruption of the judicatories of the church, and they often proposed several expedients for purging it [2].

[a] *in doing their duty* struck out.

[1] In his advice to young preachers John Livingstone, *Sel. Biog.* (Wodrow Soc.), i. 288, lays down that a sermon should be 'ordinarily for not beyond the hour.'

[2] Baillie, iii. 245, says: 'The moderator's sermon ran on the necessity of taking up the too long neglected work of purging. The man's vehemency in this, and in his prayer, a strange kind of sighing, the like whereof I had never heard, as a pythonising out of the belly of a second person, made me amazed.'

The truth was, they were more active, and their performances were livelier, than the Public men. They were in nothing more singular than in their communions. In many places the sacrament was discontinued for [a] several years, where they thought the magistracy, or the more eminent of the parish, were engaged in what they called the defection, which was much more looked at than the scandals given by bad lives. But where the greater part of the parish was more sound, they gave the sacrament with a new and unusual solemnity. On the Wednesday before they held a fast day, with prayers and sermons for about eight or ten hours together: on the Saturday they had two or three preparation sermons: and on the Lord's day they had so very many, that the action continued above twelve hours in some places: and all ended with three or four sermons on Monday for thanksgivings. A great many ministers were brought together from several parts, and high pretenders would have gone forty or fifty miles to a noted communion. The crowds were far beyond the capacity of their churches, or the reach of their voices, so at the same time they had sermons in two or three different places: and all was performed with great shews of zeal. They had stories of many signal conversions that were wrought upon these occasions; whereas others were better believed, who told as many stories of much lewdness among the multitudes that did then run together. CHAP. IV.

It is scarce credible what an effect this had among the people, to how great a measure of knowledge they were brought, and how readily they could pray *extempore*, and talk of divine matters. All this tended to raise the credit of the Protesters. The Resolutioners tried to imitate them in these practices: but they were not thought so spiritual, nor so ready at them: so the other had the chief following. 64

[a] substituted for *many*.

Of the sermon also preached by an English independent on the spiritual life Baillie's judgement accorded with Swift's, that the preacher ran out above all their understandings. See also *id.* iii. 258.

CHAP. IV. Where the judicatories of the church were near an equality of the men of both sides, there were perpetual janglings among them: at last they proceeded to deprive men of both sides, as they were the majority in the judicatories: but because the possession of the church and the benefice was to depend on the orders of the temporal courts, both sides made their application to the privy council that Aug. 1655. Cromwell had set up in Scotland[1]: and they were by them referred to Cromwell himself. So they sent deputies up to London. The Protesters went in greater numbers: they came nearer both to the principles and to that temper that prevailed in the army: so they were looked on as the better men, on whom, by reason of the first rise of the difference, the government might more certainly depend: whereas the others were considered as more in the king's interests.

The Resolutioners sent up one Sharp[2], who had been long in England, and was an active and eager man: he had a very small proportion of learning, and was but an indifferent preacher: but having some acquaintance with the presbyterian ministers of London, whom Cromwell was then courting much by reason of their credit in the city, he was, by an error that proved fatal to the whole party, sent up in their name to London; where he continued for some years soliciting their concerns, and making himself known to all sorts of people. He seemed more than ordinary zealous for presbytery. And, as Cromwell was then designing to make himself king[3], Dr. Wilkins[4] told me he often said to him, no temporal government could have a sure support without a national church that adhered to it, and he thought England was capable of no other national constitution but of episcopacy; to which, he told me, he did not doubt but Cromwell would have turned,

[1] Ludlow's *Mem.* i. 394. Lord Broghill was appointed President.

[2] See *infra* 165.

[3] Ludlow, i. 344, mentions the statement of Peters, that the idea of kingship was entertained by Cromwell directly after Worcester.

[4] Made Bishop of Chester in 1667. He married Cromwell's sister. See ff. 187, 191, 253; and Overton, *The English Church in the seventeenth century*, 35.

as soon as the design of his kingship was settled. Upon this, he spoke to Sharp, that it was plain by their breach that presbytery could not be managed so as to maintain order among them, and that an episcopacy must be brought in to settle them: but Sharp could not bear the discourse, and rejected it with horror. I have dwelt the longer on this matter, and opened it the more fully than was necessary if I had not thought that this may have a good effect on the reader, and shew him how impossible it is in a parity 65 to maintain peace and order, if the magistrate does not interpose: and then that will be cried out upon by the zealots of both sides as abominable Erastianism. CHAP. IV.

CHAPTER V.

CROMWELL.

FROM these matters I go next to set down some particulars that I knew concerning Cromwell, that I have not yet seen in books. Some of these I had from the earls of Carlisle [1] and Orrery [2]: the one had been the captain of his guards, and the other had been the president of his council in Scotland. But he from whom I learned the most was Stoupe, a Grison by birth, then minister of the French church in the Savoy [3], and afterwards a brigadier general MS. 34.

[1] Charles Howard, created Earl of Carlisle, April 20, 1661, b. 1629, d. 1685.

[2] Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill, younger son of the first Earl of Cork, created Earl of Orrery after the Restoration. He died in 1679. His life, written by his chaplain Thomas Morrice, is prefixed to 'a collection of State Papers of . . . Roger Boyle . . . first Earl of Orrery.' Many of his letters to Ormond are in the Ormond Papers, *H. M. C. Rep.* vi: those to Essex and many others in the *Essex Papers* (Camd. Soc.), vol. i. See Gardiner's *Great Civil War*, iii. 259, and *infra* 124, 127; ff. 176, 226.

[3] Jean Baptiste Stoupe was never minister of the French church in the Savoy, but of St. Martin's in the city. Besides, it is impossible that he should be minister in the Savoy, because the French church there was not open till July 1661. [Under Cromwell the French congregation in London had the use of the chapel of Somerset House. This they gave up at the Restoration to the queen-mother, petitioning for leave to use the Savoy instead. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660-1, 277. There were French

CHAP. V. in the French armies: a man of intrigue, but of no virtue: he adhered to the protestant religion as to outward appearance, but he was more a Socinian or deist than either protestant or Christian. He was much trusted by Cromwell in foreign affairs; in which Cromwell was oft [a] to seek, and having no foreign language, but the little Latin that stuck to him from his education, which he spoke very viciously and scantily, had not the necessary means of informing himself.

When Cromwell first assumed the government, he had the three great parties of the nation all against him, the episcopal, the presbyterian, and the republican party[1]. The last was the most set on his ruin, looking on him as the person that had perfidiously broke the house of commons, and was setting up for himself[2]. He had none to rely on but the army: yet that enthusiastic temper that he had taken so much pains to raise among them made them very intractable[3]: many of the chief officers were broken and imprisoned by him: and he flattered the rest the best he could. He went on in his old way of long and dark discourses, sermons, and prayers. As to the cavalier party,

[a] *much* struck out.

Protestant Churches also at Canterbury and the Isle of Ely, *id.* 1661-2, 479.] See Collier's *Supplement*, voce Durell. *Bowyer's MS. note.* 'The French, Italian, and Dutch ministers came to make their addresses to his majesty, one monsieur Stoupe pronouncing the harangue with great eloquence.' Evelyn, June 16, 1660. Burnet travelled with Stoupe to Italy in 1685. Cf. *infra* 130, 135, 138, and ff. 335, 661. See Mr. Firth's detailed note upon him and his career in Ludlow's *Memoirs*, ii. 389. There are also frequent notices in Thurlowe, who styles him simply 'minister of the French Church in London,' ii. 246, 499, 501, 566. He is still so styled on Aug. 23, 1662, when, by special notice from the king to the French Church in London, he was banished the country as 'a notorious meddler in matters not of his calling and an intelligencer for the late government.' *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661-2, 70.

[1] 'The Presbyterians in and about London are forward enough in words, but cannot rise. The Royall party will not engage before the Presbyterian for fear of a desertion as formerly.' *Thomas Coke to Charles II*, Aug. $\frac{1}{2}\frac{2}{2}$, 1650; *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 133.

[2] Firth's *Ludlow's Memoirs*, i. 347, &c., and *Life of Major General Harrison*, 40-45.

[3] *H. M. C. Report*, vi. 443.

he was afraid both of assassination and other plottings from them [1]. As to the former of these, he took a method that proved very effectual: he said often and openly, that in a war it was necessary to return upon any side all the violent things that any of the side did the other: this was done for preventing greater mischiefs, and for bringing men to fair war: therefore, he said, assassinations were such detestable things, that he would never begin them: but if any of the king's party should endeavour to assassinate him, and fail in it, he would make an assassinating war of it, and destroy the whole family: and he pretended he had instruments ready to execute it whensoever he should give orders for it. The terror of this was a more effectual security to him than his guards.

The other, as to their plottings, was the more dangerous. But he understood that one sir Richard Willis was chancellor Hyde's chief confident, to whom he wrote often, and to whom all the party submitted, looking on him as an able and wise man, in whom they confided absolutely [2]. So he found a way to talk with him: he said, he did not intend to hurt any of the party: his design was rather to 66

[1] With good reason; as in the case of the conspiracy for which Gerard and Vowell were executed in July, 1654. *Cal. Clar. St. P.* 1654, 237; *Cobbett's State Trials*, v. col. 522. Mr. Warner, in his edition of the *Nicholas Papers* (Camd. Soc.), ii. Preface, x, and 68, brings forward some interesting evidence, *pro* and *con*, regarding the complicity of Charles, Hyde, Ormond and others of the king's counsellors. *H. M. C. Report*, vi. 443. There is no question but that Ormond was privy to the plot of 1657. *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 236, 338.

[2] For this story, which, as Burnet gives it, is inaccurate in details, see Clarendon, *Rebellion*, xvi. 28–34; *English Historical Review*, 1889, 527, 528; *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 614–618, 667; Carte's *Collection of Original Letters*, ii. 220, 256, 284, 287; Lingard, xi. 337, 396, ed. 1829; Pepys, May 13, 15, August 1, 1660, August 13, 1663, Nov. 25, 1664; Clarke, *Life of James II*, i. 370. Sir R. Willis commanded a regiment at Warrington at the beginning of the war and was governor of Newark; Clarendon, *Rebellion*, ix. 129; compounded with the Parliament, Nov. 1645; was in active correspondence with Clarendon and Nicholas as late as 1659; was the head of the 'Knot,' or council of royalists, in that year; and was condemned for treason, May 15, 1660, but was pardoned, and in 1661 was petitioning for leave to show himself at court. See his detailed statement of the transactions between himself, Thurloe, and Morland here referred to in *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 232.

CHAP. V. save them from ruin: they were apt, after their cups, to run into foolish and ill concerted plots, which signified nothing but to ruin those who engaged in them: he knew they consulted him in every thing: all he desired of him was to know all their plots, that he might so deconcert them, that none might ever suffer for them: if he clapt any of them up in prison, it should only be for a little time, and they should be interrogated only about some trifling discourse, but never about the business they had been engaged in. He offered Willis whatever he would accept of, and to give it when or as he pleased. He durst not ask or take much, for if it had appeared that he had much money that would have given jealousy, so he did not take above two hundred pound a year. None was trusted with this but his secretary Thurloe, who was a very dexterous man at getting intelligence.

Thus Cromwell had all the king's party in a net, and he let them dance in it at pleasure, and upon occasions clapt them up for a short while: but nothing was ever discovered that hurt any of them. In conclusion, after Cromwell's death, Willis continued to give notice of every thing to Thurloe. At last, when the plot was laid among the cavaliers for a general insurrection, the king was desired to come over to that [a] which was to be raised in Sussex [a]: he was to have landed near Chichester [b], all by Willis's management: and a snare was laid for him, in which he would probably have been caught if Morland, Thurloe's under secretary, who was a prying man, had not discovered the correspondence between his master and Willis, and warned the king of his danger [1]. Yet it was not easy to

[a] substituted for *for Suffolk and Norfolk.* [b] substituted for *Yarmouth.*

[1] Samuel Morland (born 1625), son of Thomas Morland, a clergyman; became Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge, 1649, and was tutor to Pepys, who entered in 1650. He accompanied Whitelocke in his embassy to Sweden in 1653, became assistant to Thurloe in 1654, and went as Cromwell's agent to the Duke of Savoy in 1655, remaining for a time as resident at Geneva. In 1658 he published his *History of the Evangelical Churches of the valleys of Piedmont.* While secretary to Thurloe he sent

persuade those who had trusted Willis so much, and thought[a] him faithful in all respects, to believe that he could be guilty of so black a treachery: so Morland's advertisement was looked on as an artifice to create jealousy. But he, to give a full conviction, had observed where the secretary laid some letters of advice, on which he saw he relied most, and getting the key of that cabinet in his hand to seal a letter with a seal that hung to it, he took the impression of it in wax, and got a key to be made from it, by which he opened the cabinet, and sent over some of the most important of those letters. The hand was known, and this artful but black treachery was discovered: so the design of the rising was laid aside for that time. Sir George Booth having engaged at the same time to raise a body in Cheshire, two several messengers | were sent to him, to let him know the design could not be executed at the time appointed: both these persons were suspected by some garrisons through which they must pass, as giving no good account of themselves in a time of jealousy, and were so long stopt that they could not give him notice in time: so

CHAP. V.

1659.

MS. 35

67

[a] substituted for *believed*.

continual intelligence to Charles, and 'by unsealing letters written by (Willis) saved Charles II who was to have been murdered at Westenhanger in Kent.' *H. M. C. Rep.* vii. 245. At the Restoration, having already been knighted by Charles (Pepys, May 13, 1660), he was rewarded with a baronetcy, July 18, 1660, and a pension of £500 (*id.* August 14, 1660; August 13, 1663), 'for discovering a great many intelligences; Sir R. Willis is in the van of them.' *H. M. C. Rep.* v. 153. In 1668 he was appointed Secretary to the Irish Commission, and there is reason to believe that he was in the pay of Louis XIV as a spy upon state secrets in England. But his fame rests upon his remarkable skill as musician, mechanic, engineer, and inventor. He was largely employed in this capacity by Charles II, and in 1682 his services were secured by Louis XIV at Versailles; *id.* vii 330 (*a*). By the former he was seldom paid, and was always in embarrassed circumstances. In his later years he became quite blind (Evelyn, Oct. 25, 1695), and died in depression and penitence on Dec. 30, 1695. His MS. autobiography, containing much that is of interest, is at Lambeth Palace, No. 931. See the *Brief account of the Life, Writings, and Inventions of Sir S. Morland* by Halliwell, 1838; and Wheatley's note to Pepys, i. 137. Upon Burnet's story see Thurloe, iii. 102.

CHAP. V. he very gallantly performed his part: but not being seconded, he was soon crushed by Lambert. Thus Willis lost the merit of great and long services. This was one of Cromwell's masterpieces.

As for the presbyterians, they were so apprehensive of the fury of the commonwealth party, that they thought it a deliverance to be rescued out of their hands. Many of the republicans began to profess deism, and almost all of them were for destroying all clergymen and for breaking every thing that looked like the union of a national church. They were for pulling down the churches, for discharging[a] the tithes, and for leaving religion free, as they called it, without either encouragement or restraint. Cromwell assured the presbyterians he would maintain a public ministry with all due encouragement[1]; and he joined them in a commission with some independents to be the triers of all those who were to be admitted to benefices. These disposed also of all the churches that were in the gift of the crown, of the bishops, and of the cathedral churches: so this softened them.

He studied to divide the commonwealth party among themselves, and to set the fifth-monarchy[2] men and the enthusiasts against those who pretended to little or no religion, and acted only upon the principles of civil liberty, such as Algernon Sidney, Henry Nevill, Marten, Wildman, and Harrington. The fifth-monarchy men seemed to be really in expectation every day when Christ should appear: John Goodwin headed these, who first brought in Armin-

[a] substituted for *selling out.*

[1] The 'Instrument of Government' established a Church which admitted every variety of Puritan doctrine; and on Nov. 2, 1653, we read, 'Peters preacheth daily in defence of tithes.' *Portland MSS* vol. iii. 204; *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. The Barebone Parliament regarded such an Institution as 'Babylonish' and 'Antichrist.'

[2] The previous 'monarchies' were the Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman. The fifth was that spoken of by the Prophet Daniel, when 'The Saints shall take the kingdom and possess it,' the time when Christ should come and reign for a thousand years. See Butler's description of a 'Fifth Monarchy man' in *Genuine Remains* (1756), ii. 101.

ianism among the sectaries, for he was for liberty of all sorts. Cromwell hated that doctrine: for his beloved notion was, that once a child of God always a child of God: now he had led a very strict life for above eight years together before the wars[1]: so he comforted himself much with his reflections on that time, and on the certainty of perseverance. But none of the preachers were so thoroughpaced for him as to temporal matters as Goodwin was; for he not only justified the putting the king to death, but magnified it as the gloriousest action men were capable of[2]. He filled all people with such expectation of a glorious thousand years, speedily to begin, that it looked like a madness possessing them. CHAP. V.

It was no easy thing for Cromwell to satisfy these when he took the power into his own hands, since that looked like a step to kingship, which Goodwin had long represented as the great Antichrist that hindered Christ's being set on his throne[3]. To these he said, and as some have told me, with many tears, that he would rather have taken a shepherd's staff than the protectorship, since nothing was more contrary to his genius than a shew of greatness[4]: but he saw it was necessary at that time to keep the nation from falling into extreme disorder, and from becoming a prey to the common enemy: and therefore he only stept in between the living and the dead, as he phrased it, in that interval till God should direct them on what bottom they ought to 68 1658.

[1] Archbishop Tillotson, who had married his niece, used to say, 'that at last Cromwell's enthusiasm had got the better of his hypocrisy, and that he believed himself to be the instrument of God, in the great actions of his power, for the reformation of the world.' O.

[2] His book was entitled *The Obstructors of Justice, or A defence of the honourable sentence passed upon the late King by the High Court of Justice*, 1649, 4to.

[3] In October 1656, Titus reported to Hyde that Cromwell 'derided government by a commonwealth, and cried up monarchy' before Parliament. *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 189.

[4] See his speech to Parliament on Feb. 4, 1658 (Speech xviii. in Carlyle): 'I can say in the presence of God, in comparison with whom we are but like poor creeping ants upon the earth,—I would be glad to have lived under my woodside, to have kept a flock of sheep, rather than undertaken such a government as this.'

CHAP. V. settle: and he assured them that then he would surrender the heavy load lying upon him with a joy equal to the sorrow with which he was afflicted while under that shew of dignity. To men of this stamp he would enter into the terms of the old equality, shutting the door, and making them sit down covered by him; to let them see how little he valued those distances that, for form's sake, he was bound to keep up with others. These discourses commonly ended in a long prayer. Thus he with much ado managed the republican enthusiasts[1]. The other republicans he called the heathen, and he professed he could not so easily work upon them. He had some chaplains of all sorts: and he began in his latter years to be gentler towards those of the church of England. They had their meetings in several places about London without any disturbance from him. In conclusion, even the papists courted him: and he, with great dissimulation, carried things with all sorts of people much further than was thought possible, considering the difficulties he met with in all his parliaments[2]: but it was generally believed that his life and all his arts were exhausted at once, and that if he had lived much longer, he could not have held things together.

1655. The debates came on very high for setting up a king. All the lawyers, chiefly Glyn, Maynard, Fountain, and St. John, were vehemently for this[3]. They said, no new government could be settled legally but by a king, who

[1] He had to use other means. 'We begin to be troubled with some Quakers and Anabaptists, and some that are for fifth monarchy, that my Lord Protector might not reign, but Christ personal, and such-like camerows and ayrye stuff [sic], whereof some have been called to account for their ill discourse of langish [sic], and been desired [sic] upon their promise or parole or surety for their good behaviour, and would embrace none of these, as Col. Rich, Col. Harrison, Mr. Karye, Mr. Carnegie ... being the head of these factors, and they are secured and sent westward to several prisons;' 1654, Feb. 13, *H. M. C. Rep.* vi. 438.

[2] 'People of all sorts rail at Cromwell, and he governs and contemns them.' *Clar. St. P.* May 29, 1654.

[3] 'We have great hope that His Highness will accept of kingship, which all men desire generally, and by that means we hope to come to a settlement. Our lawyers do press hard for it.' *H. M. C. Rep.* vi. 438; 1655, May 4.

should pass bills for such a form as should be agreed on. Till then, all they did was like building upon sand: still men were in danger of a revolution: and in that case, all that had been done would be void of itself, as contrary to a law as yet in being, and not repealed. Till that was done, every man that had been concerned in the war, and in the blood that was shed, chiefly the king's, was still obnoxious: and no warrants could be pleaded but what were founded on, or approved of by, a law passed by king, lords, and commons. They might agree to trust this | king as much as they pleased, and[a] make his power determine as soon as they pleased, so that he should be a *felo de se*, and consent to an act, if need were, of extinguishing both name and thing for ever. And as no man's person was safe till this was done, so they said all the grants and sales that had been made were null and void: all men that had gathered or disposed of the public money were for ever accountable. In short, the point was made out beyond the possibility of answering it, except upon enthusiastic principles. But by that sort of men all this was called a mistrusting of God, and a trusting to the arm of flesh. They had gone out, as they said, in the simplicity of their hearts to fight the Lord's battles, to whom they made the appeals: he had heard them, and appeared for them, and now they would trust him no longer. They had pulled down monarchy with the monarch, and would they now build that up which they had destroyed: they had solemnly vowed to God to be true to the commonwealth, without a king or kingship: and under that vow, as under a banner, they had fought and prevailed: but now they must be secure, and in order to that go back to Egypt. They thought it was rather a happiness that they were still under a legal danger: this might be a mean to make them more cautious and diligent. If kings were the invaders of God's right, and the usurpers upon men's liberties, why must they have recourse to such a wicked engine? Upon these grounds

CHAP. V.

MS. 36.

69

[a] *to* struck out.

CHAP. V.

they stood out[1]: and they looked on all that was offered about the limiting this king in his power, as the gilding the pill: the assertors of those laws that made it necessary to have a king, would no sooner have one than they would bring forth out of the same storehouse all that related to the power and prerogative of this king: therefore they would not hearken to any thing that was offered on that head, but rejected it with scorn. [a] Many of them began openly to say, if we must have a king, in consequence of so much law as was alleged, why should we not rather have that king to whom the law certainly pointed than any other[2]? The earl of Orrery told me, that, coming one day to Cromwell during those heats, and telling him he had been in the city all that day, Cromwell asked him what news he had heard there: the other answered, that he was told he was in treaty with the king, who was [b] to be restored, and [b] was to marry his daughter. Cromwell expressing no indignation at this, lord Orrery said, in the state to which things were brought, he saw not a better expedient: they might bring him in on what terms they pleased, and Cromwell might retain the same authority he then had, with less trouble. He answered, the king can never forgive his father's blood. Orrery said, he was one of many that were concerned in that, but he would be alone in the merit of restoring him. Cromwell replied, he is so damnably debauched, he would undo us all; and so turned

[a] *And* struck out. [b] interlined.

[1] Less lofty motives concurred with these, if we may credit an amusing story in the *Clar. St. P.* Feb. 11, 1657, to the effect that Mrs. Claypole, Cromwell's daughter, spoke in so disparaging a way about the wives of the major-generals that those ladies, when they heard of it, determined that she should never be a princess. See Firth's *Memoirs of Hutchinson*, ii. 202.

[2] See the address of the Levellers to the king, July 1656, when they speak of their return 'to their first husband.' *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 145; Clarendon, *Rebellion*, vi. 67. In October 1657 a rising was prepared in London under Cols. Deane and Day, *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 372. But in Dec. 1657 Wildman insisted that Charles should give under his hand and seal an engagement to govern according to the ancient laws (*id.*). As early as 1649 there had been hopes of securing the Levellers for the king. *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 38.

to another discourse without any emotion, which made Orrery conclude he had often thought of that expedient[1].

70

On the day in which he refused the offer of kingship that was made to him by the parliament, he had kept himself on such a reserve that no man knew what answer he would give. It was thought more likely he would accept of it[2]: but that which determined him to the contrary was, that, when he went down in the morning to walk in S. James's park, Fleetwood and Desborough were waiting for him: the one had married his daughter, and the other his sister. With these he entered into much discourse on the subject, and argued for it: he said, it was a tempting of God to expose so many worthy men to death and poverty, when there was a certain way to secure them. The others insisted still on the oaths they had made. He said, these oaths were against the power and tyranny of kings, but not against the four letters that made the word *king*. In conclusion, they, believing from his discourse that he intended to accept of it, told him they saw great confusions would follow on it: and as they could not serve him to set up the idol they had put down, and had sworn to keep down, so they would not engage in any thing against him, but would retire and look on. So they offered him their commissions, since they were resolved not to serve a king. He desired they would stay till they heard his answer. But it was believed, that he, seeing two persons so near him ready to abandon him, concluded that many others would follow their example, and therefore thought it was too bold

May 8, 1657.

[1] The learned Dr. T. Smith's detailed account of an interview between Cromwell and the Marquis of Hertford is very similar to this. When solicited by the former to give him his advice, the marquis urged the restoration of the king; and the measure was declined by Cromwell, apparently through fear, under his circumstances, of trusting any one. The relation is printed by Hearne in his *Appendix to the Chronicon de Dunstable*, p. 812. R. According to James II (Clarke's *Life*, i. 439) Orrery was one of the foremost in endeavouring to persuade Cromwell to take the title. Morrice, *Life of Orrery*, 40 (see *supra*, 115 note); Noble, *House of Cromwell*, i. 150; Pepys, *Memoirs*, i. 314, 4to.

[2] Welwood, 100, asserts that a crown was actually made and brought to Whitehall in readiness.

CHAP. V. a venture[1]. So he refused it, but accepted of the continuance of his protectorship. Yet, if he had lived out the next winter, as the debates were to have been brought on again, so it was generally thought he would have accepted of the offer. And it is yet a question what the effect of that would have been. Some have thought it would have brought on a general settlement, since now the law and the ancient government were again to take place: others have fancied just the contrary, that it would have enraged the army, so that they would either have deserted the service, or have revolted from him, and perhaps have killed him in
MS. 37. the first fray of the tumult. | I will not determine which of these would have most probably happened. In these debates some of the cavalier party, or rather their children, came to bear some share. They were then all zealous commonwealth's men, according to the directions sent them from those about the king. Their business was to oppose Cromwell in all his demands, and so to weaken him at home, and expose him abroad. When some of the other
71 party took notice of this great change, from being the abettors of prerogative to become the patrons of liberty, they pretended their education in the court and their obligation to it had engaged them that way; but now since that was out of doors, they had the common principles of human nature and the love of liberty in them as well as others. By this means, as all the old republicans assisted and protected them, so they secured themselves at the same time that they strengthened the faction against Cromwell. But these very men at the restoration shook off this disguise, and reverted to their old principles for a high prerogative and absolute power. They said they were for liberty, when it was a mean to distress one who they thought had no right to govern, but when the government returned to its old channel, it appeared they were still as firm to all prerogative notions, and as great enemies to liberty, as ever[2].

[1] Ludlow, ii. 23, appears to be the source of this story.

[2] It has been said, that Pride told him, if he took the crown, he would

I go next to give an account of Cromwell's transactions with relation to foreign affairs. He laid it down for a maxim, to spare no cost or charge in order to procure him intelligence[1]. When he understood what dealers the Jews were every where in that trade that depends on news, that is, the advancing money upon high or low interest with a proportion to the risk they run, or gain to be made as the times might turn, and in the buying and selling of the actions of money so advanced, he, more upon that account than in compliance with the principle of toleration, brought a company of them over into England, and gave them leave to build a synagogue. All the while that he was negotiating this, they were sure and good spies for him, especially with relation to Spain and Portugal[2]. The earl

(if nobody else would) shoot him through the head, the first opportunity he had for it. O. See some interesting notices upon this in the *H. M. C. Report*, v. 163; and for an able discussion of the whole question, Ranke, iii. 176, &c. From the *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, iii. 290, it appears that while the soldiers opposed Cromwell's taking the crown, many republicans favoured it from hope of the opposition which they knew would be aroused; and that his refusal frustrated the schemes of Sexby and others. Compare Clarendon, *Rebellion*, xv. 41, on the probability of assassination, though not of revolt.

[1] According to Pepys, Feb. 14, 1668, Morrice asserted that Cromwell spent £70,000 a year for secret intelligence; and Birch said that thereby he 'carried the secrets of all the princes in Europe at his girdle.'

[2] There is abundant evidence that Jews to a considerable number had been resident in London for many years, although there had been no repeal of Edward I's edict of 1290: in 1655 at any rate they had a private synagogue in Cree Church Lane, Leadenhall St., and from 1647, when Hugh Peters (in his programme of government reform) petitioned in their favour, their re-admission had found powerful advocates. On Dec. 23, 1648, according to *Pragmaticus*, Dec. 19–26, a toleration was voted in the Council of Officers of all religions whatsoever, including Turks, Papists, and Jews (*Clarke Papers*, ii. 172 note); but no parliamentary revocation of the edict took place, though debates were held on the subject in 1653. In Jan. 1649 Joanna Cartwright and her son Ebenezer petitioned Fairfax and the Council of Officers. At length, in Nov. 1655, the celebrated Manasseh Ben Israel personally presented a petition to the Protector, at the instance of Henry Marten, following on a petition from Robert Rich and Samuel Hervey. The Council, while admitting the legality of the return of the Jews, appended the most onerous conditions; and in December the question was referred to a conference

CHAP. V. of Orrery told me, he was once walking with him in one of the galleries of Whitehall, and a man almost in rags came in view: so he presently dismissed Orrery, and carried that man into his closet, who brought him an account of a great sum of money that the Spaniards were

at which a number of divines, lawyers, and merchants met a committee of Council. This body failed to reach a decision, and was dismissed by Cromwell, who was wearied by the fruitless biblical arguments of the divines, with a request for nothing further but their prayers. He had clearly made up his mind to admit the Jews on his own authority; and this he now did; allowing them to meet for devotion in their private houses, and to acquire a piece of land in Stepney for a cemetery: they even celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles in booths on the south side of the Thames. They did not apparently gain formal leave to establish a synagogue, though this was probably connived at; it is certain that a well-attended synagogue was in existence 'in a private corner of the city,' in 1662 and 1663, in spite of the petition to Charles II for their ejection from the London Corporation in 1660 (see Remonstrance concerning Jews, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660-1, 366), a fact which amply disproves Tovey's assertion that in 1663 there were not more than twelve Jews in England. Indeed a Privy Council Order in Charles's reign confirms to the Jews the privileges enjoyed under Cromwell. A pamphlet warfare preceded, accompanied, and followed this admission 'by way of connivance,' of which Prynne's 'Short Demurrer,' Manasseh's 'Vindiciae Judaeorum,' Thomas Collier's 'Brief Answer,' and John Dury's 'Case of Conscience,' were the chief productions. In March 165⅘ Cromwell granted Manasseh a pension of £100 a year, which on Nov. 17, 1657, only three days before his death, was commuted for a lump sum of £200. This no doubt is the 'seasonable benefaction' to the Jews' 'principal agent' referred to in the editor's note on Burton's *Diary*, ii. 471. It is curious that on the strength of the note mentioned, which follows, but has not the slightest connexion with, the extract from the *Diary* for February 4, 1658, the Jews in England, in the year 1894, appointed February 4 as the anniversary of their re-admission: a more proper date would have been Dec. 12, when Cromwell dismissed his conference. Referring to Cromwell's 'Intelligencers,' Dr. Lucien Wolf states that as early as 1630 there were in London a body of Spanish Jews, who at the declaration of war with Spain in 1656 obtained protection. The chief of them were Carvajal, Dormido, and Casseres. who were useful as 'Intelligencers.' The list of authorities for the statements in this note is too extensive for quotation; but Wolf's *Anglo-Jewish History*, 1290–1656, and Jacobs & Wolf, *Bibliotheca Judaica* (published by the Committee of the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition, 1887); the *Jewish Chronicle* at various dates from 1887 to 1894; and Stern's *Manasseh Ben Israel and Cromwell* (Berne, 1882), should be specially mentioned among modern works.

sending over to pay their army in Flanders, but in a Dutch man of war: and he told him the places of the ship in which the money was lodged. Cromwell sent an express immediately to Smith, afterwards sir Jeremy Smith, who lay in the Downs, telling him that within a day or two such a Dutch ship would pass the channel, whom he must visit for the Spanish money, which was counterband goods, he being then in war with Spain. So when the ship passed by Dover, Smith sent, and demanded leave to search him. The Dutch captain answered, none but his masters might search him. Smith sent him word, he had set up an hour glass, and if before that was run out he did not submit to the search, he would force it. The captain saw it was in vain to struggle, and so all the money was found. Next time that Cromwell saw Orrery, he told him he had his intelligence from that contemptible man he saw him go to some days be- 72
fore. And thus he had on all occasions very good intelligence: he knew every thing that passed in the king's little court: and yet none of his spies were discovered but one only[1].

The greatest difficulty in him in his foreign affairs was, what side to choose? France or Spain? The prince of Condé was then in the Netherlands with a great many protestants of quality about him. He set the Spaniards on making great steps towards the gaining Cromwell into their interests. Spain ordered their ambassador to compliment him. He was esteemed one of their ablest men[2]: his name was Don Alonso de Cardenas: he offered, that if Cromwell would join with them, they would engage themselves to make no peace till he should recover Calais again

[1] Welwood, 95, relates the following story told him by Thurlow. 'He (Thurlow) was once commanded to go at a certain hour to Gray's Inn, and at such a place deliver a bill of £20,000, payable to the bearer at Genoa, to a man he should find walking in such a habit and posture as he described him, without speaking one word, . . . which he did, and never knew to his dying day either person or office.' At the same place Welwood gives three more remarkable anecdotes of Cromwell's skill in obtaining secret information. See also Ludlow, ii. 41, &c.; and Kennet, iii. 208.

[2] My lord Clarendon represents him as a man of mean abilities. Cole.

CHAP. V. to England. This was very agreeable to Cromwell, who thought it would recommend him much to the nation if he could restore that town again to the English empire, after it had been a hundred years in the hands of the French. Mazarin hearing of this, sent one over to negotiate with him, but at first without a character: and, to outbid the Spaniard, he offered to assist Cromwell to take Dunkirk, which was a place of much more importance. The prince of Condé sent over one likewise to offer Cromwell to turn protestant, and, if he would give him a fleet with good troops, he would make a descent on Guienne, where he did not doubt but that he should be assisted by the protestants; and that he should so distress France, as to obtain such conditions for them and for England as Cromwell himself should dictate. Upon this offer Cromwell sent Stoupe
MS. 38. round all France[1], | to talk with their most eminent men, to see into their strength, into their present disposition, the oppressions they lay under, and their inclinations to trust the prince of Condé. He went from Paris down the Loire, then to Bourdeaux, from thence to Montauban, and across the south of France to Lyons: he was instructed to talk to them only as a traveller, and to assure them of Cromwell's zeal and care of them, which he magnified every where. The protestants were then very much at their ease: for Mazarin, who thought of nothing but how to enrich his family, took care to maintain the edicts better than they

[1] The date of Stoupe's mission to France is fixed by the *Memoirs of the Prince of Tarentum* (1767), 169, to have been the spring or summer of 1654. See also Barrière's letter of Feb. 20, $165\frac{3}{4}$, in the Duke of Aumale's MSS. Stoupe, it appears, sold himself to France. Bordeaux wrote to the Comte de Brienne on July 1, 1655, (*Aff. Etr. Angleterre*, t. 65, f. $1\frac{4}{5}$), 'Je dois voir cette nuit le ministre Stoupe, qui m'a fait offrir par le Suisse de me découvrir de grands secrets . . . et de servir désormais la France, moyennant récompense: il veut par avance trois cents livres sterling.' On July 9 Mazarin in the king's name accepted the offer (*ib.* t. 66, p. 84); Chéruel, *Hist. de France sous le ministère de Mazarin*, i. 63, ii. 81, note 3. Both letters are given in Guizot's *Cromwell*, ii. App. 507. Concerning the journeys of Stoupe and other emissaries of Cromwell, and the reported offer of Condé to turn Protestant, see also the *Journal of Joachim Haue* (ed. Firth), xii–xxviii.

had been in any time formerly. So he returned, and gave Cromwell an account of the ease they were then in, and of their resolution to be quiet. They had a very bad opinion of the prince of Condé as an impious and immoral man, who sought nothing but his own greatness, to which they believed that he was ready to sacrifice all his friends. and every cause that he espoused. This settled Cromwell as to that particular. He also found that the cardinal had such spies on that prince, that he knew every message that had passed between them: therefore he would have no farther correspondence with him: he said upon that to Stoupe, *Stultus est, et garrulus, et venditur a suis cardinali.* That which determined him afterwards in the choice was this: he found the parties grew so strong against him at home, that he saw if the king or his brother were assisted by France with an army of Huguenots to make a descent in England, which was threatened if he should join with Spain, this might prove very dangerous to him, who had so many enemies at home and so few friends[1]. This particular consideration, with relation to himself, made great impression on him; for he knew the Spaniards could give those princes no strength, nor had they any protestant

73

[1] On the negotiations between Cromwell and Mazarin, see Chéruel, *Hist. de France sous le ministère de Mazarin.* The failure of the Royalist rising in 1655 increased the desire of the French Court for a treaty. *Nicholas Papers* (Camden Soc.), vol. ii. Preface, p. xv. See the text of the engagements between Cromwell and Mazarin in the *H. M. C. Report*, viii. 29. On March 23, 1657, an offensive alliance was signed, with a secret article, binding France and England to abstain from making a separate peace with Spain for a year from that date. Upon the importance of Cromwell's decision to the later history of Europe, see Ranke, iii. 213. Ludlow, ii. 2, gives the opinion current then and for long afterwards. 'This confederacy was dearly purchased on our part; for by it the balance of the two crowns of Spain and France was destroyed, and a foundation laid for the future greatness of the French, to the unspeakable prejudice of all Europe in general, and of this nation in particular, whose interest it had been to that time accounted to maintain that equality as near as might be.' See Mr. Firth's note on this passage. The immediate results of the alliance were the capture of Mardyke, Oct. 3, 1657, the victory of the Dunes, June 13, and the capture of Dunkirk and Gravelines, June 25, August 29, 1658.

CHAP. V. subjects to assist them in any such design. Upon this occasion K. James told me, that among other prejudices he had at the protestant religion this was one, that both his brother and himself, being in many companies in Paris *incognito*, where they met many protestants, he found they were all alienated from them, and were great admirers of Cromwell: so he believed they were all rebels in their heart. I answered, that foreigners were no other way concerned in the quarrels of their neighbours, than to see who could or would assist them: the coldness they had seen formerly in the court of England with relation to them, and the zeal which was then expressed, must naturally make them depend on one that seemed resolved to protect them. As the negotiation went on between France and England, Cromwell would have the king and his brothers
Nov. 1655. dismissed the kingdom [1]. Mazarin consented to this; for he thought it more honourable that the French king should send them away of his own accord, than that it should be done pursuant to an article with Cromwell. Great excuses were made for doing it: they had some money given them, and were sent away loaded with promises of constant supplies that were never meant to be performed: and they retired to Cologne; for the Spaniards were not yet out of hope of gaining Cromwell. But when that vanished, they invited them to Brussells, and they settled great appointments on them in their way, which was always to promise much, how little soever they could perform. They also settled a pay for such of the subjects of the three kingdoms as would come and serve under our princes: but few came, except from Ireland: of these some regiments were formed. But though this gave them a great and lasting interest in our court, especially in K. James, yet they did not much to deserve it.

[1] This was at the preliminary commercial treaty signed at Westminster on November 3, 1655. For a list of the persons whose expulsion was demanded, see Guizot, ii. 468. The offensive and defensive alliance was in May, 1657.

Before king Charles left Paris he changed his religion, CHAP. V.
but by whose persuasion is not yet known: only cardinal
de Retz was of the secret, and lord Aubigny had a great 74
hand in it. It was kept a great secret. Chancellor Hyde
had some suspicion of it, but would never suffer himself to
believe it quite[1]. Soon after the restoration, that cardinal

[1] Upon the question of Charles's conversion, see the exhaustive statement in Ranke. iii. 395, and Carte's *Ormond*, iii. 651, iv. 109, from which it appears that Bristol clearly believed in it in 1659. But see also Lister, *Life of Clarendon*, i. 396. In *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 105, 110, 119, his 'inclinations' are spoken of as perfectly well known. His ignorance of Latin alone, it is stated, kept him from being a Roman Catholic, as he probably was an English one. In 1650, however, a paper of 'Propositiones et motiva,' now at Simancas, was presented to Innocent X on the part of Charles II, a fact which obviously excludes the idea of his conversion at that time; the ground of his claim on the Pope for pecuniary help being the favour enjoyed by the Catholics under his father. This paper may be seen in the Thomason Tracts, and is published in 'The Brief Relation,' *Brit. Mus. E.* 607, 15; *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 128. The negotiations with the Pope were resumed after Worcester; in Feb., 165½, Charles expressed his desire to protect and favour the Catholics in the three kingdoms, and again in April, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1661, 582; but the Pope declined to admit his agent until he should be satisfied of Charles's personal conversion. At the end of 1652 and beginning of 1653, in interviews with a Catholic priest, Charles gravely professed his readiness to be converted if the Pope would give him effective help; but the Pope again refused to accept a convert on those terms. *Vatican Transcripts* (Record Office). In 1653, Nicholas and others of his more prudent counsellors interfered to prevent him sending a mission to Rome. *Nicholas Papers*, ii. 10. Negotiations were carried on without success in the following years. In May, 1656, it was published in newspapers at the Hague that Charles was a Catholic. See also *Plain English*, 1690; *State Tracts published in the reign of William III*, ii. 83. 'Sir Allan Brotherick [of Wandlesworth], who was with that king beyond sea at the time of his first professing the Popish religion, has been often heard to lament the burning of his Journal wherein the very day and circumstances of it were entered, and I am assured that one of His present Majesty's chaplains can give an account of his deathbed declaration [Brotherick died Nov. 25, 1680. Le Neve, *Knights' Pedigrees*, 102, of what he knew in it], with this additional circumstance, that it was done in the absence of the old Lord Culpepper, who, knowing of it at his return, fell into a great passion and told the king he must never expect to see England again, if it should be known there.' For further information about Brotherick, see Wood, *Fasti*, ii. 252 and *Ath. Ox.* iii. 808. In *Flagellum Parliamentarium* (1678) he is pilloried as 'bribe broker for his master the Chancellor.' For a curious notice see

CHAP. V

came over in disguise, and had an audience of the king: what passed is not known[1]. The first ground I had to believe it was this: the marquis de Roucy, who was the man of the greatest family in France that continued protestant to the last, was much pressed by that cardinal to change his religion: he was his kinsman, and his particular friend. Among other reasons one that he urged was, that the religion must certainly be ruined, and that they could expect no protection from England, for to his certain knowledge both the princes were already changed. Roucy told this in great confidence to his minister, who after his death sent an advertisement of it to my self. Sir Allan Brodrick, a great confident of the chancellor's, who from being very atheistical became in the last years of his life an eminent penitent, as he was a man of great parts, with whom I had lived long in great confidence, on his deathbed sent me likewise an account of this matter, which he believed was done in Fountainebleau, before king Charles was sent to Cologne. As for king James, it seems he was not reconciled at that time: for he told me, that being in
MS. 39. a monastery in Flanders, | a nun desired him to pray every day, that if he was not in the right way, God would bring him into it: and he said, the impression these words made on him never left him till he changed.

To return to Cromwell: while he was balancing in his mind what was fit for him to do, Gage, who had been a priest, came over from the West Indies, and gave him such an account of the feebleness, as well as of the wealth, of the Spaniards in those parts, as made him conclude that

Pepys, Dec. 19, 1666. Burnet, it will be noticed, merely says that Brotherick spoke of the conversion, 'which he believed was done.' The author of *Plain English* proceeds to accuse Charles implicitly of poisoning Culpepper; and in several respects his language makes his facts unworthy of credit. If Huddleston's account of the scene at the king's deathbed be genuine (Ralph, i. 834), nothing is clearer than that, whatever might have been his wishes or understanding with Rome, no formal union with the Catholic Church had taken place until then.

[1] De Retz visited England twice in 1660. *Memoirs of De Retz* (Petitot, 1825), Introd. 63. Cf. *infra* 347. Upon Aubigny see *infra* 243, note.

it would be both a great and an easy conquest to seize on their dominions[1]; by this he reckoned he would be supplied with such a treasure, that his government would be established before he should need to have any recourse to a parliament for money. Spain would never admit of a peace with England between the tropics: so he was in a state of war with them as to those parts, even before he declared war in Europe. He upon that equipped a fleet with a force sufficient, as he hoped, to have seized Hispaniola and Cuba; and Gage had assured him, that success in that expedition would make all the rest fall into his hands. Stoupe, being on another occasion called to his closet, saw him one day very intent in looking on a map, and in measuring distances. Stoupe saw it was a map of the bay of Mexico, and observed who printed it. So, there being no discourse upon that subject, Stoupe went 75
next day to the printer to buy the map. The printer denied he had printed it. Stoupe affirmed he had seen it. Then he said, it must be only in Cromwell's hand; for he only had some of the prints, and had given him a strict charge to sell none till he had leave given him. So Stoupe perceived there was a design that way. And when the time of setting out the fleet came on, all were in a gaze whither it was to go: some fancied it was to rob the church of Loretto, which occasioned a fortification to be drawn round it: others talked of Rome itself; for Cromwell's preachers had this often in their mouths, that if it were not for the divisions at home, he would go and sack Babylon: others talked of Cadiz, though he had not yet broke with the Spaniards. The French could not penetrate into the secret. Cromwell had not finished his alliance

[1] The curious career of Gage should be read in detail in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. His work *The English American; or New Survey of the West Indias*, published in 1648, aroused the greatest interest, on the grounds mentioned in the text. On the connexion between him and Cromwell, see also Long's *Hist. of Jamaica*, 221. He was appointed chaplain to Venables's expedition, and died in 1656. See Ludlow, i. 417, and *The None-such Charles*, 116.

CHAP. V. with them: so he was not bound to give them an account of the expedition: all he said upon it was, that he sent out this fleet to guard the seas, and to restore England to its dominion on that element. Stoupe happened to say in a company, he believed the design was on the West Indies. The Spanish ambassador, hearing that, sent for him very privately, to ask him upon what ground he said it: and he offered to lay down £10,000 if he could make any discovery of that. Stoupe owned to me he had a great mind to the money, and fancied he betrayed nothing if he did discover the grounds of these conjectures, since nothing had been trusted to him: but he expected greater matters from Cromwell, and so kept the secret, and said only, that, in a diversity of conjectures, that seemed to him more probable than any other. But the ambassador made no account of that, nor did he think it worth the writing to Don John, then at Brussells, about it [1].

Stoupe writ it over as his own conjecture to one about the prince of Condé, who at first hearing it was persuaded that that must be the design, and went next day to suggest it to Don John: but he relied so much on the ambassador that this made no impression; and indeed all the ministers whom he employed knew that they were not to disturb him with troublesome news: of which K. Charles told a pleasant story. One whom Don John was sending to some court in Germany, came to the king to ask his commands: he desired him only to write him news: the Spaniard asked him, whether he would have true or false news? and when the king seemed amazed at the question, he added that if he writ him true news the king must be secret, for he knew he must write news to Don John that would be acceptable, true or false. When the ministers of
76 that court shewed that they would be served in such a manner, it is no wonder to see how their affairs have declined. This matter of the fleet continued a great secret;

[1] This is greatly exaggerated. The probable destination of the fleet for the West Indies was talked about long before it sailed.

and some months after that, Stoupe being accidentally with Cromwell, one came from the fleet through Ireland with a letter. The bearer looked like one that brought no welcome news; and as soon as Cromwell had read the letter, he dismissed Stoupe, who went immediately to the earl of Leicester, then lord Lisle, and told him what he had seen. He being then of Cromwell's council went to Whitehall, and came back, and told Stoupe of the descent made on Hispaniola, and of the misfortune that had happened. It was then late, and was the post night for Flanders; so Stoupe writ it as news to his correspondent, some days before the Spanish ambassador knew any thing of it. Don John was amazed at the news, and had never any regard to the ambassador after that; but had a great opinion of Stoupe, and ordered the ambassador to make him theirs at any rate. The ambassador sent for him, and asked him, now that it appeared he had guessed right, what were | his grounds: and when he told what they MS. 40. were, the ambassador owned he had reason to conclude as he did upon what he saw. And after that he made great use of Stoupe: but he himself was never esteemed so much as he had been. This deserved to be set down so particularly, since by it it appears that the greatest designs may be discovered by an undue carelessness. The court of France was amazed at the undertaking, and was glad that it had miscarried; for the cardinal said, if he had suspected it, he would have made peace with Spain on any terms, rather than to have given way to that which would have been such an addition to England, as must have brought all the wealth of the world into their hands. The fleet took Jamaica: but that was small gain, though much 1655. magnified to cover the failing of the main design[1]. The war after that broke out, in which Dunkirk was indeed June 14, taken, and put in Cromwell's hands; but the trade of 1658.

CHAP. V.

[1] See Venables's *Letters on the Capture of Jamaica*. Carte's *Collection of Original Letters*, ii. 46; and the *Portland MSS.* ii. 92–98; *H. M. C. Rep.* xiii. App. ii.

CHAP. V. England suffered more in that than in any former war: so he lost the heart of the city by that means.

Cromwell had two signal occasions given him to shew his zeal in protecting the protestants abroad. The duke of Savoy raised a new persecution of the Vaudois: so Cromwell sent to Mazarin, desiring him to put a stop to that; adding, that he knew well they had that duke in their power, and could restrain him as they pleased: and if they did it not, he must presently break with them. Mazarin objected to this as unreasonable: he promised to do good offices, but he could not be obliged to answer for the effects they might have. This did not satisfy Cromwell: so they obliged the duke of Savoy to put a stop to that unjust fury: and Cromwell raised a great sum for the Vaudois, and sent over Morland to settle all their concerns and supply all their losses. There was also a tumult in Nîmes [1], in which some disorder had been committed by the Huguenots: and they, apprehending severe proceedings upon it, sent one over with great expedition to Cromwell, who sent him back to Paris in an hour's time with a very effectual letter to his ambassador, requiring him either to prevail that the matter might be passed over, or to come away immediately. Mazarin complained of this way of proceeding as too imperious, but the necessity of their affairs made him yield. These things raised Cromwell's character abroad, and made him be much depended on.

June–Aug. 1656. 77

His ambassador at this time was Lockhart, a Scotchman, who had married his niece, and was in high favour with him, as he well deserved to be [2]. He was both a wise and

[1] This affair of Nîmes is not generally mentioned by historians. Probably Burnet took it from Clarendon's *Rebellion*, xv. 153, 154. See Thurlow, vi. 727; *Skippon's Travels* in Churchill's *Voyages*, vi. 733.

[2] Sir William Lockhart was knighted by Charles I at Newark in 1646, served in the army of the Engagement, was one of the commissioners for the administration of justice in Scotland in 1652; and was appointed ambassador to France in 1655. Clarendon speaks of his great influence with Mazarin. See Kennet, iii. 208. He took command of the English regiments at the battle of the Dunes on the death of General Reynolds, and was then made governor of Dunkirk. See Ludlow, ii. 96,

a gallant man, calm and virtuous, and one that carried the generosities of friendship very far. He was made governor of Dunkirk and ambassador at the same time; but he told me, that when he was sent afterwards ambassador by K. Charles, he found he had nothing of that regard that was paid him in Cromwell's time. Stoupe told me of a great design Cromwell had intended to begin his kingship with, if he had assumed it. He resolved to set up a council for the protestant religion, in opposition to the congregation *de propaganda fide* at Rome. He intended it should consist of seven councillors, and four secretaries for different provinces. These were the first, France, Switzerland, and the Valleys: the Palatinate and the other Calvinists were the second: Germany, the North, and Turkey were the third: and the East and West Indies were the fourth. These were to have £500 salary apiece, and to keep a correspondence every where, to know the state of religion all over the world, that so all good designs might be by their means protected and assisted. Stoupe was to have the second province, and they were to have a *fonds* of £10,000 a year at their disposal for ordinary emergents, but to be further supplied as occasions should require it. Chelsey college was to be made up for them, which was then an old decayed building, that had been at first raised for a design not unlike this, to be a college for writers of controversy. I thought it was not fit to let such a project as this was be quite lost: it was certainly a noble

97, 171. In 1659 he acted as ambassador at the Peace of the Pyrenees; *id.* 117. At the Restoration he was deprived of this post and led a private life, refusing the overtures of the Commonwealth refugees in Holland in 1665 (f. 227), until 1671, when Lauderdale reintroduced him at Court (f. 304), where, however, he was always regarded with suspicion. In that year he was employed in the diplomacy preparative to the second Dutch war, and in 1673 went as ambassador to Paris (ff. 305, 389, 390, 394). He died in 1676 (or 1677?). See his whole career in Burton's *The Scot Abroad*, ii. 230 *et seq.*; Noble, *Protectoral House of Cromwell* (1787), ii. 235; and the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* He married, as his second wife, Cromwell's niece on the mother's side, Robina, daughter of John Sewster of Weston, Huntingdonshire.

CHAP. V. one, but how far he would have pursued it must be left to conjecture [1].

Stoupe told me another remarkable passage in his employment under Cromwell. He had desired all that were
78 about the prince of Condé to let him know some news, in return of that he writ to them. So he had a letter from one of them, giving an account of an Irishman newly gone over, who had said he would kill Cromwell, and that he was to lodge in King street, Westminster. With this he went down to Whitehall. Cromwell being then at council, he sent him a note, letting him know that he had a business of great consequence to lay before him. Cromwell was then upon a matter that did so entirely possess him, that he, fancying it was only some piece of foreign intelligence, sent Thurloe to know what it might be. Stoupe was troubled at this, but could not refuse to shew him his letter. Thurloe made no great matter of it: he said, they had many such advertisements sent them, which signified nothing, but to make the world think the Protector was in danger of his life: and the looking too much after these things had an appearance of fear, which did ill become so great a man. Stoupe told him, King street might be soon searched. Thurloe answered, what if we find no such person? how shall we be laughed at. Yet he ordered him to write again to Brussells, and promise any reward if a more particular discovery could be made. Stoupe was
MS. 41. much cast down, | when he saw that a piece of intelligence which he hoped might have made his fortune was so little considered. He wrote to Brussells: but he had no more from thence but a confirmation of what had been writ formerly to him. And Thurloe did not think fit to make any search or any further inquiry into it: nor did he so much as acquaint Cromwell with it. Stoupe being uneasy at this, told lord Lisle of it: and it happened that a few

[1] Upon Cromwell's far-reaching projects for the support of Protestantism see Guizot, *Cromwell*, ii. 221, 223, 233; and Stern, *Cromwell und die Evangelischen Kantone der Schweiz*.

Jan. 165⅘.

weeks after Syndercomb's design of assassinating Cromwell near Brentford, as he was going to Hampton court, was discovered. When he was examined, it appeared that he was the person set out in the letters from Brussells. So Lisle said to Cromwell, this is the very man of whom Stoupe had the notice given him[1]. Cromwell seemed amazed at this, and sent for Stoupe, and in great wrath reproached him for his ingratitude in concealing a matter of such consequence to him. Stoupe upon this shewed him the letters he had received; and put him in mind of the note he had sent in to him, which was immediately after he had the first letter, and that he had sent out Thurloe to him. At that Cromwell seemed yet more amazed, and sent for Thurloe, to whose face Stoupe affirmed the matter: nor did he deny any part of it; but only said that he had many such advertisements sent him, in which till this time he had never found any truth. Cromwell replied sternly, that he ought to have acquainted him with it, and left him to judge of the importance of it. Thurloe desired to speak in private with Cromwell: so 79
Stoupe was dismissed, and went away, not doubting but Thurloe would be disgraced. But, as he understood from Lisle afterward, Thurloe shewed Cromwell such instances of his care and fidelity on all such occasions, and humbly acknowledged his error in this matter, but imputed it wholly to his care, both for his honour and quiet, that he pacified him entirely: and indeed he was so much in all Cromwell's secrets, that it was not safe to disgrace him without destroying him; and that, it seems, Cromwell could not resolve on. Thurloe having mastered this point, that he might further justify his not being so attentive as

[1] *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 236. According to Bevill Higgons, 92, Miles Syndercomb was not an Irishman, having been born in Hampshire; nor was he ever in Flanders. He was dismissed from Monk's army in Scotland in Jan. 165⅘ for complicity in what was called Overton's plot. Higgons adds that he was a mortal enemy to the king. For the connexion between the royalists and levellers, however, see Lingard, 3rd ed., xi. 316, 335, and *supra* 124, note.

CHAP. V. he ought to have been, did so search into Stoupe's whole deportment, that he possessed Cromwell with such an ill opinion of him, that after that he never treated him with any confidence. So he found how dangerous it was even to preserve a prince, (so he called him,) when a minister was wounded in the doing of it; and that the minister would be too hard for the prince, even though his own safety was concerned in it[1].

These are all the memorable things that I have learnt concerning Cromwell; of whom so few have spoken with any temper, some commending and others condemning him, and both out of measure, that I thought a just account of him, which I had from sure hands, might be no unacceptable thing. He never could shake off the roughness[2] of his education and temper: he spoke always long, and very ungracefully. The enthusiast and the dissembler mixed so equally in a great part of his deportment, that it was not easy to tell which was the prevailing character. He was indeed both; as I understood from Wilkins and Tillotson, the one having married his sister and the other his niece. He was a true enthusiast, but with the principle

[1] 'The tale is pretty and may serve to amuse a reader unacquainted with this period of our history, but certainly it could not be true. Syndercombe was much better known to Cromwell and Thurloe than he could possibly be to Stoupe. Thurloe had his eye upon the man constantly, and was master of the whole design against Cromwell from the time it was first in agitation. Besides there are abundance of letters from Stoupe in this collection, which show him to have been a very busy troublesome fellow, and to have known little or nothing but what he picked up from persons newly come from abroad, whom he attended as a kind of interpreter.' *Letter on the publication of Thurloe's State Papers*, Lond. 1742, p. 9. R.

[2] Lord Clarendon (xv. 148) and Sir Philip Warwick say quite otherwise. O. After describing the rough and slovenly figure presented by Cromwell at the beginning of the parliament of Nov. 1640, Warwick says: 'And yet I lived to see this very gentleman, . . . having had a better taylor and more converse among good company, appear of a great and majestic deportment and comely presence.' *Memoirs*, 248. His interest in sport has been illustrated by Mr. Firth in *Macmillan's Magazine*, Oct. 1894. For an authentic instance of his occasional indulgence in horse-play, see Ludlow, i. 185; see also *State Trials*, v. 1200, for the story of his drawing an inky pen across Marten's face at the signing of the death-warrant of Charles.

formerly mentioned, from which he might be easily led into all the practices both of falsehood and cruelty: which was, that he thought moral laws were only binding on ordinary occasions, but that upon extraordinary ones these might be superseded. When his own designs did not lead him out of the way, he was a lover of justice and virtue, and even of learning, though much decried at that time. CHAP. V.

He studied to seek out able and honest men, and to employ them: and so having heard that my father had a very great reputation in Scotland for piety and integrity, though he knew him to be a royalist [1], he sent to him, desiring him to accept of a judge's place, and to do justice to his country, hoping only that he would not act against his government; but he would not press him to subscribe or swear to it. My father refused it in a pleasant way, 80
being a facetious man, and abounding in little stories. So when he who brought the message was running out into Cromwell's commendation, my father told a story of a pilgrim in popery, who came to a church where one saint Kilmaclotius was in great reverence: so the pilgrim was bid pray to him: but he answered, he knew nothing of him, for he was not in his breviary: but when he was told how great a saint he was, he prayed this collect; *O sancte Kilmacloti, tu nobis hactenus es incognitus; hoc solum a te rogo, ut si bona tua nobis non prosunt, saltem mala ne noccant.* My father applied it, that he desired no other favour of him, but leave to live privately, without the imposition of oaths and subscriptions: and ever after that he lived in great quiet; though Overton, one of Cromwell's major-generals, who was a high republican, being for some time at Aberdeen, where we then lived, my father and he

[1] Burnet's father had signed the Covenant. *Lockhart Papers*, i. 597. But he was utterly opposed to the intolerance of the Covenanters; see his letter to Warriston, quoted *supra* 57, note 1. He was made a Lord of Session at the Restoration, with the title of Lord Crimond. See Cockburn's *Remarks*, p. 25.

CHAP. V. were often together: in particular they were alone for
MS. 42. about two | hours the night after the order came from
1654. Cromwell to take away his commissions, and to put him in arrest[1]. Upon that, Howard, afterwards earl of Carlisle, being sent down to inquire into all the plots that those men had been in, heard of this long privacy: but when with that he heard what my father's character was, he made no further inquiry into it, but said Cromwell was very uneasy when any good man was questioned for any thing. This gentleness had in a great measure quieted people's minds with relation to him, and his maintaining the honour of the nation in all foreign countries gratified the vanity which is very natural to Englishmen[2]; of which he was so careful, that though he was not a crowned head, yet his ambassadors had all the respects paid them which our king's ambassadors ever had. He said, the dignity of the crown was upon the account of the nation, of which the king was only the representative head; so the nation being still the same, he would have the same regard paid to his ministers.

Another instance of this pleased him much. Blake with the fleet happened to be at Malaga before he made war
1655. upon Spain: and some of his seamen went ashore, and met the hostie[a] carried about and not only paid no respect to it, but laughed at those who did: so one of the priests put the people on to the resenting this indignity; they fell upon them, and beat them severely. When they returned to their ship, they complained of this usage: and upon that Blake sent a trumpet to the viceroy, to demand the priest who was the chief instrument in that ill usage. The viceroy answered, he had no authority over the priests,

[a] Perhaps *hostia*, but the last letter is like an *e*.

[1] This was in December 1654. See Ludlow, i. 406, and *English Hist. Rev.* 1888, 330.

[2] See Marvell's *Dialogue between two Horses*, 157; Pepys's 'He made all the neighbour princes fear him,' July 12, 1667; and Dryden's noble line, 'He made us freemen of the continent,' *Heroic Stanzas on the Death of Cromwell*, 113.

and so could not dispose of him. Blake upon that sent him word, that he would not inquire who had the power to send the priest to him, but if he were not sent within three hours he would burn their town: and they, being in no condition to resist him, sent the priest to him, who justified himself upon the petulant behaviour of the seamen. Blake answered, that if he had sent a complaint to him of it, he would have punished them severely, since he would not suffer his men to affront the established religion of any place at which he touched: but he took it ill, that he set on the Spaniards to do it, for he would have all the world to know that an Englishman was only to be punished by an Englishman: and so he treated the priest civilly, and sent him back, being satisfied that he had him at his mercy. Cromwell was much delighted with this, and read the letters in council with great satisfaction; and said he hoped he should make the name of an Englishman as great as ever that of a Roman had been. The States of Holland were in such dread of him, that they took care to give him no sort of umbrage: and when at any time the king or his brothers came to see their sister, the princess royal, within a day or two after they used to send a deputation to let them know that Cromwell had required of the States that they should give them no harbour. K. Charles, when he was seeking for colours for the war with the Dutch in the year 1672, urged this for one, that they suffered some of his rebels to live in their provinces. Boreel, then their ambassador, answered, that was a maxim of long standing among them, not to inquire upon what account strangers came to live in their country, but to receive them all, unless they had been concerned in conspiracies against the persons of princes. The king told him upon that how they had used both himself and his brother. Boreel, in great simplicity, answered: *Ha! sire, cela estoit une autre chose: Cromwell, c'estoit un grand homme, et il se faisoit craindre et par terre et par mer.* This was very rough. The king's answer was: *Je me*

81

CHAP. V. *feray craindre aussi à mon tour:* but he was scarce as good as his word[1].

Cromwell's favourite alliance was with Sweden. Carolus Gustavus and he lived in a great conjunction of counsels[2]. Even Algernon Sidney, who was not inclined to think or speak well of kings, commended him to me, and said he had just notions of public liberty; and added, that queen Christina seemed to have them likewise. But she was much changed from that, when I waited on her at Rome; for she complained of us as a factious nation, that did not readily comply with the commands of our princes. All Italy trembled at the name of Cromwell, and seemed under
82 a panic fear as long as he lived. His fleet scoured the Mediterranean: and the Turks durst not offend him, but delivered up Hyde[3], that kept up the character of an ambassador from the king there, who was brought over and
July 10, 1654. executed for it. And the putting the brother of the king of Portugal's ambassador to death for murder, was the carrying justice very far; since, though in the strictness of the law of

[1] Boreel might upon that occasion represent Cromwell as a tyrant that frighted people into doing unreasonable things; but it is highly improbable that he should be so simple a brute, as to fall into encomiums upon Oliver before the king, as a means to obtain his ends: but Burnet was always ready to believe and report any vulgar stuff he heard, to the disparagement of King Charles the Second. D. John Boreel was resident ambassador in England in 1671, 1672. He was ambassador also in the reign of William III. Another Boreel, William, was ambassador to France from 1650 to his death, shortly after 1668. Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 126; ii. 158.

[2] See Whitelocke's *Journal of the Swedish Embassy*, and the discussion in Ranke, iii. 119–128, upon the political objects of this alliance. Cf. Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 154, 155.

[3] Sir Henry Hyde was first cousin to Clarendon. He was the sixth son of Sir Laurence Hyde; Clarendon being the son of Henry Hyde of Hinton, brother of Sir Laurence. Le Neve, *Knights' Pedigrees*, 59. He was appointed by Charles I as ambassador to Turkey, and was sent home by Sir Thomas Bendish, the minister of the Commonwealth. He appears to have obtained the latter's discharge by the Sultan, and to have urged the merchants of the Levant company to declare for the king. He was tried by the High Court of Justice, and beheaded March 4, 165$\frac{9}{10}$. See the account by Thomas Newsom, *Harl. MSS.* 6210, ff. 42–52; *A Perfect Diurnal*, Brit. Mus. E. 784, 22; *Cal. Clar. St. P.* ii. 95, 110. Evelyn, Sept. 24, 1664.

nations it is only the ambassador's own person that is exempted from any authority but his master's that sends him, | yet the practice had gone in favour of all that the ambassador owned to belong to him[1]. Cromwell shewed his good understanding in nothing more than in seeking out capable and worthy men for all employments, but most particularly for the courts of law, which gave a general satisfaction. CHAP. V. MS. 43.

Thus he lived, and at last died, on his auspicious third of September[2], of so slight a sickness, that his death was not looked for. He had two sons, and four daughters. His sons were weak[3], but honest men. Richard, the eldest, though declared protector in pursuance of a nomination pretended to be made by him, the truth of which was much questioned[4], was not at all bred to business, nor indeed capable of it. He was innocent of all the ill his father had done: so there was no prejudice lay against him: and both the royalists and presbyterians fancied he favoured them, though he pretended to be an independent. But all the commonwealth party cried out upon his assuming the protectorship, as a high usurpation; since whatever his father had from his parliaments was only personal, and so fell with him[5]: yet in opposition to this, the city of London, and all the counties and cities almost in England, sent up addresses congratulatory, as well as condoling. So little do these pompous appearances of respect signify. Tillotson told me, that a week after Cromwell's death he being by accident at Whitehall, and hearing there was to be a fast that day in the household, he out of curiosity went into the presence chamber where it was held. On 1658.

[1] This was, according to Welwood, 101, quoted as a precedent for the arrest of Furstenberg at the treaty of Cologne in 1673. See note to f. 354.

[2] On that day he had defeated the Scotch at Dunbar, and the next year the king at Worcester. R.

[3] But see Henry Cromwell's letters in Thurloe's papers. O. The evidence is completely at variance with the text as to Henry, who bore the character of a strong and able man, which is well illustrated in Lord E. Fitzmaurice's *Life of Sir W. Petty*.

[4] 'A puzzled nomination, and that very dark and imperfect.' Burton, *Diary*, iii. 160. Ludlow, ii. 43.

[5] Cf. Ranke, iii. 223.

CHAP. V. the one side of a table Richard with the rest of Cromwell's family were placed, and six of the preachers were on the other side: Thomas Goodwin, Owen, Caril, and Sterry, were of the number. There he heard a great deal of strange stuff, enough to disgust a man for ever of that enthusiastic boldness. God was, as it were, reproached with Cromwell's services, and challenged for taking him away so soon. Goodwin, who had pretended to assure them in a prayer that he was not to die, which was but a very few minutes before he expired, had now the impudence to say to God, *Thou hast deceived us, and we were*
83 *deceived.* Sterry, praying for Richard, used those indecent words, next to blasphemy, *Make him the brightness of the father's glory, and the express image of his person*[1]. Richard was put on giving his father a pompous funeral, by which his debts increased so upon him, that he was soon run out of all credit. When the parliament met, his party tried to get a recognition of his protectorship: but it soon appeared they had no strength to carry it. Fleetwood, that married Ireton's widow, set up a council of officers: and these resolved to lay aside Richard, who had neither genius nor friends, neither treasure nor army to support him[2]. He desired only security for the debts he had contracted; which was promised, though not per-
June, 1659. formed. And so without any struggle he withdrew, and became a private man[3]. And as he had done hurt to nobody, so nobody did ever study to hurt him; by a rare instance both of the instability of human greatness and of

[1] See the description of this in Ludlow, ii. 45, and Baillie, iii. 425.

[2] Richard's Protectorship was recognised, but not his right to command the army as Lord General. The army demanded the separation of the offices, and the right of choosing the Lord General themselves. It was when it was clear that Parliament would proclaim Richard Lord General, that the army turned them out, and, declaring for a pure Republic without a 'single person,' forced Richard to resign. Ludlow, ii. 54, &c.

[3] Parliament promised payment of his debts, £29,000, July 16, 1659; voted him an income (which was not paid) of £8,700 and lands to the value of £5,000 a year, and immunity from arrest for six months, July 4. *Dict. Nat. Biog.; Com-*

the security of innocence. His brother had been made by the father lieutenant of Ireland, and had the most spirit of the two; but he could not stand his ground when his brother let go his hold[1]. One of Cromwell's daughters was married to Claypole, and died a little before himself: another was married to the earl of Fauconberg, a wise and worthy woman, more likely to have maintained the post than either of her brothers; according to a saying that went of her, that those who wore breeches deserved petticoats better, but if those in petticoats had been in breeches they would have held them faster[2]. The other daughter was married, first to the earl of Warwick's heir, and afterwards to one Russell. I knew both the lady Fauconberg and her sister. They were both very worthy[a] persons[3].

[a] substituted for *extraordinary*.

mons Journals. See also Ludlow, 73, 136, 166. He went to France early in the summer of 1660, and is stated (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*) not to have returned until 1680. See Pepys, Oct. 13, 1664. But from the *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1672, 335, 336, 340, 563, 569, 570, we find that he was regarded as dangerous by the government, and that an unavailing attempt was secretly made in that year to secure him at his house near Winchester. How or whither he disappeared so as utterly to baffle search does not appear. He died at Cheshunt, 1712.

[1] Henry Cromwell was entirely opposed to the demands of the army and the Anabaptist faction, and was anxious to retain the parliamentary constitution. In Mr. Hutchinson's eyes indeed he was 'a debauched ungodly cavalier.' Firth, *Memoirs of Hutchinson*, ii. 203. See his letter to Fleetwood, Oct. 20, 1658. Thurloe, vii. 454. He was recalled June 7, 1659, and succeeded by Ludlow July 18. Ludlow, ii. 101. He died 1674, having lived in Cambridgeshire without molestation since the Restoration.

[2] She outlived the Earl of Fauconberg, who, by her prudent management (as it was generally thought), was a privy counsellor to Oliver, Richard, King Charles the Second, King James the Second, and King William the Third. [He was not created an earl until 1689.] After his death [1700] she desired Sir Harry Sheers to write an inscription for his monument, and would have it inserted, that in such a year he married his highness the then Lord Protector of England's daughter; which Sir Harry told her, he feared might give offence: she answered, that nobody could dispute matters of fact, therefore insisted that it should be inserted. I do not know if it were ever erected, but Sir Harry told me the story, with some encomiums upon the spirit of the lady. D. She died in 1712.

[3] Cromwell's daughters were married as follows: Bridget, first to Ireton and secondly to Fleetwood; Elizabeth, who died Aug. 6,

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE DEATH OF CROMWELL TO THE RESTORATION.

UPON Richard's leaving the stage, the commonwealth was again set up: and the parliament which Cromwell had broke was brought together[1]: but the army and they fell into new disputes: so they were again broke by them: and upon that the nation was like to fall into great convulsions[2]. The enthusiasts became very fierce, and talked of nothing but the destroying all the records and the law, which, they said, had been all made by a succession of tyrants and papists: so they resolved to model all of new by a levelling and a spiritual government of the saints. There was so little sense in this, that [a] Nevill and Harrington[3], with some others, set up in Westminster a meeting

[a] A name has been erased here before that of Nevill, which has some resemblance to *Herbert*, but is not that: it begins with *H* and ends with *t*.

1658, to John Claypole; Mary to Lord Falconbridge or Fauconberg; Frances, first to Robert Rich, grandson of the Earl of Warwick, a match to conciliate the Presbyterians, and secondly to Sir John Russell. The first marriage of the last named (1657) was noted because at the wedding 'they had 48 violins and 50 trumpets and much mirth with frolics, besides mixt dancing (a thing heretofore accounted profane) 'till 5 of the clock in the morning.' 'The Earl of Newport danced with her Highness.' *H. M. C Report*, v. 177: which contradicts the account in Ludlow, ii. 38, of a secret marriage.

[1] I.e. the Rump, dissolved April 20, 1653, restored May 7, 1659, by the army and republicans as the nearest approach hitherto realized to the Republic which the army desired to establish. It was expelled by Lambert on Oct. 13, 1659.

[2] The wide gaps in the narrative here can be best supplied from Ludlow and Ranke, iii. 235-272. It was in the antagonism of the 'enthusiasts' and presbyterians that, in the summer of 1659, Hyde saw the best chance for the king. 'I wonder we hear nothing, or very little, in these great changes, of Harrison; who with his Fifth Monarchy men, would be the fittest instruments to promote the confusion, and must be as little pleased with the form of government that is like to be established by this Parliament as we can be.' *H. M. C. Report*, x. App. vi. 264. Hyde to Mordaunt, June 4, 1659. At the same time Mordaunt wrote to Hyde, 'The common discourse in the very streets is, "No Peace to England without the King."' *Id.* 267. Cf. *supra* 122-124 and notes.

[3] James Harrington, political writer, author of *Oceana*, and founder of

to consider of a form of government that should secure liberty, and yet preserve the nation. They ran chiefly on having a parliament elected by ballot, in which the nation should be represented according to the proportion of what was paid in taxes towards the public expense: and by this parliament a council of twenty-four was to be chosen by ballot: and every year eight of these were to be changed, and might not again be brought into it but after an interval of three years: by these the nation was to be governed, and they were to give an account of the administration to the parliament every year. This meeting was a matter both of diversion and scorn, to see a few persons take upon them to form a scheme of government: and it made many conclude it was necessary to call home the king, that so matters | might again fall into their old channel. Lambert became the man on whom their army depended most[1]. Upon his forcing the parliament, great applications were made to Monk to declare for the parliament: but under this the declaring for the king was generally understood; yet he kept himself on such a reserve, that he declared all the while in the most solemn manner [a] for a commonwealth, and against a single person, in particular against the king: so that none had any ground from him to believe he had any design that way[2]. Some have thought that he

CHAP. VI.

84

MS. 44.

[a] *possible* struck out.

the Rota Club in 1659, which met at Miles's Coffee House in Old Palace Yard, and lasted for only a few months. See Butler's satire upon it in *Genuine Remains*, 1756, i. 317. In 1661 he was sent to the Tower on suspicion of treason, and thence to the island of St. Nicholas, where he appears to have partially or wholly lost his reason. He was discharged and died in 1677. See Pepys, Jan. 10, 17, 1660; Masson, *Milton*, vi.; Aubrey's *Letters*, Bodl. ii. part 2, 371; Wood, *Ath. Ox.* iii. 1119 (ed. 1817); Ward, *Lives of the Professors of Gresham College*, 221; Milton, *Ready and Easy Way to establish a Free Commonwealth.*

[1] In the *Nicholas Papers* there is strong evidence that Lambert was planning a restoration, one condition of which was that his daughter should marry the Duke of York.

[2] 'That you would be pleased to hasten the settlement of the government of these nations in a Commonwealth's way, in successive parliaments, soe to be regulated in elections

CHAP. VI. intended to try, if it was possible, to set up for himself: others believed rather, that he had no settled design any way, and resolved to do as occasions should be offered to him. The Scottish nation did certainly hope he would bring home the king[1] [a] He drew the greatest part of the army towards the borders, where Lambert advanced near him, who had 7000 horse. Monk was stronger in foot[2]: and being apprehensive of engaging on such disadvantage, he sent Clarges to the lord Fairfax for his advice and assistance, who returned answer by Dr. Fairfax, now secretary to the archbishop of Canterbury, and assured him he would raise Yorkshire on the first of January; and he desired him to press upon Lambert, in case that he sent a detachment to Yorkshire. On the first of January, Fair-

Inserted on the blank leaf of MS. 34 b.

1660.

[a] The following passage has been struck out, and the one above substituted:—, *and therefore that he drew the greatest part of his army towards Newcastle, yet the nation advanced all the money he called for towards the pay and subsistence of the army. Lambert marched towards him with the whole strength of the Enthusiasts, but they were grown so odious and so dreadful that the stream of the nation turned strangely against them, and their hearts seemed to fail them in their extremity. Fairfax raised Yorkshire.* It is worth noticing that usually in the original MS. passages Monck's name is spelt *Monk*, but in the later added passages, as well as in some original parts further on (pp. 299, 300), the *c* is inserted.

---

as you shall thinke fit.' Monk to the Speaker, Oct. 13, 1659. *Portland MSS. H. M. C. Rep.* xiii. App. ii. 99. See also his letter to Lambert, *id.*, and that to Haselrig as late as Feb. 13, 1660, *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 678. Mr. Firth's analysis of this part of Monk's career in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* is especially valuable.

[1] The disposal of Scotch places in the Government was being privately and provisionally considered by Lauderdale's friends in January. Alexander Bruce to Lauderdale, Jan. $\frac{1}{2}\frac{2}{3}$, 1660. *Transcripts of the correspondence of Sir R. Moray and Bruce.* See *Scottish Review*, Jan. 1885, 22.

[2] He had, moreover, plenty of money, while Lambert was obliged to alienate Yorkshire by forced contributions. Monk declined all military help from Scotland, and left four regiments there. He marched with 5,000 foot and 2,000 horse. Brian Fairfax, who had good opportunities of knowing, says, 'It must be acknowledged that my Lord Fairfax was the first man that ever declared his mind for restoring the King; which he did first by a message to Monk by Dr. Troutbeck into Scotland, and next to Monk himself, who came to meet him at Nun Appleton. *Sic vos non vobis.*' *H. M. C. Rep.* vi. 467.

fax appeared with about 100 gentlemen and their servants. CHAP. VI.
But so much did he still maintain his great credit with the army, that the night after, the Irish brigade, that consisted of 1200 horse, and was the rear of Lambert's army, came over to him. Upon that Lambert retreated, finding his army was so little sure to him, and resolved to march back to London. He was followed by Monk, who when he came to Yorkshire met with Fairfax, and offered to resign the chief command to him. The lord Fairfax refused it, but pressed Monk to declare for a free parliament: yet in that he was so reserved to him, that Fairfax knew not how to depend on him[1]. But as Lambert was making haste up, his army mouldered away, and he himself was brought up a prisoner, and was put in the Tower of London. Yet April, 1660.
not long after he made his escape[2], and gathered a few troops about him in Northamptonshire; but these were soon scattered[a]: for Ingoldsby[3], though one of the king's 85
judges, raised Buckinghamshire against him. And so little force seemed now in that party, that with very little opposition Ingoldsby took him prisoner, and brought him into

[1] See the story in Welwood, 107, about the Parliament sending secret orders to Col. Wilkes to secure Monk.

[2] April 11, 1660. See the account in Rugge's *Diurnal*; British Museum *Add. MSS.* 10,116, 10,117.

[3] Ingoldsby was a Buckinghamshire man, being the second son of Sir Richard Ingoldsby of Lenthenborough. In 1647 he sat for Wendover, and in 1654 and 1656 for Buckinghamshire. He served on the Council of State in 1652, and was called to Cromwell's House of Lords in Dec. 1657. He supported Richard Cromwell, to whom he was related, his mother being the daughter of Sir Oliver Cromwell of Hinchinbrook in Huntingdonshire. Upon Richard's fall he negotiated for Charles's favour, but was left, as one of the regicides, to earn his pardon. Clarendon, xvi. 224, 226. This he did by the seizure of Windsor Castle from the Parliament (though it is doubtful whether this was the work of Richard or his brother Henry) and the suppression of Lambert's revolt, April 22, 1660. On April 20, 1661, at the coronation, he was made a Knight of the Bath, and sat for Aylesbury throughout the reign of Charles II, but does not appear ever to have addressed the House. He died in 1685. In a MS. list in the *Melfort Papers*, which were sold in 1829 [but which cannot now be traced], it is stated that he was among those detained during the prosecution of the Rye House Plot. Noble, *Protectoral House of Cromwell*, 184, 187, 190.

CHAP. VI. Northampton: where Lambert, as Ingoldsby told me, entertained him with a pleasant reflection for all his misfortunes. The people were in great crowds applauding and rejoicing for the success: so Lambert put Ingoldsby in mind of what Cromwell had said to them both, near that very place, in the year 1650, when they, with a body of the officers, were going down after their army that was marching to Scotland, the people all the while shouting and wishing them success: Lambert upon that said to Cromwell, he was glad to see they had the nation of their side: Cromwell answered, do not trust to that; for these very persons would shout as much if you and I were going to be hanged. So Lambert said he looked of himself now as in a fair way to that, and began to think Cromwell prophesied.

Upon the dispersing Lambert's army, Monk marched
Feb. 1660. southward, and was now the object of all men's hope[1]. At London all sorts of people began to cabal together, royalists, presbyterians, and republicans. Holles told me, the presbyterians pressed the royalists to be quiet, and to leave the game in their hands; for their appearing would give jealousy, and hurt that which they meant to promote[2]. He and Ashley Cooper, Grimston and Annesley, met often with Manchester, Robarts, and the rest of the presbyterian party: and the ministers of London were very active in the city: so that when Monk came up, he was pressed to declare himself[3]. At first he would only declare for the

[1] Lambert's escape and recapture were in April, two months subsequent to Monk's arrival in London on Feb. 3. At the Restoration he was imprisoned first in Guernsey until 1667, and afterwards on the Isle of St. Nicholas in Plymouth Sound until his death in 1683.

[2] As early as December, 1656, Hyde noted that the Presbyterians were more vehement for a restoration than either Cavaliers or Catholics, fearing lest it might be obtained without their co-operation (*Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 212, Langdale to Hyde): fearing, too, that until the king was restored they must always be at the mercy of the army.

[3] 'Monk is, I suppose, what he was; . . . and what that is a far wiser man than myself cannot tell: greate confidence is expressed on both sides.' Sir R. Burgoyne to Sir R. Verney, Jan. 26, 1660, *Verney MSS.* 'Monk was at the House on Monday last, who expressed himself so obscurely that most men know not what construction for to make of

parliament that Lambert had forced. But there was then a great fermentation all over the nation. Monk and the parliament grew jealous of one another, even while they tried who could give the best words, and express their confidence in the highest terms of one another. I will pursue the relation of this transaction no further: for this matter is well known. CHAP. VI.

The king had gone in autumn 1659 to the meeting at the Pyrenees, where cardinal Mazarin and Don Louis de Haro were negotiating a peace[1]. He applied himself to both sides, to try what assistance he might expect upon their concluding the peace. It was then known that he went to mass sometimes, that so he might recommend himself the more effectually to both courts; yet this was carried secretly, and was confidently denied. Mazarin still talked to Lockhart upon the foot of the old confidence: for he went thither to watch over the treaty; though England was now in such convulsions, that no minister from thence could be much considered, unless it was upon his own account. But matters were ripening so fast towards a revolution in England, that the king came back to Flanders in all haste, and went from thence to Breda. Lockhart had it in his power to have made a great fortune, if he had begun first, and had brought the king to Dunkirk. As soon as the peace of the Pyrenees was made, he came over, and found Monk at London, and took all the pains he could to penetrate into his designs. But Monk continued still to protest to him in the solemnest manner possible that he would be true to the commonwealth, and against 1659. 86

it.' *Id.* These are only two of a great number of such notices in this correspondence. Cf. Rugge's *Diurnal*, Jan. 21, $16\frac{59}{60}$.

[1] Charles had been negotiating with Spain for several years. In 1656 a treaty had been arranged—in expectation of Cromwell's murder—by which Spain promised to assist him in taking advantage of that event. A secret article promised on Charles's part a suspension of all the penal laws, and an endeavour to secure their revocation, with the acceptance of Ormond's treaty with the Irish Catholics in 1648. *Clar. St. P.*, April 12 and Nov. 27, 1756. The negotiations at the Peace of the Pyrenees were abortive. Ranke, iii. 247–249.

CHAP. VI. the royal family[1]. Lockhart went away, persuaded that matters would continue still in that state: so that when his old friend Middleton writ to him desiring him to make his own terms, if he would invite the king to Dunkirk, he said, he was trusted by the commonwealth, and could not betray them.

Feb. 9, 1660. The house of commons put Monk on breaking the gates of the city of London, not doubting but that would render him so odious to them, that it would force him to depend wholly on themselves. He did it: and soon after he saw how odious he was become by it. So conceiving a high indignation at those who had put him on such an ungracious piece of service, he sent about all that night to the ministers and other active citizens, assuring them that he would quickly repair that error, if they would forgive it. So the turn was sudden: for the city sent and invited him to dine the next day at Guildhall: and there he declared for the members whom the army had forced away in 47 and 48, who were known by the name of *the secluded members*. | And some happening to call the body that then sat at Westminster, the *Rump of a Parliament*[2], a sudden humour run like a madness through the whole city of roasting the rump of all sorts of animals; and thus the city expressed themselves sufficiently. Those at Westminster had now no support: so they fell unpitied and unregarded. The secluded members came, and sat down among them; but all they would do was to give orders for the summoning a new parliament to meet the first of May: and so they declared themselves dissolved[3].

Feb. 11, 1660. MS. 45.

[1] Ludlow's *Memoirs* (1698) are apparently Burnet's chief authority for all this.

[2] 'He seemed at first to court the Rump, but since I heere he hath closed with the Citty which can pay his army surer and sooner.' *Verney MSS.* John Stukely to Sir R. Verney, Feb. 16, 1660. The term 'Rump' is used in these MSS. at a date prior to that of these events, and is as early as 1653. Of the Long Parliament 420 were dead or excluded, or had withdrawn.

[3] Cf. Rugge's *Diurnal*, and the following from the *Verney MSS.*: 'Rump major' [i.e. the Rump with the secluded members] begins to smell as rank as Rump minor. . . . At the committee last night they

CHAP. VI.

April 25, 1660.

There was still a murmuring in the army; so great care was taken to scatter them in wide quarters, and not to suffer too many of those who were still for the old cause to lie near one another. The well and the ill affected were so mixed, that in case of any insurrection some might be ready at hand to resist them. They changed the officers that were ill affected, who were not thought fit to be trusted with the commanding those of their own stamp: and so created a mistrust between the officers and the soldiery. And above all they took care to have no more troops than 87
was necessary about the city: and these were the best affected. This was managed with great diligence and skill: and by this conduct was that great turn brought about without the least tumult or any bloodshed; which was beyond what any person could have imagined. Of all this Monk had both the praise and the reward; though I have been told a very small share of it belonged to him[1]. Admiral Montague[2] was then in the chief command at sea,

banded hard for a qualification that none should elect or be elected but such as had eminently acted against the King, but it could not be carried: one moved upon the covenant the clean contrary, that none might but those that had acted for king and parliament. I heare no man speake against it.' Dr. Denton to Sir R. Verney, March 2, 1660. The dissolution was one of the conditions upon which Monk secured the restoration of the secluded members. Prynne fought hard against it, but 'Mr. Annesley answered ingeniously, confessing his arguments were not to be answered, but moved to dissolve.' The same to the same, March 8, 1660. The new Parliament met April 25.

[1] Upon Monk's skilful choice of men to deal with the different parties, see Mr. Firth's article in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

[2] In a letter to Arlington, Nov. 20, 1667, while ambassador at Madrid, he says, 'I shall make no new declaration unto your Lordship, but revive the remembrance of my Master's first reception of me into his Grace and Favour, which was placed upon a person already struck with the ingratitude my youthful follies had drawn me into, towards the King my master, the son of whose servant I was, and of a family obliged to the Crown for many generations; and being in this condition, God knows, from no other principle of Interest, my heart entertained his Majesty's kindness with unexpressible joy,' &c. *Original Letters and Negotiations* of Fanshaw, Sandwich, Sunderland and Godolphin (London, 1724, 2 vols. 8vo.), ii. 88. Created Earl of Sandwich after the Restoration. He was drowned at the battle of Southwold Bay, June 7, 1672; f. 323.

CHAP. VI. newly returned from the Sound, where he and De Ruyter, upon the orders they received from their masters, had brought the two northern kings to a peace; the king of Sweden dying as it was a making up. He was soon gained to be for the king; and he dealt so effectually with the whole fleet, that the turn there was as silently brought about, without any revolt or opposition, as it had been in the army. The republicans went about as madmen, to rouse up their party; but their time was past. All were either as men amazed or asleep: they had neither the skill nor the courage to make any opposition. The elections of parliament men run all the other way. So they saw their business was quite lost, and they felt themselves struck as with a spirit of giddiness; and then every man thought only how to save or secure himself. And now they saw how deceitful the argument was from success, which they had used so oft, and triumphed so much upon. For whereas success in the field, which was the foundation of their argument, depended much upon the conduct and courage of armies, in which the will of man had a large share, here was a thing of another nature. Their union was broke, and their courage sank, without any visible reason for either; and a nation that had run on long in such a fierce opposition to the royal family was now turned as one man to call home the king.

The nation had one great happiness during the long course of the civil wars, that no foreigners had got footing among them [1]. Spain was sinking to nothing: France was under a base spirited minister: and both were in war all the while. Now a peace was made between them, and very probably, according to what is in Mazarin's letters, they would have joined forces to have restored the king. The nation was by this means entirely in its own hands: and

[1] The Restoration was equally free of foreign interference. Monk would not even let the Scotch take part except by pecuniary aid. It is clear, however, that but for the failure of the Royalist risings in 1659, this immunity would not have been preserved. Ranke, iii. 244.

now, returning to its wits, was in a condition to put every thing in joint again: whereas, if foreigners had been possessed of any important place, they might have had a large share of the management, and would have been sure to have taken care of themselves. Enthusiasm was now languid: for that, owing its mechanical force to the liveliness of the blood and spirits, men in disorder and depressed could not raise in themselves those heats with which they 88
were formerly wont to transport both themselves and others. Chancellor Hyde was all this while very busy: he sent over Dr. Morley, who talked with the presbyterians much of great moderation in general, but would enter into no particulars: only he took care to let them know he was a Calvinist: and they had the best opinion of such of the church of England as were of that persuasion[1]. Hyde wrote in the king's name to all the leading men, and got the king himself to write a great many letters in a very obliging manner. Some that had been faulty sent over considerable presents, with assurances that they would redeem all that was past with their zeal for the future. These were all accepted of: their money was also very welcome; for the king needed money when his matters were on that crisis, and he had many tools at work, the management of which was so entirely the chancellor's single performance that there was scarce any other that had so much as a share in it with him. He kept a register of all the king's promises, and of his own; and did all that lay in

[1] He was careful to secure certificates in other quarters. 'The Gallican ministry have written to ours assuring them that the King is a very good protestant.' Dr. Denton to Sir R. Verney, April 6, 1660, *Verney MSS.* 'With this next post there goes over 4 or 5 very good letters from 3 of the ministers here [Paris], and others of other places, wherein they say handsome things of the King's firmness to our [religion].' Sir R. Moray to Alexander Bruce, March 12, 1660. *Transcripts of Correspondence.* See also the *Lauderdale Papers* (Camden Soc.), i. 28; and Kennet's *History*, 238, and *Register*, 110, for letters from Protestant ministers and others in France. For Morley's mission, see *Clar. St. P.* iii.; Wood, *Ath. Ox.*, and Calamy's *Abridgment*, 569. Hyde was appointed Chancellor in January, 1658.

CHAP. VI. his power afterwards to get them all to be performed. He was also all that while giving the king many wise and good advices; but he did it too much with the air of a governor, or of a lawyer. Yet then the king was wholly in his hands[1].

April 25, 1660. I need not open the scene of the new parliament, or convention, as it came afterwards to be called, because it was not summoned by the king's writ. Such an unanimity appeared in their proceedings, that there was not the least dispute among them, but upon one single point: yet that was a very important one. Hale[2], afterwards the famous chief justice, moved that a committee might be appointed to look into the propositions that had been made, and the

MS. 46. concessions that | had been offered by the late king during the war, particularly at the treaty of Newport, that from thence they might digest such propositions as they should think fit to be sent over to the king. This was well seconded, but I do not remember by whom. It was foreseen that such a motion might be set on foot: so Monk

[1] When the Earl of Clarendon's history was first published [1702], the Lord Granville, second son to the Earl of Bath, told me that Monk had always a very particular dislike to Chancellor Hyde, and when he sent his father to Breda, gave him strict charge not to trust Hyde with anything that related to his own concerns, and desired the same caution might be given the king; and his father told him, the chief thing that staggered Monk in the whole transaction was the necessity of having anything to do with him; which Hyde soon found out, and endeavoured ever after to lessen Monk's merits as much as he could, and Lord Bath's for the same reason. D.

[2] In 1682 Burnet published *The Life and Death of Sir M. Hale*; and a second edition in the same year contained additional notes by Baxter. There is an elaborate modern work upon him by Williams. In the condensed and vivid sketch of Hale as Lord Chief Justice, which occurs in Roger North's autobiography, the writer refers thus to Burnet's work: 'Gilbert Burnet has pretended to write his life, but wanted both information and understanding for such an undertaking. Nay, that which he intended chiefly, to touch the people with a panegyric, he was not fit for, because he knew not the virtues he had fit to be praised, and I should recommend to him the lives of Jack Cade, Wat Tyler, or Cromwell as characters fitter for his learning and pen to work upon than him.' North, it should be mentioned, always spells Hale's name with a final 's.' See also Marvell, *Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*, ed. Grosart, iv. 315, upon 'good Sir Matthew Hales.'

was instructed how to answer it, whensoever it should be proposed. He told the house, that there was yet, beyond all men's hopes, an universal quiet all over the nation; but there were many incendiaries still at work, trying where they could first raise the flame. He said, he had such copious informations sent him of these things, that it was not fit they should be generally known: he could not answer for the peace, either of the nation or of the army, if any delay was put to the sending for the king: what need was there of sending propositions to him? Might they not as well prepare them, and offer them to him, when he should come over? He was to bring neither army nor treasure with him, either to fright them or to corrupt them. So he moved, that they would immediately send commissioners to bring over the king: and said, that he must lay the blame of all the blood or mischief that might follow on the heads of those that should still insist on any motion that might delay the present settlement of the nation. This was echoed with such a shout over the house, that the motion was no more insisted on[1]. CHAP. VI. 89 May 3–8, 1660.

This was indeed the great service that Monk did. It was chiefly owing to the post he was in, and to the credit he had gained: for as to the restoration itself, the tide made so strong that he only went into it so dexterously as to get much fame and great rewards for that which will have still a great appearance in history. If he had died soon after, he might have been more justly admired, because less known, and seen only in one advantageous light: but he lived long enough to have his stupidity and his other ill

[1] Carte's *Ormond*, iii. 706 (Clar. Press); Pepys, April 29, 1660. But if the readiness to bring back the king upon any terms, or without terms, needs explanation, it is probably best found in the following woman's exclamation: 'I pray God send mee my life to see peace in our dayes, and that friends may live to rejoice each other.' Penelope Denton to Sir R. Verney, March 8, 1660, *Verney MSS.* In the Latin preamble by Sir R. Fanshawe to Monk's patent he is styled 'Victor sine sanguine.' Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, ii. 514. See also Evelyn, May 29, 1660: 'And all this was done without one drop of blood shed, and by that very army which rebelled against him.'

CHAP. VI. qualities be well known : so false a judgment are men apt to make upon outward appearances[1]. To the king's coming in without conditions may be well imputed all the errors of his reign : and therefore when the earl of Southampton came to see and feel what he was [a] like to prove [a], he said once in great wrath to chancellor Hyde, it was to him they owed all they either felt or feared ; for if he had not possessed them in all his letters with such an opinion of the king, they would have taken care to have put it out of his power either to do himself or them that mischief that was like to be the effect of their trusting him so entirely. Hyde answered, that he thought he had so true a judgment, and so much good nature, that when the age of pleasure should be over, and the idleness of his exile, which made him seek new pleasures for want of other employment, was turned to an obligation to mind affairs, then he would have shaken off those unhappy entanglements[2]. I must often put my

[a] interlined afterwards.

[1] Pepys speaks of Monk in like terms, Oct. 24, 1667. After observing that the House of Commons had that day voted thanks to Prince Rupert and the Duke of Albemarle for their care and conduct in the last year's war, he says, 'this is a strange act, but I know not how the blockhead Albemarle hath strange luck to be loved, though (and every man must know it) the heaviest man in the world, but stout and honest to his country.' R. See, too, the description of him quoted from Montconis by Lingard, xii. 227 (ed. 1829). Burnet ignores the great, if phlegmatic courage which Monk displayed so abundantly in the murderous naval battles of the first Dutch war. For an amusing proof of his strength of head, see Jusserand, *A French Ambassador at the court of Charles II*, 96; cf. *infra* 178.

[2] The chancellor was afraid on the church's account, in case Hale's motion (*supra* 160) had been carried, that it would not have been restored, and on the part of the monarchy, that it would have been perhaps too much limited. It should at the same time be remembered, that this statesman abolished wardship, which Burnet calls a main part of the regal authority, and that he left the crown in a great measure dependent on parliaments for even its ordinary support. [The formal abolition of the Court of Wards—upon the previous abolition of which in 1645 and 1656 see *supra* 22, note—by the new government, which did not of course recognise the acts of the parliament of 1656, was a foregone conclusion; before the Restoration Hyde had prevented the king from bestowing the office of master of the Court upon Charles Berkeley. *Dict. Nat Biog.* on

reader in mind, that I leave all common transactions to ordinary books. If at any time I say things that occur in other books, it is partly to keep the thread of the narration in an unintangled method, and partly because I either have not read these things in books, or, at least, I do not remember to have read them so clearly and particularly as I have related them. I now leave a mad and confused scene, to open a more august and splendid one.

Hyde. A committee of the House of Commons in the Convention Parliament was indeed named to prepare a bill for the purpose as early as May 3, 1660.] The following account was given to Pepys by Clarendon's great opponent, Sir William Coventry, of the advice offered to the king by the Earl of Southampton, and of the conduct pursued by the Earl of Clarendon: 'Sir W. Coventry did tell me it as the wisest thing that ever was said to the king by any statesman of his time, and it was by my lord treasurer that is dead, whom, I find, he takes for a very great statesman, that when the king did show himself forward for passing the Act of Indemnity, he did advise the king that he would hold his hand in doing it, till he had got his power restored that had been diminished by the late times, and his revenue settled in such a manner as he might depend on himself without resting upon parliaments, and then pass it. But my lord chancellor, who thought he could have the command of parliaments for ever, because for the king's sake they were awhile willing to grant all the king desired, did press for its being done; and so it was, and the king from that time able to do nothing with the parliament almost.' Pepys, March 20, 166$\frac{8}{9}$. The notion, that he had neglected the interests of the crown at so favourable a juncture, certainly prevailed, and perhaps contributed to the chancellor's fall; but it may be doubted, whether, if willing, he would have been able to have obtained, even at that time, a large permanent revenue for the king from the loyal but frugal parliament. R. See *infra* 277.

MS. 47.

BOOK II.

Of the first twelve years of the reign of king Charles II, from the year 1660 *to the year* 1673.

CHAPTER I.

ENGLISH AND SCOTCH CHARACTERS OF THE RESTORATION.

CHAP. I.

I DIVIDE king Charles his reign into two books, not so much because, it consisting of twenty-four years, it fell, if divided at all, naturally to put twelve years in a book: but I have a much better reason for it, since as to the first twelve years, though I knew the affairs of Scotland very authentically, yet I had only such a general knowledge of the affairs of England as I could pick up at a distance:
92 whereas I lived so near the scene, and had indeed such a share in several parts of it, during the last twelve years, that I can write of these with much more certainty, as well as more fully, than of the first twelve. I will therefore enlarge more particularly, within the compass that I have fixed for this book, on the affairs of Scotland; both out of the inbred love that all men have to their native country, but more particularly, that I may give some useful instructions to those of my own order and profession, concerning the conduct of the bishops of Scotland: for having observed, with more than ordinary niceness, all the errors that were committed both at the first setting up of episcopacy and in the whole progress of its continuance in Scotland, till it was again overturned there, it may be of some use to see all that matter in a full view and in a clear and true light.

As soon as it was fixed that the king was to be restored, a great many went over to make their court: among these

Sharp, who was employed by the resolutioners of Scotland, was one[1]. He carried with him a letter from the earl of Glencairn to Hyde, made soon after earl of Clarendon[2], recommending him as the only person capable to manage the design of setting up episcopacy in Scotland: upon which he was received into great confidence. Yet, as he had observed very carefully the success of Monk's solemn protestations against the king and for a commonwealth, it seemed he was so pleased with the original, that he resolved to copy after it, without letting himself be diverted from it by anxious scruples, or any tenderness of conscience: for he stuck neither at solemn protestations, both by word of mouth and by letters, of which I have seen many proofs, nor at appeals to God of his sincerity in acting for the presbytery, both in prayers and on other occasions, joining with these many dreadful imprecations on himself if he did prevaricate. He was all the while maintained by the presbyterians as their agent, and he continued to give them a constant account of the progress of his negotiation in their service, while he was indeed undermining it. This piece of craft was so visible, he having repeated his protestations to so many persons as they grew jealous of him, that when he threw off the mask, about a year after this, it laid a foundation of such a character of him, that nothing could ever bring people to any tolerable thoughts of a man whose dissimulation and treachery was so well known, and of which so many proofs were to be seen under his own hand.

With the restoration of the king a spirit of extravagant joy being spread over the nation, that brought on with it the throwing off the very professions of virtue and piety: 93
all ended in entertainments and drunkenness, which overran

[1] See his instructions in Crookshank's *Hist. Church of Scotland*, 59. He took letters from Lauderdale also, and was Monk's agent as well. The story of Sharp's persistent knavery will be found in Baillie, iii. 484; the *Lauderdale Papers*, i; the *Scottish Review* for July 1884 and January 1885; and Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, ch. 77. See *supra* 114.

[2] Hyde, who had been appointed Lord Chancellor, Jan. 13, 1658, was created, Nov. 3, 1660, Baron Hyde of Hindon; and Viscount Cornbury and Earl of Clarendon, on April 20, 1661.

CHAP. I.

the three kingdoms to such a degree, that it very much corrupted all their morals[1]. Under the colour of drinking the king's health, there were great disorders and much riot every where: and the pretences to religion, both in those of the hypocritical sort, and of the more honest but no less pernicious enthusiasts, gave great advantages, as well as they furnished much matter, to the profane mockers at all true piety. Those who had been concerned in the former transactions thought they could not redeem themselves from the censures and jealousies that these brought on them by any method that was more sure and more easy, than by going in to the stream, and laughing at all religion, telling or making stories to expose both themselves and their party as impious and ridiculous.

The king[2] was then thirty years of age, and, as might have been supposed, past the levities of youth and the extravagance of pleasure. He had a very good understanding: he knew well the state of affairs both at home and abroad. He had a softness of temper, that charmed all who came near him, till they found how little they could depend on good looks, kind words, and fair promises, in which he was liberal to excess, because he intended nothing by them but to get rid of importunity, and to silence all further pressing upon him. He seemed to have no sense of religion: both at prayers and sacrament he, as it were, took care to satisfy people that he was in no sort concerned in that about which he was employed: so that he was very far from being an hypocrite, unless his assisting at those performances was a sort of hypocrisy, as no doubt it was; but he was sure not to increase that by any the least appearance of devotion. He said once to my self, he was no atheist, but he could not think God would make a man

[1] See the remarkable passage in Clarendon, *Cont.* 36–38.

[2] See Ranke, vi. 38, for Burnet's characters of Charles, Clarendon, Shaftesbury, Southampton, and Ormond, taken from the *Harleian MSS.* 6484. Compare with the character here given of Charles that at the end of the reign, f. 611, and many striking passages in the Memoirs of Reresby and Shefficld, Duke of Buckingham.

miserable only for taking a little pleasure out of the way. He disguised his popery to the last: but when he talked freely, he could not help letting himself | out against the liberty that under the Reformation all men took of inquiring into matters: for from their inquiring into matters of religion, they carried the humour further, to inquire into matters of state. He said often, he thought government was a much safer and easier thing where the authority was believed infallible, and the faith and submission of the people was implicit: about which I had once much discourse with him. He was affable and easy, and loved to be made so by all about him. The great art of keeping him long was, the being easy, and the making every thing easy to him[1]. He 94 | had made such observations on the French government, that he thought a king who might be checked, or have his ministers called to an account by a parliament, was but a king in name. He had a great compass of knowledge, though he was never capable of great application or study. He understood the mechanics and physic: and was a good chemist, and much set on several preparations of mercury, chiefly the fixing it. He understood navigation well: but above all he knew the architecture of ships so perfectly, that in that respect he was exact rather more than became a prince[2]. His apprehension was quick, and his memory good; and he was an everlasting talker[3]. He told his stories with a good grace: but they came in his way too often. He had a very ill opinion both of men and women; and did not think there was either sincerity or chastity in

[1] His laboratory was useful to him as securing privacy. Robert Moray in his correspondence with Lauderdale notices this more than once. In 1669, when a secret agent, the Abbé Pregnani, was sent to Charles by Louis XIV, his errand was disguised under the pretence that he came to aid him in his chemical studies. Mignet, *Négociations relatives à la succession d'Espagne*, iii. 73, 74.

[2] Charles was never happier than when on board ship. 'If the wind were fair for it, we should quickly expect him here again, and by long sea, where twenty leagues are more pleasing to him than two by land.' Arlington's *Letters* (1701), ii. 341. Pepys, May 4, 1663, and *passim*.

[3] In 1650, 'he is naturally of few words, and speakes not much to any.' *A Brief Relation*, April 2–9; *Charles II and Scotland in* 1650, 46.

CHAP. I.

the world out of principle, but that some had either the one or the other out of humour or vanity. He thought that nobody served him out of love: and so he was quits with all the world, and loved others as little as he thought they loved him. He hated business, and could not be easily brought to mind any: but when it was necessary, and he was set to it, he would stay as long as his ministers had work for him. The ruin of his reign, and of all his affairs, was occasioned chiefly by his delivering himself up at his first coming over to a mad range of pleasure [1]. One of the race of the Villiers, then married to Palmer, a papist, soon after made earl of Castlemaine [2], who afterwards, being separated from him, was advanced to be duchess of Cleveland, was his first and longest mistress, by whom he had five children [3]. She was a woman of great beauty, but most enormously vicious and ravenous, foolish but imperious,

[1] Pepys, Dec. 3, 1666, gives from hearsay Killigrew's reported remonstrance to Charles: 'There is a good, honest, able man that I could name, that if your majesty would employ, and command to see all things well executed, all things would soon be mended; and this is one Charles Stuart, who now spends his time in employing his lips about the court, and hath no other employment; but if you would give him this employment, he were the fittest man in the world to perform it.'

[2] The patent for the Earl of Castlemaine confined the title to the males born 'of this wife, the Lady Barbary; the reason whereof everybody knows.' Pepys, Dec. 7, 1661.

[3] He had her the first night he arrived at London; she was then some months gone with child of the late Countess of Sussex, whom the king adopted for his daughter, though Lord Castlemaine always looked upon her to be his, and left her his estate when he died; but she was generally understood to belong to another, the old Earl of Chesterfield, whom she resembled very much both in face and person. D. Barbara Villiers was daughter and heiress of William Villiers, Viscount Grandison, who fell at Edgehill. She was born about 1642, and was married in 1659 to Roger Palmer, a student in the Temple; and was created Duchess of Cleveland Aug. 3, 1670. See Marvell, *Last Instructions to a Painter*, 79–104. She had six children, not five, by the king; three sons, created Dukes of Southampton and Cleveland, Grafton, and Northumberland, and three daughters, Anne, the one mentioned in Dartmouth's note, who married Thomas Lennard, Earl of Sussex, at fourteen; Charlotte, who became Countess of Lichfield; and Barbara, who entered a nunnery in France. She parted from her husband 'on good terms' in 1666. Pepys, Dec. 12, 1666. She afterwards married Beau Fielding, and prosecuted him for bigamy; she died in 1709. See Steinman's *Memoir of Barbara, Duchess of Cleveland*, privately printed, 1871.

ever uneasy to the king, and always carrying on intrigues with other men, while yet she pretended she was jealous of him. His passion for her, and her strange behaviour towards him, did so disorder him, that often he was not master of himself, nor capable of minding business, which, in so critical a time, required great application: but he did then so entirely trust the earl of Clarendon that he left all to his care, and submitted to his advices as to so many oracles. CHAP. I.

The earl of Clarendon was bred to the law, and was like to grow eminent in his profession. When the wars began he distinguished himself so in the house of commons, that he became considerable, and was much trusted all the while the king was at Oxford. He stayed beyond sea following the king's fortunes, till the restoration; and was now an absolute favourite, and the chief or the only minister, but with too magisterial a way. He was always pressing the king to mind his affairs, but in vain. He 95
was a good chancellor, only a little too rough, but very impartial in the administration of justice[1]. He never seemed to understand foreign affairs well: and yet he meddled too much in them. He had too much levity in his wit, and did not always observe the decorum of his post. He was haughty[2], and was apt to reject those who addressed themselves to him, with too much contempt. He had such regard to the king, that when places were disposed of, even otherwise than as he advised, yet he would justify what the king did, and disparage the pretensions of others, not without much scorn; which created him many enemies. He was indefatigable in business,

[1] It is noted by Macdiarmid, *Three British Statesmen*, 538, that Clarendon was careful to retain the Commonwealth judges. See, however, Clarendon, *Cont.* 39. Onslow in a note states that he was told by the Master of the Rolls (Sir Thomas Clarke), that Clarendon never made a decree in Chancery without the assistance of two of the judges. This had been a practice of Bishop Williams when Keeper of the Great Seal. His reform of the procedure of the Court of Chancery was known as 'Lord Clarendon's Orders.' Lister, ii. 528. See Pepys, May 27, 1667, &c., where he gives Clarendon the reputation of selling places, and doing nothing except for money.

[2] 'Like Jove the fulminant.' *Last Instructions*, 356.

CHAP. I. though the gout did often disable him from waiting on the king: yet, during his credit, the king came constantly to him when he was laid up by the gout.

The man next to him in favour with the king was the duke of Ormond: a man every way fitted for a court, of a graceful appearance, a lively wit, and a cheerful temper: a man of great expense, decent even in his vices[1], for he always kept up the forms of religion. He had gone through many transactions in Ireland with more fidelity than success. He had made a treaty with the Irish, which was broken by the great body of them, though some few of them adhered still to him[2]. But the whole Irish nation did still pretend, that, though they broke the agreement first, yet he, or rather the king in whose name he had treated with them, was bound to perform all the articles of the treaty. He
1649. had miscarried so in the siege of Dublin that it very much lessened the opinion of his military conduct: yet his constant attendance on his master, his easiness to him, and his great sufferings for him, raised him to be lord steward of the household, and lord lieutenant of Ireland. He was firm to the protestant religion, and so far firm to the laws that he always gave good advices: but even when bad ones were followed, he was not for complaining too much of them.

MS. 49. | The earl of Southampton was next to these. He was a man of great virtues, and of very good parts: he had a lively apprehension, and a good judgment. He had merited much by his constant adhering to the king's interests during the war, and by the large supplies he had sent him every year during his exile; for he had a great estate, and only three daughters to inherit it. He was made lord treasurer: but he grew soon weary of business; for as he was subject to the stone, which returned often and violently upon him, so he retained the principles of liberty, and did not go in to the violent measures of the court. When he saw the king's temper, and his way of managing, or rather of spoiling,

[1] See Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 703.

[2] See *infra* 309, and note thereto. The details of these transactions will be best read in Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, ii. 112 *et seq.*

96

business, he grew very uneasy, and kept himself more out of the way than was consistent with that high post. The king stood in some awe of him, and saw how popular he would grow if put out of his service: and therefore he chose rather to bear with his ill humour and contradiction, than to dismiss him [1]. He left the business of the treasury wholly in the hands of his secretary, sir Philip Warwick, who was an honest but a weak man; he understood the common road of the treasury; but, though he pretended to wit and politics, he was not cut out for that, and least of all for writing of history. But he was an incorrupt man, and during seven years management of the treasury he made but an ordinary fortune out of it [2]. Before the restoration the lord treasurer had only a small salary, with an allowance for a table, but he gave, or rather sold, all the subaltern places, and made great profits out of the estate of the crown: but now, that being gone, and the earl of Southampton disdaining to sell places, the matter was settled so, that the lord treasurer was to have £8000 a year, and the king was to name all the subaltern officers. And it continued to be so all his time: but since that time the lord treasurer has both the £8000 and a main hand in the disposing of those places.

[1] 'The good old man.' Pepys, May 15, 1663. 'Sir William Coventry did to-day mightily magnify my late Lord Treasurer for a wise and solid, though infirm man: and, among other things, that when he hath said it was impossible in nature to find this or that sum of money, and my Lord Chancellor hath made sport of it, and told the king that when my lord hath said it was impossible yet he hath made shift to find it, and that was by Sir G. Carteret's getting credit, my lord did once in his hearing say thus, which he magnifies as a great saying—that impossible would be found impossible at last; meaning that the king would run himself out beyond all his credit and funds, and then we should too late find it impossible; which is, he says, now come to pass.' *Id.* Feb. 14, 1669. He died on May 16, 1667, and was 'said to die with the cleanest hands that ever any Lord Treasurer did.' *Id.* May 19, 1667.

[2] Warwick had previously been secretary under Juxon. In 1660 he was restored also to the Clerkship of the Signet, knighted, and elected for Westminster. He remained Secretary to the Treasury until 1667, and died in 1683. His memoirs were published in 1701. See Clarendon, *Cont.* 816, 817, on his general worth, and Pepys, *passim*, on his qualities as a business man. On Southampton and his salary, see Pepys, Sept. 9, 1665.

CHAP. I.

The man that was in the greatest credit with the earl of Southampton was sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, who had married his niece [1], and became afterwards so considerable, that he was raised to be earl of Shaftesbury. Since he came to have so great a name, and that I knew him for many years, and in a very particular manner, I will dwell a little longer on his character; for it was of a very extraordinary composition. He began to make a considerable figure very early. Before he was twenty, he came into the house of commons, and was on the king's side, and undertook to get Wiltshire and Dorsetshire to declare for him, but he was not able to effect it. Yet prince Maurice breaking articles to a town that he had got to receive him, furnished him with an excuse to forsake that side, and to turn to the parliament [2]. He had a wonderful faculty in speaking to a popular assembly, and could mix both the facetious and the serious way of arguing very agreeably. He had a particular talent of making others trust to his judgment, and depend on it: and he brought over so many to a submission to his opinion, that I never knew any man equal to him in the art of governing parties, and of making himself the head of them. He was, as to religion, a deist at best [3]. He had the dotage of astrology [4] in him to a high

[1] Margaret, daughter of the second Lord Spencer of Wormleighton, and sister of the Earl of Sunderland. She was Cooper's third wife. By this marriage he was connected also with Lord Russell, who married Southampton's second daughter. Cooper was placed on the Privy Council through Monk's influence. Clarendon, *Cont.* 13; *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1664–5, 436. He received a grant of his office of Chancellor and Under Treasurer of the Exchequer for life in May, 1661. *Id.* 1660–1, 604.

[2] The question of Shaftesbury's change of front will be found fully discussed in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

[3] A person came to make him a visit whilst he was sitting one day with a lady of his family, who retired upon that to another part of the room with her work, and seemed not to attend to the conversation between the earl and the other person, which turned soon into some dispute upon subjects of religion; after a good deal of that sort of talk, the earl said at last, 'People differ in their discourse and profession about these matters, but men of sense are really but of one religion.' Upon which says the lady of a sudden, 'Pray, my lord, what religion is that which men of sense agree in?' 'Madam,' says the earl immediately, 'men of sense never tell it.' O.

[4] Astrology was the fashionable nonsense of the day. Cf. *supra* 47,

degree: he told me, that a Dutch doctor had from the stars foretold him the whole series of his life. But that which was before him, when he told me this, proved false, if he told true: for he said he was yet to be a greater man than he had been. He fancied that after death our souls lived in stars. He had a general knowledge of the slighter parts of learning, but understood little to bottom: so he triumphed in a rambling way of talking, but argued slightly when he was held close to any point. He had a wonderful faculty at opposing, and running things down; but had not the like force in building up. He had such an extravagant vanity in setting himself out, that it was very disagreeable. He pretended that Cromwell offered to make him king. He was indeed of great use to him, in withstanding the enthusiasts of that time. He was one of those who pressed him most to accept of the kingship, because, as he said afterwards, he was sure it would ruin him. His strength lay in the knowledge of England, and of all the considerable men in it. He understood well the size of their understanding and their tempers: and he knew how to apply himself to them so dexterously, that, though by his changing sides so often it was very visible how little he was to be depended on, yet he was to the last much trusted by all the discontented party[1]. He had [a] no sort of virtue, for he was both a lewd and corrupt man and had [a] no regard either to truth or justice. | He was not ashamed to reckon up the many turns he had made: and he valued himself on the doing it at the properest season, and in the best manner: and was not out of countenance in owning his

CHAP. I. 97 MS. 50.

[a] struck out.

62, and *infra* 350. Lilly (*Fairfax Corr. Civil Wars*, ii. 47, 74) and Gadbury were its most noted professors. See *Letters of Dorothy Osborne*, 287, and Sidney's *Diary*, i. 253. The *Life and Times of W. Lilly* was published from the original MS. in 1715, and reprinted in 1822.

[1] I was told by one that was very conversant with him, that he had a constant maxim, never to fall out with any body, let the provocation be never so great, which he said he had found great benefit by all his life; and the reason he gave for it was, that he did not know how soon it might be necessary to have them again for his best friends. D.

CHAP. I.

unsteadiness and deceitfulness. This he did with so much vanity, and so little discretion, that he lost many by it, and his reputation was at last run so low that he could not have held much longer, had not he died in good time, either for his family or for his party. The former would have been ruined if he had not saved it by betraying his party[1].

Another man very near of the same sort, who passed through many great employments, was Annesley, advanced to be earl of Anglesea; who had much more knowledge, and was very learned, chiefly in the law. He had a faculty of speaking indefatigably upon every subject: but he spoke ungracefully, and did not know that he was ill at raillery, for he was always attempting it. He understood our government well, and had examined far into the original of our constitution. He was capable of great application, and was a man of a grave deportment, but stuck at nothing, and was ashamed of nothing. He was neither loved nor trusted by any man or any side: and he seemed to have no regard to the common decencies of justice and truth, but sold every thing that was in his power: and sold himself so often, that at last the price fell so low that he grew useless, because he was so well known that he was universally despised[2].

[1] This account of Shaftesbury omits, in especial, the facts that upon commercial questions he was more advanced than any statesman of his time; and that he was always in favour of the liberal treatment of protestant dissent. Where party or personal feeling did not interfere his views were humane, as when in 1663 he successfully opposed a bill for the transportation of persons convicted of petty larceny. For an unrelieved censure on Shaftesbury's character see Salmon, 696, and, for his rehabilitation, Christie's *Life*. Mr. Traill, in his monograph in *Twelve English Statesmen*, has some interesting remarks upon his position as a parliamentary debater and as the first strictly party leader.

[2] There seems to be nothing to justify this strongly adverse character of Annesley, though it is clear from the *Essex Papers* and many other sources that he was not liked. See Lord Lansdowne's *Works*, ii. 260. He was President of the Council of State immediately before the Restoration, was created Earl of Anglesea, 1661, and was in continual employment, though without power, for twenty-two years; and he died in April, 1686. He had 'a smooth, sharp, and keen pen,' wrote several books, and is noted for his knowledge of records and Church History, and as the first nobleman who collected a great library. His chief interest

Holles was a man of great courage, and of as great pride. He was counted for many years the head of the presbyterian party. He was faithful and firm to his side, and never changed through the whole course of his life. He engaged in a particular opposition to Cromwell in the time of the war. They hated one another equally. Holles seemed to carry this too far: for he would not allow Cromwell to have been either wise or brave; but often applied Solomon's observation to him, *that the battle was not to the strong, nor favour to the men of understanding, but that time and chance happened to all men.* He was well versed in the records of parliament, and argued well, but too vehemently; for he could not bear contradiction. He had the soul of an old stubborn Roman in him. He was a faithful but a rough friend, and a severe but fair enemy. He had a true sense of religion, and was a man of an unblameable course of life, and of a sound judgment when it was not biassed by passion. He was made a lord for his merit in bringing about the restoration [1].

CHAP. I. 98

The earl of Manchester was made lord chamberlain [2]: a man of a soft and obliging temper, of no great depth, but universally beloved, being both a virtuous and a generous man. The lord Robarts [3] was made lord privy seal, after-

lay in Irish affairs. Cf. *infra* 312 and ff. 225, 429. His MS. Diary, written in an ostentatiously religious style is in the British Museum, *Add. MSS.* 18730, and there is a curious notice of him in the *H. M. C. Rep.* ii. 213.

[1] Cf. *supra* 50. Denzil Holles, created Baron Holles of Ifield, April 20, 1661, was ambassador to France from July, 1663, until May, 1666. His uncompromising assertion of his dignity and his punctiliousness in matters of personal etiquette (cf. f. 207) were the cause of a good deal of friction, removed by the skill and attractions of Charles's sister Henrietta (Mrs. Ady's *Madame*, 150–161), and by the counsels of Bennet. See the latter's postscript to his letter to Holles of May 26, 1664. *Original Letters and Negotiations* (1724), i. 141; his own letters to Fanshawe in the same volume; and Arlington's *Letters* (1701), ii. 16. He died Feb. $16\frac{7}{8}\frac{9}{0}$ after a life of incessant political activity.

[2] Clarendon, *Cont.* 44: *supra* 154, *infra* 341, and f. 263. Manchester was chosen Speaker of the House of Lords. He died in May, 1671.

[3] Robarts was appointed at the Restoration temporary Deputy for Monk, who was made Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; and he succeeded Ormond in that post in 1668, f. 266. He was created Earl of Radnor, 1679; was dismissed from the Presidentship of Council, 1684; and died 1685.

CHAP. I.

wards lord lieutenant of Ireland, and at last lord president of the council. He was a man of a morose and cynical temper, just in his administration, but vicious under the appearances of virtue: learned beyond any man of his quality, but intractable, stiff and obstinate, proud and jealous.

These five, whom I have named last, had the chief hand in engaging the nation in the design of the restoration. They had great credit, chiefly with the presbyterian party, and were men of much dexterity. So the thanks of that great turn was owing them: and they were put in great posts by the earl of Clarendon's means[1], by which he lost most of the cavaliers, who could not bear the seeing such men so highly advanced and so much trusted[2].

See ff. 460, 477, 592. On his character, see Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 355. Clarendon, *Cont.* 198, bears out Burnet's account. He adds, 'he had parts which in council and parliament were very troublesome; for of all men alive, who had so few friends, he had the most followers.' See also Ludlow, ii. 495; Pepys, March 2, $166\frac{7}{4}$. In the *Harl. MSS.* Brit. Mus. 2224, there are some MS. extracts from the *Journals of the House of Lords*, 1643–4, with original notes by Robarts. See Sandford, *Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion*, 291, note.

[1] 'In the maddest of our rejoicings it will be very difficult to satisfy the expectations of men for Majesty to walk so evenly as not to give offence to our formerly dissenting Grandees.' Edward Butterfield to Sir Ralph Verney, May 4, 1660, *Verney MSS.* The conferring of high posts, in the first instance, upon Presbyterians was a necessity. But the inner cabal was composed of staunch royalists, Hyde, Colepepper, Ormond, and Nicholas. Clarendon, *Cont.* 3. Southampton appears to have confined himself strictly to the work of the Treasury. He and Hertford were the only genuine royalists included in Monk's suggested list of privy councillors.

[2] The Earl of Clarendon, upon the restoration, made it his business to depress everybody's merits to advance his own, and (the king having gratified his vanity with high titles) found it necessary, towards making a fortune in proportion, to apply himself to other means than what the crown could afford (though he had as much as the king could well grant); and the people who had suffered most in the civil war were in no condition to purchase his favour. He therefore undertook the protection of those who had plundered and sequestered the others, which he very artfully contrived, by making the king believe it was necessary for his own ease and quiet to make his enemies his friends; upon which he brought in most of those who had been the main instruments and promoters of the late troubles, who were not wanting in their acknowledgments in the manner he expected, which produced the great house in the Picadille, furnished chiefly with cavaliers' goods, brought thither for peace-offerings, which

At the king's first coming over, Monk and Mountague were the most considered They both had the garter[1]. CHAP. I.

the right owners durst not claim when they were in his possession. In my own remembrance Earl Paulett was an humble petitioner to his sons, for leave to take a copy of his grandfather and grandmother's pictures (whole lengths drawn by Vandyke), that had been plundered from Hinton St. George; which was obtained with great difficulty, because it was thought that copies might lessen the value of the originals. And whoever had a mind to see what great families had been plundered during the civil war, might find some remains either at Clarendon house or at Cornbury. D. The truth of the latter part of this relation is confirmed by the Hon. G. A. Ellis in his curious account of the division and subsequent reunion of Lord Clarendon's collection of portraits. See *Historical Inquiries respecting the character of the Earl of Clarendon*, Lond. 1827, pp. 27–46. [The imputations against Clarendon in the first part of Dartmouth's note will be found fairly refuted by Lady Theresa Lewis in the Introduction to her work on *The Clarendon Gallery*, 1852.] Evelyn, who had suggested the improvement of his collection to the noble owner, accounts, in a letter to Pepys, August 12, 1689, for the extensiveness of it in the following way: 'When Lord Clarendon's design of making this collection was known, everybody who had any of the portraits, or could purchase them at any price, strove to make their court by presenting them. By this means he got many excellent pieces of Vandyke, and other originals by Lely and other the best of our modern masters.' [See also his letter to Clarendon, March 18, 1667.] As to his neglect of his fellow-sufferers in the late times, the same author indeed observes, that 'the Lord Chancellor made few friends during his grandeur among the royal sufferers, but advanced the old rebels.' August 27, 1667. He seems to have in part renewed his former connections before the civil war, from private regard as well as public policy, rather than from censurable motives, although it is true that they have been imputed to him. It is a curious circumstance, that, when he was created an earl, the ceremony is thus noticed by Evelyn: 'Edward lord Hide, lord chancellor, earle of Clarendon, supported by y^e^ earles of Northumberland and Sussex; y^e^ earle of Bedford carried the cap and coronet, the earle of Warwick the sword, the earle of Newport the mantle.' April 22, 1661. One would have supposed, if we leave out the last-mentioned nobleman, that this had been the court not of King Charles but of King Pym. R. The disgust of the Cavaliers is well expressed in the following letter from one of them; *H. M. C. Rep.* v. 105. 'As yet men of my loyalty have only our mouths filled with laughter and our hearts [with heaviness]. His Majesty, having not hitherto found enough in honours and offices to satisfy his enemies, expects his loyal friends will stay till he be more able.' This view found frequent expression in Parliament. See especially the *Petition of the distressed Royalists, Parl. Hist.* iv. 234, and *Somers Tracts*, vii. 516 557; Pepys, March 7, 166½; Dec. 15, 1665.

[1] This favour was bestowed at Canterbury with every circumstance that could render their adhesion

CHAP. I. The one was made duke of Albemarle, and the other earl of Sandwich, and they had noble estates given them. Monk was ravenous, as well as his wife, who was a mean and contemptible creature. They both asked and sold all that was within their reach, nothing being denied them for some time; till he became so useless, that little personal regard could be paid him. But the king maintained still the appearances of it: for the appearance of the service he did him was such, that the king thought it fit to treat him with great distinction, even after he saw into him, and despised him[1]. He took care to raise his kinsman Grenville, who was made earl of Bath, and groom of the stole, a mean[a] minded man, who thought of nothing but of getting and spending money[2]; only in spending he had

[a] *and base* struck out.

secure, since the one was master of the army, the other of the navy. *H. M. C. Rep.* v. 144, 154. Monk was made Master of the Horse, and received the garter from the king himself, 'for his princely blood and signal services.' Cf. Rugge's *Diurnal.* This was an admission of his claim that he was descended from the Plantagenets, Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick, and Arthur Plantagenet, natural son of Edward IV, his title being derived from a place in Normandy formerly belonging to them. 'Margaretam enim filiam primogenitam et unam cohaeredum inclitissimi proceris Richardi Beauchampe, Warwici et Albemarliae comitis, post invictissimum Bedfordiae ducem regentis Franciae et ducatus Normanniae locum tenentis. Johannes Talbot, bellicosissimus ille Salopiae comes uxorem ducit.' And Arthur Plantagenet, an illegitimate son of Edward IV, married a descendant of this marriage. Peck's *Desid. Cur.* Monk was also appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, resigning the post to Ormond in Nov. 1661. On July 13 he entered the House of Peers as Baron Monk of Potheridge, Beauchamp and Heyes, Earl Torrington, and Duke of Albemarle, with a pension of £7,000 a year and the estate of New Hall in Essex. He had, in Colepepper's words in 1659, found 'all his ends (those of honour, power, profit and safety), with the king better than in any other way he can take.' *Clar. St. P.* iii. 413. For his wife, Anne, daughter of John Clarges, a farrier in the Savoy, her breeding and character, and her previous relations with other men, see Jesse, *Memoirs of the Court of England*, iii. 431–3. See also Aubrey's *Lives* (1813), ii. part 2, 451.

[1] See a character of the Duke of Albemarle [and the high opinion of his usefulness and powers which prevailed] in Lord Lansdowne's *Works*, ii. 263. Cole. In 1668 Albemarle still enjoyed uninterrupted consideration. See for a striking instance, Ranke, iii. 490.

[2] See this account of Sir John Grenville put in a true light, Lansdowne, ii. 257. Cole. Bevill Higgons,

a peculiar talent of doing it with so ill a grace and so bad a conduct, that it was long before those who saw how much he got, and how little he spent visibly, would believe he was so poor as he was found to be at his death: which was [a]thought to be[a] the occasion of his son's shooting himself in the head a few days after his death, finding the disorder of his affairs; for both father and son were buried together. The duke of Albemarle raised two other persons. One was Clarges, his wife's brother, who was an honest but haughty man[1]. He became afterwards a very considerable parliament man, and valued himself on his opposing the court, and on his frugality in managing the public money; for he had Cromwell's economy ever | in his mouth, and was always for reducing the expense of war to the modesty and parsimony of those times. Many thought he carried this too far: but it made him very popular. After he was become very rich by the public money, he seemed to take care that nobody else should grow so rich as he was in that way. Another person raised by the duke of Albemarle was Morrice[2], who was [b][the person that had chiefly prevailed with Monk to declare for the king; upon that he was made secretary of state][b]. He was very learned, but full of pedantry and affectation. He had no

CHAP. I.

99

MS. 51.

[a] interlined afterwards. [b] These bracketed words are written by another hand on the opposite page, or, if written by Burnet, written when his hand was very feeble.

129, states that Grenville had a warrant for his Earldom and a pension of £3,000 a year signed at Brussels some months before Charles and Monk met, though not actually created earl until the coronation. He was one of the gentlemen of the bed-chamber before the Restoration, though never in favour with Clarendon; and, with Mordaunt, he brought the king's Declaration and Letters from Breda. He died in 1701.

[1] Knighted at Breda; member for Westminster in the Convention Parliament, and for Southwark at a bye-election in 1666; Commissary General of Musters; died 1695.

[2] Lord Lansdowne, ii. 259, asserts that Morrice was appointed without Monk's knowledge. He retained the Secretaryship until 1668. There is a curious account in the *Verney MSS.* of a dispute between Morrice and the Bishop of Lincoln, over the relative antiquity of Oxford and Cambridge, in which the Secretary and the Prelate very nearly came to blows. Dr. Denton to Sir R. Verney, Nov. 24, 1665. Morrice died in 1676.

CHAP. I. true judgment about foreign affairs; and Albemarle's judgment of them may be measured by what he said when he found the king grew weary of Morrice, but that in regard to him had no mind to turn him out: upon which the duke of Albemarle replied, he did not know what was necessary for a good secretary of state in which he was defective, for he could speak French and write short hand [1].

Nicholas was the other secretary, who had been employed by king Charles the first during the war, and had served him faithfully, but had no understanding in foreign affairs. He was a man of virtue, but could not fall in to the king's temper, or become acceptable to him [2]. So, not long after the restoration, Bennet, advanced afterwards to be earl of Arlington, was by the interest of the popish
1662. party made secretary of state, and was admitted into so particular a confidence that he began to raise a party in opposition to the earl of Clarendon. He was a proud and insolent man. His parts were solid, but not quick. He had the art of observing the king's temper, and managing it beyond all the men of that time. He was believed a papist; he had once professed it, and when he died he again reconciled himself to that church. Yet in the whole course of his ministry he seemed to have made it a maxim, that the king ought to shew no favour to popery, but that all his affairs would be spoiled if ever he turned that way; which made the papists become his mortal enemies, and accuse him as an apostate and the betrayer of their interests. He was a man of great vanity, and lived at

[1] There appears to be no other evidence as to Morrice's power of writing shorthand. It was, however, the great accomplishment of William Clarke, Monk's old secretary, of whom Monk was perhaps thinking.

[2] Nicholas was secretary during the exile, and had to struggle against the pronounced dislike of the queen-mother, both before and after the Restoration. Pepys, Nov. 16, 1667. 'Secretary Nicholas,' says Clarendon, 'was a very honest and industrious man, and always versed in business.' See the *Nicholas Papers* (Camd. Soc.), ed. Warner. Unfortunately they are at present printed up to 1655 only. He ceased to be Secretary in October, 1662, nominally on account of his age, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 525, but probably through the influence of the queen-mother and Lady Castlemaine. He died in 1669.

a vast expense, without taking any care of paying the debts which he contracted to support that[1]. His chief friend was Charles Berkeley, made earl of Falmouth, who, without any visible merit[2], unless it was the managing the king's amours, was the most absolute of all the king's favourites: and, which was peculiar to himself, he was as much in the duke of York's favour as in the king's[3]. He was generous in his expense: and it was thought if he had outlived the lewdness of that time, and come to a more

[1] He was esteemed so good a courtier, that it was said he died a Roman Catholic to make his court to King James. But whatever his religion might be, he always professed himself of the whig party, as many papists had done before him: and particularly the famous Lambert declared a little before his death [1683], he had always been of the church of Rome. D. As early as 1654, Bennet was the chosen confidant of Charles, *Clar. St. P.*, July 8, 1654; and in 1656-7 was his envoy at Madrid; but he seems never to have been in favour with James; *id.* Jan. 28, 1657. He was made Secretary in Oct 1662. During 1663 he was created a Baron, and Earl of Arlington in 1672, when he received the Garter also. His influence in foreign affairs was largely due (as in later times with Carteret) to the fact that he was the only one of the king's ministers, except Morrice (*supra* 180), who could speak foreign languages with ease. See Evelyn, Sept. 10, 1668; and Jusserand, *A French Ambassador at the Court of Charles II*, 52. He had been educated for the Church and had acquired a good knowledge of the classics. The evidence as to his religion is collected in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* In the *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 295, Peter Talbot speaks of him as a 'creature of Lord Bristol,' and as an enemy of the Catholics, meaning obviously his own section of them. But see Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 109, which is contradictory to this. His marriage to a Dutch lady, Isabella van Beverweert, daughter of Louis of Nassau, and sister of Ossory's wife, was probably of service to him in dealing with the States. Of his ability as a diplomatist, Mignet's account of the negotiations leading to the Treaty of Dover, *Négociations relatives, &c.*, is sufficient evidence. Sheffield, however, though his account of Bennet is on the whole favourable, calls him, 'rather a subtle courtier than an able statesman'; and Carte says he was regarded as a 'fourbe' in politics.

[2] See Clarendon, *Cont.* 62, for part of this man's merit. O. Pepys observes, that no man, except the king, wished him alive again, after being killed in the engagement with the Dutch [at Solebay, June 3], 1665. Pepys, June 9, 1665. But it appears, that the earl's friend, Sir William Coventry, held him in great esteem, setting aside his subserviency to the king in his pleasures. *Id.* August 30, 1668. R. See Clarendon's characters of Digby, Bennet, and Berkeley in the Appendix to the *Clarendon State Papers*, li-lxxxiv.

[3] Lauderdale also enjoyed the full favour of both Charles and James. It was not until the very close of his life that he lost that of the latter.

CHAP. I. 100

sedate course of life, he would have put the king on great and noble designs. This I should have thought more likely, if I had not had it from the duke, who had so wrong a taste[a], that there was reason to suspect his judgment both of men and things. Bennet and he had the management of the mistress, and all the earl of Clarendon's enemies came about them: the chief of whom were the duke of Buckingham and the earl of Bristol.

The first of these was a man of a noble presence. He had a great liveliness of wit, and a peculiar faculty of turning all things into ridicule, with bold figures and natural descriptions. He had no sort of literature: only he was drawn into chemistry, and for some years he thought he was very near the finding the philosopher's stone; which had the fate that attends on all such men as he was, when they are drawn in, to lay out for it. He had no principles either of religion, virtue, or friendship. Pleasure, frolic, and extravagant diversions, was all that he laid to heart. He was true to nothing: for he was not true to himself[1]. He had no steadiness nor conduct: he could keep no secret, nor execute any design without spoiling it. He could never fix his thoughts, nor govern his estate, though then the greatest in England. He was bred about the king, and for many years he had a great ascendant over him: but he spake of him to all persons with that contempt that at last he drew a lasting disgrace upon himself; and he also ruined both body and mind, fortune and reputation equally. The madness of vice appeared in his person in very eminent instances; since at last he became contemptible and poor, sickly, and sunk in his parts, as well as in all other respects, so that his conversation was as much avoided as ever it had been courted. He found the king, when he came from his travels in the year 45, newly come to Paris, sent over by

[a] *of these things* struck out.

[1] No consequence. S.

his father when his affairs declined: and finding him enough inclined to receive ill impressions, he, who was then got into all the impieties and vices of the age, set himself to corrupt the king, in which he was too successful, being seconded in that wicked design by the lord Percy. And to complete the matter, Hobbes was brought to him [1], under the pretence of instructing him in mathematics: and he laid before him his schemes, both with relation to religion and politics, which made deep and lasting impressions on the king's mind. So that the main blame of the king's ill principles and bad morals was owing to the duke of Buckingham [2]. CHAP. I.

The earl of Bristol was a man of courage and learning, of a bold temper and a lively wit, but of no judgment nor steadiness. He was | in the queen's interests during the war at Oxford, and he studied to drive things past the possibility of a treaty or any reconciliation; fancying that nothing would make the military men so sure to the king as his being sure to them, and giving them hopes of sharing the confiscated estates among them; whereas, he thought, all discourses of treaty made them feeble and fearful. When he went beyond sea he turned papist; but it was after a way of his own: for he loved to magnify the difference between the church and the court of Rome [3]. He was esteemed a very good speaker: but he was too copious and too florid. He was set at the head of the popish party, and was a violent enemy of the earl of Clarendon. MS. 52. 101

[1] Cf. f. 187.

[2] Butler says in his *Characters*, [*Genuine Remains* (1756), ii. 72,] 'The duke of Bucks is one that has studied the whole body of vice.' And says also of this abominable man, 'that continual wine, women, and music, had debauched his understanding.' O. See *supra* 90, note, and Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 291: and compare the *Essex Papers* (Camd. Soc.), i. 271, for the King's 'Buckingham hours.' Upon the character sketches of Buckingham, Walpole writes thus: 'Burnet has hewn it out with his rough chisel; Count Hamilton touched it with that slight delicacy which finishes while it seems but to sketch; Dryden caught the living likeness; Pope completed the historical resemblance.' *Royal and Noble Authors.*

[3] 'I am a catholic of the church of Rome, not of the court of Rome,' are the words of the Earl of Bristol in a speech addressed by him to the House of Commons, July 1, 1663. *Parl. Hist.* iv. 274.

CHAP. I.

Having now said as much as seems necessary to describe the state of the court and ministry at the restoration, I will next give an account of the chief of the Scots, and of the parties that were formed among them [1]. The earl of Lauderdale, afterwards made duke, had been for many years a zealous covenanter: but in the year '47 he turned to the king's interests, and had continued a prisoner from Worcester fight, where he was taken. He was kept for some years in the Tower of London, in Portland castle, and in other prisons, till he was set at liberty by those who called home the king [2]. So he went over to Holland. And since he continued so long, and, contrary to all men's opinion, in so high a degree of favour and confidence, it may be expected that I should be a little copious in setting out his character; for I knew him very particularly. He made a very ill appearance: he was very big: his hair was red, hanging oddly about him: his tongue was too big for his mouth, which made him bedew all that he talked to: and his whole manner was rough and boisterous, and very unfit for a court. He was very learned, not only in Latin, in which he was a master, but in Greek and Hebrew. He had read a great deal in divinity, and almost all the historians ancient and modern: so that he had great materials. He had with these an extraordinary memory, and a copious but unpolished expression. He was a man, as the duke of Buckingham called him to me, of a blundering understanding, not always clear, but often clouded, as his looks were always. He was haughty beyond expression; abject to those he saw he must stoop to, but imperious and insolent and brutal to all others. He had a violence of passion that carried him often to fits like madness, in which he had no temper. If he took a thing

March, 1660.

[1] It ought to be specially noted here that upon the course of affairs in Scotland, and the characters of the chief actors in that country throughout this reign,—that is upon what he knew most about,—Burnet is, in spite of his strong political and personal predilections, conspicuously accurate and fair.

[2] He was released from Windsor Castle in March, $16\frac{5}{6}\frac{9}{0}$.

wrong, it was a vain thing to study to convince him: that would rather provoke him to swear he would never be of another mind: he was to be let alone, and then perhaps he would have forgot what he had said, and come about of his own accord. He was the coldest friend and the violentest enemy I ever knew: I felt it too much not to know it. He at first seemed to despise wealth: but he 102 delivered himself up afterwards to luxury and sensuality: and by that means he ran into a vast expense, and stuck at nothing that was necessary to support that. In his long imprisonment he had great impressions of religion on his mind: but he wore these out so entirely that scarce any trace of them was left. His great experience in affairs, his ready compliance with every thing that he thought would please the king, and his bold offering at the most desperate counsels, gained him such an interest in the king, that no attempt against him, nor complaint of him, could ever shake it, till a decay of strength and understanding forced him to let go his hold. He was in his principles much against popery and arbitrary government: and yet, by a fatal train of passions and interests, he made way for the former, and had almost established the latter. And, whereas some by a smooth deportment make the first beginnings of tyranny less unacceptable and discernable, he, by the fury of his behaviour, heightened the severity of his ministry, which was liker the cruelty of an inquisition than the legality of justice, not to say mercy. With all this he was at first a presbyterian, and retained his aversion to king Charles I. and his party to his death [1].

[1] See the *Quarterly Review* for April, 1884, 'Lauderdale and the Restoration.' The *Lauderdale Papers*, from which the account of his character is derived, fully bear out the statements in the text, which, however, omit the broad and pungent wit, and the brutal *bonhomie* which probably went as far as anything else in securing Charles's favour. Lauderdale was an 'engager' in 1648, and in the interests of Charles in 1650–1, but was, up to the Restoration, nominally a Presbyterian, and, as may be seen from Baillie *passim*, in the highest repute among good Presbyterians. The tyranny of Presbyterianism made such a profession absolutely necessary for any of the nobility who wished to keep in the

CHAP. I.

The earl of Crawford had been his fellow prisoner for ten years, and that was a good title for maintaining him in the post he had before, of being lord treasurer [1]. He was a sincere but weak man, passionate and indiscreet, and continued still a zealous presbyterian. The earl, afterwards duke, of Rothes [2], had married his daughter, and had the merit of a long imprisonment likewise to recommend him: he had a ready dexterity in the management of affairs, with a soft and insinuating address: he had a quick apprehension with a clear judgment: he had no advantage of education, no sort of literature, nor had he travelled abroad: all in him was mere nature, but it [was] nature very much depraved; for he seemed to have freed himself from all the impressions of virtue or religion, of honour or good nature. He delivered himself, without either restraint or decency, to all the pleasures of wine and women. He had but one maxim, to which he adhered firmly, that he was to do every thing, and deny himself in nothing, that might maintain his greatness, or gratify his appetites. He was unhappily made for drunkenness; for as he drank all his friends dead, and was able to subdue two or three sets

front of political life. As to his reputation among his friends for real religion, Balcarres, himself a man of genuine piety, expresses at the time of Lauderdale's imprisonment his assurance that he 'will go to the saints.' The proverb 'Jeune hermite, vieux diable,' applies to him with especial truth. See Baxter's letter of sorrowful reproof, *Lauderdale Papers*, iii. 235. Cf. Clarendon's account, *Cont.* 96, and *Malet Papers*, iii. f. 1, where it is entitled 'Mr. Richard Baxter's Canting Letter.' For an account of his high intellectual cultivation, his interest in literature, and the splendour of his house at Ham after his marriage to Lady Dysart, see Roger North's *Lives of the Norths*, i. 232, ed. 1890, and Evelyn, August 27, 1678. Pepys, July 28, 1666, records Lauderdale's dislike of music, expressed in his usual forcible style. Hostile critics of Burnet point with justice to what Cole calls his 'fawning and abject dedication' to Lauderdale of his *Vindication of the Authority of the Church and State of Scotland* in 1673, which, after the quarrel between them, he took great pains to suppress. It may be seen in the British Museum copy of the work, in Salmon's *Examination*, 466, and in Rose's *Observations upon Fox's James II*, App. vi.

[1] He gave up this post in June, 1663, and was succeeded by Rothes. Mackenzie, *Memoirs*, 113.

[2] John, sixth Earl, first Duke, of Rothes.

of drunkards one after another, so it scarce ever appeared that he was disordered; and after the greatest excesses, an hour or two of sleep carried them off so entirely that no sign of them remained: he would go about business without any uneasiness, or discovering any heat either in body or mind. This had a terrible conclusion; | for after he had killed all his friends, he fell at last under such a weakness of stomach, that he had perpetual cholics, when he was not hot within and full of strong liquor, of which he was presently seized; so that he was always either sick or drunk. CHAP. I. MS. 53.

The earl of Tweeddale was another of Lauderdale's friends[1]. He was early engaged in business, and continued in it to a great age: he understood all the interests and concerns of Scotland well: he had a great stock of knowledge, with a mild and obliging temper. He was of a blameless, or rather an exemplary, life in all respects. He had loose thoughts both of civil and ecclesiastical government; and seemed to think that what form soever was uppermost was to be complied with. He had been in Cromwell's parliaments, and had abjured the royal family, which lay heavy on him. But the disputes about the guardianship of the duchess of Monmouth and her elder sister, to which he pretended in the right of his wife, who was their father's sister, against their mother, who 103
was Rothes's sister, drew him into that compliance, that brought a great cloud upon him: though he was in all other respects the ablest and worthiest man of the nobility: only he was too cautious and fearful.

A son of the marquis of Douglas, made earl of Selkirk, had married the heiress of the family of Hamilton, who by her father's patent was duchess of Hamilton[2]: and when

[1] His son, Lord Yester, married Lauderdale's daughter and heiress Anne. Tweeddale was a man of good sense, and always an advocate of tolerance. Cf. ff. 239-246.

[2] Hamilton, like Rothes, was a hard drinker, and both received personal rebukes from Charles II on that ground. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 81, 90. The lucrative Commissionership of Taxes and Fines afforded him the funds for raising the family from

CHAP. I.

the heiress to a title in Scotland marries one not equal to her in rank, it is ordinary, at her desire, to give her husband the title for life: so he was made duke Hamilton. He then passed for a soft man, who minded nothing but the recovery of that family from the great debts under which it was sinking, till it was raised up again by his great managing. After he had compassed that, he became a more considerable man. He wanted all sorts of polishing: he was rough and sullen, but candid and sincere. His temper was boisterous, neither fit to submit nor to govern. He was mutinous when out of power, and imperious in it. He wrote well, but spoke ill: for his judgment when calm was better than his imagination. He made himself a great master in the knowledge of the laws, of the history, and of the families of Scotland, and seemed always to have a great regard to justice and the good of his country: but a narrow and selfish temper brought such an habitual meanness on him, that he was not capable of designing or undertaking great things.

Another man of that side that made a good figure at that time was Bruce, afterwards earl of Kincardine[1], who

its load of debt, and also acquired for him the nickname of 'The Great Publican.' He led the first organized opposition to Lauderdale in 1673, *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 241 *et seq.*, and was the head of the 'Party' or 'Faction' in 1676 and onwards. Both he and the duchess were in favour of toleration, he because his rent-roll suffered by the persecution of his tenants, she from sympathy with them.

[1] Alexander Bruce was the second son of Sir George Bruce of Clackmannan, whose father, also Sir George, possessed coal mines at Culross, stone quarries, salt mines, &c., which founded the fortunes of the family. His elder brother Edward was the first earl, the peerage being created at Carisbrooke in 1647, and Alexander succeeded him in 1661. See his brilliant correspondence after 1660 with Lauderdale and Robert Moray, in the *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. and iii. For his earlier letters to Moray, while in exile (still more interesting, and displaying the most varied knowledge), see the *Scottish Review*, Jan. 1885. There was scarcely a subject admitting of practical experiment in which he was not actually interested, and there is ample evidence that his absorption in these pursuits, as Burnet says, hindered him from becoming a great political figure. Moray to Kincardine, Aug. 22, 1668. After Robert Moray himself he was certainly the most interesting Scotchman of his time.

had married a daughter of Mr. Somelsdyck in Holland, and by that means he had got acquaintance with our princes beyond sea, and had supplied them liberally in their necessities. He was both the wisest and the worthiest man that belonged to his country, and fit for governing any affairs but his own; which he by a wrong turn, by his love of the public, neglected to his ruin; for they consisting much in works, coals, salt, and mines, required much care; and he was very capable of it, having gone far in mathematics, and being a great master at all mechanics. His thoughts went slow, and his words came much slower: but a deep judgment appeared in every thing he said or did. He had a noble zeal for justice, in which even friendship could never bias him. He had solid principles of religion and virtue, which shewed themselves with great lustre on all occasions. He was a faithful friend, and a merciful enemy. I may be perhaps inclined to carry his character too far; for he was the first man that entered into friendship with me. We continued for seventeen years in so entire a friendship, that there was never either 104
reserve or mistake between us all the while till his death; and it was from him that I understood the whole secret of affairs; for he was trusted with every thing. He had a wonderful love to the king; and would never believe me when I warned him what he might look for, if he did not go along with an abject compliance in every thing. He found it true in conclusion; and the love he bore the king

CHAP. I.

Mackenzie's account of him in his *Memoirs* fully confirms that of Burnet. He was married in 1659 to Veronica, daughter of Van Arson Van Sommelsdyck, Lord of Sommelsdyck and Spycke in Holland, with a fortune of 80,000 guilders; at the Restoration he was made a Privy Councillor, and, in 1667, Extraordinary Lord of Session and Commissioner of the Treasury. He opposed the introduction of Episcopacy into Scotland, and afterwards consistently did his best for toleration. He was, like Moray (although, before the Restoration, by 'monarchy' he understood 'tyranny'; Moray to Kincardine, *Transcripts of Correspondence*), a *persona grata* with Charles, and supported Lauderdale as long as he conscientiously could, until 1676; suffering in his turn from Lauderdale's ingratitude. He died July 9, 1680.

CHAP. I. made his disgrace sink deeper in him than became [a] such [a] a philosopher or so good a Christian as he was.

I now turn to another set of men, of whom the earls of Middleton and Glencairn were the chief[1]; and they were followed by the rest [b] of the cavalier party, who were now very fierce and full of courage over their cups, though they had been very discreet managers of it in the field, and in time of action; but now every one of them vaunted that he had killed his thousands, and all were full of merit, and as full of high pretensions, far beyond what all the wealth and revenue of Scotland could answer. The subtilest of all lord Middleton's friends was sir Archibald Primrose[2], a man of long and great practice in affairs; for he and his father had served the crown [c] successively [c] an hundred
MS. 54. years | all but one, when he was turned out of employment. He was a dexterous man in business: he had always expedients ready at every difficulty. He had an art of speaking to every man according to their sense of things, and so drew out their secrets, while he concealed his own: for words went for nothing with him. He said every thing that was necessary to persuade those he spoke to, that he was of their mind, and did it in so genuine a way that he seemed to speak his heart. He was always for soft counsels and slow methods: and thought that the chief thing that a great man ought to do was to raise his family and his kindred, who would naturally stick to him; for he had seen so much of the world, that he did not depend much on friends, and so took no care of making any. He always advised the earl of Middleton to go on slowly in the king's business, but to do his own effectually, before

[a] interlined. [b] *herd* struck out and *rest* substituted.
[c] interlined by a feeble hand.

[1] See *supra* 104, 106, 107; *infra* 199, &c. Glencairn was brother-in-law to Tweeddale.

[2] Primrose, who was made Clerk-Register, with the title of Lord Carrington, became the adherent of Lauderdale when it was clear that his was the stronger side. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 180. He died in 1679.

the king should see that he had no farther occasion for him. That earl had another friend who had more credit with him, though Primrose was more necessary for managing a parliament: he was sir John Fletcher, made the king's advocate or attorney-general: for Nicolson[1] was dead. Fletcher was a man of a generous temper, who despised wealth, except as it was necessary to support a vast expense; he was a bold and fierce man, who hated all mild proceedings, and could scarce speak with decency or patience to those of the other side, so that he was looked on by all that had been faulty in the late times, as an inquisitor-general[2]. On the other hand, Primrose took money [a] liberally,[a] and was the intercessor for all who made such effectual applications to him. CHAP. I. 105

CHAPTER II.

THE SETTLEMENT OF SCOTLAND AND THE 'DRUNKEN' ADMINISTRATION.

THE first thing that was to be thought on with relation to Scottish affairs, was the manner in which offenders in the late times were to be treated: for all were at mercy. In the letter the king writ from Breda to the parliament of England, he had promised a full indemnity for all that was past, excepting only those who had been concerned in his father's death: to which the earl of Clarendon persuaded

[a] substituted for *with both hands* struck out.

[1] See *supra* 99.

[2] Middleton appears to have offended the Scotch Bar by the appointment of his kinsman Fletcher, who succeeded Sir Thomas Hope (*supra* 34). There were many members of the bar senior in the profession and of equal reputation who were passed over. Fletcher had been a leading criminal counsel under the Commonwealth, and was suspected during that time of corresponding with Middleton. Mackenzie, *Memoirs*, 9; Kirkton, *History of the Church of Scotland*, 66. In the reign of terror which now followed, his office was one which enabled him to amass vast sums from bribery. Omond's *Lord Advocates of Scotland*, i. 172. His influence ceased with that of Middleton, and he resigned, Sept. 14, 1664.

CHAP. II. the king to adhere in a most sacred manner, since the breaking of faith in such a point was that which must for ever destroy confidence, and the observing all such promises seemed to be a fundamental maxim in government, which was to be maintained in such a manner, that not so much as a stretch was to be made in it. But there was no promise made for Scotland: so all the cavaliers, as they were full of revenge, hoped to have the estates of those who had been chiefly concerned in the late wars divided among them. The earl of Lauderdale told the king, on the other hand, that the Scottish nation had turned eminently, though unfortunately, to serve his father in the year 48, that they had brought himself among them, and had lost two armies in his service, and had been under nine years' oppression on that account; that they had encouraged and assisted Monk in all he did: they might be therefore highly disgusted, if they should not have the same measure of grace and pardon that he was to give England [1]. Besides, the
1651. king, while he was in Scotland, had, in the parliament at Stirling [2], passed a very full act of indemnity, though in the terms and with the title of an act of approbation. It is true, the records of that parliament were not extant, but lost in the confusion that followed upon the reduction of that kingdom: yet the thing was so recent in every man's memory, that it might have a very ill effect if the king should proceed without a regard to it. There was indeed another very severe act made at that parliament against all that should treat with or submit to Cromwell, or comply in any sort with him: but in that, he said, a difference ought to be made between those who during the struggle had deserted the service, and gone over to the enemy, of which number it might be fit to make some examples, and the rest of the kingdom, who upon the general reduction

[1] Lauderdale's object was to secure his power in the first instance upon the sympathy of his countrymen. He appears to have expressed his displeasure at the burning of the Covenant by the hangman. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 260.

[2] See *supra* 96.

had been forced to capitulate: it would seem hard to punish any for submitting to a superior force, when they were in no condition to resist it. This seemed reasonable: and the earl of Clarendon acquiesced in it; but the earl of Middleton and his party complained of it, and desired that the marquis of Argyll, whom they charged with an accession to the king's murder, and some few of those who had joined in the remonstrance while the king was in Scotland, might be proceeded against. The marquis of Argyll's craft made them afraid of him, and his estate made them desire to divide it among them. His son, the lord Lorn, was come up to court, and was well received by the king: for he had adhered so firmly to the king's interests, that he would never enter into any engagements with the usurpers [1]: and upon every new occasion of jealousy he was | clapt up. In one of his imprisonments he had a terrible accident from a cannon bullet [2], which the soldiers were throwing to exercise their strength; it by a recoil struck him in the head, and made such a fracture in his skull, that the operation of the trepan, and the cure, was counted one of the greatest performances of surgery in that time. The difference between his father and him went on to a total breach [3]; so that his father was set upon the disinheriting him of all that was still left in his power. Upon the restoration the marquis of Argyll went up to the Highlands for some time, till he advised with his friends what to do; who were divided in opinion. He writ by his son to the king, asking leave to come and wait on him. The king gave an answer that seemed to encourage it, but did not bind him to any thing. I have forgot the words: there was an equivocating in them that did not become a prince: but his son told me, he wrote them very particularly to his father, without any advice of his own.

CHAP. II.

106

MS. 55.

[1] In 1655 he entered into a bond of £5,000 with Monk. Thurloe, iv. 162.

[2] In 1658. The general of the castle was 'playing at bulletts' with him. Moray to Alex. Bruce. *Transcripts of Correspondence.* See also Baillie, iii. 367.

[3] See Firth's *Scotland and the Commonwealth*, xxxix, 120, and especially 166.

CHAP. II. Upon that the marquis of Argyll came up so secretly, that he was within Whitehall, before his enemies knew any thing of his journey[1]. He sent his son to the king, to beg admittance. But instead of that, he was sent to the Tower, and orders were sent down for clapping up three of the chief remonstrators. Of these Warriston was one: but he had notice sent him before the messenger came: so he made his escape, and went beyond sea, first to Hamburg[2]. He had been long courted by Cromwell, and had stood at a distance from him for seven years: but in the last year of his government he had gone into his counsels, and was summoned as one of his peers to the other house, as it was called. He was after that put into the council of state after Richard was put out: and then in another court set up by Lambert and the army, called the committee of safety. So there was a great deal against him. Swinton[3], one of Cromwell's lords, was also sent down a prisoner to Scotland. And thus it was resolved to make a few examples in the parliament that was to be called as soon as
July 7, 1660.
107 the king could be got to prepare matters for it. It was resolved on to restore the king's authority to the same state it was in before the wars, and to raise such a force as might be necessary to secure the quiet of that kingdom for the future.

It was a harder point, what to do with the citadels that were built by Cromwell, and with the English garrisons that were kept in them. Many said, it was necessary to keep that kingdom in that subdued state at least till all things were settled, and that there were no more danger from thence. The earl of Clarendon was of this mind. But the earl of Lauderdale laid before the king, that the conquest Cromwell had made of Scotland was for their

[1] See Argyll's letter to Clarendon (undated) asking for the king's clemency, in Lister, *Life of Clarendon*, iii. 129.

[2] For the kidnapping and death of Warriston, see *infra* 354 and 364.

[3] Swinton and Sir William Lockhart were the only two Scotchmen who were members of the Council which assisted Monk in the government of Scotland after July, 1655. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1655, 108, 152, 255.

adhering to him: he might then judge what they would think, who had suffered so much and so long on his account, if the same thraldom should be now kept up by his means. It would create an universal disgust [1]. He told the king, that the time might come in which he would wish rather to have Scotch garrisons in England. It would become a national quarrel, and lose the affections of the country to such a degree, that perhaps they might join with the garrisons, if any disjointing happened in England against him: whereas, without any such badge of slavery, Scotland might be so managed that they might be made entirely his. The earl of Middleton and his party durst not appear for so unpopular a thing. So it was agreed on, that the citadels should be evacuated and slighted, as soon as the money could be raised in England for paying and disbanding the army. Of all this the earl of Lauderdale was believed the chief adviser. So he became very popular in Scotland. CHAP. II.

The next thing that fell under consideration was the church, and whether bishops were to be restored or not. The earl of Lauderdale at his first coming to the king stuck firm to presbytery. He told me, the king spoke to him to let that go, for it was not a religion for gentlemen. He being really one, but at the same time resolving to get into the king's confidence, studied to convince the king by a very subtle method to keep up presbytery still in Scotland. He told him, that both king James and his father had ruined their affairs by engaging in the design of setting up episcopacy in that kingdom: and by that means Scotland became discontented, and was of no use to them: whereas the king ought to govern them according to the

[1] The Restoration, to the Scotch nobility, meant in the first instance the recovery of national freedom, and perhaps also of their own supremacy. See especially the letter from Crawford, Lauderdale, and Sinclair who were then in London to friends in Scotland. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 6, 18. According to Sharp, Clarendon insisted upon retaining the English garrisons until episcopacy was restored. See Sharp's letters to Middleton, May 20, 25, 1661, *id.* ii. App. iii; and Mackenzie's *Memoirs*, 24.

CHAP. II. grain of their own inclinations, and so make them sure to him: he ought, instead of endeavouring an uniformity in both kingdoms, to keep up the opposition between them, and rather to increase than to allay that hatred that was between them: and then the Scots would be ready, and might be easily brought, to serve him upon any occasion
MS. 56. | of the disputes he might afterwards have with the parlia-
108 ment of England: all things were then smooth, but that was the honey-moon, and it could not last long: nothing would keep England more in awe, than if they saw Scotland firm in their duty and affection to him: whereas nothing gave them so much heart, as when they knew Scotland was disjointed. It was a vain attempt to think of doing any thing in England by means of the Irish, who were a despicable people, and had a sea to pass: but Scotland could be brought to engage for the king in a silenter manner, and could serve him more effectually. He therefore laid it down as a maxim from which the king ought never to depart, that Scotland was to be kept quiet and in good humour, that the opposition of the two kingdoms was to be kept up and heightened: and then the king might reckon on every man capable of bearing arms in Scotland as a listed soldier, who would willingly change a bad country for a better. This was the plan he laid before the king. I cannot tell whether this was only to cover his zeal for presbytery, or on design to encourage the king to set up arbitrary government in England[1].

To fortify these advices, he wrote a long letter in white ink to a daughter of the earl of Cassillis, lady Margaret Kennedy[2],

[1] This must be interpreted in the light of later events, in 1669 and 1672. See *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 140–176; *Quarterly Review*, April 1884, 437; *English Hist. Review*, July 1886, 446, 450, 456. At the present moment, however, the most immediate reason for Lauderdale's advice was the fear of losing influence in Scotland.

[2] See her *Letters*, published by the Bannatyne Club. In Cockburn's *Remarks*, 46, 47, it is stated that the marriage was kept secret for some time, since Lady Margaret Kennedy was an inmate of the Duke of Hamilton's house; and that, as soon as it was known, it broke off Burnet's friendship with that family.

who was in great credit with the party, and was looked on as a very wise and good woman, and was out of measure zealous for them. I married her afterwards, and after her death found this letter among her papers: in which he expressed great zeal for the cause: he saw the king was very indifferent in the matter, but he was easy to those who pressed for a change: which, he said, nothing could so effectually hinder as the sending up many men of good sense, but without any noise, who might inform the king of the aversion the nation had to that government, and assure him that, if in that point he would be easy to them, he might depend upon them as to every thing else, and more particularly, if he stood in need of their service in his other dominions: but he charged her to trust very few, if any, of the ministers with this, and to take care that Sharp might know nothing of it: for he was then jealous of him. This had all the effect that the earl of Lauderdale intended by it. The king was no more jealous of his favouring presbytery; but looked on him as a fit instrument to manage Scotland to serve him in the most desperate designs: and on this was all his credit with the king founded. In the mean time Sharp, seeing the king cold in the matter of episcopacy, thought it was necessary to lay the presbyterians asleep[1], and to make them apprehend no danger to their government, and to engage the public resolutioners to proceed against all the protesters; that so those who were like to be the 109
most inflexible in the point of episcopacy might be censured by their own party, and by that means the others might become so odious to the more violent presbyterians, that thereby they might be the more easily disposed to submit to episcopacy, or at least might have less credit to act against it. So he, being pressed by those who employed him, to procure somewhat from the king that might look like a confirmation of their government, and put to silence all discourses of an intended change, obtained by the earl of Lauderdale's means, that a letter should be writ by the

CHAP. II.

[1] *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 24-91.

CHAP. II. king to the presbytery of Edinburgh, to be communicated by them to all the other presbyteries in Scotland, in which he confirmed the general assemblies that sat at St. Andrews and Dundee while he was in Scotland, and that had confirmed the public resolutions; and he ordered them to proceed to censure all those who had protested against them, but[a] would not now submit to them. The king did also confirm their presbyterian government, as it was by law established. This was signed and sent down without communicating it to the earl of Middleton or his party. But as soon as he heard of it, he thought Sharp had betrayed the design; and sent for him, and charged him with it. He said, in his own excuse, that somewhat must be done for quieting the presbyterians, who were beginning to take the alarm: that might have produced such applications as would perhaps make some impression on the king: whereas now all that was secured, and yet the king was engaged to nothing; for his confirming their government, as it was established by law, could bind him no longer than while that legal establishment was in force: so
MS. 57. the reversing of that would release the king. | This allayed the earl of Middleton's displeasure a little. Yet Primrose told me, he spake often of it with great indignation, since it seemed below the dignity of a king thus to equivocate with his people, and to deceive them. It seemed that Sharp thought it was not enough to cheat the party himself, but would have the king share with him in the fraud. This was no honourable step to be made by a king, and to be contrived by a clergyman. The letter was received with transports of joy: the presbyterians reckoned they were safe, and they began to proceed severely against the protesters, which was set on by some aspiring men, who hoped to merit by the heat expressed on this occasion[1]. And if Sharp's impatience to get into the archbishopric of

[a] *but* substituted for *and*.

[1] See the letter from Robert Douglas and George Hutcheson to Lauderdale, Nov. 10, 1660. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 34.

St. Andrews had not wrought too strong in him, it would have given a great advantage to the restitution of episcopacy if a general assembly had been called, and the two parties had been let loose on one another. That would have shewn the impossibility of maintaining the government of the church in a parity, and the necessity of setting a superior order over them for keeping them in unity and peace. CHAP. II. 110

The king settled the ministry in Scotland[1]. The earl of Middleton was declared the king's commissioner for holding the parliament and general of the forces that were to be raised: the earl of Glencairn was made chancellor: the earl of Lauderdale was secretary of state: the earl of Rothes president of the council: the earl of Crawford was continued in the treasury: Primrose was clerk register, which is very like the place of the master of the rolls in England. The rest depended on these; but the earls of Middleton and Lauderdale were the two heads of the parties. The earl of Middleton had a private instruction, which, as Lauderdale told me, was not communicated to him, to try the inclinations of the nation for episcopacy, 1660.

[1] The composition of the Scottish ministry was a compromise between the influences of Clarendon and Lauderdale. Of Middleton the former had held a very high opinion since 1652, when he describes him, in language which is grotesque in the light of later events, as being 'as worthy a person as ever that nation bred, of great modesty, courage, and judgement, worthy of any trust.' *Clar. St. P.*, August 23, 1652. The similar terms used by Baillie at the Restoration were those of hope rather than of experience. With Middleton went Glencairn, who obtained the Chancellorship through Monk's influence, and Primrose. But the critical contest, that for the Secretaryship ('the most considerable in all the land of cakes,' Alexander Bruce to Lauderdale, Jan $\frac{18}{28}$, 1660), which gave the holder constant access to the king, a matter all important in the case of one of Charles's nature, was won by Lauderdale, who besides possessing the qualities already described had the merit of a long imprisonment, against Newburgh, who had been with the king in 1653, and who was on terms of affectionate intimacy with Clarendon. *Clar. St. P.* Dec. 26, 1656. Crawford, his fellow-prisoner in the Tower, and shortly Rothes, Crawford's son-in-law, must be counted on Lauderdale's side. Middleton's initial mistake was that he paid his court to Clarendon instead of directly to the king.

CHAP. II.

and to consider of the best methods in setting it up[1]. This was drawn from the king by the earl of Clarendon: for he himself was observed to be very cold in it. While these things were doing, Primrose got an order from the king to put up all the public registers of Scotland, which Cromwell had brought up and lodged in the Tower of London, as a pawn upon that kingdom, and in imitation of what king Edward I was said to have done when he subdued that nation. They were put up in fifty hogsheads, and a ship was ready to carry them down. But it was suggested to Clarendon that the original covenant signed by the king, and some other declarations under his hand, were among them[2]; and he apprehending that at some

[1] In his official instructions, Dec. 17, 1660, there is not a word about the Church. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 39.

[2] Dr. Montague showed it me in the library belonging to Trinity College in Cambridge. D. It is there still, but *not* signed by the king. Charles 'swore and subscryved the covenant' on board ship at the mouth of the Spey on the Sunday before he landed on coming from Holland, in the presence of Mr. John Livingstone, one of the Scottish Commissioners, who records that 'for the outward part of swearing and subscryving the Covenant the King performed anything that could have been required.' *Life of Livingstone* (Wodrow Soc., *Sel. Biog.*). Sir E. Walker was also present. *Journal*, 158. On July 1, 1650, the Covenant 'subscrybed by the King's Maj^ties' was 'produced and read in parliat,' and on July 12 in the Assembly. This document, which recites the 1580 Confession of Faith, with the Solemn League and Covenant, is on a large sheet of parchment, endorsed by Archibald Johnston, Clerk Register, and by Kerr for the Assembly, which will be found among the *Clarendon MSS.* in the Bodleian, vol. 40, f. 80 (*Cal. Clar. St. P.* ii. p. 67, No 347). Burnet states that Clarendon searched for it in vain. But in the *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660-1, 260, there is the statement of William Ryley, clerk in the Record Office, dated Sept. 7, 1660, that he was highly commended by Newburgh, Robinson, and Middleton, for finding the Covenant among the Scotch papers; that Lauderdale was highly displeased, but that they said that mattered not, for 'the Book of Common Prayer would soon be settled in Scotland'; while in the vol. for 1668–9, 135, the same William Ryley sends in a petition for help on the ground that, 'in 1660, I aided my father in sorting the Scottish records, where we found the original of the "Solemn League and Covenant," and refused £2,000 offered by the Scots to deliver it up.' Clarendon doubtless refrained from publishing the discovery, and the copy in the Bodleian was probably the one found by Ryley. The personal engagement of Charles runs as follows:—'I Charles, King of

time or other an ill use might have been made of these, he would not suffer them to be shipped till they were visited: nor would he take Primrose's promise of searching for these carefully, and sending them up to him. So he ordered a search to be made. None of the papers he looked for were found. But so much time was lost that the summer was spent: so they were sent down in winter: and by some easterly gusts the ship was cast away

Great Brittane, France, and Ireland, doe assure and declair by a solemne oath in the presence of Almighty God, the searcher of hearts, my allowance and approbation of the Nationall Covenant and of the Solemne League and Covenant above written, and faithfully obleidge myselfe to prosecute the ends thereof in my station and calling, and that I for myselfe and successors shall consent and agree to all Actes of Parliat enjoyning the Nationall Covenant and the Solemne League and Covenant, and fully establishing presbyteriall government, Directory of Worship, Confession of Faith, and Catechismes in the kingdome of Scotland, as they are approven by the Generall Assembly of this Kirk and parliat of this kingdome, and I shall give my Royall consent to the Actes of Parliat (bills or ordinances past or to be past in the houses of parliat) C. R. enjoyning the same in the rest of my Dominions, and that I shall observe these in my owne practise and family and shall never make opposition to any of these or endeavour any change y^r^of. Charles R.' By the marginal addition in brackets, Charles promised to accept the establishment of Presbyterianism as already existing by virtue of ordinances and bills passed by the Long Parliament, to which neither his father nor himself had given assent. *Charles II and Scotland in* 1660, Pref. xxii. The king's previous promise to sign, and the letter from the Commissioners, saying that they are satisfied with this promise, are also in these MSS. David Laing, in his 'Notes on the Scottish Covenant,' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, iv. 240, quotes from an unsigned and undated MS. list of persons owning original copies of the Covenant, which he thinks may have been prepared for the work known as Dunlop's *Collection of Confessions*, Edinb. 1719 and 1722, a statement that a copy 'subscribed by Charles 2^nd^, the Nobility and others at his Coronation,' was at that time in the hands of Mr. James Anderson, Writer to the Signet at Edinburgh; but of the existence of this no further evidence has been found. Finally, there was sold to an unknown purchaser at the Burton-Constable sale, on June 26, 1889, a document on parchment, possibly that just mentioned, endorsed (apparently in a later hand) 'National Covenant and Solemn Leage and Covenant subscribed by King Charles the Second at his Coronation, Anno 1651,' which, from its contents, was evidently a copy of that in the Bodleian. Mr. Joseph Bain, to whom I am indebted for this information, has no doubt as to the genuineness of the signature, after comparison with others in the Record Office.

CHAP. II. near Berwick. So we lost all our records[1]; and we have nothing now but some fragments in private hands to rely on, having made at that time so great a shipwreck of all our authentic writings. This heightened the displeasure the nation had at the designs then on foot.

The main thing, upon which all other matters depended, was the method in which the affairs of Scotland were to be conducted. The earl of Clarendon moved, that there might be a council settled to sit regularly at Whitehall on
1661. Scotch affairs[2], to which every one of the Scotch privy
111 council that happened to be on the place should be admitted: but with this addition, that, as two Scotch lords were called to the English council, so six of the English were to be of the Scotch council. The effect of this would have been, that whereas the Scotch counsellors had no great force in English affairs, the English, as they were men of great credit with the king, and were always on the place, would have the government of the affairs of Scotland wholly in their hands. This probably would have saved that nation from much injustice and violence, when there was a certain method of laying their grievances before the king: complaints would have been heard, and matters well examined: Englishmen would not, and durst not, have given way to crying oppression and illegal proceedings: for though these matters did not fall under the cognizance of an English parliament, yet it would have very much blasted a man's credit, that should have concurred in such methods of government as were put in practice afterwards in that kingdom. Therefore all people quickly saw how wise a project this was, and how happy it would have proved if affairs had still gone in that channel. But the earl of Lauderdale opposed this with all his strength. He told the king, it would quite destroy the scheme he had

[1] Not all, but most that were of special value. Primrose to Lauderdale, Jan. 19, 1661. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 64.

[2] Clarendon himself states that this was moved by the Scotch Commissioners. *Cont* 97.

laid before him, which must be managed | secretly, and by men that were not in fear of the parliament of England, nor obnoxious to it. He said to all Scottishmen, this would make Scotland a province to England, and subject it to English counsellors, who knew neither the laws nor the interests of Scotland, and yet would determine every thing relating to it: and all the wealth of Scotland would be employed to bribe them, who, having no concern of their own in the affairs of that kingdom, must be supposed capable of being turned by private considerations. To the presbyterians he said, this would infallibly bring in not only episcopacy, but every thing else from the English pattern. Men who had neither kinred nor estates in Scotland would be biassed chiefly by that which was most in vogue in England, without any regard to the inclination of the Scots. These things made great impressions on the Scottish nation. The king himself did not much like it; but the earl of Clarendon told him, Scotland, by a secret and ill management, had begun the embroilment of his father's affairs, which could never have happened if the affairs of that kingdom had been under a more equal inspection: if Scotland should again fall into new disorders, he must have the help of England to quiet them: and that could not be expected if the English had no share in the conduct of matters there. The king yielded to it: and this method was followed for two or three years; but was afterwards broke by the earl of Lauderdale, when he got into the chief management. He began early to observe some uneasiness in the king at the earl of Clarendon's positive way; he saw the mistress hated him: and he believed she would in time be too hard for him: therefore he made great applications to her. But his conversation was too coarse: and he had not money enough to support himself by presents to her: so he could not be admitted into that cabal which was held in her lodgings. He saw that in a council, where men of weight who had much at stake in England bore the chief sway, he durst not have

CHAP. II. MS. 58. 112 1663.

CHAP. II. proposed those things by which he intended to establish his own interest with the king, and to govern that kingdom which way his pride or passion might guide him. Among others, he took great pains to persuade me of the great service he had done his country by breaking that method of governing it; though we had all occasion afterwards to see how fatal that proved, and how wicked his design in it was.

I have thus opened with some copiousness the first beginnings of this reign; since, as they are little known, and I had them from the chief of both sides, so they may guide the reader to observe the progress of things better in the
1660. sequel than he could otherwise do. In August the earl of Glencairn was sent down to Scotland, and had orders to call together the committee of estates[1]. This was a practice begun in the late times: when the parliament made a recess, they appointed some of every state to sit and act as a council of state in their name till the next session; for which they were to prepare matters, and to which they gave an account of their proceedings. Now when the parliament of Stirling was adjourned, the king being present,
1651. a committee had been named: so, such of these as were yet alive were summoned to meet, and to see to the quiet of the nation, till the parliament should be brought together;
1661. which did not meet before January. On the day in which
Aug. 23, 1660. the committee met, ten or twelve of the protesting ministers met likewise at Edinburgh, and had before them a warm paper[2] prepared by one [James] Guthrie, one of the violentest of the whole party. In it, after some cold compliments to

[1] This was in answer to a petition from 'the Noblemen, Gentlemen, and Burgesses of your Majesties Antient Kingdom of Scotland, mett at London by your Majesties authority.' *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 32.

[2] *Life of John Livingstone*, ii. 205; Wodrow, i. 160. The paper is dated Feb. 22, 1651. Wodrow gives it *in extenso*, i. 68. James Guthrie had been professor at St. Andrews, minister of Lauder 1638 and of Stirling 1649. He was a leading protester in 1650, and was the author and presenter of the Western Remonstrance. There is a Life of him published by the Committee of the Assembly in 1847. See also Howie, *Scots Worthies*, ed. Carslaw (1870), 257.

the king upon his restoration, they put him in mind of the covenant he had so solemnly sworn while among them: they lamented that, instead of pursuing the ends of it in England, as he had sworn to do, he had set up the common prayer in his chapel, and the order of bishops: upon which they made terrible denunciations of heavy judgments from God on him, if he did not stand to the covenant, which they called the oath of God. The earl of Glencairn had notice of this meeting: and he sent and seized on them all, together with this remonstrance. The paper was voted scandalous and seditious: and the ministers were all clapt in prison, and were threatened with great severities. Guthrie was kept still in prison, who had brought the others together, but the rest were after a while's imprisonment let go. Guthrie, being minister of Stirling while the king was there, had let fly at him in his sermons in a most indecent manner; which at last became so intolerable that he was cited to appear before the king to answer for some passages in his sermons: he would not appear, but declined the king and his council, | who, he said, were not proper judges of matters of doctrine, for which he was only accountable to the judicatories of the kirk. He also protested for remedy of law against the king, for thus disturbing him in the exercise of his ministry. This personal affront had irritated the king more against him than against any other of the party[1]; and it was resolved to strike a terror into them all by making an example of him. He was a man of [a] courage, and went through all his trouble with great firmness. But this way of proceeding struck the whole party with such a consternation, that it had all the effect which was designed by it: for whereas the pulpits had, to the great scandal of religion, been places where the preachers had for many years vented their spleen and arraigned all

CHAP. II.

113

Aug. 1660.

MS. 59.

[a] *great* struck out.

[1] Middleton had his own private quarrel with Guthrie, *supra*, 107 note, and *infra*, 227.

CHAP. II. proceedings, they became now more decent, and there was a general silence every where with relation to the affairs of state: only they could not hold from many sly and secret insinuations, as if the ark of God was shaking and the glory departing. A great many offenders were summoned, at the king's suit, before the committee, and required to give bail that they should appear at the opening of the parliament, and answer to what should be then objected to them. Many saw the design of this was to fright them to a composition, and also into a concurrence with the measures that were to be taken. [a]The greater part [a] complied, and redeemed themselves from further vexation by such presents as they were able to make. And in these transactions Primrose and Fletcher were the great dealers.

In the end of the year Middleton came down with great magnificence: his way of living was the greatest the nation had ever seen: but it was likewise the most scandalous; for vices of all sorts were the open practices of those about him. Drinking was the most notorious of all, which was
114 often continued through the whole night to the next morning: and many disorders happening after those irregular heats, the people, who had never before that time seen any thing like it, came to look with an ill eye on every thing that was done by such a set of lewd and vicious men [1]. This laid in all men's minds a new prejudice against episcopacy: for they, who could not examine into the nature of things, were apt to take up a very ill opinion of every change in religion that was brought about by such bad instruments. There had been a face of gravity and piety in the former administration, which made the libertinage of the present time more odious.

[a] *For* and *they* struck out.

[1] The administration was known as 'The Drunken Administration.' Middleton appears to have deteriorated rapidly with prosperity: cf. *supra*, 199 note.

The earl of Middleton opened the parliament on the first of January with a speech setting forth the blessing of the restoration: he magnified the king's person, and enlarged on the affection that he bore to that his ancient kingdom: he hoped they would make suitable returns of zeal for the king's service, that they would condemn all the invasions which had been made on the regal authority, and assert the just prerogative of the crown, and give supplies for keeping up such a force as was necessary to secure the public peace, and to preserve them from the return of such calamities as they had so long felt. The parliament writ in answer to the king's letter a letter full of duty and thanks. The first thing proposed was to name lords of the articles. In order to the apprehending the importance of this, I will give some account of the constitution of that kingdom.

The parliament was anciently the king's court, where all who held lands of him were bound to appear. All sat in one house, but they were considered as three estates. The first was the church, represented by the bishops, and mitred abbots, and priors. The second was the baronage, the nobility and gentry who held their baronies of the king. And the third was the boroughs, who held of the king by barony, though in a community. So that the parliament was truly the baronage of the kingdom. The lesser barons grew weary of this attendance: so in king James the first's time (during the reign of Henry IV. of England) they were excused from it, and were impowered to send proxies, to an indefinite number, to represent them in parliament. Yet they neglected to do this. And it continued so till king James the sixth's time, in which the mitred abbots being taken away, and few of the titular bishops that were then continued appearing at them, the church lands being generally in lay hands, the nobility carried matters in parliament as they pleased: and as they oppressed the boroughs, so they had the king much under them. Upon this the lower barons got themselves to be 115

CHAP. II.

restored to the right which they had neglected near two hundred years. They were allowed by act of parliament to send two from a county: only some smaller counties send only one. This brought that constitution to a truer balance; and the lower barons have a right to choose, at their county courts after Michaelmas, their commissioners, to serve in any parliament that may be called within that
MS. 60. year. | And they who choose them sign a commission to him who represents them. So the sheriff has no share of the return; and in the case of controverted elections the parliament examines the commissions, and see[s] who has the greatest number, and judge[s] whether every one that signs it had a right so to do. The boroughs[a] choose their members out of their own body when the summons goes out: and all are chosen by the men of the corporation, or, as they call them, the town council. And these sit in one house, and vote together. Anciently the parliament sat only two days, the first and the last. On the first they chose those who were to sit on the articles, eight for every state, to whom the king joined eight officers of state. These received all the heads of grievances or articles that were brought to them, and formed them into bills as they pleased: and on the last day of the parliament, these were all read, and were approved or rejected by the whole body. So they were a committee that had a very extraordinary authority, since nothing could be brought before the parliament but as they pleased. This was pretended to be done only for the shortening and dispatching of sessions. The crown was not contented with this limitation, but got it to be carried further. The nobility came to choose the eight bishops, and the bishops to choose eight noblemen: and these sixteen chose the eight barons, (so the representatives for the shires are called,) and the eight burgesses. By this means our kings did upon the matter choose all the lords of the articles; so entirely had they got the liberty of that parliament into their hands.

[a] *only* struck out

During the late troubles they had still kept up a distinction of three estates, the lesser barons making one: and then every estate might meet apart, and name their own committees: but still all things were brought in and debated in full parliament. So now the first thing proposed was, the returning to the old custom of naming lords for the articles. The earl of Tweeddale opposed it, but was seconded only by one person. So it passed with that small opposition; only, to make it go easier, it was promised that there should be frequent sessions of parliament, and that all the acts should not be brought in in a hurry, and carried with the haste that had been practised in former times[1]. CHAP. II. 1661–1663.

[1] Burnet here anticipates the change by which, in 1663, Lauderdale succeeded in rendering the power of the crown absolute. To understand the bearing of this change it is necessary briefly to state the variations in practice which had preceded it. Without extending the research further backwards we find that from 1544 onwards the 'Electi ad Articulos,' or 'Lords of the Articles,' containing separate representations of clergy, barons, and burghs or boroughs—the number of members of each estate varying for each parliament—took the place of all previous committees. In May, 1592, for the first time, there is the fourfold division of clergy, nobles, barons, and boroughs. Also for the first time it is there mentioned that they were chosen 'by the whole estates'; and this is repeated up to 1609. Whether this means that the estates voted collectively, or that each estate, independently of the others, elected its own members, is not clear. In July, 1606, occurred the first attempt of the Crown to secure control of the 'Articles,' when James VI sent a letter from Greenwich *nominating* Lords of the Articles 'by reason there are some more perfectly acquainted than others with our favourable designs concerning the universal weal of that our kingdom.' His nominees were, however, elected 'by the whole estates,' as was also the case in 1607, 1609; though in these years there is no mention of the king's nomination. From 1612 to 1621 the Articles are merely 'elected,' without mention of the method of election. But in the critical year 1633 we find, for the first time, that the nobles elected eight of the clergy, the clergy eight of the nobles: 'and thereafter immediately the clergy and nobility being convened together, and having made publication of their several elections, they *all jointly together* elected and chose the persons following of the Commissioners of the Barons and Free Boroughs to be upon the Articles,' eight of each. So that Crawford's recollection was right, when he told Lauderdale in 1663, that 'it was the whole noblemen (he probably meant to include clergy in this term) that choosed the Barons and Burghs.' *Lauderdale*

CHAP. II. 116 The parliament granted the king an additional revenue for life of £40,000 a year, to be raised by an excise on

Papers, i. 138. In 1639 the Crown gained a point. Charles I, through his Commissioner Traquair, nominated *and elected* the eight nobles; the nobles, as a whole, nominated *and elected* the barons and boroughs. Argyll, however, while acquiescing in this innovation under the special circumstances, demanded the settlement of 'a perfect order of election in all time coming, whereby the Noblemen *by themselves*, the Barons *by themselves*, and the Boroughs *by themselves* (clergy are now, of course, not mentioned), may elect such of their own number as shall be upon the Articles.' The barons and boroughs handed in similar protests, demanding election of representatives in future by '*each state separately by itself without any other*.' Sir Thomas Hope, the king's Advocate ('a subtle lawyer,' says Burnet, *supra* 34), replied by asserting that the power of election of noblemen resided solely in the king, and that of the barons and boroughs solely in the noblemen. This doctrine was utterly repudiated, but was acquiesced in for the moment on the express condition that unless a settled order were established during that session, no other Act which should pass the Articles should be held to be of any force. After the election the protests were renewed by Argyll and others at the first meeting. Hope thereupon declared that they were 'contrary to the laws and Acts of Parliament, and derogatory to the inviolable and uncontroverted customs of all preceding Parliaments and liberties thereof'; while Huntly affirmed that 'the noblemen have been constantly in use to elect the Barons and Boroughs.'

Passing now to 1661, we find that, on January 8, the precedents of 1633 and 1639 were both ignored, and the practice previous to 1633 revived. The nobles, barons, and burghs each chose twelve members of their own body—as Argyll had demanded—the only intervention of the Crown being contained in the words, 'subject to the approbation of His Majesty's Commissioner.' Their meetings were to be preparatory only, and full power was reserved to Parliament to debate all matters which had passed through their hands. But, before episcopacy was restored by Act of Parliament (May 27, 1662), i. e. on May 8, 1662, nine bishops were added by the Crown, and it was declared that the nomination and constitution of the Articles should be as now settled, 'without prejudice of what course His Majesty shall take hereafter.' This brings us to 1663, when the great *coup* was brought off. The Commissioner, Rothes, informed the Parliament that 'it was His Majesty's expresse pleasure that in the constitution of Parliament and choosing of Articles at this session and in all time coming' the precedent of 1633 should be observed. What had been then done appears to have been a matter of recollection. Crawford, as we have seen, remembered correctly that *the whole body of the noblemen* elected the barons and the boroughs. But Lauderdale, probably at the suggestion of Primrose, resolved, while apparently maintaining the precedent of 1633, to make a simple but drastic alteration. By his scheme the clergy chose eight nobles, and the nobles eight clergy; 'which being done, the clergy and nobility

beer and ale, for maintaining a small force: upon which two troops and a regiment of foot guards were to be raised [1]. They ordered Montrose's quarters to be brought together, and they were buried with great state. They fell next upon the acts of the former times that had limited the prerogative: they repealed these, and asserted it with a full extent in a most extraordinary manner. Primrose had the drawing of these acts. He often confessed to me, that he thought he was as one bewitched while he drew them: for, not considering the ill use might be made of them afterwards, he drew them with preambles full of extravagant rhetoric, reflecting severely on the proceedings of the late times, and swelled them up with the highest phrases and fullest clauses that he could invent. In the act which asserted the king's power of the militia, the power of arming and levying the subjects was carried so far that it would have ruined the kingdom, if Gilmour,

met together, and having shown their elections to each other, the *persons elected* (*not* the whole nobility and clergy, as in 1633) . . . stayed together in that room (whilst all others removed) and *they* jointly made choice' of eight barons and eight burgesses. That is, these latter sixteen were chosen by sixteen episcopal clergy and nobles, every one of whom was pledged to the king, the clergy because they were episcopal clergy, the nobles because elected by the clergy; instead of by the whole body of both, which it would have been comparatively difficult to corrupt. Thus Burnet has placed in 1661 what ought to be placed in 1663. Having filched this power the Crown made sure of it by having the scheme adopted and 'recorded in the Register of Parliament *ad futuram rei memoriam*' (*Lauderdale Papers*, i. 134). In Lauderdale's own words, 'whether this way pitched upon be the old way exactly or no, sure. nothing ever was or can be devised more advantageous for the king than it' (*id.* 138); and, more emphatically, 'not only hath the King of Scotland his negative vote but, God be thanked, *by this constitution of the Articles* His Majesty hath the affirmative vote also; for nothing can come to the Parliament but through the Articles, and nothing can pass in Articles but what is warranted by His Majesty; *so that the king is absolute master in Parliament, both of the negative and affirmative*' (*id.* 173).

[1] This revenue had hitherto, or at any rate during the last twelve years, been raised by cess or land tax. Charles now promised not to re-impose this. A similar concession to the landed interest had already been made in England at the abolition of the Court of Wards. *Supra* 21, 162.

CHAP. II. an eminent lawyer, and a man of great integrity, who had now the more credit, for he had always favoured the king's side, had not observed that, as the act was worded, the king might require all the subjects to serve at their own charge, and so might oblige them, in order to the redeeming themselves from serving, to pay whatever might be set on them. So he made such an opposition to this that it could not pass, till a proviso was added to it, that the kingdom should not be obliged to maintain any force levied by the king, otherwise than as it should be agreed to in parliament, or in a convention of estates. This was the only thing that was then looked to: for all the other acts passed in the articles as Primrose had penned them, and from thence they were brought into parliament, and upon one hasty reading of them they were put to the vote, and were always carried.

One act troubled the presbyterians extremely. In the act asserting the king's power in treaties of peace and war, all treaties with any other nation not made by the king's authority were declared treasonable: and in consequence of this, the league and covenant made with England in the year [16]43 was condemned, and declared to be of no force for the future[1]. This was the idol of all the presbyterians: so they were much alarmed at it. But Sharp restrained all those with whom he had credit: he told them, the only way to preserve their government was, to let all that related to the king's authority be separated from it, and be condemned, that so they might be no more
MS. 61. | accused as enemies to monarchy, or as leavened with the
117 principles of rebellion. He told them, they must be contented to let that pass, that the jealousy which the king had of them as enemies to his prerogative might be extinguished in the most effectual manner. This restrained many, but some hotter zealots could not be governed. One Macquaird, a hot man, and considerably learned, did

[1] The Earl of Cassillis (*supra*, 89 note) refused the oath. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 63. Cf. *infra* 255, and f. 292.

in his church at Glasgow openly protest against this act, as contrary to the oath of God, and so void of itself. To protest against an act of parliament was treason by their law. And Middleton was resolved to make an example of him for terrifying others. But Macquaird was as stiff as he was severe, and would come to no submission: yet he was condemned only to perpetual banishment. Upon which he, and some others who were afterwards banished, went and settled themselves at Rotterdam, where they formed themselves into a presbytery, and writ many seditious books [1], and kept a correspondence over all Scotland, that being the chief seat of the Scottish trade: and by that means they did much more mischief to the government than they could have done had they continued still in Scotland. CHAP. II.

The lords of the articles grew weary in preparing so many acts as the practices of the former times gave occasion for; but did not know how to meddle with those acts that the late king had passed in the year [16]41, or the present king had passed while he was in Scotland. They saw, that, if they should proceed to repeal those by which presbyterian government was ratified, that would raise much

[1] 'There is a Damned book come hither from beyond sea called "Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland" &c., nameless. It hath all the Traytors' speeches on the scaffold here, and in a word all that a Toung set on fire by hell can say of things and persons hereaway.' Moray to Lauderdale, Dec. 10, 1667, *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 88. This was compiled by an eminent lawyer, Mr. (afterwards Sir) James Stuart of Goodtrees, and Mr. James Stirling, minister at Paisley. Wodrow, ii. 100. It was proclaimed on Dec. 12, and ordered to be burnt; all copies were to be brought in to the magistrates by Feb. 1, and a fine of £10,000 Scots was laid upon any one possessing a copy after that date. An answer to it was published by Bishop Honeyman, which drew from Stuart another book, *Jus Populi vindicatum*, 1671, 'which hath castin a greater reproach upon our religion and nation than any in print hath yet offered to doe.' Sharp to Lauderdale, Feb. 2, 1671, *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 213. Sharp ascribes it and *Naphtali* both to Mr. John Brown, a banished minister in Holland, 'who has published another book in Latin at Amsterdam against the Libertins and Erastians, in which he does most abusively traduce the proceedings of King and State.'

CHAP. II. opposition, and bring petitions from all that were for that government over the whole kingdom; which Middleton and Sharp endeavoured to prevent, that so the king might be confirmed in what they had affirmed, that the general bent of the nation was now turned against presbytery and for bishops. So Primrose proposed, but half in jest, as he assured me, that the better and shorter way would be to pass a general act rescissory, (as it was called,) annulling all the parliaments that had been held since the year 1638, during the whole time of the war, as faulty and defective in their constitution[1]. But it was not so easy to know upon what point that defect was to be fixed. The only colourable pretence in law was, that, since the ecclesiastical state was not represented in those parliaments, they were not a full representative of the kingdom, and so not true parliaments. But this could not be alleged by the present parliament, which had not bishops in it: so if that inferred a nullity, this was no parliament. Therefore they could only fix the nullity upon the pretence of force and violence. Yet it was a great strain to insist on that, since it was visible that neither the late king nor the present were
118 under any force when they passed them: they came of their own accord, and passed those acts[2]. If it was insisted on, that the ill state of their affairs was of the nature of a force, the ill consequences of this were visible; since no prince by this means could be bound to any treaty, or be concluded by any law, that limited his power, since these are always drawn from them by the necessity of their affairs, which can never be called a force as long as their persons are free. So, upon some debate about it on those grounds, at a private junto, the proposition, though well liked, was let fall, as not capable to have good colours

[1] Middleton's instructions were that the Convention of Estates of 1643 and the Parliament of 1649 were to be ignored, and all acts of other parliaments since that time rescinded if they entrenched upon the royal prerogative. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 39.

[2] Both kings were under a force. S.

put upon it: nor had the earl of Middleton any instruction to warrant his passing any such act. Yet within a day or two, when they had drunk higher, they resolved to venture on it. Primrose was then ill; so one was sent to him to desire him to prepare a bill to that effect. He set about it: but perceived it was so ill grounded, and so wild in all the frame of it, that he thought, when it came to be better considered, it must certainly be laid aside. But it fell out otherwise: his draught was copied out next morning, without altering a word in it, and carried to the articles, and from thence to the parliament, where it met indeed with great opposition. The earl of Crawford and the duke of Hamilton argued much against it. The parliament in the year 1641 was legally summoned: the late king came thither in person with his ordinary attendance, and without any force: if any acts then passed needed to be reviewed, that might be well done: but to annul a parliament was a terrible precedent, which destroyed the whole security of government: another parliament might annul the present parliament, as well as that which was now proposed to be done: so no stop could be made, nor any security laid down for fixing things for the future. The parliament in the year 1648 proceeded upon instructions under the king's own hand, which was all that could be had, considering his imprisonment: | they had declared for the king, and raised an army for his preservation. To this the earl of Middleton, who, contrary to custom, managed the debate himself, answered, that though there was no visible force on the late king in the year [16]41, yet they all knew he was under a real force, by reason of the rebellion that had been in that kingdom, and the apparent danger of one ready to break out in England; which forced him to settle Scotland on such terms as he could bring them to: that distress of his affairs was really equivalent to a force on his person: yet he confessed, it was just, that such an appearance of a parliament should be a full authority to all who acted under it, and care was taken to secure

CHAP. II.

MS. 62.

CHAP. II. 1669 these by a proviso that was put in the act to indemnify them. He acknowledged the design of the parliament in the year [16]48 was good: yet they had declared for the king in such terms, and had acted so hypocritically in order to the gaining the kirk party, that it was just to condemn the proceedings, though the intentions of many were honourable and loyal: for we went into it, he said, as knaves, and therefore no wonder if we miscarried in it as fools. This was very ill taken by all who had been concerned in it. The bill was put to the vote, and carried by a great majority in the affirmative: and the earl of Middleton immediately passed it without staying for an instruction from the king. The excuse he made for it was, that, since the king had by his letter to the presbyterians confirmed their government as it was established by law, there was no way left to get out of that but the annulling all those laws. This was a most extravagant act, and only fit to be concluded after a drunken bout; it shook all possible security for the future, and laid down a most pernicious precedent. The earl of Lauderdale aggravated this heavily to the king. It shewed, the earl of Middleton understood not the first principles of government, since he had, without any warrant for it, given the king's assent to a law that must for ever take away all the security that law can give: no government was so well established, as not to be liable to a revolution: this would cut off all hopes of peace and submission, if any disorders should happen at any time thereafter. And since the earl of Clarendon had set it up for a maxim never to be violated, that acts of indemnity were sacred things, he studied to possess him against the earl of Middleton, who had now annulled the very parliaments in which two kings had passed acts of indemnity[1]. This raised a great clamour; and upon that the earl of

March 28, 166

[1] Middleton had already, March 22, 1661, been rebuked by Charles for making bargains for pardons. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 92. He had lost influence with the king by paying his court to Clarendon; kings, as Moray remarked, like to see their servants depend directly upon themselves. Cf. note, *supra* 199.

Middleton complained in parliament that their best services were represented to the king as blemishes on his honour, and as a prejudice to his affairs: so he desired they would send up some of the most eminent of their body to give the king a true account of their proceedings. The earls of Glencairn and Rothes were sent up: for the earl of Rothes gave secret engagements to both sides, resolving to strike into that to which he saw the king most inclined. The earl of Middleton's design was to accuse the earl of Lauderdale of misrepresenting the proceedings of parliament, and of lying of the king's good subjects, called in the Scottish law leasing making; which either to the king of the people, or to the people of the king, is capital. CHAP. II. 1662.

Sharp went up with these lords to press the speedy setting up of episcopacy, now that the greatest enemies of that government were under a general consternation, and were upon other accounts so obnoxious that they durst not make any opposition to it, since no act of indemnity was yet passed [1]. He had expressed a great concern to his old brethren when the act rescissory passed, and acted that part very solemnly for some days: yet he seemed to take heart again, and persuaded the ministers of that party that it would be a service to them, since now the case of ratifying their government was separated from the rebellion of the late times: so that hereafter it was to subsist by a law passed in a parliament that sat and acted in full freedom. So he undertook to go again, and to move for an instruction to settle presbytery on a new and undisputed bottom. The poor men were so struck with the ill state of their affairs, that they either trusted him, or at least seemed to do it; for indeed they had neither sense nor courage left them. During the session of parliament, the most aspiring men of the clergy were picked out to preach before the parliament. They did not speak out: but they all insinuated the necessity of a greater authority 120

[1] Sharp's letters to Patrick Drummond from Jan. 26, 1660, to March 19, 1661, will repay careful perusal. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 65–90.

CHAP. II. than was then in the church, for keeping them in order. One or two spoke plainer: upon which the presbytery of Edinburgh went to the earl of Middleton, and complained of that, as an affront to the law and to the king's letter. He dismissed them with good words, but took no notice of their complaint. The synods in several places resolved to
MS. 63. prepare addresses both to king and parliament, | for an act establishing their government; and Sharp dissembled so artificially, that he met with those who were preparing an
April, 1661. address to be presented to the synod of Fife, that was to sit within a week after. The heads were agreed on; and Honeyman, afterwards bishop of Orkney, drew it up with so much vehemence, that Wood, their divinity professor, told me, he and some others sat up almost the whole night before the synod met, to draw it over again in a smoother strain. But Sharp gave the earl of Middleton notice of this; so the earl of Rothes was sent over to see to their behaviour, and as soon as the ministers entered upon this subject, he in the king's name dissolved the synod, and commanded the ministers under pain of treason to retire to their several habitations. Such care was taken that no public application should be made in favour of presbytery. Any attempt that was made on the other hand met with great encouragement. The synod of Aberdeen was the only body that made an address looking towards episcopacy. In a long preamble they reflected on the confusions and violence of the late times, of which they enumerated many particulars; and they concluded with a prayer, that since
121 the legal authority upon which their courts proceeded was now annulled, that therefore the king and parliament would settle their government conform to the Scriptures and the rules of the primitive church. The presbyterians of that body saw what was driven at, and how their words would be understood: but I heard one of them say, for I was present at that meeting, that no man could decently oppose those words, since by that he would insinuate that he thought presbytery was not conform to these.

In this session of parliament another act passed, which was a new affliction to all the party. The 29 of May was appointed to be kept as a holy day; since on that day an end had been put to three and twenty years' course of rebellion, of which the whole progress was reckoned up in the highest strains of Primrose's eloquence. The ministers saw, that by observing this act, passed with such a preamble that condemned all their former proceedings as rebellious and hypocritical,[a] they would lose all their credit, and contradict all they had been building up in a course of so many years. Yet such was the heat of that time that they durst not except to it on that account: so they laid hold on the subtilty of a holy day [1], and covered themselves under that controversy, denying it was in the power of any human authority to make a day holy. But withal they fell upon one of their poor shifts: they enacted in their several presbyteries that they should observe that day as a thanksgiving for the king's restoration: so they took no notice of the act of parliament, but observed it in obedience to their own act. But this, though it covered them from prosecution, since the law was obeyed, yet it laid them open to much contempt. When the earls of Glencairn and Rothes came to court, the king was soon satisfied with the account they gave of the proceedings of parliament: and the earl of Lauderdale would not own that he had ever misrepresented them. They were ordered to proceed in their charging of him as the earl of Clarendon should direct them. He told them the assaulting of a minister, as long as he had an interest in the king, was a practice that could never be approved: it was one of the uneasy things that a house of commons of England sometimes ventured on, which was always ungrateful to the court: such an attempt, instead of shaking the earl of Lauderdale, would give him a faster

[a] *They saw, that by obeying it* struck out.

[1] Wodrow, i. 104.

CHAP. II. root with the king. They must therefore content themselves with letting the king see how well his service went on in their hands, and how injustly they had been misrepresented to him: and thus by degrees they would gain their point, and the earl of Lauderdale would become useless to
122 the king. So this design was let fall. But the earl of Rothes assured Lauderdale he had diverted the storm: though Primrose [a] told [a] me, this was the true ground on which they proceeded. They became all friends, as to outward appearance.

Thus I have gone through the actings of the first session of this parliament with relation to public affairs. It was a mad roaring time, full of extravagance; and no wonder it was so, when the men of affairs were almost perpetually drunk. I shall in the next place give an account of the attainders passed in it.

The first and chief of these was of the marquis of Argyll. He was indicted at the king's suit for a great many facts, that were reduced to three heads. The first was of his public actings during the war, of which many instances
MS. 64. were given; such as his | being concerned in the delivering up of the king to the English at Newcastle, his opposing the engagement in the year [16]48, and his heading the rising in the west in opposition to the committee of estates: in this, and many other steps made during the war, he was esteemed the principal actor, and so ought to be made the greatest example for terrifying others. The second head consisted of many murders and other barbarities committed by his officers, during the war, on many of the king's party; chiefly those who had served under the marquis of Montrose, many of them being murdered in cold blood. The third head consisted of some articles of his concurrence with Cromwell and the usurpers, in opposition to those who appeared for the king in the Highlands; his being one of his parliament, and assisting in proclaiming him protector, with a great many particulars into which his compliance

[a] substituted for *assured*.

was branched out. He had counsel assigned him, who performed their part very well.

The substance of his defence was, that during the late wars he was but one among a great many more: he had always acted by authority of parliament, and according to the instructions that were given him, as oft as he was sent on any expedition or negotiation. As to all things done before the year [16]41, the late king had buried them in an act of oblivion then passed, as the present king had also done in the year [16]51: so he did not think he was bound to answer to any particulars before that time[1]. For the second head, he was at London when most of the barbarities set out in it were committed: nor did it appear that he gave any orders about them. It was well known that great outrages had been committed by the Macdonalds, and he believed his people, when they had the better of them, had taken cruel revenges. This was to be imputed to the heat of the time, and to the tempers of the people, 123
who had been much provoked by the burning his whole country, and by much blood that was shed. And as to many stories laid to the charge of his men, he knew some of them were mere forgeries, and others were aggravated much beyond the truth: but, what truth soever might be in them, he could not be answerable but for what was done by himself or by his orders. As to the third head, of his compliance with the usurpation, he had stood out till the nation was quite conquered: and in that case it was the received opinion both of divines and lawyers, that men might lawfully submit to an usurpation, when forced to it by an inevitable necessity. It was the epidemical sin of the nation. His circumstances were such, that more than a bare compliance was required of him. What he did that way was only to preserve himself and his family, and was not done on design to oppose the king's interest: nor

[1] See also the striking letter from Charles to Argyll of Sept. 24, 1650, quoted in the Introduction to Cookshank's *History of the Church of Scotland*, 44.

CHAP. II. did his service suffer by any thing he did. This was the substance of his defence: he was often brought to the bar, and began every article of his defence with a long speech, which he did with so good a grace, and so skilfully, that his character was as much raised as his family suffered by the prosecution. In one speech excusing his compliances with Cromwell, he said, what could he think of that matter after a man so eminent in the law as his majesty's advocate had taken the engagement? This inflamed the other so much, that he called him an impudent villain, and was not so much as chid for that barbarous treatment. Argyll gravely said, he had learned in his affliction to bear reproaches: but so the parliament saw no cause to condemn him, he was less concerned at the advocate's railing. The king's advocate[1] put in an additional article, of charging him with accession to the king's death: for which all the proof he offered lay in a presumption. Cromwell had come down to Scotland with his army in September [16]48, and at that time he had many long conferences with Argyll; and since immediately upon his return to London the treaty with the king was broke off, and the king was brought to his trial, he from thence inferred that it was to be presumed that Cromwell and he had concerted that matter between them. While this process was carried on, which was the solemnest that ever was in Scotland, the lord Lorn continued at court soliciting for his father; and obtained a letter to be writ by the king to the earl of Middleton, requiring him to order his advocate not to insist on any public proceedings before the indemnity he himself had passed in the year 1651. He also required him, when the trial was ended, to send up the whole process, and lay it before the king, before the parliament

[1] The shameless injustice of the trial was shown in the refusal to allow Argyll's counsel the usual licence, 'that what should escape them in pleading, either by word or writ, for the life, honour, and estate of their client, might not thereafter be obtruded to them as treasonable.' Sir John Fletcher induced Parliament to order that they were to plead 'at their hazard.' Wodrow, i. 135; Mackenzie, 36.

should give sentence[1]. The earl of Middleton submitted to the first part of this: so all further inquiry into those matters was superseded. But as to the second part of the letter, it looked so like a distrust of the justice of the parliament, that he said he durst not let it be known, till he had a second and more positive order, which he earnestly desired might not be sent, for it would very much discourage this loyal and affectionate parliament: and he begged earnestly to have that order recalled; which was done. For some time there was a stop in the proceedings, in which Argyll was | contriving[a] an escape out of the castle. He kept his bed for some days: and his lady being of the same stature with himself, and coming to him in a chair, he had put on her clothes, and was going into the chair: but he apprehended he should be discovered, and his execution hastened; and so his heart failed him. The earl of Middleton resolved, if possible, to have the king's death fastened on him. By this means, as he would die with the more infamy, so he reckoned this would put an end to the family, since nobody durst move in favour of the son of one judged guilty of that crime. And he, as was believed, hoped to obtain a grant of his estate. Search was made into all the precedents, of men who had been at any time condemned upon presumption; and the earl of Middleton resolved to argue the matter himself, hoping that the weight of his authority would bear down all opposition. He managed it indeed with more force than decency: he was too vehement, and maintained the argument with a strength that did more honour to his parts than to his justice or his character. But Gilmour, though newly made lord president of the session, which is the supreme court of justice in that kingdom, abhorred the precedent of attainting a man upon so remote a presumption; and he

CHAP. II. 124

MS. 65.

[a] *how he should risk* struck out.

[1] Mackenzie states that Lauderdale did what he could for Argyll, as an old opponent of Middleton, until he was won over by Rothes to cease his advocacy. *Memoirs*, 37.

CHAP. II. looked upon it as less justifiable than the much decried attainder of the earl of Strafford. So he undertook the argument against Middleton: they replied upon one another thirteen or fourteen times in a debate that lasted many hours. Gilmour had so clearly the better of the argument, that though the parliament was so set against Argyll that every thing was like to pass that might blacken him, yet, when it was put to the vote, he was acquitted as to that by a great majority: at which he expressed so much joy, that he seemed little concerned at any thing that could happen to him after that. All that remained was to make his compliance with the usurpers appear to be treason. The debate was like to have lasted long. The earl of Loudoun, who had been lord chancellor[1], and was counted the eloquentest man of the time, for he had a copiousness in speaking that was never exhausted, and was of his family
125 and his particular friend, had prepared a long and learned argument on that head. He had gathered the opinions both of divines and lawyers, and had laid together a great deal out of history, more particularly out of the Scottish history, to shew that it had never been censured as a crime, but that, on the contrary, in all their confusions, the men who had merited the most of the crown in all its shakings, were persons who had got credit by compliances with the side that prevailed, and by that means had brought things about again. But, while it was very doubtful how it would have gone, Monk, by an inexcusable baseness, had searched among his letters, and found some that were writ by Argyll to himself, that were so hearty and zealous on their side, that after they were read it could not be pretended that his compliance was feigned, or extorted from him. Every

[1] See *supra* 42, 47, 73. Sir John Campbell of Lawers, created Earl of Loudoun in 1633. The patent was suspended until 1641 (cf. *supra* 48, note), when he was again created Earl, with precedency from 1633; he died 1663. He was a member of the Argyll family through his descent from Donald Campbell, the second son of Sir Colin Campbell of Lochow, in the thirteenth century. Douglas, *Peerage of Scotland*. See also Howie, *Scots Worthies*, ed. Carslaw (1870), 270.

body blamed Monk for sending these down, since it was a betraying the confidence that they then lived in. They were sent down by an express, and came to the earl of Middleton after the parliament was engaged in the debate. So he ordered the letters to be read. This was much blamed, as contrary to the forms of justice, since probation was closed on both sides; but the reading of them silenced all further debate[1]. All his friends rose and went out: and he was condemned as guilty of treason. The marquis of Montrose only refused to vote; he owned he had too much resentment to judge in that matter. It was designed he should be hanged, as Montrose had been: but it was carried that he should be beheaded, and that his head should be set up where Montrose's had been set. He received his sentence decently, and composed himself to suffer with a courage that was not expected from him.

The day before his death he wrote to the king, justifying his intentions in all he had acted in the matter of the covenant: he protested his innocence as to the death of

[1] Many negative arguments have been brought in regard to this charge against Monk both by Campbell in the *Biographia Britannica*, and in his *Lives of the Admirals*; and by Rose, in his *Observations on Fox's Historical Work*. But they have been ably discussed by Sergeant Heywood in his vindication of the last-mentioned work; and the truth of the accusation is perhaps sufficiently confirmed by the similar statements of Baillie, iii. 465, and of Cunningham in his *History of Great Britain*, i. 13, who is said to have been connected with the Argyll family, and who does not appear to have founded his report on the authority of his contemporary, Bishop Burnet. R. The evidence against Monk is overwhelming. In addition to the authorities mentioned in the note, Mackenzie, who was one of Argyll's counsel, states that he was present when Monk's letters arrived. His *Memoirs* were not published until 1821. See also the *Lockhart Papers*, 599. The letters themselves, which were not private, as Burnet suggests, but official, 'produced be the K. Advocat in Parliament for proving actis of hostilitie with, and assisting of the English by counsall; and acknowledged be my Lord Argyll to be all writtin and subscrivit w^t^ his awne hand,' are in the *H. M. C. Rep.* vi. 617; cf. Guizot's *Monk*, ed. Wortley, 293. They are indorsed 1654. Earlier letters of 1651–2, from Argyll to Deane, Monk, and Lilburne, may be read also in Firth's *Scotland and the Commonwealth*, 333, 335, 338, &c.; cf. 'Monk' in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* To read the letters was contrary to legal custom, since the Lord Advocate had closed his case. Omond, *Lord Advocates of Scotland*, i. 174.

CHAP. II. the late king: he submitted patiently to his sentence, and wished the king a long and happy reign: he cast his family and children upon his mercy; and prayed that they might not suffer for their father's fault. On the 27 May, the day appointed for his execution, he came to the scaffold in a very solemn but undaunted manner, accompanied with many of the nobility and some ministers. He spoke for half an hour with a great appearance of serenity. Cunningham, his physician, told me he touched his pulse, and that it did then beat at the usual rate, calm and strong. He did in a most solemn manner vindicate himself from all know-
126 ledge or accession to the king's death: he pardoned all his enemies; and submitted to the sentence, as to the will of God: he spoke highly in justification of the covenant, calling it the cause and work of God; and he expressed his apprehension of sad times like to follow, and exhorted
MS. 66. all people to adhere to the covenant, | and to resolve to suffer rather than sin against their consciences. He parted with all his friends very decently: and after some time
May 27, 1661. spent in his private devotion he was beheaded; and did end his days much better than those who knew the former parts of his life expected. Concerning which the earl of Crawford told me this passage. He had lived always in ill terms with him, and went out of town on the day of his execution. The earl of Middleton, when he saw him first, after it was over, asked him, if he did not believe his soul was in hell? He answered, not at all. And when the other seemed surprised at that, he said his reason was, he knew Argyll was naturally a very great coward, and was always afraid of dying: so, since he heard he had died with great resolution, he was persuaded that was from some supernatural assistance; he was sure it was not his natural temper.

A few days after him, Guthrie suffered. He was accused of his accession to the remonstrance when the king was in Scotland, and for a book he had printed with the title of *The causes of God's wrath upon the nation*[1], in which the

[1] *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 72, 74, 78, and *supra* 205, 213. Guthrie was the

treating with the king, the tendering him the covenant, and the admitting him to the exercise of the government, were highly aggravated as great acts of apostasy. His declining the king's authority to judge of his sermons, and his protesting for remedy of law against him, and the late seditious paper that he was drawing others to concur in, were the matters objected to him. He was a resolute and stiff man: so when his lawyers offered him legal defences, he would not be advised by them, but resolved to take his own way. He confessed and justified all that he had done, as agreeing to the principles and practices of the kirk, who had asserted all along that the doctrine delivered by them in their sermons did not fall under the cognizance of the temporal courts, till it was first judged by the church; for which he brought much dull and tedious proof[1]. He said, his protesting for remedy of law against the king was not meant at the king's person, but was only with relation to costs and damages. The earl of Middleton had a personal animosity to him; for in the late times he had excommunicated him[2]: so his eagerness in the prosecution did not look well. The defence he made signified nothing to justify himself, but laid a great load on presbytery; since he made it out beyond all dispute that he had acted upon their principles, which made them the more odious, as having among them some of the worst maxims of the church of Rome; that in particular, which was to make the pulpit a privileged place, in which a man might safely vent treason, and be secure in doing it, if the church judicatory should agree to acquit him. So upon this occasion great advantage was taken, to shew how near the spirit that had reigned in presbytery came to popery. It was resolved to make a public example of a preacher: so he was singled out. He gave no advantage to those who wished to have saved him, by the least step towards any

chief author of the 'Remonstrance.' *The Causes of the Lord's wrath against Scotland manifested in his sad late dispensation* was published in 1653.

[1] Popery. S.

[2] In 1650. Cf. *supra* 107, 204.

CHAP. II. 127

submission, but much to the contrary. Yet, though all people were disgusted at the earl of Middleton's eagerness in the prosecution, the earl of Tweeddale was the only man that moved against the putting him to death[1]. He said, banishment had been hitherto the severest censure that had been laid on the preachers for their opinions: he knew Guthrie was a man apt to give personal provocation, and he wished that might not have too great a share in carrying the matter so far. Yet he was condemned to die.

June 1, 1661.

I saw him suffer. He was so far from shewing any fear, that he rather expressed a contempt of death: he spoke an hour upon the ladder, with the composedness of a man that was delivering a sermon rather than his last words. He justified all he had done, and exhorted all people to adhere to the covenant, which he magnified highly. With him one Govan was also hanged; he had deserted the army while the king was in Scotland, and had gone over to Cromwell. The man was inconsiderable, till they made him more considered by putting him to death on such an account at so great a distance of time[2].

The gross iniquity of the court appeared in nothing more eminently than in the favour shewed Macleod of Assynt, who had betrayed the marquis of Montrose, and was brought over upon it[3]. He in prison struck up to a high pitch of vice and impiety, and gave great entertainments: and that, notwithstanding the baseness of the man and of his crime, begot him so many friends, that he was let go without any censure. The proceedings against Warriston were soon despatched, he being absent. It was proved

[1] Tweeddale's creditable opposition to the court resulted in his imprisonment, Sept. 1661, *infra* 231. He was released in May, 1662, upon the petition of the Privy Council, and upon Middleton's assurance that he had promised to support the re-introduction of episcopacy. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 99–103. For the details of the trial see Wodrow, and, for the death of Guthrie, Mackenzie's *Memoirs*, 50.

[2] Mackenzie says that the real reason of his death was the suspicion that he had been upon the scaffold at the death of Charles I; that he brought the first news of it to Scotland, 'and seemed to be well satisfied with it.' Cf. Baillie, iii. 113, 122, 124, 317.

[3] See *supra* 92.

that he had presented the remonstrance; that he had acted under Cromwell's authority, and had sat as a peer in his parliament; that he had confirmed him in his protectorship, and had likewise sat one of the committee of safety: so he was attainted. Swinton had been attainted [1] in the parliament at Stirling for going over to Cromwell: so he was brought before the parliament to hear what he could say why the sentence should not be executed. He was then become a quaker; and did, with a sort of eloquence that moved the whole house, lay out all his own errors, and the ill spirit he was in when he committed them, with so tender a sense, that he seemed as one indifferent what they should do with him: and, without so much as moving for mercy, or even for a delay, he | did so effectually MS. 67. prevail on them, that they recommended him to the king as a fit object of his mercy. This was the more easily consented to by the earl of Middleton in hatred to the earl of Lauderdale, who had got the gift of his estate. He had two good pleas in law: the one was, that the record of his attainder at Stirling, with all that had passed in that parliament, was lost: the other was, that by the act rescissory that parliament 128 being annulled, all that [was] done by it was void: but he urged neither, since there was matter enough to attaint him of new if the defects of that supposed attainder had been observed. So till the act of indemnity was passed he was still in danger, having been the man of all Scotland that had been the most trusted and employed by Cromwell: but upon passing the act of indemnity he was safe [2].

The session of parliament was now brought to a conclusion, without any motion for an indemnity. The secret of this was, that since episcopacy was to be set up, and

[1] See *supra* 96, 194; and Aikman's *Annals of the Persecution*, 24. He was cited before parliament at Perth, 1651, but absented himself and was thereupon forfaulted. Lauderdale now acquired his estates in recompense for the rents of Brunston which Swinton possessed by donation when he himself was forfaulted by the English parliament.

[2] Middleton's instructions concerning an Act of Indemnity are dated Jan. 29, 166½. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 103.

CHAP. II. that those who were the most like to oppose it were on other accounts obnoxious, it was thought best to keep them under that fear till the change should be made The earl of Middleton went up to court full of merit, and as full of pride. He had a mind to be lord treasurer; and told the king, that, if he intended to set up episcopacy, the earl of Crawford, that was a noted presbyterian, must be put out of that post: it was the opinion of the king's zeal for that form of government that must bear down all the opposition that might otherwise be made to it: and it would not be possible to persuade the nation of that as long as they saw the white staff in such hands. Therefore, on the first day that a Scottish council was called after he came up, he gave a long account of the proceedings of parliament, and magnified the zeal and loyalty that many had expressed, while others that had been not only pardoned, but were highly trusted by the king, had been often cold and backward, and sometimes plainly against his service. The earl of Lauderdale was ill that day: so the earl of Crawford undertook to answer this reflection, which he thought was meant of himself, for opposing the act rescissory. He said, he had observed such an entire unanimity in carrying on the king's service that he did not know of any that had acted otherwise: and therefore he moved, that the earl of Middleton might speak plain, and name persons. The earl of Middleton desired to be excused: he did not intend to accuse any, but yet he thought he was bound to let the king know how he had been served. The earl of Crawford still pressed him to speak out after so general an accusation: no doubt he would inform the king in private who these persons were: and since he had already gone so far in public, he thought he ought to go further. The earl of Middleton was in some confusion, for he did not expect to be thus attacked: so to get off, he named the opposition that the earl of Tweeddale had made to the sentence passed on Guthrie, not without indecent reflections,
129 as if his prosecution had flowed from the king's resentments

of his behaviour to himself: and so he turned the matter, that the earl of Tweeddale's reflection, which was thought indeed pointed against himself, should seem as meant against the king. The earl of Crawford upon this said, that the earl of Middleton ought to have excepted to the words when they were first spoken, and no doubt the parliament would have done the king justice: but it was never thought consistent with the liberty of speech in parliament, to bring men into question afterwards for words spoken in any debate when they were not challenged as soon as they were spoken. The earl of Middleton excused himself: he said, the thing was passed before he made due reflections on it; and so asked pardon for that omission. The earl of Crawford was glad he himself had escaped, and was silent as to the earl of Tweeddale's concern: so, nobody offering to excuse him, an order was presently sent down for committing him to prison, and for examining him upon the words he had spoken, and on his meaning in them [1]. That was not a time in which men durst pretend to privilege, or the freedom of debate: so he did not insist on it, but sent up such an account of his words, and such an explanation of them, as fully satisfied the king. So after the imprisonment of some weeks, he was set at liberty. But this raised a great outcry against the earl of Middleton, as a thing that was contrary to the freedom of debate, and destructive of the liberty of parliament. It lay the more open to censure, because the earl of Middleton had accepted of a great entertainment from the earl of Tweeddale after Guthrie's business was over: and it seemed contrary to the rules of hospitality, to have such a design in his heart against a man in whose house he had been so treated: all the excuse he made for it was, that he never intended it, but that the earl of Crawford had pressed him so hard upon the complaint he had made in general, that he had no way of getting out of it without naming some particular, and he had no other so ready then at hand.

CHAP. II.

Sept. 1661.

May, 1662.

[1] See *supra* 228, note.

CHAP. II. MS. 68. | Another difference of greater moment fell in between him and the earl of Crawford. The earl of Middleton was now raising the guards that were to be paid out of the excise granted by the parliament. So he moved, that the excise might be raised by collectors named by himself as general, that so he might not depend on the treasury for the pay of the forces. The earl of Crawford opposed this with great advantage, since all revenues given the king did by the course of law come into the treasury. Scotland was not in a condition to maintain two treasurers: and, as to what was said of the necessity of having the pay of the
130 army well ascertained, and ever ready, otherwise it would become a grievance to the kingdom, he said the king was master, and what orders soever he thought fit to send to the treasury they would be most punctually obeyed. But the earl of Middleton knew there would be a great overplus of the excise, beyond the pay of the troops: and he reckoned that if the collection was put in his hands, he would easily get a grant of the overplus at the year's end. The earl of Crawford said, no such thing was ever pretended to by any general, unless by such as set up to be independent, and who hoped by that means to make themselves the masters of the army. So he carried the point, which was thought a victory. And the earl of Middleton was much blamed for putting his interest at court on such an issue, where the pretension was so unusual and so unreasonable.

The next point was concerning Argyll's estate. The king was inclined to restore the lord Lorn; though much pains was taken to persuade him that all the zeal he had expressed in his service was only an artifice between his father and him to preserve the family in all adventures: it was said, that had been an ordinary practice in Scotland for father and son to put themselves in different sides[1]. The marquis of Argyll had taken very extraordinary methods to raise his own family to such a superiority in the Highlands that he was a sort of a king among them.

[1] See *supra* 102, note.

The marquis of Huntly had married his sister, and during their friendship he was bound with him for some of his debts. After that, the marquis of Huntly, as he neglected his affairs, so he engaged in the king's side, by which Argyll saw he must be undone[1]. So he pretended that he only intended to secure himself, when he bought in prior mortgages and debts, which, as was believed, were compounded at very low rates. The friends of that family pressed the king hard to give his heir the confiscation of that part of Argyll's estate in which the marquis of Huntly's debts and all the pretensions on his estate were comprehended. And it was given to the marquis of Huntly, now duke of Gordon, then a young child: but no care was taken to breed him a protestant[2]. The marquis of Montrose, and all others whose estates had been ruined under Argyll's conduct, expected likewise reparation out of his estate; which was a very great one, but in no way able to satisfy all those demands. And it was believed that the earl of Middleton himself hoped to have carried away the main bulk of it: so that both the lord Lorn and he concurred, though with different views, to put a stop to all the pretensions made upon it. CHAP. II.

CHAPTER III.

Restoration of Episcopacy in Scotland.

THE point of the greatest importance then under consideration was whether episcopacy should be restored in Scotland or not. The earl of Middleton assured the king, 131

[1] The Covenanters at length took the head of this brave and loyal nobleman from his shoulders [March 16, 1649], but not his heart from his sovereign, as in the beginning of these troubles he told them they should not. R.

[2] Burnet, Archbishop of Glasgow, informed Sheldon, on Sept. 4, 1665, that he had obtained an order to the Privy Council, to take care of the education of the Marquis of Huntly's and other noblemen's children, who were Papists. *Sheldon MSS.*, Bodl. R. Cf. *infra* 428.

CHAP. III. it was desired by the greater and honester part of the nation. One synod had as good as petitioned for it: and many others wished for it, though the share they had in the late wars made them think it was not fit or decent for them to move for it. Sharp assured the king, that none but the protesters, of whom he had a very bad opinion, were against it; and that of the public resolutioners there would not be found twenty that would oppose it. All who were for making the change agreed that it ought to be done now in the first heat of joy after the restoration, and before the act of indemnity passed. The earl of Lauderdale and all his friends, on the other hand, assured the king, that the national prejudice against it was still very strong; that those who seemed zealous for it run into that only as a method to procure favour, but that those who were against it would be found stiff and eager in their opposition to it; that by setting it up the king would lose the affections of the nation, and that the supporting it would grow a heavy load on his government. The earl of Lauderdale turned all this, that looked like a zeal for presbytery, to a dexterous insinuating himself into the king's confidence, as one that seemed to design nothing but his greatness, and the having Scotland sure to him, in order to the executing of any design he might afterwards be engaged in. He said, he remembered well the aversion that he himself had observed in that nation to any thing that looked a superiority in the church. But to that the earl of Middleton and Sharp answered by assuring him that the insolencies committed by the presbyterians while they governed, and the ten years' usurpation that had followed, had made such a change in people's tempers that they were much altered since he had been among them.

MS. 69. The king naturally hated | presbytery: and, having called a new parliament in England that did with great zeal espouse the interests of the church of England, and was beginning to complain of the evacuating the garrisons held by their army in that kingdom, he did easily give way,

though with a visible reluctancy, to the change of the church government in Scotland. The aversion he seemed to express was imputed to his own indifference as to all those matters, and to his unwillingness to involve his government in new troubles. But the view of things that the earl of Lauderdale had given him was the true root of all that coldness. The earl of Clarendon set it on with great zeal; and so did the duke of Ormond, who said it would be very hard to maintain the government of the church in Ireland if presbytery continued in Scotland; since the northern counties, which were the best stocked of any they had, as they were originally from Scotland, 132
so they would still follow the way of that nation[1]. Upon all this diversity of opinion, the thing was proposed in a Scotch council at Whitehall. The earl of Crawford declared himself against it: but the earl of Lauderdale, the duke of Hamilton, and sir Robert Moray, were only for delaying the making any such change till the king should be better satisfied concerning the inclinations of the nation[2]. The result of the debate, all the rest who were present being earnest for the change, was, that a letter was writ to the privy council of Scotland, intimating the king's intentions for setting up episcopacy, and demanding their advice upon it. The earl of Glencairn ordered the letter to be read, having taken care that such persons should be present who he knew would speak warmly for it, that so others who might intend to oppose it might be frightened from doing it. None spoke against it but the earl of Kincardin. He proposed that some certain methods might be taken, by which they might be well informed, and so be able to inform the king, of the temper of the nation, before they offered an advice, that might have such effects[a] very much

[a] *as might* struck out.

[1] The close touch between the Presbyterians of the two countries is fully illustrated in both the *Essex* and *Lauderdale Papers*.

[2] Compare Mackenzie, 55, and the far less probable account in Clarendon, *Cont.* 485.

CHAP. III. to perplex, if not to disorder, all their affairs. Some smart repartees passed between the earl of Glencairn and him. This was all the opposition that was made at that board. So a letter was writ to the king from thence, encouraging him to go on, and assuring him that the change he intended to make would give a general satisfaction to the main body of the nation.

Upon that the thing was resolved on. It remained after this only to consider the proper methods of doing it, and the men who ought to be employed in it. Sheldon and the English bishops had [a]an[a] aversion to all that had been engaged in the covenant: so they were for seeking out all the episcopal clergy who had been driven out of Scotland in the beginning of the troubles, and preferring them. There was but one of the old bishops left alive, Sydserfe, that had been bishop of Galloway. He had come up to London, not doubting but that he should be advanced to the primacy of Scotland. It is true, he had of late done some very irregular things. When the act of uniformity required all men who held any benefices in England to be episcopally ordained, he, who by observing the ill effects of their former violence was become very moderate,[b] with others of the Scotch clergy that gathered about him,[c] did set up a very indefensible practice of ordaining all those of the English clergy who came to him, and that without demanding either oaths or subscriptions of them. Some believed that this was done by him only to subsist on the fees that arose from the letters of orders so granted; for
133 he was very poor. This did so disgust the English bishops at him and his [d]company,[d] that they took no care of him. Yet they were much against a set of presbyterian bishops; they believed they could have no credit, and that they would have no zeal. This touched Sharp in the quick: so he laid the matter before the earl of Clarendon. He said, these old episcopal men, by their long absence out of Scot-

[a] altered from *a deep*. [b] *and* struck out. [c] *was reduced to extreme want* struck out. [d] substituted for *crew*.

land, knew nothing of the present generation: and by the ill usage they had met with, they were so irritated that they would run matters quickly to great extremities: and, if there was a faction among the bishops, some valuing themselves upon their constant steadiness, and looking with an ill eye on those who had been carried away with the stream, this would divide and distract their councils, whereas a set of men of moderate principles would be more uniform in their proceedings. This prevailed with the earl of Clarendon, who saw the king so remiss in that matter that he resolved to keep things in as great temper as was possible. And he, not doubting that Sharp would pursue that in which he seemed to be so zealous, and that he would carry things with great moderation, persuaded the bishops of England to leave the management of that matter wholly to him. And upon that, Sharp, being assured of that at which he had long aimed, laid aside his mask, and owned that he was to be archbishop of St. Andrews. He said to some, from whom I had it, that when he saw that the king was resolved on the change, and that some hot men were like to be advanced, whose violence would ruin the country, he had submitted to that post on design to moderate matters, and to cover some good men from a storm that might otherwise break upon them. So deeply did he still dissemble: for now he talked of nothing so much as of love and moderation. CHAP. III.

| Sydserfe was removed to be bishop of Orkney, one of the best revenues of any of the bishoprics in Scotland: but it had been almost in all times a sinecure. He lived little more than a year after his translation. He had died in more esteem if he had died a year before it[1]. But Sharp was ordered to find out proper men for filling the other sees. That care was left entirely to him. The choice was generally very bad. MS. 70

[1] Cf. *supra* 39. See the testimony to Sydserfe's character in the letter of Burnet's father, quoted above, 58, note. He held the See of Orkney from 1662 to 1664.

CHAP. III. Two men were brought up to be consecrated in England, Fairfoul, designed for the see of Glasgow, and Hamilton, brother to the lord Belhaven [1], for Galloway. The former of these was a pleasant and facetious man, insinuating and crafty: but he was a better physician than a divine. His life was scarce free of scandal, and he was eminent in nothing that belonged to his own function. He had not
134 only sworn the covenant, but had persuaded others to do it; and when one objected to him, that it went against his conscience, he answered, there were some very good medicines that could not be chewed, but these were to be swallowed down in a pill or a bolus; and since it was plain that a man could not live in Scotland unless he sware it, therefore it must be swallowed down without any further examination [2]. Whatever the matter was, soon after his consecration his parts sunk so fast that in a few months he, who had passed his whole life long for one of the cunningest men in Scotland, became almost a changeling; upon which it may be easily collected what commentaries the presbyterians would make. Sharp lamented this to me, as one of their great misfortunes; he said it began to appear in less than a month after he came to London. Hamilton was a good natured man, but weak: he was always believed episcopal, yet he had so far complied in the time of the covenant, that he affected a peculiar expression of his counterfeit zeal for their cause, to secure himself from suspicion: at every time when he gave the sacrament, he excommunicated all that were not true to the covenant, using a form in the Old Testament of shaking out the lap of his gown, saying, so did he cast out of the church and communion all that dealt falsely in the covenant.

[1] Sir John Hamilton of Broomhill and Beil, created Baron Belhaven, Dec. 15, 1647, died in 1679. The former Belhaven peerage (*supra* 30) was extinct in 1639. Fairfoul was Bishop of Glasgow from 1661 to 1664, and Hamilton of Galloway from 1661 to 1674.

[2] At once the explanation and the excuse for the action of all the turncoats. It is especially the key to the contrast between the early and later careers of Lauderdale and his like.

With these there was a fourth man found out, who was then at London in his return from the Bath, where he had been for his health: and on him I will enlarge more copiously. He was the son of doctor Leighton, that had in archbishop Laud's time writ *Zion's Plea against the Prelates*; for which he was condemned in the Star-chamber to have his ears cut and his nose slit. He was a man of a violent and ungoverned heat[1]. He sent his eldest son Robert to be bred in Scotland, who was accounted a saint from his youth up[2]. He had great quickness of parts, a lively apprehension, with a charming vivacity of thought and expression. He had the greatest command of the purest Latin that ever I knew in any man. He was a[a] master both in Greek and Hebrew, and in the whole compass of theological learning, chiefly in the study of the Scriptures. But that which excelled all the rest, he came to be possessed with the highest and noblest sense of divine things that I ever saw in any man. He had no regard to his person, unless it was to mortify it by a constant low diet, that was like a perpetual fast. He had[b] a contempt both of[b] wealth or reputation. He seemed to have the lowest thoughts of himself possible, and to desire that all other persons should think as meanly of him as he himself did. He bore all sort of ill usage and reproach like a man that

[a] *great* struck out. [b] substituted for *no regard to*.

[1] In his book, which was dedicated to the Parliament, he incited the members of it to 'smite the prelates under the fifth rib,' p. 128, 2nd edit. However, in the conclusion, where he says that the bishops are like pleuritic patients, whom nothing but incision will cure, he adds, 'we mean of their callings, not their persons.' R. Walker, *Journal*, 177, styles him 'Keeper of the Prisoners for the Rebels in Lambeth House.'

[2] See later, f. 288. The saintliness of Leighton (1611–1684), in contrast with the selfish, subservient, and cruel conduct of many of the other bishops of Scotland at this period, and with the uncompromising fanaticism of the Conventiclers, was at once the admiration and the embarrassment both of the government and of its opponents. See especially the *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 84–238 and iii. 49, 76. There is a sympathetic memoir of Leighton, by Principal Tulloch, in the third series of the *St. Giles Lectures on Scottish Divines*. See also S. T. Coleridge, *Works* (1884), v. 364.

CHAP. III. took pleasure in it. He had so subdued the natural heat of his temper, that in a great variety of accidents, and
135 in a course of 22[a] years' intimate conversation with him, I never observed the least sign of passion, but upon one single occasion. He brought himself into so composed a gravity, that I never saw him laugh and but seldom smile. And he kept himself in such a constant recollection, that I do not remember that ever I heard him say one idle word. There was a visible tendency in all he said to raise his own mind, and those he conversed with, to serious reflections. He seemed to be in perpetual meditation. And, though the whole course of his life was strict and ascetical, yet he had nothing of the sourness of temper that generally possesses men of that sort. He was the freest of superstition, of censuring others, or of imposing his own methods on them, possible; so that he did not so much as recommend them to others. He said there was a diversity of tempers, and every man was to watch over his own, and to turn it in the best manner he could. When he spoke of divine matters, which he did almost perpetually, it was in such an elevating manner, that I have often reflected on these words, and felt somewhat like them within myself while I was with him, *Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked with us by the way?* His thoughts were lively, oft out of the way and surprising, yet just and genuine. And he had laid together in his memory the
MS. 71. greatest | treasure of the best and wisest of all the ancient sayings of the heathens as well as Christians, that I have ever known any man master of, and he used them in the aptest manner possible. He had been bred up with the greatest aversion imaginable to the whole frame of the church of England. From Scotland his father sent him to travel. He spent some years in France, and spoke that language like one born there. He came afterwards and settled in Scotland, and had presbyterian ordination; but he quickly broke through the prejudices of his education.

[a] altered from *21*.

His preaching had a sublimity both of thought and expression in it; and, above all, the grace and gravity of his pronunciation was such that few heard him without a very sensible emotion: I am sure I never did. It was so different from all others, and indeed from every thing that one could hope to rise up to, that it gave a man an indignation at himself and all others. It was a very sensible humiliation to me, and for some time after I heard him, I could not bear the thought of my own performances, and was out of countenance when I was forced to think of preaching. His style was rather too fine[1]: but there was a majesty and beauty in it that left so deep an impression, that I cannot yet forget the sermons I heard him preach thirty year[s] ago. And yet with all this he seemed to look on himself as so ordinary a preacher, that while he had a cure he was ready to employ all others: and when he was a bishop he chose to preach to small auditories, and would never give notice beforehand. He had indeed a very low voice, and so could not be heard by a great crowd. He soon came to see into the follies of the presbyterians, and to hate their covenant, particularly the imposing it, and their fury against all who differed from them. He found they were not capable of large thoughts: theirs were narrow, as their tempers were sour. So he grew weary of mixing with them: he scarce ever went to their meetings, and lived in great retirement, minding only the care of his own parish at Newbotle near Edinburgh. Yet all the opposition that he made to them was, 136
that he preached up a more universal charity, and a silenter but sublimer way of devotion, and a more exact rule of life than seemed to them consistent with human nature: but his own practice did even outshine his doctrine.

CHAP. III.

In the year [16]48 he declared himself for the engagement for the king. But the earl of Lothian, who lived in his parish, had so high an esteem for him that he persuaded the violent men not to meddle with him: though he gave occasion to great exception; for when some of his parish,

[1] Burnet is not guilty of that. S.

CHAP. III. who had been in the engagement, were ordered to make public profession of their repentance for it, he told them, they had been in an expedition in which, he believed, they had neglected their duty to God, and had been guilty of injustice and violence, of drunkenness and other immoralities, and he charged them to repent of these very seriously, without meddling with the quarrel, or the grounds of that war. He entered into great correspondence with many of the episcopal party, and with my own father in particular, and did wholly separate himself from the presbyterians. At last he left them, and withdrew from his cure: for he could not do the things imposed on him any longer. And yet he hated all contention so much, that he chose rather to leave them in a silent manner than to engage in any disputes with them. But he had generally the reputation of a saint, and of something above human nature in him: so the mastership of the college of Edinburgh falling vacant some time after, and it being in the gift of the city, he was prevailed with to accept of it, because in it he was wholly separated from all church matters. He continued ten years in that post, and was a great blessing in it; for he talked so to all the youth of any capacity or distinction that it had a great effect on many of them. He preached often to them: and if crowds broke in, which they were apt to do, he would have gone on in his sermon in Latin, with a[a] purity and life that charmed all who understood it. Thus he had lived above twenty years in Scotland, in the highest reputation that any man in my time ever had in that kingdom.

But he had a brother, well known at court, sir Elisha, who was very like him in face and in the vivacity of his parts, but the most unlike him in all other things that can be imagined: for, though he loved to talk of great sublimities in religion, yet he was a very immoral man, both lewd, false, and ambitious. He was a papist of a form of his own: but he had changed his religion to raise himself at

[a] *extemporary* struck out.

court; for he was at that time secretary to the duke of York[1], and was very intimate with the lord Aubigny, a brother of the duke of Richmond's, who had changed his religion, and was a priest, and had probably been a cardinal if he had lived a little longer[2]. He maintained an outward decency, and had more learning and better notions than men of quality, who enter into orders generally have. Yet he was a very vicious man: and this perhaps made him the more considered by the king, who loved and trusted him to a high degree. No man had more credit with the king; for he was of the secret as to his religion, and was more trusted with the whole design that was then managed in order to it, than any man whatsoever. Sir Elisha brought his brother and him acquainted: for Leighton loved to know men in all the varieties of religion. CHAP. III. 137

| In the vacation time he made excursions, and came oft MS. 72.

[1] North, in the *Examen*, relates that when Sir Ellis Leighton was secretary to the English ambassador at Paris, he was guilty of great extortion; and that when he pursued the same practices in Ireland, where he acted also as secretary, on being expostulated with on this account by the Irish, he answered, 'Do you think I come here to learn your language?' He adds, that Leighton died miserably in prison. R. The extortion referred to by North was, according to Andrew Marvell (*Popery and Arbitrary Government*, ed. Grosart, 317), that in 1675 he used his interest as secretary to the embassy in redeeming English ships which had been taken by French privateers, for a heavy consideration from the owners. For this he was imprisoned in 1677. *Fleming Papers*, Aug. 1, 1677. In 'The Duke of B's Litany' (*Poems on State Affairs*, ed. 1703, iii. 93) is the following doggerel:—

'From learning new morals from Bedlam Sir Payton
And truth and modesty from Sir Ellis Layton
Libera nos, Domine.'

North sums him up as 'The most corrupt man then, or since, living.' I am not aware of a single word extant in his favour. See f. 300. See, too, Walker's *Journal*, 177; *Portland MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiii, App. ii. 140; *Cal. St. P.* 1671, 266, 286, 512.

[2] Lodovick Stuart, Sieur d'Aubigny, was the uncle, not the brother, of Charles Stuart, sixth Duke of Lennox and third Duke of Richmond, who succeeded to the title in 1660 and died in 1672. He was the third son, and the duke was son of the second son, of Esmé Stuart, third Duke of Lennox. He was a canon of Notre Dame, was named Cardinal in 1665, and died at Paris in November of the same year, immediately after receiving the news of his elevation, at the age of forty-six. Burke, *Extinct Peerage*. Cf. *supra* 5, note.

CHAP. III. to London, where he observed all the eminent men in Cromwell's court, and in the several parties then about the city of London. But he told me he never could see any thing among them that pleased him: they were men of unquiet and meddling tempers[a]: and their discourses and sermons were dry and unsavoury, full of airy cant, or of bombast swellings. Sometimes he went over to Flanders, to see what he could find in the several orders of the church of Rome. There he found some of Jansenius's followers, who seemed to be men of extraordinary tempers, and who studied to bring things, if possible, to the purity and simplicity of the primitive ages; on which all his thoughts were much set. He thought controversies had been too much insisted on, and had been carried too far. His brother, who thought of nothing but the raising himself at court, fancied that his being made a bishop might render himself more considerable. So he possessed the lord Aubigny with such an opinion of him, that he made the king apprehend that a man of his piety and his notions (and his not being married was not forgot) might contribute to carry on their design. He fancied such a monastic man, who had a great stretch of thought, and so many other eminent qualities, would be a mean, at least, to prepare the nation for popery, if not directly to come over to them; for his brother did not stick to say he was sure that lay at root with him. So the king named him of his own proper motion, which gave all those who began to suspect the king himself great jealousies of him. Leighton was averse to this promotion, as much as was possible. His brother had great power over him; for he took care to hide his vices from him, and to make before him a great shew of piety. He seemed to be a papist rather in name and shew than in reality, of which I will set down one instance that was then much talked of. Some of the church of England loved to magnify the sacrament in an extraordinary man-
138 ner, affirming the real presence, only blaming the church of

[a] *both ambitious and sensual* struck out.

Rome for defining the manner; they saying Christ was present in a most unconceivable manner. This was so much the mode, that the king and all the court went into it. So the king, upon some raillery about transubstantiation, asked sir Elisha if he believed it. He answered, he could not well tell; but he was sure the church of England believed it. And when the king seemed amazed at that, he replied, do not you believe that Christ is present in a most unconceivable manner? Which the king granted: then said he, that is just transubstantiation, the most unconceivable thing that was ever yet invented. When Leighton was prevailed on to accept a bishopric, he chose Dunblane, a small diocese, as well as a little revenue[1]. But the deanery of the chapel royal was annexed to that see. So he was willing to engage in that, that he might set up the common prayer in the king's chapel; for the rebuilding of which orders were given. The English clergy were well pleased with him, finding him both more learned, and more thoroughly theirs in the other points of uniformity, than the rest of the Scotch clergy, whom they could not much value. And though Sheldon did not very much like his great strictness, in which he had no mind to imitate him, yet he thought such a man as he was might give credit to episcopacy in its first introduction to a nation much prejudiced against it. Sharp did not know what to make of all this: he neither liked his strictness of life nor his notions: he believed they would not take the same methods, and he fancied he might be much obscured by him; for he feared he would be well supported. He saw the earl of Lauderdale began to magnify him; and so he did all he could to discourage him, but without any effect; for he had no regard to him. I bear still the greatest veneration for the memory of that man that I do to any person, and reckon my early knowledge of him, which happened the year after this, and my long and intimate conversation with him, that

CHAP. III.

[1] He remained at Dumblane from 1661 until he succeeded Alexander Burnet in the archbishopric of Glasgow in 1674.

CHAP. III. continued to his death for 23 years, in all which time he made it very visible that I was the person he made most use of, and relied most upon, I say I reckon this among the greatest blessings of my life, and for which I know I must give an account to God in the great day in a most particular manner. And yet, though I know this account of his promotion may seem a blemish upon him, I would not conceal it, being resolved to write of all persons and things with all possible candor. I had the relation of it from himself, and more particularly from his brother. But what hopes soever the papists had of him at this time, when he knew nothing of the design of bringing in popery, and had therefore talked of some points of popery with the freedom of an abstracted and speculative man, yet he expressed another sense of the matter, when he came to see
139 it was really intended to be brought in among us. He then spoke of popery in the complex at much another rate: and he seemed to have more zeal against it than I thought was in his nature with relation to any points in controversy; for his abstraction made him seem cold in all those matters. But he gave all who conversed with him a very different view of popery, when he saw we were really in danger of coming under the power of a religion that had, as he used to say, much of the wisdom that was earthly, sensual, and devilish,
MS. 73. | but had nothing in it of the wisdom that was from above, and was pure and peaceable. He did indeed think the corruptions and cruelties of Popery were such gross and odious things, that nothing could have maintained that church under those just and visible prejudices but the several orders among them, that had such an appearance of mortification and contempt of the world; that with all the trash that was among them this maintained a face of piety and devotion. He also thought the great and fatal error of the Reformation was, that more of those houses and of that course of life, free from the entanglements of vows and other mixtures, was not preserved: so that the Protestant churches had neither places of education, nor

retreat for men of mortified tempers. I have dwelt long upon this man's character: but it was so singular, that it seemed to deserve it. And I was so singularly blessed by knowing him as I did, that I am sure he deserved it of me that I should give so full a view of him; which I hope may be of some use to the world. CHAP. III.

When the time fixed for the consecration of the bishops of Scotland came on, the English bishops finding that Sharp and Leighton had not episcopal ordination to be priests and deacons, the other two having been ordained by bishops before the wars, they stood upon it that they must be ordained first deacons and then priests. Sharp was very uneasy at this, and remembered them of what had happened when king James had set up episcopacy. Bishop Andrews moved at that time the ordaining them, as was now proposed: but that was overruled by king James, who thought it went too far towards the unchurching of all those who had not bishops among them[1]. But the late wars, and the disputes during that time, had raised these controversies higher, and brought men to stricter notions, and to maintain them with more fierceness. The English bishops did also say, that by the late Act of Uniformity that matter was more positively settled than it had been before; so that they could not legally consecrate any but those who were, according to that constitution, made first priests and deacons. They also made this difference between the present time and king James's: for then the Scots were only in an imperfect state, having never had bishops among them since the Reformation; so in such 140
a state of things, in which they had been under a real necessity, it was reasonable to allow of their orders, how defective soever: but that of late they had been in a state of schism, they had revolted from their bishops, and had thrown off that order: so that orders given in such a wilful opposition to the whole constitution of the primitive church

[1] Spottiswoode, 514. O. Compare Heylin's *History of the Presbyterians*, b. xi. c 4, p. 514. R.

CHAP. III. was a thing of another nature. They were positive in the point, and would not dispense with it. Sharp [a] stuck more at it than could have been expected from a man that had swallowed down greater matters [1]. Leighton did not stand much upon it. He did not think orders given without bishops were null and void. He thought the forms of government were not settled by such positive laws as were unalterable, but only by apostolical practice, which, as he thought, authorized episcopacy as the best form. Yet he did not think it necessary to the being of a church. But yet he thought [2] that every church might make such rules in ordination as they pleased, and that they might reordain all that came to them from any other church; so that the reordaining a priest ordained in another church imported no more but that they received him into orders according to their rules, and did not infer the annulling the orders he
Dec. 1661. had formerly received. These two were upon this privately ordained deacons and priests; and then all the four were consecrated publicly in the abbey of Westminster. Leighton told me he was much struck with the feasting and jollity of that day: it had not such an appearance of seriousness or piety as became the new modelling of a church [3]. When that was over, he made some attempts to work up Sharp to the two designs which possessed him most. The one was, to try what could be done towards the uniting the
1641. presbyterians and them: he offered Usher's Reduction as

[a] *was very uneasy at this, and* struck out.

[1] 'The Scots' bishops by submitting to a fresh ordination as presbyters, declared that they looked upon presbyterial ordination as invalid; but it is plain their after-conduct was inconsistent with this principle; for when they returned to Scotland, and entered upon their episcopal functions, they reordained none of these ministers who complied with them; and consequently, according to their own principles, these were no lawful ministers, since they had not prelatical ordination.' Crookshank's *Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, i. chap. 3, 126. Compare Skinner's *Eccl. Hist. of Scotland*, ii. 462, where it appears that reordination by the bishop was not always dispensed with. R.

[2] Think, thought, thought, think, thought. S.

[3] This is borne out by Clarendon, *Cont.* 488. The consecration was on Dec. 15, 1661.

the plan upon which they ought to form their schemes. The other was, to try how they could raise men to a truer and higher sense of piety, and bring the worship of that church out of their extempory methods into more order, and so to prepare them for a more regular way of worship, which he thought was of much more importance than a form of government. But he was amazed, when he observed that Sharp had neither formed any scheme, nor seemed so much as willing to talk of any. He reckoned they would be established in the next session of parliament, and so would be legally possessed of their bishoprics: and then every bishop was to do the best he could once to get all to submit to their authority, and when that point was carried, they might proceed to other things as should be found expedient: but he did not care to lay down any scheme. Fairfoul, when he talked to | him, had always a merry tale ready at hand to divert [a]him[a]: so that he avoided all serious discourse, and indeed did not seem capable of any. By these means Leighton quickly lost all heart and hope; and he said often to me upon it, that in the whole progress of that affair there appeared such cross characters of an angry Providence, that, how fully soever he was satisfied in his own mind as to episcopacy itself, yet it seemed that God was against them, and that they were not like to be the men that should build up his church; so that the struggling about it seemed to him like a fighting against God. He who had the greatest hand in it proceeded with so much dissimulation, and the rest of the order were so [b]mean[b] and so selfish, and the earl of Middleton, with the other secular men that conducted it, were so openly impious and vicious, that it did cast a reproach on every thing relating to religion, to see it managed by such instruments.

CHAP. III.

141 MS. 74.

All the steps that were made afterwards were of a piece with this melancholy beginning. Upon the consecration

[a] substituted for *the discourse.* [b] substituted for *carnal.*

CHAP. III. of the bishops, the presbyteries of Scotland that were still sitting began now to declare openly against episcopacy, and to prepare protestations, or other acts and instruments, against them. Some were talking of entering into new engagements against submitting to them. So Sharp moved, that, since the king had set up episcopacy, a proclamation might be issued out, forbidding clergymen to meet together in any presbytery or other judicatory, till the bishops should settle a method of proceeding in them. Upon the setting out this proclamation, a general obedience was given to it: only the ministers, to keep up a shew of acting on an ecclesiastical authority, met once, and entered in their books a protestation against this proclamation, as an invasion on the liberties of the church, to which they declared they gave obedience only for a time, and for peace sake. Sharp did this without any advice: and it proved very fatal. For when king James brought in the bishops before, they had still suffered the inferior judicatories to continue sitting, till the bishops came and sat down among them: some of them protested indeed against that: yet they sat on after that: and so the whole church had a face of unity, while all sat together in the same judicatories, though upon different principles. The old presbyterians said, they sat still as in a court settled by the laws of the church and state: and though they looked on the bishops sitting among them, and assuming a negative vote, as an usurpation, yet they said it did not infer a nullity on the court: whereas now, by this silencing these courts, the case was much
142 altered: for if they had continued sitting, and the bishops had come among them, they would have said it was like the bearing with an usurpation when there was no remedy: and what protestations soever they might have made, or what opposition soever they might have given the bishops, that would have been kept within their own walls, but would not have broke out into such a distraction, as the nation was cast into upon that. All the opposition that might have been made would have died with those few

that were disposed to make it: and, upon due care to fill the vacant places with worthy and well-affected men, the nation might have been brought off from their prejudices. But these courts being now once broken, and brought together afterwards by a sort of connivance, without any legal authority, only as the bishop's assistants and officials, to give him advice, and to act in his name, they pretended they could not sit in them any more, unless they should change their principles, and become thoroughly episcopal, which was too great a turn to be soon brought about. So fatally did Sharp precipitate matters: he affected to have the reins of the church put wholly in his hands. The earl of Lauderdale was not sorry to see him commit errors; since the worse things were managed, his advices would be thereby the more justified. And the earl of Middleton and his party took no care of any business, being almost perpetually drunk: by which they came in a great measure to lose the king, for though, upon a frolic, he, with a few in whose company he took pleasure, would sometimes run into excess, yet he did it seldom, and had a very bad opinion of all that got into the habit and love of drunkenness [1]. CHAP. III.

The bishops came down to Scotland soon after their consecration, all in one coach. Leighton told me, he believed they were weary of him, for he was very weary of them: but he, finding they intended to be received at Edinburgh with some pomp, left them at Morpeth, and came to Edinburgh a few days before them: he hated all the appearances of vanity. He would not have the title of lord given him by his friends, and was not easy when others forced it on him. In this [a]he was thought[a] too stiff: it provoked the other bishops, and looked like singularity and affectation, and furnished those who were prejudiced against him with a specious appearance, to represent him

[a] altered from *I always thought him.*

[1] *Supra* 187, note.

CHAP. III. as a man of odd notions and practices. The lord chancellor, with all the nobility and privy-counsellors then at Edinburgh, went out, together with the magistracy of the March, April, 1662. city, and brought the bishops in, as in triumph [1]. I looked on; and though I was thoroughly episcopal, yet I thought 143 there was somewhat in the slight pomp of that entry, that did not look like the humility that became their function. Soon after their arrival, six other bishops were consecrated, MS. 75. but not ordained | priests and deacons [2]. The see of Edinburgh was for some time kept void. Sharp hoped that Douglas might be prevailed on to accept it: but he would enter into no treaty about it. So the earl of Middleton forced upon Sharp one Wishart, that had been the marquis of Montrose's chaplain, and had been taken prisoner, and used with so much cruelty in the gaol of Edinburgh, that he had been almost eat up with vermin; so the earl of Middleton thought it was but justice to advance a man in that place, where he had [3] been so near [a] an advancement of another sort [a].

The session of parliament came on in April 1662: where the first thing that was proposed by the earl of Middleton was, that since by the act rescissory, that had annulled all the parliaments after that held in the year [16]33, the former laws in favour of episcopacy were now again in force,

[a] struck out, and *suffering for the king's service* substituted.

[1] On the forenoon of April 20, 1662, Sharp preached his first sermon since his consecration at St. Andrews, 'a velvet cushion on the pulpit before him, his text 1 Cor. ii. 2: "For I am determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified."' His sermon 'did not run much on the words, but on a discourse of vindicating himself, and of pressing episcopacy and the utility of it.' Lamont's *Diary*. He possibly remembered how on Dec. 13, 1660, he had declared that 'whatever lot I may meet with, I scorn to prostitute my conscience and honesty to base unbecoming allurements.' *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 50; *Scottish Review*, July, 1884, 4, 5.

[2] Cf. *supra* 248, note.

[3] *Where he had suffered so much*, was substituted in the printed copy. He was the author of the book *De Rebus a Jacobo Marchione Montisrosarum in Scotia gestis*. Paris, 1648. See more of this able and good man, f. 236. R. A new and enlarged edition of Wishart's *Memoirs of Montrose* was published by Murdoch and Simpson, 1893.

the king had restored that function that had been so long glorious in the church, and for which his blessed father had suffered so much: and though the bishops had a right to come and take their place in parliament, yet it was a just piece of respect to send some of every state to invite them to come and sit among them. This was agreed to: so upon the message that was sent the bishops came and took their places[1]. Leighton came not with them, as indeed he never came to parliament but when there was something before them that related to religion or to the church.

May 27, 1662.

The first act that passed in this session was for restoring of episcopacy, and settling the government of the church in their hands. Sharp had the framing of this act, as Primrose told me; and it appeared to be his; for, according to the fable of the harpies, he had an art of spoiling every thing that he touched. The whole government and jurisdiction of the church in the several dioceses was declared to be lodged in the bishops, which they were to exercise with the advice and assistance of such of their clergy as were of known loyalty and prudence: all men that held any benefice in the church were required to own and submit to the government of the church as now by law established. This was plainly the setting episcopacy on another bottom than it had been ever on in Scotland before this time: for the whole body of the presbyters did formerly maintain such a share in the administration, that the bishops had never pretended to any more than to be their settled presidents, with a negative voice upon them[2].

[1] On May 8, 1662, nine bishops were added to the Lords of the Articles by the king. *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 371. Episcopacy was not formally restored until May 27.

[2] But this negative voice appears to have been objected to by those ministers who were deprived of their benefices at this time. Archbishop Burnet, in a MS. letter to Sheldon, says, that 'our ejected and dissatisfied ministers plead everywhere that they are not against bishops, but allow episcopal praesides, who shall preside in their meetings, but have no more power than any.' R. *Sheldon MSS.* (Bodl.). A selection from these letters, relating to Scottish affairs, is printed in the App. to vol. ii. of the *Lauderdale Papers*.

CHAP. III. But now it was said, that the whole power was lodged singly in the bishop, who was only bound to carry along with him in the administration so many presbyters as he thought fit to single out, as his advisers and assistants; which was the taking all power out of the body of the clergy. Church judicatories were now made only the
144 bishop's assistants: and the few of the clergy that must assist being to be picked out by him, that was only a matter of shew: nor had they any authority lodged with them, all that being vested only in the bishop. Nor did it escape censure, that among the qualifications of those presbyters that were to be the bishop's advisers and assistants, loyalty and prudence were only named, and that piety and learning were forgot, which must always be reckoned in the first rank of the qualifications of the clergy. In the next place, exception was taken to the obligation laid on the clergy to own and submit to the government thus established by law. They said, it was hard even to submit to so high an authority as was now lodged with the bishops; but to require them to own it, seemed to import an antecedent approving, or at least a subsequent justifying, of such an authority, which carried the matter far beyond a bare obedience even to an imposing upon conscience. These were not only the exceptions made by presbyterians, but by the episcopal men themselves, who had never carried the argument farther in Scotland than for a presidency, with some authority in ordination, and a negative in matters of jurisdiction. They thought the body of the clergy ought to be a check upon the bishops, so that without a consent of the majority they ought not to be legally empowered to act in so imperious a manner, as was warranted by this act. Many of them would never subscribe to this form of owning and submitting: and the prudenter bishops did not impose it on their clergy. The whole frame of the act was liable to great censure. It was thought an unexcusable piece of madness, that, when a government was brought in upon a nation so averse to it, the first step

should carry their power so high. All the bishops, except Sharp, disowned their having any share in the penning the act; which indeed was passed in haste, without due consideration: nor did any of the bishops, no not Sharp himself, ever carry their authority so high as by the act they were warranted to do. But all the enemies to episcopacy had this act ever in their mouth, to excuse their not submitting to it; that it asserted a greater stretch of authority in bishops than they themselves thought fit to assume.

Soon after that act passed, some of the presbyterian preachers were summoned to answer before the parliament for some reflections made in their sermons against episcopacy. But nothing could be made of it: for their words were general, and capable of different senses. So it was resolved, for a proof of their loyalty, to tender them the oath of allegiance and supremacy, that had been enacted in the former parliament, and was refused by none but | the earl of Cassillis. He desired that an explanation might be made of the supremacy. The words of the oath were large: and when the oath was enacted in England, a clear explanation was given in one of the articles of the church of England, and more copiously afterwards in a discourse of archbishop Usher's, published by king James's order. But the parliament would not satisfy him so far: and they were well pleased to see scruples raised about the oath, that so a colour might be put on their severities against such as should refuse it, as being men that refused to swear allegiance to the king. Upon that the earl of Cassillis left the parliament, and quitted all his employments: for he was a man of most inflexible firmness[1]. Many said there was no need of an explanation, since how ambiguous soever the words might be in themselves, yet that oath, being brought to Scotland from England, ought to be understood

Sept. 5, 1662. April 11, 1661. MS. 76. 145

[1] See *supra* 89. It seems that the Earl of Melville among the Nobles, and the Laird of Kilburnie among the Commissioners, also failed to take the oath, having probably absented themselves. Wodrow, i. 107.

CHAP. III. in the same sense in which it was imposed in that kingdom. On the other hand, there was just reason for men's being tender in so sacred a matter as an oath. The earl of Cassillis had offered to take the oath, provided he might join his explanation to it. The earl of Middleton was contented to let him say what he pleased, but he would not suffer him to put it in writing. The ministers to whom it was now tendered offered to take it upon the same terms; and in a petition to the lords of the articles they offered their explanation. Upon that a debate arose, whether an act explanatory of the oath should be offered to the parliament or not. This was the first time that Leighton appeared in parliament. He pressed it might be done, with much zeal. He said the land mourned by reason of the many oaths that had been taken: the words of this were certainly capable of a bad sense: in compassion to papists a limited sense had been put on them in England: and he thought there should be a like tenderness shewed to [a] protestants [a], especially when the scruple was just, and there was an oath in the case, in which the matter ought certainly to be made clear: to act otherwise looked like the laying snares for people, and the making men offenders for a word. Sharp took this ill from him, and replied upon him with great bitterness: he said it was below the dignity of government to make acts to satisfy the weak scruples of peevish men: it ill became them, who had imposed their covenant on all people without any explanation, and had forced all to take it, now to expect such extraordinary favour. Leighton insisted that it might be done for that very reason, that all people might see a difference between the mild proceedings of the government now, and their severity: and said it ill became the very same persons that had complained of that rigour now to practise it themselves; for thus it may be
146 said, the world will go mad by turns. This was ill taken by the earl of Middleton and all his party: for they designed to keep the matter so, that the presbyterians should

[a] substituted for *tender consciences.*

be possessed with many scruples on this head, and that when any of the party should be brought before them that they believed in fault, but had not full proof against him, the oath should be tendered as the trial of his allegiance, and that for refusing it they should censure him as they thought fit. So the ministers' petition was rejected, and they were required to take the oath as it stood in the law, without putting any sense upon it. They refused to do it, and were upon that condemned to perpetual banishment, as men that denied allegiance to the king. And by this an engine was found out to banish as many as they pleased: for the resolution was taken up by the whole party to refuse it, unless with an explanation. So soon did men forget all their former complaints of the severity of imposing oaths, and began to set on foot the same practices, now that they had it in their power to do it. But how unbecoming soever this rigour might be in laymen, it was certainly much more indecent when managed by clergymen. And the supremacy which now was turned against the presbyterians, was not long after this laid much heavier on the bishops themselves: and then they desired an explanation, as much as the presbyterians did now, but could not obtain it. CHAP. III.

The parliament was not satisfied with this oath: for they apprehended that many would infer, that, since it came from England, it ought to be understood in the public and established sense of the words that was passed there, both in an article of doctrine and in an act of parliament. Therefore another oath was likewise taken from the English pattern, of abjuring the covenant, both the league and the national covenant. It is true this was only imposed on men in the magistracy, or in public employments. By it all the presbyterians were turned out[1]: for this oath was Sept. 5, 1662.

[1] See *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 405: and Wodrow, i. 270, 294, for its effects. Mackenzie states, with every likelihood, that the oath was pressed in the hope that Lauderdale would refuse it, and thus be compelled to resign. But his enemies did not know their man. The events of 1648 might indeed be regarded as absolving him from the charge of breach of faith; but, besides this, he was, in his own genial phrase,

CHAP III. decried by the ministers as little less than open apostasy from God, and a throwing off their baptismal covenant.

CHAPTER IV.

CONTEST BETWEEN MIDDLETON AND LAUDERDALE.

THE main business of this session of parliament, now that episcopacy was settled, and these oaths were enacted, Sept. 9, 1662. was the passing the act of indemnity[1]. The earl of Middleton had obtained of the king an instruction to consent to the fining of the chief offenders, or to other punishments not extending to life[2]. This was intended to enrich him and his party, since all the rich and great offenders would be struck with the terror of this, and choose rather to make a good present than be fined on record, as guilty persons. 147 This matter was debated at the council in Whitehall. The earls of Lauderdale and Crawford argued against it. They said the king had granted a full indemnity in England, out of which none were excepted but the regicides: it seemed therefore an unkind and unequal way of proceeding towards Scotland, that had merited eminently at the king's hands ever since the year [16]48, and had suffered much for it, that the one kingdom should not have the same measure of grace and pardon that was granted in the other. The MS. 77. earl of Middleton answered, that all he desired was in | favour of the loyal party in Scotland, who were undone by their adhering to the king: the revenue of the crown was too small, and too much charged, to repair their losses: so the

willing 'to swallow a cartload of such oaths,' while hating 'damn'd insipid lies.' They then had recourse to the clumsy contrivance of the Billetting Act, *infra* 263.

[1] As a matter of policy the English Act of Indemnity was forced through parliament and passed at the earliest possible moment. In Scotland, where no such necessity existed, it was delayed as long as possible. *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 415.

[2] See the list of persons fined in Wodrow, i. 271, the sums amounting to over £1,000,000 Scots. For Middleton's instructions, dated Jan. 29, 166½, see *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 103.

king had no other way to be just to them, but by making their enemies pay for their rebellion. Limitations were offered to the fines into which any should be condemned that were plausible; as, that it should be only for offences committed since the year [16]50, and that no man should be fined in above a year's rent of his estate; and these were agreed to. So he had an instruction to pass an act of indemnity, with a power of fining restrained to these rules. There was one sir George Mackenzie, since made lord Tarbot [1], a young man of great vivacity of parts, but full of ambition, and very crafty, who has had the art to recommend himself to all sides and parties by turns, and is yet alive, having made a great figure in that country now above fifty years. He has great notions of virtue and religion: but they are only notions, at least they have not had great effect on himself at all times. He became now the earl of Middleton's chief favourite. Primrose was grown rich and cautious: and his maxim having always been, that when he apprehended a change he ought to lay in for it by courting the side that was depressed, that so in the next turn he might secure friends to himself, he began to think that the earl of Middleton went too fast to hold out long. He had often advised him to manage the business of restoring episcopacy: he had formed a scheme by which it should have been the work of seven years, in a slow progress; but the earl of Middleton's heat and Sharp's vehemence spoiled all his project. The earl of Middleton, after his disgrace, said often to him, that his advices had been always wise and faithful: but he thought princes were

CHAP. IV.

[1] Sir George Mackenzie of Tarbot (or Tarbet), appointed Lord of Session with the judicial title of Lord Tarbot in Feb. 1661. He succeeded to Lauderdale's power in Scotland in 1682, and was created Viscount Tarbot and Lord Macleod of Castlehaven, Feb. 1685; Secretary of State, 1702; and Earl of Cromarty, 1703; he died 1714. He was a man of wide attainments, and was consulted by Moray on the formation of the Royal Society, to which he contributed many papers. He must be distinguished from Sir George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, the writer of the *Memoirs* frequently referred to in the notes. See *Carstares State Papers* (1774), 94.

CHAP. IV. more sensible of services, and more apt to reflect on them, and to reward them, than he found they were.

When the settlement of episcopacy was over, the next care was to prepare the act of indemnity. Some proposed, that, besides the power of fining, they should move the king that he would consent to an instruction, empowering them likewise to put some under an incapacity to hold any
148 public trust. This had never been proposed in public; but the earl of Middleton pretended that many of the best affected of the parliament had proposed it in private to himself. So he sent the lord Tarbot up to the king with two draughts of an act of indemnity; the one containing an exception of some persons to be fined, and the other containing likewise a clause for the incapacitating of some, not exceeding twelve, from all public trusts[1]. He was ordered to lay both before the king: the one was penned according to the earl of Middleton's instructions: the other was drawn at the desire of the parliament, for which he prayed an instruction, if the king thought fit to approve of it. The earl of Lauderdale had no apprehension of any design against himself in the motion: so he made no objection to it. And an instruction was drawn, empowering the earl of Middleton to pass an act with that clause. Tarbot was then much considered at court, as one of the most extraordinary men that Scotland had produced, and was the better liked, because he was looked on as the person that the earl of Middleton intended to set up in the earl of Lauderdale's room, who was then so much hated that nothing could have preserved him but the course that was taken to ruin him. So lord Tarbot went back to Scotland; and the duke of Richmond and the earl of Newburgh went down with him, by whose mild and ungoverned extravagancies the earl of Middleton's whole conduct fell under such an universal odium, and so much contempt, that it was well his own ill management forced the king to put an end to his ministry; for he could not

[1] *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 472.

have served there much longer with any reputation. One instance of unusual severity was, that a letter of the lord Lorn's to the lord Duffus was intercepted, in which he did a little too plainly, but very truly, complain of the practices of his enemies in endeavouring to possess the king against him by many lies: but he said he had now discovered them, and had defeated them, and had gained the person upon whom the chief among them depended. This was the earl of Clarendon, upon whom the earl of Berkshire had wrought so much, that he resolved to oppose his restoration no more: and for this the earl of Berkshire was to have a thousand pound. This letter was carried into the parliament, and complained of as leasing-making; since lord Lorn pretended he had discovered the lies of his enemies to the king, which was a sowing dissension between the king and his subjects, and the creating in the king an ill opinion of them. So the parliament desired the king would send him down to be tried upon it. The king thought the letter very indiscreetly writ, but could not see any thing in it that was criminal; yet, in compliance with the desire of so zealous a parliament, Lorn 149
was sent down upon his parole: but the king writ positively to the earl of Middleton not to proceed to the execution of any sentence that might pass upon him. Lorn, upon his appearance, was made a prisoner: and an indictment was brought against him for leasing-making. He made no defence: but in a long speech he set out the great provocation he had been under, the many libels [that] had been printed against him: some of these had been put in the king's own hands, to represent him as unworthy of his grace and favour: so, after all that hard usage, it was no wonder if he had writ with some sharpness: but he protested he meant no harm to any person; his design being only to preserve and save himself from the malice and lies of others, and not to make lies of any. In conclusion, he submitted to the justice of the parliament, and cast himself on the king's mercy. He was upon this condemned to die,

CHAP. IV. as guilty of leasing-making: and the day of his execution
Aug. 26, 1662. was left to the earl of Middleton by the parliament. I never knew any thing more generally cried out on than this
MS. 78. was, | unless it was the second sentence passed on him about twenty years after this, which had more fatal effects and a more tragical conclusion. He was certainly born to be the signalest instance in this age of the rigour, or rather of the mockery, of justice. All that was said at this time to excuse the proceeding was, that it was certain his life was in no danger. But since that depended on the king, it did not excuse those who passed so base a sentence, and left to posterity the precedent of a parliamentary judgment, by which any man may be condemned for a letter of common news. This was not all the fury with which this matter was driven: for an act was passed against all persons, who should move the king for restoring the children of those who were attainted by parliament; which was an unheard-of restraint on applications to the king for his grace and mercy. This the earl of Middleton also passed, though he had no instruction for it. There was no penalty put in the act, from a maxim of the pleaders for prerogative, who thought the fixing a punishment was a limitation on the crown: whereas an act forbidding any thing made the offenders criminals: and in that case they did reckon, that the punishment was arbitrary; only that it could not extend to life. A committee was next appointed for setting the fines. They proceeded without any regard to the rules the king had set them. The most obnoxious compounded secretly. No consideration was had either of men's crimes or of their estates: no proofs were brought; inquiries were not so much as made: but as men were
150 delated, they were marked down for such a fine: and all was transacted in a secret committee. When the list of the men and of their fines was read in parliament, exceptions were made to divers particulars: some had been under age all the time of transgression, and others had been abroad. But to every thing of this kind an answer

was made, that there would come a proper time in which every man was to be heard in his own defence: for the meaning of setting the fine was only this, that such persons should have no benefit by the act of indemnity unless they paid the fine: therefore every man that could stand upon his innocence, and renounce the benefit of the indemnity, was thereby freed from the fine, that was only his composition for the grace and pardon of the act. So all passed in a great hurry.

The other point, concerning the incapacity, was carried further than was perhaps intended at first; though the lord Tarbot assured me, he had from the beginning designed it. It was infused into all people that the king was weary of the earl of Lauderdale, but that he could not decently throw him off, and that therefore the parliament must help him with a fair pretence for doing it. Yet others were very apprehensive that the king could not approve of a parliament's falling upon a minister. So lord Tarbot proposed two expedients. The one was, that no person should be named, but that every member was to do it by ballot, and was to bring twelve names in a paper; and that a secret committee, two of every estate, should make the scrutiny; and that they, without making any report to the parliament, should put those twelve names on whom the greater number fell in the act of incapacity; which was to be an act apart, and not made a clause of the act of indemnity[1]. This was taken from the ostracism in Athens, and seemed the best method in an act of oblivion, in which all that was passed was to be forgiven: so no seeds of feuds would remain, when it was not so much as known against whom any one had voted. The other expedient was, that a clause should be put in the act, that it should have no force, and that the names in it should never be

[1] The whole of this very curious affair, with the discovery and frustration of the plot, may be read in the original letters, *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 106–140. The connected story will be found in the *Quarterly Review*, April, 1884, 417–419.

CHAP. IV. published, unless the king should approve of it. By this means it was hoped, that, if the king should dislike the whole thing, yet it would be easy to soften that, by letting him see how entirely the act was in his power. Emissaries
Aug. 1663. were sent to every parliament man, directing him how to make his list, that so the earls of Lauderdale, Crawford, and sir Robert Moray, might be three of the number. This was managed so carefully, that by a great majority they were three of the incapacitated persons[1]. The earl of Middleton passed the act, though he had no instruction
151 about it in this form. The matter was so secretly carried, that it was not let out till the day before it was done: for they reckoned their success in it was to depend on the secrecy of it, and on their carrying it to the king before he should be possessed against it by the earl of Lauderdale or his party. So they took great care to visit the packet, and to stop any that should go post: and all people were under such a terror that no courage was left. Only lord Lorn sent one on his own horses, who was to go on in cross roads, till he got into Yorkshire; for they had secured every stage to Durham[2]. By this means the earl of Lauderdale had the news three days before the duke of Richmond and lord Tarbot got to court. He carried it presently to the king, who could scarce believe it. But when he saw by the letters that it was certainly true, he assured the earl of Lauderdale that he would preserve him, and never suffer such a destructive precedent to pass. He said he looked for no better upon the duke of Richmond's

[1] This is an error. Crawford was not excepted. He escaped by three or four votes. For one of the original billetting papers see the *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 115.

[2] This story is barely possible. From August 26, 1662, to June 4, 1663, Lorn was close prisoner in Edinburgh castle; and this affair was in Sept. 1662. But there is no doubt that Lauderdale's friends managed to send him timely information of what had happened, and that he was on his guard. See William Sharp's letters, *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 112, 117. The secret was apparently betrayed by James Sharp, who was one of the scrutineers; *id.* 245. Tarbot and Primrose hoped to be respectively Clerk Register and Secretary. *Id.* 115, 117.

going to Scotland, and his being perpetually drunk there. CHAP. IV.
This mortified the earl of Lauderdale; for it looked like the laying in an excuse for the earl of Middleton. From him, by his orders, he went to the earl of Clarendon, and told all to him. He was amazed at it; and said, that certainly he had some secret friend that had got into their confidence, and had persuaded them to do as they had done on design to ruin them; but growing more serious, he added, he was sure the king on his own account would take care not to suffer such a thing to pass: otherwise no man could serve him: if way was given to such a method of proceeding, he himself would go out of his dominions as fast as his gout would suffer him. Two days after this, the duke of Richmond and lord Tarbot came to court. They brought the act of incapacity sealed up, together with a letter from the parliament magnifying the earl of Middleton's services, and another letter signed by ten of the bishops, setting forth his zeal for the church, and his care of them all: | and in particular they set out the design MS. 79.
he was then on, of going round some of the worst affected counties to see the church established in them, as a work that was highly meritorious. At the same time he sent over the earl of Newburgh to Ireland, to engage the duke of Ormond to represent to the king the good effects that they began to feel in that kingdom from the earl of Middleton's administration in Scotland, hoping the king would not discourage, much less change, so faithful a minister. The king received the duke of Richmond and lord Tarbot very coldly. When they delivered the act of incapacity to him, he assured them it should never be opened by him; 152
and said their last actings were like madmen, or like men that were perpetually drunk. Tarbot said, all was yet entire, and in his hands, the act being to live or to die as he pleased: he magnified the earl of Middleton's zeal in his service, and set out the loyal affections of his parliament, who had on this occasion consulted both the king's safety and his honour: the incapacity act was only intended

CHAP. IV. to put it out of the power of men, who had been formerly bad instruments, to be so any more: and even that was submitted by them to the king's judgment. The king heard him patiently, and, without any farther discourse on the subject, dismissed them: so they hoped they had
Feb. 1663. mollified him. But the earl of Lauderdale turned the matter upon the earl of Middleton and lord Tarbot, who had made the king believe that the parliament desired leave to incapacitate some; whereas no such motion had ever been made in parliament: and then, after that the king upon that misrepresentation had given way to it, the parliament was made believe that the king desired that some might be put under that censure: so that the abuse had been equally put on both. Honours went by ballot at Venice, but punishments had never gone so, since the ostracism at Athens, which was the factious practice of a jealous commonwealth, never to be set up as a precedent under a monarchy: even the Athenians were ashamed of it when Aristides, the justest man among them, fell under the censure: and they laid it aside not long after[1].

The earl of Clarendon gave up the thing as unexcusable: but he studied to preserve the earl of Middleton. The change newly made in the church of Scotland had been managed by him with zeal and success: but though it was well begun, yet if these laws were not maintained by a vigorous execution, the presbyterians, who were quite dispirited by the steadiness of his conduct, would take heart again; especially if they saw the earl of Lauderdale grow upon him, whom they looked on as theirs in his heart: so he prayed him to forgive one single fault, that came after so much merit. He also sent advices to the earl of Middleton to go on in his care of establishing the church, and to get the bishops to send up copious accounts of all he had done. The king ordered him to come up, and to

[1] 'That cursed sovereign Lord the People, and their oystershell billetting,' is Lauderdale's phrase in his great speech against Middleton. Mackenzie, *Memoirs*, 87. Burnet had probably seen Lauderdale's own copy of his speech.

give him an account of the affairs in Scotland. But he represented the absolute necessity of seeing some of the laws lately made put in execution: for it was hoped the king's displeasure would be allayed, and go off, if some time could be but gained. CHAP. IV.

One act passed in the last parliament that restored the rights of patronage [1], the taking away of which even presbytery could not carry till the year [16]49, in which they had the parliament entirely in their hands; for then the election of ministers was put in the church session and the lay elders, so that, from that time, all that had been admitted to churches came in without presentations. One clause in the act declared all these incumbents to be unlawful possessors: only it indemnified them for what was past, and required them between [[a]] and Michaelmas to take presentations from the patron, who was obliged to give it, being demanded, and to get themselves to be instituted by the bishops; otherwise their churches were declared vacant on Michaelmas day. This took in all the young and hot men: so the presbyterians had many meetings about it, in which they all resolved not to obey the act. They reckoned the taking institution from a bishop was such an owning of his authority that it was a renouncing of all their former principles: whereas some few, that had a mind to hold their benefices, thought that was only a secular law for a legal right to their tithes and benefices, and had no relation to their spiritual concerns; and therefore they thought they might submit to it, especially where bishops were so moderate as to impose no subscription upon them, as the greater part were. But the resolution taken by the main body of the presbyterians was to pay no obedience to any of the acts made in this session, and to look on, and see what the state would do. The earl of Middleton was naturally fierce, and that was June 12, 1662. 153

[a] a word left out.

[1] *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 376.

CHAP. IV. heightened by the ill state of his affairs at court: so he resolved on a punctual execution of the law. He and all about him were at this time so constantly disordered by high entertainments and other excesses, that, even in the short intervals between their drunken bouts, they were not cool nor calm enough to consider what they were doing. He had also so mean an opinion of the party, that he believed they would comply with any thing rather than lose their benefices; and therefore he declared he would execute the law in its utmost rigour. On the other hand, the heads of the presbyterians reckoned, that if great numbers were turned out all at once, it would not be possible to fill their places all of the sudden; and that the government would
MS. 80. be forced to take them in | again, if there were such a vacancy made, that a great part of the nation were cast destitute, and had no divine service in it. For that which all the wiser of the party apprehended most was, that the bishops would go on slowly, and single out some that were more factious, upon particular provocations, and turn them out by degrees, as they had men ready to put in their room; which would have been more insensible, [defensible?] and more excusable, if indiscreet zealots had, as it were, forced censures from them. The advice sent over all the
154 country from their leaders, that had settled measures at Edinburgh, was, that they should do and say nothing that might give a particular distaste, but should look on, and do their duty as long as they were connived at; and that if any proclamation should be issued out, commanding them to be silent, that they should all obey at once. In these measures both sides were deceived in their expectations. The bishops went to their several dioceses: and according as the people stood affected, they were well received: and they held their synods every where in October. In the northern parts very few stood out: but in the western parts scarce any came to them. The earl of Middleton went to Glasgow before Michaelmas. So when the time fixed by the act was past, and that scarce any one in all

those counties had paid any regard to it, he called a meeting of the privy council, that they might consider what was fit to be done. Duke Hamilton told me, they were all so drunk that day, that they were not capable of considering any thing that was laid before them, and would hear of nothing but the executing the law, without any relenting or delay. So a proclamation was issued out, requiring all who had their livings without presentations, and that had not obeyed the late act, to give over all further preaching, or serving the cure, and to withdraw from their parishes immediately: and the military men that lay in the country were ordered to pull them out of their pulpits, if they should presume to go on in their functions. This was opposed only by duke Hamilton, and sir James Lockhart, father to sir William Lockhart. They represented, that the much greater part of the preachers in these counties had come into their churches since the year [16]49; that they were very popular men, both esteemed and beloved of their people: it would be a great scandal if they should be turned out, and none be ready to be put in their places: and it would not be possible to find a competent number of well qualified men to fill the many vacancies that this proclamation would make. The earl of Middleton would hear of nothing but the immediate execution of the law. So the proclamation was issued out: and upon it above two hundred churches were shut up in one day: and about one hundred and fifty more were to be turned out for not obeying, and submitting to, the bishops' summons to their synods[1]. All this was done without considering the consequence of it, or communicating it to the other bishops. Sharp said to my self, that he knew nothing of it, nor did he imagine that so rash a thing could have been done till he saw it in print. He was glad that this was done without his having any share in it: for by it he was furnished with somewhat in which he was no way concerned, upon which he cast the blame of all the ill things that followed. Yet this was suitable

Oct. 1, 1662.

155

[1] See the list in Wodrow, i. 324.

CHAP. IV.

enough to a maxim that he and all that sort of people set up, that the execution of laws was that by which all governments maintained their strength as well as their honour [1]. The earl of Middleton was surprised at this extraordinary submission of the presbyterians; he had fancied that the greatest part would have complied, and that some of the more intractable would have done some extraordinary thing, to have justified the severities he would have exercised in that case; and was disappointed both ways. Yet this obedience of a party, so little accustomed to it, was much magnified at court. It was said that all plied before him: they knew he was steady: so they saw how necessary it was not to change the management, if it was really intended to preserve the church. Tarbot told me, that the king had expressed to himself the esteem he had for Sheldon, upon the account of the courage that he shewed [in] the debate concerning the execution of the act of uniformity at the day prefixed, which was St. Bartholomew's, when some suggested the danger that might arise, if the act were vigorously executed. From thence, it seems, the earl of Middleton concluded, the zeal he shewed now would be so acceptable, that all former errors would be forgiven, if he went through with it; as indeed he stuck at nothing. Yet the clamour of putting several counties as it were under an interdict, was very great. So all endeavours were used to get as many as could be had to fill those vacancies; and among others, I was much pressed both by the earl of Glencairn and the lord Tarbot, to go into any of the vacant churches that I liked best. I was then but nineteen: but there is no law in Scotland limiting the age of a priest. And it was upon this account that I was let in so far into the secret of all affairs: for they had such an imagination of some service I might do them, that they treated me with a very particular freedom and confidence. But I had drunk in the principle of moderation so early, that, though I was entirely episcopal, yet I would not engage with a body

[1] Dunce, can there be a better maxim? S.

of men that seemed to have the principles and tempers of inquisitors in them, and to have no regard to religion in any of their proceedings. So I stood upon my youth, and could not be wrought on | to go to the west; though the earl of Glencairn offered to carry me with him under his protection[1]. There was a sort of an invitation sent over the kingdom, like a hue and cry, to all persons to accept of benefices in the west. The livings were generally well endowed, and the parsonage houses were well built, and in good repair: and this drew many very worthless persons thither, who had little learning, less piety, and no sort of discretion. They came thither with great prejudices upon them, and had many difficulties to wrestle with. The former incumbents, who were for the most part Protesters, were a grave, solemn sort of people; their spirits were eager, and their tempers sour: but this had an appearance that created respect. They were related to the chief families in the country, either by blood or marriage; and had lived in so decent a manner that the gentry paid great respect to them. They used to visit their parishes much, and were so full of the Scriptures, and so ready at extempory prayer, that from that they grew to practise extempory sermons: for the custom in Scotland was after dinner or supper to read a chapter in the Scriptures: and where they happened to come, if it was acceptable, they of the sudden expounded the chapter. They had brought the people to such a degree of knowledge, that cottagers and servants

CHAP. IV.

MS. 81.

156

[1] It is a little surprising that a youth of nineteen should have been let into the secret of all affairs. No doubt the great moderation, and zeal for episcopacy, which he mentions with a singular degree of modesty, which appeared early in him, and continued to his dying day, must have been the inducements: besides a notable faculty he had in keeping a secret; which I gave Queen Anne a proof of, by telling her beforehand I would tell the Bishop of Salisbury a particular story, and enjoin him secrecy, which he readily promised, but came two days after from London to Windsor, to tell it her, which made her laugh very heartily. D. See Cockburn, *Specimen of Remarks*, 28, for an account of Burnet's forwardness at the age of twenty. But Cockburn himself was only ten years old at the time. *Vindication of Dr. Burnet*, 21.

CHAP. IV. could have prayed extempore. I have often overheard them at it: and, though there was a large mixture of odd stuff, yet I was astonished to see how copious and ready they were in it. Their ministers generally brought them about them on the Sunday nights, where the sermons were talked over; and every one, women as well as men, were desired to speak their sense and their experience: and by these means they had a comprehension of matters of religion, greater than I have seen among people of that sort any where. The preachers went all in one tract, of raising observations of points of doctrine out of their texts, and of proving these by reasons, and then of applying those, and shewing the use that was to be made of such a point of doctrine, both for instruction and terror, for exhortation and comfort, for trial of themselves upon it, and for furnishing them with proper directions and helps: and this was so methodical, that the people grew to follow a sermon quite through, in every branch of it. To this some added, the resolving of doubts concerning the state they were in, and their progress or decay in it; which they called cases of conscience: and these were taken from what their people said to them at any time, very oft being under fits of melancholy, or vapours and obstructions, which, though they flowed from natural causes, were looked on as the work of the Spirit of God, and a particular exercise to them; and they fed this disease of weak minds too much. Thus they had laboured very diligently, though with a wrong method and wrong notions. But as they had lived in great familiarity with their people, and used to pray and talk oft with them in private, so it can hardly be imagined to what
157 a degree they were loved and reverenced by them. They kept scandalous persons under a severe discipline[1]: for breach of sabbath, for an oath, or the least disorder in drunkenness, persons were cited before the church session,

[1] For the tyranny of the ministers see the Records of the Synods of Fife, St. Andrews, Lanark, and Cupar (Abbotsford Club); the *St. Andrews Kirk Register* (Scottish Hist. Soc.); and Buckle, *Hist. Civiliz.* iii. ch. iv.

that consisted of ten or twelve of the chief of the parish who with the minister had this care upon them, and were solemnly reproved for it: for fornication they were not only reproved before these, but there was a high place in the church, called the stool or pillar of repentance, where they sat at the time of worship for three Lord's days, receiving admonitions, and making professions of repentance on all these days; which some did with many tears, and serious exhortations to all the rest, to take warning by their fall[1]. For adultery they were to sit six months in that place, covered with sackcloth. These things had a grave appearance. Their faults and defects were not so conspicuous. They had a very low measure of learning, and a narrow compass in it. They were little men, of a very indifferent size of capacity, and apt to fly out into great excesses of passion and indiscretion. They were servile, and too apt to fawn [upon] and flatter their admirers[a]. They were affected in their deportment, and very apt to censure all who differed from them, and to believe and report whatsoever they heard to their prejudice; and they were supercilious and haughty. In their sermons they were apt to enlarge on the present state of the times, and to preach against the sins of princes and courts: a topic that naturally makes men popular. It has an appearance of courage: and the people are glad to hear those sins insisted on in which they perceive they have no share, and to believe that all the judgments of God come down by the means and procurement of other men's sins. But their opinions about the independence of the church and clergy on the civil

[a] *especially the ladies, who were indeed their chief supports* struck out.

[1] This puts me in mind of a ridiculous story Duke Hamilton told me of the old Earl of Eglington, who had done penance for fornication, and the fourth Lord's day came, and sat there again, which the minister perceiving, called to him to come down, for his penance was over. 'It may be so,' said the earl, 'but I shall always sit here for the future, because it is the best seat in the kirk, and I do not see a better man to take it from me.' D. See another case, even more absurd, at the time of the 'engagement,' detailed in Cockburn's *Specimen of Remarks*, 52.

CHAP. IV. power, and their readiness to stir up the people to tumults and wars, was that which begot so ill an opinion of them at this time in all men, that very few who were not deeply engaged with them in these conceits pitied them much, under all the ill usage they now met with. I hope this is no impertinent nor ingrateful digression; it is a just and true account of these men and times, from which a judicious reader will make good inferences. I will conclude it with a very judicious answer that one of the wisest and best of
MS. 82. them, Colvil, that succeeded Leighton | in the headship of the college of Edinburgh, made to the earl of Middleton, when he pressed him in the point of defensive arms to tell plainly his opinion, whether it was lawful to use them or not. He said the question had been often put to him, and he had always declined to answer it: but to him he plainly
158 said, he wished that kings and their ministers would believe them lawful, and so govern as men that expected to be resisted; but he wished that all their subjects might believe them unlawful, and so the world would be at quiet.

I do now return to end the account of the state of that country at that time. The people were much troubled when so many of their ministers were turned out. Their ministers had, for some months before they were thus silenced, been infusing this into their people, both in public and private, that all that was designed in this change of church government was to destroy the power of godliness, and to give an impunity to vice; that prelacy was a tyranny in the church, set on by ambitious and covetous men, who aimed at nothing but authority and wealth, luxury and idleness; and that they intended to encourage vice, that they might procure to themselves a great party among the impious and immoral. The people, thus prepossessed, seeing the earl of Middleton, with all the train that followed him through those counties, running into excesses of all sorts, and railing at the very appearances of virtue and sobriety, were confirmed in the belief of all that their ministers had told them.

What they had heard concerning Sharp's betraying those who had employed him, and the other bishops, who had taken the covenant, and had forced it on others, who now preached against it, openly owning that they had in so doing gone against the express dictate of their own consciences, did very much heighten all their prejudices, and fixed them so in them, that it was scarce possible to conquer them afterwards. All this was out of measure increased by the new incumbents, who were put in the places of the ejected preachers; who were generally very mean and despicable in all respects. They were the worst preachers I ever heard: they were ignorant to a reproach: and many of them were openly vicious. They were a disgrace to orders, and the sacred functions; and were indeed the dreg and refuse of the northern parts. Those of them who arose above contempt or scandal, were men of such violent tempers, that they were as much hated as the others were despised. This was the fatal beginning of episcopacy in Scotland, of which few of the bishops seemed to have any sense. Fairfoul, the most concerned, had none at all: for he fell into a paralytic state, in which he languished a year before he died. I have thus opened the first settlement of things in Scotland: of which I myself observed what was visible, and understood the secreter transactions from those who had such a share in them, that, as it was not possible for them to mistake them, so I had no reason to think they intended to deceive or misinform me. CHAP. IV.

CHAPTER V.

ENGLAND. THE INDEMNITY ACT. THE ROYAL MARRIAGES. THE SETTLEMENT OF IRELAND.

I WILL in the next place change the climate, and give as 159
particular an account as I can of the settlement of England both in church and state: which, though it will be perhaps

CHAP. V.

imperfect, and will in some parts be out of order, yet I am well assured it will be found true; having picked it up at several times, from the earl of Lauderdale, sir Robert Moray, the earl of Shaftesbury, the earl of Clarendon (the son of the Lord Chancellor), the lord Holles, sir Harbottle Grimston, who was the Speaker of the house of commons [1], under whose protection I lived nine years when I was preacher [a] at the rolls, he being then master of the rolls. From such hands I could not be misled, when I laid all together, and considered what reason I had to make allowances for the different accounts that a diversity of parties and interests may lead men to give, they too easily believing some things, and as easily rejecting others, as they stood affected.

After the king came over, no person in the house of commons had the courage to move the offering propositions for any limitation of prerogative, or the defining of any doubtful points; all was joy and rapture. If the king had applied himself to business, and had pursued those designs which he studied to retrieve all the rest of his reign, when it was too late, he had probably in those first transports carried every thing that he would have desired, either as to revenue or power. But he was so given up to pleasure, that he devolved the management of all his affairs on the earl of Clarendon; who, as he had his breeding in the law, so he had all along declared himself for the ancient liberties of England, as well as for the rights of the crown. A domestic accident had happened to him, which heightened this. He, when he began to grow eminent in his profession, came down to see his aged father, a gentle-

MS. 83.

man of Wiltshire: and, one day, as they | were walking in the fields together, his father told him, that men of his

[a] substituted for *chaplain*.

[1] Grimston was Speaker to the Convention Parliament only, but sat throughout the reign for Colchester. He died Jan. 168⅘. After sitting on the commission to try the regicides he was made Master of the Rolls in Nov. 1660. See ff. 380, 381.

profession did often stretch law and prerogative to the prejudice of the liberty of the subject, to recommend and advance themselves: so he charged him, if ever he grew to any eminence in his profession, that he should never sacrifice the laws and liberties of his country to his own interest, or to the will of a prince. He repeated this twice: and immediately he fell into a fit of an apoplexy, of which he died in a few hours. This the earl of Clarendon told the lady Ranelagh, who put him often in mind of it: and from her I had it [1]. He resolved not to stretch the prerogative beyond what it was before the wars, and would neither set aside the Petition of Right, nor endeavour to raise the courts of the Star-chamber or the High Commission again, which could have been easily done if he had set about it [2]: nor did he think fit to move for the repeal of the act for triennial parliaments till other matters were well settled [3]. He took care indeed to have all the things that were extorted by the Long Parliament from king Charles I to be repealed; and since the dispute of the power of the militia was the most important, and the most insisted on, he was very officiously earnest to have that clearly determined for the future. But as to all the acts

CHAP. V.

1632.

160

[1] Clarendon's father died at the age of seventy, on Michaelmas Day, 1632. See the account in Clarendon, *Cont.* i. 17, where, however, there is no mention of the anecdote in the text.

[2] Burnet's misconception of the conditions of the restoration in England is nowhere more strikingly shown than in this sentence. It is not credible that any such enterprise could have been successful, nor was it seriously contemplated. James II singles out Clarendon's sound sense in this matter for special rebuke from his point of view. Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 393. The revival of the Star Chamber was indeed suggested in 1662, but the idea was at once dropped. Lister, *Life of Clarendon*, ii. 112.

[3] The bill for the repeal of the Triennial Act received the royal assent on April 5, 1664; cf. *infra* 354. It was accompanied by another Act, providing that parliaments should not be intermitted for more than three years, but containing none of the safeguards against violation which the former Act contained; or, as Arlington describes it, 'another short one for the security of these ends, but by more dutiful means.' Arlington's *Letters* (1701), ii. 19. A bill for unconditional repeal had been brought in previously, 1662, when the compromise of April, 1664, was first suggested by Vaughan. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 330.

CHAP. V. relating to property, or the just limitation of the prerogative, such as the matter of the ship-money, the tonnage and poundage, and the *habeas corpus*[a], he did not touch on these. And as for the standing revenue, 1,200,000*l.* a year was all that was asked: and, though it was much more than our kings had formerly, yet it was readily granted. This was to answer all the ordinary expense of the government. It was believed that if two millions had been asked, he could have carried it. But he had no mind to put the king out of the necessity of having recourse to his parliament. The king came afterwards to believe he could have raised both his authority and his revenue much higher, but that he had no mind to carry it further, or to trust him too much. Whether all these things could have been got at that time, or not, is above my conjectures. But this I know, that all the earl of Clarendon's enemies after his fall said, these things had been easily obtained, if he had taken any pains in the matter, but that he himself had no mind to it: and they infused this so into the king, that he believed it, and hated him mortally on that account; and in his difficulties afterwards he said often, all these might have been prevented, if the earl of Clarendon had been true to him [1].

Jan. 7, 166⅔. The king had not been many days at Whitehall, when one Venner [2], a violent fifth-monarchy man, who

[a] *act* struck out.

[1] See the memorial in the Record Office (*Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 7), quoted by Ranke, iii. 312. The sum was quite inadequate to the current expenditure and the payment of interest upon the vast sums—amounting to three millions—borrowed by Charles before 1660. Welwood states (*Memoirs*, 110) that Southampton urged Clarendon to secure a larger revenue for the king, but was argued out of the design by the latter; and that Charles heard of it. James supports this; Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 393; Macpherson, *Orig. Pap.* iii. 15; *infra* 287, note.

[2] This was on Jan. 7, 166⅔, seven months after the king's return. Venner, who had previously headed a plot for a rising of Fifth Monarchy men, in April, 1657, had lately returned from New England. He had chosen Jan. 6, Twelfth Night, for the attempt, because the king was away from London, and it was hoped that the guards at Whitehall, engaged in

thought it was not enough to believe that Christ was to reign on earth, and to put the saints in the possession of the kingdom (an opinion that they were all unspeakably fond of), but thought that the saints were to take the kingdom themselves [1]. He gathered some of the most furious of the party to a meeting in Coleman street. There they concerted the day and the manner of their rising to set Christ on his throne, as they called it. But withal they meant to manage the government in his name; and were so formal, that they had prepared standards and colours with their devices on them, and furnished themselves with very good arms. But when the day came, there was but a small appearance, not exceeding twenty. Howsoever they resolved to venture out into the streets, and cry out, No 161
king but Christ. Some of them seemed persuaded that Christ would come down, and head them. They scoured the streets before them, and made a great progress. Some were afraid, and all were amazed at this piece of extravagance. They killed a great many, but were at last mastered by numbers: and were all either killed, or taken and executed. Upon this some troops of guards were raised, and there was great talk of a design, as soon as the army was disbanded, to raise a force that should be so chosen and modelled that the king might depend upon it; and that it should be so considerable, that there might be no reason to apprehend new tumults any more. The earl of Southampton looked on a while: and when he saw how

the usual festivities, would be easily overpowered. See the account of the rising, differing from that in the text, by Reresby, who was engaged in its suppression; *Memoirs* (ed. Cartwright), 50. See also Clarke, *Life of James II*, i. 388; Baker's *Chronicle*, 757; Cobbett's *State Trials*, vi. 114. There were fresh alarms in London in August. *Hatton Correspondence* (Camd. Soc.), i. 22. The rising resulted in the prisons being filled with Quakers and other sectaries; the proclamation against conventicles was enforced; no one was permitted to remain in London without taking the oath of allegiance, or to have arms in the house unless he were in the city militia.

[1] This wants grammar. S. A comma at 'themselves,' and the omission of 'He,' makes the sentence plain. Cf. Ludlow's conversation with Harrison in 1656; *Memoirs*, ii. 5–8.

CHAP. V. this design seemed to be entertained and magnified, he entered into a very free expostulation with the earl of Clarendon about it. He said, they had felt the effects of a military government, though sober and religious, in Cromwell's army: he believed vicious and dissolute troops would be much worse: the king would grow fond of them, and they would quickly become insolent and ungovernable: and then such men as he was must be only instruments to serve their ends. He said he could not look on, and see the ruin of his country begun, and be silent: a white staff would not bribe him. The earl of Clarendon was persuaded he was in the right, and promised he would divert the king from any other force than what might be decent to make a shew with, and what might serve to disperse unruly multitudes. The earl of Southampton said, if it went no farther he could bear it; but it would not be easy to fix such a number as would please our princes, and not give jealousy. The earl of Clarendon persuaded the king, that it was necessary for him to carry himself with great caution till the old army should be disbanded: for, if an ill humour got among them, they knew both their courage and their principles, which though it was for a while a little suppressed, yet upon any just jealousy there might be great cause to
MS. 84. fear new and more violent disorders[1]. | By these means the king was so far wrought on, that there was no great occasion given for jealousy. The army was to be disbanded, but in such a manner, with so much respect, and so exact an account of arrears[2] and gratuities, that it looked rather like a dismissing them to the next opportunity, and a reserving

[1] Clarendon, *Cont.* 18, 19.

[2] The arrears were paid in full, with an additional week's pay. Sixteen infantry and thirteen cavalry regiments, in all nearly 24,000 men, with fifty garrisons, were disbanded. The discontent which this aroused resulted in a widespread conspiracy for the overthrow of the government and the murder of Monk, discovered in September. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1663 *passim*. More than one proclamation was issued ordering the disbanded soldiers to leave London, where their presence was regarded with great alarm; cf. *infra* 326, note. Clarendon, *Cont.* 37, confirms Burnet's estimate of the high quality and the self-respect of these disbanded men.

them till there should be occasion for their service, than a breaking of them. They were certainly the bravest, the best disciplined, and the soberest army that has been known in these latter ages: every soldier was able to do the functions of an officer. The court was at great quiet when they got rid of so uneasy a burden as lay on them from the fear of such a body of men. The guards, and the new troops that were raised, were made up of such of the army as Monk recommended and answered for [1]. And with that his great interest at court came to a stand; he was little considered after that [2]. CHAP. V. 162

In one thing the temper of the nation appeared to be contrary to severe proceedings: for, though the regicides were at that time odious beyond all expression, and the trials [3] and executions of the first that suffered were run to by vast crowds, and all people seemed pleased with the sight, yet the odiousness of the crime grew at last to be so much flatted by the frequent executions, and most of those who suffered died with such firmness and shews of piety, justifying all they had done, not without a seeming joy for their suffering on that account, that the king was advised not to proceed further, at least not to have the scene so near the court as Charing-cross. It was indeed remarkable that Peters, a sort of an enthusiastical buffoon preacher, [a] though a very vicious man,[a] that had been of great use to Cromwell, and had been outrageous in pressing the king's death with the cruelty and rudeness of an inquisitor, was the man of them all that was the most sunk in his spirit, and could

[a] interlined.

[1] Monk's regiment of foot became the Coldstream Guards, and a regiment of horse was raised 'under colour of being a guard to the King.' Ludlow, ii. 325; Mackinnon, *Coldstream Guards*, vol. i. 98.

[2] See *supra* 178, note.

[3] The trial was made the occasion, by Orlando Bridgeman, for emphasising the doctrine that no authority, either of a single person or of the people, collectively or through parliament, could exercise any coercive power over the Crown. The responsibility of ministers was urged with equal force. 'If any other men do wrong, though by his command, they are punishable.' Cobbett's *State Trials*, v. 989, 991; Ludlow, ii. 303.

CHAP. V.

not in any sort bear his punishment. He had neither the honesty to repent of it, nor the strength of mind to suffer as all the rest of them did. He was observed all the while to be drinking some cordials to keep him from fainting[1].

Oct. 13, 1660.

Harrison was the first that suffered. He was a fierce and bloody enthusiast; and it was believed, that while the army was in doubt whether it was fitter to kill the king privately or to bring him to an open trial, that he offered, if a private way was to be settled on, to be the man that should do it. So he was begun with. But, how reasonable soever this might be in it self, it had a very ill effect: for he was a man of great heat and resolution, fixed in his principles, and so persuaded of them, that as he had never looked after any interests of his own, but had opposed Cromwell when he set up for himself, so he went through all the indignities and severities of the execution, in which the letter of the law in cases of treason was punctually observed, with a calmness, or rather a cheerfulness, that astonished the spectators[2]. He spoke very positively that what they had done was the cause and work of God, which he was confident God would own, and raise it up again, how much soever it suffered at that time. Upon this a report was spread, and generally believed at that time, that he said he himself should rise again: though the party denied that, and reported the words as I have set them down. One person escaped, as was reported, merely by his vices:

[1] Peters was a man of great nervous sensibility. Once, we read, 'he was so schooled by the Protector that it put him into a high fever, which soon after turned into a downright frenzy. Nothing would do until the Protector went to see how he did, which set him pretty right again.' *Fleming Papers*, 1656, May 2; *H. M. C. Rep.* xii, App. vii. 22; *British Museum Catalogue of Prints and Drawings*, division i. satires 1, 960–978. See the charges against Peters in Ludlow, ii. 311, with a short memoir of his earlier career.

[2] 'He looking as cheerful as any man could do in that condition.' Pepys, Oct. 13, 1660. 'He trembled much, . . . but excused it by the ill usage he had in Newgate since his condemnation.' *H. M. C. Rep.* v. 157, 207. See Firth's *Life of Harrison*; *American Antiquarian Society*, April 26, 1893; and *Dict. Nat. Biog.* 'Dying under a hardness of heart that created horror in all who saw him,' was Nicholas's account. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 312.

Henry Marten, who had been a most violent enemy to monarchy, but all that he moved for was upon Roman or Greek principles. He never entered into matters of religion, but on design to laugh both at them and at all morality; for he was both an impious and vicious man, and now in his imprisonment he delivered himself up unto vice and blasphemy. It was said that this helped him to so many friends, that upon that very account he was spared [1]. John Goodwin and Milton [2] did also escape all censure, to the scandal of all people. Goodwin had so often not only justified but magnified the putting the king to death, both in his sermons and books, that few thought he could have been either forgot or excused: for Peters and he were the only preachers that spoke of it in that strain. But Goodwin had been so zealous an Arminian, and had sown such division among all the sectaries upon these heads, that it was said this procured him friends. Upon what account soever it was, he was not censured. Milton had appeared so boldly, though with much wit, and great purity and elegancy of his Latin style, against Salmasius and others, upon that argument, and had discovered so virulent a malice against the late king and all the family, and against monarchy, that it was a strange omission if he was forgot, and an odd strain of clemency if it was intended he should be forgotten; but he was not excepted out of the act of indemnity [3]. And after-

[1] He was kept in confinement until his death, first at Berwick, then at Windsor—where, however, he was 'an eyesore to His Majesty' — and lastly at Chepstow. He died there, September 9, 1680. See *Parl. History* iv. 226; *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

[2] See the debate, Dec. 17, 1660; *Parl. Hist.* iv. On June 16, 1660, the works of both Milton and Goodwin, with those of many other anti-monarchical writers, and Baxter's *Holy Commonwealth*, were taken from the Bodleian Library and burnt. Clarke, *Life of Anthony Wood.* On August 13, 1660, Charles issued a proclamation calling in all copies of Milton's *Iconoclastes* and *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*, together with Goodwin's *Obstructors of Justice.* Masson, *Life of Milton*, vi. 181.

[3] His life was spared by the means of the famous Sir William Davenant, whose life he had saved under the former powers. O. But see Masson, *Life of Milton*, vi. 187, whence it appears that Milton's escape was

CHAP. V. wards he came out of his concealment, and lived many years, much visited by all strangers, and much admired by all at home for the poems he writ, though he was then blind; chiefly that of Paradise [a]Lost[a], in which there is a nobleness both of contrivance and execution, that, though he affected to write in blank verse without rithm, and made many new and rough words, yet it was esteemed the beautifulest and perfectest poem that ever was writ, at least in our language. But as the sparing these persons was much censured, so on the other hand the putting Sir Henry Vane to death was as much blamed[1]: for the declaration from Breda being full for an indemnity to all except the regicides, he was comprehended in that; since, though he was for changing the government, and deposing
MS. 85. | the king, yet he did not approve of the putting him to death, nor of the force put on the parliament, but did for some time, while these things were acted, withdraw from the scene[2]. This was so represented by his friends, that an address was made by both houses on his behalf, to which the king gave a favourable answer, though only in general words. So he reckoned that he was safe[3]; that being

[a] interlined.

probably due to the action of Annesley, Morrice, and Clarges.

[1] Upon the judicial murder of Vane in 1662, see Hallam, *Const. Hist.* ii. 326 (sm. ed.); Ranke, iii. 376; Cobbett's *State Trials*, vi. 119; and Forster's *Life of Vane*, 224. For the discreditable letter of the king, in which he presses for Vane's death, 'if we can honestly put him out of the way,' see also *infra* 286, note.

[2] 'His hand was proved to a warrant issued out to the officers of the navy to put the fleet in readiness, on that very 30th of January, 1648, on which the king was murdered. He was proved also to be an acting member in the rebels' council of state of the 13th of February, and the 23rd of March following: and it was proved that he continued to act in their councils and armies until the year 1659 inclusive.' Salmon's *Examination*, i. 507. R.

[3] So did everybody at that time, and it was so designed: it was a medium to accommodate the difference between the two houses, upon his case. The commons had expressly provided for the sparing of his life. [*Parl. Hist.* iv. 68.] The lords disagreed to that [*id.* 91], and the commons only yielded upon the proposal of this joint address [*id.* 109]. The words of the address, or rather petition, were, 'That, as his

equivalent to an act of parliament, though it wanted the necessary forms. Yet the great share he had in the attainder of the earl of Strafford, and in the whole turn of affairs to the total change of government, but above all the great opinion that was had of his parts and capacity to embroil matters again, made the court think it necessary to put him out of the way[1]. He was naturally a very fearful man, as one who knew him well told me, and gave me eminent instances of it. He had a head as darkened in his notions of religion, as his mind was clouded with fear[2]: for though he set up a form of religion in a way of his own, yet it consisted rather in a withdrawing from all other forms than in any new or particular opinions or forms; from which he and his party were called *seekers*, and seemed to wait for some new and clearer manifestations. In these meetings he preached and prayed often himself, but with so peculiar a darkness, that though I have sometimes taken pains to see if I could find out his meaning in his books, yet I could never reach it; and since many others have said the same, it may be reasonable to believe he hid somewhat that was a necessary key to the rest. His friend told me he leaned to Origen's notion of an universal salvation of all, both the devils and the damned, and to the doctrine of pre-existence. When he saw his death was designed, he 164

majesty had declared he would proceed only against the immediate murderers of his father, they (the lords and commons) not finding Sir Henry Vane or Colonel Lambert to be of that number, are humble suitors to his majesty, that if they shall be attainted, yet execution as to their lives may be remitted' [*id.* 119]. The king's answer, as reported by the Lord Chancellor, was, 'That his majesty grants the desires in the said petition.' It is true, in the next parliament, there was an address to prosecute them [*C. J.*, July 1, 1661]. Lambert was attainted as well as Sir Henry Vane, but his life was spared. He lived several years afterwards in prison, and died a papist. O. Cf. *supra* 154. There is no evidence for the truth of this last statement beyond Onslow's assertion.

[1] Baillie says in his *Letters*, iii. 471, 'They speak of Sir Henry Vane and Lambert as to be tried for their lives. They are two of the most dangerous men in England. Their execution will be well enough taken by all generally, yea, though solicitor St. Johns should be added to them.' This language is of course natural in the mouth of a zealous presbyterian.

[2] See Clarendon, *Rebellion*, iii. 34; vii. 267.

CHAP. V.

composed himself to it, with a resolution that surprised all who knew how little of that was natural to him. Some instances of this were very extraordinary, though they cannot be mentioned with decency [1]. He was beheaded on Tower-Hill, where a new and very indecent practice was begun. It was observed that the dying speeches of the regicides had left impressions on the hearers that were not at all to the advantage of the government. So strains of a peculiar nature being expected from him, to prevent that, drummers were placed under the scaffold, who, as soon as he began to speak of the public, upon a sign given, struck up with their drums. This put him in no disorder. He desired they might be stopped, for he understood what was meant by it. Then he went through his devotions. And, as he was taking leave of those about him, he happening to say somewhat with relation to the times, the drums struck up a second time: so he gave over, and died with so much composedness that it was generally thought the government had lost more than it had gained by his death [2].

June 14, 1662.

[1] His lady conceived of him the night before his execution. S. He cohabited with his lady the night before he was executed, and declared he had done so, next morning; for fear any reflection should be made upon her, if she proved with child: which occasioned an unlucky jest when his son was made a Privy Counsellor with Father Peters in King James's reign. The Earl of Dorset said, he believed his father got him after his head was off. D. Cole, in a MS. note, relates, on the information of Speaker Onslow, that this son of Sir Henry Vane was remarkable for absence of mind in company, and that, when he was abroad, being asked whether he was the son born after his father's death, he answered, 'No, it was my elder brother'; thinking, it is supposed, on the circumstance of his brother's having attended on his father at his execution. R. See Pepys, June 14, 1662.

[2] 'Hamton courte, Saturday, two in the afternoon.

'The relation that has been made to me of Sir H. Vane's carriage yesterday in the hall, is the occasion of this letter, which, if I am rightly informed, was so insolent, as to justyfy all he had done; acknowledgeing no supreame power in England, but a parliament: and many things to that purpose. You have had a true accounte of all, and if he has given new occasion to be hanged, certaynly he is too dangerous a man to lett live, if we can honestly put him out of the way. Thinke of this, and give me some accounte of it tomorrow, till when I have no more to say to you. C.' Indorsed in Lord

Aug. 28, 1660.

The act of indemnity passed with very few exceptions; at which the cavaliers were highly dissatisfied, and made great complaints of it [1]. In the disposal of offices and places, as it was not possible to gratify all, so there was little regard had to men's merits or services. The king was determined to most of these by the cabal that met at 165
[a] mistress Palmer's lodgings [a]. And though the earl of Clarendon did often prevail with the king to alter the resolutions taken there, yet he was forced to let a great deal go that he did not like. He would never make applications to [b] mistress Palmer [b], nor let any thing pass the seal in which she was named [2], as the earl of Southampton

[a] substituted for *the mistresses'*. [b] substituted for *the mistress*.

Clarendon's hand, *The King, 7th June.*

Sir Henry Vane was beheaded that day sennight, viz. 14th of June, 1662. See among the *State Trials*, that of Sir Henry Vane, especially the latter end of what is printed there.

16th of April, 1766.

The above letter I had copied from the original, which is in the possession of — (James West, of Covent Garden, Esq.) and which I saw, the 24th of June, 1759. Arthur Onslow.

I find this letter is lately printed in Dr. Harris's *Account of King Charles the Second.* But how he came by it, I do not know. O. 'This day I saw Sir Harry Vane die, who showed very great boldness and indeed seditious impudence on the scaffold, insomuch that to silence him the noise of drums and trumpets was five or six times used by the command of the captain of the guard at his execution, as he was making his harangue.' Peter Pett to Bishop Bramhall, *Rawdon Papers*, 166. Ludlow, ii. 338.

[1] Every political offence between June 1, 1637, and June 24, 1660, was passed over. A free pardon for all but the regicides had been determined upon by Charles's advisers as early as the beginning of 1657. *Cal. Clar. St. P.* iii. 286; *Lords Journals*, xi. 240, 379; Clarendon, *Cont.* 130, 184, 285; and Pepys, March 20, 1669, from which it appears that Southampton urged the king not to pass the Act until the prerogative was restored and the revenue sufficiently raised to enable him to dispense with parliaments, but that Clarendon insisted on the passing of the Act, in confidence that 'he could have the command of parliaments for ever.' See the valuable account in Ludlow, ii. 284 *et seq.*, of the transactions regarding the Act of Indemnity.

[2] For which reason the husband was prevailed upon, though with difficulty, to accept of an Irish patent to be Viscount Castlemaine, that she might be qualified to be a lady of the bedchamber to the queen. O. See Steinman's *Barbara Duchess of Cleveland*, 28. It is probable that the connection with Charles began at the Hague, whither she accompanied her husband in 1659. See *supra*, 168 note. She was not created Duchess of Cleveland until 1670; *supra*, 474.

CHAP. V.

would never suffer her name to be in the treasury books. Those virtuous ministers thought it became them to let the world see that they did not comply with the king in his vices; but whether the earl of Clarendon spoke so freely to the king about his course of life as was given out, I cannot tell[1]. When the cavaliers saw they had not that share in places that they expected, they complained of it so high, that the earl of Clarendon, to excuse the king's passing them by, was apt to beat down the value they set on their services. This laid the foundation of an implacable hatred in many of them, that was completed by the extent and comprehensiveness of the act of indemnity, which cut off their hopes of being reimbursed out of the fines, if not the confiscations, of those who had during the course of the wars been on the parliament side[2]. It is true, the first parliament, called by way of derogation the convention, had been too much of that side not to secure themselves and their friends. So they took care to have the most comprehensive words put in it that could be thought of[3].

March, 166$\frac{0}{1}$.

Lord Clarendon has left behind him a letter under the king's own hand, in which he tells Clarendon, he will never hope for happiness in this world, or in the next, if he does not carry his point, to make Mrs. Palmer (afterwards Lady Castlemaine) a lady of the queen's bedchamber; that whoever does anything to obstruct it, he will be his enemy as long as he lives; and recommends it to him to bring the queen to a compliance, as far as in his power. Bowyer's *Note on this History*. R. Clarendon, *Cont.* 359 *et seq.* The letter is printed in Lister's *Life of Clarendon*, iii. 202.

[1] See his own statement. *Cont.* 919 *et seq.*

[2] See the 'Complaint of the Royal and Loyal Party to the King,' August, 1660, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 217, and the 'Petition of the Distressed Royalists,' March 1, 166$\frac{0}{1}$, *Parl. Hist.* iv. 234, in consequence of which an Act was passed in 1662 for distributing £60,000 among distressed cavaliers. *Lords and Commons Journals* for April and May, 1662. From further notices and debates it is, however, clear that only a portion of this sum ultimately reached those for whom it was intended. The need which existed for firmness on Clarendon's part may be judged from the 'Petition of Twenty-five Gentlemen Pensioners to the King,' 'for a promise to grant to them anything they may discover.' This petition was referred to the Attorney-General 'to know whether what was desired may stand with law and the Act of Indemnity.'

[3] In the interval between the two parliaments many persons obtained particular pardons under the great seal, for what was included in the Act of Indemnity. My great grandfather had one, which I have seen. O.

But when the new parliament was called, a year after, in which there was a design to set aside the act of indemnity, and to have brought in a new one, the king did so positively insist on his adhering to the act of indemnity, that the design of breaking into it was laid aside[1]. The earl of Clarendon owned it was his counsel. Acts or promises of indemnity, he thought, ought to be held sacred: a fidelity in the observation of them was the only foundation upon which any government could hope to quiet seditions or civil wars: and if people once thought those promises were only made to deceive them, without an intent to observe them religiously, they would never for the future hearken to any treaty. He often said it was the making those promises had brought the king home. So that whole work, from beginning to end, was wholly his. The angry men, that were thus disappointed of all their hopes, made a jest of the title of it, *An act of oblivion* | *and indemnity*, and said, the king had passed an act of oblivion for his friends and of indemnity for his enemies; and to load the earl of Clarendon the more, it was given out that he advised the king to gain his enemies, since he was sure of his friends by their principles. With this he was often charged, though he always denied it[2]. Whether the king fastened it upon him after he had disgraced him, to make him the more odious, I cannot tell. It is certain the king said many very hard things of him, for which he was much blamed: and in most of them little believed.

CHAP. V. May, 1661.

MS. 86.

166

It was natural for the king, upon his restoration, to look out for a proper marriage. And it was soon observed that he was resolved not to marry a protestant. He pretended

[1] Parliament met on May 8, 1661. 'I am glad the king is honest in spite of parliament. They could not have done more to make him loved and themselves hated.' Edw. Butterfield to Sir R. Verney, June 24, 1661, *Verney MSS.* See *Lords Journals*, xi. 240, 379; Clarendon, *Cont.* 130, 184, 285; and Pepys, March 20, 1669.

[2] He might deny the words, but the practice was suitable to such doctrine, and everybody knew there was nothing done at that time but by his advice. D.

CHAP. V.

a contempt of the Germans, and of the northern crowns [1]. France had no sister. He had seen the duke of Orleans' daughters, and liked none of them. Spain had only two infantas: and as the eldest was married to the king of France, so the second was to go to Vienna. So the house of Portugal only remained, to furnish him a wife, among the crowned heads. Monk began to hearken to a motion made him for this by a Jew, that managed the concerns of Portugal [2], which were now given for lost, since they were abandoned by France by the treaty of the Pyrenees; in which it appears, by cardinal Mazarin's letters, that he did entirely deliver up their concerns; which was imputed to his desire to please the queen-mother of France, who, being a daughter of Spain, owned herself still to be in the interests of Spain in every thing in which France was not concerned, for in that case she pretended she was true to the crown of France. And this was the true secret of cardinal Mazarin's carrying on that war so feebly as he did, to gratify the queen-mother on the one hand, and his own base covetousness on the other: for the less public expense was made, he had the greater occasions of enriching himself, which was all he thought on. The Portuguese being thus, as they thought, cast off by France, were very apprehensive of

[1] Shortly after the death of Cromwell, Charles had made an offer of marriage to the Princess Henrietta, daughter of Frederick Henry of Nassau, Prince of Orange; but his fortunes then seemed so doubtful that her mother, the Princess Dowager of Orange, declined it. Carte's *Ormond*, iii. 673; Clarendon, *Cont.* 152. After the Restoration he had serious thoughts of an alliance with Mazarin's niece, Hortense Mancini, a match strongly urged by the queen-mother. Upon this design and the opposition which prevented it, see Ranke, iii. 347. Carte, iv. 108, is responsible for the story of Charles's reply to the proposal that he should marry a German princess, 'Cod's fish! they are all foggy, and I cannot like any one of them for a wife.'

[2] There can be little doubt that this Jew was Augustine Coronel Chacon, one of the Spanish Crypto-Jews under the Commonwealth, who became wealthy by risky trafficking with Royalists. At the Restoration he was baptized, became financial agent for Portugal, and was knighted by Charles II. See Dr. Lucien Wolf's very interesting paper, *Crypto-Jews under the Commonwealth*, 1894.

falling under the Castilians, who, how weak soever they were in opposition to France, yet were like to be too hard for them, when they had nothing else on their hand. So, vast offers were made if the king would marry their infanta, and take them under his protection. Monk was the more encouraged to entertain the proposition, because in the beginning of the war of Portugal, king Charles had entered into a negotiation for a marriage between his son and this infanta; and the veneration paid his memory was then so high, that everything he had projected was esteemed sacred. Monk promised to serve the interests of Portugal: and that was, as sir Robert Southwell[1] told me, the first step made in that matter. Soon after the king came into England, an embassy of congratulation came from thence, with orders to negotiate that business. The Spanish ambassador, who had a pretension of merit from the king in behalf of 167
that crown, since they had received and entertained him at Brussells when France had thrown him off, set himself much against this match: and, among other things, affirmed the infanta was incapable of having children. But this was little considered[2]. The Spaniards are not very scrupulous in affirming any thing that serves their ends: and this

[1] Southwell was Clerk to the Privy Council, and in Charles's confidence. He was Envoy Extraordinary to Lisbon in 1665.

[2] The Portuguese marriage scheme was not a new one. As early as 1645 Catherine's father, John of Braganza, had proposed it, and it was alive in 1646 and 1647. The English alliance was always desired by Portugal, and with especial urgency after the Peace of the Pyrenees. Monk was sounded in April, 1660, and the terms were then practically agreed to (Echard, 31; Kennet, *Register*, 394). The marriage was concluded in March, 166$\frac{2}{3}$, through French influence, as offering a means of supporting Portugal and thereby weakening Spain without an open violation of the terms of the Peace of the Pyrenees. For this object Charles had already secretly received 200,000 crowns out of 800,000 promised. Louis's agents were the queen-mother, who came to England in November, 1660, and La Bastide de la Croix, a former agent between Mazarin and Cromwell. Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, i. 87 note; Lister, iii. 516. The marriage was opposed to popular feeling in England, which ran strongly in favour of Spain against France. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 100, 104, 105; Jusserand, *A French Ambassador at the Court of Charles II*, 124. Clarendon, however,

CHAP. V.

marriage was like to secure the kingdom of Portugal. So it was no wonder that he opposed it: and little regard was had to all that he said to break it.

At this time monsieur Fouquet was gaining an ascendant in the counsels of France, cardinal Mazarin falling then into
March 9, 166$\frac{0}{1}$. a languishing, of which he died a year after. He sent one over to the king[1] with a project of an alliance between France and England. He was addressed first to the earl
NOV. 1660. of Clarendon, to whom he enlarged on all the heads of the scheme he had brought, of which the match with Portugal was a main article. And, to make all go down the better, Fouquet desired to enter into a particular friendship with the earl of Clarendon; and sent him the offer of 10,000*l.*

had acquired an extreme dislike of Spain before the Restoration, and was obviously in favour of the match. Clarendon, *Cont.* 152; *Mémoires de Louis XIV*, i. 66–68. The Spanish memorial against it is in Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*, 517. The Portuguese gave Tangiers, Bombay, free-trade with the Brazils and the East Indies, religious freedom for British subjects in Portuguese territory, and £500,000. Charles promised to furnish them with 3,000 infantry and 1,000 horses, and to place 8 frigates at their disposal. Laclède, *Hist. de Portugal*, viii. 307. Monk, anxious to see Cromwell's European policy maintained, was also favourable. Carte, *Ormond*, iv. 102. As Fornéron points out (*Louise de Kéroualle*, 9) Louis failed in his intention of securing a permanent influence over Charles by this marriage, from the nature and education of Catherine of Braganza; and this led to the appointment, as it were, first of Henrietta of Orleans, and, after her death, of Louise de Kéroualle, as French agent, when it was clear that the coarse and passionate temper of Lady Castlemaine unfitted her for such confidence. Catherine was born in 1638 and died in 1670. There is much curious evidence upon the matter of the queen's incapacity for child-bearing. See the article upon her in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, and *infra*, 307, note. For a refutation of the scandalous accusation against Clarendon, for which see Reresby 53, that he brought about the marriage with full knowledge of the queen's incapacity, in the interests of any children James might have by his daughter, see Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 105, and Clarke, *Life of James II*, 394.

[1] La Bastide de la Croix, mentioned in the last note. He had letters of credit to the amount of 500,000 livres for bribery in England. Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, i. 87. Upon Clarendon's dealings with him in 1661, see Rose's *Observations, &c.*, 54. Mazarin died March 9, 1661. Jusserand states that drafts for a treaty of intimate union and for the restoration of Catholicism abound in the French archives, some by French and some by English hands. *A French Ambassador, &c.*, 123 note.

and assured him of the renewing the same present every year. The lord Clarendon told him, he would lay all that related to the king faithfully before him, and give him his answer in a little time: but for what related to himself, he said he served a great and bountiful master, who knew well how to support and reward his servants: he would ever serve him faithfully; and, because he knew he must serve those from whom he accepted the hire, therefore he rejected the offer with great indignation[1]. He laid before the king the heads of the proposed alliance, which required much consultation; but in the next place he told both the king and his brother what had been offered to himself. They both advised him to accept of it. Why, said he, have you a mind that I should betray you? The king answered, he knew nothing could corrupt him. Then, said he, you know me better than I do my self: for if I take the money, I will find the sweet of it, and will study to have it continued to me by deserving it. He then told them how he had rejected the offer, and very seriously warned the king of the danger he saw he might fall in, if he suffered any of those who served him, to become pensioners of other princes: those presents were made only to bias them in their affairs, and to discover secrets by their means: and the taking money would soon grow to a habit, and spread like an infection through the whole court. CHAP. V.

As the motion for the match with Portugal | was carried on, an incident of an extraordinary nature happened in the court. The earl of Clarendon's daughter, being with child, and near her time, called upon the duke of York to own his marriage with her. She had been maid of honour to the princess royal: and the duke, who was even to his old age of an amorous disposition, tried to gain her to comply with his desires. She managed the matter with so much address, that in conclusion he married her. Her father did very MS. 87. 168

[1] Jusserand, *A French Ambassador, &c.*, 126, gives an interesting account of the impatience of De Cominges, the French Ambassador, with the calculated coldness and delay of Clarendon.

CHAP. V.

solemnly protest, that he knew nothing of the matter till it broke out [1], and then the duke thought to have shaken her from claiming it by great promises, and as great threatenings [2]. But she was a woman of a high spirit. She said she was his wife, and would have it known that she was so; let him use her afterwards as he pleased. Many discourses were set about upon this occasion. But the king ordered some

[1] Lord Shaftesbury told Sir Mich. Wharton, from whom I had it, that some time before the match was owned, he had observed a respect from Lord Clarendon and his lady to their daughter, that was very unusual from parents to their children, which gave him a jealousy she was married to one of the brothers, but suspected the king most. D. As far as Lord Clarendon's lady is concerned in this story, Sir Michael Wharton's veracity is established by Locke's *Memoirs of the Earl of Shaftesbury*. See Locke's *Works*, vol. iii. 493. R. James states explicitly that he fell in love with Anne Hyde at Paris, in 1657, that after the Restoration Charles at first refused his consent, but gave way finally, and that they were then privately married. Clarke, *Life of James*, i. 387. The marriage took place on Sept. 3, 1660, at Clarendon's residence, Worcester House (see James's own deposition, *Fairfax Correspondence, Civil Wars*, ii. 273); and the first child, a boy, who died May 5, 1661, was born in October. Pepys, Oct. 24, 1660. A secret promise of marriage had been given as early as Nov. 24, 1659. (Clarke's *Life of James*, 387; Pepys, Feb. 23, 166$\frac{9}{1}$; Anne Hyde's deposition, *Fairfax Correspondence, Civil Wars*, ii. 272). From Evelyn, Oct. 7, 1660, it appears that the passionate opposition of the queen-mother was waived on consideration of Clarendon arranging for the payment of her debts. The marriage was not publicly owned until, or just before, Dec. 13, 1660. See the letter of Nicholas to Bennet of that date, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 412; Evelyn, Dec. 23, 1660. Clarendon (*Cont.* 51 *et seq.*) states that, while fully cognizant of all the former steps, he was ignorant of the actual celebration of the marriage until some time subsequent; but it is quite clear, from his own words and from James's statement, that he knew it would take place. For the subsequent scandal, for which Sir Charles Berkeley was responsible, and under cover of which James—according to Clarendon (but see following note)—endeavoured to disavow the marriage, see Clarendon, *Cont.* 62. See also Marvell's savage lampoons upon the Duchess in *Last Instructions to a Painter; A Historical Poem:* and *State Poems* (1710), i. 95. Upon James's promise, in the autumn of 1659, to marry Lambert's daughter, see Ranke, iii. 340, 341, and *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

[2] This can hardly be possible, since there were unimpeachable witnesses of the marriage; Ossory, Ormond's son, who gave the bride away, was one. See his deposition, *H. M. C. Rep.* ix. 445. See also the *Fairfax Correspondence*, quoted above, which contains the depositions, dated Feb. 18, 166$\frac{9}{1}$, of Ellen Stroud the duchess's servant, and Dr. Crowther the clergyman who married them, besides those of James, Ossory, and Anne herself.

bishops and judges to peruse the proofs she had to produce: and they reported that, according to the doctrine of the Gospel, and the law of England, it was a good marriage. So it was not possible to break it, but by trying how far the matter could be carried against her for marrying a person so near the king without his leave. The king would not break with the earl of Clarendon: and so he told his brother, he must drink as he brewed, and live with her whom he had made his wife. All the earl of Clarendon's enemies rejoiced at this: for they reckoned that how much soever it seemed to raise him at present, yet it would raise envy so high against him, and make the king so jealous of him, as being more in his brother's interests than in his own, that they looked on it as that which would end in his ruin. And he himself thought so, as his son told me: for, as soon as he knew of it, and when he saw his son lifted up with it, upon that he protested to him that he knew nothing of the matter till it broke out; but added, that he looked on it as that which must be all their ruin sooner or later. CHAP. V. Feb. 166$\frac{6}{7}$.

Upon this I will digress a little, to give an account of the duke's character, whom I knew for some years so particularly, that I can say much upon my own knowledge. He was very brave in his youth[1], and so much magnified by monsieur Turenne, that, till his marriage lessened him, he really clouded the king, and passed for the superior genius. He was naturally candid and sincere, and a firm friend, till affairs and his religion wore out all his first principles and inclinations. He had a great desire to understand affairs: and in order to that he kept a constant journal of all that passed, of which he shewed me a great deal. The duke of 169
Buckingham gave me once a short but severe character of the two brothers; it was the more severe, because it was true. The king could see things if he would, and the duke would see things if he could. He had no true judgment,

[1] This courage was equally conspicuous in the naval wars of this reign, at Lowestoft in 1665 and at Southwold Bay in 1672.

CHAP. V. and so was soon determined by those whom he trusted: but he was obstinate against all other advices. He was bred with high notions of the kingly authority, and laid it down for a maxim, that all who opposed the king were rebels in their hearts. He was perpetually in one amour or other, without being very nice in his choice: so that the king said once, he believed his brother had his mistresses given him by his priests to do penance. He gave me this account of his changing his religion. When he escaped out of the hands of the earl of Northumberland, who had the charge of his education trusted to him by the parliament, and had used him with great respect, all due care was taken as soon as he got beyond sea to form him to a strict adherence to the church of England: among other things, much was said of the authority of the church, and of the traditions from the apostles in support of episcopacy: so that when he came to observe that there was more reason to submit to the catholic church than to one particular church, and that other traditions might be taken on her word, as well as episcopacy was received among us, he thought the step was not great but very reasonable to go over to the church of Rome: and doctor Stewart[1] having taught them to believe a real but unconceivable presence of Christ in the sacrament, he thought that went more than half way to transubstantiation. He said that a nun that advised him to pray every day, that if he was not in the right way, that God would set him

[1] Dr. Richard Stewart was Prebendary of Worcester, 1629, and Provost of Eton in 1639: during the Civil War he was nominally appointed Dean of St. Paul's and of Westminster. In 1645, while Clerk of the Closet to Charles I, he was one of the Commissioners at Uxbridge, and had the task of answering Henderson (Clarendon, *Rebellion*, viii. 226). In 1646 he was made dean of the king's chapel—which office he held under Charles II, until his death in 1651—and in 1648 had the duty of instructing the Prince of Wales in all matters relating to the Church (*id.* xi. 36; xiii. 133). In 1650 he was one of the Duke of York's Cabinet Council, and, according to Sir G. Radcliffe, was 'the heifer the queen plowes with.' *Nicholas Papers*, i. 195, 197; *Cal. Clar. St. P.* i, ii.

right, did make a great impression on him; but he never told me when or where he was reconciled[1]. He suffered me to say a great deal to him on all these heads. I shewed him the difference between submission and obedience in indifferent things, and an implicit submission from the belief of infallibility. I also shewed him the difference between a speculation of a mode of Christ's presence, when it rested in an opinion, and an adoration founded on it. Though the opinion of such a presence was wrong, there was no great harm: but the adoration of an undue object was idolatry. He has suffered me to talk much and often to him on these heads; but I plainly saw it made no impression, and all that he seemed to intend by it was | to make use of me as an instrument to soften the aversion MS. 88. that people began to be possessed with to him. He was naturally eager and revengeful: and was much against the taking off any that set up in an opposition to the measures of the court, and who by that means grew 170 popular in the house of commons. He was for rougher methods. He continued for many years dissembling his religion[2], and [a] seemed zealous for the church of England: but it was chiefly on design to hinder all propositions that tended to unite us among ourselves. He was a frugal prince, and brought his court into method and magnificence: for he had 100,000*l.* a year allowed him. CHAP. V.

[a] *always* struck out.

[1] Before the Restoration he had zealously seconded the king's endeavours to prevent the then meditated perversion of their brother the Duke of Gloucester; but it appears from Pepys, Feb. 18, 1661, that so early as the year after the king's return, the Duke of York was considered to be a professed friend to the Roman Catholics. R. On the attempts to convert the Duke of Gloucester, see Carte's *Ormond*, iii. 633–642 (Clar. Press); *Cal. Clar. St. P.* ii. 382, &c.; iii. 325, &c., and especially the graphic letters from Lord Hatton and Sir G. Ratcliffe to Nicholas, printed in the *Nicholas Papers*, vol. ii.

[2] Reresby asserts (*Memoirs*, ed. Cartwright, 1875, 81) that until 1670 James had not been generally suspected of Popery. His formal conversion took place in 1669, after he had tried in vain to obtain a dispensation from the pope to conform to the Anglican Church. Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 441.

CHAP. V. He was made high admiral: and he came to understand all the concerns of the sea very particularly. He had a very able secretary about him, sir William Coventry: a man of great notions and eminent virtues, the best speaker in the house of commons, and capable of bearing the chief ministry, as it was once thought he was very near it[1]. The duke found all the great seamen had a deep tincture from their education: they both hated popery and loved liberty: they were men of severe tempers, and kept good discipline. But in order to the putting the fleet into more confident hands, the duke began a method of sending pages of honour, and other young persons of quality, to be bred to the sea[2]. And these were put in command, as soon as they were capable of it, if not sooner. This discouraged many of the old seamen, when they saw in what a channel advancement was like to go; who upon that left the service, and went and commanded merchantmen. By this means the virtue and discipline of the navy is much lost. It is true we have a breed of many gallant men[a], who do distinguish themselves in action; but it is thought that the nation has suffered much by the vices and disorders of those captains, who have risen by their quality more than by merit or service.

The duchess of York was a very extraordinary woman. She had great knowledge, and a lively sense of things. She soon understood what belonged to a princess, and took state on her, rather too much[3]. She writ well; and had begun the duke's life, of which he shewed me a volume; it was all drawn from his journal: and he

[a] *by this means* struck out.

[1] Cf. *infra* 478.

[2] From the story in Pepys, June 27, 1662, James seems acquitted of the blame of these appointments in the first instance. Cf. *id.* Nov. 20, 1661; July 2, 1662; June 2, 1663; June 8, July 20, 1666, 'the gentleman captains will undo us': July 27, Oct. 20, 1666; Feb. 3 and June 14, 1667; and see also Jusserand, *A French Ambassador, &c.*, 136.

[3] Pepys, Jan. 27, 166$\frac{7}{8}$, describes her interference in the Duke of York's Council.

intended to have employed me in carrying it on[1]. She was bred to great strictness in religion, and practised secret confession. Morley told me he was her confessor; she began at 12, and continued under his direction, till, upon her father's disgrace, he was put from the court. She was generous and friendly; but was too severe an enemy[2]. CHAP. V.

The king's third brother, the duke of Gloucester, was of a temper different from both his brothers. He was active and loved business, apt to have particular friendships, and had an insinuating temper, [a]which was generally very acceptable.[a] The king loved him much better than the duke of York. But he was uneasy when he saw there 171
was no post left for him, since Monk was general. So he spoke to the earl of Clarendon, that he might be made lord treasurer. But he told him, it was a post below his dignity. He would not be put off with that: for he could not bear an idle life, nor to see his brother at the head of the fleet, when he had neither business nor dependence. But the mirth and entertainments of that time raised his blood so high, that he took the small-pox; of which he Sept. $\frac{3}{13}$, 1660.

[a] interlined.

[1] See Horace Walpole, *Royal and Noble Authors*, 417, 418.

[2] Her marriage with the duke created great uneasiness in the royal family. The princess royal could little bear the giving place to one she thought she had honoured very much in having admitted into her service, and avoided being in a room with her as much as she could; and the Duke of Gloucester could never be prevailed upon to show her any sort of civility. My grandfather (who loved him the best of all his old master's children) told him he feared it might prove prejudicial to him if the king should die without children: the duke said he believed it was not prudent, but she smelt so strong of her father's green bag, that he could not get the better of himself, whenever he had the misfortune to be in her presence. The Queen-mother, who hated the chancellor, was with great difficulty persuaded to see her [Clarendon, *Cont.* 59, &c.], and gave it for a reason to induce the king to agree to the Princess Henrietta's marriage with the Duke of Orleans, that she might avoid being insulted by Hyde's daughter. D. Upon her practice of secret confession, and conversion to the Roman Catholic faith in 1670, see *infra* 556, and *Fairfax Correspondence*, ii. 268.

CHAP. V. died[1], much lamented by all, but most particularly by the king, who was never in his whole life seen so much troubled as he was on that occasion. Those who would not believe that he had much tenderness in his nature, imputed this rather to his jealousy of the brother that survived, since he had now lost the only person that could balance him. Not long after him the princess royal died likewise of the small-pox; but was not much lamented[2]. She had lived in her widowhood for some years with great reputation, kept a decent court, and supported her brothers very liberally; and yet lived within bounds. But her mother, who had the art of making herself believe any thing she had a mind to, upon a conversation with the queen-mother of France, fancied the king of France might be inclined to marry her. So she writ to her to come to Paris. On that, she made an equipage far above what she could support. So she run herself into debt, sold all her jewels, and some estates that were in her power as her son's guardian; and was not only disappointed of that vain expectation, but fell into some misfortunes that lessened the reputation she had formerly lived in[3]. Upon her death,

Dec. 24, 1660.

[1] Henry of Oatlands, born July 3, 1639, died Sept. $\frac{3}{13}$, 1660, 'by the great negligence of the doctors' Pepys says. Clarendon had a very high opinion of 'the sweete Duke of Gloucester.' *Clar. St. P.* 1659. He was remarkable for his knowledge of languages (Macpherson, *Orig. Pap.* iii. 18), and displayed personal courage at the battle of the Dunes in 1658. Marvell hints, without any justification, that he died by foul means. *An Historical Poem*, 18, &c.

[2] Mary, eldest sister of Charles II, widow of William II, Prince of Orange (who died in 1650; cf. *infra* 569), and mother of William III.

[3] Particularly in relation to young Harry Jermyn, nephew to the Earl of St. Albans, who left him his heir; he was after created Lord Dover by King James. At the Revolution he was more favoured by King William than any Roman Catholic that had been in King James's service; in regard, as was thought, to the favour he had been in with his mother, who was suspected to have been married to him; which King William was willing to have believed (rather than worse), though it was not proper for her to own the marriage. And the late behaviour of her mother with the Earl of St. Albans, and her aunt with the Earl of Craven, seemed to countenance, if not justify, such a management. D. His lordship means the private marriages said to have taken place between these parties. Pepys, Dec. 21, 1660, mentions the current report of the Princess of Orange's marriage with Jermyn. R.

it might have been expected, both in justice and gratitude, that the king would in a most particular manner have taken her son, the young prince of Orange, into his protection[1]. But he fell into better hands: for his grandmother[2] became his guardian, and took care both of his estate and his education. CHAP. V.

Thus two of the branches of the royal family were cut off soon after the restoration[3]; and so little do the events of things answer the first appearances, that a royal family of three princes and two princesses, all young and graceful persons, that promised a numerous issue, did moulder away so fast, that now, while I am writing, all is reduced to the person of the queen, and the duchess of Savoy[4]. And as the king had a very numerous spurious issue, though none by his queen, so the duke had by both his wives, and some | irregular amours, a very numerous issue ; MS. 89. and the present queen has had a most fruitful marriage as to issue, though none of them survive. The princess Hen- 172 riette was so pleased with the diversions of the French court, that she was glad to go thither again to be married to the king's brother[5], a poor-spirited and voluptuous prince, monstrous in his vices, and effeminate in his luxury in more

[1] In her will, which may be seen in Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*, 515, she besought Charles to take the guardianship; and he appointed a commission, presided over by Clarendon, to watch the prince's interests. Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 272. He is said to have afterwards given the guardianship to the Princess Dowager and the Elector of Brandenburg. *Ambassades et Négociations de M. le Comte d'Estrades* (Amsterdam, 1718), 203. Little credit can be given to the statements in this work. Some of the documents quoted previous to 1660 are undoubtedly forgeries, and those dealing with subsequent events would need collation with the MSS. in the French Foreign Office.

[2] Amélie de Solms, widow of Frederick Henry. Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 59.

[3] Elizabeth of Bohemia died Feb. 23, 1662.

[4] Namely, Queen Anne, and this duchess, who was daughter of Henrietta, Duchess of Orleans, the youngest daughter of King Charles the First: the bishop setting aside the other children of the Duke of York, then alive at the time of his writing this part of his history. R. See note, *infra* 358.

[5] Philip, Duke of Orleans. The courage, to which Burnet alludes, was very questionable. See Mrs. Ady's '*Madame*,' *Memoirs of Henrietta, Duchess of Orleans.*

CHAP. V. senses than one. He had not one great or good quality, but courage: so that he became both odious and contemptible.

As the treaty with Portugal went on, France did engage in the concerns of that crown. They had by treaty pro-
1659. mised the contrary to the Spaniards[1]; so to excuse their perfidy, count Schomberg[2], a German by birth and a Calvinist by his religion, was ordered to go thither, as one prevailed with by the Portugal ambassador, and not as sent over by the orders of the court of France. He passed through England to concert with the king the matters of Portugal, and the supply that was to be sent thither from England. He told me, the king had admitted him into great familiarities[a] at Paris. He had known him first at the Hague, for he was the prince of Orange's particular favourite[3]; but had so great a share in the last violent actions of his life in seizing the states, and in the attempt upon Amsterdam, that he left the service upon his death; and gained so great a reputation in France, that, after the prince of Condé and Turenne, he was thought the best general they had. He had much free discourse with the king, though he found his mind was so turned to mirth and pleasure that he seemed scarce capable of laying any thing to heart. He advised him to set up for the head of the protestant religion: for though he said to him he knew he had not much religion, yet his interests led him to that. It would keep the princes of Germany in a great dependence on him, and make him the umpire of all their affairs; so it would procure him great credit with the Huguenots of France, and keep that crown in perpetual fear of him. He advised the king to employ the military men that had served under Cromwell, whom he thought the best officers

[a] *with him* struck out.

[1] At the Peace of the Pyrenees, 1659.

[2] Frederick Schomberg, more properly Schœnberg. He was born in 1618 and killed at the battle of the Boyne, July 11, 1690. His father was Hans Meynard Schœnberg, who died governor of Juliers and Cleves; his mother was an Englishwoman, Anne Dudley, daughter of Edward, Earl of Dudley. Cf. f. 345.

[3] Cf. Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 51.

he had ever seen: and he was sorry to see they were dismissed, and that a company of wild young men were those the king relied on[1]. But that he pressed most on the king as the business then in agitation, was concerning the sale of Dunkirk. The Spaniards pretended it ought to be restored to them, since it was taken from them by Cromwell, when they had the king and his brothers in their armies: but that was not much regarded. The French pretended that by their agreement with Cromwell he was only to hold it till they had repayed the charge of the war[2]: therefore they, offering to lay that down, ought to have the place delivered to them. The king was in no sort bound by this. So the matter under debate was, whether it ought to be kept or sold? The military men, who were believed to be corrupted by France, said, the place was not tenable; that in time of peace it would put the 173
king to a great charge, and in time of war it would not quit the cost of keeping it[3]. The earl of Clarendon said, he understood not those matters, but appealed to Monk's judgment, who did positively advise the letting it go for the sum that the French offered[4]. To make the business

CHAP. V.

[1] See *supra* 298, note.

[2] There was no such agreement. Cromwell had demanded the permanent possession of Dunkirk from the first.

[3] See the *Parl. Hist.* iv. 266, for a list of issues from the Treasury, June 1663, from which it appears that the annual charge for Dunkirk was over £113,000. Lister, iii. 510.

[4] It is impossible to ascertain with accuracy the responsibility to be attached to individuals regarding this transaction. It seems clear, however, if any credit could be given to the work quoted, *supra* 301 note, that the matter was first opened from the French side, in a conversation between D'Estrades and Charles II, on July 21, 1661; *Ambassades et Négociations de M. le Comte d'Estrades*, 167. On June 29, 1662, the discussion was, according to the same doubtful authority, resumed in a letter from Clarendon to D'Estrades, and Bellings was sent over from England; and in reply to a request of Charles, on July 27, D'Estrades interrupted his journey to the Hague to come to England and discuss the question personally, *id.* 387; when Aubigny acted as interpreter between him and Clarendon, *id.* 175. Regarding his own share in the matter, Clarendon states that he took little part in the later discussions, but relied upon the authority of Monk, Sandwich, and other experts; that these, with the Duke of York and the secretaries, were unanimous in favour of giving up the place—the Earl of St Albans,

CHAP. V.

go the easier, the king promised that he would lay up all the money in the Tower, and that it should not be touched but upon extraordinary occasions. Schomberg advised, in opposition to all this, that the king should keep it; for, considering the naval power of England, it could not be taken. He knew that, though France spoke big as if they would break with England unless that was delivered up, yet they were far from the thoughts of it. He had considered

for interested motives, being the sole dissentient in the Council—and indeed that the cession had been decided upon before he was consulted. Clarendon, *Cont.* 455; Cobbett's *State Trials*, viii. 434. This, however, must be contrasted with the following passage, whatever may be its worth, from D'Estrades, under date August 17, 1662: 'A tout cela le Chancelier ajoûta, que la pensée de ce Traité était venue de lui; . . . qu'il était seul dans ce sentiment avec le roi et M. le Duc d'Yorck, et qu'il avait encore a ménager Monck, le grand Trésorier, et Sandwich, lesquels il ne pouvait espérer de gagner que par les grands deniers qui en reviendraient au Roi.' *Ambassades, &c.*, 411. See also Combe's *Sale of Dunkirk* (1728), drawn chiefly from D'Estrades's memoirs. For Sandwich's reasons see Pepys, Oct. 27, 1662. The feeling in the city was strongly adverse: 'The merchants, howbeit, are all of a flame,' *H. M. C. Rep.*.xi. App. v. 10; Louis XIV states that they offered large sums for the retention of the place. Cf. Combe, *Sale of Dunkirk*, 126. For this, with several other curious facts, especially the way in which Louis outwitted the English government in the matter of payment, see *Œuvres de Louis XIV, Mémoires Historiques*, 1re partie, 167. (Paris, 1806.) Oldmixon intimates (290) that the queen-mother, who had come to England shortly before this, had a hand in arranging the affair. See also Carte's *Ormond*, ii. 250 (iv. 101, Clar. Press ed.); *General Dictionary*, vi. 337; Kennet's *History*, 224; and Southwell's MS. Letter to the second Earl of Clarendon at the end of vol. ii. of Onslow's copy of Clarendon's *Life*. This, however, again must be compared with the passages in D'Estrades (*Ambassades, &c.* 414), where the best way of concealing the transaction from the queen-mother is discussed. The price paid by the French, after prolonged haggling (see Louis to D'Estrades, Aug. 27, 1662, quoted by Combe), was 500,000 pistoles (or 5,000,000 livres: *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 545), about £200,000. See upon this, the king's instructions in Lister, iii. 512 and 516; Ranke, iii. 387–389. Sir E. Harley, writing to Lady Harley, Nov. 25, 1662, says: 'Dunkirk is come to town, that is the garrison. Brave fellows they are; every man has brought the king his weight in silver.' *Portland MSS.* vol. III; *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 270. Many medals were struck by Louis, one with the motto 'Dunquerca recuperata providentiâ principis, MCLXII.' Jusserand, *A French Ambassador, &c.*, 31; Hawkins's *Medallic Illustrations of British History*, i. (ed. Franks and Grueber, 1885). For the text of the treaty see Combe, 148.

the place well; and he was sure it could never be taken, as long as England was master of the sea. The holding it would keep both France and Spain in a dependence upon the king. But he was singular in that opinion; so it was sold: and all the money that was paid for it was immediately squandered away among the mistress's creatures. By this the king lost his reputation abroad. The court was believed venal; and because the earl of Clarendon was in greatest credit, the blame was cast chiefly on him; though his son assured me, he kept himself out of that affair entirely[1]. The cost bestowed on that place since that time, and the great prejudice we have suffered by it, has made that sale to be often reflected on very severely. But it was pretended that Tangier, which was offered as a part of the portion that the infanta of Portugal was to bring with her, was a place of much greater consequence. Its situation in the map is indeed very eminent; and if Spain had been then in condition to put any restraint on our trade, it had been of great use to us; especially if the making a mole there had been more practicable than it proved to be. It was then spoke of in the court in the highest strains of flattery. It was said, this would not only give us the entire command of the Mediterranean trade, but it would be a place of safety for a squadron to be kept always there, for securing our East and West India trade. And such mighty things were said of it, as if it had been reserved for the king's reign, to make it as glorious abroad as it was happy at home: though since that time we have never been able, neither by force nor treaty, to get ground enough round the town from the Moors to maintain the garrison. But every | man that MS. 90. was employed there studied only his own interest, and how to rob the king. If the money, that was laid out in the mole at different times, had been raised all in a succession, as fast as the work could be carried on, it might have been

CHAP. V.

[1] In his opinion and advice, but not in his actings: an unhappy distinction of his, which went to other matters, and made him to be called the author of many things he was really averse to. O.

CHAP. V. made a very valuable place. But there were so many discontinuings, and so many new undertakings, that after an
174 immense charge the court grew weary of it: and in the year [16]83 they sent a squadron of ships to bring away the garrison and to destroy all the works[1].

To end this matter of the king's marriage with the infanta of Portugal all at once: it was at last concluded. The earl of Sandwich went for her, and was the king's proxy in the nuptial ceremony[2]. The king communicated the matter both to the parliament of England and Scotland; and so strangely were people changed, that though they all had seen the mischievous effects of a popish queen in the former

[1] See, on the occupation of Tangiers, the *History of the 2nd Queen's Royal Regiment*, by Lieut.-Col. John Davis, vol. i. (1887), which contains excellent plates and plans. In the Sloane Collection in the British Museum there is a mass of papers relating to this matter; and there is a great deal of interesting information about the incessant and harassing war maintained upon it by the Moors in *Spanish Negotiations*, 'Original Letters and Negotiations of Fanshawe, Sandwich, Sunderland, and William Godolphin, 1665–78,' vol. i. (1724), and in Arlington's *Letters* (1701), vol. ii; a description of Teviot's vigorous command as deputy-governor occurs in the *Portland MSS.*, vol. iii, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. He was killed there in May, 1664 (*infra*, 370 note). Among the *Dartmouth MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xi. App. v. p. 28, there is a paper headed 'An establishment for Tangier,' from which the annual charge appears to have been more than £42,000; and the continuous loss of life was very great. The desire to get rid of so irksome a charge (Pepys, *passim*) was seconded by the jealousy displayed in the House of Commons of its maintenance as a nursery for a 'popish' army (Debate of Nov. 17, 1680, *Parl. Hist.* iv. 1216). The original instructions for the abandonment (for which cf. f. 593) are dated July 2, 1683. *Dartmouth MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xi. App. v. 53; where may be seen detailed accounts from Pepys, who accompanied the squadron under Legge, afterwards Earl of Dartmouth. See also Pepys's 'Tangier Journal' in Rev. J. Smith's *Life, Journal and Correspondence of Pepys*, i. 331 (1841). The successive governors of Tangier were Lord Peterborough to Sept. 1663; Rutherford, created Earl of Teviot, to May, 1664; Lord Bellasys, to Sept. 1666; Col. H. Norwood, lieut.-governor until 1669; Earl of Middleton, from 1667 to June, 1674.

[2] The marriage was approved in Council, May 3, 1661, and performed in May, 1662. There was no proxy marriage. The pope, who would not recognize the independence of Portugal, declined to grant a dispensation. Lister, App. ccxxxviii, and Clarke's *Life of James II*, 394, where the reason given is that the Portuguese refused to have the ceremony performed in their own country by a protestant.

reign, yet not one person moved against it in either parliament, except the earl of Cassillis [1] in Scotland; who moved for an address to the king to marry a protestant. He had but one to second him: so entirely were men run from one extreme to another. When the queen was brought over, the king met her at Winchester, in summer [16]62. The archbishop of Canterbury came to perform the ceremony: but the queen was bigoted to such a degree, that she would not say the words of matrimony, nor bear the sight of the archbishop [2]. The king said the words hastily: and the archbishop pronounced them married persons. Upon this some thought afterwards to have dissolved the marriage, as a marriage only *de facto*, in which no consent had been given. But the duke of York told me, they were married by the lord Aubigny [3] according to the Roman ritual, and that he himself was one of the witnesses: and he added, that, a few days before he told me this, the queen had said to him, that she heard some intended to call her marriage in question; and that, if that was done, she must call on him as one of her witnesses to prove it. I saw the letter that the king writ to the earl of Clarendon the day after their marriage, by which it appeared very plainly, if not too plainly, that the marriage was consummated, and that the king was well pleased with her [4], which convinced me of the falsehood of

CHAP. V.

May 24, 1662.

[1] See *supra* 89, note.

[2] According to De Wiquefort the king delayed meeting her until he could bring the session to an end, as he feared a parliamentary attack upon Clarendon if he were absent. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 372. Sheldon was still Bishop of London. See, upon this marriage, Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 104–112. For the Catholic ceremony on May 24, *Cal. Clar. St. P.* App. xx. and *Mem. of Lady Fanshawe*, 142–145; Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 395.

[3] For Aubigny, see *supra* 243, note. Bellings was sent at this time to ask for the cardinalate for him.

[4] Before he was married, he told old Colonel Legge (who he knew had never approved of the match), that he thought they had brought him a bat, instead of a woman; but it was too late to find fault, and he must make the best he could of a bad matter. She was very short and broad, of a swarthy complexion, one of her fore teeth stood out, which held up her upper lip; had some very nauseous distempers, besides excessively proud and ill-

CHAP. V.

the reports that had been so set about that I was once persuaded of them, that she was not fit for marriage. The king himself told me, she had been with child: and Willis, the great physician, told doctor Lloyd, from whom I had it, that she had once miscarried of a child, which was so far advanced, that, if it had been carefully looked to, the sex might have been distinguished[1]. But she proved a barren wife, and was a woman of a mean shape, and of no agreeable temper: so that the king never considered her much, and she made ever after but a very mean figure. For some time the king carried things decently, and did not visit his mistress openly[2]. But he grew weary of that restraint; and shook it off so entirely, that he had ever after that mistresses to the end of his life, to the great scandal of the world, and to the particular reproach of all that served about him in the church[3]. He usually came

humoured. D. The accounts of the person of the queen are as various as the writers. The king's own letter (*Lansdowne MSS.*, 1236, f. 124, partly printed in Lister, iii. App. lxx. and, *in extenso*, in Macpherson, *Orig. Papers*, i. 22) says indulgently (Jesse's *Memoirs of the Court of England*, iii. 388), that there was 'nothing in her face that can in the least shocke one.' It does not however bear Burnet's interpretation. Clarendon says that 'she had beauty and wit enough to make herself very agreeable to his Majesty'; Sandwich spoke of 'the most lovely and agreeable person of the Queene'; Sir J. Williamson calls her 'of person short, but lovely, fair, and blackeyed.' (*Fleming Papers*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xii. App. vii. 28). See also Nicholas to Rutherford (*Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 396); Reresby's *Memoirs* (ed. Cartwright), 53, 'very little, not handsome (though her face was indifferent)'; Chesterfield's *Letters*, 123; Evelyn's *Diary*, May 30, 1662; Pepys's *Diary*, May 31, Sept. 7, 1662. See also Macdiarmid's *Lives of three British Statesmen*, 551. Reresby adds (53) that 'Her education was so different from his, being most of her life brought up in a monastery, that she had nothing visible about her capable to make the king forget his inclination to the Countess of Castlemaine.'

[1] The affirmative evidence on this point is so abundant (Salmon, 616; Pepys, Feb. 22, 166$\frac{3}{4}$, &c.) as to leave no reasonable doubt. It is perhaps enough to quote Charles's own letter to his sister, of May 7, 1668: 'My wife miscarried this morning.' Mrs. Ady's *Madame*, 262, 264; cf. *supra* 292, note, and *infra* 470.

[2] Lady Castlemaine's lodgings were the rendezvous of the anti-Clarendon gang, of whom Ashley, Bennet, Buckingham, and Lauderdale were the chief. See De Wiquefort's dispatch, May 14, 1662. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 371.

[3] It is but justice to remark, that

from his mistress's lodgings to church, even on sacrament days. He held as it were a court in them, and all his ministers made applications to them; only the earls of Clarendon and Southampton would never so much as make a visit to them, which was the maintaining the decencies of virtue in a very solemn manner. The lord Clarendon put the justice of the nation in very good hands; and employed some who had been on the bench in Cromwell's time, the famous sir Matthew Hale in particular[1].

CHAP. V.

The business of Ireland was a harder province[2]. The Irish that had been in the rebellion had made a treaty with the duke of Ormond, then acting in the king's name:

March 28, 1646.

Archbishop Sheldon refused the sacrament to the king; and that Bishop Ken, when his majesty's chaplain, denied the loan of his house to the king's mistress. R. This was at Winchester in 1683, when Ken was Prebendary of Winchester. Charles, it is said, determined to give the next bishopric to 'the good little black man who refused a lodging to poor Nell,' and accordingly Ken was made Bishop of Bath and Wells in 1684. Hawkins, *Account of Ken's Life*, 1713, 9; Overton, *Life in the English Church*, 1660–74, 72; Plumptre's *Life of Ken*, i. 158, 178.

[1] *Supra* 160, note; 169, note.

[2] There is a confusion in the text here which renders a clear statement of the sequence of events necessary. The instructions which Ormond received from Charles in January and February, 1645, empowered him to offer the suspension of Poyning's law for such bills as should be agreed upon between him and the Irish Catholics, and the immediate taking away of the penal laws. The treaty signed by Ormond and the Supreme Council, March 28, $164\frac{8}{6}$, and proclaimed July 30, provided for the admission of Catholics and Protestants to office on equal terms, but postponed the question of religious liberty, and said nothing about Poyning's law. Burnet wrote apparently in complete ignorance of Glamorgan's action. On Feb. 6, 1647, Ormond offered to surrender Dublin and the Lord Lieutenancy to the Parliament, and actually gave up the sword on July 28; he sailed for England a few days later. On August 8, the parliamentary commander, Michael Jones, defeated Preston at Dungan Hill. In January, 1647, Rinuccini, the nuncio, gained control of the new Supreme Council, formed from the General Assembly which, on Feb. 2, condemned the peace with Ormond. Ormond landed again at Cork as Lord-Lieutenant in October, 1648. On Jan. 17, $164\frac{8}{9}$, he signed a peace with the confederate Catholics at Kilkenny, granting them the free exercise of their religion, and the complete independence of the Parliament, with other reforms; the confederates agreeing to supply him with 15,000 foot and 500 horse. He was, however, routed by Jones at Rathmines ('the misfortune at Dublin') on Aug. 2, 1649. Cromwell landed on Aug. 15, at Dublin, whereas Ormond did not finally leave until Dec. 7, 1650.

CHAP. V. though he had no legal powers under the great seal, the king being then a prisoner. But the queen-mother got, as they give out, the crown of France to become the guarantee for the performance. By the treaty they were to furnish him with an army, to adhere to the king's interests, and serve under the duke of Ormond: and for this they were to be pardoned all that was past, to have the open exercise of their religion, and a free admittance into all employments, and to have a free parliament without the curb of Poyning's law. But after the misfortune at Dublin, they set up a supreme council again, and refused to obey the duke of Ormond; in which the pope's nuncio conducted them. After some disputes, and that the duke of Ormond saw he could not prevail with them to be commanded by him any more, he left Ireland and Cromwell came over, and reduced the whole kingdom, and made a settlement of the confiscated estates for the pay of the undertakers for the Irish war and of the officers that had served in it[1]. The king had in his declaration from Breda[2] promised to confirm the settlement of Ireland. So now a great debate arose between the native Irish and English settled in Ireland. The former claimed the articles that the duke of Ormond had granted them. He, in answer to this, said they had broke first on their part, and so had forfeited their claim to them. They seemed to rely much on the court of France, and on the whole popish party abroad, of
MS. 91. which they were the most | considerable branch at home. But England did naturally incline to support the English interest: and, as that interest in Ireland had gone in very unanimously into the design of the king's restoration, and

[1] An admirable account of the Cromwellian settlement of Ireland, and of the proceedings subsequent to the Restoration under the Acts of Settlement and Explanation, the only one indeed from which this most intricate matter can be clearly understood, may be seen in Lord E. Fitzmaurice's *Life of Sir W. Petty*. Petty carried out the gigantic work of the 'Down Survey' under which the lands were distributed. See also Sir Thomas Larcom's *History of the Down Survey*.

[2] There is nothing in the Declaration of Breda about Ireland.

had merited much on that account, so they drew over the duke of Ormond to join with them, in order to an act confirming Cromwell's settlement. Only a court of claims was set up to examine the pretensions of some of the Irish, who had special excuses for themselves, why they should not be included in the general forfeiture of the nation[1]. Some were under age: others were travelling, or serving abroad: and many had distinguished themselves in the king's service, when he was in Flanders, chiefly under the duke of York, who pleaded much for them, and was always depended on by them as their chief patron. It was thought most equitable to send over men from England, who were not concerned in the interests or passions of the parties of that kingdom, to try those claims. Their proceedings were much cried out on: for it was said that every man's claim who could support it with a good present was found good, and that all the members of that court came back very rich: so that, though the Irish thought they had not justice enough done them, the English said they had too much. When any thing was to be proved by witnesses, sets of them were hired to depose according to the instructions given them. This was then cried out on, as a new scene of wickedness that was then opened, and that must in [the] end subvert all justice and good government. The infection has spread since that time, and crossed the seas, and the danger of being ruined by false witnesses has become so terrible, that there is no security against it, but from the sincerity of

176

[1] Arthur Capel, Earl of Essex, then Lord-Lieutenant, writing on March 28, 1674, says: 'The truth is, the lands of Ireland have been a mere scramble, and the least done by way of orderly distribution of them as perhaps hath ever been known, which makes all men so unsettled in their estates, and so unquiet in their possessions, . . . which, considering Ireland as a plantation (for in reality it is little other), cannot but be so great a discouragement to all people from coming hither,' &c. *Essex Papers* (Camd. Soc.), i. 201. The *Ormond Papers*, *H. M. C. Rep.* viii., bear full testimony to this 'mere scramble.' And Sir W. Petty, *Treatise on Taxes*, 33, says that 'The claims upon claims which each hath to the other's estates, and the facility of making good any pretence whatsoever . . .; as also the frequency of false testimonies and abuse of solemn oaths, made security of title impossible.' See Arthur Young's *Travels in Ireland*, ch. vii.

CHAP. V.

juries; and if these come to be packed, then all men may be soon at mercy, if a wicked government should set on a violent prosecution, as has appeared oftener than once. I am not instructed enough in the affairs of Ireland, to carry this matter into more particulars [1]. The English interest was managed chiefly by two men of a very indifferent reputation: the earls of Anglesey and Orrery [2]. The chief manager of the Irish interest was Richard Talbot [3], one of the duke's bedchamber men, who had much cunning, and had the secret of his master's pleasures for some years, and was afterwards raised by him to be earl and duke of Tyrconnel. Thus I have gone over the several branches of the settlement of matters after the restoration. I have reserved the affairs of the church to the last, as those about which I have taken the most pains to be well informed, and which I do therefore offer to the reader with some assurance, and on which I hope due reflections will be made.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PENSIONARY PARLIAMENT. THE ENGLISH CHURCH AND THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY.

AT the restoration, Juxon, the ancientest and most eminent of the former bishops, who had assisted the late king in his last hours, was promoted to Canterbury, more out of decency than that he was then capable to fill that post; for as he was never a great divine, so he was now

Sept. 20, 1660.

[1] For full accounts see Clarendon, *Cont.* 228–283; Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 67–74 (Clar. Press ed.).

[2] Upon Orrery see *supra* 115, 124; and for Anglesey, *supra* 174, note. The disaffection of Anglesey to the interests of the Church of Ireland, and the good services of Orrery, are intimated more than once in the letters addressed by Michael Boyle, then Archbishop of Dublin and chancellor of that kingdom, to Archbishop Sheldon; *Sheldon MSS.*

[3] Richard Talbot was married to Frances Jennings, sister of the Duchess of Marlborough. See his petition to the king 'on behalf of His Majesty's most distressed subjects of the Kingdom of Ireland, who were ousted of their estates by the late usurped governments, and are not yet restored.' *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1671, 30, 595. For a description of his person, see Marvell, *Advice to a Painter*, 66–74.

superannuated[1]. Though others have assured me, that after some discourses with the king, he was so much struck with what he observed in him, that upon that he lost both heart and hope. The king treated him with outward respect, but had no great regard to him. Sheldon and Morley were the men that had the greatest credit. Sheldon was esteemed a learned man before the wars: but he was then engaged so deep in the politics, that scarce any prints of what he had been remained. He was a very dexterous man in business, had a great quickness of apprehension, and a very true judgment. He was a generous and charitable man. He had a great pleasantness of conversation, perhaps it was too great. He had an art that was peculiar to him, of treating all that came to him in a most obliging manner: but few depended much on his professions of friendship. He seemed [a] not to have a deep [a] sense of religion, if any at all: and spoke of it most commonly as of an engine of government, and a matter of policy; and by this means the king came to look on him

CHAP. VI. 177

[a] altered from *seemed to have very little.*

[1] Juxon died in July, 1663. He was succeeded by Sheldon; and the Bishopric of London was filled by Henchman.

Upon Sheldon, who, Sir Francis Wenman said, was born and bred to be Archbishop of Canterbury, see Bishop Parker's work *De Rebus sui temporis Commentarii*, 35–46. R. See also Salmon's *Lives of English Bishops* (1733), 737; Pope's *Life of Seth Ward* (1697), 53; Echard under the year 1677 (when Sheldon died); and Overton's *Life in the English Church*, 1660–74, 19, 20. The last is a useful work of reference on the leading clergy of the time, although the favourable side is naturally the one which most engages the author's attention. Sheldon amply represents the harsher side of the Church in all his dealings with Dissent; 'exclusion,' not 'comprehension,' was his principle: while the minatory tone which he assumed towards Charles perfectly reflects the political subjection in which the king was kept by the Church under his guidance. See especially his letter to Charles, when the latter suggested toleration, in December, 1662, *infra* 350, note; *British Quarterly Review*, April, 1883, 332. His munificence and private charity were undoubted. He is said to have given away between £60,000 and £70,000. All preferment was in his hands, and he used it with credit. He was emphatically a strong, sincere, and courageous man, and it was to his honour that he stayed in London during the plague, and that he did not hesitate to rebuke Charles for his licentiousness, even refusing him the sacrament.

CHAP. VI. as a wise and honest clergyman, that had little virtue and less religion[a]. Sheldon was at first made bishop of London, and was upon Juxon's death promoted to Canterbury. Morley had been first known to the world as a friend of the lord Falkland's: and that was enough to raise a man's character[1]. He had continued for many years in the lord Clarendon's family, and was his particular friend. He was a Calvinist with relation to the Arminian points, and was thought a friend to the puritans, before the wars: but he took care after his promotion to free himself from all suspicions of that kind. He was a pious and charitable man, of a very exemplary life, but extreme passionate, and very obstinate. He was first made bishop of Worcester. D^r. Hammond, for whom that see was designed, died a little
MS. 92. before the restoration, | which was an unspeakable loss to the church: for, as he was a man of great learning and of most eminent merit, he having been the person that during the bad times had maintained the cause of the church in a very singular manner, so he was a very moderate man in his temper, though with a high principle, and probably he would have fallen into healing counsels. He was also much set on reforming abuses, and for raising in the clergy a due sense of the obligations they lay under. But by his death Morley was advanced to Worcester: and not long after he
1662. was removed to Winchester, void by Duppa's death, who

[a] The following passage is here struck out. *The duke told me that he had often tried him in several points of Popery, and that he seemed always very complying: in particular, when Stillingfleet's book charging the Church of Rome with idolatry came out, he asked him if that was the doctrine of the Church of England; he told him it was not, but that men who had a mind to be popular would fall into such methods for raising themselves.*

---

[1] 'The best man alive,' Clarendon calls him. *Cal. Clar. St. P.* ii. 271. He was a friend also of Izaak Walton, under whose roof he found protection during the Rebellion. Pepys, under Dec. 25, 1662, relates a piece of gossip reflecting upon his reputation for charity which is, however, worthless in the face of the positive evidence. See Elmes's *Sir C. Wren and His Times* (1823), 423, and Salmon's *Lives of the Bishops*. He was Bishop of Worcester from 1660 to 1662, when he was promoted to Winchester, which see he held to his death in 1684.

had been the king's tutor, though no way fit for that post. CHAP. VI.
He was a meek and humble man, and much beloved for the sweetness of his temper; and would have been more esteemed if he had died before the restoration; for he made not that use of the great wealth that flowed in upon him that was expected. Morley was thought always the honester man of the two, as Sheldon was certainly the abler man.

The first point in debate was, whether concessions 178
should be made and pains taken to gain the dissenters, or not; especially the presbyterians. The earl of Clarendon was much for it; and got the king to publish a declaration[1] Oct. 25, 1660.
soon after his restoration, concerning ecclesiastical affairs, to which if he had stood, very probably the greatest part of them might have been gained. But the bishops did not

[1] The Declaration was a compromise arrived at between Episcopalians and Presbyterians at a conference, the final meeting of which was held at Clarendon's lodgings in Worcester House, on Oct. 23, 1660, when the king, with Albemarle and Ormond, Manchester and Hollis, Sheldon, Morley, three other bishops and some more Episcopalian divines, met Reynolds, Calamy, Baxter, and other representative Presbyterians. It was issued on Oct. 25. Charles endeavoured in vain to secure the insertion of a clause giving religious liberty to the Catholics, Baxter being especially vehement against it. For Morley's opinion, see Lister, iii. 110. Upon the motion of Hale, the Commons ordered in a Bill for turning the Declaration into an Act. This was brought to a second reading on Nov. 28, but was then thrown out on the 'previous question' by 183 to 157. Monk's friend, Secretary Morrice, spoke strongly against it. See the Declaration in Kennet's *Hist.* 243 and in the *Parl. Hist.* iv. 131, with Clarendon's speech of Sept. 13, *id.* 123; his own account, *Cont.* 142; *Commons Journals*, Nov. 6, 28; and Ranke, iii. 353. How far the Declaration was a pure 'blind' cannot be ascertained; but, read between the lines, it leaves no doubt as to the king's own inclinations. 'Though the Presbyter would have the Church settled in Parliament, the other party are resolved to put it off with delay, and by that means compass their design, which is to have it settled by a Synod . . . after the dissolution of this Parliament.' *Verney MSS.* A royal proclamation was issued against conventicles as early as Jan. 10, 1661. It is stated by Ralph (i. 52), that the annoyance of the sects, other than the Presbyterians, at being left out in the cold by the Declaration, led them to further the Act of Uniformity, which affected the Presbyterians as much as themselves. Nicholas, writing to Bennet, Dec. 6, 1661, speaks of the Bill as quashed by the violence of its promoters, and *happily* thrown out. *R. O.* vol. xxii. ff. 36, 40.

CHAP. VI.

approve of this: and after the service they did that lord in the duke of York's marriage, he would not put hardships on those that had so signally obliged him [1]. This disgusted the lord Southampton much, who was for carrying on the designs that had been much talked of during the wars, of moderating matters both with relation to the government of the church and the worship and ceremonies: which created a coldness between him and the earl of Clarendon when he went off from those designs. The consideration that those bishops and their party had in the matter was this: the presbyterians were possessed of most of the great benefices in the church, chiefly in the city of London and in the two universities [2]. It is true, all that had come into the room of those who were turned out by the parliament, or the visitors sent by them, were turned out by the course of law, as men that were illegally possessed of other men's rights: and that, even where the former incumbents were dead, because a title originally wrong was still wrong in law. But there were a great many of them in very eminent posts who were legally possessed of them. Many of these, chiefly in the city of London, had gone in to the design of the restoration in so signal a manner, and with such success, that they had great merit, and a just title to very high preferment. Now, as there remained a great deal of the old animosity against them for what they had done during the war, so it was said that it was better to have a schism out of the church than within it; and that the half conformity of the puritans before the war had set up a faction in every city and town between the lecturers and the incumbents; that the former took all methods to render themselves popular, and to raise the benevolence of their people, which was their chief subsistence, by disparaging

[1] Macdiarmid, in his *Life of Clarendon*, observes, that both the statements and sentiments in his later writings are so irreconcilable with this account, that it seems reasonable to suppose that the bishop was misinformed. See Macdiarmid's *Lives of Three British Statesmen*, 540. R.

[2] The Presbyterians resigned their livings without remonstrance, in many cases voluntarily recalling their predecessors.

the government both in church [and] in state. They had also many stories among them of the credit they had in the elections of parliament men, which they infused in the king, to possess him with the necessity of having none to serve in the church but persons that should be firmly tied to his interest, both by principle, and subscriptions and oaths. It is true, the joy then spread through the nation had got at this time a new parliament to be elected of men so high and so hot, that, unless the court had restrained them, they would have carried things much farther than they did, against all that had been concerned in the late wars: but they were not to expect such success at all times: therefore they thought it was necessary to make sure work at this time, and, instead of using methods to bring in the sectaries, they resolved rather to seek the most effectual ones for casting them out, and for bringing in a new set of men into the church [1]. This took with the king, at least it seemed to do so. But, though he put on an outward appearance of moderation, yet he was in another and deeper laid design, to which the heat of these men was subservient, for bringing in of popery. A popish queen was a great step to keep it in countenance at court, and to have a great many priests going about the court making converts; but it was thought a toleration was the only method for setting it a going all the nation over. And nothing could make a toleration for popery pass, but the having great bodies of men put out of the church, and put under severe laws, which should force them to move for a toleration, and should make it reasonable to grant it to them. And it was resolved, that whatever should be granted of that sort, should go in so large a manner that papists should be

May 8, 1661.

179

[1] The Convention Parliament had a large Presbyterian majority. In that which now met, May 8, 1661, there were but fifty-six Presbyterian members. The City of London, to the great annoyance of the Court, elected four Presbyterians; the taking away the Court of Wards and laying the charge upon the Excise appear to have contributed to this result. See *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 535–550 *passim*, for interesting notices of the excitement caused by the City elections.

CHAP. VI. comprehended within it. So the papists had this generally spread among them, that they should oppose all propositions for comprehension, and should animate the church
MS. 93. party to maintain their ground | against all the sectaries. And in that point they seemed zealous for the church. But at the same time they spoke of toleration, as necessary both for the peace and quiet of the nation, and for the encouragement of trade. And with this the duke was so possessed, that he declared himself a most violent enemy to comprehension, and as zealous for toleration. The king being thus resolved on fixing the terms of conformity to what they had been before the war, without making the least abatement or alteration, they carried on still an appearance of moderation, till the strength of the parties should appear in the new parliament. So, after the Declaration was set out, a commission was granted to twelve of a side, with nine assistants to each side, who were appointed to meet at the Savoy, and to consider on the ways of
March 25–July 25, 1661. uniting both sides[1]. At their first meeting Sheldon told them, that those of the church had not desired this meeting as not being satisfied with the legal establishment; and therefore they had nothing to offer; but it belonged to the other side, who moved for alterations, to offer both their exceptions to the laws in being, and the alterations that
180 they proposed. He told them they were to lay all they had to offer before them at once; for they would not engage to treat about any one particular till they saw how far their demands went: and he said that all was to be transacted in writing, though the others insisted on an amicable conference; which was at first denied, yet some hope was given of allowing it at last. Papers were upon
1641. this given in. The presbyterians moved that bishop Usher's Reduction should be laid down as a groundwork to treat on[2]; that bishops should not govern their diocese by their

[1] 'Jack the Levite labours to confound Aaron the *jure divino* priest.' *Sutherland Papers, H.M.C.Rep.* v. 173.

[2] Neal's *Puritans* (1733), ii. 407, 466. The 'Reduction' provided for monthly, yearly and triennial synods,

single authority, nor depute it to the lay officers in their courts, but should in matters of ordination and jurisdiction take along with them the council and concurrence of their presbyters. They did offer several exceptions to the liturgy; against the many responses by the people, the answers to the litany, which they desired might be made one continued prayer. They desired that no lessons should be taken out of the apocryphal books; that the psalms used in the daily service should be according to the new translation. They excepted to many parts of the office of baptism, that import the inward regeneration of all that were baptized. But as they proposed these amendments, so they did also offer a liturgy new drawn by Mr. Baxter. They insisted, mainly, on kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord's supper as a thing imposed, and moved that the posture might be left free; and that the use of the surplice, of the cross in baptism, of godfathers being the sponsors in baptism, and of the holy days, might be abolished. Sheldon saw well what the effect would be of putting them to make all their demands at once. The number of them raised a mighty outcry against them, as people that could never be satisfied. But nothing gave so great an advantage against them, as their offering a new liturgy. In this they were divided among themselves. Some were for insisting only on a few important things, reckoning that if these were gained, and a union followed upon that, it would be easier to gain other things afterwards. But all this was overthrown by Mr. Baxter, who was a man of great piety, and, if he had not meddled in too many things, he would have been esteemed one of the learned men of the age: he writ near two hundred books[1]: of these, three are large folios.

under the presidency of deans and bishops, regarded only as *primi inter pares*, and not qualified to act without the advice of the synod. Gardiner, ix. 387.

[1] Very sad ones. S. Dr. Samuel Johnson was of a different opinion; for when asked by Mr. Boswell, what works of Baxter he should read, he said, 'Read any of them, they are all good.' R. See Grosart's *Bibliographical List of the Works of Baxter*, 1868; also Orme's *Life and Times of Baxter*, 1830.

CHAP. VI. He had a very moving and pathetical way of writing, and as he was his whole life long a man of great zeal and much simplicity, so he was most unhappily subtle and metaphysical in every thing. There was a great submission paid to him by the whole party. So he persuaded them, that from the words of the commission they were bound to offer every thing that they thought might conduce to the good or peace of the church, without considering what was
181 like to be obtained, or what effect their demanding so much might have, in irritating the minds of those who were then the superior body in strength and number. All the whole matter was at last reduced to one single point, whether it was lawful to determine the certain use of things indifferent in the worship of God? The bishops held them to that point, and pressed them to shew that any of the things imposed were of themselves unlawful. The presbyterians declined this; but affirmed that other circumstances might make it become unlawful to settle a peremptory law about things indifferent; which they applied chiefly to kneeling in the sacrament; and stood upon it, that a law which excluded all that did not kneel from the sacrament was unlawful, as a limitation in the point of communion put on the laws of Christ, which ought to be the only condition of those who had a right to it. Upon this point there was a free conference, that lasted some days. The two men that had the chief management of the debate, were the most unfit to heal matters, and the fittest to widen them, that could have been found out. Baxter was the opponent, and Gunning was the respondent, who was afterwards advanced, first to Chichester, and then to Ely[1]. He was

[1] Baxter himself names Pierce, then Master of St. John's and Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, afterwards President of Magdalen, Oxford, as by far the ablest of his opponents, and says that he and Gunning did all the work for that side; though in Calamy's *Abridgement*, 154, 171, Morley is called the 'Prime Manager.' Another account of the conference, of great interest from the Anglican side, is contained in the *Danby MSS.*, Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 28,053, f. 1. See Kennet's *Hist.* 254, on Baxter's 'fencing.' On Gunning, who was made Bishop

a man of great reading, and noted for a special subtilty of arguing: all the arts of sophistry were made use of by him on all occasions, in as confident a manner as if they had been sound reasoning. He was a man of an innocent life, unweariedly active to very little purpose. He was much set on the reconciling us with popery in some points: and because the charge of idolatry seemed a bar | to all thoughts of reconciliation with them, he set himself with very great zeal to clear the church of Rome of idolatry. This made many suspect him as inclining to go over to them: but he was far from it, and was a very honest, sincere man, but of no sound judgment, and of no prudence in affairs. He was for our conforming in all things to the rules of the primitive church, particularly in praying for the dead, in the use of oil, with many other rituals: he formed many in Cambridge upon his own notions, who have carried them perhaps farther than he intended. Baxter and he spent some days in much logical arguing, to the diversion of the town, who thought here were a couple of fencers engaged into a thread of disputes, that could never be brought to an end, nor have any good effect. In conclusion, this commission, being limited to such a number of days, came to an end before any one thing was agreed on. The bishops insisted on the laws that were still in force, to which they would admit of no exception, unless it was proved that the matter of those laws was sinful. They charged the presbyterians for having 182
made a schism, upon grounds which now they themselves could not call sinful. They said there was no reason to gratify such a sort of men in any thing: one demand granted would draw on many more: all authority both in church and state was struck at by the position they had insisted on, that it was not lawful to impose things indifferent, since they seemed to be the only proper matter in which human authority could interpose. So this furnished

CHAP. VI.

MS. 94.

of Chichester in 1669 and of Ely in 167⅘, see *Reliquiae Baxterianae* and ff. 436, 590. 'He can do nothing but what is well,' Evelyn, Feb 23, 1673. He died on July 6, 1684.

CHAP. VI. an occasion to expose them as enemies to all order. Things had been carried at the Savoy with great sharpness, and many reflections. Baxter said once, such things would offend many good men in the nation. Stearn[1], upon that took notice, that he would not say kingdom, but nation, because he would not acknowledge a king. Of this great complaints were made, as an indecent return for the zeal they had shewn in the restoration[2].

The conference broke up without doing any good; it did rather hurt, and heightened the sharpness that was then on people's minds to such a degree, that it needed no addition to raise it higher. The presbyterians laid their complaints before the king: but little regard was had to them. And now all the concern that seemed to employ the bishops' thoughts was, not only to make no alteration on their account, but to make the terms of conformity much stricter than they had been before the war. So it was resolved to maintain conformity to the height, and to put lecturers in the same condition with the incumbents as to oaths and subscriptions, and to oblige all persons to subscribe an unfeigned assent and consent to all and every particular contained and prescribed in the book of common prayer. Many who thought it lawful to conform in submission yet scrupled this, as importing a particular approbation of every thing: and great distinction was made between a conformity in practice and so full and distinct an assent. Yet men got over that, as importing no more but a consent of obedience: for though the words of the subscription, which were to be also publicly pronounced before the congregation, were the declaring the person's unfeigned assent and consent, seemed to import this, yet the clause that enjoined this carried

[1] He was then Bishop of Carlisle. O.

[2] This is chiefly taken from Silvester's *Life of Baxter* (fol. 1696), which was drawn from his autobiographical remains. Calamy's *Abridgement* of this work (1702 and 1713) and Orme's *Life and Times of Baxter* are the principal authorities. A new *Life of Baxter*, by the Rev. J. Hamilton Davies, was published in 1887.

a clear explanation of it, for it enacted this declaration as an assent and consent to the use of all things contained in the book. Another subscription was enacted with relation to the league and covenant; by which they were required to declare it unlawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take arms against the king, renouncing the traitorous position of taking arms by his authority against his person, or those commissioned by him, together with a declaration that no obligation lay on them or any other person, from the league or covenant, to endeavour any change or alteration of government in church and state, and that the covenant was in itself an unlawful oath. This was contrived against all the old men, who had both taken the covenant themselves, and had pressed it upon others[1]. So they were now to own themselves very guilty in that matter. And those who thought it might be lawful upon great and illegal provocation to resist unjust invasions on the laws and liberties of the subjects, excepted to the subscription, though it was scarce safe for any at that time to have insisted on that point. Some thought, that since the king had taken the covenant, he at least was bound to stand to it. Another point was fixed by the act of uniformity, which was more at large formerly. Those who came to England from the foreign churches had not been required to be ordained among us. But now all that had not episcopal ordination were made incapable of holding any ecclesiastical benefice[2].

CHAP. VI. 1662

Some few alterations were made in the liturgy by the bishops themselves: a few new collects were made, as the prayer for all conditions of men, and the general thanks-

[1] The record in the *Lords Journals* for May 8, 1662, of the discussion in the conference between the Houses on disputed points is of extreme interest, especially for the clauses insisting upon episcopal organization, and upon all incumbents, officers of universities, public schoolmasters, and even private tutors, taking the oaths here mentioned. Such ministers as should hereafter conform were by another clause made capable of holding livings, though not of the livings from which they had been ejected.

[2] Except the ministers of the French and Dutch Churches in London allowed by the king. Clarendon, *Cont.* i. 152.

CHAP. VI. giving: a collect was also drawn for the parliament, in which a new epithet was added to the king's title that gave great offence, and occasioned much indecent raillery: he was styled *our most religious king*[1]. It was not easy to give a proper sense to this, and to make it go well down; since, whatever the signification of *religion* might be in the Latin word, as importing the sacredness of the king's
MS. 95. | person, yet in the English language it bore a signification that was no way applicable to the king. And those who took great liberties with him have often asked him, what must all his people think when they heard him prayed for as their most religious king? Some other lesser additions were made; but care was taken that nothing should be altered so as it had been moved by the presbyterians; for it was resolved to gratify them in nothing. One important addition was made, chiefly by Gauden's means[2]: he pressed that a declaration explaining the reasons of their kneeling at the sacrament, which had been in king Edward's liturgy but was left out in queen Elizabeth's time, should be again set where it had once been. The papists were highly offended when they saw such an express declaration made against the real presence; and the duke told me, that when he asked Sheldon how they came to declare against a doctrine on which he had been instructed that it was the
184 doctrine of the church, Sheldon answered, Ask Gauden for that, that is a bishop of your own making: for the king had ordered his promotion for the service he had done[3]. The convocation that prepared those alterations, as they

[1] The same expressions of *our most religious and gracious king*, as appear in the present prayer for the parliament, occur in that which was used for the same assembly in 1625. It is to be found in the *Summary of Devotions*, compiled and used by Archbishop Laud. The beginning of which prayer, as far as the words *of our sovereign and his kingdoms*, together with its conclusion, *These and all other necessaries, &c.*, are exactly the same as in the present form, except in the late substitution of *dominions* for *kingdoms*. R.

[2] See the author's *History of the Reformation*, iii. 5 of the Preface; Kennet's *Register*, 585, for the alteration; and *History*, 261, for the Act.

[3] Gauden was made Bishop of Exeter, 1660, and translated to Worcester, 1662.

added some new holy days, St. Barnabas and the Conversion of St. Paul, so they took in more lessons out of the Apocrypha, in particular the Bel and the Dragon. New offices were also drawn for two new days, the thirtieth of January, called king Charles the Martyr, and the twenty-ninth of May, the day of the king's birth and return. Sancroft drew for these some offices of a very high strain; yet others of a moderater strain were preferred to them. But he, coming to be advanced to the see of Canterbury, got his offices to be published by the king's authority, in a time when so high a style as was in them did not sound well in the nation[1]. Such care was taken in the choice and returns

[1] But the words 'grand rebellion' were not put in, or the other alterations made, till King James came to the throne. The word *rebellion*, I think, is never used in any Act of Parliament, except in one. See the Act 13 & 14 Charles II, for the distribution of £60,000 to the loyal and indigent officers, &c. See also the *Commons Journals*, Oct. 31, 1665. Note, I had the above observation from Lord Chancellor King, relating to the former times. See with regard to the services for Jan. 30 and May 29, those in King Charles's time, and those of King James's, and compare them well. See my folio Clarendon, vol. iii. page last (see Preface, v). When these services for Jan. 30, and May 29, in the two reigns, are compared, it may perhaps be deemed more prudent to restore those of Charles II, than to abolish the religious observance of those two days. The suffering of the forms of King James to continue after the Revolution, might possibly be in some measure owing to this author, who, in his speech upon Sacheverel's impeachment, says, the war between the king and the parliament was 'plainly a rebellion' in the latter. I say nothing of his reasons, but see the whole passage in the *State Trials*, vol. v. pp. 652, 653. For the distinction between the war, and the taking off the king's head, see *Commons Journals*, May 13, 1660. I have said that in some measure it might be owing to this author, that the old forms for Jan. 30 and May 29 were not restored at the Revolution: but the chief reason, no doubt, was the general principle of policy that governed that whole change, which was to connect it as little as possible with what had happened in the time of the former troubles, against which the clergy, and the body of the people, at that time had very strong prejudices. O. With respect to the observation on the term *rebellion*, words explicitly condemning the lawfulness of the war levied by the parliament against the king are to be found in the Militia Act of 1662. And in the first form of prayer here mentioned by the Speaker [Onslow] for Jan. 30 these words occur, *permitting cruel men, sons of Belial, to execute the fury of their rebellion upon our late gracious sovereign.* R.

CHAP. VI.

of the members of the convocation, that every thing went among them as was directed by Sheldon and Morley. When they had prepared all their alterations, they offered them to the king, who sent them to the house of commons: upon which the act of uniformity was prepared by Keeling, afterward lord chief justice[1]. When it was brought into the house, many did apprehend that so severe an act might have ill effects, and began to abate of their first heat: upon which reports were spread, and much aggravated as they were reported to the house of commons, of the plots of the presbyterians in several counties[2]. Many were taken up on those reports: but none were ever tried[3]: so, the thing being let fall, it has been given out since, that these were forged by the direction of some hot spirits, who might think such arts were necessary to give an alarm, and by rendering the party odious, to carry so severe an act against them. The lord Clarendon himself was charged as having directed this piece of artifice: but I could never see any ground for fastening it on him: though there are great appearances

[1] In December, 1667, Keeling was called to the Bar of the House of Commons, to answer a charge of 'miscarriages towards juries in tryalls before him.' *Kenyon MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. iv. 81. See also Pepys for Oct. 17, 21; Dec. 12, 13, 1667; Oct. 23, 1668; *Commons Journals*, Dec. 10, 13, 1667. He was charged with having 'undervalued, vilified and contemned Magna Charta.' After hearing his defence, however, the House resolved to proceed no further in the matter.

[2] It requires a study of the *State Papers* for the early years of the reign to gain an idea of the alarm of the government and of the consequent growth of the trade of informer. See Bennet's report to the king, Lister, iii. 198; Clarendon's Declaration, Dec. 19, 1661; and Report of the Joint Committee, *Parl. Hist.* iv. 226. The Corporation Act, which is not mentioned by Burnet, was passed on the 19th. A letter from Nicholas to Bennet, Dec. 17, 1660, shows that the plots were allowed to ripen. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 413 and *passim*. On Jan. 9 and April 24, 166$\frac{1}{2}$, attempts were made to surprise Berwick and Newcastle; *id.* 470, 572. The number of disbanded soldiers in London caused great alarm, and previous to the coronation a proclamation was put out ordering them all to leave the city; *id.* 567. It was stated that there were 20,000 or 30,000, chiefly in Wapping. But see Sir G. Carteret's opinion, Pepys, Oct. 29, 1662. A proclamation to the same effect was issued June 10, 1670. Rugge's *Diurnall*.

[3] A common practice. S.

May 19, 1662.

of foul dealing among some of the fiercer sort. The act passed by no great majority[1]: and by it all who did not conform to the liturgy by the twenty-fourth of August, St. Bartholomew's day, in the year 1662, were deprived of all ecclesiastical benefices, without leaving any discretional power with the king in the execution of it, or without making provision for the maintenance of those who should be so deprived: a severity neither practised by queen Elizabeth in the enacting her liturgy, nor by Cromwell in ejecting the royalists[2], a fifth part of the benefice being reserved for their subsistence[3]. St. Bartholomew's day was pitched on, that, if they were then deprived, they should lose the profits of the whole year, since the tithes 185
are commonly due at Michaelmas. The presbyterians remembered what a St. Bartholomew's had been held at Paris ninety years before, which was the day of that massacre, and did not stick to compare the one to the other. The common prayer with the new corrections was that to which they were to subscribe; but the corrections were so long a preparing, and the vast number of copies,

[1] See the *Commons Journals*, of April 16, 1662, for a very extraordinary resolution, as to their not admitting any debate upon the amendments made by the convocation to the former Book of Common Prayer. O. The division on this resolution was 96–90. An earnest effort was made by Charles and Clarendon, while the Bill was before the Lords, to introduce a dispensing proviso for ministers holding cures at the time. It was brought in by Clarendon on March 17, 166½, as recommended by the king, but rejected after prolonged debate. Christie's *Life of Shaftesbury*, i. 263 and App. vi. The Bill received the royal assent on May 19. For those who had no livings imprisonment was to take the place of deprivation. The 17th was the last day of grace. On that day farewell sermons were preached in London, and about 2,000 ministers left the Church. The tithes of which they were deprived were the great tithes. The Lords desired to follow the precedents named in the text by reserving one-fifth of the revenues (*Lords Journals*, April 17), but the Commons refused. It is curious, on the other hand, that, as the Bill came up to the Lords, Michaelmas Day was the day named for conforming, and that the alteration to St. Bartholomew's Day was by their amendment. There is no record of a division on the final stages of the Bill.

[2] But by King William. S. Cf. *supra*, 280 note.

[3] This provision soon fell into arrear. See Newcome's *Diary*, Jan. 5, 166½.

CHAP. VI. above 20,000, that were to be wrought off for all the parish churches of England, made the impression go on so slowly, that there were few books out when the day came [1]. So, many that were well affected to the church, but that made conscience of subscribing to a book that they had not seen, left their benefices on that very account. Some made a journey to London on purpose to see it. With so much precipitation was that matter driven on, that it seemed expected that the clergy should subscribe implicitly to a book they had never seen. This was done by too many, as I was informed by some of the bishops [2]. But the presbyterians were now in great difficulties. They had many meetings, and much disputing about conformity. Reynolds accepted of the bishopric of Norwich. But Calamy and Baxter refused the sees of Litchfield and Hereford. And

[1] In the Session of Parliament, in the year 1663, a Bill was sent from the Commons to the Lords, for the relief of such persons as by sickness or other impediments were disabled from subscribing to the declaration of assent and consent to the Book of Common Prayer, required by the Act of Uniformity. The Bill passed the Lords with a clause added to it, 'declaring the subscription of assent and consent, &c., should be understood only as to practice and obedience'; but the Commons rejected the clause [saying, 'there was neither justice nor prudence in it'], which the Lords [though highly indignant at this attack upon their privileges,] not insisting upon, the Bill passed without it; when this clause was added by the Lords, some of them dissented to it, and entered their protestations against it, in these words; 'being destructive to the Church of England, as now established.' The protest was first signed by the Duke of York, and then by some few temporal lords; but not one bishop. *Lords Journals*, July 25, 1663. O.

[2] Kennet says, 'It is certain the book came out of the press, not a few days but several weeks before August 24.' See also what he says further fully contradictory to this account. *Register and Chronicle*, 837. *Cole.* R. See Pepys, August 10, 1662. Ralph, however, i. 75, adduces a piece of evidence which goes far to support the statement in the text. By the Act, 'Some lawful impediment' was held to be good reason for not reading the new Liturgy on or before the 17th. The Bishop of Peterborough, in his certificate signed on that day, states that 'the books . . . could not be gotten by the Dean and Prebendaries of the Cathedral Church of Peterborough (so as they might read the same in the said Cathedral) before the 17th of this instant August.' Many sent to London to have the new Liturgy copied out, but had no certainty that the copies were correct. Calamy's *Defence of Nonconformity*, ii. 100.

about two thousand of them fell under the parliamentary deprivation, which raised a grievous outcry over the nation; though it was less considered at that time than it would have been at any other. Baxter told me then that had the terms of the king's declaration been stood to, he did not believe that above three hundred of these would have been so deprived. Some few, and but few, of the episcopal party were troubled at this severity, or apprehensive of the very ill effects it was like to have. Here were many men much valued, some on better grounds and others on worse, who were now cast out ignominiously, reduced to great poverty, provoked by much spiteful usage, and cast upon those popular practices that both their principles and their circumstances seemed to justify, in forming separate congregations, and of diverting men from the public worship, and from considering their successors as the lawful pastors of those churches in which they | had served. The blame MS. 96. of all this fell heaviest on Sheldon. The earl of Clarendon was charged with having entertained the presbyterians with hopes and good words, while he was all the while carrying on, or at least giving way to, the bishops' project. When the convocation had gone through the book of common prayer, it was in the next place proposed, that, according to a clause in the king's licence, they should consider the canons of the church. They had it then in their power to 186 have reformed many abuses, and particularly to have provided an effectual remedy to the root of all those which arise from the poor maintenance that is reserved to the incumbents. Almost all the leases of the church estates over England were fallen in, there having been no renewal for twenty years. The leases for years were determined: and the wars had carried off so many men, that most of the leases for lives were fallen into hand[1]. So that the church estates were now in hand: and the fines raised by the renewing the leases rose to about a million and a half. It was an unreasonable thing to let those who were now

CHAP. VI.

[1] See Clarendon, *Cont.* 189, 190.

CHAP. VI. promoted carry away so great a treasure. If the half had been applied to the buying in of tithes or glebes for small vicarages, here a foundation had been laid down for a great and effectual reformation[1]. In some sees forty or fifty thousand pound was raised, and applied to the [a] enriching the bishops' families[2]. Something was done to churches and colleges, in particular to St. Paul's in London, and a noble collection was made for redeeming all the English slaves that were in any part of Barbary. But this fell far short of what might have been expected. In this the lord Clarendon was heavily charged, as having shewed that he was more the bishops' friend than the church's. It is true the law made those fines belong to the incumbents; but such an extraordinary occasion deserved that a law should have been made on purpose. What the bishops did with greater fines was a pattern to all the lower dignitaries, who generally took more care of themselves than of the church. The men of merit and service were loaded with many livings and many dignities. With this great accession of wealth there broke in upon the church a great deal of luxury and high living, on the pretence of hospitality; while others made purchases, and left great estates, most of which we have seen melt away. And with this overset of wealth and pomp, that came on men in the decline of their parts and age, they who were now growing into old age became lazy and negligent in all the true concerns of the church: they left preaching and writing to others, while they gave themselves up to ease and sloth. In all which sad representation, some few exceptions were to be made; but so few, that, if a new set of men had not appeared of another stamp, the church had quite lost her esteem over the nation[3].

[a] *raising and* struck out.

---

[1] He judges here right, in my opinion. S.

[2] Bevill Higgons, in a long note upon this passage, vindicates the bishops from the charge by quoting their charities.

[3] To omit the mention of several of the old clergy, distinguished by

CHAP. VI.

These were generally of Cambridge, formed under some divines, the chief of whom were Drs. Whitchcot, Cudworth, Wilkins, More, and Worthington[1]. Whitchcot was a man of a rare temper, very mild and obliging. He had great 187
credit with some that had been eminent in the late times, but made all the use he could of it to protect good men of all persuasions. He was much for liberty of conscience: and being disgusted with the dry systematical way of those times, he studied to raise those that conversed with him to a nobler set of thoughts, and to consider religion as the seed of a Deiform nature, (to use one of his own phrases.) In order to this, he set young students much on reading the ancient philosophers, chiefly Plato, Tully, and Plotin, and on considering the Christian religion as a doctrine sent from God both to elevate and sweeten human nature; in which he was a great example, as well as a wise and kind instructor. Cudworth carried this on with a great strength

their erudition as well as their loyalty, who among the successors of the Caroline bishops equalled in munificence Juxon, Sheldon, Cosin, Morley, and Warner, or surpassed in piety and learning, Sanderson, Pearson, and Fell? R.

[1] Overton, *Life in the English Church*, 49–53, has a useful notice of the 'Cambridge Platonists'—to use the term by which they are best known—of whom, previous to the Restoration, John Smith, author of *Select Discourses*, was the greatest. The sympathetic account in the text is creditable to Burnet, whose robust and aggressive nature was in marked contrast with the qualities most characteristic of these divines. He, however, frequently shows his appreciation of the gentler virtues, as in his accounts of Nairn, Charteris, Tillotson, Leighton, and many others. Ranke, oddly enough, says that Burnet allied himself with them (Overton, 52). The terms 'Latitudinarian,' which appears to date from this time (*id.* 50, and Warwick, *Memoirs*, 89), and 'Rationalist,' are singularly inapplicable. See S. T. Coleridge, *Notes on English Divines* (Collected Works), v. 266; *A Brief Account of the New Sect of Latitudinarians*, &c., by S. P. (Simon Patrick?) of Cambridge, in answer to a friend at Oxford; Mullinger's *Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century* (1867); *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century*, by J. Tulloch, D.D., 1862. In Clarke's *Life of Anthony Wood*, 355, we find them vaguely described as 'in some respects like the Independents in the late warrs.' Cudworth was the opponent of Hobbes, in his *Intellectual System*. On Whitchcot, Provost of King's College, Cambridge, see curious notices in the *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 31, and *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 121, 160. Worthington edited John Smith's *Discourses*.

CHAP. VI. of genius and a vast compass of learning. He was a man of great conduct and prudence: upon which his enemies did very falsely accuse him of craft and dissimulation. Wilkins was of Oxford, but removed to Cambridge[1]. His first rise was in the prince elector palatine's family, when he was in England. Afterwards he married Cromwell's sister; but made no other use of that alliance but to do good offices, and to cover the university from the sourness of Owen[2] and Goodwin[3]. But at Cambridge he joined with those who studied to propagate better thoughts, to take men off from being in parties, or from narrow notions,

[1] See the *Life of Dr. John Wilkins*, prefixed to his works (1708): he was one of the founders of the Royal Society (*infra* 342, note); Warden of Wadham (1648–59), Bishop of Chester 1667 (f. 253). See Pope's *Life of Seth Ward*. Besides his great scientific acquirements, he was noted for his tolerant temper and for his protection of Royalist divines during the Commonwealth. Cromwell appears to have steadily protected the two universities from the fanatical party, especially during the sitting of the Barebone Parliament, 1653.

[2] John Owen (1616–83), originally a moderate Presbyterian and friend of Fairfax, but by 1646 as moderate an Independent, chaplain to Cromwell in Ireland in 1649, and in Scotland in 1650. He was made Dean of Christ Church by Cromwell in March, 1651, and Vice-Chancellor in 1652, retaining this office until 1658. For a short time, in 1654, he was member for Oxford University, but was unseated on account of his orders. As one of the Triers he was kind and considerate. His first great controversial work was with John Goodwin on *The Perseverance of Saints* (1654), and he combated the Socinians in his *Vindiciae Evangelicae* (1655), which led to a controversy with Hammond. These were followed by many minor works. At Clarendon's request, in 1662, he answered the Romanist pamphlet, 'Fiat Lux,' by his 'Animadversions'; he entered into controversy with Bishop Parker in 1669, and replied to Stillingfleet's *Mischief of Separation* (1674) by *A Brief Vindication* (1680), which in turn drew from Stillingfleet the *Unreasonableness of Separation*, a perusal of which, as of the *Irenicum*, (*infra* 335), is necessary if a fair idea is to be obtained of the views held by the purest advocates of the Church. This also Owen answered. In 1674 Charles gave him 1,000 guineas to assist impoverished dissenters. There does not seem to be any evidence in support of Burnet's charge of 'sourness.' He died in 1683.

[3] Thomas Goodwin (1600–80) took his B.A. degree at Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1616. In 1650 he became President of Magdalen, Oxford, was made a D.D. in 1653, and was an assistant to the Commissioners for removing scandalous ministers in Oxfordshire in 1654. See *supra* 148.

from superstitious conceits, and a fierceness about opinions. CHAP. VI.
He was also a great observer of natural, and a promoter of experimental, philosophy, which was then a new thing, and much looked after. He was naturally ambitious, but was the wisest clergyman I ever knew. He was a lover of mankind, and had a delight in doing good. More was an open hearted and sincere Christian philosopher, who studied to establish men in the great principles of religion against atheism, | that was then beginning to gain ground, chiefly MS. 97.
by reason of the hypocrisy of some, and the fantastical conceits of the more sincere enthusiasts. Hobbes, who had long followed the court, and passed there for a mathematical man, though he really knew [a] little that way,[a] being disgusted of the court, came into England in Cromwell's time, and published a very wicked book, with a very strange 1651.
title, *The Leviathan*. His main principles were, that all men acted under an absolute necessity, in which he seemed protected by the then received doctrine of absolute decrees. He seemed to think that the universe was God, and that souls were material; thought being only a subtil and imperceptible motion. He thought interest and fear were the chief principles of society: and he put all morality in the following that which was our own private will or advantage. He thought religion had no other foundation than the laws of the land; and he put all law in the will of 188
the prince, or of the people: for he writ his book at first in favour of absolute monarchy, but turned it afterwards to gratify the republican party. These were his true principles, though he had disguised them, for deceiving unwary readers[1].

[a] substituted for *nothing of it*.

[1] See Mr. Leslie Stephen's article upon Hobbes in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, and Ranke's analysis of his opinions, iii. 572, as contrasted with those of Locke. There are some interesting letters from Hobbes to the Earl of Newcastle from 1633 to 1637, in the *Portland MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* viii. App. ii. 120–30. In November, 1640, he fled from England, remaining abroad until 1651, in which year the English translation of the *De Cive*

CHAP. VI.

And this set of notions came to spread much. The novelty and boldness of them set many on reading them; the impiety of them was acceptable to men of corrupt minds, which were but too much prepared to receive them by the extravagance of the late times. So this set of men at Cambridge studied to assert and examine the principles of religion and morality, on clear grounds, and in a philosophical method. In this More led the way to many that came after him. Worthington was a man of eminent piety, of great humility, and practised a most sublime way of self-denial and devotion. All these, and those who were formed under them, studied to examine further into the nature of things than had been done formerly. They declared against superstition on the one hand, and enthusiasm on the other. They loved the constitution of the church, and the liturgy, and could well live under them: but they did not think it unlawful to live under another form. They wished things might have been carried with more moderation; and they continued to keep a good correspondence with those who differed from them in opinion, and allowed a great freedom both in philosophy and in divinity: from whence they were called men of latitude. And upon this men of narrower thoughts and fiercer tempers fastened upon them the name of Latitudinarians [1]. They read Episcopius much, and the making out the reasons of things being a main part of their studies, their

(first printed in 1642), and the *Leviathan*, were published. The views expressed in these works led to his being compelled to leave France, and in the same year Nicholas notes that he was being 'caressed in London for his traitorous and rebellious tenets.' *Cal. Clar. St. P.* ii. 122. See the valuable remarks in Lord E. Fitzmaurice's *Life of Sir W. Petty*, 16, 187; Austin's *Jurisprudence*, i. 249, note. As an 'Assertor Regum' he naturally commended himself to Louis XIV, whom he affected to admire. De Cominges, French Ambassador in 1663, advised his master to confer some pecuniary reward upon 'this *bonhomme*'; he was sure that no favour could be more profitably bestowed. Jusserand, *A French Ambassador*, &c., 60. Whether Hobbes actually received a pension is not clear. He died in Nov. 1679, at the age of ninety-two. Luttrell, 30.

[1] See note, *supra* 331.

enemies called them Socinians. They were all very zealous against popery; and so, they becoming soon very considerable, the papists set themselves against them to decry them as atheists, deists, or at best Socinians. And now that the main principles of religion were struck at by Hobbes and his followers, the papists acted upon this a very strange part. They went in so far even into the argument for atheism, as to publish many books in which they affirmed, that there was no certain proof of the Christian religion, unless we took it from the authority of the church as infallible. This was such a delivering up of the cause to them, that it raised in all good men a very high indignation at popery; that party shewing, that they chose to make men who would not turn papists become atheists, rather than believe Christianity upon any other ground than infallibility. The most eminent of those who were formed 189
under those great men were Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and Patrick. The first of these was a man of a clear head and a sweet temper. He had the brightest thoughts and the most correct style of all our divines, and was esteemed the best preacher of the age. He was a very prudent man; and had such a management with him, that I never knew any clergyman so universally esteemed and beloved as he was for above twenty years. He was eminent for his opposition to popery; he was no friend to persecution, and stood up much against atheism: nor did any man contribute more to bring the city to love our worship than he did. But there was so little superstition, and so much reason and gentleness in his way of explaining things, that malice was long levelled at him, and in conclusion broke in fiercely on him. Stillingfleet was a man of much more learning, but of a more reserved and a haughtier temper. He, in his youth, writ an *Irenicum* for healing our divisions, with 1659.
so much learning and moderation, that it was esteemed a masterpiece[1]. His notion was, that the apostles had

[1] The *Irenicum* was published in 1659. See Stillingfleet's *Collected Works*, 6 vols., 1710.

CHAP. VI. settled the church in a constitution of bishops, priests, and deacons, but had made no perpetual law about it, having only taken it in as they did many other things, from the customs and practice of the synagogue; from which he inferred, that certainly the constitution was lawful, since authorized by them, but not necessary, since they had made no settled law about it. This took with many; but was cried out upon by others, as an attempt against the church; yet the argument was managed with so much learning and skill, that none of either side ever undertook
MS. 98. to answer it[1]. After that, he | wrote against infidelity, beyond any that had gone before him. And then he engaged to write against popery, which he did with such an exactness and liveliness, that no books of controversy were so much read and valued as his were. He was a great man in many respects. He knew the world well, and was esteemed a very wise man. The writing his *Irenicum* was a great snare to him: for, to avoid the imputations which that brought upon him, he not only retracted the book, but he went in to the humours of that high sort of people beyond what became him, perhaps beyond his own sense of things. He applied himself much to the study of law and records, and the original of our constitution, and was a very extraordinary man, too much conceited of himself, and too much concerned for his family. Patrick was a great preacher[2]. He wrote much and well, chiefly on the Scriptures. He was a laborious man in his function, of

[1] The book itself was answered in the year 1680, by Bishop Parker, as it was then said. See Wood's *Athenae Oxon*, art. S. Parker. R.

[2] Simon Patrick (1626-1707), at first a disciple of the Cambridge Platonists, but afterwards identified with the High Church party: Dean of Peterborough, 1679, Bishop of Chichester, 1689 (upon Burnet's recommendation), and of Ely, 1691. He was the author, in 1669, of the *Friendly Debate between a Conformist and Nonconformist*, an attack upon the Nonconformists which he appears to have regretted. As Vicar of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, from 1662 until his unsought promotion, he appears to have been a model parish priest; and he was one of the few who stayed at his post during the Plague. His autobiography is extant.

great strictness of life, but a little too severe against those who differed from him; but that was when he thought their doctrines struck at the fundamentals of religion. He became afterwards more moderate. To these I shall add another divine, who, though of Oxford, yet as he was formed by bishop Wilkins, so he went in to most of their principles, but went far beyond them in learning. Lloyd was a great critic both in the Greek and Latin authors, but chiefly in the Scriptures; of the words and phrases of which he carries the most perfect concordance in his memory, and has it the readiest about him, of all that ever I knew. He is an exact historian, and the most punctual in chronology of all our divines. He has read the most books and with the best judgment, and has made the most copious abstracts out of them, of any in this age: so that Wilkins used to say, he had the most learning in ready cash of any he ever knew. He is so exact in every thing he sets about, that he never gives over any part of study, till he has quite mastered it. But when that is done, he goes to another subject, and does not lay out his learning with the diligence with which he lays it in. He has many volumes of materials upon all subjects, laid together in so distinct a method that he could with very little labour write on any of them. He has more life in his imagination, and a truer judgment, than may seem consistent with such a laborious course of study[1]. Yet, as much as he is set on learning, he has

190

[1] Lloyd, after several translations, was Bishop of Worcester. In the year 1712, he told Queen Anne he thought it his duty to acquaint her, that the Church of Rome would be utterly destroyed, and the city of Rome consumed by fire, in less than four years; which he could prove beyond contradiction, if Her Majesty would have the patience to hear him upon that subject. The queen appointed him next day in the forenoon; and a great Bible was brought, which was all he said would be wanting. The Bishop of London came with him; and the Duke of Shrewsbury, Lord Oxford, Lord Dartmouth, and Dr. Arbuthnot were ordered to attend by the queen. He showed a vast memory and command of the Scriptures at that age (for he was then above eighty years old); but the Earl of Oxford offering to give another interpretation to one of his texts than he did, though in extreme civil terms, the bishop turned to the

CHAP. VI. never neglected his pastoral care. For several years he had the greatest cure in England, St. Martin's, Westminster, which he took care of with an application and diligence beyond any about him; to whom he was an example, or rather a reproach, so few following his example. He is a holy, humble, meek, and patient man, ever ready to do good when he sees a proper opportunity: even his love of study does not divert him from that. He did indeed, upon his promotion, find a very worthy successor in his cure, Tenison, who carried on and advanced all those good methods that he had begun in the management of that great cure; he endowed schools, set up a public library, and kept many curates to assist him in his indefatigable labours among them. He was a very learned man[1], and took much pains to state the notions and practices of the heathenish idolatry, to fasten that charge on the church of Rome. And, Whitehall lying within that parish, he stood as in the front of the battle all king James's reign; and maintained, as well as managed, that dangerous post with great courage and much judgment, and was held in very high esteem for his whole deportment, which was ever grave and moderate. These have been the greatest divines we have had these forty years[2]: and may we ever have
191 a succession of such men to fill the rooms of those who have already gone off the stage, and of those who, being

queen in the greatest passion I ever saw any man, and told her, 'So says your treasurer; but God says otherwise, whether he like it or no.' The queen seeing him so angry and rude, called for her dinner, after which he said, that if what he had advanced was not true, he did not know any truth, and was a very unfit person to be trusted with explaining the gospel to other people, and desired the queen would dispose of his bishopric to some man of greater ability, if what he said did not prove true; and then spoke something to the queen in a very low voice, that nobody else might hear; which she told me afterwards was, that after four years were expired, Christ would reign personally upon earth for a thousand years. D.

[1] The dullest, good for nothing man I ever knew. S. Compare Lord Dartmouth's note at vol. ii. of the folio edition, f. 136. R.

[2] Dr. Routh points out in the 1823 edition, that Burnet, in saying this, forgets Pearson, Cave, South, Beveridge, Hooper, and Kidder.

now very old, cannot hold their posts long. Of these I have writ the more fully, because I knew them well, and have lived long in great friendship with them, but most particularly with Tillotson and Lloyd. And, as I am sensible I owe a great deal of the consideration that has been had for me to my being known to be their friend, so I have really learned the best part of what I know, and of the services I may have done, to them. And if I have arrived at any faculty of writing clear and correctly, I owe that entirely to them. For as they joined with Wilkins in that noble though despised attempt at an *universal character*, and a philosophical language[1], they took great pains to observe all the common errors of language in general, and of ours in particular: and in the drawing the tables for that work, which was Lloyd's province, he had looked further into a natural purity and simplicity of style than any man I ever knew; into all which he led me, and so helped me to any measure of exactness of writing which may be thought to belong to me. But I owed them much more on the account of those excellent principles and notions, in which they were in a most particular manner communicative to me. This set of men contributed more than can be well imagined to reform our way of preaching; which, among the divines of the church of England before them, overrun with pedantry, a great mixture of quotations from fathers and ancient writers, | a long opening of a text with the concordance of every word in it, and a giving all the different expositions with the grounds of them, and the

CHAP. VI.

MS. 99.

[1] *An Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language*, by John Wilkins, D.D., Dean of Ripon, and Fellow of the Royal Society, London, 1668. This laborious folio was the amplification of a paper read before the Society, and was ordered to be printed at a meeting of Council held on Monday, April 13, 1668. In the Introduction Wilkins states that it would have been produced earlier, had not the already printed sheets and much of the MS. been destroyed in the Fire of London. He says that he had often talked the matter over with Seth Ward (see the latter's *Vindiciae Academiarum*) and had been greatly helped by Wray, Lloyd, and Francis Willoughby; but he does not mention any debt to Tillotson.

CHAP. VI.

entering in some parts of controversy; and all was to conclude in some, but very short, practical application, according to the subject or the occasion. This was both long and heavy, especially when all was pye-balled[1], full of many sayings of different languages. The common style of sermons was either very flat and low, or swelled up with rhetoric to a false pitch of a wrong sublime. The king had little or no literature, but true and good sense; and had got a right notion of style[2]; for he was in France at a time when they were much set on reforming their language[3]. It soon appeared that he had a true taste. So this helped on the value of these men, when the king approved of the style their discourses generally run in; which was clear, plain, and short[4]. They gave a short paraphrase of their text, unless where great difficulties required a more copious enlargement: but even then they cut off unnecessary shews of learning, and applied themselves to the matter, in which they opened the nature and reasons of things so fully, and with that simplicity, that their hearers felt an instruction of another sort than had commonly been observed before. So they became very much followed: and a set of these men brought off the city

[1] A noble epithet. S.

[2] How came Burnet not to learn this style? S. Something is added to this note both in vol. xxviii of the *European Magazine*, and in Dr. Barrett's *Essay on the Life of Swift*, where about half of Swift's notes are published, but it is unacknowledged by the Lansdowne autograph. R.

[3] The first edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* did not appear until 1694, though it was begun in 1639. Introduction to Wilkins's *Essay towards a Real Character*, &c. It expressed the results of the labours of Malherbe (1556–1628) in the sixteenth, and of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, the Précieuses, the Academy, and the grammarians, Vaugelas, d'Olivet, and Thomas Corneille in the seventeenth century. See Brachet's *Grammaire Historique de la Langue Française*, Introd. 63–65; and Bridge, *Hist. of French Literature*, 142–203.

[4] Charles's *general* view of sermons is simply expressed by himself in a letter to his sister in 1666: 'We have the same disease of sermons that you complaine of there, but I hope you have the same convenience that the rest of the family has, of sleeping out most of the time, which is a greate ease to those who are bounde to heare them.' Mrs. Ady, *Madame*, 228.

in a great measure from the prejudices they had formerly to the church [1]. CHAP. VI.

There was a great debate in council a little before S. Bartholomew's day, whether the act of uniformity should be punctually executed, or not. Some moved to have the execution of it delayed till the next session of parliament. Others were for executing it in the main, but to connive at some eminent men, and to put curates in their churches to read and officiate according to the common prayer, but to leave them to preach on, till they should 192
all die out. The earl of Manchester laid all these things before the king with much zeal, but with no great force. Sheldon, on the other hand, pressed the execution of the law. England was accustomed to obey laws: so while they stood on that ground they were safe, and needed fear none of the dangers that seemed to be threatened. He also undertook to fill all the vacant pulpits, that should be forsaken in London, better and more to the satisfaction of the people than they had been before: and he seemed to apprehend that a very small number would fall under the deprivation, and that the gross of the party would conform. On the other hand, those who led the party took great pains to have them all stick together: they infused it into them that if great numbers stood out, it would shew their strength, and produce new laws in their favour; whereas they would be despised, if, after so much noise made, the greater part of them should conform [2]. So it was thought, that many went out in the crowd to keep their friends company [3]. They were reckoned to be

[1] The Act of Uniformity was seconded by the king's letter to the archbishops, containing directions concerning preachers. 'None are in their sermons to bound the authority of sovereigns, or determine the differences between them and the people; nor to argue the deep points of election, reprobation, free will,' &c., Oct. 14, 1662. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661–2, 517.

[2] Ralph, i. 74–77.

[3] See the account of 'Black Bartholomew's' at Oxford in Clarke's *Life of Anthony Wood*, i. 453. For a register of those deprived, see Calamy's *Account of the Ejected Clergy*.

CHAP. VI. about 2000 in all. Many of these were distinguished by their abilities and zeal. They cast themselves upon the providence of God and the charity of their friends, which had a fair appearance, as of men that were ready to suffer persecution for their consciences. This begot esteem, and raised compassion: whereas the old clergy, now much enriched, were as much despised. But the young clergy that came from the universities did good service. Learning was then very high at Oxford; chiefly the study of the oriental tongues, which was much raised by the Polyglot Bible, lately set forth[1]. They read the fathers much there. Mathematics and the new philosophy were in great esteem. And the meetings that Wilkins had begun at Oxford were now held in London to such a degree, that the king himself encouraged them much, and had many experiments made before him. The men that formed the Royal Society in London were, sir Robert Murray, the lord Brouncker, a profound mathematician, and Dr. Ward, soon after promoted to Exeter, and afterwards removed to Salisbury[2]. He was a man of a great reach, went deep in mathematical studies, and was a very dexterous man, if not too dexterous; for his sincerity was much questioned. He had complied during the late times, and held in by taking the covenant: so he was hated by the high men as a time-server. But the lord Clarendon saw that most

[1] *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*, London, 1657, 6 vols.

[2] Dr. Wallis, Savilian Professor of Astronomy, Dr. (afterwards Sir William) Petty, Robert Boyle, Kenelm Digby. Dr. Wilkins himself, with others of less note, should be added to the list. Hobbes was not an original member, owing to the antagonism between him and Wallis. Fitzmaurice's *Life of Sir W. Petty*, 107, note. Burnet himself became a member, on the introduction of Sir R. Moray, in 1664. The nucleus of the Society was apparently formed in 1645 by Theodore Haak, a German from the Palatinate, Wallis and Wilkins, joined in 1646 by Hartlib and Boyle, under the title of the 'London Philosophical Society.' *Life of Sir W. Petty*, 15. See Plans for the Royal Society, *Tangier Papers*, *Sloane MSS.* (Brit. Mus.), 3984, f. 34. In 1659 they removed to Robert Boyle's lodgings. See Birch's *Hist. Roy. Soc.* and *Life of Boyle*; and the attack upon the Society by Henry Stubbs in 1670. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1670, 224.

of the bishops were men of merit by their sufferings, but of no great capacity for business; so he brought Ward in, as a man fit to govern the church: for Ward, to get his former errors to be forgot, went in to the high-flown notions of a severe conformity, and became the most considerable man on the bishops' bench. He was a profound statesman, but a very indifferent clergyman[1]. Many physicians, and other ingenious men, went in to this society for natural philosophy; but he who laboured most, at the greatest charge, and with the most success at experiments, was Robert Boyle, the earl of Cork's youngest son[2]. He was looked on by all who knew him as a very

CHAP. VI.

193

[1] See his letters to Sheldon in the *Sheldon MSS.* (Bodl.) They are of the greatest interest as illustrating the difficulties of carrying out the severities of Clarendon's Acts. Thus, on Dec. 19, 1663, he writes: 'There are in this county of Devon onely, (besides what there are in Cornwall,) at least 14 justices of the peace who are accounted arrant Presbyterians, and some of them esteemed as dangerous as any men within my Diocese.' 'The only persons in this City (Exeter) who have had the heart and courage to endeavour an obedience to the laws have been checked and discouraged for their labour, and some put out of employment as being too pragmaticall and forward to draw the people to obedience.' 'My diocese hath two places in it especially which are disorderly and troublesome, one in the Easterne part which borders upon Somerset and Dorsetshire, which being the border of three dioceses as well as of three counties, gives great opportunity to the sectaries to play their tricks and escape.' 'Some of the most populous and considerable places within my Diocese . . . have stood void ever since August 24, 1662, and there is hardly one parish . . . where I have not met with complaint, either that they have no minister, or a pitiful ignorant one.' 'One imprisoned minister told him that after his removeall he staid some moneths to see whether any other would supply his place, but at length finding that . . . the people went off, some to Atheism and Debauchery, others to Sectarianism (for he is a presbyterian) he resolved to adventure to gather his flock again. And he had gathered a flock of 1,500 or 2,000 upon Sunday last when by the warrant of Sir W^m^ Strode he was taken from the pulpit and brought away.'

On the disinclination of the magistrates to press the law, see also *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1668–9, 342, where we read that the Mayor of Newcastle 'slights the informers,' and 564; *id.* 1670, 289; 1671, 15, 'The Mayor winks at all conventicles,' &c., and *passim.*

[2] On Robert Boyle (1626-91), seventh son of Richard Earl of Cork, see his *Life* by Birch (1691). Burnet's funeral sermon upon him, which is in print, was preached on Jan. 7, 169$\frac{1}{2}$, at St. Martin's-in-the-

CHAP. VI. perfect pattern; he was a very devout Christian, humble and modest, almost to a fault, of a most spotless and
MS. 100. exemplary life in all respects. | He was highly charitable; and was a mortified and self-denied man, that delighted in nothing so much as in the doing good. He neglected his person, despised the world, and lived abstracted from all pleasures, designs, or interests. I preached his funeral sermon, in which I gave his character so truly that I do not think it necessary now to enlarge more upon it. The society for philosophy grew so considerable that they thought fit to take out a patent, which constituted them a body by the name of the Royal Society; of which sir Robert Murray was the first president, bishop Ward the second, and the lord Brouncker the third[1]. Their history is writ so well by Dr. Sprat, that I will insist no more on them, but go on to other matters.

CHAPTER VII.

ALARM AT POPERY. DESIGN OF THE FIRST DUTCH WAR.

AFTER S. Bartholomew's day, the dissenters, seeing both court and parliament was so much set against them, had much consultation together what to do. Many were for going over to Holland, and settling there with their ministers. Others proposed New England, and the other plantations. Upon this the earl of Bristol drew to his house a meeting of the chief papists in town: and, after

Fields. Boyle's will contains a passage dealing with the Royal Society, which ends thus: 'Wishing them also a happy success in their laudable attempts to discover the true nature of the works of God; and praying that they and all other searchers into physical truths may cordially refer their attainments to the glory of the great Author of Nature and to the comfort of mankind.'

[1] Brouncker was first President under the Charter, which was dated July 15, 1662. See note, *supra* 105. Sprat's *History* was published in 1667.

an oath of secrecy, he told them, now was the proper time for them to make some steps towards the bringing in of their religion: in order to that it seemed advisable for them to take pains to procure favour to the nonconformists; for that became the common name to them all, as puritan had been before the war. They were the rather to bestir themselves to procure a toleration for them in general terms; that they themselves might be comprehended within it. The lord Aubigny seconded the motion[1]. He said, it was so visibly the interest of England to make so great a body of the trading men stay within the kingdom, and be made easy in it, that it would have a good grace in them to seem zealous for it, and to draw in so great a number of those, who had been hitherto the hottest against them to feel their care, and see their zeal to serve them; that he recommended to them to make this the subject of all their discourses, and to engage all their friends into the design. Bennet did not meet with them, but was known to be in the secret; as the lord Stafford told me in the Tower a little before his death. But that lord soon withdrew from those meetings: for he apprehended the earl of Bristol's heat, and that he might raise a storm against them by his indiscreet meddling. 194

The king was so far prevailed on by them, that in December [16]62 he set out a declaration[2], that was Dec. 22, 1662.

[1] Cf. *supra* 307, note.

[2] The Declaration of Dec. 22, 1662 (*Parl. Hist.* iv. 259), was issued under the influence of Bennet, Bristol, and Ashley. Bennet, who probably compiled it, told Ormond that it was read twice to Clarendon, who entirely approved of it; but Clarendon wrote to Ormond denying this—it was not his act, and he would have nothing to do with it. Lister, iii. 231-233, *infra* 348. In Feb. 1663, Lord Robarts introduced a Bill, enabling Charles to dispense with the Act of Uniformity, but espressly excluding Catholics (*H. M. C. Rep.* vii. 167); it was opposed by Clarendon, but supported by Ashley, who urged the harm (see Aubigny's remark quoted in the text above) which the Act was doing to the trading interest. Christie's *Shaftesbury*, i. 267–280; ii. App. i. Clarendon's own account (*Cont.* 416–425) is clearly erroneous. Ranke, iii. 402. It appears from Pepys, Sept. 3, 1662, as if indulgence had been even then decided upon by the Council, but that a speech from Sheldon prevented its promulgation at that time.

CHAP. VII. generally thought to be procured by the lord Bristol: but it had a deeper root, and was designed by the king himself. In it the king expressed his aversion to all severities on the account of religion, but more particularly to all sanguinary laws; and gave hopes both to papists and nonconformists, that he would find out such ways for tempering the severity of the laws, that all his subjects should be easy under them. The wiser of the nonconformists saw at what all this was aimed, and so received it coldly. But the papists went on more warmly, and were preparing a scheme of a toleration for them; and one part of it raised great disputes among themselves. Some were for their taking the oath of allegiance, which renounced the pope's deposing power; but all those that were under a management from Rome refused this, and the internuntio at Brussells proceeded to censure those that were for it, as enemies to the papal authority. A proposition was also made for having none but secular priests tolerated in England, who should be under a bishop, and under an established government; but that all regulars, in particular all Jesuits, should be under the strictest penalties forbid the kingdom. The earl of Clarendon set this on; for he knew well it would divide the papists among themselves. But, though a few honest priests, such as Blackloe, Serjant Carron, and Walsh, were for it, yet they could not make a party among the leading men of their own side. It was pretended that this was set on foot with a design to divide them, and so to break their strength[1]. The earl of Clarendon knew, that cardinal de Rets, for whom

[1] Mention was before made of the unpublished letters addressed by Boyle, then Archbishop of Dublin and Chancellor of Ireland, to Archbishop Sheldon; in one of them, dated June 7, 1666, an account is given of some proceedings of the Roman Catholics on what was entitled the *Remonstrance*. It begins thus: 'Your grace, I presume, very well remembers a subscription of loyalty and obedience, which was made some three or four years since by many of the Romish Catholic nobility and clergy of this kingdom, and presented to His Majesty, contrived and patronised by Walsh and Carron. This remonstrance, though

he saw the king had a particular esteem, had come over incognito, and had been with the king in private[1]. So, to let the king see how odious a thing his being suspect of popery would be, and what a load it would lay on his government if it came to be believed, he got some of his party, as sir Allain Brodrick[2] told me, to move in the house for an act rendering it[a] highly penal to say the king was a papist. And, whereas the king was made believe that the old cavaliers were become milder with relation

[a] *capital* struck out.

carried on by them in the name of the clergy, was disowned by a great part, I may say the greater part, of the ecclesiastics there; which hath been so long contended between them, that the remonstrance is considered as a fit expedient to try their loyalties.' The archbishop proceeds to state, that when for that purpose the remonstrants designed to have a general meeting of their bishops and clergy at Dublin to decide on the adoption or rejection of this instrument, the anti-remonstrants opposed it with all their power. He adds, 'that of late one Farel, a Dominican friar, hath brought over some letters from the internuncius apostolicus at Brussels and from Cardinal Barbarini at Rome, to show the great danger of that meeting and the proper detestation thereof. The letters were intercepted by my Lord-Lieutenant, who hath sent copies of them to my Lord Chancellor, and also to my Lord Arlington. I have likewise here inclosed them to your grace.' (A letter from Barbarini on this subject is to be seen amongst the Sheldon papers.) 'I shall make no comments upon them, but upon the whole your grace will perceive, that the grandees of Rome, notwithstanding all professions to the contrary, will not willingly allow any obedience to the temporal magistrate, but in subordination to that see to dispense with it, or disallow it, as it shall be there thought fit.' It appears from another letter, that the convention of the clergy after laying aside Walsh's remonstrance, drew up a declaration of their own, which being considered as both imperfect and ambiguous, by no means gave satisfaction to the Lord-Lieutenant. An account is given, not to mention other works, in a *Life of King William*, published at Dublin in the year 1747, of the disputes between the remonstrants and anti-remonstrants; and of the final triumph of the latter party, which supported the doctrine of the papal power in temporals as well as spirituals; vol. i. 263–270. R.

[1] De Retz visited England twice in 1660, and, it is said, tried to induce Charles to marry one of Mazarin's nieces. Charles, probably in remembrance of his help to the queen-mother in Paris, assisted him largely. See the *Memoirs of De Retz* (Petitot, 1825, Introd. 63), vol. 44 of the *Collection de Mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France.*

[2] See *supra* 131, and note.

CHAP. VII. to popery, the lord Clarendon upon this inferred, that it still appeared that the opinion of his being a papist would so certainly make him odious, that for that reason the parliament had made the spreading those reports so penal.

195 But this was taken by another handle, while some said that this act was made on purpose, that, though the design of bringing in popery should become ever so visible, none should dare to speak of it. The earl of Clarendon had a quite contrary design in it, to let the king see how fatal the effects of any such suspicions were like to be. When the Declaration was proposed in council, lord Clarendon and the bishops opposed it[1]. But there was nothing in it directly against law, hopes being only given of endeavours to make all men easy under the king's government: so it passed. The earl of Bristol carried it as a great victory; and he, with the duke of Buckingham, and all lord Clarendon's enemies, declared openly against him. But the poor priests, who had made those honest motions, were very ill looked on by all their own party, as men gained on design to betray them. I knew all this from Peter Walsh himself, who was the honestest and learnedest man I ever knew among them[2]. He was of Irish extraction, and of the Franciscan order: and was indeed in all

MS. 101. points of controversy | almost wholly protestant: but he had senses of his own, by which he excused his adhering to the church of Rome: and maintained that with these he could continue in the communion of that church without sin: and he said that he was sure he did some good, staying still on that side, but that he could do none at all if he should come over. He thought no man ought to forsake that religion in which he was born and bred, unless he was clearly convinced that he must certainly be damned if he continued in it. He was an honest and able

[1] James mentions this as a special cause of the king's annoyance with Clarendon. Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 428.

[2] Ormond had a high opinion of Walsh. *H. M. C. Rep.* vi. 740. He died in March, 1688, having signed a recantation of his errors; *id.* iii. 197.

man, much practised in intrigues, and knew well the methods of the Jesuits and other missionaries. He told me often, there was nothing which the whole popish party feared more than an union of the church of England with the presbyterians: they knew we grew the weaker the more our breaches were widened; and that the more we were set against one another, we would mind them the less. The papists had two maxims from which they never departed: the one was to divide us, and the other was to keep themselves united, and either to set on an indiscriminated toleration, or a general prosecution; for so we loved to soften the harsh word of *persecution*. And he observed, not without great indignation at us for our folly, that we, instead of uniting among ourselves and dividing them, according to their maxims, did all we could to keep them united and to disjoint our own body. For he was persuaded, if the government had held an heavy hand on the regulars and the Jesuits, and had been gentle to the seculars, and had set up a distinguishing test, renouncing all sort of power in the pope over the temporal 196
rights of princes, to which the regulars and the Jesuits could never submit, that this would have engaged them into such violent quarrels among themselves, that censures would have been thundered at Rome against all that should take any such test; which would have procured much disputing, and might have probably ended in the revolt of the soberer part of that church[1]. But he found, that, though the earl of Clarendon and the duke of Ormond liked the project, little regard was had to it by the governing party at court.

CHAP. VII.

The church party was alarmed at all this, and though they were unwilling to suspect the king or the duke, yet

[1] Essex, in 1673, acted in Ireland upon this principle: 'I made use of some Fryers, who all wayes have their litle wrangles with the secular clergy, to sett up Factions against some of their Bishops, and, by encouraging these litle animosities among them, brought them at last to that pass,' &c. *Essex Papers* (Camd. Soc.), i. 138.

CHAP. VII. Feb. 166⅔. the management for popery was so visible, that in the next session of parliament the king's declaration was severely arraigned, and the authors of it were plainly enough pointed at[1]. This was done chiefly by the lord Clarendon's friends, and at this the earl of Bristol was highly displeased, and resolved to take all possible methods to ruin the earl of Clarendon. He had great skill in astrology, and had possessed the king with a high opinion of it[2]: and told the

[1] Within a week from the assembling of Parliament, on Feb. 27, 166⅔, Charles realized formally that his Declaration had raised the 'No Popery!' cry, which increased continually in vehemence. The address of the Commons was uncompromising. 'It will establish schism by a law. . . . It will be a cause of increasing sects and sectaries, whose numbers will weaken the Protestant Profession so far that it will become difficult for it to defend itself against them; . . . and, in time, some prevalent sect will, at last, contend for an establishment, which, for aught can be foreseen, may end in Popery' *Parl. Hist.* iv. 260. and the 'Petition of Both Houses,' *id.* 263. *Commons Journals*, Feb. 27, 166⅔; Pepys, Feb. 28. Sheldon's letter to the king has already been mentioned, *supra* 313, note: 'By your Act,' he says, 'you labour to set up that most damnable and heretical doctrine of the Church of Rome, whore of Babylon.' He then points out that Charles is really taking 'liberty to throw down the laws of the land at your pleasure'; and he warns him against 'God's heavy wrath and indignation upon the kingdom in general and yourself in particular.' It is important to remember that at this very time Charles was in communication with the Pope for a national return to the Catholic Church. He was ready to accept the Confession of Pius IV, decrees of the Council of Trent, &c. But the Anglican Church was to be national and almost independent of the Holy See. Ranke, iii. 398.

[2] It was always an objection to his skill in astrology, that he declared himself a Papist the year before the Restoration, which had disqualified him for any employment in England: but the truth was, he had turned to qualify himself to serve under Don John, in Flanders, who had a very great esteem for him, and there was little prospect of the change that happened the year after, nor had any almanack foretold it: but he took care to have his children brought up Protestants, that they might not lie under the like disadvantage. D. On Digby as an astrologer, see Clarendon, xv. 79. Charles laughed at the science (*Lauderdale Papers*), Shaftesbury played at it, *supra* 172, note. In 1669, when Louis XIV wished to have a private agent with Charles, he sent over the Abbé Pregnani, astrologer and fortune-teller. The Abbé unfortunately advised the courtiers, Monmouth especially, to put their money on the wrong horses, and was immediately recalled as discredited. Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, iii. 73–76; Mrs. Ady's *Madame*, 278–284; Fornéron, *Louise de Kéroualle*, 30; and *infra* 556, note.

duke of Buckingham, as he said to the earl of Rochester, Wilmot, from whom I had it, that he was confident he could lay that before the king that would totally alienate him both from his brother and from the lord Clarendon: for he could demonstrate by the principles of that art, that he was to fall by his brother's means, if not by his hand: and he was sure this would work on the king. It would so, said the duke of Buckingham, but in another way than he expected: for it would make the king be so afraid of offending him, that he would do any thing rather than provoke him. Yet the lord Bristol would lay this before the king; and the duke of Buckingham believed that it had the effect ever after that he had apprehended: for though the king never loved nor esteemed the duke, yet he seemed to stand in some sort of awe of him. But this was not all: the lord Bristol resolved to offer articles of impeachment of the earl of Clarendon to the house of lords, though it was plainly provided against by the statute against appeals in the reign of Henry the fourth. Yet both the duke of Buckingham and the lord Bristol, the fathers of these two lords, had broke through that in the former reign. So the lord Bristol drew his impeachment, and carried it to the king, who took much pains on him in a soft and gentle manner to persuade him from it. But he would not be wrought on; and he told the king plainly, that, if he forsook him, he would raise such disorders that all England should 197
feel them, and the king himself should not be without a large share in them. The king, as the earl of Lauderdale told me, who said he had it from himself, said he was so provoked at this that he durst not trust himself in answering it, but went out of the room, and sent the lord Aubigny to soften him: but all was in vain. It is very probable that the lord Bristol knew the secret of the king's religion, and that both made him so bold and the king so fearful. The next day July 10, 1663.
he carried the charge to the house of lords[1]. It was of

CHAP. VII.

[1] *Lords Journals* for July 10, 1663, xi. 555. The possibility of such an attack by a private person upon the greatest officer of state excited

CHAP. VII. a very mixed nature: in one part he charged the lord Clarendon with raising jealousies, and spreading reports of the king's being a papist: and yet in the other articles he charged him with a correspondence with the court of Rome, in order to the making the lord Aubigny a cardinal, and several other things of a very strange nature; and as soon as he put it in, he, it seems, either repented of it, or at least was prevailed with to abscond, and he was ever after that looked on as a man capable of the highest extravagancies possible. He made the matter worse by a letter that he writ to the lords, in which he expressed his fear of the danger the king was in by the duke's having of guards. Proclamations went out for discovering him, but he kept out of the way till the storm was over. The parliament expressed a firm resolution to maintain the act of uniformity. And the king being run much in debt, they gave him four subsidies, being willing to return to the ancient way of taxes by subsidies[1]. But these were so evaded, and brought in so little money, that the court resolved never to have recourse to that method of raising money any more, but to betake themselves for the future to the assessment begun
MS. 102. in the war. | And the convocation gave at the same time four subsidies, which proved as heavy on them as they were light on the temporalty. This was the last aid that the spiritualty gave: for the whole proving so inconsiderable, and yet so unequally heavy on the clergy, it was resolved

inexpressible astonishment among those accustomed to the idea of royal authority as it existed in France. Jusserand, *A French Ambassador, &c.*, 105. The mob, we learn from the dispatches of De Cominges, was on the side of Bristol, as 'le champion de la patrie.' Clarendon was supposed to be 'irrecoverably lost.' Pepys, April 28, 1663. For the scene when Bristol read his accusation, see Ranke, iii. 409. Bristol's fortunes declined after this fiasco, and in 1670 we find him petitioning the king for support. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1670, 504. Cf. Lister, iii. 245. Upon Aubigny, see *supra* 243, 307.

[1] 'The House is as zealous as ever for His Majesty, but is sensible also of the necessities of the country.' Marvell, June 6, 1663 (Grosart's ed. ii. 92). Upon the difference between a 'subsidy' and an 'assessment,' as imposed by the Commonwealth, see Macaulay, iii. 607 (Library ed.); and compare Hallam, *Hist. of Engl.* (sm. ed.), i. 371, note.

on[1] hereafter to tax church benefices as temporal estates were; which proved indeed a lighter burden, but was not so honourable as when it was given by themselves: yet interest prevailing above the point of honour, they acquiesced in it, though the convocations being no more necessary to the crown made that there was less regard had to them afterwards. They were often discontinued and prorogued: and when they met, it was only for form. The parliament did pass another act that was very acceptable to the court, and that shewed a confidence in the king, for repealing the act of triennial parliaments[2], which had been

[1] It was first settled by a verbal agreement between Archbishop Sheldon and the Lord Chancellor Clarendon, and tacitly given into by the clergy in general, as a great ease to them in taxations. The first public act of any kind relating to it, was an Act of Parliament in 1665, by which the clergy were, in common with the laity, charged with the tax given in that Act, and were discharged from the payment of the subsidies they had granted before in Convocation; but in this Act of Parliament of 1665, there is an express saving of the right of the clergy to tax themselves in Convocation, if they think fit; but that has never been done since, nor attempted, as I know of, and the clergy have been constantly from that time charged with the laity in all public aids to the Crown by the House of Commons. In consequence of this (but from what period I cannot say), without the intervention of any particular law for it, except what I shall mention presently, the clergy (who are not Lords of Parliament) have assumed, and, without any objection, enjoyed the privilege of voting in the election of members of the House of Commons, in virtue of their ecclesiastical freeholds. This having constantly been practised from the time it first began, there are two Acts of Parliament which suppose it to be now a *right*. The Acts are the 10th of Anne, chap. 23; and the 18th of George II, chap. 18. And here it is best, the whole of this matter should remain without further question or consequence of any kind; as it now stands, both the Church and the State have a benefit from it. Gibson, Bishop of London, said to me, that this was the greatest alteration in the constitution ever made, without an express law. O. For another clear account of what was actuallydone, see Echard, 818, quoted in *Parl. Hist.* iv. 309. Burnet antedates this important change by nearly two years. It took place during the session ending March 2, 166$\frac{4}{5}$. See *Commons Journals*, Nov. 25, 1664; Feb. 3, 166$\frac{4}{5}$; *Lords Journals*, xi. 654.

[2] 'Mr. Prin is the man against it, comparing it to the idol whose head was of gold, and his body and legs and feet of different metal.' Pepys, March 26, 1664. Vaughan, who suggested the compromise of 1662, we read, 'pealed it away about Triennials an hour and a half by the clock, spake

CHAP. VII. obtained with so much difficulty, and was clogged with so many clauses, that they seemed to transfer the power from the crown to the people, and that[a] when carried in the year 1641, was thought the greatest security that the people had for all their other liberties, was now given up without a struggle, or any clauses for a certainty of parliaments, besides a general one, that there should be a parliament called within three years after the dissolution of the present parliament, and so ever afterwards; but without any severe clauses in case the act was not observed.

198

April 5, 1664.

As for our foreign negotiations, I know nothing in particular concerning them. Secretary Bennet had them all in his hands: and I had no confidence with any about him. Our concerns with Portugal were public, and I know so secrets about these.

By a melancholy instance to our private family, it appeared that France was taking all possible methods to do every thing that the king desired. The commonwealth's-men were now thinking that they saw the stream of the nation beginning to turn against the court: and upon that they were meeting, and laying plots to retrieve their lost game[1]. One of these being taken, and he apprehending

1662–1665.

[a] [*which*] wanted to complete the sense.

---

so desperately home that he outshot Sir R. T. [Temple] ten bowes length, but all in vaine (cf. *id.* March 28, 1664): the Bill is ingrossed, marcht up to the Lords, and soe farewell Magna Charta.' *Verney MSS.*, March 31, 166$\frac{3}{4}$. The Bill received the royal assent, April 5, 1664. During the last four years of his reign Charles, thanks to the absence of 'any clauses for a certainty of parliaments,' ruled without a parliament. Cf. *supra* 277. An attempt was made on Feb. 18, 166$\frac{7}{8}$, by Sir Richard Temple, to pass a Bill for the frequent holding of parliaments, but it met with no support. *Parl. Hist.* iv. 410.

[1] Lord Clarendon, in an unpublished letter, addressed to Archbishop Sheldon about this time, expresses his apprehensions of a design for the surprisal of the Tower of London; but adds, that he relies on the honesty of the lieutenant of that fortress, he being altogether under the direction of Monk. R.

A year before this Sir Robert Harley wrote: 'Being here [Dover] I have learned that there is most certainly a very greate designe amongst

that he was in danger, begged his life of the king, and said, if he might be assured of his pardon, he would tell where my uncle Wariston was, who was then in Rouen: for he agreed so ill with the air of Hamborough, that he was advised to go to France; and this man was on the secret[1]. So the king sent one to the court of France, desiring he might be put in his hands: and this was immediately done: and no notice was sent to my uncle to go out of the way, as is usual in such cases, when a person is not charged with assassinations or any infamous action, but only with crimes of state. He was sent over, and kept some months in the Tower; and from that was sent to Scotland, as shall be told afterwards[2]. May, 1663.

the fanaticks, commonwealth men, and those kind of people, and they are resolved of some greate and desperate action. This I have from a greate sectary in this ship who was pressed on poynt of conscience to stay to be instrumental.' *Portland MSS.* vol. iii., *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 270. For detailed accounts of these plots (which were largely manufactured by informers, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1662-4, 279, 293, 331, 362, 482, &c., &c.), see *Portland MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiii. App. ii. 144; letter of Sir T. Osborne to the Mayor of Newcastle, Oct. 9, 1663; and *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1662-4, *passim*. See also the king's speech at the opening of the session, March 16, 166$\frac{3}{4}$, *Parl. Hist.* iv. 289; and especially Reresby's *Memoirs* (ed. Cartwright), 58. A special Commission sat at York to try the prisoners of the Farnly Wood rising (*infra* 366) in January, 1664, and fifteen were executed. Bennett to Buckingham and Ormond, Oct. 3, Oct. 14, Nov. 24, 1663, Jan. 20, 1664. *Miscellanea Aulica*, 303, 307, 326, 330.

[1] For the case of Warriston, see *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1663. The prisoner who informed of his hiding-place was a Major Johnston, possibly a relative, and Alexander Murray was the king's messenger to Louis XIV. Wodrow, i. 355.

[2] This kidnapping went on throughout the reign. On June 21, 1660, an order was issued that 'in case Sir George Deyrick, the king's agent in Flanders, shall bring into Dunkirk any person or persons who were of the king's pretended judges, such persons shall be sent to England by the next ship and placed in the Tower.' See also, especially, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 420, 550. Barkstead, Okey, and Corbett were thus kidnapped in March, 1662, and brought over for execution. *Id.* 316, 344. See Ludlow's *Memoirs*, ii. 330–390, and especially the note to 330; *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1662–4, 380, 398, 476, 505, 661. Temple describes at length his attempts, in 1670, to get Joyce of Holmby House fame, then a refugee in Holland, into his hands, and their failure. *Works*, ii. 138. In 1684, Sir T. Armstrong was taken at Leyden, brought over, and executed. *Id.* ii. 418.

CHAP. VII. The design of a war with Holland was now working; and I have been very positively assured by statesmen of both sides, that the French set it on in a very artificial manner[1]: for while they encouraged us to insist on some extravagant demands, they at the same time pressed the Dutch not to yield to them: and as they put them in hope that if a rupture should follow they would assist them according to their alliance, so they assured us that they would do us no hurt. Downing[2] was then employed in Holland, a crafty fawning man, who was ready to turn to every side that was uppermost, and to betray those who by their former friendship and services thought they might depend on him; as he did some of the regicides, whom he got into his hands under trust, and then delivered them up. He
1657. had been Cromwell's ambassador in Holland, where he had offered personal affronts both to the king and the duke:
199 yet he had by some base practices got himself to be so effectually recommended by the duke of Albemarle, that all former offences were forgiven, and he was sent over to

[1] See *infra* 408, note.

[2] Sir George Downing married Frances Howard, sister to the first Earl of Carlisle of that family, who had been very instrumental in the restoration of the king, who not only protected him, but answered for his good behaviour for the future. But the bishop delights in throwing dirt upon the Duke of Albemarle, and making a mystery of everything, though never so plain and well known. D. In 1656, Downing, who had formerly been a preacher and chaplain to Okey's regiment (Ludlow, ii. 330), was 'loud against the Dutch' (Burton's *Diary*, i. 181), and was made Resident at the Hague by Cromwell in 1657. When the Restoration became certain, he made terms with Charles by showing him Thurlow's despatches and betraying other official secrets. Remaining as Resident after the Restoration, with a knighthood, he kidnapped Barkstead, Okey, and Corbett in 1662; and was created a baronet in 1663 (Clarendon, *Cont.* 516, and *Dict. Nat. Biog.*). Sir W. Temple (*Works*, iii. 93, 1754), says that he did his utmost to bring on war. See Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 323, 328. Colbert de Croissy described him to Louvois in 1671, as 'le plus grand querelleur des diplomates de son temps.' *Id.* ii. 136. 'So stingy a fellow,' 'perfidious rogue,' 'ungrateful villain,' &c., are Pepys's epithets, though on May 27, 1667, he bears witness to his ability and business qualities. See Sibley's *Hutchinson*, 72. There are a great many important letters from Downing while employed in Holland in the *Egerton MSS.* (Brit. Mus.). He died in 1684.

Holland as the king's ambassador, whose behaviour towards himself the States had observed. So they had reason to conclude he was sent over with no good intent, and that he was capable of managing a bad design, and very ready to undertake it. There was no visible cause of war[1]. A complaint of a ship taken was ready to have been satisfied, but Downing hindered it. So it was plain the king hated them[2]; and fancied they were so feeble, and the English were so much superior to them, that a war would humble them, and bring them to an entire submission and dependence on him in all things. The States had treated and presented the king with great magnificence, and at a vast charge, during the time that he had stayed among them, after England had declared for him. And, as far as appearances could go, the king was sensible of it: insomuch that the party for the prince of Orange were not pleased, because their applications to him could not prevail | to make him MS. 103. interpose either in the behalf of himself or of his friends, to get [a] his party again put in places of trust and command. The king put that off, as not proper to be pressed by him at that time. But neither then nor afterwards did he bestir himself in that matter; though, if either gratitude or interest had been of force, and if these had not been overruled by some more prevalent considerations, he must have been inclined to make some returns for the services the late prince of Orange did him: and must have seen what a figure he must make by having the prince of Orange tied to him in interest as much as he was by blood[3]. France and popery

CHAP. VII.

[a] *the perpetual edict to be repealed, or* all struck out.

[1] See *infra* 389, note.

[2] Charles was always forcible, and often decidedly coarse, in his expressions of dislike to the Dutch. See his letter to his sister in Feb. 1669; Dalrymple's *Memoirs*, i. 66 (ed. 1740). He had at present a special cause of annoyance in the true but scurrilous cartoons upon him published in Holland. Pepys, Nov. 28, 1663.

[3] From Lord Arlington's letters to Sir William Temple, it should appear, that the king was not inattentive to the interests of the prince, so far as was consistent with

CHAP. VII. were the true springs of all these counsels. It was the interest of the king of France that the armies of the States might fall under such a feebleness, that they should not be in condition to make a vigorous resistance, when he should be ready either to invade them or to fall into Flanders, which he was resolved to do whensoever the king of Spain should die. The French did thus set on the war between the English and the Dutch, hoping that our fleets should mutually weaken one another so much, that the naval force of France, which was increasing very considerably, should be near an equality to them when they should be shattered by a war[1]. The States were likewise the greatest strength of the protestant interest, and were therefore to be humbled. So, in order to make the king more considerable both at
200 home and abroad, the court resolved to prepare for a war, and to seek for such colours as might serve to justify it. The earl of Clarendon was not let into the secret of this design, and was always against it[2]. But his interest was now sunk low, and he began to feel the power of an imperious mistress over an amorous king, who was so disgusted of the queen that he abandoned himself wholly to amour and luxury.

This was, as far as I could penetrate into it, the state of the court for the first four years after the restoration. I was in the court a great part of the years [16]62, [16]63[3], and [16]64, and was as inquisitive as I could possibly be, and had more than ordinary occasions to hear and see a great deal[4].

the relations subsisting between England and the States. R.

[1] See notes *supra* 356; *infra* 408.

[2] Pepys says, on fair authority, Dec. 15, 1664, that Clarendon was scarcely consulted regarding the Dutch war. 'Only he is a good minister in other respects, and the king cannot be without him.' Clarendon himself, *Cont.* 449, describes his vehement opposition to the war, which he says was the Duke of York's war, not the king's.

[3] This may be reconciled with his son's account before mentioned, of the bishop's journey to England in 1663, supposing that he came hither in the early part of that year, which would be, according to the reckoning of those days, called 1662 till the 25th day of March. He was then nineteen years of age. R.

[4] Cockburn, *Specimen of Remarks, &c.*, 66, details Burnet's industry in

CHAPTER VIII.

SCOTLAND, 1663–1666. SUPREMACY OF LAUDERDALE.

But now I return back to the affairs of Scotland. The earl of Middleton, after a delay of some months, came up to London, and was very coldly received by the king. The earl of Lauderdale moved that a Scottish council should be called[2]. The lord Clarendon got this to be delayed a fortnight. When it met, the lord Lauderdale accused the earl of Middleton of many malversations in the great trust he had been in, which he aggravated severely. The lord Middleton desired he might have what was objected to him in writing; and when he had it he sent it to Scotland; so that it was six weeks before he had his answer ready; all on design to gain time. He excused some errors in point of form, that, having served in a military way, he understood not so exactly what belonged to law and form: but insisted on this, that he designed nothing but that the king's service might go on, and that his friends might be taken care of, and his enemies be humbled, and that so loyal a parliament might be encouraged, who were full of zeal and affection to his service; that, in complying with

Feb. 5, $166\frac{6}{5}$.

obtaining information. It is extremely curious that Burnet should have omitted all mention of the Corporation Act of Dec. 1661. For the First Conventicle Act of May, 1664, see *infra* 366, and *Statutes at Large*, iii. 290.

[2] Lauderdale was in some danger from the existence of compromising letters, included in the proceedings of the Scotch Commissioners regarding the surrender of Charles I to the English; although, according to the statement of his agent, William Sharp, who had seen them, they were only 'unauthenticated doubles' (*Lauderdale Papers*, i. 125, 128). They were given by Chieslie, the Secretary to the Commission, to Middleton, and by him, in 1670, to Lauderdale, when they were burned; Mackenzie's *Memoirs* (1821), 49.

CH. VIII. them, he had kept every thing so entirely in his majesty's power, that the king was under no difficulties by any thing they had done. In the mean while Sheldon was very earnest with the king to forgive the lord Middleton's errors; otherwise he concluded the change so newly made in the church would be so ill supported that it must fall to the ground. The duke of Albemarle, who knew Scotland, and so had more credit on that head than on any other, pretended that the lord Middleton's party was that on which the king could only rely: he magnified both their power and their zeal, and represented the earl of Lauderdale's friends as cold and hollow in the king's service. And to support all this, the letters that came from Scotland were full of the insolencies of the presbyterians, and of the dejection the bishops and their friends were under. Sharp was prevailed on to go up. He promised to all the earl of
201 Middleton's friends that he would stick firm to him, and that he would lay before the king that his standing or falling must be the standing or falling of the church. Of this the earl of Lauderdale had advice sent him. Yet when he came to London, and saw that the king was alienated from the lord Middleton, he resolved to make great submissions to the lord Lauderdale. When he reproached him for his engagements with the earl of Middleton, he denied all; and said he had never gone further than what was decent, considering his post. He also denied he had writ to the king in his favour. But the king had given the original letter to the lord Lauderdale, who upon that shewed it to Sharp; with which he was so struck that he fell a crying in a most abject manner. He begged pardon for it, and said, what could a company of poor men refuse to the earl of Middleton, who had done so much for them, and had them so entirely in his power. The lord Lauderdale, upon this, comforted him, and said he would forgive them all that was past, and would serve them and the church at another rate than lord Middleton was capable of doing. So Sharp became wholly his. Of all this lord Lauderdale gave me

a full relation the next day, and shewed me the papers that passed between lord Middleton and him. Sharp thought he had | escaped well. The earl of Middleton treated them too much as his creatures, and assumed a great deal to himself, and exercised a sort of authority over them, which he was uneasy under, though he durst not well complain of it, or resist it: whereas he reckoned, that lord Lauderdale, knowing the suspicions that lay on him as favouring the presbyterians, would have less credit and courage in opposing any thing that should be necessary for their support. It proved that in this he judged right: for the lord Lauderdale, that he might maintain himself at court, and with the church of England, was really more compliant and easy to every proposition the bishops made, than he would otherwise have been if he had been always of the episcopal party[1]. But all he did that way was against his heart, except when his passions were vehemently stirred, which a very slight occasion would readily do. After the earls of Lauderdale and Middleton were writing papers and answers for above three months[2], an accident happened which hastened lord Middleton's disgrace. The earl of Lauderdale laid before the king the unjust proceedings in the matter of laying on fines; and to make all that party sure to himself, he procured a letter from the king to the council in Scotland, ordering them to issue out a proclamation for superseding the execution of the act of fining till

Ch. VIII.

MS. 104.

[1] See *supra* 185, note. The feeling, if it ever existed, soon wore off. Presbyterianism was far more 'against his heart,' as it was against the heart of almost all the Scotch nobles, who, if they wanted to continue in public employment, were compelled to appear to espouse it, and whose power it had largely transferred to the middle classes. Clarendon states (*Cont.* 96), what the *Lauderdale Papers* sufficiently show, that he lost no opportunity of ridiculing the Presbyterians. See Marvell, *Nostradamus's Prophecy*:—

'When an old Scotch Covenanter shall be
The champion of the English Hierarchy.'

[2] See *supra* 265. The attack and defence may be read in full in Mackenzie's *Memoirs*, 78–113; *Miscellanea Aulica* (1700); the *Lauderdale Papers*, and the *Sheldon MSS.* in the Bodleian.

CH. VIII. 1662 further order. The privy council being then for the greater part composed of lord Middleton's friends, it was pretended by some of them, that as long as he was the king's commissioner, they could receive and execute no orders from the king but through his hands. So they writ to him, desiring him to represent to the king that this would be an affront on the proceedings of parliament, and would raise the spirits of a party that ought to be kept down. Lord Middleton writ back, that he had laid the matter before the king, and that he, considering better of it, had ordered, that no proceeding should be made upon his former letter. This occasioned a hot debate in council. It was said a letter under the king's hand could not be countermanded but from the same hand. So the council wrote to know the king's mind in the matter. The king protested he knew nothing of it, and that lord Middleton had not spoke one word on the subject to him. He upon that sent for him, and chid him so severely, that lord Middleton concluded from it that he was ruined. Yet he always stood upon it, that he had the king's order by word of mouth for what he had done, though he was not so cautious as to procure an instruction under his hand for his warrant. It is very probable that he spoke of it to the king when his head was full of somewhat else, so that he did not mind it; and that to get rid of the earl of Middleton, he bid him do whatsoever he proposed, without reflecting much on it; for the king was at that time often so distracted in his thoughts, that he was not at all times master of himself. The queen-mother had brought over from France one Mrs. Stewart [1], reckoned a very great beauty, afterwards married to

[1] Daughter of Walter Stewart, son of Walter, second Lord Blantyre; born 1647; married March, 1667; died 1702. Upon her arrival in England, in 1662, she was appointed maid of honour to the queen. Jesse, *Memoirs, &c.*, iv. 128. Mrs. Ady, *Madame*, 102, 112, &c. Sandwich told Pepys that 'as soon as the king can get a husband for Mrs. Stewart, my Lady Castlemaine's nose will be out of joint.' Pepys, July 22, 1663. In November the king was 'besotted' upon her. *Id.* Nov. 9, 1663.

the duke of Richmond. The king was believed to be deeply in love with her; yet his former mistress kept her ground still, and what with her humours and jealousy, and what with this new amour, the king had very little quiet, between both their passions and his own. Towards the end of May the king called many of his English counsellors together, and did order all the papers that had passed between the earls of Lauderdale and Middleton to be read to them. When that was done, many of them who were Middleton's friends said much in excuse of his errors, and of the necessity of continuing him still in that high trust. But the king said his errors were so great and so many, that the credit of his affairs must suffer, if he continued them any longer in such hands. Yet he promised them he would be still kind to him; for he looked on him as a very honest man. A few days after that, secretary Morrice was sent to him with a warrant under the king's hand, requiring him to deliver up his commission, which he did; and so his ministry came to an end, after a sort of a reign of much violence and injustice: for he was become very imperious. He and his company were delivered up to so much excess, and to such a madness of frolic and intemperance, that as Scotland had never seen any thing like it, so upon his disgrace there was a general joy over the kingdom, though that lasted not long; for those that came after him grew worse than ever he was like to be. He had lived in great magnificence, which made him acceptable to many[1]: and he was a firm friend, though

203

[1] Hurt perhaps in his fortune by that; for he retired after his disgrace to the friary near Guildford, to one Dalmahoy there, a genteel and generous man, who was of Scotland, had been gentleman of the horse to William, Duke Hamilton (killed at the battle of Worcester), married that duke's widow, and by her had this house, and a considerable estate adjoining to it, where, over the river, which runs through the estate, this earl built a very handsome large bridge, calling it by his own name, and was the present he made to Mr. Dalmahoy for entertaining him at this place. The bridge is now down; but I remember it standing with brass plates upon it, that had *Middletoun Bridge* inscribed upon them. This gentleman, Dalmahoy, being much in the interest of the Duke of

CH. VIII. a violent enemy. The earl of Rothes[1] was declared the king's commissioner; but the earl of Lauderdale would not trust him[2]; so he went down with him, and kept him too visibly in a dependence on him, for all his high character.

May 29, 1663.

One of the first things done in this session of parliament was the execution of my unfortunate uncle[3]. He was so disordered both in body and mind, that it was a reproach to a government to proceed against him. His memory was so gone that he did not know his own children. He was brought before the parliament, to hear what he had to say why his execution should not be awarded. He spoke long, but in a broken and disordered strain, which his enemies fancied was put on to create pity[4]. So he was sentenced to die. The presbyterians came about him, and

July 22, 1663.

York, and a man to be relied upon, and being a candidate for the town of Guildford, at the election of the Parliament after the long one in 1678, and being opposed, as I think, by the famous Algernon Sydney, the Duke of York came from Windsor to Dalmahoy's house to countenance his election, and appeared for him in the open court, where the election was taken. O. Middleton succeeded Teviot (on whose death and reputation for personal bravery, see Pepys, June 2–6, 1664) as governor of Tangier, in April, 1667 (Pepys, April 15, 1667), and died there of a fall, when drunk, in 1674.

[1] Rothes became also Treasurer, in succession to Crawford who was persuaded to retire.

[2] He left Robert Moray (see *supra* 104), who resigned the Justice Clerkship for the purpose (*Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1662–4, 179), as his deputy, June 5. The correspondence between them is in the *Lauderdale Papers*, and is of extreme interest.

[3] Was he hanged or beheaded? A fit uncle for such a bishop. S. He was beheaded. See Carstares's *State Papers*, p. 92. R. Lauderdale, who was present, says, 'On Wednesday Archibald Johnston was hanged at the cross of Ed^{n}. according to his most just sentence.' Lauderdale to Moray, July 28, 1663.

[4] 'According to former order, Arch. Johnston was brought into heare what he could say against execution. He did crying reade out of a paper. That his memorie was lost, that he remembered neither matter of law nor matter of fact, nor a word of the Bible.' Lauderdale to Moray, July 10, 1663. 'His speech at the scaffold was stark-staring, nought.' *Id.* See *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1662–4, 141. Lauderdale adds that, at Burnet's importunity, he wrote '3 or 4 insignificant lines' to Moray about him, but refused to ask the king for a reprieve. Mackenzie, 134, 135; Wodrow, i. 356–358 (ed. 1828).

prayed for him in a style like an upbraiding of God with the services he had done him. His deportment was unequal, as might be expected from a man in his condition. Yet when the day of his execution came, he was very serene: he was cheerful, and seemed fully satisfied with his death. He read a speech twice on the scaffold, that to my knowledge he composed himself, in which he justified all the proceedings in the covenant, and asserted his own sincerity; but condemned his joining with Cromwell and the sectaries, though even in that his intentions had been sincere for the good of his country and the security of religion. Lord Lauderdale had lived in great friendship with him: but he saw the king was so set against him, that he, who at all times took more care of himself than of his friends, would not in so critical a time seem to favour a man whom the presbyterians had set up as a sort of an idol among them, and on whom they did depend more than on any other then alive. CH. VIII.

| The business of the parliament went on as the lord Lauderdale directed. The whole proceeding in the matter of the billoting was laid open[1]. It appeared that the parliament had not desired it, but had been led into it by being made believe that the king had a mind to it; and of all the members of parliament not above twelve could be prevailed on to own, that they had advised the earl of Midletoun to ask leave of the king for it, whose private suggestions he had represented to the king as the desire of the parliament. So this finished his disgrace, as well as it occasioned the putting all his party out of employments. While they were going on with their affairs, they understood that an act had passed in the parliament of England against all conventicles[2], empowering justices of peace to MS. 105. June 26–Sept. 9, 1663. 204 Royal assent, May 17, 1664.

[1] A Commission was appointed to investigate the matter on June 26; it reported on July 24; and the Act rescinding the Billetting Act was passed on Sept. 9. *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 450, 460, 471.

[2] The Conventicle Act passed the Commons and went to the Lords in June, 1663; but Parliament was pro-

CH. VIII.

convict offenders without juries; which was thought a great breach on the security of the English constitution, and a raising the power of justices to a very arbitrary pitch. Any meeting for religious worship at which five were present more than the family, was declared a conventicle; and every person above sixteen, that was present, was to lie three months in prison, or to pay 5*l.* for the first offence; six months for the second offence, or 20*l.* fine; and for the third offence, being convict by a jury, he was to be banished to any plantation, except New England or Virginia, or to pay an 100*l.* All people were amazed at this severity[2]; but the bishops in Scotland took heart upon it, and resolved

July 10, 1663.

to copy from it. So an act passed there, almost in the same terms: and, at the passing it, lord Lauderdale in a long speech expressed great zeal for the church. There was some little opposition made to it by the earl of Kincardine[3], who was an enemy to all persecution; but though some few voted against it, it was carried by a great majority.

Aug. 22, 1663.

Another act passed, declaring the constitution of a national synod[4], that it was to be composed of the archbishops and bishops, of all deans, and of two to be deputed from every presbytery; of which the moderator of the presbytery named by the bishop was to be one. All

rogued from July 27, 1663, to March 21, 1664, and therefore it did not receive the royal assent until May 17, 1664. The Scotch Act was passed on July 10, 1663. For the English Act in full, see *Statutes at Large*, iii. 290. For the Scotch, *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 455.

[2] ('This Act was temporary [for three years, *Commons Journals*, June 30, 1663, and *infra*, 490]; it was made upon occasion of that general disaffection that appeared about this time among the dissenters in England and Scotland. In the north the dissenters broke out into actual rebellion, and assembled at Farnly Wood in Yorkshire [*supra* 355, note]. They had their agents also in London, and an oath of secrecy passed amongst them. They assured their friends, that the insurrection would be general, and that they expected forces from Holland and other countries to join them.' Salmon's *Examination of Bishop Burnet's Hist.* 553.)

[3] Upon Kincardine, see *supra* 188.

[4] *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 465.

things were to be proposed to this court by the king or his commissioner; and whatsoever should be agreed to by the majority and the president, the archbishop of St. Andrews, was to have the force of an ecclesiastical law when it should be confirmed by the king. Great exceptions were taken to this act. The church was restrained from meddling with any thing, but as it should be laid before them by the king; which was thought a severe restraint, like that of the *proponentibus legatis* so much complained of at Trent. The putting the negative not in the whole bench of the bishops, but singly in the president, was thought very irregular. But it passed with so little observation, that the lord Lauderdale could scarce believe it was penned as he found it to be, when I told him of it. Primrose told me Sharp put that clause in with his own hand. The inferior clergy complained that the power was wholly taken from them; since, as one of their deputies was to be a person named by the bishops, so, the moderators claiming a negative vote as the bishops' delegates, the other half were only to consist of persons to whom they gave their vote. The act was indeed so penned, that nobody moved for a national synod when they saw how it was to be constituted. CH. VIII. 205

Two other acts passed in favour of the crown. The parliament of England had laid great impositions on all things imported from Scotland: so, the parliament being speedily to be dissolved, and not having time to regulate such impositions on English goods as might force the English to bring that matter to a just balance, they put that confidence in the king, that they left the laying of impositions on all foreign merchandize wholly to the king[1]. The other act was looked on but as a pompous compliment: and so it passed without any observation or opposition[2]. Nov. 16, 1663.

[1] *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 471. The Scotch had succeeded in 1661 in obtaining the suspension of the Navigation Act in favour of Scotch subjects. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1661-2, 74, 136.

[2] Nov. 16, 1663, *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 554. The Act of Supremacy was passed on the same day. *Id.* No use was made of the former one until the disbanding, in 1667, of the former standing forces.

CH. VIII. In it they made an offer to the king of an army of 20,000 foot and 2,000 horse, to be ready upon summons, to march with forty days' provision into any part of his majesty's dominions, to oppose invasions, to suppress insurrections, or for any other cause in which his authority, power, or greatness was concerned. Nobody dreamt that any use was ever to be made of this; yet the earl of Lauderdale had his end in it, to let the king see what use the king might make of Scotland, if he should intend to set up arbitrary government in England. He told the king that the earl of Midletoun and his party understood not what was the greatest service that Scotland could do him: they had not much treasure to offer him: the only thing they were capable of doing was to furnish him with a good army when his affairs in England should require it. And of this he made great use afterwards to advance himself, though it could never have signified any thing to the advancing the king's ends[1]. So easy was it to draw the parliament of Scotland to pass acts of the greatest consequence in a hurry, without considering the effects they might have. After these acts were passed, the parliament was dissolved, which gave a general satisfaction to the country, for they were a furious set of people. The government was left in the earl of Glencairn's hands, who began, now that he had little favour at court, to set himself on all occasions to oppose Sharp's violent motions. The earl of Rothes stuck firm to Sharp, and was recommended by him to the bishops of England as the only man that supported their interests. The king at this time restored lord Lorn to

[1] Lauderdale's fortune was now made. In November, 1663, Bennet writing to Ormond, says: 'My Lord Lauderdale came last night hither. The great things that are done in Scotland, the vindication of His Majesty's authority in all points, have made him very welcome to those who cared not much for him before. I confess ingenuously, for my part, he has converted me, which I am glad to be, so it is to His Majesty's advantage.' *Miscellanea Aulica*, 320. Cf. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 183, 187, 190. Pepys, on March 2, 166$\frac{3}{4}$, records a report made to him, 'that my Lord Lauderdale is never from the King's eare nor council, and that he is a most cunning fellow.'

his grandfather's honour, of being earl of Argyll, passing over his father; and gave him a great part of the estate, leaving the rest to be sold for the payment of debts, which did not rise in value to above a third part of them. This occasioned a great outcry, that continued long to pursue him. CH. VIII.

| Sharp went up to London to complain of the lord Glencairn and of the privy council; where, he said, there was such a remissness, and so much popularity appeared on all occasions, that unless some more spirit were put in the administration, it would be impossible to preserve the church[1]. That was the word always used, as if there had been a charm in it. He moved that a letter might be writ, giving him the precedence of the lord chancellor. This was thought an inexcusable piece of vanity: for in Scotland, when there was no commissioner all matters passed through the lord chancellor's hands, who by act of parliament was to preside in all courts, and was considered as representing the king's person. He also moved, that the king would grant a special commission to some persons for executing the laws relating to the church. All the privy counsellors were to be of it; but to these he desired many others might be added, for whom he undertook that they would execute them with zeal. Lord Lauderdale saw that this would prove a high commission court: yet he gave way to it, though much against his own mind. Upon these things I took the liberty, though then too young to meddle in things of that kind, to expostulate very freely with him. I thought he was acting the earl MS. 106. Aug. 1664. 206

[1] 'The schismaticall and seditious spirit amongst us is not yet conjured down, nor will it be suppressed unless the execution of the lawes may be more rigorously prosecuted.' Sharp to Sheldon, Oct. 9, 1663. On Feb. 27, 166$\frac{3}{4}$, Alexander Burnet wrote to Sheldon, complaining 'how much the discontented persons are countenanced and encouraged by some who have pretended to your Grace to be our great patrons and patriots.' *Lauderdale Papers* (Camd. Soc.), App. A. i. See also Sharp's own letter of complaint of July 19, 1664, in the *Sheldon MSS.* Sharp did not go to London in person until after Glencairn's death (*infra* 373) in August, 1664. See Alexander Burnet's letter of Aug. 20. *Id.*

CH. VIII. of Traquair's part, giving way to all the follies of the bishops on design to ruin them [1]. He upon that ran out into a great deal of freedom with me: he told me many passages of Sharp's past life: he was persuaded he would ruin all: but he said he was resolved to give him line, for he had not credit enough to stop him; nor would he oppose any thing he proposed, unless it were very extravagant: he saw the earl of Glencairn and he would be in perpetual war: and it was indifferent to him how matters might go between them. Things would run to a height, and then the king would of himself put a stop to their career: for the king said often, he was not priest-ridden, he would not venture a war, nor travel again for any party. This was all that I could obtain of the earl of Lauderdale. I pressed Sharp himself to think of more moderate methods [2]; but he despised my applications, and from that time he was ever very jealous of me.

Fairfoul, archbishop of Glasgow, died this year: and one Burnet succeeded him [3], who was a near kinsman of
April, 1663. the lord [a] Teviot's [a]; who, from being governor of Dunkirk when it was sold, was sent to Tangier, but soon after in
May 3, 1664. an unhappy encounter, going out to view some grounds, was intercepted, and cut to pieces by the Moors [4]. Upon

[a] substituted for *Rutherford's* struck out.

[1] See *supra* 39.

[2] The author was only twenty-one when he gave the archbishop advice. Cole.

[3] Alexander Burnet was consecrated by Sharp, assisted by other bishops, on Sept. 18. He had been chaplain at Dunkirk in 1661, having previously had a living at Teynham in Kent. The character given of him here is not borne out by his actions and expressed opinions, which, as may be seen from his letters to Sheldon already referred to, and from his later history, were often harsh to Nonconformity. But he was perfectly honest, and a thorough hater of Erastianism, and he fell through these qualities. See *infra* 378, and 422–515. His nickname with Tweeddale, Moray, and Lauderdale, is 'Longifacies' or 'Longnez.' There does not appear to be any portrait of him in existence. See the *Life and Times of Archbishops Burnet and Ross*; the *True and Impartial Account of Archbishop Sharp*; and Grubb's *Letters from Burnet to Sancroft, Cal. St. P. Dom.*

[4] Rutherford, who was Alexander Burnet's kinsman, was created Earl of Teviot. The disaster, May 3, 1664,

[a] Teviot's [a] recommendation, Burnet, who had lived many years in England, and knew nothing of Scotland, was sent thither, first to be bishop of Aberdeen, and from thence he was raised to Glasgow. He was of himself a soft and good natured man, tolerably learned, and of a blameless life: but was a man of no genius, and though he was inclined to peaceable and moderate counsels, yet he was much in the power of others, and took any impression that was given him very easily. I was much in his favour at first, but could not hold it long: for as I had been bred up by my father to love liberty and moderation, so I spent the greatest part of the year 1664 in Holland and France, which contributed not a little to root and fix me in those principles. I saw much peace and quiet in Holland, notwithstanding the diversity of opinions among them; which was occasioned by the gentleness of the government, and the toleration that made all people easy and happy. An universal industry was spread through the whole country: there was little aspiring to preferment in the state, because little was to be got that way. It is true there seemed to be among them too much coldness and indifference in the matters of religion; but I imputed that to their phlegmatic tempers, that were not apt to take fire, rather than to the liberty they enjoyed. They were then apprehending a war with England, and were preparing for it. From thence, where every thing was free, I went to France, where nothing was free. The king was beginning to put things in great method, both in his revenue, in his troops, in his government at home, but above all in the increasing of trade, and the building a great fleet. His own deportment was solemn and grave, save only that he kept his

[a] substituted for *Rutherford's* struck out.

was the result of a gross military blunder. See Sir T. Bridge's report to Fanshawe; *Original Letters and Negotiations*, i. 99 (1724). Davis's *Hist. of the 2nd Queen's Royal Regiment*, i. 35-61, 62-67. For his character, see Pepys, June 4, 1664.

CH. VIII. mistresses very avowedly. He was diligent in his own councils, and regular in the despatch of affairs: so that all things about him looked like the preparing of matters for all that we have seen acted since. The king of Spain was considered as dying, and the infant his son was like to die as soon as he: so that it was generally believed the king of France was designing to set up a new empire in the west. He had carried the quarrel at Rome about the Corses so high with the house of Chigi, that the protestants were beginning to flatter themselves with great hopes. When I was in France, cardinal Chigi came as legate to give the king full satisfaction in that matter[1]. Lord Holles was then ambassador at Paris[2]. I was so effectually recommended to him, that he used me with great freedom, which he continued to do to the end of his days. He stood upon all the points of an ambassador with the stiffness of former ages, which made him very unacceptable to a high-spirited young prince, who began even then to be flattered as if he had been somewhat more than a mortal. This established me in my love of law and liberty, and
MS. 107. in my hatred of absolute | power. When I came back,
208 I stayed for some months at court, and observed the scene as carefully as I could, and became acquainted with all the men that were employed in Scottish affairs. I had more than ordinary opportunities of being well informed. This drew a jealousy on me from the bishops, which was increased from the friendship into which Leighton received me. I was thought no great friend to church power, nor to persecution. So it was thought that lord Lauderdale was preparing me, as one who was known to have been always episcopal, to be set up against Sharp and his set of men, who were much hated by one side, and not loved or trusted by the other.

[1] See this incident minutely described in Martin's *Hist. de France*, xiii. 287–290. Cardinal Chigi was the nephew of Fabio Chigi, then pope under the title of Alexander II.

[2] See *supra* 175, note.

In the mean while the earl of Glencairn died, which set Sharp at ease, but put him on new designs. He apprehended that the earl of Tweeddale might be advanced: for in the settlement of the duchess of Buccleugh's estate[1], who was married to the duke of Monmouth, the best beloved of all the king's bastards, by which, in default of issue by her, it was to go to Monmouth and the issue he might have by any other wife, the earl of Tweeddale, though his children were the next heirs, who were by this robbed of their right, had yet given way to it in so frank a manner, that the king was enough inclined both to oblige and to trust him. But Sharp had great suspicions of him, as cold in their concerns. So he writ to Sheldon[2], that upon the disposal of the seals the very being of the church did so absolutely depend, that he begged be would press the king very earnestly in the matter, and that he would move that he might be called up before that post should be filled. The king bid Sheldon assure him he should take a special care of that matter, but that there was no occasion for his coming up[3]: for the king by this time had a very ill opinion of him. Sharp was so mortified with this, that he resolved to put all to hazard, for he believed all was at stake: and he ventured to come up. The king received him coldly, and asked him if he had not the archbishop of Canterbury's letter. He said he had; but he would choose rather to venture on his majesty's displeasure, than to see the church ruined through his caution or negligence. He knew the danger they were in in Scotland, where they had but few and cold friends, and many violent enemies. His majesty's protection, and the execution of the law, were the only things they could

Ch. VIII. May 29 or 30, 1664.

[1] Anne Scott, niece of Rothes.

[2] Sharp, as usual, was unable to avoid playing a double game. On June 19, 1664, Alexander Burnet wrote to Sheldon, saying that the reason for Sharp's not writing himself was 'to avoyd suspicion of being a sueter for the Chancellor's place.' *Sheldon MSS.* But on the same date Sharp himself wrote in unmistakable language. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. App. A. iv, v, and vii.

[3] Alexander Burnet to Sheldon, Aug. 20, 1664. *Id.* App. A. viii.

CH. VIII. trust to: and so much depended on the good choice of a chancellor, that he could not answer it to God and the church if he did not bestir himself in that matter. He knew many thought of himself for that post: but he was
209 so far from that[a], that, if his majesty had any such intention, he would choose rather to be sent to a plantation: he desired that he might be a churchman in heart, but not in habit, that should be raised to that trust. These were his very words, as the king reported them. From thence he went to Sheldon, and pressed him to move the king for himself, and furnished him with many reasons to support the proposition; a main one being, that the late king had raised his predecessor Spotswood to that trust. Sheldon upon that did move the king with more than ordinary earnestness in it. The king suspected who had set him on, and charged him to tell him the truth. The other did it, though not without some uneasiness. Upon that the king told him what he had said to himself; and then it may be easily imagined in what a style they both spoke of him. Yet Sheldon prayed the king that, whatsoever he might think of the man, he would consider the archbishop and the church; which the king assured him he would do. Sheldon told Sharp that he saw the motion for himself did not take; so he must think of somewhat else. He proposed that the seals should be put in the earl of Rothes's hands, till the king should pitch on a proper person. He also proposed that the king would make him his commissioner, in order to the preparing matters for a national synod, that they might settle a book of common prayer, and a book of canons. This he said must be carried on slowly, and with great caution; of which the late troubles did demonstrate the necessity.

All this was easily agreed to: for the king loved the lord Rothes, and the earl of Lauderdale would not oppose

[a] *thought* struck out.

his advancement[1]: though it was a very extravagant thing to see one man possess so many of the chief places of so poor a kingdom[2]. The earl of Crawford would not abjure the covenant; so he had been made lord treasurer in his place: he continued to be still what he was before, lord president of the council: and upon the earl of Middleton's disgrace he was made captain of a troop of guards: and now he was both the king's commissioner and upon the matter lord chancellor[3]. Sharp reckoned this was his masterpiece. Lord Rothes, being thus advanced by his means, was in all things governed by him. His instructions were such as Sharp proposed, to prepare matters for a national synod, and in the mean while to execute the laws that related to the church with a steady firmness[4]. So, when they parted from Whitehall, Sharp said to the king, that he had now done all that could be desired of him for the good of the church: so that, if all matters went not right in Scotland, none must bear the blame but either the earl of Lauderdale or of Rothes. And so they came 210
to Scotland, where a very furious scene of illegal violence was opened. Sharp governed lord Rothes, who abandoned himself to pleasure: and was more barefaced in some indecent courtships, than that kingdom had ever seen before: and when some censured this, all the answer that was made was a severe piece of raillery, that the king's commissioner ought to represent his person.

[1] It was believed to be Lauderdale's appointment. *Letters of Lady Margaret Kennedy* (*supra* 196) (Bannatyne Club), March 11, 1665.

[2] The extreme poverty of Scotland from 1660 to 1668, especially during the Dutch war, which closed the chief export trade, finds ample and continuous expression in both official and private letters, contained in the *Lauderdale MSS.*, from 23,122, f. 229 to 23,128, f. 290.

[3] He was not Lord Chancellor until later (July, 1667), when he accepted the office 'with a sad hert.' *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 16. It was the place for which he was least fitted but in which he could do least harm. On Sept. 4, 1665, Burnet complains to Sheldon that 'the King hath not yet nominated a Chancellor.' *Id.* App. xxvii. The post was kept vacant until Rothes's appointment. Cf. *infra* 433.

[4] See Collier's *Eccl. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 892. Dr. Bliss.

CH. VIII. MS. 108.

| The government of Scotland as to civil matters was very easy. All were quiet and obedient; but all those counties that lie towards the west became very fierce and intractable [1], and the whole work of the council was to deal with them and to subdue them. It was not easy to prove any thing against any of them, for they did stick firm to one another. The people complained of the new set of ministers that was sent among them, as [a] immoral, stupid, and ignorant. Generally they forsook their churches, and if any of them went to church, they were so little edified with their sermons that the whole country was full of strange reports of the weakness and indecency of their preaching and their whole deportment [2]. The people treated them with great contempt, and with an aversion that broke out often into violence and injustice. But their ministers, on their parts, were not wanting in their complaints, aggravating matters, and possessing the bishops with many stories of designs and plottings against the state. So, many were brought before the council, and the new ecclesiastical commission, for pretended riots [3], and for using their ministers ill, but chiefly for not coming to church and for holding conventicles. The proofs were often defective, and lay rather in presumptions than clear evidence: and the punishments proposed were often arbitrary, not warranted by law. So the judges and other lawyers that were of those courts,

[a] *lewd and* struck out.

[1] Cantyre, especially, is reported by Rothes to be 'a nest of gnats.' The proposal was now first made to disarm the west country. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 214.

[2] See Lady Margaret Kennedy's letter, referred to above (*supra* 375, note 1), of March 11, 1665: 'For God's sake endeavour to persuade the King to part with Bishops, or I much fear we will all be lost. They are now hated, and hated by all as much as by Presbyterians.'

[3] See Alexander Burnet's letters to Sheldon for Nov. 26, 1664 and May 22, 1665. He naturally makes the riots out to be anything but 'pretended.' *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. App. A. xiv, xxii. The second disturbance was celebrated as the riot of the West Kirk. Rothes says that 'effter all the trayill and strick searthe I can meack I ffaynd no bodie ingadgied in it, but boayies and ffanatieck shumackiers and ther woyffs and printiesies.' *Id.* 221. Wodrow, i. 422, scarcely notices it.

were careful to keep proceedings according to forms of law: upon which Sharp was often complaining that favour was shewed to the enemies of the church under the pretence of law. It was said that the people of the country were in such a combination that it was not possible to find witnesses to prove things fully: and he often said, Must the church be ruined for punctilios of law? When he could not carry matters by a vote, as he had a mind, he usually looked to the earl of Rothes; who upon that was ever ready to say, he would take it upon [him] to order the matter as Sharp proposed, and would do it in the king's name[1]. Great numbers were cast in prison, where they were kept long, and ill used: and sometimes they were fined, and the younger sort whipped about the streets. The people grew more sullen on all this ill usage. Many were undone by it, and went over to the Scots in Ulster, where they were well 211 received, and had all manner of liberty as to their way of religion. CH. VIII.

Burnet was sent up to possess the king with the apprehensions of a rebellion in the beginning of the Dutch war[2]. He proposed that about twenty of the chief gentle-

[1] 'My Lord Commissioner pretends great readiness to do whatever my Lord St. Andrews and I advyse him.' Alexander Burnet to Sheldon, Feb. 2, 166⅘. Sharp, writing in April, to Sheldon, says, 'We do what we can to rid the Church of the corrupt and perverse clergy. . . . Those ill disposed persons have too much matter to work upon by the poverty and discontent of many of our nobility and gentry.' *Sheldon MSS.*

[2] The *Lauderdale* and *Sheldon Papers* are full of references to the probability that the people will take the occasion of the Dutch war for a rising. Thus, on June 23, 1666, Rothes speaks of 'the strong evil affectedness of our pipill in this countrie who due rejouys that the duthe are not overthrown'; while immediately after the Pentland Revolt, he declared that 'befor the Lord I beliff they would joayn with Turcks to feaght against the King and his guffernment, and should anie fforiners send . . . ten thousand earms, in a verie fyou days ther wold be pritie men to teack them in ther hands.' Dec. 1666. Tweeddale, writing later to Lauderdale, June 27, 1667, says, 'When the news of the Dutch coming into Chattam cam, the reflectione thereon was, no sojer shal live a year longer.' See also Alexander Burnet to Sheldon, June 20 and Sept. 4, 1665, Feb. 5, 166⅝. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. App. A. xxxi.

CH. VIII. men of those counties might be secured: and he undertook for the peace of the country, if they were clapped up[1]. This was plainly illegal; but the lord Lauderdale opposed nothing. So it was done; but with a very ill effect. For those gentlemen, knowing how obnoxious they were, had kept measures a little better: but they being put in prison, both their friends and tenants laid all to the door of the clergy, and hated them the more, and used them the worse for it. The earls of Argyll, Tweeddale, and Kincardine, who were considered as the lord Lauderdale's chief friends, were cold in all those matters[2]. They studied to keep proceedings in a legal channel, and were for moderate censures; upon which Sharp said they appeared to be the friends and favourers of the enemies of the church. When the people had generally forsaken their churches, the guards were quartered through the country. Sir James Turner[3], that commanded them, was naturally fierce, but was mad when he was drunk; and was often so. He was ordered by the lord Rothes to act according to such

[1] Burnet to Sheldon, April 18, 1665. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. App. A. xxxi.

[2] Burnet to Sheldon, Sept. 4, 1665, and June 8, 1666. *Id.*

[3] Said to be Scott's original of Major Dalgetty. He had served for a long while in Germany, and, previous to the Restoration, had adhered to the Covenant. He served under Hamilton in the invasion of 1648. His *Pallas 'Armata,' or Manual of Military Order*, was highly reputed. In 1669 he translated Louis de May's work on the War of Hungary. See his *Memoirs*, published by the Bannatyne Club, 1829. His commission instructed him, among other things, 'to exact the 20 shill. for being absent from church, and to take such information as he thought fit when ministers did not use it.' 'The first part he streacht as far back as he pleased, as if his commission had reached to the year 60.' He had, too, 'letters of F. L. ("Longifacies," *scil.* Alexander Burnet), which excite to all severity.' *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 183. Moray, writing to Lauderdale, Oct. 20, 1667 (*id.* 82), relates that 'Sir James had 10 horsemen that helped to levy his church fines, &c., they were sent out to quarter by pairs, and every 2 exacted in every place quartering for themselves and for 8 horse more at 12d. a piece, threatening to send for the other 8 if they refused. Thus by a more solid kind of Arithmetic than the Scholar reckoned 2 eyes to be 3, he had a way to multiply 10 horse to 50; *egregie quidem.*' See *infra* 417, 440. An attempt was made to confiscate all the firearms in the west. Sharp to Sheldon, April, 1665; *Sheldon MSS.*

directions as Burnet should send him; so he went about the country, and received such lists as the ministers brought him of those who came not to church: and, without any other proof or any legal conviction, he set such fines on them as he thought they could pay, and sent soldiers to lie on them till they were paid. I knew him well afterwards, when he came to himself, being out of employment. He was a learned man; but had been always in armies, and knew no other rule but to obey orders. He told me he had no regard to any law, but acted as he was commanded, in a military way. He confessed it went often against the grain with him to serve such a debauched and worthless company as the clergy generally were, and that sometimes he did not act up to the rigour of his orders; for which he was oft chid both by lord Rothes and Sharp, but was never checked for his illegal and violent proceedings. And though the complaints of him were very high, so that when he was afterwards seized on by the party, they intended to make a sacrifice of him[a]; yet, when they looked into his orders, and found that his proceedings, how fierce soever, fell short of these, they spared him, as a man that had merited by being so gentle among them. CH. VIII.

The truth is, the whole face of the government looked liker the proceedings of an inquisition than of legal courts: and yet Sharp was never satisfied. So lord Rothes and he went up to court in the first year of the Dutch war[1]. When they waited first on the king, Sharp put him in mind of what he had said at his last parting, that if their matters 212

[a] *quickly* struck out.

[1] The dates here are somewhat confused by Burnet. Sharp went to London in August, 1664, and was there in November. It is not probable that Rothes was with him then, as he was certainly in Edinburgh at the end of that month. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 200, and ii. App. A. ix. He went again with Rothes in November, 1666. *Id.* i. 243. There is much about this in Alexander Burnet's letters to Sheldon in the *Sheldon MSS.* War was declared in March, 166$\frac{4}{5}$.

Ch. VIII. went not well, none must be blamed for it but either the earl of Lauderdale or of Rothes: and now he came to tell him that things were worse than ever: and he must do the earl of Rothes the justice as to say he had done his part. Lord Lauderdale was all on fire at this, but durst not give himself vent before the king. So he only desired that Sharp would come to particulars, and then he knew what
MS. 109. he had to say. Sharp put that off | in a general charge, and said, he knew the party so well, that if they were not supported by secret encouragements, they would have been weary of the opposition they gave the government. The king had no mind to enter further into their complaints. So lord Rothes and he withdrew, and were observed to look very pleasantly upon one another as they went away [1]. Lord Lauderdale told the king he was now accused to his face, but he would quickly let him see what a man Sharp was. So he obtained a message from the king to him, of which he himself was to be the bearer, requiring him to put his complaints in writing, and to come to particulars. He followed Sharp home, who received him with a gaiety as if he had given him no provocation. But lord Lauderdale was more solemn, and told him it was the king's pleasure that he should put the accusation with which he had charged him in writing. Sharp pretended he did not comprehend his meaning. He answered, the matter was plain: he had accused him to the king, and he must either go thorough with it and make it out, otherwise he would charge

[1] Rothes very soon settled down as Lauderdale's tool. A dynastic alliance was made by the marriage, in 1666, of Tweeddale's son to Lauderdale's only daughter and heiress, Mary, who was Rothes's cousin. On Sept. 23, 1666, he is completely devoted to Lauderdale's interest. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 241. The Dumfries matter, which follows (*infra* 381), broke up his close connexion with Sharp, who also, upon judicious pressure, came over to the winning side; *id.* 241–269, especially the last page, and ii. 86–93. Sharp was taken into favour at the end of 1667, upon betraying his former associates. Charles wrote him a personal note, which was received with an overflowing of servility. 'For myself, his Majt's hand with the diamond seal, was to me as a resurrection from the dead,' &c., &c. See *infra* 440.

him with leasing-making: and spoke in a terrible tone to him. Upon that, as he told me, Sharp fell a trembling and weeping: he protested he meant no harm to him: he was only sorry that his friends were upon all occasions pleading for favour to the *fanatics*: (that was become the name of reproach.) Lord Lauderdale said, that would not serve turn: he was not answerable for his friends, except when they acted by directions from him. Sharp offered to go with him presently to the king, and to clear the whole matter. Lord Lauderdale had no mind to break openly with him; so he accepted of this, and carried him to the king, where he retracted all he had said in so gross a manner, that the king said afterwards, lord Lauderdale was ill- 213
natured to press it so heavily, and to force Sharp on giving himself the lie in such coarse terms. This went to Sharp's heart: so he [a] made [a] a proposition to the earl of Dumfries, who was a great friend of the lord Middleton's, to try if a reconciliation could be made between him and the earl of Rothes, and if he would be content to come into the government under lord Rothes. Lord Dumfries went into Kent, where the lord Middleton was then employed in a military command on the account of the war [1]: and he laid Sharp's proposition before him. The earl of Middleton gave lord Dumfries power to treat in his name; but said he knew Sharp too well to regard any thing that came from him. Before lord Dumfries came back, Sharp had tried lord Rothes, but found he would not meddle in it: and they both understood that the earl of Clarendon's interest was declining, and that the king was like to change his measures. So when lord Dumfries came back to give Sharp an account of his negotiation, he seemed surprised, and denied he had given him any such commission. This enraged the earl of Dumfries so, that he published the

CH. VIII.

[a] substituted for *entered into.*

[1] See *supra* 363, note. There is no trace of any 'military command.'

CH. VIII. thing in all companies: among others, he told it very particularly to myself.

At that time Leightoun was prevailed on to go to court, and to give the king a true account of the proceedings in Scotland; which, he said, were so violent, that he could not concur in the planting the Christian religion itself in such a manner, much less a form of government. He therefore begged leave to quit his bishopric, and to retire, for he thought he was in some sort accessory even to the violences done by others, since he was one of them, and all was pretended to be done to establish them and their order. There were indeed no violences committed in his diocese. He went round it constantly every year, preaching and catechising from parish to parish. He continued in his private and ascetic course of life, and gave all his income, beyond the small expense on his own person, to the poor. He studied to raise in his clergy a greater sense of spiritual matters, and of the care of souls, and was in all respects a burning and shining light, highly esteemed by the greater part of his diocese: even the presbyterians were much mollified, if not quite overcome, by his mild and heavenly course of life[1]. The king seemed touched with the state that the country was in: he spoke very severely of Sharp, and assured Leightoun he would quickly come to other measures, and put a stop to those violent methods: but he would by no means suffer him to quit his bishopric. So the king gave orders that the ecclesiastical commission should be discontinued; and signified his pleasure that another way of proceeding was necessary for his affairs.

214 He understood by his intelligence from Holland that the exiles at Rotterdam were very busy, and that perhaps the Dutch might furnish the malecontents of Scotland with money and arms: so he thought it was necessary to raise more troops. Two gallant officers that had served him in the wars, and had gone with his letters to serve in Muscovy,

[1] See *supra* 239. The *Lauderdale Papers* fully bear out this account.

where one of them, Dalziel[1], was raised to be a general, and the other, Drummond[2], was a lieutenant-general, and governor of Smolensko, were now, not without great difficulty, sent back by the Czar. So the king intended they should command some forces that he was to raise. Sharp was very apprehensive of this, but the king was positive. A little before this, the Act of fining, that had lien so long asleep that it was thought forgot, was revived; and all were required to bring in one moiety of their fines, but the other moiety was forgiven those who took the declaration renouncing the covenant. The money was by act of parliament to be given among those who had served and suffered for the king; so that the king had only the trust of distributing it. There was no more Scottish councils called at Whitehall after lord Middleton's fall, but upon particular occasions the king ordered the privy counsellors of that kingdom that were about the town to be brought to him, before whom he laid out the necessity of raising some more force for securing the quiet of Scotland: he only asked their advice, how they should be paid. Sharp | very readily said, the money raised by the fining was not yet disposed of: so he proposed the applying it to that use. None opposed this: so it was resolved on, and by that means the cavaliers, who were come up with their pretensions, were disappointed of their last hopes of being recompensed for their sufferings. The blame of all

CH. VIII.

MS. 110.

[1] Invariably called Dalyel, or Dyel (as the family still is), in the correspondence of the period. He was born about 1599 and died in 1685. He served at Rochelle in 1628; was taken prisoner at Worcester, but escaped in May, 1652, served under Middleton, and in 1655 was recommended by Charles II to the King of Poland. He then entered the Russian service, and returned in 1665. See the *Dalyel Papers* in the *H. M. C. Rep.* ix.

[2] William Drummond, first Viscount Strathallan, 1617–88. Cf. *supra* 107, *infra* 429, and f. 375. He served in various capacities in Ireland; joined Charles II in Holland after the execution of Charles I; was made prisoner at Worcester, but escaped, and joined Glencairn in 1653. In August, 1655, he went with Dalyel to Russia, where he was made Lieut.-General of the 'strangers,' and Governor of Smolensko. On returning in 1665 with Dalyel he was made Major-General. He received his peerage in 1686.

CH. VIII. was cast on Sharp, at which they were out of measure enraged, and charged him with it. He denied it boldly; but the king published it so openly that he durst not contradict him. Many to whom he had denied that he knew any thing of the matter, and called that advice a diabolical invention, affirmed it to the king; and the lord Lauderdale, to complete his disgrace with the king, got many of his letters [1], which he had writ to the presbyterians after the time in which the king knew that he was negotiating for episcopacy, in which he had continued to protest with what zeal he was soliciting their concerns, not without dreadful imprecations on himself if he was prevaricating with them, and laid these before the king: so that he looked on him as one of the worst of men [2].

215 Many of the episcopal clergy in Scotland were much offended at all these proceedings. They saw the prejudices of the people were increased by them. They hated violent courses, and thought they were contrary to the meek spirit of the Gospel, and that they alienated the nation more and more from the church. They set themselves much to read church history, and to observe the state of the primitive church, and the spirit of those times: and they could not but observe so great a difference between the constitution of the church under those bishops and our own, that they seemed to agree in nothing but the name. I happened to be settled near two of the most eminent of them, who were often moved to accept of bishoprics, but always refused them, both out of a true principle of humility and self-denial, and also because they could not engage in the methods by which things were carried on. One of these, Mr. Nairn [3], was the politest man I ever knew bred in Scotland; he had formed clear and lively schemes of

[1] These letters, a remarkable record of self-exposure, may be seen at the beginning of vol. i. of the *Lauderdale Papers*.

[2] Surely there was some secret cause for this perpetual malice against Sharp. S. See *infra* 388.

[3] On Nairn and Charteris, see Wodrow, ii. 177. Nairn appears to have known Burnet as a boy.

things, and was the most eloquent of all our preachers. CH. VIII.
He considered the pastoral function as a dedication of the whole man to God and his service. He read the moral philosophers much, and had wrought himself into their equal temper, as much as could consist with a great deal of fire that was in his own: but he turned it all to melting devotion. He had a true notion of superstition, as a narrowness of soul, and a meanness of thought in religion. He studied to raise all that conversed with him to great notions of God, and to an universal charity. This made him pity the presbyterians, as men of low notions and ill tempers. He had indeed too much heat of imagination, which carried him to be very positive in some things, in which he afterwards changed his mind, that made him pass for an inconstant man. In a word, he was the brightest man I ever knew among all our Scottish divines. Another of these was Mr. Charteris, a man of a composed and serene gravity, but without affectation or sourness. He scarce ever spoke in company, but was very open and free in private. He made true judgments of things and of men's tempers, and had a peculiar talent in managing such as he thought deserved his pains. He had little heat either in body or mind: for, as he had a most emaciated body, so he spoke both slow, and in so low a voice that he could not easily be heard. He had great tenderness, and was a very perfect friend, and a most sublime Christian. He lived in a constant contempt of the world, and a neglect of his person. There was a gravity in his conversation that raised an attention and begot a composedness in all about 216
him, without frightening them; for he made religion appear amiable in his whole deportment. He had read all the lives and the epistles of great men very carefully, and delighted much in the mystics. He had read the fathers much, and gave me this notion of them, that in speculative points, for which writers of controversy searched into their works, they were but ordinary men, but their excellency lay in that which was least sought for, their sense of

CH. VIII. spiritual things, and of the pastoral care. In these he thought their strength lay; and he often lamented, not without some indignation, that in the disputes about the government of the church, much pains was taken to seek out all those passages that shewed what their opinions were, but that due care was not taken to set out the notions that they had of the sacred functions, of the preparation of mind and inward vocation with which men ought to come to holy orders; or of the strictness of life, the deadness to the world, the heavenly temper, and of the constant application to the doing of good, that became them. Of these things he did not talk like an angry reformer, that set up in that strain because he was neglected or provoked, but like a man full of a deep but humble sense of them. He was a great enemy to large confessions of faith, chiefly when they were imposed in the lump as tests: for he was positive in very few things. He had gone through the chief parts of learning, but was then most conversant in history, as the innocentest sort of study, that did not fill the mind with subtilty, but helped to make a man wiser and better. These were both single persons, and men of great sobriety, and lived on a constant low diet, which they valued more than severer fastings. Yet they both became miserable by the stone. Nairn went to Paris, where he was cut of a great one, of which he recovered, but lived not many years after. Charteris lived to a great age, and died in the end of the year 1700, having in his last years suffered unspeakable torment from the stone, which the operator would not venture to cut; but all that saw what he suffered, and how he bore it, acknowledged that in him they saw a most perfect pattern of patience and
MS. III. submission to the will of God. It was a great | happiness for me, after I had broke into the world by such a ramble, that I fell into such hands, with whom I entered into a close and particular friendship. They both set me right, and kept me right; though I made at this time a sally that may be mentioned, since it had some relation to public

affairs. I observed the deportment of our bishops was in all points so different from what became their function that I had a more than ordinary zeal kindled within me upon it. They were not only furious against all that stood out against them, but were very remiss in all the parts of their function. Some did not live within their dioceses, and those who did, seemed to take no care of them, they shewed no zeal against vice: the most eminently wicked men in the country were their particular confidents: they took no pains to keep their clergy strictly to rules and to their duty: on the contrary, there was a levity and a carnal way of living about them, that very much scandalized me. There was indeed one Scougal, bishop of Aberdeen, that was a man of a rare temper, great piety and prudence: but I thought he was too much under Sharp's conduct, and was at least too easy to him [1]. Ch. VIII. 217

Upon all this I took a resolution of drawing up a memorial of the grievances we lay under by the ill conduct of our bishops [2]. I resolved that no other person besides myself should have a share in any trouble it might bring on me: so I communicated it to none. This made it not to be in all the parts of it so well digested as it otherwise might have been: and I was then but three and twenty. I laid my foundation in the constitution of the primitive church; and shewed how they had departed from it, by 1666.

[1] See a high character of this bishop, and of his son, who was the author of the book entitled, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man*, in Bishop Burnet's Preface to his *Life of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore* (1685). R.

[2] Cockburn, *Specimen of Remarks*, 35, gives an account of the memorial, which he had seen and possessed, but had lost. It was 'on three sheets of fine post paper, written folio-wise.' It began with the words of Elihu, 'I am young, and ye are old,' and went on to upbraid the bishops for their pride and vanity in hanging their rooms, riding in coaches, and having footmen and other servants in livery; for marrying their daughters to gentlemen rather than to clergymen, &c. The bishops were not unnaturally annoyed, especially when they found that Burnet had given copies to Presbyterian friends and others, and had allowed them to be handed about before they themselves had seen them. See also *Vindication of Dr. Burnet, &c.* (1724).

CH. VIII. their neglecting their dioceses, meddling so much in secular affairs, raising their families out of the revenues of the church, and above all by their violent prosecuting of those who differed from them. Of this I writ out some copies, and signed them, and sent them to all the bishops of my acquaintance. Sharp was much alarmed at it, and fancied I was set on to it by some of the lord Lauderdale's friends. I was called before the bishops, and treated with great severity. Sharp called it a libel. I said I had set my name to it, so it could not be called a libel. He charged me with the presumption of offering to teach my superiors. I said, such things has been not only done, but justified in all ages. He charged me for reflecting on the king's putting them on his councils. I said, I found no fault with the king for calling them to his councils, but with them for going out of that which was their proper province, and for giving ill counsel. Then he charged me for reflecting on some severities, which, he said, was a reproaching public courts, and a censuring the laws. I said, laws might be made *in terrorem*, not always fit to be executed: but I only complained of clergymen's pressing the rigorous execution of them, and going often beyond what the law dictated. He broke out into a great vehemence, and proposed to the bishops that I should be summarily deprived and excommunicated: but none of them would agree to that. By this management of his the thing grew public. What I had ventured on was variously censured: but the greater part
218 approved of it. Lord Lauderdale and all his friends were delighted with it: and he gave the king an account of it, who was not ill pleased at it. Great pains was taken to make me ask pardon, but to no purpose: so Sharp let the thing fall[1]. But, that it might appear that I had not done

[1] Scougal of Aberdeen opposed the sentence, and quarrelled with Sharp about it. See Scougal's opinion of Burnet in Cockburn's *Specimen of Remarks*, 62. Cockburn, who knew Burnet well, gives a very different version of the affair. He says that Burnet only saved himself by 'a great submission,' on his knees, *id.* 33-43. But see *Vindication, &c.*, 22.

it upon any factious design, I entered into a very close state of retirement, and gave my self wholly to my studies and the duties of my function. CH. VIII.

CHAPTER IX.

FIRST DUTCH WAR. THE PLAGUE. COURT SCANDALS. THE FIRE.

THUS I have run over the state of Scotland in the years [16]63, [16]64, [16]65, and till near the end of [16]66. I now return to the affairs of England; in which I must write more defectively, being then so far from the scene. In winter [16]64 the king declared his resolution of entering into a war with the Dutch. The grounds were so slight[1], that it was visible there was somewhat more at bottom than was openly owned. A great comet[2], which appeared

[1] See the causes—chiefly concerned with Downing—as they appeared to De Witt, and those given by other Dutchmen, in Temple's *Works*, i. 307-310 (1770). Charles had his own private quarrel. Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, 412. Cf. Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 323; Ranke, iii. 417-422. Pepys mentions the satirical pictures and medals in Holland, Nov. 28, 1663. But the overriding causes were commercial rivalry, and the irritation among the Dutch caused by the conditions of peace in 1654, aggravated by the re-enactment of the Navigation Act in 1661. Since 1661, although formal amity was preserved, the nations had been in fierce and incessant strife in every quarter of the globe. See 'Report of Committee of Trade to the House of Commons,' and 'Resolutions of both Houses,' *Parl. Hist.* 292, April 22; and the 'King's Narrative,' Nov. 24, 1664, *id.* 297. On the Dutch side see Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 325. The feeling in England is well expressed by two lines in 'King Charles his glory and the Rebell's shame' (*British Museum Catalogue of Prints and Drawings*, Div. i. Satires, No. 979, p. 549):

'Make warrs with Dutchmen, Peace
with Spain,
Then we shall have money and
trade again.'

There was a corresponding proverb in Spain, 'Con todos guerra et paz con Inglaterra' ('War with all and peace with England'), Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, i. 430. Compare *infra* 545, 546, notes, upon the war of 1672.

[2] This comet has no distinctive name, and has not been seen again. Halley computed its orbit, from observations by Helvelius, and Lubienietski wrote about it. See Hind's work on *Comets*, 106, 144; Pepys, Dec. 17, 21, 1664; *Portland MSS., H.M.C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 289. 'We have here no news at all, tho' a comet seen every night seems to tell us we shall have enough here-

CHAP. IX. that winter, raised the apprehensions of those who did not enter into just speculations concerning those matters. The house of commons was so far from examining nicely into the grounds of the war, that without any difficulty they gave the king two millions and a half for carrying it on [1]. A great fleet was set out, which the duke commanded in person [2]; as Opdam had the command of the Dutch fleet. But as soon as the war broke out, a most terrible plague broke out also in the city of London, that scattered all the inhabitants that were able to remove themselves elsewhere [3]. It broke the trade of the nation, and swept away about an hundred thousand souls; the greatest havock that any plague had ever made in England. This did dishearten all people: and coming in the very time in which so unjust a war was begun, it had a dreadful appearance. All the king's enemies and the enemies of monarchy said, here was

after.' Holles to Fanshawe, *Orig. Lett. and Negot.* i. 401. In May, 1668, 'the same metor' appeared again, 'God grant it portend some good to this distracted nation, but many apprehend otherwise.' Sir R. Verney, *Verney MSS.*, May 21. In 1677, again, 'The Queene is ill, and much affected with the blazing star.' *Letters of Lady Russell*, April, 1677. Another comet, in 1680, upon which see Hind, 106–109, caused great consternation. *Portland MSS.* iii. 368; *Kenyon MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. iv. 122, 125.

[1] For the manner in which this vote was engineered through the House, see *Parl. Hist.* iv. 304; Clarendon, *Cont.* 228.

[2] De Cominges, French Ambassador, speaks of the Duke of York's energy in fitting out the fleet; and especially notes that it was officered by 'the old generals and captains of Cromwell, who are very loyal and full of confidence on account of their last successes against the Dutch.' Jusserand, *A French Ambassador, &c.*, 135, 136.

[3] Lord Clarendon, in an unpublished letter to Archbishop Sheldon, written on Sept. 28, in this year, congratulates him on the decrease of no less than 1,827 deaths in the bill of mortality from the number reported in the preceding week; and hopes that they shall be relieved with the same comfort every week. The number here mentioned was probably the true one, as Pepys, in his *Diary*, Sept. 27, 1665, states the decrease to have been above 1,800. But in Vincent's *God's terrible Voice in the City*, as cited at least by Oldmixon, in his *History of the Stuarts*, 522, the number given is 1,627. The plague was at the highest in the preceding week, during which there died of it 7,165 persons. This number is mentioned also by Pepys, Sept. 20, 1665. R. In the autumn and winter of 1664 the Dutch had themselves suffered severely from the plague.

a manifest character of God's heavy displeasure; as indeed the ill life the king led, and the viciousness of the whole court, gave but a melancholy prospect. Yet God's ways are not as our ways. What all had seen in the year [16]60 ought to have silenced those who at this time pretended to comment on providence. But there will be always much discourse of things that are very visible, as well as very extraordinary. When the two fleets met, it is well known what accidents disordered the Dutch, and what advantage the English had[1]. If that first success had | been followed, MS. 112. as was proposed, it might have been fatal to the Dutch, who, finding they had suffered so much, steered off. The duke ordered all the sail to be set on to overtake them. There was a council of war called to concert the method of 219 action, when they should come up with them. In that council Penn[2], who commanded under the duke, happened to say, that they must prepare for hotter work in the next engagement: he knew well the courage of the Dutch was never so high as when they were desperate. The earl of Montague, who was then a volunteer, and one of the duke's court, said to me, it was very visible that made an impression: and all the duke's domestics said, he had got honour enough: why[a] should he venture a second time? The duchess had also given a strict charge to all the duke's servants, to do all they could for hindering him to engage too far. When matters were settled, they all went to sleep: and the duke ordered a call to be given him when they should get up to the Dutch fleet. It is not known what passed between the duke and Brouncker[3], who was of his

CHAP. IX.

June 3, 1665.

[a] *what* MS.

[1] This battle was fought off Lowestoft, June 3, 1665. The Dutch fleet, slightly inferior in number of ships, had a larger number of guns and men. De Guiche (*Mémoires*, ii. 81, 107) accounts for the victory of the English by their superior discipline. See Pontalis, i. 343–346. 'Et Pontus Serviet' is the motto on the medal struck by Charles II.

[2] Admiral Penn, father of William Penn the Quaker. See Granville Penn's *Memoirs of Sir W. Penn.* His letters, and extracts from his journal, may be found in the *Portland MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiii. App. ii. 70, 71, &c.

[3] Brouncker was brother to Wil-

CHAP. IX. bedchamber, and was then in waiting: but he came to Penn, as from him, and said, the duke ordered the sail to be slackened. Penn was struck with the order; but did not go to argue the matter with the duke himself, as he ought to have done, but obeyed it. When the duke had slept, he, upon his waking, went out on the quarter-deck, and seemed amazed to see the sails slackened, and that thereby all hope of overtaking the Dutch was lost. He questioned Penn upon it. Penn put it on Brouncker, who said nothing. The duke denied he had given any such order; but he neither punished Brouncker for carrying it, nor Penn for obeying it [1]. He indeed put Brouncker out of his service: and it was said that he durst do no more, because he was so much both in the king's favour and in the mistress's. Penn was more in his favour after that than ever, which he continued to his son after him, though a quaker: and it was thought that all that favour was to oblige him to keep the secret. Lord Montague did believe that the duke was struck, seeing the earl of Falmouth [2], the favourite, and two other persons of quality, killed very near him; and that he

liam second Lord Brouncker, President of the Royal Society (*infra* 344, note), whom he succeeded in the title in 1684. There seems to be no extant word in his favour. Pepys (Oct. 20, 1667) terms him 'a pestilent rogue, an atheist, that would have sold his King and country for sixpence almost, so corrupt and wicked a rogue he is by all men's reports.' Evelyn (March 24, 1688) says he 'was ever noted a hard, covetous, vicious man, but, for his worldly craft and skill in gaming, few exceeded him.' Clarendon's account is no better; and De Grammont gives some characteristic details, adding, as his one qualifying word, that he was a fine chess-player. 'Bronkard, Love's Squire,' is Marvell's note of him. *Last Instructions*, 175. He was one of the Navy Commissioners, and as such was accused of swindling the sailors of their pay, and of appropriating the prize money. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 340.

[1] *Commons' Journals*, April 17, 1668. See Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 415–433, where James accuses Brouncker of lying; and Macpherson's *Original Papers*, which differ from Burnet in some details. It was ordered that both Brouncker and Penn should be impeached, the former (who was expelled the House, April 17, 1668, for non-attendance) on account of this affair, the latter for fraud and embezzlement. *Parl. Hist.* iv. 408, 409, Feb. 10, 166⅞. The matter was not further pursued, as the House was adjourned on May 8, 1668, and did not meet again for business until Oct. 19, 1669.

[2] Charles Berkeley, created Earl

had no mind to engage again, and that Penn was privately with him. If Brouncker was so much in fault as he seemed to be, it was thought the duke, in the passion that this must have raised in him, would have proceeded to greater extremities, and not have acted with so much phlegm. This proved the breaking the designs of the king's whole reign: for the Dutch themselves believed that, if our fleet had followed them with full sail, we must have come up with them next tide, and have either sunk or taken their whole fleet. De Witt was struck with this misfortune: and, imputing some part of it to errors in conduct, he resolved to go on board himself, as soon as their fleet was ready to go to sea again. CHAP. IX.

Upon this occasion I will say a little of him, and of the affairs of Holland. His father was the deputy of the town of Dort in the States, when the late prince of Orange[1] was so much offended with their proceedings in disbanding a great part of their army: and he was one of those whom he ordered upon that to be carried to the castle of Loevestein. Soon after that, his design on Amsterdam miscarrying, he saw a necessity of making up the best he could with the States. But, before he had quite healed that wound, he died of the small-pox. Upon his death all his party fell in disgrace, and the Loevesteiners carried all before them. So De Witt got his son John, then but twenty-five years of age, made pensioner of Dort[2]. And within a year after, the pensioner of Holland dying, he was made pensioner of Holland. His breeding was to the civil law, which he understood very well. He was a great mathematician: and as his *Elementa Curvarum* shew what 220 July 30, 1650. 1653.

of Falmouth. See his character, *supra* 181. It is to his credit that he died penniless, through generosity to old cavaliers rather than through extravagance. Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 397.

[1] *scil.* William II, who died Nov. 1650. Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 47, 58.

[2] He was born Dec. 24, 1625, and was made Pensioner of Dort, Dec. 21, 1650. Adrien Pauw d'Hemstede, Grand Pensionary of Holland, did not die until Feb. 21, 1653. John de Witt succeeded him July 23, 1653.

CHAP. IX.

a man he was that way, so perhaps no man ever applied algebra to all matters of trade so nicely as he did. He made himself so entirely the master of the state of Holland, that he understood exactly all the concerns of their revenue, and what sums, and in what manner, could be raised upon any emergent of state: for this he had a pocketbook full of tables, and was ever ready to shew how they could be furnished with money. He was a frank, sincere man, without fraud, or any other artifice but silence: to which he had so accustomed the world, that it was not easy to know whether he was silent on design or custom. He had a great clearness of apprehension: and when any thing was proposed to him, how new soever, he heard all patiently, and then asked such questions as occurred to him: and by the time he had done all this, he was as much master of the proposition as the person was that had made it. He knew nothing of modern history, nor of the state of courts: and was eminently defective in all points of form. But he laid down this for a maxim, that all princes and states followed their own interests: so by observing what their true interests were, he thought he could without great intelligence calculate what they were about. He did not enough consider how far passions, amours, humours, and opinions wrought on the world, chiefly on princes. He had the notions of a commonwealth from the Greeks and Romans: and from them he came to fancy, that an army commanded by officers of their own country was both more in their own power, and would serve them with the more zeal, since they themselves had such an interest in the success. And so he was against their hiring foreigners, unless it was to be
221 common soldiers, to save their own people. But he did not enough consider the phlegm and covetousness of his countrymen; of which he felt the ill effects afterwards. This was his greatest error, and it turned fatally upon him. But for the administration of justice at home, and for the management of their trade, and their forces by sea, he was the ablest minister they ever had. He had a hereditary

hatred to the house of Orange. He thought it was im- CHAP. IX.
possible to maintain their liberty if they were still stat-
holders. Therefore he did all that was possible to put an
invincible bar in their way, by the perpetual edict. But at Jan. 1668.
the same time he took great | care of preserving the young MS. 113.
prince's fortune; and looked well to his education, and
gave him, as the prince himself told me, very just notions
of every thing relating to their state. For he said, he did
not know, but that at some time or other he would be set
over them: therefore he intended to render him fit to
govern well[1]. The town of Amsterdam became at that
time very ungovernable. It was thought that the West
India company had been given up chiefly by their means;
for it was in value so equal to the East India company,
that the actions of both were often exchanged for one
another. When the bishop of Munster[2] began his preten-
sions on that city and on a great part of Westphalia, they
offered themselves up to the States, if they would preserve
them. But the town of Amsterdam would not consent
to it, nor submit to the charge. Yet they never seemed
to set up for a superiority over the rest, nor to break
the credit of the courts at the Hague: only they were
backward in every thing that was proposed and increased
the charge, and were become so weary of De Witt, that he
felt how much this miscarriage at sea had shaken his
credit; since misfortunes are always imputed to the errors
of those that govern. So he resolved to go on board.
De Ruyter often said, that he was amazed to see how
soon he came to a perfect understanding of all sea affairs.
The winds were so long backward, that it was not easy

[1] Old Mr. Inglish, who was surgeon to Chelsea College, told me he had it from very good hands in Holland, that De Witt corrupted the prince's nurse to give him a pinch in his secret parts, that should hinder his ever having any children: and I remember Mr. Charles Barnard, who was surgeon to Queen Anne, told the last Earl of Aylesford and me, that he was at the opening of King William; and observed something in relation to his private parts, that he had never seen before in any man that was not an eunuch. D. Compare Maidment's *Scottish Pasquils*, 260, 280; but see *supra* 5, note.

[2] See *infra* 450, note.

CHAP. IX. to get their great ships through the Zuyder Sea: so he went out in boats himself, and plummed it all so carefully, that he found many more ways of getting out by different winds, than was thought formerly practicable. He got out in time to be master of the sea before the end of the season: and so recovered the affront of the former loss, by keeping at sea after the English fleet was forced to put in. The earl of Sandwich was sent to the north with a great part of the fleet, to lie for the East India ships; but he was thought too remiss. They got, before he was
222 aware of it, into Bergen in Norway. If he had followed them quick, he could have forced the port, and taken them all. But he observed forms, and sent to the viceroy of Norway demanding entrance. That was denied him. But while these messages went backward and forward, the Dutch had so fortified the entrance into the port, that, though it was attempted with great courage, yet Tiddiman, and those who composed that squadron, were beat off with great loss, and forced to let go a very rich fleet.

[a] Here I will add a particular relation of a transaction relating to that affair, taken from the account given of it in a MS. that I have in my hands by sir Gilbert Talbot [1], then the king's envoy at the court of Denmark. That king did, in June 1665, open himself very freely to Talbot, complaining of the States, who, as he said, had drawn the Swedish war on him, on design that he might be forced to depend on them for supplies of money and shipping, and so to get the customs of Norway and the Sound into their hands for their security. Talbot upon that told him, that the Dutch Smyrna fleet was now in Bergen, besides many rich West India ships; and that they stayed there in expectation of a double East India fleet, and of De Ruyter, who was returning with the spoils of the coast of Guinea. So he said the king of Denmark might seize

[a] [Here there is this note: 'Here the affixed paper comes in'; and the following two sections have been inserted by Burnet on a separate leaf, subsequently.]

[1] See next page, note 2.

those ships before the convoy came which they expected. The king of Denmark said, he had not strength to execute that. Talbot said, the king his master would send a force to effect it: but it was reasonable he should have the half of the spoil. To which the king of Denmark readily agreed, and ordered him to propose it to his master. So he immediately transmitted it to the king, who approved of it, and promised to send a fleet to put it in execution. The ministers of Denmark were appointed to concert the matter with Talbot; but nothing was put in writing, for the king of Denmark was ashamed to treat of such an affair otherwise than by word of mouth. Before the end of July, news came that De Ruyter, with the East India fleet, was on the coast of Norway. Soon after he came into Bergen. The riches then in that port were reckoned at many millions[1].

The earl of Sandwich was then in those seas[2]. So Talbot sent a vessel express to him with the news, but that vessel fell into the Dutch fleet, and was sent to Holland. The king of Denmark wrote to the viceroy of

[1] The details here given are not quite accurate. On July 2, 1665, James sent orders to Penn 'to wax diligent in execution hereof in regard of the intelligence which his Majesty has received of De Ruyter being upon his way from Newfoundland,' and mentions the Dutch East India fleet as being also 'suddanely expected.' He was to follow the latter to Norway if they went there, 'and though they should goe into any harbours belonging to the King of Danemarke in those parts, if you finde you are able to take or destroy them or any considerable part of them within those harbours you are not to neglect the opportunity of doing it.' *Portland MSS., H. M. C. Rep.* xiii. App. ii. 103. The attack was therefore premeditated. Ruyter, from Newfoundland, reached the Ems on Aug. 6, 1665 (Pontalis, i. 350); he then sailed north, Aug. 11, in time to bring off the Dutch East India fleet escaping from Bergen.

[2] See Arlington's account in his *Letters*, ii. 84, 85, 87, from the last of which (Aug. 22, 1665), it is clear that Sandwich was not actually present at the fight. See also Sandwich's own account to Pepys, Sept. 18, 1665; Sir Gilbert Talbot's *True Narrative*, Harl. MSS. 6,859; and, especially, Talbot's letters to Arlington in Lister's *Life of Clarendon*, iii. 389–391, 393–395, 398, 405. He was, however, held responsible, and for this and his conduct in the matter of the prizes was entirely out of favour at Court, especially with Monk, in the winter of 1665. *Id.* Dec. 31, 1665; July 6, 1666. See Hawkins's *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland* (ed. Franks and Grueber, 1885), i. 508.

CHAP. IX. 223

Norway and to the governor of Bergen, ordering them to use all fair means to keep the Dutch still in their harbour, promising to send particular instructions in a few days to them how to proceed. Talbot sent letters with these, to be delivered secretly to the commanders of the English frigates, to let them know that they might boldly assault the Dutch in port; for the Danes would make no resistance, pretending a fear that the English might destroy their town: but that an account was to be kept of the prize, that the king of Denmark might have a just half of it. They were not to be surprised, if the Danes seemed at first to talk high: that was to be done for shew: but they would grow calmer when they should engage. The earl of Sandwich sent his secretary to Talbot, to know the particulars of the agreement with the king of Denmark. But the vessel that brought him was ordered, upon landing the secretary, to come back to the fleet, so that it was impossible to send by that vessel what was desired, and no other ship could be got to carry back the secretary. And thus the earl of Sandwich went to attack the Dutch fleet without staying for an answer from Talbot, or knowing what orders the governor of Bergen had yet received: for though the orders were sent, yet it was so great a way, ten or twelve days' journey, that they could not reach the place but after the English fleet had made the attack. The viceroy of Norway, who resided at Christiana, had his orders sooner, and sent out two galleys to communicate the agreement to the earl of Sandwich; but missed him, for he was then before Bergen. The governor of Bergen, not having yet the orders that the former express had promised him, sent a gentleman to the English fleet, desiring they would make no attack for two or three days; for by that time he expected his orders. Clifford was sent to the governor, who insisted that till he had orders he must defend the port, but that he expected them in a very little time. Upon Clifford's going back to the fleet, a council of war was called, in which the officers, animated with the

hope of a rich booty, resolved without further delay to attack the port, either doubting the sincerity of the Danish court, or unwilling to give them so large a share of that on which they reckoned as already their prize. Upon this Tiddiman began the attack, which ended fatally. Divers frigates were disabled, and many officers and seamen were killed. The squadron was thus ruined, and Tiddiman was ready to sink: so he was forced to slip his cables, and retire to the fleet, which lay without the rocks. This action was on the third of August: and on the fourth the governor received his orders. So he sent for Clifford, and shewed him his orders. But, as the English fleet had by their precipitation forced him to do what he had done, so he could not, upon what had happened the day before, execute these orders till he sent an account of what had passed to the court of Denmark, and had the king's second orders upon it. And, if the whole English fleet would not stay in those seas so long, he desired they would leave six frigates before the harbour, and he would engage the Dutch should not in the mean while go out to sea. But the English were sullen upon their disappointment, and sailed away. The king of Denmark was unspeakably troubled at the loss of the greatest treasure he was ever like to have in his hands. Thus a design well laid, that would have been as fatal to the Dutch as ignominious to the king of Denmark, was, by the impatient ravenousness of the English, lost without a possibility of recovering it. And indeed there was not one good step made after this in the whole progress of the war. The blame of the miscarriage was cast on the lord Sandwich, who was sent ambassador into Spain, that his disgrace might be a little softened by that employment [1]. The duke's conduct was much blamed, and it was said he was most in fault, but that the earl of Sandwich was made the sacrifice [2].

CHAP. IX.

Aug. 3, 1665.

224

[1] Pepys, Dec. 6, 1665. Fanshawe was superseded; cf. Clarendon, *Cont.* 755–769, and Lister, ii. 359.

[2] 'The duke was at this time at London, above one hundred and fifty leagues from Bergen in Norway.' Higgons's *Remarks*, 145. R.

CHAP. IX.

England was at this time in a dismal state[1]. The plague continued for the most part of the summer in and about London, and began to spread over the country. The earl of Clarendon moved the king to go to Salisbury, but the plague broke out there: so the court removed to Oxford, where another session of parliament was held, and though the conduct at sea was severely reflected on, yet all that was necessary for carrying on the war another year was given[2]. The house of commons kept up still the ill humour they were in against the nonconformists[a]. A great many of the ministers of London were driven away by the plague, though some few stayed. Many churches being shut up[3], when the inhabitants were in a more than ordinary disposition to profit by good sermons, some of the non-conformists went into the empty pulpits, and preached, as it was given out, with very good success: and in many other places they began to preach openly,

Oct. 9–31, 1665.

[a] *very high* struck out.

[1] See *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1665-6, 5, 68, 102, 212, 247, 277; and the Bills of Mortality, *id.* 1666, 392–394, from which it appears that during 1665, while the births were 9,967, the deaths were 97,306, those from the Plague alone being 68,596. For a vivid and previously unpublished description of the streets during the Plague, see the *Portland MSS.* iii, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 292. The laxity and recklessness of the Court at Oxford at this time also receive full illustration from the same source.

[2] A supply of a million and a quarter was given, although the former grant of two millions and a half (*supra* 390), which was to have lasted three years, had been expended in one. In September, 1666, after the Fire, another sum of £1,800,000 was voted. The vote was taken before the House had assembled in full numbers, and the country gentry, who were now murmuring, secured, when they came up, a proviso insisting that the money raised should be applied only to the ends for which it was asked, and appointing a parliamentary commission to inspect the expenditure and examine the officials upon oath. The system of 'appropriation of supplies,' and the common use of the terms 'court party' and 'country party,' appear to date from this. The proviso was Downing's device. Clarendon, *Cont.* 787, &c.

[3] Ellis, *Original Letters*, 2nd Series, iv. 26. In a letter to Sancroft it is said that the Bishop of London wrote to the clergy who had deserted their posts, informing them that they would forfeit their livings if they did not return. See the letters of Stephen Bing (a 'Petti canon of St. Paul's') to Sancroft, *Harl. Misc.* 3785, ff. 19–47.

not without reflecting on the sins of the court, and on the ill usage that they themselves had met with. This was represented very odiously at Oxford. So a severe bill was brought in, requiring all the silenced ministers to take an oath, declaring it was not lawful on any pretence whatsoever to take arms against the king, or any commissioned by him; and that they would not at any time endeavour an alteration in the government, in church or state[1]. Such as refused this were not to come within five miles of any city, or parliament borough, or of the church where they had served. This was much opposed in both houses, but more faintly in the house of commons. The earl of Southampton spoke vehemently against it in the house of lords; he said he could take no such oath himself: for, how firm soever he had always been to the church, yet, as things were managed, he did not know but he himself might see cause to endeavour an alteration. Dr. Earle, the bishop of Salisbury[2], died at that time, but before his death he declared himself much against the act. He was the man of all the clergy for whom the king had the greatest esteem: he had been his subtutor, and had followed him in all his exile, with so clear a character that the king could never see or hear of any one thing

CHAP. IX.

225

[1] See the same oath, now applied to Nonconformists, in the Act of Uniformity, *supra* 323. The penalty for refusing it was a fine of £40 and six months imprisonment. An attempt was made in the Lords to impose it upon the whole nation, and the motion was only lost by six votes, 57–51, and even then by an accident. Christie's *Shaftesbury*, i. 293. See Locke, *Letter from a Person of Quality*, Works, x. 203; *Parl. Hist.* iv. 328; *Commons' Journals*, Oct. 27, 1665; Ralph, i. 125. With the passing of the Five Mile Act, which received the royal assent Oct. 31, 1665, the machinery of persecution was complete. Dr. Manton, one of the most respected of Presbyterian ministers, was committed to the Gate House under this Act in March, 1670. *Portland MSS.* iii. 313.

[2] Author of *Microcosmography*. He was appointed one of the Westminster assembly of divines in 1643, but refused to serve; he was afterwards successively Dean of Westminster, 1660, Bishop of Worcester, 1662, and of Salisbury, 1663. The consensus of opinion upon his virtues is remarkable. See Evelyn's enthusiastic character of him, Nov. 30, 1662. He died November, 1665. He was succeeded in September, 1667, by Seth Ward, Bishop of Exeter.

CHAP. IX. amiss in him. So he, who had a secret pleasure in finding out any thing that lessened a man esteemed eminent for piety, had a value for him beyond all the men of his order. Sheldon and Ward were the bishops that acted and argued most for this act, which came to be called the five mile act. All that were the secret favourers of popery promoted it: their constant maxim being, to bring all the sectaries into so desperate a state, that they should be at mercy, and forced to desire a toleration on such terms as the king should think fit to grant it. Clifford began to make a great figure in the house of commons[1]. He was the son of a clergyman, born to a small fortune, but was a man of great vivacity. He was reconciled to the church of Rome before the restoration. Lord Clarendon had many spies among the priests, and the news of this was brought him among other things. So, when Clifford began first to appear in the house, he got one to recommend him to the lord Clarendon's favour. He looked into the advice that was brought him: and by comparing
MS. 114. things together, he perceived that he | must be that man: so he excused himself the best he could. Upon this Clifford struck in with his enemies, and tied himself particularly to Bennet, made lord, and afterwards earl of Arlington. [a]While the act was before the house of commons, Vaughan[2], made afterward chief justice of the common pleas, moved that the word *legally* might be added to the word *commissioned by the king:* but Finch[3], then attorney-general, said that was needless; since unless the commission was legal it was no commission, and, to

[a] [The passage from *While the act* down to *take the oath.* was added subsequently on the opposite page].

[1] Not apparently as a speaker; he is mentioned in the *Parl. Hist.* as speaking only four times, and then very briefly.

[2] John Vaughan, a member of the Long Parliament, resigned, and was regarded as a 'Malignant': member for Cardiganshire 1660–1668; Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, May, 1668; died 1674. See *supra* 277, 354; and *infra*, f. 389.

[3] Finch was Solicitor-General. He did not become Attorney-General until May, 1670, at the death of Sir Geoffrey Palmer. See f. 365 for his character.

make it legal it must be issued out for a lawful occasion, and to persons capable of it, and must pass in the due form of law. The other insisted that the addition would clear all scruples, and procure an universal compliance. But that could not be obtained; for it was intended to lay difficulties in the way of those against whom the act was levelled[1]. When the bill came up to the lords, the earl of Southampton moved for the same addition; but was answered by the earl of Anglesea upon the same grounds on which Finch went. Yet this gave great satisfaction to many who heard of it, this being the avowed sense of the 226
legislators; and the whole matter was so explained by Bridgeman, when Bates with a great many more came into the court of common pleas to take the oath[a]. The act passed: and the nonconformists were put to [b]great straits[b]. Oct. 1665.
They had no mind to take the oath, and they scarce knew how to dispose of themselves according to the terms of the act. Some moderate men took pains to persuade them to take the oath; it was said that by *endeavour* was only meant an unlawful endeavour; and that it was so declared in the debates in both houses. Some judges did on the bench expound it in that sense, and so [c]some few[c] of them took it; many more refused it, who were put to hard shifts to live, being so far separated from the places from which they draw their chief subsistence. Yet as all this severity in a time of war, and of such a public calamity, drew very hard censures on the promoters of it, so it raised the compassions of their party so much, that I have been told they were supplied more plentifully at that time than ever. There was better reason than perhaps those of Oxford knew to suspect practices against the state.

[a] See note on page 402. [b] substituted for *hard shifts*.
[c] substituted for *many*.

[1] In his speech on the Occasional Conformity Bill, in 1702, Burnet stated that, after the passing of the Five Mile Act, Bristol called a meeting of the chief Papists, who resolved to make common cause with the Dissenters for a general toleration. But see *supra* 344, where it appears that this meeting was after the Act of Uniformity, in 1662.

CHAP. IX.

Algernon Sidney, and some others of the commonwealth party, came to De Witt, and pressed him to think of an invasion of England and Scotland, and gave him great assurances of a strong party: and they were bringing many officers to Holland to join in the undertaking. They dealt also with some in Amsterdam, who were particularly sharpened against the king, and were for turning England again into a commonwealth. The matter was for some time in agitation at the Hague: but De Witt was against it, and got it to be laid aside [1]. He said, their going into such a design would provoke France to turn against them: it might engage them in a long war, the consequences of which could not be foreseen: and, as there was no reason to think that, while the parliament was so firm to the king, any discontents could be carried so far as to a general rising, which these men undertook for, so, he said, what would the effect be of turning England into a commonwealth, if it could possibly be brought about, but the ruin of Holland? It would naturally draw many of the Dutch to leave their country, that could not be kept and maintained but at a vast charge, and to exchange that with the plenty and security that England afforded. Therefore all that he would engage in was, to weaken the trade of England, and to destroy their fleet; in which he succeeded the following year beyond all expectation. The busy men in Scotland, being encouraged from Rotterdam, went about the country, to try if any men of weight would set themselves at the head of their designs for an insurrection. The earl of Cassillis and Lockhart were the two persons they resolved to try; but they did it at so great a distance, that, from the proposition, there was no danger of misprision. Lord Cassillis had given his word to the king,

227

[1] See Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 375, 376; Mignet, *Négociations, &c.* i. 421; Salmon, 578; Ludlow, ii. 291. Sidney had fled at the Restoration, and was unable to obtain permission for his return to England until the end of 1676. *Somers Tracts*, viii, and Mrs. Ady's *Sacharissa*, 198. Compare Ralph, i. 116. For intended Dutch aid to the Scotch, see the Secret Resolutions of the States-General, July 15, 1666; *Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch*, 379.

that he would never engage in any plots: and he had got under the king's hand a promise, that he and his family should not be disturbed, let him serve God in what way he pleased: so he did not suffer them to come so far as to make him any proposition. Lockhart did the same. They seeing no other person that had credit enough in the country to bring the people about him, gave over all projects for that year. But, upon the informations that the king had of their caballing at Rotterdam, he raised those troops of which mention was formerly made[1].

An accident happened this winter at Oxford, too inconsiderable and too tender to be mentioned, if it were not that great effects were believed to have followed on it. The duke had always one private amour after another, in the managing of which he seemed to stand more in awe of the duchess, than, considering the inequality of their rank, could have been imagined. Talbot[2] was looked on as the chief manager of those intrigues. The duchess's deportment was unexceptionable, which made her authority the greater. At Oxford there was then a very graceful young man of quality that belonged to her court, whose service was so acceptable, that she was thought to look at him in a particular manner[3]. This was so represented to the duke, that he, being resolved to emancipate himself into more open practices, took up a jealousy, and put the person

[1] See note, *supra* 377.

[2] Richard Talbot, afterwards Earl and Duke of Tyrconnel, *supra* 312.

[3] Harry Sidney, brother of Algernon Sidney, created Earl of Romney by William III. Bishop Burnet took the liberty to tell this story once before her daughter Queen Mary, in a good deal of company, as the Earl of Jersey, who was present, told me; only with this difference, that he did not conceal the gentleman's name. D. See Walpole's edition of *Memoirs of De Grammont*, 245, and his note. Burnet seems to have taken this story, and that of Lady Southesk, from the same *Memoirs*, as also that of Lord Chesterfield. Cole's *MS. Note*. In Pepys's *Diary*, Nov. 16, 1665, Jan. 9, 166$\frac{5}{6}$, Oct. 15, 1666, the suspicions concerning the duchess and Sidney are noticed. R. Upon this Reresby says, 64: 'She was a very handsome woman, and had a great deal of wit; therefore it was not without reason that Mr. Sidney, the handsomest youth of his time, of the duke's bed-chamber, was so much in love with her, as appeared to us all, and the duchess not unkind to him, but very innocently.'

CHAP. IX. out of his court with so much precipitation, that the thing became very public. By this means the duchess lost the power she had over him so entirely, that no method she could think on was like to recover it, except one. She began to discover what his religion was, though he still came not only to church but to sacrament. And upon that, she, to regain what she had lost, entered into private discourses with his priests; but in so secret a manner, that there was not for some years after this the least suspicion given. She began by degrees to slacken in her constant coming to prayers and to sacrament, in which she had been before that regular, almost to superstition. She put that on her ill health: for she fell into an ill habit of body, which some imputed to the effect of some of the duke's distempers communicated to her. A story was set about, and generally believed, that the earl of Southesk[1], that had married a daughter of duke Hamilton, suspecting some familiarities
228 between the duke and his wife, had taken a sure method to procure a disease to himself, which he communicated to his
MS. 115. wife, and that was by that means set round till it | came to the duchess, who was so tainted with it, that it was the occasion of the death of all her children, except the two daughters, our two queens; and that was believed the cause of an illness under which she languished long, and died so corrupted, that in dressing her body after her death, one of her breasts burst, being a mass of corruption. Lord Southesk was for some years not ill pleased to have this believed; it looked like a peculiar strain of revenge, with which he seemed much delighted. But I know he has to some of his friends denied the whole[a] story very solemnly. Another earl[2] acted a better part. He did not like a com-

[a] *of the* struck out.

[1] Robert Carnegie, third Earl of Southesk, married Lady Anne Hamilton. See De Grammont's *Memoirs* on this incident; Pepys, April 6, 1667; Marvell, *Historical Poem*, 43.

[2] Philip Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield; he married Frances Butler, youngest daughter of the Duke of Ormond.

merce that he observed between the duke and his wife. CHAP. IX.
He went and expostulated with him upon it. The duke fell a commending his wife much. He told him he came not to seek his wife's character from him: the most effectual way of his commending her, was to have nothing to do with her. He added, that if princes would do those wrongs to subjects, who could not demand such a reparation of honour as they could from their equals, it would put them on secreter methods of revenge: for there were injuries that men of honour could not bear. And, upon a new observation he made of the duke's designs upon his wife, he quitted a very good post, and went with her into the country, where he kept her till she died. Upon the whole matter the duke was often ill: the children were born with ulcers, or they broke out soon after: and all his sons died young and unhealthy[1]. This has, as far as any thing whatsoever that could be brought in the way of proof, prevailed to create a suspicion that so healthy a child as the pretended prince of Wales could neither be his, nor be born of any wife with whom he had lived long[2]. The violent pain that his eldest daughter had in her eyes, and the gout which has so early seized our present queen, are thought the dregs of a tainted original. Upon which, Willis, the great physician, being called to consult for one of his sons, gave his opinion in these words, *Mala stamina vitæ;* which gave such offence that he was never called for afterwards.

I know nothing of the councils of the year [16]66, nor 1666.

[1] In the *Memoirs of De Grammont*, the unsavoury story is differently told, as if Lord Southesk was disappointed of his revenge, by his lady's having no longer any correspondence with the duke. And as to the well-known Ferguson's account, and this author's suggestion, that James's constitution was ruined by disease, the fact is contradicted by the report of Cockburn, who had been in attendance on his person, and of Boileau the king's surgeon. *Specimen of Remarks, &c.* 13–17. R.

[2] He had one daughter by his second marriage, Louisa Maria Theresa, born in France in 1691: she died in 1712, much beloved for the sweetness of her disposition. Her portrait is in the small gallery at Versailles. Lindsay, *Pedigree of the House of Stuart; Life and Letters of Charlotte Elizabeth*, 77; and, especially, vol. ii. of the folio edition, f. 602, note.

CHAP. IX. whose advices prevailed. It was resolved on that the duke should not go to sea, but that Monk[1] should command the great fleet of between fifty and sixty ships of line, and that prince Rupert should be sent with a squadron of about twenty-five ships to meet the French fleet, and to
229 hinder their conjunction with the Dutch: for the French promised a fleet to join the Dutch, but never sent it[2]. Monk went out so certain of victory that he seemed only concerned for fear the Dutch should not come out. The court flattered themselves with the hopes of a very happy year. But it proved a fatal one: the Dutch came out, De Witt and some of the States being on board[3]. They
June 1–4, 1666. engaged the English fleet for two days, in which they had a manifest superiority; but it cost them dear, for the English fought well. But the Dutch were superior in number[4], and were so well furnished with chained shot,

[1] This is the last mention in the text of Monk, who died Jan. 3, 1670. See the account of his death in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.* The memory of Cromwell's military government was emphasised in the urgent advice of James that no successor should be appointed to his command, 'for that it was too great a power and trust, as things stood, to be put in any one body's hand.' If, however, the office were continued, he trusted it would be conferred upon himself. Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 446.

[2] Upon the policy of Louis XIV regarding this war (cf. *supra* 356) see the masterly sketch in Mignet, *Négociations relatives, &c.*, part ii. sect. 3. His eyes were fixed upon the Spanish Low Countries, and he was anxious not to be compelled to weaken himself by joining in the conflict, or to see either nation become stronger through the conquest of the other. The 'célèbre ambassade' was sent to London, Feb. 166$\frac{4}{5}$, in the hope of securing peace (Jusserand, *A French Ambassador, &c.*, ch. ix); but it was useless against the national desire for war. Louis himself delayed fulfilling his treaty obligations with the Dutch, of April, 1662, as long as possible. Even when he did so, his nominal assistance was carefully prevented from being effective. The diplomacy of the Dutch had been so skilful that England began the campaign in complete isolation. Pontalis, i. 375.

[3] John De Witt was not on board this fleet. Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 376–379.

[4] The Dutch, through Rupert's absence, which Pontalis ascribes to Monk's jealousy, had eighty ships to Monk's fifty. They 'shot mostly at masts, sails, rigging, and upper decks, which so disabled our ships as to make them useless.' *Fleming Papers*, June 21, 1666, *H. M. C. Rep.* xii. App. vii. For a detailed account of this murderous four days' battle (June 1–4), and its importance in the history of naval tactics, see

with a peculiar contrivance of which De Witt had the honour to be thought the inventor, that the English fleet was quite unrigged, and they were in no condition to work themselves off. So they must have all been taken, sunk, or burnt, if Prince Rupert, being yet in the Channel, and hearing that they were engaged by the continued roaring of guns, had not made all possible haste to get to them. He came in good time: and the Dutch, who had suffered much, seeing so great a force come up, steered off. He was in no condition to pursue them; but brought off our fleet, which saved us a great loss, that seemed otherwise unavoidable[1]. The court gave out that it was a victory: and public thanksgivings were ordered, which was a horrid mocking of God, and a lying to the world. We had in one respect reason to thank God, that we had not lost our whole fleet. But to complete the miseries of this year. The plague was so sunk in London that the inhabitants began to return to it, and brought with them a great deal

Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power in History*, 118, &c. See also, especially, the eyewitness account by Clifford, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1665–6, 430, given in full in the Preface, xix.

[1] On June 4, the last day of the battle, desperate fighting began at 9 a.m. and lasted till dusk, without cessation. The English then fell back, but Ruyter could not pursue. He had lost three vice-admirals, 2,000 men, and four ships. The English fleet lost 5,000 men killed, and 3,000 prisoners; eight ships were sunk or burnt, and nine more captured. See the reasons given by Penn for the defeat, in Pepys, July 4, 1666. In his despatch to the Duke of York, Rupert admits some errors, 'not of courage but of conduct.' *H. M. C. Rep.* v. 315. Clifford however says, 'If the king do not cause some of the captains to be hanged, he will never be well served.' See *supra* 298, note. As soon as the fleets could be refitted they came to close quarters again, July 25, 4 a.m., to July 26, 5 p.m., with the result that after two days of carnage the Dutch were driven back into the Texel, while on Aug. 8, 9, Sir Robert Holmes attacked and practically destroyed their merchant fleet of more than 150 vessels in the harbour of Vlie, and burned all the houses on Vlie and Schelling 'as bonfires for his good success at sea.' *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 22, 27, 28, 32. See, again, Clifford's eyewitness official account of the July battle. *Id.* 1665–6, 579, &c. In the latter volume, as in the preceding one, there is abundant evidence of the sympathy with which many Nonconformists viewed the cause of the Dutch, in hopes of an alteration of government, or at least of their own condition in case of the enemy's success.

CHAP. IX. of manufacture, which was lying on the hands of the clothiers and others, now in the second year of the war, in which trade and all other consumption were very low. It was reckoned that a peace must come next winter[1]. The merchants were preparing to go to market as soon as possible. The summer had been the driest that was known of some years, and London being for the most part built of timber filled up with plaister, all was extreme dry. On the second of September a fire broke out, that raged for three days as if it had a commission to devour every thing that was in its way. On the fourth day it stopt, in the midst of very combustible matter[2].

I will not enlarge on the extent nor the destruction made by the fire: many books are full of it. That which is still a great secret is, whether it was casual, or raised on design. The English fleet had landed on the Vlie, an island lying near the Texel, and had burnt it: upon which some came to De Witt, and offered a revenge, that they would set London on fire, if they might be well furnished and well rewarded for it. He rejected the proposition:
230 for he said he would not make the breach wider, nor the quarrel irreconcilable. He said it was brought him by one of the Labadists[3], as sent to him by some others. He made no farther reflections on the matter till the city was burnt. Then he began to suspect there had been a design, and that they had intended to draw him into it, and to lay the odium of it upon the Dutch. But he could

[1] 'If the warre continue, which God forbid, I am sad to think what will become of us the next yeare; may it prove happy to all, and let not a 66 come these hundred yeares againe.' Sir R. Burgoyne to Sir R. Verney, *Verney MSS.* Dec. 31, 1666.

[2] *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 99, 107, &c.; 1670, Addenda, 712.

[3] Followers of Labadie the mystic (1610–1674). He was brought up by the Jesuits, and joined successively the Jansenists and Carmelites. By the latter he was known as S. Jean Baptiste. In 1650 he became a Protestant, and was a pastor at Montauban, Orange, and Geneva; but was afterwards excommunicated for refusing the confession of faith. His mysticism included the assertion that neither law nor ceremony was needed by one whose spirit had been enlightened. His followers were chiefly in the little Duchy of Cleves. See Larousse, *Dictionnaire du Dix-neuvième Siècle.*

hear no news of those who had sent that proposition to him. In the April before, some commonwealth's men were found in a plot, and hanged; who at their execution confessed they had been spoke to to assist in a design of burning London on | the third of September. This was printed in the Gazette of that week, which I my self read[1]. Now the fire breaking out on the second, made all people conclude that there was a design some time before on foot for doing it. The papists[2] were generally charged with it. One Hubert, a French papist[3], was seized on in Essex, as he was getting out of the way in great confusion: he con- CHAP. IX. MS. 116.

[1] I.e. *The Gazette* of April 23–26, 1666. Pepys had this fact pointed out to him, Dec. 13, 1666. The day named is the third (not the second), 'as being found by Lilly's Almanack, and a scheme erected for that purpose, to be a lucky day, a planet then ruling which prognosticated the downfall of Monarchy.' The plot mentioned was evidently inconsiderable, as no mention of it appears in the royal speech at the opening of the session in September, 1666. Reresby, however, speaks of 'the late plot.' Cf. Ludlow, ii. 489.

[2] Or the 'Commonwealth's men,' the connexion of whom with Sept. 3 was more obvious. The report of the Parliamentary Committee, appointed in Jan. 166⅘, was 'full of manifest testimonies that it was by a wicked designe.' Marvell, ii. 208. In June, 1672, Marvell again writes: 'Here have been several fires of late. One at St. Catherine's, which burned about six score or two hundred houses, and some seven or eight ships. Another in Bishopsgate Street. Another in Critchet Fryars. Another in Southwark; and some else where. You may be sure all the old talk is hereupon revived.'

[3] 'Hubert, who was known to all his countrymen here, as well as the whole town of Rouen in Normandy, to have been born and bred a protestant, lived a protestant, and owned himself to be a protestant, on his examination as well as at his execution, if a man who was downright distracted may be said to be of one religion more than another. Yet the committee of the house of commons reported him to be a papist, although they allowed he professed himself to be a protestant. But what is more considerable, by the oath of Lawrence Peterson, the master of the vessel, who brought Hubert to England at this time, he was still on board, and did not set his foot on English ground till two days after the fire began.' Bevill Higgons's *Postscript*, 342. R. Echard confirms the statement of Hubert's protestantism. In the *Portland MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 298–301, there is a detailed account, in which it states that 'Hubert, a Frenchman of Roan, a watchmaker,' was apprehended at Romford and confessed. It is clear from the account that his brain was turned. See Pepys, Feb. 24, 166⅘; and *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 191, 209. 'The wretched Frenchman who said he fired London has been executed at Tyburn, but denied the fact at the gallows,' &c.

CHAP. IX. fessed he had begun the fire, and persisted in his confession to his death; for he was hanged upon no other evidence but that of his own confession. It is true he gave so broken an account of the whole matter that he was thought mad: yet he was blindfolded, and carried to several places of the city: and then, his eyes being opened, he was asked if that was the place: and he being carried to wrong places, after he looked round about for some time, he then said that was not the place: but when he was brought to the place where it first broke out, he affirmed that was the true place. And Tillotson told me that Howell, then the recorder of London, was with him, and had much discourse with him; and he concluded it was impossible that it could be a melancholy dream. The horror of the fact, and the terror of death, and perhaps some engagements in confession, might put him in such disorder, that it was not possible to draw a clear account of any thing from him but of what related to himself. Tillotson, who believed the city was burnt on design, told me a circumstance that made the papists employing such a creased man in such a service more credible. Langhorn[1], the popish counsellor at law, who for many years passed for a protestant, was despatching a half-witted man to manage the elections in Kent before the Restoration. Tillotson being present, and observing what a sort of a man he was, asked Langhorn how he could employ him in such services. Langhorn answered, it was a maxim with him in dangerous services to employ none but half-witted men, if they could be but secret and obey orders: for if they should change their minds, and turn informers instead of agents, it would be easy to discredit them, and to carry off the weight of
231 any discoveries they could make, and shew they were madmen, and so not like to be trusted in critical things. The most extraordinary passage, though it is but a presumption, was told me by doctor Lloyd and the countess of Clarendon, who had a great estate in the New River

[1] Upon Langhorn, see *infra*, ff. 427, 430, 465.

that is brought from Ware to London, which is brought together at Islington, where there is a great room full of pipes that convey it through all the streets of London. The constant order of that matter was, to set all the pipes a running on Saturday night, that so the cisterns might be all full by Sunday morning, there being a more than ordinary consumption of water on Saturdays. There was one Grant, a papist[1], under whose name sir William Petty published his observations on the bills of mortality: he applied himself to Lloyd some time before, who had great credit with the countess of Clarendon[2], and said he could raise that estate considerably, if she would make him a trustee for her. His schemes were probable: and he was made one of the board that governed that matter: and by that he had a right to come as oft as he pleased, to view their works at Islington. He went thither the Saturday before the fire broke out, and called for the key of the place where the heads of the pipes were, and turned all the cocks that were then open, and stopped the water, and went away, and carried the key with him[3]. So when the fire broke out next morning, they opened the pipes

[1] John Grant, or Graunt, was a clothier who acquired a considerable fortune. In the Civil War he became Captain and Major in the City Train Bands. He was elected to the Common Council, and was often employed as an arbitrator in trade disputes. His friendship for Petty was formed before 1651, for in that year he secured for the latter the Professorship of Music at Gresham College. Early in Charles II's reign he was converted to Catholicism. He published the *Observations on the Bills of Mortality in the City of London* in 1661, the first work of the kind in English, and Charles thereupon ordered him to be enrolled as a member of the Royal Society. Internal evidence—especially the medical illustrations—points to Petty as the real, or at any rate the joint, author. In 1683 Petty himself published similar *Observations on the Dublin Bills of Mortality*. Graunt fell into pecuniary embarrassment after the Fire, and Petty assisted him liberally. He died in 1674. Chalmers's *Biog. Dict.*, and Lord E. Fitzmaurice, *Life of Sir W. Petty*, 180, &c.

[2] The Countess of Clarendon was a very weak woman, but a great pretender to learning and devotion; which occasioned her conversing much with the clergy: and the Revelations had turned Lloyd's head, who was naturally a jealous, passionate man. D.

[3] It is strange that Swift should have missed these five 'and's in one sentence.

CHAP. IX. in the streets to find water, but there was none; so some hours were lost in sending to Islington, where the door was to be broke open, and the cocks turned; and it was long before the water got to London. Grant indeed denied that he had turned the cocks; but the officer of the works affirmed that he had, according to order, set them all a running, and that no person had got the keys from him besides Grant, who confessed he had carried away the keys, but pretended he did it without design[1]. There were many other stories set about, as that the papists in several places had asked if there was no news of the burning of London, and that it was talked of in many parts beyond sea, long before the news could get thither from London. In this matter I was much determined by what sir Thomas Littleton, the father, told me[a]. He was treasurer of the navy in conjunction with Osborn,
232 afterwards made lord treasurer, who supplanted him in that post, and got it all into his own hands[2]. He had a very bad opinion of the king; and thought that he had worse intentions than his brother, but that he had a more dexterous way of covering and managing them; only his

[a] *He was a man of a strong head and a sound judgment. He had just as much knowledge in trade, history, the disposition of Europe, and the constitution of England, as served to feed and direct his own thoughts, and no more. He lived all the summer long in London, where I was his next neighbour, and had for seven years a constant and daily conversation with him.* struck out.

[1] The following record is produced by Bevill Higgons, 149, in contradiction to this account. 'Islington, March 3, 172$\frac{3}{4}$. Captain John Grant admitted a member of the New River Company, on Tuesday, September 25, 1666. (Twenty-three days after the fire.) No particular member of the company has power to order the main to be shut down; nor can it ever be done without a particular direction of the board, of which minutes are always taken; and there are no minutes of this, as will appear by the company's books.' Cole, in a MS. note, refers to Maitland's *History of London*, vol. i. pp. 435, 436, where the above extract from the company's books is also inserted. R. See also *Defence of Dr. Cockburn*, 93, and Salmon, 582.

[2] Littleton and Osborn succeeded Anglesey in the Treasurership of the Navy in October, 1668, and Osborn held the place alone in September, 1671. Sir Thomas Littleton, the son, was Treasurer of the Navy in the reign of William III.

laziness made him less earnest in prosecuting them[1a]. CHAP. IX.
His chief estate lay in the city, not far from the place where the fire broke out, though it did not turn that way. He was one of the committee of the House of Commons that examined all the presumptions of the city's being burnt on design: and he often assured me that there was no clear presumption well made out about it, and that many stories that were published with great assurance came to nothing upon a strict examination[2]. He was at that time that the inquiry was made | in MS. 117.
employment at court. So whether that biassed him or not, I cannot tell[b]. There was so great a diversity of opinions in the matter that I must leave it under the same uncertainty in which I found it. If the French and Dutch had been at that time designing an impression elsewhere, it might have been more reasonable to suppose it was done on design, to distract our affairs: but it fell out at

[a] *He had generally the character of the ablest parliament man in his time.* struck out. [b] *; and having once given it out that he thought there was no design in the fire, he might perhaps be engaged in honour to persist still in that opinion.* struck out.

---

[1] See Pepys, Oct. 29, 1668, where he mentions Littleton as 'a creature of Arlington's.' On July 18, 1666, he describes him as 'one of the greatest speakers in the House of Commons, and the usual second to the great Vaughan.' On Feb. 14, 166$\frac{7}{8}$, he names him with Sir Robert Howard and Lord Vaughan as 'Undertakers' for the Court. Cf. *infra* 451. On June 12, 1678, Littleton spoke in favour of the Bill to incapacitate all Papists from sitting in either House. He does not appear to have sat in either the third or fourth Parliament; but in the fifth and last he took an active part in the exclusion debates. See his speech in favour of one of the 'Expedients,' *Parl. Hist.* iv. 1322; Reresby (Cartwright), 209.

[2] Marvell definitely espouses the theory that it was 'acted by Hubert, hired by Pieddeloup, two Frenchmen,' in *Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Power* (Grosart), 259. Amid the wild nonsense talked it is refreshing to come upon Williamson's memorandum, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 175, that 'after many careful examinations by Council and His Majesty's ministers, nothing has been found to argue the fire of London to have been caused by other than the hand of God, a great wind, and a very dry season.' Cf. *supra* 411, note. For the stories 'published with good assurance,' see *id.* 110, 121.

CHAP. IX. a dead time, when no advantage could be made of it. And it did not seem probable that the papists[a] engaged in the design merely to impoverish and ruin the nation, for they had nothing ready then to graft upon the confusion that this put all people in. Above twelve thousand houses were burnt down, with the greatest part of the furniture and merchandise that was in them. All means used to stop it proved ineffectual; though the blowing up of houses was the most effectual. But the wind was so high, that fleaks of fire and burning matter were carried in the air cross several streets, so that the fire spread not only in the next neighbourhood, but at a great distance. The king and the duke were almost all the day long on horseback, with the guards, seeing to all that could be done, either for quenching the fire, or for the carrying off persons and goods to the fields all about London[1]. The most astonishing circumstance of that dreadful conflagration was, that, notwithstanding the great destruction that was made, and the great confusion in the streets, I could never hear of any one person that was either burnt or trode to death. The king was never observed to be so much struck with any thing in his whole life as with this. But the citizens were not so well satisfied with the duke's behaviour; they thought it looked too gay and too little concerned. A jealousy of his being concerned in it was spread about with great industry, but with very little
233 appearance of truth. Yet it grew to be generally believed, chiefly after he owned that he was a papist.

[a] *had* struck out.

[1] *Fleming Papers*, Sept. 13, 1666.

CHAPTER X.

THE PENTLAND REBELLION AND INDULGENCE IN SCOTLAND.

IN Scotland the fermentation went very high. Turner was sent again into the west, in October this year, and he began to treat the country at the old rate [1]. The people were alarmed, and saw they were to be undone. They met together, and talked with some fiery ministers [2]; Semple, Maxwell, Welsh, and Guthrie were the chief incendiaries. Two gentlemen that had served in the wars, one a lieutenant-colonel, Wallace, and the other that had been a major, Learmouth, were the best officers they had to rely on [3]. The chief gentlemen of those counties were all 1666.

[1] On Turner see *supra* 378. He had been sent in the spring. The 'fermentation' was increased by the proclamation of the Privy Council of the orders enjoining all heritors and landlords to be answerable for their servants and tenants being orderly and refraining from attending conventicles.

[2] Cruikshank, in his *History of the Church of Scotland*, i. 219, denies that this rising of the people was the effect of any previous consultation with their ministry, which Bishop Burnet here intimates, as Cruikshank expresses himself, without any ground or proof. R. See also *Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch*, ed. McCrie, 380. But Burnet's account is supported by Rothes's letter to Lauderdale, March 20, 1666. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 235.

[3] Wodrow, ii. 25; *Life of John Livingstone* (Wodrow Soc. Select Biog.), 300. The Privy Council mention also Colonel Gray (sc. Andrew Gray, a merchant in Edinburgh; Wodrow, ii. 18), as one of the chief commanders. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 246. James Wallace, of Auchlanes, of the family of Craigie, left a narrative of the whole affair, which is contained in full in the *Memoirs of Mr. William Veitch*, and of which extracts may be found in Maidment, *Scottish Ballads, Historical and Traditional* (1868), ii. 281. Wallace was vigorously pursued after the defeat, but succeeded in escaping to Holland, where he lived almost till his death in 1678. In July, 1676, Charles wrote to ask for his surrender by the States, and the demand was after long argument acceded to, though not apparently acted on. Wodrow, ii. 344, compared with *Memoirs of Veitch*. His sentence of forfeiture of life and fortune, passed Aug. 15, 1667 and ratified in 1669, was rescinded at the Revolution. Semple was tortured and executed in 1684. *Id.* iv. 152. Gabriel Maxwell, minister of Dundonald, turned informer. *Id.* ii. 28. John Welsh, minister of Irongray, also escaped, and was present at Bothwell Brigg, but was captured and executed, 1685. *Id.* iv. 235. John Guthrie, minister at Tarbolton, was executed, 1667. *Id.* ii. 75. Major Joseph Learmont, who com-

CHAP. X.

clapt up in prison, as was formerly told; so that preserved them: otherwise they must either have engaged with the people, or have lost their interest among them. The people were told that the fire of London had put things in that confusion at court, that any vigorous attempt would disorder all the king's affairs. If the new levied troops had not stood in their way, they would have been able to have carried all things before them: for the two troops of guards, with the regiment of foot guards, would not [have] been able to have kept their ground before them. The people, as some of them told me afterwards, were made to believe that the whole nation was in the same disposition. So on the thirteenth of November they run together: and two hundred of them went to Dumfries, where Turner then lay with a few soldiers about him; the greatest part of his men being then out in parties for the levying of fines. So they surprised him before he could get to his arms: otherwise, he told me, he would have been killed rather than taken, since he expected no mercy from them. With himself they seized his papers and instructions, by which it appeared he had been gentler than his orders were. So they resolved to keep him, and exchange him as occasion should be offered: but they did not tell him what they intended to do with him; so he thought they were keeping him till they might hang him up with the more solemnity. There was a considerable cash in his hands, partly for the pay of his men, partly of what he had raised in the country, that was seized: but he to whom they trusted the keeping of it run away with it[1]. They spread a report, which they have since printed, and it passed for some time current, that this rising was the effect of a sudden heat that the country was put in by seeing one of their neighbours tied

manded part of the horse, escaped, but was condemned, and on his capture in 1682 ordered to be executed, but was reprieved and imprisoned in the Bass. *Id.* ii. 70; iii. 410.

[1] This was Andrew Gray, mentioned in the note above. Cf. Kirkton, 232, note. But see the *Memoirs of Veitch*, where the accusation is disproved. Upon the capture of Turner, see his *Memoirs* (Bannatyne Club), and Wodrow, ii. 18, note.

on a horse hand and foot, and carried away, only because he could not pay a high fine that was set upon him; and that upon this provocation, the neighbours, who did not know how soon such usage would fall to their own turn, run together, and rescued him; and that they, fearing some severe usage for that, they kept together, and that others coming in to them they went in and seized on Turner. But this was a story raised only to beget compassion: for, after the insurrection was quashed, the privy council sent some round the country, to examine the violences that had been committed, particularly in the parish where it was given out that this was done. I read the report they made to the council, and all the depositions that the people of the country brought before them: but this was not mentioned in any one of them. CHAP. X. 234

The news of this rising was brought to Edinburgh, fame increasing their numbers to some thousands. And this happening to be near Carlisle, the governor of that place sent an express to court, in which the strength of the party was magnified, much beyond the truth. The earl of Rothes was then at court, who had assured the king that all things were so well managed in Scotland, that they were in perfect quiet: there were, he said, some stubborn fanatics still left, that would be soon subdued: but there was no danger from any thing that they or their party could do[1]. He gave no credit to the express from Carlisle: but two days after the news was confirmed by an express from Scotland[2]. Sharp was then at the head of the government: so he managed this little war, and gave all the orders and directions in it. Dalyel was commanded to draw all the force they had together, which lay then

[1] 'I will positively say ther is no hazard nor scarcely a possibilitie of anie sturreing in this countrie to oppose the esteablished lawes and gouverment off Church and State.' Rothes to Lauderdale, March 20, 1666. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 236. On June 23, however, he regrets 'the strang evill affectednes of our pipill in this countrie.'

[2] The alarm at Court is shown in the king's instructions to the Earl of Carlisle, Rothes, &c. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 282, 283.

CHAP. X. dispersed in quarters. When that was done, he marched westward. A great many run to the rebels, who came to be
MS. 118. called the Whigs[1]. | At Lanerick, in Clydesdale, they had a solemn fast day, in which, after much praying, they renewed the covenant, and set out their manifesto, in which they denied that they rose against the king; they complained of the oppression under which they had groaned; they desired that episcopacy might be put down, and that presbytery and the covenant might be set up, and their ministers restored again to them; and then they promised that they would be in all other things the king's most obedient subjects. The earl of Argyll raised fifteen hundred men, and wrote to the council that he was ready to march upon order. Sharp thought that if he came into the country, either he or his men would certainly join with the rebels: so he sent him no orders at all; but he was at the charge of keeping his men together to no purpose. Sharp was all the while in a dreadful consternation, and wrote dismal letters to court, praying that the forces which lay in the north of England might be ordered down; for he wrote they were surrounded with the rebels, and did not know
235 what was become of the king's forces[2]. He also moved that the council would go and shut themselves up within the castle of Edinburgh; but that was opposed by the rest of the board, as an abandoning of the town, and the betraying an unbecoming fear, which might very much encourage both the rebels and all such as intended to

[1] Upon this name see *supra* 73, note.

[2] Lord Bellenden, writing to Lauderdale, Dec. 11, 1666, says: 'Le jour que les Rebels ce sont montre proche de cet vil, il estoit dans la plus grand confusion du monde, tantot voulan se retirer chez luy, tantot a Bervick, tantot ce casher dans un coign prive, qu'il ne ce pu pas dire la confusion et timidité de son esprit.' *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 260. Alexander Burnet, writing to Sheldon, Dec. 8, 20, 1666, says, however, 'My Lord St. Andrews hath given a very extraordinary proofe both of his prudence and resolution in managing the counsell.' *Sheldon MSS.* Of Alexander Burnet himself we read that he was 'deadly sick' when the rising took place, but that 'the breaking out of the rebels has cured him.' *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, Nov. 6 and 22, 244, 280. For accounts of the progress and results of the rebellion, see *id.* 295, &c.

go over to them. Orders were given out for raising the country, but there was no militia yet formed. In the mean while Dalyel followed the rebels as close as he could. He published a proclamation of pardon, as he was ordered, to all that should in twenty-four hours' time return to their own houses, and declared all that continued any longer in arms rebels. He found the country was so well affected towards them, that he could get no sort of intelligence but what his own parties brought in to him[1]. The Whigs marched towards Edinburgh, and came within two mile of the town, but finding neither town nor country declared for them, and that all the hopes their leaders had given them proved false, they lost heart. From being once above two thousand, they were now come to be not above eight or nine hundred. So they resolved to return back to the west, where they knew the people were of their side, and where they could more easily disperse themselves, and get either into England or Ireland. The ministers were very busy in all those counties, plying people of all ranks not to forsake their brethren in this extremity; and they had got a company of about three or fourscore gentlemen together, who were marching towards them, when they heard of their defeat: and upon that they dispersed themselves. The rebels thought to have marched back by the way of Pentland hills. They were not much concerned for the few horses they had, and knew that Dalyel, whose horse was fatigued with a fortnight's constant march, could not follow them; and if they had gained but one night more in their march, they had got out of his reach. But on the twenty-eighth of November, about an hour before sun-set, he came up to them. They were posted on the top of a hill[2]: so he engaged with great disadvantage. They,

Nov. 28, 1656.

[1] This circumstance is confirmed by what is said by the Archbishop of Glasgow, in a letter to Sheldon, dated Dec. 27, 1666 [*Sheldon MSS.*, Bodl.], that 'so great and general is the affection of the people, especially in the west, to that party, that my lord commissioner complains of these that are known to be returned home to their houses, few or none can be secured or apprehended. R.

[2] Rullion Green, where the fight

CHAP. X.

finding they could not get off, stopt their march. Their ministers did all they could by preaching and praying to infuse courage into them: and they sung the seventy-fourth and the seventy-eighth Psalms, and so they turned on the king's forces. They received the first charge that was given by the troop of guards very resolutely, and put them in disorder, but that was all the action; for immediately they lost all order, and run for their lives. It was now dark: about forty were killed on the spot, and a hundred and thirty were taken. The rest were favoured by the darkness of the night and the weariness of the king's troops, that were not in case to pursue them, and had no great heart to it: for they were a poor harmless com-
236 pany of men, become mad by oppression [1]: and they had taken nothing during all the time they had been together, but what had been freely given them by the country people. The rebellion was broke with the loss only of five of the king's side. The general came next day into Edinburgh with his prisoners.

took place, is not the top of a hill, but an alp or upper plateau of the Pentlands. There is a detailed account of the skirmish from Lauderdale's younger brother, Charles Maitland of Haltoun, who was present, in the *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 248, which should be compared with Wallace's *Narrative*. For the cruelties which followed, see *id.* 252, 253, &c. Of the ministers, 'the gallantest, whose name was Cruckshank, receaved the just reward for rebellioun upon the feild, which is death and damnation.' *Id.* 255. Cf. Maidment's *Scottish Pasquils*, 232.

[1] 'Ther be some of them the most obdurat villains that ever I did see or heard of, the rest simple misled poore people, upon pretence of religion, mantayning of the Covenant, and the outing of prelats; some of them will doubtless be putt to the torture before they be execute.' Bellenden to Lauderdale, Dec. 1, 1666, *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 252; *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666-7, 325. Rothes's account is similar: 'Ther are now in this prisoun house above one hundred and twentie, all of them being onlie mean beggerlie fellowes, bot stubborne in ther wicked and rebellious way . . . which render them in my opinion uncapable of mercie. But the number being great, and the persouns inconsiderable, I shall intreat to know his Ma^ties pleasure, if I shall cause put them all to the tryall, and so hang them, or if they shall be banished the kingdome, and sent to Barbados. This I am pressed to say by severalls of the Councell, not that I am a wearie of causing hang such rebellious traitors.' *Id.* 254. See Alexander Burnet's advice to Williamson, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666-7, 330.

The two archbishops were now delivered out of all their fears: and the common observation[a], that cruelty and cowardice go together[b], was too visibly verified on this occasion. Lord Rothes came down full of rage: and that being inflamed by the two archbishops, he resolved to proceed with the utmost severity against the prisoners. Burnet advised the hanging of all those who would not renounce the covenant, and would not promise to conform to the laws for the future: but that was thought too severe; yet he was sent up to London, to procure of the king an instruction that they should tender the declaration renouncing the covenant to all who were thought disaffected, and to proceed against those who refused that as against seditious persons. The best of the episcopal clergy set upon the bishops, to lay hold on this opportunity for regaining the affections of the country, by becoming intercessors for the prisoners, and for the country, that was like to be quartered on and eat up for the favour they had expressed to them. Many of the bishops went into this, and particularly Wishart of Edinburgh, though a rough man, and sharpened by ill usage[1]; yet upon this occasion he expressed a very Christian temper, such as became one who had felt what the rigours of a prison had been; for he sent every day very liberal supplies to the prisoners: which was indeed done by the whole town in so bountiful a manner, that many of them, who being shut up had neither air nor exercise, were in greater danger by their plenty, than they had been by all their unhappy campaign. But Sharp could not be | mollified. On the contrary, he MS. 119. encouraged the ministers in the disaffected counties to bring in all the informations they could gather, both against the prisoners and against all who had been among them, that they might be sought for and proceeded against. Most of those got over to Ireland. But the ministers

CHAP. X.

[a] *s* struck out. [b] *and that in all councils the clergy are of the cruel side,* struck out.

[1] See *supra* 252.

CHAP. X. acted so ill a part, so unbecoming their character, that the aversion of the country to them was increased to all possible degrees. They looked on them now as wolves, and not as shepherds. It was a moving sight to see ten of the prisoners hanged upon one gibbet at Edinburgh:
237 thirty-five more were sent to their countries, and hanged up before their own doors; their ministers all the while using them hardly, and declaring them damned for their rebellion. They might all have saved their lives, if they would have renounced the covenant[a]. They did all at their death give their testimony, according to their phrase, to the covenant, and to all that had been done pursuant to it: and they expressed great joy in their sufferings. Most of them were but mean and inconsiderable men in all respects, yet even these were firm and inflexible in their persuasions[1]. Many of them escaped, notwithstanding the great search was made for them. Guthrie[2], the chief of their preachers, was hid in my mother's house, who was bred to her brother's principles, and could never be moved from them. He died next spring. One McKail, that was only a probationer preacher, who had been chaplain in sir James Stewart's house, had gone from Edinburgh to them. It was believed he was sent by the party in town, and that he knew their correspondents: so he was put to the torture, which in Scotland they call the boots; for they put a pair of iron boots close on the leg, and drive wedges between these and the leg. The common torture was only to drive these in the calf of the leg: but I have been told they were sometimes driven upon the chine bone. He bore the torture with great constancy: and either he could say nothing, or he had the firmness not to discover those who had trusted him. Every man of them could have saved his own life, if he would accuse any other: but they

[a] *: so they were really a sort of martyrs for it.* struck out.

[1] Or, as Rothes put it, 'damd incorrigeable phanaticks,' 'damd fules.'

[2] William Guthrie, brother of James Guthrie, who was hanged in 1661. See *supra* 226.

were all true to their friends[1]. McKail, for all the pain of the torture, died as in a rapture of joy: his last words were, 'Farewell sun, moon, and stars, farewell kindred and friends, farewell world and time, farewell weak and frail body; welcome eternity, welcome angels and saints, welcome Saviour of the world, and welcome God the Judge of all: which he spoke with a voice and manner that struck all that heard it[2]. His death was the more censured, because it came to be known afterwards, that Burnet, who had come down before his execution, had brought with him a letter from the king, in which he approved of all that they had done, but added, that he thought there was blood enough shed, and therefore he ordered that such of the prisoners as would promise to obey the laws for the future should be set at liberty, and that the incorrigible should be sent to plantations[3]. Burnet let the execution go on, before he produced his letter, pretending there was no council-day between; but he, who knew the contents of it, ought to have moved the lord Rothes to call an extraordinary council to prevent the execution. So that blood 238
was laid on him. He was, contrary to his natural temper, very violent at that time, much inflamed by his family, and by all about him.[a] Thus this rebellion, that might have been so turned in the conclusion of it that the clergy might have gained reputation and honour by a wise and merciful conduct, did now exasperate the country more than ever against the church. The forces were ordered to lie in the west, where Dalyel acted the Muscovite too grossly[4]: he

[a] *He was condemned by his best friends as very unjust and deceitful in his private dealings, and fell under the censure of being a very bad man, though with a fair and grave appearance.* struck out.

[1] Rothes complains bitterly of their 'unparalleled obdurdnes' in refusing to give information.

[2] Like Renwick, in 1683, Hugh McKail believed 'that if the Lord could be tyed to any place it is to the mosses and muirs of Scotland.' *Webster MSS.* Cf. Wodrow, i. 304; ii. 59, note. McKail was hanged, a few days after the torture. See the curious details given in *Memoirs of Veitch*, 35, note.

[3] See Lady Margaret Kennedy's letter of Feb. 2, 1667 (Bannatyne Club).

[4] Dalyel (Dec. 6, 1666) advised Lauderdale that it was not possible

CHAP. X.

threatened to spit men and to roast them, and killed some in cold blood, or rather in hot blood; for he was then drunk when he ordered one to be hanged, because he would not tell where his father was, for whom he was in search[a]. When he heard of any that did not go to church, he would not trouble himself to set a fine upon him, but he set as many soldiers upon him as should eat him up in a night. By this means all people were struck with such a terror that they came regularly to church. And the clergy were so delighted with it, that they used to speak of that time as the poets do of the golden age. They never interceded for any compassion to their people; nor did they take care to live more regularly, or to labour more carefully. They looked on the soldiery as their patrons: they were ever in their company, complying with them in their excesses, and, if they were not much wronged, they rather led them into them than checked them for them. Dalyel himself and his officers were so disgusted with them, that they increased the complaints, that had now more credit from them than from those of the country, who were looked on as their enemies.[b] Things of so strange a pitch in vice were told of them, that they seemed scarce credible. The person, whom I believed the best as to all such things, was one sir
MS. 120. John Cunningham, an eminent lawyer, | who had an estate in the country, and was the most extraordinary man of his profession in that kingdom[1]. He was episcopal beyond

[a] , *upon some information that was brought him.* struck out. [b] *Some scandals of a crying nature broke out on some of them, who fled the country upon it, but these left an ill savour upon all the rest.* struck out.

to secure the country 'without the inhabitens be removet or destroied.' *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 255. Writing to Rothes on Dec. 29, he says: 'If I be not totale desevet, without extirpation the moist pairts of this countray vil second this rebellion with a girter.' *Dr. Webster's MSS.* It is interesting to find the Archbishop of Glasgow, Alexander Burnet, endorsing this opinion in a letter to Sheldon, Aug. 9, 1667, 'If his counsell had been followed I am confident this kingdome had (by this tyme) beene in a very happy and quiet condition.' *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. App. Letter xxxii.

[1] Sir John Cunningham of Lambrughton was one of the counsel assigned to defend Argyll at his trial in 1661. He was made a Baronet of Nova Scotia in 1669; was suspended

most men in Scotland, who for the far greatest part thought that forms of government were in their own nature indifferent, and might be either good or bad according to the hands in which they fell; whereas he thought episcopacy was of divine right, settled by Christ. He was not only very learned in the civil and canon law, and in the philological learning, but was very universal in all other learning: he was a great divine, and well read in the fathers and ecclesiastical history. He was, above all, a man of eminent probity, and of a sweet temper, and indeed one of the piousest [1] men of the nation. The state of the church in those parts went to his heart: for it was not easy to know how to keep an even hand between the perverseness of the people on the one side, and the vices of the clergy on the other. They looked on all those that were sensible of their miscarriages, as enemies of the church. It was after all hard to believe all that was set about against them [a]. CHAP. X. 239

The king's affairs in England forced him to soften his government every where. So at this time the earls of Tweeddale and Kincardine went to court, and laid before the king the ill state the country was in. Sir Robert Moray talked often with him about it [2]. Lord Lauderdale was more cautious, by reason of the jealousy of his being a presbyterian. Upon all which, the king resolved to put Scotland into other hands. A convention of estates had been called the year before, to raise money for maintaining the troops. This was a very ancient practice in the Scottish 1667.

[a] , *though when I went and lived among* [*them*] *I found that what I had heard was true, and a great deal more.* struck out.

from the bar in 1674 for opposing a rescript of Charles II declaring the Scotch legal process of 'protestation in remeid of law' illegal (Omond, *Lord Advocates of Scotland*, i. 201, 209 and *infra*, f. 370); was member for Ayrshire in 1681, and died, Nov. 17, 1684. He, with Lockhart, acted for the 'Faction' in their attack upon Lauderdale, in 1678. *Lauderdale Papers*, iii. 125 and *infra*, f. 420.

[1] Is that Scotch? S.

[2] These three were Lauderdale's principal agents. Clarendon had now fallen, and Charles was attempting to enter upon a policy of tolerance in England.

CHAP. X.

constitution: a convention was summoned to meet within twenty days: they could only levy money, and petition for the redress of grievances, but could make no new laws, and meddled only with that for which they were brought together. In the former convention Sharp had presided, being named by the earl of Rothes as the king's commissioner. In the winter [16]66, or rather in the spring [16]67, there was another convention called, in which the king by a special letter appointed duke Hamilton to preside. And the king in a letter to lord Rothes ordered him to write to Sharp to stay within his diocese, and to come no more to Edinburgh [1]. He upon this was struck with so deep a melancholy, that he shewed as great an abjectness under this slight disgrace, as he had shewed insolence before when he had more favour. The convention continued the assessment for another year at six thousand pounds a month. Sharp, finding himself under a cloud, studied to make himself popular, by looking after the education of the marquis of Huntly, now the duke of Gordon. He had an order long before from the king to look to his education, that he might be bred a protestant; for the strength of popery within that kingdom lay in his family; but, though this was ordered during the earl of Middleton's ministry, Sharp had not looked after it [2]. The earl of Rothes's mistress was a papist, and nearly related to the marquis of Huntly. So Sharp, either to make his court the better, or at the lord Rothes's desire, had

Jan. 9, $166\frac{8}{7}$.

[1] This, his first public and official rebuff, was a severe blow to Sharp, who had hoped for the place. The Convention met on Jan. 9, 1667. Sharp, as Rothes tells Lauderdale, was 'strangely cast down, yeay, lower than the dust.' *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 269, 270. On Jan. 16, through his brother William, he tried to make his peace; but it was not until a year had passed that he was accepted after the most grovelling submission. The whole matter, one of the most amusing episodes of the time, and a most vivid illustration of Sharp's knavery, is detailed in the *Scottish Review* for July, 1884, 15–24. See *supra* 380, note. Hamilton was at this time very active in suppressing discontent. Alexander Burnet to Sheldon, Oct. 24, 1667.

[2] See Alexander Burnet to Sheldon, Sept. 4, 1665. *Sheldon MSS.*

neglected it these four years: but now he called for him. CHAP. X.
He was then about fifteen, well hardened in his prejudices by the loss of so much time. What pains was taken on him I know not; but after a trial of some months Sharp said, he saw he was not to be wrought on, and so sent him back to his mother. So the interest that popery had in Scotland was believed to be chiefly owing to Sharp's compliance with the earl of Rothes's amours. The neglect of his duty in so important a matter was much blamed: but 240
the not doing it upon such a motive was reckoned yet more infamous. After the convention was over, lord Rothes sent up Drummond to represent to the king the ill affection Jan. 12, 166⅝.
of the western parts[1]; and, to touch the king in a sensible point, he said the covenant stuck so deep in their hearts, that no good could be done till that was rooted out. So he proposed as an expedient, that the king would give the council a power to require all whom they suspected to renounce the covenant, and to proceed against such as refused it as traitors. Drummond had yet too much of the air of Russia about him, though not with Dalyel's fierceness[2]: he had a great measure of knowledge and learning, and some true impressions of religion: but he was ambitious and covetous, and he thought, that upon such a power granted, there would be great dealing in bribes and confiscations. A slight accident happened, which raised a jest that spoiled his errand. The king flung the cover of the letter into the fire, which was carried up all in a flame, and set the chimney on fire: upon which it was said that the Scottish letter had fired Whitehall: but it was answered, the cover had almost set Whitehall on fire, but the contents of it would certainly set Scotland all in a flame. It was said that the law for renouncing the covenant inferring only a forfeiture of employments to those who refused it, the stretching it so far as was now proposed would be liable to great exception. Yet in

[1] Alexander Burnet went with Drummond, who started before the Convention was over. *Lauderdale Papers*, i. 271. Rothes was now engaged in obtaining Sharp's humiliation.

[2] Cf. *supra* 383, note.

CHAP. X. compliance with a public message, the instruction was sent down, as it was desired: but by a private letter lord Rothes was ordered to make no use of it, except upon a special command; since the king had only given way to what was desired, to strike terror in the ill affected. The secret of it broke out: so it had no effect, but to make the lord Rothes and his party more odious. Burnet, upon Sharp's disgrace, grew to be more considered; so he was sent up with a proposition of a very extraordinary nature, that the western counties should be cantoned under a special government, and peculiar taxes, together with the quartering of soldiers. It was said that those counties put the nation to the charge of keeping up such a force, and therefore it seemed reasonable that the charge should lie wholly on them. He also proposed that a special council should be appointed to sit at Glasgow: and, among other reasons to enforce that motion, he said to the king, and afterwards to lord Lauderdale, that some at the council board were
MS. 121. ill affected to the church, who favoured her enemies, | and that traitors had been pleaded for at that board. Lord Lauderdale writ this down presently to know what ground there was for it; since, if it was not true, he had Burnet at
241 mercy for leasing-making, which was more criminal when the whole council was concerned in the lie that was made. The only ground for this was, that one of the rebels, excepted in the indemnity that was proclaimed some time before, being taken, and it being evident that his brain was turned, it was debated in council whether he should be proceeded against or not: some argued against that, and said it would be a reproach to the government to hang a madman. This could in no sort justify such a charge: so lord Lauderdale resolved to make use of it in due time. The proposition itself was rejected, as that which the king could not do by law. Burnet upon this went to the lord Clarendon, and laid before him the sad estate of their affairs in Scotland. He spoke to the king of it: and he set the English bishops on the king, with whom Burnet

had more credit, as more entirely theirs, than ever Sharp had. The earl of Clarendon's credit was then declining: and it was a clear sign of it when the king told lord Lauderdale all that he had said to him on Scottish affairs; which provoked him extremely. Burnet was sent down with good words: for the king was resolved to put the affairs of Scotland under another management. Lord Kincardine came down in April, and told me that Lord Rothes was to be stript of all his places, and to be only lord chancellor. The earl of Tweeddale and sir Robert Moray were to have the secret in their hands[1]. He told me the peace was as good as made: and when that was done, the army would be disbanded, and things would be managed with more temper both in church and state. This was then so great a secret, that neither the lord Rothes nor the two archbishops had the least hint of it. Some time after this, lord Rothes went to visit his mistress, who was obliged to live in the north; upon which an accident happened that hastened his fall. The Scots had during the war set out many privateers, and these had brought in very rich prizes. The Dutch, being provoked with this, sent Van Ghendt with a good fleet into the Frith, to burn the coast, and to recover such ships as were in port. He came into the Frith on the first of May. If he had at first hung out English colours, and attacked Leith harbour immediately, which was then full of ships, he might have done what mischief he pleased: for all were secure, and were looking for sir Jeremy Smith with some frigates for the defence of the coast, since the king set out no fleet this year[2]. There

CHAP. X. 1667.

[1] All this is fully illustrated by the *Lauderdale Papers*. See *supra* 374, 434, notes.

[2] 'He is a gallant fellow, and we must allow him to bragg.' Nathaniel Hobart to Sir R. Verney, Nov. 16, 1665, *Verney MSS.* Other letters, however, cast a slur on his courage, and Sir R. Holmes publicly accused him of cowardice, on Oct. 25, 1666, and in March, 166⅞. The Committee of Miscarriages, however, let the matter drop, 'most men, almost all, being satisfyed . . . that the charge against him proceeded rather from animosity than any good ground.' Marvell, ii. 240, 244. He died in November, 1675. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 14, 15, 40, 222, 231, 236.

CHAP. X. had been such a dissipation of treasure, that, for all the money that was given, there was not enough left to set out a fleet[1]. But the court covered this by saying the peace was as good as ended at Breda, where the lord Holles and
242 sir William Coventry[2] were treating it as plenipotentiaries: and, though no cessation was agreed on, yet they reckoned on it as sure. Upon this a saying of the earl of Northumberland's was much repeated: when it was said that the king's mistress was like to ruin the nation, he said it was she that saved the nation; while we had a house of commons that gave all the money that was asked, it was better to have the money squandered away in luxury and prodigality, than to have it saved for worse purposes. Van Ghendt did nothing in the Frith: for some hours he shot against Bruntisland, without doing any mischief. The country people run down to the coast, and made a great show. But this was only a feint, to divert the king from that which was chiefly intended: for he sailed out and joined De Ruyter[3]: and so the fatal[a] attack was made upon the river of Medway: the chain at the mouth of it, which was then all its security, was broke: and the Dutch fleet sailed up to Chatham: of which I will say no more in this place, but go on with the affairs of Scotland.

Lord Rothes his being out of the way when the country

[a] substituted for *shameful*.

[1] A supply of £1,800,000 was given at the end of September, in addition to the two former grants of two and a half and one and a quarter millions respectively. See *supra* 400, note 2.

[2] This should be Henry Coventry, younger brother of William. He was afterwards Secretary of State. Cf. *infra* 548, and Pepys, November 16, 1667. Upon this mission of Coventry and Holles, see Marvell, *Last Instructions*, 368, 461:—

'While chain'd together, two embassadors
Like slaves shall beg for peace at Holland's doors: . . .
But Harry's order'd, if they won't recall . . .
Their fleet, to threaten—we'll give them all.' . . .

Pepys, Feb. 14, 166$\frac{6}{7}$, mentions the popular opinion that it was 'a mean thing.'

[3] Van Ghendt had the command of the squadron which sailed up the Medway.

was in such danger was severely aggravated by the lord Lauderdale, and did bring on the change somewhat the sooner. In June Moray came down with a letter from the king, superseding lord Rothes's commission, putting the treasury in commission, and making lord Rothes lord chancellor. He excused himself from being raised to that post all he could, and so desired to continue lord treasurer: but he struggled in vain, and was forced to submit at last [1]. Now all was turned to a more sober and more moderate management. Even Sharp grew meek and humble: and said to my self, it was a great happiness to have to deal with sober and serious men, for lord Rothes and his crew were perpetually drunk. When the peace of Breda was concluded, the king wrote to the Scottish council, and communicated that to them; and with that signified it was his pleasure that the army should be disbanded. The earl of Rothes, Burnet, and all the officers, opposed this much. The rebellious disposition of the western counties was much aggravated: it seemed necessary to govern them by a military power. Several expedients were proposed on the other hand. Instead of renouncing the covenant, in which they pretended there were many points of religion concerned, a bond was proposed for keeping the peace, and against rising in arms [2]. This seemed the better test; since it secured the public quiet and the peace of the country, which was at present the most necessary: the religious part was to be left to time and good management. So an 243
indemnity of a more comprehensive nature was proclaimed:

CHAP. X.

[1] See Robert Moray's amusing account of this. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 3. Rothes was not called upon to resign the Commissionership until Sept. 24. The appointment to the Chancellorship was polite dismissal from power. Cf. *supra* 375.

[2] This was Robert Moray's suggestion. In a subsequent private letter he says: 'The bonds . . . have been signed very cheerfully and unanimously, and the forces . . . are marched to their several garrisons, so that all is in great quiet every where, blest be God.' *Portland MSS.* iii., *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 305. See the Council's proposals, Sept. 13, in the *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 52, and the meeting of the bishops, with very different views, Sept. 23, *id.* 60.

CHAP. X. and the bond was all the security that was demanded. Many came into the bond: though there were some among them that pretended scruples, for it was said, *peace* was a word of a large extent: it might be pretended that obeying all the laws was implied in it. Yet the far greater number submitted to this. Those who were disturbed with scruples were a few melancholy inconsiderable persons.

In order to the disbanding the army with the more
MS. 122. security, it was proposed that a county militia | should be raised, and trained for securing the public peace. The archbishops did not like this: they said, the commons, of whom the militia must be composed, being generally ill affected to the church, this would be a prejudice rather than a security[1]. But to content them, it was concluded that in counties that were ill affected there should be no foot raised, and only some troops of horse. Burnet complained openly, that he saw episcopacy was to be pulled down, and that in such an extremity he could not look on and be silent. He writ upon these matters a long and sorrowful letter to Sheldon, who upon that wrote a very long one to Sir R. Moray, which I read, and found more temper and moderation in it than I could have expected from him. Moray had got so far into his confidence, and he seemed to depend so entirely on his sincerity, that no informations against him could work upon Sheldon[2]. Upon Burnet's carrying things so high, Sharp was better used, and was brought again to the council board, where he began to talk of moderation: and in the debate concerning the disbanding the army, he said it was better to expose the bishops to whatsoever might happen, than to

[1] Tweeddale reported that Sharp and the bishops were willing, but not Burnet.

[2] Whether Moray returned the confidence of Sheldon may be doubted; for there is extant among the *Sheldon MSS.* (Bodl.) a long glozing letter from Sir Robert to the archbishop, in which, although he begins with owning his obligation 'to give his grace the scene in which he is engaged,' yet he so contrives, as to inform him of nothing. It is dated Oct. 17 in this year. R.

have the kingdom governed for their sakes by a military power. Yet in private he studied to possess all people with prejudices against the persons then employed, as the enemies of the church[1]. At that time lord Lauderdale got the king to write to the privy council, letting them know that he had been informed traitors had been pleaded for at that board. This was levelled at Burnet. The council, in their answer, as they denied the imputation, so they desired to know who it was that had so aspersed them. Burnet, when the letter was offered to him to be signed by him, said he could not say traitors had never been pleaded for at that board, since he himself had once pleaded for one, and put them in mind of the particular case. After this, he saw how much he had exposed himself, and grew tamer. The army was disbanded: so lord Rothes's authority as general, as well as his commission, was now at an end, after it had lasted three years. The pretence of his commission was the preparing matters for a national synod: yet in all that time there was not one 244
step made towards one: for the bishops seemed concerned only for their authority and their revenues, and took no care of regulating either worship or discipline. The earls of Rothes and Tweeddale went to court. The former tried what he could do by the duke of Monmouth's means, who had married his niece[2]: but he was then young, and was engaged in a mad ramble after pleasure, and minded no business. So he saw the necessity of applying himself to lord Lauderdale: and he did dissemble his discontent so dexterously, that he seemed well pleased to be freed from the load of business that lay so heavy upon him. He moved to have his accounts of the treasury passed, to

CHAP. X.

[1] Still, in a confidential letter to Archbishop Sheldon, dated Nov. 2 in this year, Sharp speaks in the following manner of Sir Robert Moray: 'I am converted to the persuasion, that if I be not deceived, he is as right for episcopal government in the church, and as dissatisfied with the way of our opposers, as any person intrusted by the king for his service in Scotland.' R. Sharp was at this time, it must be remembered, the humble servant of Lauderdale.

[2] Anne Scott. See *supra* 373.

CHAP. X.

which great exceptions might have been made; and to have an approbation passed under the great seal of all he had done while he was the king's commissioner. Lord Tweeddale was against both and moved that he should be for some time kept under the lash: he knew that, how humble soever he was at that time, he would be no sooner secured from being called to an account for what was passed, than he would set up a cabal in opposition to every thing; whereas they were sure of his good behaviour, as long as he continued so obnoxious. The king loved lord Rothes: so the earl of Lauderdale consented to all he asked. But they quickly saw good cause to repent of their forwardness.

At this time a great change happened in the course of the earl of Lauderdale's life, which made the latter part of it very different from what the former had been. Mr. Murray[1] of the bedchamber had been page and whipping-boy to king Charles I, and had great credit with him, not only in procuring private favours but in all his counsels. He was well turned for a court, very insinuating, but very false; and of so revengeful a temper that rather than any of the counsels given by his enemies should succeed, he would have revealed and betrayed both the king and them. It was generally believed that he discovered the most important of all his secrets to his enemies[2]. He had one particular quality, that when he

[1] William Murray, son of the Rev. William Murray, minister of Dysart, Co. Fife, and nephew of Thomas Murray, tutor to Charles I. He was created Lord Huntingtower and Earl of Dysart, with succession to his heirs, male or female, Aug. 3, 1643. His family was descended from the Murrays of Ochtertyre, a branch of the Tullibardine line. He married Catherine Bruce, of the house of Clackmannan, leaving two daughters, Elizabeth and Margaret.

[2] That he was an agent of the Scottish Covenanters to persuade King Charles I to comply with their demands in the year 1646, appears from Baillie's *Letters*, ii. 225. Particular instances of his treachery may be seen in Bishop Guthrie's *Memoirs*, 101. But the nefarious contrivance by which he deprived his royal master of the town of Hull, and Sir John Hotham, the governor, eventually of his life, is mentioned in Carte's *Hist. of England*, iv. 428. [Clarendon, iv. 154, states that 'it was generally

was drunk, which was very often, he was upon a most exact reserve, though he was pretty open at all other times. He got a warrant to be an earl, which was signed at Newcastle, yet he got the king to antedate it, as if it had been signed at Oxford, to get the precedence of some whom he hated: but he did not pass it under the great seal during the king's life, but did it after his death, though his warrant not being passed, it died with the king. His eldest daughter, to whom his honour, such as it was, descended, married sir Lionel Tollemasche of Suffolk [1], a man of a noble family. After her father's death, she took 245 the title of countess of Dysart. She was a woman of great beauty, but of far greater parts. She had a wonderful quickness of apprehension, and an amazing vivacity in conversation. She had studied not only divinity and history, but mathematics and philosophy. She was violent in every thing she set about, a violent friend, but a much more violent enemy. She had a restless ambition, lived at a vast expense, and was ravenously covetous; and would have stuck at nothing by which she might compass her ends [2]. She had blemishes of another kind, which she

believed that the king's purpose of going to the House (for the five members) was communicated with William Murray of the bed-chamber, with whom the Lord Digby had great friendship, and that it was betrayed by him.' See *Id.* iv. 20, 222; v. 91, note.] It was the fate of the house of Stuart to be served by unfaithful attendants on their persons. Thus, in the year 1596, James I was in the greatest personal danger from an insurrection at Edinburgh, which originated in the infidelity of his servants. Being disgusted at some new regulations in the royal household, they informed the people, that the king their master was about to turn Papist. See a tract entitled *Presbytery Displayed*, 47-49; and compare Archbishop Spottiswood's *Hist. of the Church of Scotland* under the year 1596. Thus too his son, of whom we first spoke, was accustomed to have his letters copied, whilst he was asleep, and sent to his enemies by his unfaithful servants, of whom this Murray was one. See Evelyn's *Memoirs*, i. 253. R. Compare *supra* 106.

[1] Sir Lionel Tollemasche of Helmingham Hall, Suffolk, who married Elizabeth Murray, as she then was, and who had by her three sons and two daughters, traced his pedigree to Saxon times. He died in 1668. Burke's *Peerage*. See 'Dialogue between Lauderdale and Sir Lionel Talmarsh' in Maidment's *Scottish Pasquils*, 248.

[2] The confirmation of her title is dated Dec. 5, 1670. She married

CHAP. X. seemed to despise, and to take little care of the decencies of her sex. She had been early in a correspondence with lord Lauderdale, that had given occasion to censure. When he was a prisoner after Worcester fight, she made him believe he was in great danger of his life, and that she saved it by her intrigues with Cromwell: which was not a little taken notice of. Cromwell was certainly fond of her, and she took care to entertain him in it, till he, finding what was said upon it, broke it off[1]. Upon the king's restoration, she thought that lord Lauderdale made not those returns that she expected; so they lived for some years at a distance. But upon her husband's death she made up all quarrels: so that lord Lauderdale and
MS. 123. she | lived so much together, that his lady was offended at it, and went to Paris, where she died about three years after[2]. The lady Dysart came to have so absolute a power over the lord Lauderdale, that it lessened him much in the esteem of all the world; for he delivered himself up to all her humours and passions. All applications were made to her: she took upon her to determine every thing. She sold all places, and was wanting in no methods that could bring her money, which she lavished out in a most profuse vanity. As the conceit took her, she made him fall out with all his friends, one after another: with the earls of Argyll, Tweeddale, and Kincardine, with duke Hamilton, the marquis of Athol, and sir Robert Moray, who all had their turns in her displeasure, which very quickly drew lord Lauderdale's after it. If after such names it is not a presumption to name my self, I had my share likewise. So that from this time to the end of his days he became quite another sort of man than he had

Lauderdale, Feb. 17, 167½, *infra* 550; and died without further issue on Aug. 24, 1697. Burke's *Peerage*. Burnet's account of her, compared with other evidence, is not overdrawn. For the laudatory verses to her, ascribed to him, see *infra* 601, note.

[1] Reresby says the same in his *Memoirs* (Cartwright), 116.

[2] Lauderdale's first wife was Anne Hume, daughter of Alexander, first Earl of Hume. Almost her last letter to her husband is dated from Paris, Sept. 22, 1670 (?). *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 203.

been in all the former parts of his life. Sir Robert Moray had been designed by her father to be her husband, and was long her true friend. She knew his integrity was proof to all attempts. He had been hitherto the lord Lauderdale's chief friend and main support. He had great esteem paid him, both by the king and by the whole court: and he employed it all for the earl of Lauderdale's service. He used great freedom with him at proper times; and was a faithful adviser, and reprover as much as the other could bear it. Lady Dysart laid hold on his absence 246
in Scotland to make a breach between them. She made lord Lauderdale believe that Moray assumed the praise of all that was done to himself, and was not ill pleased to pass as his governor. Lord Lauderdale's pride was soon fired with those ill impressions[1].

The government of Scotland had now another face. All payments were regularly made: there was an overplus of 10,000*l.* of the revenue saved every year: a magazine of arms was bought with it: and there were several projects set on foot for the encouragement of trade and manufactures. Lord Tweeddale and sir Robert Moray were so entirely united, that, as they never disagreed, so all plied before them. Lord Tweeddale was made a privy councillor in England: and his son having married the earl of Lauderdale's only child[2], they seemed to be inseparably united. When he came down from London, he brought a letter from the king to the council, recommending the concerns of the church to their care: in particular, he charged them to suppress conventicles, which began to spread generally through the western counties: for upon the disbanding the army, the country, being delivered from that terror, did now forsake their churches, and got their old ministers to come among them; and they were not

[1] The final breach with Moray did not occur until between August, 1670 and January, 1671. See *infra* 442. There is a dignified letter of partial and formal reconciliation from Moray of Jan. 19, 1671, in the *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 211.

[2] Lord Yester married Anne Maitland in 1666.

CHAP. X. wanting in holding conventicles from place to place. The king wrote also by him a letter to Sharp with his own pen, in which he assured him of his zeal for the church, and of his favour to himself[1]. Lord Tweeddale hoped this would have gained him to his side: but he was deceived in it, for Sharp quickly returned to his former insolence. Upon the earl of Tweeddale's return, there was a great application to public business: no vice was in reputation: justice was impartially administered: and a commission was sent to the western counties to examine into all the complaints of unjust and illegal oppressions by Turner[2], Dalyel[3], and others. Turner's warrants for his proceedings had been seized with himself; and though upon the defeat given the whigs he was left by them, so that, beyond all men's expectations, he escaped out of their hands, yet he had nothing to justify himself by. The truth is, this inquiry was chiefly levelled at lord Rothes and Burnet, to cast the odium of the late rebellion on their injustice and ill conduct. And it was intended that Turner should accuse them: but he had no vouchers to shew. These were believed to be withdrawn by an artifice of the lord Rothes. But, before the matter was quite ended, those in whose hands his papers were left, sent them sealed up to his lodgings; yet he was by that time broken: so, since the government had used him hardly, he, who was a man of spirit, would not shew his

[1] See *supra* 380 for Sharp's reception of the letter. Sharp made many attempts, but they were short-lived and abortive, to assert himself. It was the peculiar pleasure of Lauderdale, Tweeddale, Kincardine, and Robert Moray, to keep him in his place. *Scottish Review*, July, 1884, 24.

[2] See *supra* 378, 418. Turner was merely obliged to surrender his commissions. Wodrow, ii. 101; *Lauderdale Papers*, 23,128, ff. 314, 321–324; 23,129, f. 17. He admitted exactions to the amount of £30,000 Scots; but in 'Napthali' was charged with £17,000 sterling.

[3] Archbishop Burnet, in a letter to Sheldon dated Aug. 9, 1667, says of General Dalyel, that however they may represent him to his grace, or the king, he is the only person he ever saw fit to curb the insolencies of that surly party; and that if his counsel had been followed, he himself is confident, that the kingdom had by this time been in a very happy and quiet condition. R. See this counsel, *supra* 425, note.

vouchers nor expose his friends. So that matter was carried no further. And the people of the country cried out against those censures. It was said that when by such violent proceedings men had been inflamed to a rebellion, upon which so much blood was shed, all the reparation given was that an officer or two were broken; and a great man was taken down a little upon it, without making any public examples for the deterring others. Sir Robert Moray went through the west of Scotland; but when he came back, he told me the clergy were such a set of men, so ignorant and so scandalous, that it was not possible to support them, unless the greatest part of them could be turned out, and better men found to put in their places. But it was not easy to know how this could be done. Burnet had placed them all: and he thought himself in some sort bound to protect them. The clergy were so linked together, that none of them could be got to concur in getting proofs of crimes brought against their brethren. And the people of the country pretended scruples. They said, to accuse a minister before a bishop was an acknowledging his jurisdiction over his clergy, or, to use a hard word much in use among them, it was a homologating his power. So Moray proposed that a court should be constituted, by a special commission from the king, made up of some of the laity as well as the clergy, to try the truth of these scandalous reports that went upon the clergy: and he writ about it to Sheldon, who approved of it[1]. Sharp also seemed well pleased with it, though he abhorred it in his heart: for he thought it struck at the root of their authority, and was Erastianism in the highest degree. Burnet said it was a turning him out of his bishopric, and the declaring him either incapable of judging his clergy, or unworthy of that trust. His clergy cried out upon it, and said | it was a delivering them up to the rage of their enemies, who hated them only for the sake of their functions and for their obedience to the laws; and that

CHAP. X. 247

MS. 124.

[1] See Argyll's letter of Dec. 12, 1667 (Bannatyne Club).

CHAP. X. if irregular methods were taken to encourage them, they would get any thing, true or false, to be sworn against them. The difficulties that arose upon this put a stop to it. And the earl of Lauderdale's aversion to sir Robert Moray began a disjointing of all the councils of Scotland. Lord Tweeddale had the chief confidence, and next him lord Kincardine was most trusted. The presbyterians, seeing a softening in the execution of the law, and observing that the archbishops were jealous of lord Tweeddale, fancied he was theirs in his heart: upon that they grew very insolent. The clergy was in many places ill used by them[1]. They despaired of any farther protection from the government. They saw designs were forming to turn
248 them out: and, hearing that they might be better provided for in Ireland, they were in many places bought out, and prevailed on to desert their cures[2]. The people of the country hoped that upon their leaving them they might have their old ministers again, and upon that were willing enough to enter into those bargains with them: and so in a very little time there were many vacancies made all over those counties. The lord Tweeddale took

[1] Salmon, in his *Examination*, vol. i. 586, produces a passage from the bishop's *Four Conferences*, published in 1673, in which, after particularizing the cruel usage the conforming clergy met with from these people, the author says, 'Believe me, these barbarous outrages have been such, that worse could not have been apprehended from heathens. . . . From these things I may well assume, that the persecution lies mainly on the conformists' side, who, for their obedience to the laws, lie thus open to the fury of their enemies;' 290. His namesake, Archbishop Burnet, in a letter without date to the Archbishop of Canterbury, informs him, that the clamours against the soldiers are great, 'but I am afraid,' he proceeds to say, 'greater upon design; and I am sure, if those who command the militia vindicate not themselves to his majesty's satisfaction, I shall not plead for them. Our ministers who are loyal, and own the present government, will be forced, for what I see, to desert their stations; several of them have been robbed, and sore beaten, and some wounded. The counsel is now considering what will be the best and most effectual remedy against the anger and fury of those merciless rebels, who, in the army's absence from the west, range up and down the country in small parties.' R.

[2] So Ireland was well provided. S.

great pains to engage Leighton into the same counsels with him. He had magnified him highly to the king, as the much greatest man of the Scottish clergy; and the lord Tweeddale's chief aim with relation to church matters was to set him at the head of them: for he often said to me, that more than two parts in three of the whole business of the government related to the church. So he studied to bring in a set of episcopal men of another stamp, and to set Leighton at their head. He studied to draw in Mr. Charteris, but he had such sad thoughts of mankind, and such humble ones of himself, that he thought little good could be done, and that, as to that little, he was not a proper instrument. Leighton was prevailed on to go to London, where, as he told me, he had two full audiences of the king. He laid before him the madness of the former administration of church affairs, and the necessity of turning to more moderate counsels: in particular, he proposed a comprehension of the presbyterian party, by altering the terms of the laws a little, and by such abatements as might preserve the whole for the future, by granting somewhat for the present[1]. But he entered into no expedients: only he studied to fix the king in the design that the course of his affairs led him to, though contrary to his own inclinations, both in England and Scotland[2]. In order to the opening this, I must change the scene.

[1] See Alexander Burnet to Sheldon, Aug. 9, 1667. 'It is thought some of our great persons designe Dumblane for his successour [in the bishopric of Edinburgh]; and if they have the confidence to offer al this they will give us just reason to suspect that it is not without their privity and consent that our ejected and dissatisfied ministers pleade everywhere that they are not against Bishops, but allow *episcopos presides* . . . and this in their wisdome they propose as an expedient to reconcile the presbyterian and episcopal church.' *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. App. A, Letter xxxii. On Charteris, see *supra* 385.

[2] Burnet intimates that Charles was opposed to toleration. But he was always trying for indulgence whenever parliament was not sitting and it was safe to do so.

CHAPTER XI.

THE FALL OF CLARENDON.

THE Dutch war had turned so fatally on the king, that it made it necessary for him to try how to recover the affections and esteem of his people. He found a slackening the execution of the law went a great way in the city of London, and with the trading part of the nation. The house of commons continued still in their fierceness, and aversion to all moderate propositions; but in the intervals of parliament the execution was softened. The earl of Clarendon found his credit was declining, that all the secrets of state were trusted to Bennet, and that he had no other share in them than his post required[1]. The lady Castlemaine set herself most violently against him[2]; and the duke of Buckingham[3], as oft as he was admitted to

[1] The former attempts to dislodge Clarendon had failed, for reasons probably well summed up by Charles Lyttleton in 1664: 'Yet undoubtedly he still retaines the primier ministre's place, and has the greatest manage of affaires in his hands; and I cannot tell well how it should be otherwise, for they that seeme to rival him in it are, in my opinion, too much the companions of [the king's] pleasure to be at leisure to drudge in ye matters of State.' *Hatton Corr.* (Camd. Soc.), i. 35. See also Pepys, as early as July 27, 1661; and *id.* Dec. 15, 1664.

[2] Clarendon had refused to pass Lady Castlemaine's patents of nobility, which had consequently to be passed under the Irish seal, had forbidden his wife to visit her, and had consistently refused her the official and social recognition which she desired. Cf. *supra* 309. 'This business of my Lord Chancellor's was certainly designed in my Lady Castlemaine's chamber; when he went from the king on Monday morning she was in bed (though about twelve o'clock) and ran out in her smock into her aviary; and thither her woman brought her her nightgown; and stood blessing herself at the old man's going away.' Pepys, Aug. 27, 1667, speaking from hearsay, and Sept. 8.

[3] In February, 166$\frac{6}{7}$, however, Buckingham was in disgrace, with the loss of all his employments, owing to offence given by too great leniency to Nonconformists in his capacity of Lord-Lieutenant of the West Riding (*Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 532, 552, 560), and a proclamation was out for his arrest. Reresby, 71. But his restoration to favour followed almost immediately. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1667, 246. Marvell, in *Last Instructions*, 356, makes the cause of his disgrace more personal to Clarendon.

any familiarities with the king, studied with all his wit and humour to make lord Clarendon and all his counsels appear ridiculous[1], and lively jests were at all times apt 249
to take with the king. The earl of Clarendon fell under two other misfortunes before the war broke out. The king had granted him a large piece of ground near St. James's to build a house on. He intended a good ordinary house, but, not understanding those matters himself, he put the managing of that into the hands of others, who run him into a vast charge of about 50,000*l.*, three times as much as he had designed to lay out upon it[2]. During the war, and in the plague year, he had about three hundred men at work, which he thought would have been an acceptable thing, when so many men were kept at work, and so much money, as was duly paid, did circulate about. But it had a contrary effect: it raised a great outcry against him[3].

[1] Pepys was informed, on good authority, 'that the duke of Buckingham did by his friends treat with my lord chancellor by the mediation of Matt. Wren and Clifford, to fall in with my lord chancellor, which he (Gibson) tells me, he did advise my lord chancellor to accept of, as that, that with his own interest and the duke of York's, would undoubtedly have secured all to him and his family; but that my lord chancellor was a man not to be advised, thinking himself too high to be counselled; and so all is come to nothing; for by that means the duke of Buckingham became desperate, and was forced to fall in with Arlington to his ruin.' R.

[2] His son, the Earl of Rochester, told me, when he left England, he ordered him to tell all his friends, that if they could excuse the vanity and folly of the great house, he would undertake to answer for all the rest of his actions himself. D. See Clarendon, *Cont.* ii. 587, and *infra* 258.

[3] 'Some rude people . . . have cut down the trees before the house, and broke his windows; and a gibbet either set up before or painted upon his gate, and these three words writ, "Three sights to be seen, Dunkirk, Tangier, and a barren queene."' Pepys, June 14, 1667. Upon the last charge here implied, see *id.* Feb. 22, 166$\frac{7}{8}$. Clarendon House was in St. James's Street. It was sold to the young Duke of Albemarle for £25,000, and pulled down to make room for new buildings in 1683. Evelyn, June 19, Sept. 18, 1683; Clarendon, *Cont.* 1358; Marvell, i. 384. See also 'News from Dunkirk House,' *Somers Tracts*, viii. Marvell in *Last Instructions*, 355, says of Clarendon:

'See how he reigns in his new palace culminant,
And sits in state divine like Jove the fulminant;'

and *Poems on State Affairs*, i. 253. See also Marvell's poem, 'Clarendon's House Warming.' Evelyn, in

CHAP. XI. Some called it Dunkirk house, intimating that it was out of his share of the price of Dunkirk. Others called it Holland house, because he was believed to be no friend to the war: so it was given out that he had the money from the Dutch. It was visible that in a time of public calamity he was building a very noble palace. Another accident was, that before the war there were some designs on foot for the repairing of St. Paul's, and many stones were brought thither. That project was laid aside during the war. He upon that bought the stones, and made use of them in building his own house. This, how slight soever it may seem to be, yet had a great effect by the management of his enemies. His other misfortune was, that he lost his chief friend, to whom he trusted most, and who was his greatest support, the earl of Southampton. The pain of the stone grew upon him to such a degree, that he had resolved to be cut: but a woman came to him who pretended she had an infallible secret for dissolving the stone, and brought such vouchers to him that he put himself into her hands. The medicine had a great operation, though it ended fatally: for he passed great quantities of gravel, that looked like the coats of a stone sliced off. This encouraged him to go on, till his pains increased so that no man was ever seen die in such torment; which made him oft tremble all over, so that the bed shook with it; yet he bore it with an astonishing patience. He not only kept himself from saying any indecent thing, but endured all that misery with the firmness of a great man and the submission of a good Christian. The cause of all appeared when he was opened after his death: for the medicine had stripped the stone of its outward slimy coats, which made
MS. 125. it lie soft and easy | upon the muscles of the bladder; whereas when these were dissolved, the inner and harder parts of the stone, that were all ragged by the dissolution

a letter to Lord Cornbury, Jan. 20, 1665, speaks of Clarendon House as 'without hyperbole, the best contrived, the most useful, graceful, and magnificent house in England; I except not Audley End.'

that was begun, as the stone fell down, lay upon the neck of the bladder, which raised those violent pains of which he died. The court was now delivered of a great man, whom they did not much love, and who they knew did not love them. The treasury was put in commission: and the earl of Clarendon had no interest there. He saw the war, though managed by other counsels, yet was like to end in his ruin: for all errors were cast on him. The business of Chatham was a terrible blow: and though the loss was great, the infamy was greater. The parliament had given above five millions towards the war: but, through the luxury and waste of the court, this money was so squandered away, that the king could neither set out a fleet nor defend his coast[1]. Upon the news of the Dutch fleet's being in the river, the king did not ride down himself, nor appear at the head of his people, who were then in such imminent danger. He only sent the duke of Albemarle

CHAP. XI. 250

June 9–13, 1667.

[1] On the ground that peace was practically certain, the greater number of first and second rates had, against the advice of James (Clarke, *Life of James II*, i. 425), been laid up, to save expense. Marvell, *Last Instructions*, 317–324. Evelyn states, July 29, 1667, that William Coventry, then one of the Treasury Commissioners, was responsible for this fatal step; and Pepys, April 1, 1667, notes Coventry's assertion of the impossibility of setting out a fleet. On April 4, Pepys 'made Sir G. Carteret merry with telling him how many land admirals we are to have this year; Allen at Plymouth, Holmes at Portsmouth, Spragge for Medway, Tiddiman at Dover, Smith to the northward, and Harman to the southward.' The helplessness of the country was fully realized: 'the enemy can come and cut our throats when he likes.' Sir R. Burgoyne to Sir R. Verney, *Verney MSS.*, June 17, 1667; and the prevalent fear of a French invasion is depicted in the *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. iv. 79. An attack upon Dartmouth in July was beaten off. The City ordered the enlistment of all men between 16 and 60; and it is stated that the Quakers themselves sent the king an offer of 6,000 men. *H. M. C. Rep.* xii. App. vii. June 18, 1667. How the money went which was thus saved may be gathered from one instance; see the note by Brouncker that the privy seal for payment of £9,750 for a great pair of diamond pendants, and £1,200 for a pair of pearl pendants, must be payable into the privy purse. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1668–9, 136. Upon the Chatham disgrace, the subsequent panic, and the numerous naval engagements which followed, see *id.* 1667, Preface xvii–xxxix and *passim*. See also the list of Dutch engravings illustrative of the more important events of the war, *id.* 422.

CHAP. XI.

down, and was intending to retire to Windsor, but that looked so like a flying from danger, that he was prevailed on to stay. And it was given out that he was very cheerful that night at supper with his mistress[1], which drew many libels upon him, that were writ with as much wit as malice, and brought him under a general contempt. He was compared to Nero, who sung while Rome was burning[a]. A day or two after that, he rode through London, accompanied with the most popular men of his court, and assured the citizens he would live and die with his people, upon which there were some acclamations, but the matter went heavily. The city was yet in ashes, and the jealousy of burning it on design had got so among them that the king himself was not free from suspicion[2]. If the Dutch had pursued their advantage in the first consternation, they might have done more mischief, and have come a great way up the Thames, and burnt many merchant ships: but they thought they had done enough, and so they sailed away.

The court was at a stand what to do: for the French assured them the treaty was as good as finished. Whether the French set this on, as that which would both weaken the fleet of England, and alienate the king so entirely from the Dutch that he would be easily engaged into new alliances to revenge this affront, as many believe, I cannot

[a] , *and was made look worse than Sardanapalus.* struck out.

[1] Pepys, June 21, 1667: 'All merry a hunting a poor moth.' The party was at the Duchess of Monmouth's.

[2] The House of Commons resolved, '*That the thanks of that house should be given his majesty for his great care and endeavour to prevent the burning of the city of London.*' Salmon, i. 602. It is observable, that Oates makes use of the known fact of the king's activity in preventing the progress of the fire; for when, according to Burnet's account below, he accused the Papists of an intention to kill the king during the conflagration, he said that they relented upon seeing him so active in quenching it. See f. 427. 'It is not indeed imaginable,' writes Evelyn, Sept. 6, 1666, 'how extraordinary the vigilance and activity of the king and duke was, even labouring in person, and being present to command, order, reward, or encourage workmen, by which he shewed his affection to his people and gained theirs.' R.

pretend to determine. The earl of Essex was at that time in Paris, on his way home from the waters of Bourbon: and he told me the queen-mother of England sent for him, as being one of her son's privy council, and told him the Irish had sent over some to the court of France, desiring money and arms with some officers, and they undertook to put that island into the hands of the French[1]. He told me, he found the queen was in her inclinations and advices true to her son's interest: but he was amused to see, that a woman who in a drawing-room was the liveliest woman of the age, and had a vivacity of imagination that surprised all who came near her, yet after all her practice in affairs, had so little either of judgment or conduct that he did not wonder at the miscarriage of all the late king's counsels, since she had such a share in them. But the French had 251
then greater things in view. The king of Spain was dead. 1665.
And now, after they had managed the war so that they had been at no part of the expense of it, nor brought a ship to the assistance of the Dutch, and that both England and Holland had made great losses both in ships and treasure, they resolved to manage the treaty so, as to oblige the king

CHAP. XI.

[1] During the late war with the Dutch, Boyle, Archbishop of Dublin and Chancellor of Ireland, draws the following picture of the state of affairs in that kingdom: 'The condition of this kingdom is at present very unpleasant. We receive daily rumours of intendment in the Irish to raise another rebellion: I confess I am no farther alarmed at this, than to collect the discontents and dissatisfactions of the people from these reports, for I know they are no way able to do any thing considerable upon that account. That which indeed gives us greater disturbance is, that great robbery and plundering of houses made by them in several places of this kingdom, which they commit in parties of twenty or thirty horse, to the great terror of the people; which affrights them out of the country to shelter themselves in towns; wherein they will not be able to continue long for want of means to support their families and themselves, and they must necessarily return again to England, to the discouragement of all persons in this country; and though my lord lieutenant doth very industriously appear in the prosecution of such villainies, yet the want of money for the army is so great, that he is not able to cause them to march upon any design, lest he should increase their discontents, which for want of pay are grown so high already.' *Sheldon MSS.* R.

CHAP. XI. by giving him a peace, when he was in no condition to carry on the war[1]. I enter not into our negotiation with the bishop of Munster[2], nor his treacherous departing from his engagements, since I know nothing of that matter, but what is in print.

July 3, 1667. As soon as the peace was made, the king saw with what disadvantage he was like to meet his parliament. So he thought the disgracing a public minister, who, by being long in so high a post had drawn upon himself much envy and many enemies, would cover himself and the rest of his court[3]. Other things concurred to set this forward. The king was grown very weary of the queen: and it was

[1] The Peace of Breda, July 3, 1667 thus extorted by De Witt, was viewed with the utmost humiliation in England; Pepys, July 29, 1667; *Lindsey MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv; App. ix. 368. It was the more creditable to the Dutch since their condition at the end of 1665 is thus described by Temple, *Works*, i. 236: 'For the Hollanders, they were certainly never worse at their ease than now, being braved and beaten both at sea and land; flayed with taxes, distracted with factions, and their last resource, which is the protection of France, poisoned with extreme jealousies; yet that must be their game, or else a perfect truckling peace with England.' By this peace England obtained New Amsterdam, translated into New York, the Dutch retaining Surinam. For another important article, afterwards shamefully broken by Charles, see *infra* 551, and Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, ii. 261.

[2] See the description of this picturesque figure in Temple's *Works*, i. 231, and Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 362. Bernard von Galen was the last representative of the warrior prelates of the Middle Ages. His youth had been passed in the army, and his vast wealth enabled him to indulge his military tastes. As Temple says, he was undoubtedly, 'in his naturals rather made for the sword than the cross.' His position on the Dutch frontier gave him at this time special importance, and in June, 1665, Charles formed an alliance with him by which, for a large subsidy, he engaged to maintain 30,000 men and to attack the Dutch within two months. In October he took Zutphen and overran Overyssel.

'Great Charles and Munster will
conjoyne in one
To share his flesh; let Lewis
pick the bone.'

Brit. Mus. Catalogue of Prints and Drawings, Div. i. Satires, i. 1,034. The Dutch diplomacy in the spring of 1666 was however so successful, that under the pressure of the Elector of Brandenburg the bishop was obliged to make peace in April, so that England was then without a single ally. Arlington's *Letters* (1701), ii. 174. Cf. Dryden, *Annus Mirabilis*, stanza 37. In the war of 1672 he at first joined Louis XIV, but made peace after the capture of Bonn by William and Montecuculi in November, 1673; joined the coalition against Louis, and made peace at the Treaty of Nimwegen in 1679.

[3] Pepys says the same, Aug. 26, 1667.

believed, he had a great mind to be rid of her. The load of that marriage was cast on the lord Clarendon, as made on design to raise his own grandchildren. Many members of the house of commons, such as Clifford, Osborne, Carr, Lyttleton, and Seymour, were brought to the king, who all assured him that upon his restoration they intended both to have raised his authority and to have increased his revenue, but that the earl of Clarendon had discouraged it, and that all his creatures had possessed the house with such jealousies of the king, that they thought it was not fit to trust him too much nor too far. This made a deep impression on the king, who was weary of lord Clarendon's imposing way, and had a mind to be freed from the authority, to which he had been so long accustomed, that it was not easy to keep him within bounds[1]. Yet the king was so afraid to engage himself too deep in his own affairs, that it was a doubt whether he would dismiss him or not, if a concern of one of his amours had not sharpened his resentments. What other considerations could not do, was brought about by an ill-grounded jealousy. Mistress Stewart had gained so much on the king, and yet had kept her ground with so much firmness, that the king 252
seemed | to design, if possible, to legitimate his addresses MS. 126.
to her, since he saw no hope of succeeding any other way[2].

[1] See the king's letter to Ormond in Ellis, *Original Letters*, 2nd series, iv. 38: 'The truth is, his behaviour and humour was grown so unsupportable to myself and to all the world else, that I could not longer endure it, and it was impossible for me to live with it, and do those things with the Parliament that must be done, or the Government will be lost.' On Nov. 30, he wrote to his sister, 'The truth is, the ill conduct of my L^d. Clarendon in my affaires has forced me to permitt many inquiryes to be made [referring no doubt to the Bill for inspecting the public accounts in 1666], which otherwise I would not have suffered the Parliament to have done, though I must tell you that in themselves they are but inconvenient appearances rather than real mischives.' Mrs. Ady, *Madame*, 248; Clarendon, *Cont.* ii. 318–322. See also Pepys, Sept. 2, 1667. According to Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 428, 429, James was instructed to tell Clarendon that his dismissal 'was not out of any dissatisfaction he had against him, but that the necessity of his affairs requir'd it.'

[2] The king was once so much provoked as to tell her, he hoped he

CHAP. XI. The duke of Richmond, being a widower, courted her[1]. The king seemed to give way to it; and pretended to take such care of her, that he would have good settlements made for her. He hoped by that means to have broke the matter decently, for he knew the duke of Richmond's affairs were in disorder. So the king ordered lord Clarendon to examine the estate he pretended to settle. But he was told, whether true or false I cannot tell, that lord Clarendon told her that the duke of Richmond's affairs, it is true, were not very clear; but that a family so nearly related to the king could never be left in distress, and that such a match would not come in her way every day; so she had best consider well before she rejected it. This was carried to the king, as a design he had that the crown might descend to his own grandchildren; and that he was afraid lest strange methods should be taken to get rid of the queen, and to make way for her. When the king saw that she had a mind to marry the duke of Richmond, he offered to make her a duchess, and to settle an estate on her. Upon this she said, she then saw that she must either marry him, or suffer much in the opinion of the world. And she was prevailed on by the duke of Richmond, who was passionately in love with her, to go privately from Whitehall, and marry him without giving the king notice. The earl of Clarendon's son, the lord Cornbury, was going to her lodgings upon some assignation that she had given him about her affairs, knowing nothing of her intentions. He met the king in the door, coming out full of fury[2]; and

should live to see her ugly and willing: but after she was married, she had more complaisance, which King Charles could not forbear telling the Duke of Richmond, when he was drunk, at Lord Townshend's in Norfolk, as my uncle told me, who was present. D. .

[1] Charles Stuart, sixth Duke of Lennox and fourth Duke of Richmond, was directly descended from Esmé Stuart, first cousin of Henry Darnley, whose pedigree is given in the note *supra* 5. Upon his marriage, March, 1667, and the scenes which immediately preceded it, see De Grammont.

[2] This is one of the two or three instances in which Charles appears to have lost his customary imperturbability. Cf. *Lauderdale Papers*, iii. 131, 140.

he, suspecting that lord Cornbury was in the design, spake to him as one in a rage, that forgot all decency, and for some time would not hear lord Cornbury speak in his own defence. In the afternoon he heard him with more temper, as he [lord Cornbury] himself told me. Yet this made so deep an impression, that he resolved to take the seals from his father [1]. The king said to lord Lauderdale, that he had talked of the matter with Sheldon, and that he convinced him that it was necessary to remove lord Clarendon from his post. And as soon as it was done, the king sent for Sheldon, and told him what he had done; but he answered nothing. When the king insisted to oblige him to declare himself, he said, *Sir, I wish you would put away this woman that you keep.* The king upon that replied sharply, why had he never talked to him of that sooner, but took this occasion now to speak of it [2]? Lauderdale told me, he had all this from the king: and that the king and Sheldon had gone into such expostulations upon it, that from that day forward Sheldon could never recover the king's confidence [3]. 253

CHAP. XI.

Aug. 30, 1667.

[1] 'As soon as Secretary Morrice brought the Great Seale from my Lord Chancellor [August 30, 1667], Bab May (*infra* 472) fell upon his knees and catched the king about the legs, and joyed him, and said that this was the first time that ever he could call him King of England, being freed from this great man.' Pepys, Nov. 11, 1667.

[2] Salmon, in his *Examination of Burnet's History*, i. 608, remarks, 'that if the archbishop's friendship to the lord Clarendon was one inducement for his grace's using this freedom, as our author would insinuate, this rather advances than depresses Sheldon's character.' The reverential regard which the Earl of Clarendon had for the archbishop, is evidenced by the following passage in a letter addressed by him to Sheldon about this time: 'I beg your grace a thousand pardons for the presumption in intruding in an affair of this nature' (his lordship had objected to the translation of the Bishop of Limerick to an English bishopric), 'which, God knows, nothing could have led me into but my faithful and filial duty to the church, whose peace and lustre I pray for as much as I do for myself. Forgive me, and give me your benediction.' *Sheldon MSS.* R.

[3] Sheldon had refused the sacrament to the king for living in adultery. S. The king had asked Sheldon, if the Church of England would allow of a divorce, where both parties were consenting, and one of them lay under a natural incapacity of having children; which he took time to consider of, under a strict com-

CHAP. XI. The seals were given to sir Orlando Bridgeman [1], lord chief justice of the common pleas, then in great esteem, which he did not maintain long after his advancement. His study and practice lay so entirely in the common law, that he never seemed to apprehend what equity was: nor had he a head made for business or for such a court. He was a man of great integrity, and had very serious impressions of religion on his mind. He had been always on the side of the church, yet he had great tenderness for the nonconformists: and the bishops having all declared for lord Clarendon, except one or two, he and the new scene of the ministry were inclined to favour them. The duke of Buckingham, who had been in high disgrace before lord Clarendon's fall, came upon that into high favour, and set up for a patron of liberty of conscience and of all the sects.

1667. The see of Chester happened to fall vacant soon after: Wilkins was by his means promoted to that see, and it was no small prejudice to him that he was recommended by so

mand of secresy: but the Duke of Richmond's clandestine marriage, before he had given an answer, made the king suspect he had revealed the secret to Lord Clarendon, whose creature Sheldon was known to be. And this was the true cause of Lord Clarendon's disgrace. D. Clarendon himself clearly believed it. *Cont.* ii. 477. See his letter of vindication to the king, Nov. 16, 1667. Ludlow, ii. 407, gives the same account.

[1] Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, 1624; one of the Parliamentary Commissioners to treat with the king in January, 164⅝. He practised with reputation throughout the Commonwealth, and was the first baronet created at the Restoration. 'The removing him from the Common Pleas to the Chancery did not at all contribute any increase to his fame, but rather the contrary; for he was timorous to an impotence, and that not mended by his great age. He laboured very much to please every body, and that is a temper of ill consequence in a judge. . . . And in his time the Court of Chancery run out of order into delays and endless motions in causes, so that it was like a fair field overgrown with briars. And, what was worst of all, his family was very ill qualified for that place; his lady being a most violent intriguess in business, and his sons kept no good decorum while they practised under him; and he had not a vigour of mind and strength to coerce the cause of so much disorder in his family.' North's *Life of Lord Keeper Guilford*, 128, 297. In the *Examen*, 38, North says that his family 'gathered like a snowball while he had the seals.' See Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 429. Bridgeman remained Lord Keeper from Aug. 30, 1667 to Nov. 19, 1672.

bad a man[1]. He had a courage in him that could stand against a current, and against all the reproaches with which ill-natured clergymen studied to load him. He said, he was called for by the king, without any motion of his own, to a public station, in which he would endeavour to do all the good he could, without considering the ill effects that it might have on himself. The king had such a command of himself, that when his interest led him to serve any end, or court any sort of men, he did it so dexterously, and with such an air of sincerity, that till men were well practised with him, he was apt to impose on them. He seemed now to go into moderation and comprehension with so much heartiness, that both Bridgeman and Wilkins believed he was in earnest in it: though there was nothing that the popish counsels were more fixed in, than to oppose all motions of that kind. But the king saw it was necessary to recover the affections of his people: and since the church of England was now gone off from him, upon lord Clarendon's disgrace, he resolved to shew some favour to the sects, both to soften them, and to force the others to come back to their dependence upon him. CHAP. XI.

He began also to express his concerns in the affairs of Europe: and as he brought about the peace between Castile and Portugal[2], so now that the king of France pretended that by the law of Brabant his queen, as the heir of the king of Spain's first marriage, though a daughter, was to be preferred to the young king of Spain, as the heir of the second venter, without any regard to the renunciation

[1] Buckingham, it should be remembered, had married the daughter of Lord Fairfax, *supra* 90. Wilkins, upon whom see *supra* 332, 342, and Pope's *Life of Seth Ward*, 27, 138, was Dean of Ripon until created Bishop of Chester; 'now a bishop, a creature of Buckingham's.' Ludlow, ii. 503. The consecration of 'this incomparable man, universally beloved of all that knew him,' took place in November, 1668. Evelyn, Nov. 14, 1668.

[2] The negotiations are given in detail in *Original Letters and Negotiations*, ii. (1724). The chief difficulty between the two kings was that of acknowledging one another to be kings *de facto*. Spain treated with 'Corona Portugalis,' and Portugal with the King of Castile. See William Godolphin's letter of May $\frac{1}{11}\frac{6}{6}$, 1667. A truce was made for forty-five years.

CHAP. XI. 1667. of any succession to his queen, stipulated by the peace of 254 the Pyrenees, he was upon that pretension like to overrun the Netherlands[1], Temple was sent over to enter into an alliance with the Dutch, by which some parts of Flanders were yielded up to France, but a barrier was preserved for the security of Holland. Into this the king of Sweden, then a child, was engaged: from whence it was called the MS. 127. Triple Alliance. I will say no | more of that, since so particular an account is given of it by him who could do it best, Temple himself. It was certainly the masterpiece of king Charles's life: and, if he had stuck to it, it would have been both the strength and the glory of his reign[2]. This disposed his people to be ready to forgive all that was passed, and to renew their confidence in the king, which was much shaken by the whole conduct of the Dutch war.

Oct. 10, 1667. The parliament were upon their first opening set on to destroy lord Clarendon. Some of his friends went to him a few days before the parliament met, and told him many were at work to find out matter of accusation against him[3].

[1] This was a local custom, referring solely to private property, and in force in some only of the provinces of the Spanish Low Countries; it was known to lawyers as the *jus devolutionis*, Mignet, *Négociations, &c.* i. 159 *et seq.* *Lindsey MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv; App. ix. 370.

[2] The alliance with the Dutch was concluded in January, 166$\frac{7}{8}$, but Sweden did not join it until April. See Ranke, iii. ch. iv. Its successful conclusion, in a few days, was largely due to the personal favour in which Temple was held in the States. For the terms, see Temple, *Works*, i. 362. Burnet was ignorant of the secret articles threatening the use of force against whichever of the powers, France and Spain, should refuse to make peace, which, when he learnt them, so angered Louis XIV, that he was henceforth eager for revenge upon 'Messieurs les Marchands.' What Burnet calls Charles's masterpiece was an act of gross political knavery. His hopes were fixed on France, and on the day following the signature of the treaty he wrote to his sister Henrietta, who was in the confidence of Louis, and to Louis himself, to excuse his action on the plea of momentary necessity. Dalrymple, i. 67 (ed. 1790). Temple recounts Clifford's exclamation, 'For all this great joy it must not be long before we have another war with Holland;' *Works*, i. 463; ii. 341.

[3] Parliament had been summoned, against the advice of the Duke of York and of Clarendon, for July 25; but was then prorogued to Oct. 10. The first attack was on Oct. 26. The impeachment was voted on Nov. 11—the same day, it was noticed, as that of Strafford. *Add. MSS.* 28,045,

He best knew what could be brought against him with any truth; for falsehood was infinite, and could not be guessed at. They desired he would trust some of them with what might break out, since probably nothing could lie concealed against so strict a search; and the method in which his friends must manage for him, if there was any mixture or allay in him, was to be very different from that they would use if he was sure that nothing could be brought out against him. The lord Burlington and bishop Morley both told me they talked to this purpose to him. Lord Clarendon upon that told them, that if either in matters of justice or in any negotiations abroad he had ever received a farthing, he gave them leave to disown all friendship to him. The French king, hearing he had sent for all the books of the Louvre impression, had prevented him and sent these to him, which he took, as thinking it a trifle, as indeed it was: and this was the only present he ever had from any foreign prince. He had never taken any thing by virtue of his office, but what his predecessors had claimed as a right. But now hue and cry was, as it were, sent out against him: and all persons who had heard him say any thing that could bear an ill construction were examined. Some thought they had matters of great weight against him: and, when they were told these would not amount to high treason, they desired to know what would amount to it[1].

f. 6 (Brit. Mus.). The anti-Clarendon faction in the Council had defeated the Chancellor and Sheldon on the point of summoning Parliament. *Verney MSS.*, June 20, 1667.

[1] When they made some difficulty, in the House of Commons, of accusing him without proof, the last Earl of Carbery told them, if they would but impeach him, he would undertake to make out the facts afterwards: though I have heard him since say, he did not know any one thing against him, but knew he had so many enemies, that he could never want assistance to make good what he said. D. This Earl of Carbery was a man of pleasure and wit, and is said by Pepys, Nov. 19, 1667 [who calls him 'one of the lewdest fellows of the age, worse than Sir Charles Sedley], to have vowed the destruction of the chancellor. But the answer also of the chancellor's great adversary, Sir William Coventry, to Pepys, exonerates his character from any grievous charge. 'I did then,' Pepys says, 'desire to hear what was the great matter that grounded his desire of the chancellor's re-

CHAP. XI. Nov. 6, 1667. 255

When twenty-three articles were brought into the house against him, the next day he desired his second son, the now earl of Rochester[1], to acquaint the house, that he, hearing what articles were brought against him, did, in order to the despatch of the business, desire that those who knew best what their evidence was, would single out any one of all the articles that they thought could be best proved; and if they proved that, he would submit to the censure due upon them all. But those who had the secret of this in their hands, and knew they could make nothing of it, resolved to put the matter upon a preliminary, in which they hoped to find cause to hang up the whole matter, and fix upon the lords the denial of justice. So, according to some few and late precedents, they sent up a general impeachment to the lords' bar of high treason, without any special matter, and demanded that upon that he might be committed to prison. They had reason to believe the lords would not grant this: and they resolved to insist on it, and reckoned that, when so much money was to be given, the king would prevail with the lords. Upon this occasion it appeared, that the private animosities of a court could carry them to establish the most destructive precedent that could have been thought on. For if this had passed, then every minister upon a general impeach-

moval? He told me many things not fit to be spoken, and yet not any thing of his being unfaithful to the king, but *instar omnium*, he told me that while he was so great at the council-board, and in the administration of matters, there was no room for any body to propose any remedy to what was amiss, or to compass any thing, though never so good for the kingdom, unless approved by the chancellor, he managing all things with that greatness; which now will be removed, that the king may have the benefit of others' advice.' Sept. 2, Dec. 3, 1667. R. James II says, that without Coventry's help Buckingham and Arlington would not have prevailed against Clarendon; and that their jealousy of Coventry's influence was the cause of his loss of all his employments in 1668. Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 433. Cf. *infra* 479. Coventry, while being Clarendon's vehement opponent, never seems to have allowed himself to be one of the 'gang' which met at Lady Castlemaine's lodgings. The inferior offices were now filled by the hangers-on of Buckingham and Arlington.

[1] Laurence Hyde. See his speech, and the seventeen articles of impeachment in the *Parl. Hist.* iv. 375, 377.

ment was to be ruined, though no special matter was laid against him. Yet the king himself pressed this vehemently. It was said, the very suspicions of a house of commons, especially such a one as this was, was enough to blast a man, and to secure him: for there was reason to think that every person so charged would run away, if at liberty. Lord Clarendon's enemies had now gone so far that they thought they were not safe till his head was off: and they apprehended, that if he were once in prison, it would be easy either to find, or at least to bring, witnesses against him. This matter is all in print: so I will go no further in the particulars. The duke was at this time taken with the small-pox: so he was out of the whole debate. The peers thought that a general accusation was only a clamour, and that their dignities signified little if a clamour was enough to send them to prison. All the earl of Clarendon's friends pressed the king much on his behalf, that he might be suffered to go off gently, and without censure, since he had served both his father and himself so long, so faithfully, and with such success. But the king was now so sharpened against him, that, though he named no particulars, he expressed a violent and an irreconcileable aversion to him; which did the king much hurt in the opinion of all that were not engaged in the party. The affair of the king's marriage was the most talked of, as that which indeed was the only thing that could in any sort justify such a severity. Lord Clarendon did protest, as some that had it from himself told me, that he had no other hand in that matter than 256
as a counsellor: and in that he appealed to the king himself. After many debates and conferences and protestations, in which the whole court went in visibly to that which was so plainly destructive both to the king and to the ministry, the majority of the house stood firm, and adhered to their first resolution against commitment[1]. The commons were

Nov. 20, 1667.

[1] See the protest against this resolution in the *Lords Journals*, Nov. 20, 1667. It is signed by Buckingham and Arlington among the lay peers, and by Cosins, Croft, and Lucy, the Bishops of Durham,

CHAP. XI. upon that like to carry the matter far against them, as denying justice. The king, seeing this, spoke to the
MS. 128. duke | to persuade lord Clarendon to go beyond sea[1], as the only expedient that was left to make up the breach between the two houses: and he let fall some words of kindness, in case he should comply with this. The earl of Clarendon was all obedience and submission; and was charmed with those tender words that the king had said of him. So, partly to serve the king and save himself and his family, but chiefly that he might not be the occasion of any difference between the king and the duke, who had heartily espoused his interest, he went privately beyond sea; and writ a letter from Calais to the house of lords, protesting his innocence in all the points objected to him, and that he had not gone out of the kingdom for fear, or out of any consciousness of guilt, but only that he might not be the unhappy occasion of any difference between the two houses, or of obstructing public business[2]. This put an end to the dispute. But his enemies called it a confession of guilt, and a flying from justice: such colours will people give to the most innocent actions[3]. A bill was brought in, banishing him the king's dominions, under pain of treason if he should return: and it was made treason to correspond with him without leave from the king. This
Dec. 18, 1667. act did not pass without much opposition. It was said, there was a known course of law when any man fled from

Hereford, and St. David's. Pepys mentions Reynolds among the three (Nov. 21, 1667); this appears to be an error.

[1] Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 431.

[2] The letter was sent by the Lords to the Commons, who voted it to be 'scandalous, seditious, a reproach of the king and justice of the kingdom,' and ordered it to be burnt by the hangman.

[3] Evelyn, Dec. 9, 1667, relates that after paying a melancholy visit to the fallen minister, he heard the next morning that he was gone; and proceeds to remark, 'I am persuaded that had he gone sooner, though but to Cornbury (his country seat), and there lain quiet, it would have satisfied the parliament. That which exasperated them was his presuming to stay, and to contest the accusation as long as possible; and they were on the point of sending him to the Tower.' R.

justice: and it seemed against the common course of justice to make all corresponding with him treason, when he himself was not attainted of treason [1]: nor could it be just to banish him unless a day were given him to come in: and then, if he did not come in, he might incur the punishment upon contempt. The duke, whom the king had employed to prevail with him to withdraw himself, thought he was bound in honour to press the matter home on the king; which he did so warmly, that for some time a coldness between them was very visible. The part the king had acted in this matter came to be known, and was much censured, as there was just cause for it. The vehemence that he shewed in this whole matter was imputed by many to very different causes. Those who knew him best, but esteemed him least, said to me on this occasion, that all the 257
indignation that appeared in him on this head was founded on no reason at all; but was an effect of that easiness, or rather laziness, of nature that made him comply with every person that had the greatest credit with him. The mistress, and the whole bedchamber, were perpetually railing at him [2]. This, by a sort of infection, possessed the king, who, without giving himself the trouble of much thinking, did commonly go into any thing that was at the present time the easiest, without considering what might at any other time follow on it. Thus the lord Clarendon fell under the common fate of great ministers, whose employments expose them to envy, and draw upon them the

[1] Bishop of Rochester's [Atterbury's] case. S.

[2] I have heard my uncle say (who was a groom of the bed-chamber), the first proof the courtiers had of his being out of favour, was Harry Killigrew's mimicking of him before the king; which he could do in a very ridiculous manner, by carrying the bellows about the room, instead of a purse, and another before him with a shovel for a mace, and could counterfeit his voice and style very exactly; which the king was so much pleased with, that he made him do it before the Duchess of Cleveland, who hated Lord Clarendon most heartily, therefore took care he should know what a jest he was made of at court, in hopes (knowing him to be a very proud man) that it would have provoked him to have quitted his post. D. In his MS. before spoken of [Claren-

CHAP. XI.

indignation of all who are disappointed in their pretensions[1]. Their friends do generally shew that they are only the friends of their fortunes: and upon the change of favour, they not only forsake them in their extremity, but, that they may secure to themselves the protection of a new favourite, they will redeem all that is past, by turning as violently against them as they formerly fawned abjectly on them: and princes are so little sensible of merit or great services, that they sacrifice their best servants, not only when their affairs seem to require it, but to gratify the humour of a mistress or the passion of a rising favourite[2].

I will end this relation of lord Clarendon's fall with an account of his two sons. The eldest, now the earl of Clarendon, is a man naturally sincere: except in the payment of his debts; in which he has a particular art, upon his breaking his promises, which he does very often, to have a plausible excuse, and a new promise ever ready at hand: in which he has run longer than one could think possible. He is a friendly and good-natured man. He keeps an exact journal of all that passes[3], and is punctual to tediousness in all that he relates. He was very early engaged in great secrets: for his father, apprehending of

don's *Life and Cont.*], he intimates, that his misfortunes were chiefly owing to the ladies and laughers at Court. O.

[1] An attempt has been made to sum up briefly the causes of Clarendon's downfall in ch. xiii of 'The English Restoration and Louis XIV' in *Epochs of Modern History*. It is pointed out in especial that his great knowledge of and devotion to constitutional law, which were of such vital service at the Restoration, when an old order had in great measure to be revived, prohibited him from dealing successfully with the new problems which immediately declared themselves, and which needed something more than a policy of negations.

[2] Sheffield says of Charles, 'In one week's absence he would forget those servants who had been about him for years,' and W. Godolphin speaks bitterly of 'the black cloud of forgetfulness which in courts always covers absent men.' *Spanish Negotiations*, ii. 45.

[3] It was published by Dr. Douglas, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, together with his State Letters, in two volumes quarto, from the Clarendon Press in 1763. These pieces have been lately republished by Mr. Singer, with the addition of the Correspondence and Diary of his brother Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester. R.

what fatal consequence it would have been to the king's affairs, if his correspondence had been discovered by unfaithful secretaries, engaged him when very young to write all his letters to England in cipher; so that he was generally half the day writing in cipher, or deciphering, and was so discreet, as well as faithful, that nothing was ever discovered by him. He continued to be still the person whom his father trusted most: and was the most beloved of all the family; for he was humble and obliging, but was peevish and splenetic[1]. His judgment was not to be much depended on; for he was much carried by vulgar prejudices and false notions. He was much[2] in the queen's favour, and was her chamberlain long. His father's being so violently prosecuted on the | account of her marriage, made that she thought herself bound to protect him in a particular manner. He was so provoked at the ill usage his father met with, that he struck in violently with the party that opposed the court: and the king spoke always of him with great sharpness and much scorn. His brother, now earl of Rochester, is a man of far greater parts. He has a very good pen, but speaks not gracefully[3]. He was thought the smoothest man in the court: and during all the dispute concerning his father, he made his court so dexterously, that no resentments appeared on that head. When he came into business, and rose to high posts, he grew both violent and insolent: but was thought by many an incorrupt man. He has high notions of government, and thinks it must be maintained with great severity. He delivers up his own notions to his party, that he may lead them; and on all occasions he is wilful and imperious.

CHAP. XI.

MS. 129.

258

[1] *though sometimes peevish*, was substituted by the editors.

[2] much, much, much. S.

[3] He was apt to give a positive assertion instead of an argument; and when any objection was made to it, all the answer was, that he could not help thinking so. And I never knew a man that was so soon put into a passion, that was so long before he could bring himself out of it, in which he would say things that were never forgot by anybody but himself: therefore had always more enemies than he thought he had; though he had as many professedly so, as any man of his time. D.

CHAP. XI. He passes for a sincere man, and seems to have too much heat to be false. This natural heat is inflamed by frequent excesses in drinking. Morley was long dean of the chapel: but he stuck so to the lord Clarendon, that he was sent into his diocese: and Crofts, bishop of Hereford, was made dean in his room. He was a warm devout man, but of no discretion in his conduct: so he lost ground quickly. He used much freedom with the king; but it was in the wrong place, not in private but in the pulpit.

The king was highly offended at the behaviour of most of the bishops[1], and he took occasion to vent it at the council board, upon the complaints that were made of some disorders, and of some conventicles. He said the clergy were chiefly to blame for these disorders; for if they had lived well, and had gone about their parishes, and taken pains to convince the nonconformists, the nation might have been by that time well settled; but they thought of nothing but to get good benefices, and to keep a good table. This I read in a letter that sir Robert Moray writ down to Scotland: and it agrees with a conversation that the king was pleased to have with my self once, when I was alone with him in his closet. While we were talking of the ill state the church was in, I was struck to hear a prince of his course of life so much disgusted at the ambition, covetousness, and the scandals of the clergy. He said, if the clergy had done their part, it had been an easy thing to have run down the nonconformists: but he added, they will do nothing, and will have me do every thing: and most of them do worse than if they did nothing. He told me he had a chaplain that was a very honest man, but a very great blockhead, to whom he had given a living in Suffolk, that was full of that sort of people: he had gone about among them from house to house, though he could not imagine what he could say to them, for, he said, he was

[1] Sheldon especially was in disgrace. Pepys, Dec. 27, 1667. Shortly afterwards the two Hydes, with Dolben and Morley, the Bishops of Rochester and Winchester, were driven from Court. *Id.* Feb. 6, 166⅞.

a very silly fellow, but that he believed his nonsense suited their nonsense; yet he had brought them all to church: and, in reward of his diligence, he had given him a bishopric in Ireland [1]. CHAP. XI. 259

CHAPTER XII.

ENGLAND FROM THE PEACE OF BREDA TO THE TREATY OF DOVER. FIRST CONVENTICLE ACT.

BRIDGEMAN and Wilkins set on foot a treaty, for a comprehension of such of the dissenters as could be brought into the communion of the church, and a toleration of the rest [2]. Hale, the chief justice, concurred with them in the Dec. 1667.

[1] Bishop Woolley had been chaplain to both the Charleses, and had suffered much for his adherence to their cause. He was afterwards, according to the account of him in Antony Wood's *Athenae Oxon.*, made rector of a church in Essex, in order to counteract the effects of the preaching of Stephen Marshall, the famous Independent minister, his predecessor in that cure. In 1665 he was promoted to the see of Clonfert, 'where,' as it is said by the same writer, 'he sat for some time, and was held in great admiration for his admirable way of preaching, and exemplary life and conversation.' R.

[2] This scheme was under the patronage of Buckingham (Pepys, Dec. 21, 1667), who was playing the statesman after Clarendon's fall, and of Arlington, who sympathized warmly with the Catholics. It lasted until Parliament met in February, 166⅞. The policy of indulgence, and the dread of Clarendon's return, were the only feelings which these rivals had in common. We soon hear of the 'insolencies' of the Non-conformists (Andrew Marvell, March 7, 166⅞); and Pepys has many notices showing that they were breathing freely. On Nov. 22, 1667, the king listened to a congratulatory speech from Dr. Bates. *Somers Tracts*, viii. 11. There are many passages in the *Sheldon MSS.* which show that before Clarendon actually fell, the penal laws were almost a dead letter, so far as the magistrates were concerned. Thus the Bishop of Chester wrote to Sheldon, April 5, 166⅞, 'I am still informed of several incorrigible Non-conformists, who continue to preach in many parts of this diocese, notwithstanding my certificate to the respective Justices, who indeed are so remiss and languid putting laws in execution, as if they reserved themselves for some new revolution.' See Marvell, ii. 239 (Grosart's ed.). Some of Cromwell's old officers, such as Wildman, who had been in confinement since 1662, were now released. Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 434. The effect of the change was felt equally in Scotland. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii, and *supra* 427.

CHAP. XII. design. Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and Burton[1] joined also in it. Bates, Manton, and Baxter were called for on the side of the presbyterians; and a project was prepared, consisting chiefly of those things that the king had promised by his declaration in the year 1660. Only in the point of reordination this temper was proposed, that those who had presbyterian ordination should be received to serve in the church by an imposition of hands, accompanied with words which imported that the person so ordained was received to serve as a minister in the church of England. This treaty became a common subject of discourse. Many books were printed upon it. All lord Clarendon's friends cried out that the church was undermined and betrayed. It was said the cause of the church was given up if we yielded any of those points about which there had been so much disputing: if the sectaries were humble and modest, and would tell what would satisfy them, there might be some colour for granting some concessions: but it was unworthy of the church to go and court, or treat with, enemies, when there was no reason to think that, after we had departed from our grounds, which was to confess we had been in the wrong, that we should gain much by it, unless it were to bring scorn and contempt on ourselves. On the other hand it was said, the nonconformists could not legally meet together to offer any schemes in the name of their party: it was well enough known what they had always excepted to, and what would probably bring over most of the presbyterians: such
MS. 130. a yielding | in some lesser matters would be no reproach, but an honour to the church; that, how much soever superior she might be both in point of argument and of power, [she] would yet of her own accord, and for peace sake, yield a great deal in matters indifferent. The apostles complying with many of the observances of the Jews, and the offers that the church of Africk made to the Donatists,

[1] Hezekiah Burton, a London divine, whose posthumous sermons were published by Archbishop Tillotson. R.

were much insisted on. The fears of popery, and the progress that atheism was making, did alarm good and wise men, and they thought every thing that could be done without sin ought to be done towards the healing our divisions. Many books were upon that occasion writ to expose the presbyterians as men of false notions in religion, which led to Antinomianism, and that would soon 260
carry them into a dissolution of morals, under a pretence of being justified by faith only, without works. The three volumes of the Friendly Debate, though writ by a very good man [1], and with a good intent, had an ill effect in sharpening people's spirits too much against them. But the most virulent of all that writ against the sects was Parker, afterwards made bishop of Oxford by king James, who was full of satirical vivacity, and was considerably learned; but was a man of no judgment, and of as little virtue, and as to religion he seemed rather to have become quite impious. After he had for some years entertained the nation with several virulent books, writ with much life, he was attacked by the liveliest droll of the age, who writ in a burlesque strain, but with so peculiar and so entertaining a conduct, that from the king down to the tradesman his book was read with great pleasure. That not only humbled Parker, but the whole party: for the author of the Rehearsal Transprosed [2] had all the men of wit (or,

[1] Writt by Bishop Patrick. S. See *supra* 336, note.

[2] Andrew Marvell. S. 'We still read Marvell's answer to Parker with pleasure, though the book it answers is sunk long ago.' *Swift's Apology prefixed to the Tale of the Tub.* R. Parker published his *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity*, 'wherein the authority of the Civil Magistrate in matters of external religion is asserted, the mischiefs and inconveniences of Toleration are represented, and all pretences pleaded in behalf of Liberty of conscience fully answered,' in 1670. In 1672 Marvell replied by the first part of the *Rehearsal Transprosed*, in which Parker figures as Mr. Bayes, a character in Buckingham's play *The Rehearsal.* Parker was stung to an ill-tempered rejoinder, affording Marvell another opportunity, of which he availed himself so effectively in the second part of the *Rehearsal Transprosed*, that no more was heard of his opponent. Writing on May 3, 1673, to Sir E. Harley, he says: 'Dr. Parker will be out next week . . . I perceive by what I have

CHAP. XII. as the French phrase it, all the *laughers*) of his side. But what advantages soever the men of comprehension might have in any other respect, the majority in the house of commons was so possessed against them, that when it was known, in a succeeding session, that a bill was ready to be offered to the house for that end, a very extraordinary vote passed that no bill to that purpose should be received [1].

Oct. 1667. An act passed in this session that gave lord chief justice Hale great reputation, for rebuilding the city of London, which was drawn with so true a judgment, and so great foresight, that the whole city was raised out of its ashes without any suits of law; which, if that bill had not prevented them, would have brought a second charge on the city, not much less than the fire it self had been. And upon that, to the amazement of all Europe, London was in

read that it is the rudest book, one or other, that ever was published—I may say since the first invention of printing. Although it handles me so roughly, yet I am not at all amated by it.... However, I will for my own private satisfaction forthwith draw up an answer that shall have as much of spirit and solidity in it as my ability will afford and the age we live in will endure. I am, if I may say it with reverence, drawn in, I hope by a good Providence, to intermeddle in a high and noble argument, which therefore by how much it is above my capacity, I shall use the more industry not to disparage it.' *Portland MSS., H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 337. Marvell's second controversial work, *Mr. Smirke, or the Divine in Mode* (1676), a defence of Croft, Bishop of Hereford (Mr. Smirke is the chaplain in Etheredge's *Man of Mode*), against a violent attack by Turner, Master of St. John's, Cambridge, obtained an equal success. See Croft's letter of thanks, July, 1676. Marvell, ii. 489. Marvell was a master of banter. Charles himself interfered when the licenser, L'Estrange, wished to suppress the second edition of the first part of the *Rehearsal Transprosed*. *H. M. C. Rep.* vi. 518. Marvell died in 1678.

[1] In April, the proposal to ask the king to bring together divines of various persuasions was defeated by 167 to 70. Marvell, April 11, 1668. Charles had already, in March, been forced to issue a proclamation against conventicles; and in September the Corporation Act was enforced by an order in council to the justices, who had been lax in enforcing the penal laws. Ranke notes that the king's endeavour to tolerate Protestant Dissent had, by rousing the jealousy of Parliament as to his real intention of favouring the Catholics, brought about complete unanimity in a hitherto disunited body; cf. iii. 482.

four years' time rebuilt[1], with so much beauty and magnificence, that we who saw it in both states, before and after the fire, cannot reflect on it without wondering where the wealth could be found to bear so vast a loss as was made by the fire, and so prodigious an expense as was laid out in the rebuilding it. This did demonstrate that the intrinsic wealth of the nation was very high when it could answer such a dead charge. CHAP. XII.

I return to the intrigues of the court. Lord Clarendon's enemies thought they were not safe as long as the duke had so much credit with the king, and the duchess had so much power over him: so they fell on propositions of a strange nature to ruin them. The duke of Buckingham[2] pressed the king to own a marriage with the duke of Monmouth's mother, and he undertook to get witnesses to attest it. 261
The duke of York told me, in general, that there was much talk about it, but he did not descend to particulars. The earl of Carlisle offered to begin the matter in the house of lords[3]. The king would not consent to this, yet he put it

[1] See Roger North's *Autobiography*, 76, for the jerry-building which went on under the hands of Nicholas Barbon, son of Praise-God Barbon. It is stated by Pepys, Dec. 3, 1667, that after the rebuilding land hitherto worth fourpence a foot was expected to be worth fifteen shillings. See the king's instructions for rebuilding, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 121. The first Rebuilding Act passed in October, 1667, and a second in April, 1670. *Statutes at Large*, iii. 303, 331.

[2] 'The Duke of Buckingham . . . acted as principal Minister of State. The king consulted him in all matters of moment, the foreign ministers applied themselves to him before they had audience of the king; but he was so unfit for this character, by reason of his giving himself up to his pleasures (turning the night into day and the day into night), he neglected both his attendance upon the king, the receiving of ministers, and indeed all sorts of business; so that he lasted not long.' Reresby's *Memoirs*, 76 (ed. Cartwright).

[3] See Marvell, March 21, 16$\frac{70}{71}$: 'It is my opinion that Lauderdale at one ear talks to the king of Monmouth, and Buckingham at the other of a new queen.' In Macpherson, *Orig. Pap.* 45, Carlisle and Shaftesbury are joined with Lauderdale, and Bristol with Buckingham. There is a memorandum extant from Bridgeman to Arlington to the effect that some time before October, 1670, Charles insisted upon the writ to Monmouth running 'filio nostro naturali et illegitimo.' The patent creating him duke does not name him 'filius.' *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1670, 492. The apprehension that he

CHAP. XII. by in such a manner as made them all conclude he wished it might be done, but did not know how to bring it about. These discourses were all carried to the duke of Monmouth, and got fatally into his head. When the duke talked of this matter to me in the year [16]73 I asked him if he thought the king had still the same inclinations? He said he believed not: he thought the duke of Monmouth had not spirit enough to think of it, and he commended the duchess of Monmouth so highly, as to say to me that the hopes of a crown could not work on her to do an unjust thing. I thought he gave that matter too much countenance by calling the duke of Monmouth nephew: but he said he knew it pleased the king. When the party saw they could make nothing of the business of the duke of Monmouth, they tried next by what methods they could get rid of the queen, that so the king might marry another wife: for the king had children by so many different creatures, that they hoped for issue if he had a wife fit or capable of any. Some thought the queen and he were not legally married: but the avowing a marriage, and the living many years in that state, did certainly supply any defect in point of form. Others pretended she was barren from a natural cause, and that seemed equivalent to frigidity in men; but the king had often said he was sure she had once miscarried. This, though not overthrown by such an evidence, could never be proved, unless the having no children was to be concluded a barrenness: and the dis-
MS. 131. solving | a marriage on such an account could neither be justified in law nor conscience. Other stories were given out of the queen's person, which were false, for I saw in a letter under the king's own hand that the marriage was consummated[1]. Others talked of polygamy: and officious persons were ready to thrust themselves into any thing that could contribute to their advancement. Lord Lauderdale and sir Robert Moray asked my opinion of these

would be acknowledged as legitimate, and that in consequence 'there will be a difference follow between the Duke of York and him,' was rife in 1662. Pepys, Dec. 31, 1662.

[1] See *supra* 307, and 308, note.

things. I said I knew speculative people could say a great deal in the way of argument for polygamy and divorce: yet these things were so decried, that they were rejected by all Christian societies: so that [a]all such propositions[a] would throw us into great convulsions, and entail wars upon us if any issue came from a marriage so grounded[1].

An accident happened at that time that made the discoursing of those matters the common subject of conversation. The lord Roos, now earl of Rutland, brought proofs 262
of adultery against his wife, and obtained a sentence of divorce in the spiritual court; which amounting only to a separation from bed and board, he moved for a bill dissolving the bond, and enabling him to marry another wife. The duke and all his party apprehended the consequences of a parliamentary divorce: so they opposed this with great heat, and almost all the bishops were of that side: only Cosins and Wilkins, the bishops of Durham and Chester, were for it[2]; and the king was as earnest in the

[a] substituted for *these methods they were in.*

[1] There is extant a brief resolution by Burnet of two cases of conscience, viz., *Is a woman's barrenness a just ground for divorce or polygamy; and is polygamy in any case lawful under the Gospel?* The questions are resolved affirmatively. The original, in the author's hand-writing, was copied at Ham in 1680, with Duke Lauderdale's permission, by Paterson, Archbishop of Glasgow, as he had testified under his episcopal seal, Burnet's papers being then in the duke's possession. [Cf. *infra* 601, note. They were written about 1671 at Lauderdale's request. See Burnet's *Reflections on Dr. Hickes's Discourses*, 76, where he says that he afterwards retracted the paper and answered all the material things in it.] The cases were printed in 1731 [and are reprinted in full by Higgons, as well as in the Appendix to Macky's *Memoirs*]. He says above, *supra* 308, that he was once persuaded that the queen was not fit for marriage. R.

[2] Of which one doted through age and the other was reputed a Socinian. *Life of James II*, i. 439. Ralph and Marvell add Reynolds as opposing the Bill. Marvell adds that 'Anglesey and Ashley, who study and know their interests as well as any gentlemen at Court, and whose sons have married two sisters of Roos, yet they also drive on the Bill with the greatest vigour.' March 21, 16$\frac{88}{9}$. Wilkins, according to Ludlow, 503, urged, like Burnet, that 'divorce might be not only in case of adultery, but alsoe of the immundicity of the womb, which is given forth to bee the queen's condition, and wherewith she was soe touched, that shee

CHAP. XII. setting it on as the duke was in opposing it. The zeal which the two brothers expressed on that occasion made all people conclude that they had a particular concern in
1668. the matter. The bill passed: and upon that precedent some moved the king that he would order a bill to be brought in to divorce him from the queen. This went so far that a day was agreed on for making the motion in the house of commons, as Mr. May of the privy purse told me, who had the greatest and the longest share in the king's secret confidence of any man in that time; for it was never broke off, though often shaken, he being in his notions against every thing that the king was for, both France, popery, and arbitrary government: but a particular sympathy of temper, and his serving the king in his vices[1], created a confidence much envied, and often attempted to be broke, but never with any success beyond a short coldness. But he added, when he told me of this design, that

wept day and night, though her husband to appease her for the present sweares he will have him hanged that shall speake thereof.' Charles himself publicly expressed the same view. Marvell, April 14, 1670. Charles, whether he had any real purpose of using the decision as suggested or not, took the liveliest interest in the proceedings. He attended the debates in the Lords, and was thanked by them. Evelyn, Feb. 22; Marvell, March 21, 26, 1668. The Bills received the royal assent, April 11. From a letter in the *Verney MSS.*, March 10, 1668, it appears that 'the 5 and 19 chapters of S^t^. Matthew and 10 Mark and 16 Luke are the principall places about this business.' There was a precedent in the case of the Marquis of Northampton, who 'did marry again after his first wife was put away for adultery, and in Edw. VI^th's^ time the last marriage was confirmed and the children made legitimate by Act of Parliament.' *Id.* The sentence of divorce in the Ecclesiastical Court was followed by an Act which received the royal assent on Feb. 8, 1668, making Lord Roos's children illegitimate. In her petition to the Lords, Feb. 2, 1668, Lady Roos stated that for four years she had not received a penny from her husband and was absolutely destitute. *H. M. C. Rep.* viii. 104, 117, 141. The parliamentary divorce here narrated, which was not enacted until 1668, is antedated by Burnet to 1668. Clarendon, *Cont.* 999–1008.

[1] 'Bab May went down in great state to Winchelsea with the Duke of York's letters, not doubting to be chosen; and then the people chose a private gentleman in spite of him, and cried out that they would have no Court pimp to be their burgesse.' Pepys, Oct. 21, 1666. 'Bab May, Lady Castlemaine, and that wicked crew.' *Id.* Sept. 2, 1667.

three days before the motion was to be made, the king called for him, and told him that matter must be let alone, for it would not do. This disturbed him much, for he had engaged himself far in laying the thing, and in managing those who were to undertake the debate. CHAP. XII.

At this time the court fell into much extravagance in masquerading; both king and queen, and all the court, went about masked, and came into houses unknown, and danced[1].[a] People were so disguised, that without being on the secret none could distinguish them[2]. They were carried about in hackney chairs. Once the queen's chairmen, not knowing who she was, went from her: so she was alone, and was much disturbed, and came to Whitehall in a hackney coach: some said it was in a cart. The duke of Buckingham proposed to the king, that if he would give him leave he would steal her away, and send her to a plantation, where she should be well and carefully looked to, but never heard of any more; so it should be given out that she had deserted; and upon that it would fall in with some principles 263
to carry an act for a divorce, grounded upon the pretence of a wilful desertion[3]. Sir Robert Moray told me that the king himself rejected this with horror. He said it was

[a] *there with a great deal of wild frolic. In all this* struck out.

[1] See, besides Pepys, *passim*, the *Portland MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 294; and for the excessive plainness of the skits upon Lady Castlemaine, *id.* 296. The private family correspondence of the time abounds with expressions of disgust at the state of London, 'that wicked towne' (*Verney MSS.*), and with hopes that the younger members who have to go there will 'remain pure in the general profanity of London' (*Isham MSS.*). 'Sin every day grows high and impudent: The Lord I trust will graciously provide a hiding-place for his poor children.' Sir E. Harley, *Portland MSS.* iii., *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 322. 'My children are in no heart to marry; and I believe if they do not marry till they can have religious men they never will. I think they will not be in the worse condition if they never do unless men were better . . . than as the world goes now.' Lady Fitzjames, *id.* App. iii. 339. See also Marvell to Ramsden, undated (Grosart), ii. 390; and *infra* 476.

[2] King George. S. Swift alludes to similar frolics in the Court of George I. R.

[3] Bevill Higgons pours well deserved ridicule upon this story. *Remarks*, 246.

CHAP. XII. a wicked thing to make a poor lady miserable, only because she was his wife, and had no children by him, which was no fault of hers. The hints of this broke out: for the duke of Buckingham could conceal nothing. And upon that the earl of Manchester, then lord chamberlain, told the queen, it was neither decent nor safe for her to go about in such a manner as she had done of late: so she gave it over. But at last all these schemes settled in a proposition into which the king went, which was to deal with the queen's confessor, that he might persuade her to leave the world, and to turn religious: upon which the parliament would have been easily prevailed on to pass a divorce. This came to be known: but what steps were made in it were never known. It was believed that upon this the duchess of York sent an express to Rome with the notice of her conversion; and that orders were sent from Rome to all about the queen to persuade her against such a proposition, if any should suggest it to her. She herself had no mind to be a nun, and the duchess was afraid of seeing another queen: and the mistress, created at that time
1670. duchess of Cleveland, knew that she must be the first sacrifice to a beloved queen: and she reconciled herself upon this to the duchess of York[1]. The duke of Buckingham upon that broke with her, and studied to take the king from her by new amours: and because he thought a gaiety of humour would take much with the king, he engaged him to entertain two players one after another, Davis and Gwyn. The first did not keep her hold long; but Gwyn, the indiscreetest and wildest creature that ever
MS. 132. was in a court[2], yet continued | to the end of the king's life in great favour, and was maintained at a vast expense. The duke of Buckingham told me, that when she was first

[1] *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1670, 357.

[2] Forneron (*Louise de Kéroualle*) gives some amusing and hitherto unpublished instances of a buoyant and humorous 'indiscretion.' Of her relatives, her father appears to have died in prison at Oxford, and 'Nell's mother was drowned dead drunk in a ditch,' July, 1679. Luttrell. See Wheatley's ed. of Cunningham's *Life of Nell Gwynn* (1892), xxi–xxv, and 5.

brought to the king she asked only five hundred pounds a year, and the king refused it; but when he told me this, about four years after, he said she had got of the king above sixty thousand pounds. She acted all persons in so lively a manner, and was such a constant diversion to the king, that even a new mistress could not drive her away. But after all, he never treated her with the decencies of a mistress [1], but rather with the lewdness of a prostitute, as she had been indeed to a great many: and therefore she called the king her Charles the third, since she had been formerly kept by two of that name. The king had another mistress, that was managed by Shaftesbury [2], that was the daughter of a clergyman, Robarts; in whom her first education had so deep a root, that, though she fell into many scandalous disorders, with very dismal adventures in them all, yet a principle of religion was so deep laid in her, that, howsoever it did not restrain her, yet it kept alive in her such a constant horror at sin, that she was never easy 264
in an ill course, and died with a great sense of her former ill life, for I was often with her the last three months of her life [3]. The duchess of Cleveland, finding that she had lost the king [4], abandoned herself to great disorders: one of which, by the artifice of the duke of Buckingham, was discovered by the king in person, the party concerned leaping out at the window [5]. She also spoke of the king to all people

[1] Pray what decencies are those? S.

[2] There is no evidence of this.

[3] 'I cannot but say she was very lucky in her choice of a confessor; it was hard to find one with limbs more brawny, conscience more supple, or principles more loose; all these extreme good qualifications for a lady of pleasure.' Philalethes, *Remarks upon Bishop Burnet's Posthumous History*, 1724, 56. Dryden is as scurrilous:

'Broad back'd, and brawny, built for love's delight;
A prophet formed to make a female proselyte.'

Hind and Panther, part iii. 2438.

[4] The king made Will Legge sing a ballad to her, that began with these words—*Poor Allinda's growing old; those charms are now no more*—which she understood were applied to herself. D. Nevertheless, 'The great Duchess of Cleveland goes about the streets with 8 horses in her coach, the streets, balconies, and windows full of people to admire her.' *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1671, 271.

[5] Jack Churchill, since Duke of

CHAP. XII. in such a manner, as brought him under much contempt. But he seemed insensible: and though libels of all sorts had then a very free course, yet he was never disturbed at it.

The three most eminent wits of that time, on whom all the lively libels were fastened, were the earls of Dorset and Rochester, and sir Charles Sedley. Lord Dorset was a generous good-natured and modest man. He was so oppressed with phlegm, that till he was a little heated with wine he scarce ever spoke, but was upon that exaltation a very lively man. Never was so much ill nature in a pen as in his, joined with so much good nature as is in himself, even to excess, for he is against all punishing, even of malefactors. He is bountiful, even to run himself into difficulties, and charitable to a fault; for he commonly gives all he has about him, when he meets an object that moves him. But he was so lazy, that, though the king seemed to court him to be a favourite, he would not give himself the trouble that belonged to that post. He hated the court, and despised the king, when he saw he was neither generous nor tender hearted. Wilmot, earl of Rochester, was naturally modest, till the court corrupted him. His wit had a peculiar brightness, to which none could ever arrive. He gave himself up to all sorts of extravagance, and to the wildest frolics that a wanton wit could devise. He would have gone about the streets as a beggar, and made love as a porter. He set up a stage as an Italian mountebank. He was for some years always drunk, and was ever doing some mischief. The king loved his company for the diversion it afforded, better than his person: and there was no love lost between them[1]. He took his revenges in many libels. He found out a footman that knew all the court, and he furnished him with a red coat and a musket as a sentinel, and kept him all the

Marlborough; who, the duchess said, had received a great deal of her money for very little service done her, to a near relation of hers, from whom I had it. D. Charles is reported to have said to Churchill on this occasion, 'I forgive you, for you do it for your bread.' (*Aff. Étr. Angleterre*, vol. 137, f. 400.)

[1] A noble phrase. S.

winter long every night at the doors of such ladies as he believed might be in intrigues. In the court a sentinel is little minded, and is believed to be posted by a captain of the guards to hinder a combat: so this man saw who walked about and visited at forbidden hours. By this means lord Rochester made many discoveries, and when he was well furnished with materials, he used to retire into the country for a month or two to write libels. Once 265 being drunk, he intended to give the king a libel that he had writ on some ladies, but by a mistake he gave him one wrote on himself[1]. He fell into an ill habit of body, and in several fits of sickness he had deep remorses; for he was guilty both of much impiety and of great immoralities. But as he recovered he threw these off, and turned again to his former ill courses. In the last year of his life I was much with him, and have writ a book of what passed between him and me. I do verily believe, he was then so entirely changed, that if he had recovered he would have made good all his resolutions[2]. Sedley had a more sudden and copious wit, which furnished a perpetual run of discourse: but it was not so correct as lord Dorset's, nor so sparkling as lord Rochester's. The duke of Buckingham loved to have these much about him: and he gave himself up into a monstrous course of studied immoralities of the worst kinds. He was so full of mercury that he could not fix long in any friendship or to any design. Bennet[3], now made lord Arlington, and he fell out[4]: the one was all

CHAP. XII.

[1] Beginning, 'In the Isle of Great Britain long since famous known.' See Curll's *Works of Roscommon and Rochester.*

[2] 'My Lord Rochester does appear a real convert. He cannot live, he has ulcers in two places. He sees nobody but his mother, wife, divines, and physicians.' Dorothy, Countess of Sunderland, to Halifax, July 8, 1680 (*Sacharissa*, by Julia Cartwright, 277). 'Lord Rochester has converted his wife, and is a mighty penitent at present.' Lady Russell to Lord W. Russell, 1680. He died July 26, 1680. Burnet's book was published the same year.

[3] 'A weak man, and with his pride very timorous: yet had cursed cunning.' Macpherson, *Orig. Pap.* 50. Cf. *supra* 181, note.

[4] The differences between the two rivals for Clarendon's succession were common property. Cf. *supra* 465. 'Buckingham and Arlington are still pecking one at the other.' They

CHAP. XII. cunning and artifice, and so could not hold long with him who was so open that he blabbed out every thing. Lord Arlington was engaged in a great intimacy with Clifford, Lyttleton, and Duncombe. I have already given some account of the two first. Duncombe was a judicious man, but very haughty, and apt to raise enemies against himself: he was an able parliament man, but could not go in to all the designs of the court; for he had a sense of religion, and a zeal for the liberty of his country[1]. The duke of Buckingham's chief friends were the earls of Shaftesbury and Lauderdale, but above all sir Thomas Osborn, raised afterwards to be lord treasurer and earl of Danby, and made duke of Leeds by the late king[a].

The king took sir William Coventry from the duke, and put him in the treasury. He was in a fair way to be the chief minister, and deserved it more than all the rest did. But he was too honest to engage into the designs into which the court was resolved to turn, as soon as it had recovered a little reputation, which was sunk very low by the ill management of the Dutch war, and the squandering away of the money given to it. He was the man of the finest parts and the best temper that belonged to the court.

MS. 133. [a] *He is a very | ignorant man in all the parts of knowledge, and is neither a man of wit nor of quick parts, but has a clear judgment and a flowing copious expression, even to tediousness: he has an undertaking way with him, so that till matters break in his hands he gives full assurances, and undertakes boldly, and when the hopes he had given fail, he has always somewhat ready on which he lays the disappointment so positively that he seems to acquit himself fully. He passes for a man that has no regard to truth, and that will pursue his revenge very far, nor is to be put out of countenance by any discovery, for he can deny things with an assurance that has all the airs of sincerity and truth in it. His lady is more than half mad, yet she has such power over him that she engages him to pursue all her quarrels as well as his own.* struck out.

'have made friends, and long it will last.' 'They have broke out again.' *Verney MSS.*, Oct. 13, Nov. 10, 16, 1669. They maintained a formal union until they had disarmed their only competitor, William Coventry.

[1] Duncombe was member for Bury St. Edmunds: Commissioner of Ordnance in 1670, and Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1672. His speeches, as reported, show much good sense and humanity. 'Resolute, proud, and industrious' is Pepys's comment, April 24, and May 31, 1667.

The duke of Buckingham and he fell out, I know not for what reason, and a challenge passed between them: upon which he was forbid the court[1]; and he upon that seemed to retire very willingly. And he became a very religious man when I knew him. He was offered after that the best posts in the court, oftener than once: but he would never engage again[2]. He saw what was at bottom, and was resolved not to go through with it; and so continued to his death in a retired course of life. CHAP. XII. 1668. 266

[1] Sir William Coventry was the most esteemed and beloved of any courtier that ever sat in the House of Commons, where his word always passed for an undoubted truth without further inquiry, which the Duke of Buckingham would have had him make use of to deceive them, upon which Coventry challenged him, as his nephew, Lord Weymouth, told me. D. According to Pepys, Oct. 23, 1668, and March 4, 166⅘, the offence was characteristic of Buckingham. He designed, with Sir R. Howard, 'to bring Coventry into a play in the King's House.' There is scarcely a dissentient note (if we omit Clarendon's verdict) in the general testimony to William Coventry's worth and integrity; though James himself says that Coventry gave up his post as his secretary in order to be free to attack Clarendon. Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 431. See *supra* 458, note. He was made Commissioner of the Treasury, May, 1667. Sir Edward Hinton, writing to Sir E. Harley about the incident in the text, says, indeed 'It is much to be wondered at here how he durst attempt such a thing (sc. the challenge to Buckingham) the world knowing him to be a coward and a knave.' *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 311. Coventry was expelled the Council and sent to the Tower, March 5. See Newsletter, March 9, 166⅘, *Fleming Papers*; *Danby Papers*, *Add. MSS.* 28,040. Charles's own notice of the event is characteristic, 'I am not sorry that Sir Will: Coventry has given me this good occasion, by sending my L[d] of Buckingham a challenge, to turne him out of the Council. I do intend to turn him also out of the Tresury. The truth of it is, he has been a troublesome man in both places, and I am well rid of him.' Charles to Henrietta of Orleans, March 7, 166⅘, Mrs. Ady's *Madame*, 283. Coventry died in 1686. Buckingham and Arlington succeeded also in securing the appointment of Trevor as secretary in place of Morrice, December, 1668. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1668–9, 89.

[2] In any court office: but continued to attend the Parliament, acting a great part there, in very able though decent opposition to the court measures; and those debates were chiefly carried on between him and his brother Mr. Henry Coventry, then Secretary of State, who however was of a fair character in himself, and deemed the only honest minister the king had since my Lord Clarendon. O. Marvell in *Last Instructions*, 228, distinguishes thus between the brothers:

'While hector Harry steers by
Will the wit.'

CHAP. XII. The duke of Ormond continued still in the government of Ireland, though several interests joined together against him; the earls of Orrery and Ranelagh on the one hand, and Talbot on the other. Lord Orrery[1] was a deceitful and vain man, who loved to appear in business, but dealt so much underhand that he had not much credit with any side. Lord Ranelagh[2] was a young man of great parts, and as great vices: he had a pleasantness in his conversation that took much with the king, and he had great dexterity in business[a]. Many complaints were secretly brought against the duke of Ormond. The king loved him, and he accommodated himself much to the king's humour. Feb. 166⅔. Yet the king was, with much difficulty, prevailed on to put an end to his government of Ireland[3], and to put lord Robarts[4], afterwards made earl of Radnor, in his place;

[a] *Few trusted him, though every body loved his company, and nobody hated himself, for he was very ready to serve all people, and was free of malice and spite.* struck out.

[1] 'A person famous for having changed parties so often, and for his speech to Cromwell to take upon him the title of king.' *Life of James II*, i. 435. In Macpherson's *Orig. Pap.* 43, the following sentence is added: 'His tongue was well hung; he had some good parts, and he was reckoned so cunning a man that nobody would trust him.' Cf. *supra* 115, 125, note. See the *Essex Papers*, *passim*, for the strongly adverse opinion of straightforward men. On Dec. 1, 1669, he was forced to defend himself on a charge of defrauding the king's subjects and raising money on his own authority for bribing hungry courtiers. He did so with great ability, and finally the motion for impeachment was rejected by 121 to 118, and the accusation left to be prosecuted at law. *Parl. Hist.* iv. 440; Marvell, Nov. 4, 1669; Morrice's *Memoirs of the Earl of Orrery*, ch. vi. Colbert, writing to Louis on Nov. 13, 1669, states that Charles described Orrery as a Catholic in heart, to whom he looked to supply Ormond's place in Ireland if the latter abandoned his allegiance when he himself acknowledged his Catholicism. Dalrymple, i. 90.

[2] On Ranelagh see f. 398. He was as active in 1672, in trying to undermine the power of the honest Essex as now in plotting against the honest Ormond.

[3] 'A great stroke to show the power of Buckingham, and the poor spirit of the king, and the little hold that any man can have of him.' Pepys, Feb. 13, March 4, 166⅔.

[4] See *supra* 175, and Ludlow's *Memoirs*, ii. 495: 'If I may guesse of the rest by the person whom I heare proposed to bee employed by them, to witt the Lord Roberts, it's the honestest party of those about the King that have now got the power into their hands, this Lord Roberts beeing a sollid, sobre person.' October, 1667. He was at this time

who was a sullen and morose man, believed to be severely just, and as wise as a cynical humour could allow him to be[1]. The manner of removing the duke of Ormond will give a particular character of the king's temper. He sent lord Arlington to him for his commission. The duke of Ormond said he had received it from the king's own hand, and he would go and deliver it to him. When he carried it to the king, he denied he had sent him any such message. Two days after that, lord Arlington was sent again with the same message: and he had the same answer, and the king disowned it again to him. So the king declared in the privy council the change of the government of Ireland, and made Robarts lord-lieutenant[2]. And it flew abroad as a piece of news. The duke of Ormond hearing that, came to the king in great wrath, to expostulate upon it; and the king denied the whole thing, and so sent him away: but he sent for Fitzpatrick, who had married his sister, and who told me the whole story, and sent him to the duke of Ormond to tell him the king had denied the matter, though it was true, for he observed he was in such a heat, that he was afraid he might have said indecent things: and he was resolved not to fall out with him: for, though his affairs made it necessary to change the government of Ireland, yet he would still be kind to him, and continue him lord steward. Radnor did not continue long in Ireland: he was cynical in the whole administration, and uneasy to the king in every thing: and in one of his peevish humours he writ to the king that he had but one thing to ask of him, which if it might be granted, he should never ask another, and that was, to be discharged of his

Keeper of the Privy Seal. See Lady Russell to Lord W. Russell, *Letters of Lady Russell* (1680), i. 62. 'Lord Radnor was sent for on Sunday to the Council, but he said he must serve God before the king, and desired to be excused, as my author says.'

[1] How does that hinder wisdom? S.

[2] According to Carte's account, *Life of Ormond*, iv. 351 (Clar. Press), Burnet's statements, founded of course upon hearsay, are very erroneous.

CHAP. XII. employment. The lord Berkeley[1] succeeded him, who was
1670. brother to the lord Fitzharding, and from small beginnings
May, 1670. had risen up to the greatest posts a subject was capable of. In the war he was governor of Exeter for the king, and one of his generals. He was named by him governor to the duke of York. He was now made lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and was afterwards sent ambassador to France, and plenipotentiary to Nimeguen. He was a bold assuming man in whom it appeared with how little true judgment courts distribute favours and honours. He had a positive way of undertaking and determining in every thing, and looked fierce and big: but was both a very weak and a very proud man, and corrupt without shame or decency[2].

The court delivered itself up to vice[3]: so the house of commons lost all respect in the nation, for they gave still all the money that was asked[4]. Yet those who opposed the court carried one great point, that a committee should be named to examine the accounts of the money that was given during the Dutch war[5]. It was carried that they should be

[1] 'My Lord John Berkeley is to go immediately as Lord Lieutenant into Ireland in the place of My Lord Roberts, who is as weary of the Imployment as the Imployment is of him.' Arlington's *Letters*, ii. 290; Carte's *Ormond*, iv. 355. In April, 1671, Marvell tells us 'Barclay is still Lieutenant of Ireland; but he was forced to come over to pay ten thousand pounds rent to his Landlady Cleveland.' See *infra*, f. 397. John, Lord Berkeley of Stratton, was succeeded in Ireland by the Earl of Essex in August, 1672; he died in 1678. Sir Charles Berkeley (*supra* 181) was created Viscount Fitzharding in July, 1663.

[2] I have read some letters of his, which show him to be a man of no mean parts, though of very loose principles; the letters were written to Long, secretary to Charles II; both before and after his father's death. They are in the custody of Sir Robert Long of Wilts. O. See his letters to Clarendon, and Clarendon's character of him, *Clarendon State Papers*, iii, Supplement lxxiv.

[3] Sir G. Carteret told the king 'the necessity of having at least a show of religion in the government, and sobriety.' See note, *supra* 473. Pepys, July 27, 1667; *id.* Sept. 23, 1667.

[4] 'We are all venal cowards, except some few.' Marvell.

[5] In 1665, after a sum of £1,250,000 had been voted, a proviso, suggested by Downing, was carried by the wish of the king and against the opinion of Clarendon that the money thus raised should be applicable to the purposes of the war only. In December, 1666, a proviso was in-

all men who were out of the house. Lord Brereton was the chief of them, and had the chair. He was a philosophical man, and was all his life long in search of the philosopher's stone, by which he neglected his own affairs; but was a man of great integrity, and was not to be gained by the flatteries, hopes, or threatenings of the court. Sir William | Turner was another of the committee, who had been lord mayor of London the former year, under whose wise and just administration the rebuilding of the city advanced so fast, that he would have been chosen lord mayor for the ensuing year, if he had not declined it. Pierpoint was likewise of this committee: so was sir James Langham, a very weak man, famed only for his readiness of speaking florid Latin, which he had attained to a degree beyond any man of the age; but he was become a pedant with it, and his style was too poetical, and full of epithets and figures[1].

CHAP. XII.

MS. 134.

I name sir George Savile last, because he deserves a more copious character[2]. He rose afterwards to be

serted in the Poll Bill, appointing a commission of Lords and Commons, without power to impose an oath, to inspect and thoroughly examine the expenditure of former grants. *Commons' Journals*, ix. 100. Marvell, *Prose Works*, ii. 200, 202, 205. 'The great proviso passed the House of Parliament yesterday, which makes the king and court mad, the king having given orders to my Lord Chamberlain to send to the Playhouses and brothels to bid all the parliament men that were there to go to the parliament presently.' Pepys, Dec. 8, 1666. See the account drawn up by Pepys, Oct. 10, 1666, where he makes out a sum of £2,500,000 totally unaccounted for. Parliament was prorogued, but after Clarendon's fall the committee named in the text was formed with power to examine upon oath. Their report, which laid bare a deficiency of £1,500,000, was presented by Brereton on Oct. 26, 1669. *Commons' Journals*, ix. 101. It is quoted by Ralph and in the *H. M. C. Rep.* viii. 128. It led to the suspension from the House of Commons, by 100 to 97, of Carteret, Treasurer to the Admiralty, for issuing money without legal warrant. Hallam, ii. 359 (sm. ed.).

[1] Pierrepont (*supra* 21) was second son of Robert, first Viscount Newark. Langham was one of the London citizens who waited on Charles II at the Hague, when he was knighted. He died in 1699. Other members of the committee were C. Osborn, Dunston, Tomson, and Gregory. Marvell, ii. 230. Turner was in the chair when Pepys attended the committee July 3, 1668.

[2] 'A man of incomparable wit.'

CHAP. XII. viscount, earl, and marquis of Halifax. He was a man of a great and ready wit, full of life, and very pleasant, much turned to satire [1]. He let his wit run much on matters of religion, so that he passed for a bold and determined atheist; though he often protested to me he was not one; and said he believed there was not one in the world. He confessed he could not swallow down every thing that divines imposed on the world. He was a Christian in submission, and he believed as much as he could, and he hoped God would not lay it to his charge if he could not digest iron, as an ostrich did, nor take into his belief things that must burst him: if he had any scruples, they were not sought for, nor cherished by him; for he never read an atheistical book. [a] These were his excuses, but I could not quite believe him; yet [a] in a fit of sickness I knew him
268 very much touched with a sense of religion. I was then oft with him: he seemed full of good purposes: but they went off with his sickness. He was always talking of morality and friendship. He was punctual in all payments, and just in all his private dealings; but with relation to the public he went backwards and forwards, and changed sides so often, that in conclusion no side trusted him. He seemed full of commonwealth notions, yet he went in to the worst part of king Charles's reign. He was out of measure vain and ambitious. The liveliness of his imagin-

[a] Bowyer's transcript.

North's *Life of Lord Keeper Guilford*, 351. Reresby describes him as, 'considering all, the greatest in parts I ever knew,' 191, 231. Henry Sidney says, ten years later, 'Essex and Halifax are of that reputation that nobody can blame them for any one action in their whole lives.' *Diary*, July 17, 1679. In Mrs. Ady's *Sacharissa* he appears in a most amiable light. Besides his brilliant intellectual gifts, he was remarkable for sober good sense, political honour, and chivalrous adherence to friends at a time when these qualities were particularly rare. See his correspondence with his brother Henry Savile (Camd. Soc.).

[1] I remember Burnet once made a very long impertinent speech in the House of Lords, for prohibiting the use of French salt; which the marquis desired the House would excuse, it being none of that salt which seasoned all things; if it had, he was sure the bishop would have spoken more to the purpose, though possibly less in quantity. D.

ation was always too hard for his judgment. A severe jest was preferred by him to all arguments whatsoever; and he was endless in consultations. For when after much discourse a point was settled, if he could find a new jest to make even that which was suggested by himself seem ridiculous, he could not hold, but would study to raise the credit of his wit, though it made others call his judgment in question[1]. When he talked to me as a philosopher of his contempt of the world, I asked him what he meant, to be getting so many new titles, which I called the hanging himself about with bells and tinsel. He had no other excuse for it but this, that, since the world were such fools as to value those matters, a man must be a fool for company: he considered them but as rattles: yet rattles please children: so these might be of use to his family. His heart was much set on raising his family: but though he made a vast estate for them, he buried two of his sons himself, and almost all his grandchildren. The son that survived was an honest man, but far inferior to him, which appeared the more sensibly because he affected to imitate him; but the distance was too wide. I do not remember who besides these were of that committee, that, because it sat in Brookhouse, was called by the name of that house.

The court was much troubled to see an inquiry of this kind set on foot. It was said the king was basely treated, when all his expense was to be looked into. On the other hand it was answered that the parliament did not look into his revenue, but only to the distribution of that treasure

Report, Oct. 26, 1669.

[1] In the House of Lords he affected to conclude all his discourses with a jest, though the subject were never so serious, and if it did not meet with the applause he expected, would be extremely out of countenance and silent, till an opportunity offered to retrieve the approbation he thought he had lost; but was never better pleased than when he was turning Bishop Burnet and his politics into ridicule. In King James's time he told his lady he was sorry he must part with her, but he designed to turn Papist. She said, she hoped he would consider better of it, but if he did, where was the necessity of parting from her? He said, because he was resolved to be a priest, and having considered the matter fully, thought it was much better to be a coachman than a coach-horse. D.

CHAP. XII. that was trusted to him for carrying on the war [1]. I was told that, after all the most shameful items that could be put into an account, there was no account offered for about 800,000*l.*; but I was not then in England: so I was very imperfectly informed as to this matter. The chief men that promoted this were taken off, (as the word then was for corrupting members,) in which the court made so great a progress, that it was thought the king could never have been prevailed on to part with a parliament so much practised on, and where every man's price was known; for as a man rose in his credit in the house, he raised his price, and expected to be treated accordingly. In all this inquiry the carelessness and luxury of the court came to be
269 so much exposed, that the king's spirit was much sharpened upon it [2]. All the flatterers about him magnified foreign

[1] Sir William Temple writing to Bridgeman, Nov. 2, 1668, makes several suggestions for raising supplies without appealing more than was necessary to Parliament; the disposal of quit rents and chimney money, the reduction of the interest paid to the bankers from ten to eight per cent., and the resumption of crown lands, are among them. The decay of trade at this time was so serious as to demand the appointment of a special committee to ascertain its causes. See their minutes, *H. M. C. Rep.* viii. 133. Land was a drug in the market. *Portland MSS., id.* xiv. App. ii. 311.

[2] 'He (sc. the king) and the keeper spoke of nothing but to have money. . . . The House was thin and obsequious. They voted at first they would supply him, according to his occasions, *Nemine*, as it was remarked, *contradicente*; but few affirmatives, rather a silence as of men ashamed and unwilling. Sir R. Howard, Seymour, Temple, Car, and Hollis, openly took leave of their former party, and fell to head the king's business.' Marvell to William Ramsden, Nov. 28, 1670. 'Nevertheless, such was the number of the constant courtiers increased by the apostate patriots, who were bought off for that turn, some at six, others ten, one at fifteen thousand pounds in money, besides what offices, lands, and reversions to others, that it is a mercy they gave not away the whole land and liberty of England.' *Id.* Aug. 6, 1671. See *The Seasonable Argument &c.* (ascribed to Marvell), *Flagellum Parliamentarium* and the anonymous *Alarum* with the characters therein of the leading men, and *infra*, f. 382. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1668-9, 541. 'The House of Commons is a beast not to be understood, it being impossible to know beforehand the success almost of any small plain thing, there being so many to think and speak to any business, and they of so uncertain minds and interests and passions.' Pepys, Dec. 19, 1666.

governments, where the princes were absolute, that in France more particularly. Many, to please him, said it was a very easy thing to shake off the restraints of law, if the king would but set about it. The crown of Denmark was elective, and subject to a senate, and yet was in one day, without any visible force, changed to be both hereditary and absolute, no rebellion nor convulsion of state following on it. The king loved the project in general, but would not give himself the trouble of laying or managing it; and therefore till his affairs were made easier, and the prospect grew clearer, he resolved to keep all things close within himself, and went on in the common maxim, to balance party against party, and by doing popular things to get money of his parliament, under the pretence of supporting the triple alliance. So money-bills passed easily in the house of commons, which by a strange reverse came to be opposed in the | house of lords; who MS. 135. began to complain that the money-bills came up so thick, that it was said there was no end of their giving; *end* signifying purpose as well as a measure, this passed as a severe jest at that time. It is true sir John Coventry made a gross reflection on the king's amours. He was one of those who struggled much against the giving money. The common method is, after those who oppose such bills fail in the main vote, the next thing they endeavour is to lay the money on funds that will be unacceptable, and will prove deficient. So these men proposed the laying a tax on the playhouses, which in so dissolute a time were become nests of prostitution, and the stage was defiled beyond all example, Dryden, the great master at dramatic poesy, being a monster of immodesty and of impurity of all sorts. This was opposed by the court: it was said the players were the king's servants, and a part of his pleasure. Coventry asked, whether did the king's pleasure lie among the men or the women that acted? This was carried with great indignation to the court. It was said this was the first time that the king was personally reflected on: if it

CHAP. XII.

CHAP. XII. was passed over, more of the same kind would follow, and it would grow a fashion to talk so. It was therefore fit to take such severe notice of this, that nobody should dare to talk at that rate for the future. The duke of York told me he said all he could to the king to divert him from the resolution he took; which was to send some of the guards, and watch in the streets where sir John lodged, and leave a mark upon him. Sands and O'Brian[1], and some others,
270 went; and as Coventry was going home they drew about
Oct. 1670. him: he stood up to the wall, and snatched the flambeau out of his servant's hand, and with that in the one hand, and his sword in the other, he defended himself so well, that he got more credit by it than by all the actions of his life. He wounded some of them, but was soon disarmed: and then they cut his nose to the bone, to teach him to remember what respect he owed to the king: and so they left him, and went back to the duke of Monmouth's, where O'Brian's arm was dressed. That matter was executed by orders from the duke of Monmouth: for which he was severely censured, because he lived then in professions of friendship with Coventry; so that his subjection to the king was not thought an excuse for directing so vile an attempt on his friend without sending him secret notice of what was designed. Coventry had his nose so well needled up, that the scar was scarce to be discerned[2]. This put the

[1] O'Brian was son of the Earl of Inchequin. He was in trouble again in 1678. Marvell, May 11, 1678. See the account of this affair, which took place in October, 1670, in Marvell's undated letter to Ramsden (Grosart), ii. 389. Marvell notices another instance of this lawlessness: 'Doubtless you have heard before this time, how Monmouth, Albemarle, Dunbane, and seven or eight gentlemen, fought with the watch, and killed a poor bedle.' See also *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666-7, 263.

[2] Sir J. Coventry always professed himself a zealous Protestant, and was much engaged in the Whig party, but in his will recommended his soul to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, and desired his body might be buried in Somerset House Chapel, and left most of his estate to the English Jesuits at St. Omer's; to the great surprise of all his family (as Lord Weymouth told me, who was his near relation, and present at the opening of it), there having never been the least suspicion during his life. The will was afterwards set aside by law. D.

house of commons in a furious uproar [1]. They passed a bill of banishment against the actors of it; and put a clause in it that it should not be in the king's power to pardon them [2]. This gave great advantages to all those that opposed the court, and was often remembered and much improved by all the angry men. At this time the names of the Court and Country party, which till now had seemed to be forgotten, were again revived. CHAP. XII. Jan. 167⅞.

When the city was pretty well rebuilt, they began to take care of the churches, which had lain in ashes some years; and in that time conventicles abounded in all the parts of the city [3]. It was thought hard to hinder men from worshipping God any way as they could, when there were no churches, nor ministers to look after them. But now they began to raise churches of boards, till the public allowance should be raised towards the building the churches. These they called tabernacles, and they fitted them up with pews and galleries as churches. So now an

[1] This was in January, 167⅞. Marvell says at that time, 'The Court is at the highest pitch of want and luxury, and the people full of discontent.'

[2] And to perpetuate the memory of this mean outrage, there is a provision in the Act to make it felony without benefit of clergy, maliciously to maim or disfigure any person in the manner there mentioned. See, in the *State Trials*, that of one Coke, convicted upon this Act. The words spoken by Coventry were indiscreet and very indecent in the place where he was, and the House might well have censured him for them; but this method of punishing him was of the highest concernment to both Houses; and unnoticed, might have been of the most dangerous consequence with regard to their privileges. The Duke of York's behaviour in this matter was like that of a great man, and the king's and Duke of Monmouth's that of assassins. O. True, but Sir John's uncle, the celebrated Sir William Coventry, on being informed that there was a design to ridicule him, by some farcical representation in a play, told Mr. Killigrew 'to tell his actors, whoever they were, that he would not complain to my Lord Chamberlain, which was too weak, nor get him beaten, as Sir Charles Sedley is said to have done, but that he would cause his nose to be cut.' Pepys, March 6, 166⅞. R.

[3] And throughout the country, causing great alarm. *Fleming Papers*, Feb. 9, 16⅞. 'On Friday the king in Council gave order for the pulling down of the seats and pulpits in all the meeting houses in London, Bristol, and other places.' *Id.* June 14, 1670. Sir W. Temple remarks upon the impression of the king's weakness created by the activity of the conventicles.

CHAP. XII. act was proposed reviving the former act against conventicles [1], with some new clauses in it. One was very extraordinary, that if any doubt should arise concerning the meaning of any part of this act, it was to be determined in the sense that was the most contrary to conventicles, it being the intention of the house to repress them in the most effectual manner possible. The other was, the laying a heavy fine on such justices of the peace as should not execute the law, when informations were brought them [2].

April 11, 1670.

[1] The second Conventicle Act received the royal assent on April 11, 1670. A Bill to continue the Act of March, 1664 (see *supra* 366, note), whose period of three years had run out, passed the Commons and went to the Lords on April 28, 1668: it was read a first time in the Lords on the 29th, but, in spite of the remonstrance of the Commons on May 4, never reached a second reading. *Journals of the Lords and Commons.* Charles was forced to issue a proclamation on Nov. 4, 1669, for the suppression of conventicles and for putting in force all laws against Nonconformists. See also Marvell, March 7, 166$\frac{7}{8}$. The present Act was famous for the proviso (*Parl. Hist.* iv. 447) sent down by the Lords and rejected by the Commons, which would have restored the king 'to all civil and ecclesiastical prerogatives which his ancestors had enjoyed at any time since the conquest. There never was so compendious a piece of universal tyranny. . . . The Parliament was never so embarrassed beyond recovery. We are all venal cowards except some few.' Marvell, April 14, 1670, and March 10, 166$\frac{8}{9}$. The Lords' amendments were all in favour of leniency; e.g. reducing the penalty by one-half, abolishing imprisonment, restricting penalties to indoor meetings, granting the power of appeal, &c. *H. M. C. Rep.* viii. 142. See the provisions of the Act in the *Statutes at Large*, iii. 332, and Besse, *Sufferings of the Quakers*, i. Pref. xx.

[2] Another very significant provision was that constables withholding information were to be fined £5, and Justices of the Peace refusing to convict were to pay £100 in each case. From Seth Ward's letters to Sheldon (*supra* 343, note) it appears that it had been found almost impossible in his diocese to carry out the former laws, through this sympathy of the Justices with the offenders. Informers were now to receive half the fine. By 1671 'informer against conventicles' appears to have become a recognized profession. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1671, 106; Luttrell's *Diary.* See also Marvell, March 10, 1670; *Kenyon Papers*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. iv. 90; *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 206; 1668–9, 419 and *passim.* The vigilance of the government extended to girls' schools, *id.* 1670, 18. See the remonstrance of John Lerie, *id.* 151; John Hicks's *Sufferings of the Fanaticks in Devon in* 1670, 1671, *Somers Tracts*, vii. 586; Besse's *Sufferings of the Quakers.* The records of the Baptist congregation at Broadmead, near Bristol (105, 223, 226), contain amusing accounts of the devices resorted to for evading

Upon this, many who would not be the instruments of such severities left the bench, and would sit there no longer. This act was executed in the city very severely in Starlin[g]'s mayoralty [1]; and put things in such disorder, that many of the trading men of the city began to talk of removing with their stock over to Holland: but the king ordered a stop to be put to further severities. Many of the sects either discontinued their meetings, or held them very secretly with small numbers, and not in the hours of the public worship; yet informers were encouraged, and were every where at work. The behaviour of the quakers was more particular, and had something in it that looked bold. They met at the same place and at the same hour as before; and when they were seized, none of them would go out of the way: they went altogether to prison: they staid there till they were dismissed, for they would not petition to be set at liberty, nor would they pay the fines set on them, nor so much as the jail fees, calling these the wages of unrighteousness. And as soon as they were let out, they went to their meeting-houses again: and when they found these were shut up by order, they held their meetings on the streets, before the doors of those houses. They said they would not disown or be ashamed of their meeting together to worship God: but, in imitation of Daniel, they would do it the more publicly, because they were forbidden doing it. Some called this obstinacy, while others called it firmness. But by it they carried their point, for the government | grew weary of dealing with so much perverseness, and so began with letting them alone [2].

CHAP. XII.

271

MS. 136.

the Act. See also, for another instance of passive resistance, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1671, 419.

[1] Sir Samuel Starling's mayoralty was in 1669.

[2] The dread and repugnance against the Quakers was excited apparently by nothing but the unusualness of their language and tenets. Every one was puzzled and every one was therefore angry. 'The Quakers, the most incorrigible sinners that I know.' *Kenyon MSS., Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1660–1, 585–587, &c. From the *Broadmead Records*, 45, 46, and Baxter's *Narrative*, it appears that Papists went about in Quaker disguise, which increased suspicion. Their language was often violent, or at least indiscreet. Marvell, ii. 307;

CHAP. XII.

The king had by this time got all the money that he expected from the house of commons, and that after great practice on both lords and commons. Many bones were thrown in, to create differences between the two houses, to try if by both houses insisting on them the money-bills might fall. But to prevent all trouble from the lords, the king was advised to go and be present at all their debates. Lord Lauderdale valued himself to me on this advice, which he said he gave. At first the king sat decently in the chair, on the throne; [a]that was a great restraint on the freedom of debate, which had some effect for a while: but afterwards many of the lords seemed to speak with the more boldness, because, they said, one heard it to whom they had no other access but in that

[a] *though even* struck out.

Cal. St. P. Dom. 1662–4, 175, 649. The average ignorance about, and dislike of them, is amusingly illustrated in the *Verney MSS.*, Dec. 13, 1666, when Sir Ralph Verney, a man of sound sense and sweet disposition, warns his son against the Quakeress who is to nurse his wife. He is not to permit her to be alone with her patient, for 'such persons are apt to instill theire ill principles into the mindes of weak persons.' 'I know not this Quaker, but I am sure they are a dangerous sort of people, and those that coloure theire designs with a show of religion are ever the most dangerous.' See Ranke, iii. 580; *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1662–4, 372, 444, and especially the *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 180. It was during this period of senseless persecution (of which see examples in *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1666–7, 94, 270; 1671, 450) that a great advance was made in constitutional liberty in the case of the Quakers, William Penn and William Mead; when the right of juries to find verdicts against the direction of the Bench was established, September, 1670. Marvell, Nov. 28, 1670. 'The Jury not finding them guilty, as the Recorder and Mayor would have had them, they were kept without meat or drink some three days, till almost starved, but would not alter their verdict; so fined and imprisoned.' One of their number, Bushell, then sued a writ of Habeas Corpus from the Court of Common Pleas, and on the return that he had been committed for finding a verdict against the evidence was discharged by Vaughan, Lord Chief Justice, who held the ground to be insufficient. The judges, however, by eight to four, remanded them to Newgate on the ground that the cause, being a criminal one, was not cognizable by the Common Pleas, but in the King's Bench. The victory was none the less won. See Besse, *Sufferings of the Quakers* (1753), i. 416–426; Hallam, *History of England*, iii. 8 (sm. ed.).

place; and they took the more liberty because what they said could not be reported wrong. The king, who was often weary of time, and did not know how to get round the day, liked the going to the house, as a pleasant diversion. So he went constantly[1]: and he quickly left the throne, and stood by the fire; which drew a crowd about him, that broke all the decency of that house. For before that time every lord sat regularly in his place: but the king's coming broke the order of their sitting as became senators. The king's going thither had a much worse effect: for he became a common solicitor, not only 272
in public affairs, but even in private matters of justice. He would in a very little time have gone round the house, and spoke to every man that he thought worth speaking to; and he was apt to do that upon the solicitation of any of the ladies in favour, or of any that had credit with him. He knew well on whom he could prevail: so being once in a matter of justice desired to speak to the earl of Essex and lord Holles, he said they were stiff and sullen men: but when he was next desired to solicit two others, he undertook to do it, and said, 'they are men of no conscience, so I will take the government of their conscience into my own hands.' Yet when any of the lords told him plainly that they could not vote as he desired, he seemed to take it well from them. When the act against conventicles was in that house, Wilkins argued long against it. The king was much for having it pass, not that he intended to execute it, but he was glad to have that body of men at mercy, and to force them to concur in the design for a general toleration[2]. He spoke to Wilkins not to oppose

[1] See the extremely interesting account of this in Marvell's letter to Ramsden of April 14, 1670. Marvell intimates that the king's object was to neutralize the Duke of York's influence. He was solemnly thanked by the Lords for the honour he did them. After the Roos Act 'the king has ever since continued his session among them, and says it is better than going to a play.'

[2] Besides the second Conventicle Act, which received the royal assent on April 11, 1670, there was a Bill for 'an additional Act to prevent and suppress seditious conventicles,' which passed the Commons on April 5, 1671, and a Bill against Popery,

CHAP. XII. it. He answered, he thought it an ill thing both in conscience and policy: therefore, both as he was an Englishman and a bishop, he was bound to oppose it. The king then desired him not to come to the house while it depended. He said, by the law and constitution of England, and by his majesty's favour, he had a right to debate and vote: and he was neither afraid nor ashamed to own his opinion in that matter, and to act pursuant to it. So he went on: and the king was not offended with his freedom. But though he bore with such a frank refusing to comply with his desire, yet if any had made him such a general answer as led him to believe they intended to be compliant, and had not in all things done as he expected, he called that a juggling with him, and he was apt to speak hardly of them on that account, of which bishop Ward felt a very heavy share. No sooner was the king at ease, and had his fleet put in good case, and his stores and magazines well furnished, than he immediately fell a negotiating with France, both to ruin Holland and to subvert the government of England. The Brook-house business, as well as the burning his fleet, stuck as deep as any thing could go into his heart. He resolved to revenge the one, and to free himself from the apprehensions of the other's returning upon him: though the house of commons were so far practised on, that the report of Brook-house was let fall, and that matter was no more insisted on. Yet he abhorred
273 the precedent, and the discoveries that had been made upon it.

1670. The prince of Orange came over to him in the winter [16]69[1]. He was then in the twentieth year of his age,

sent to the Lords in March. Marvell, March 11, 167$\frac{4}{5}$. They were lost by the successive prorogations of Parliament from April 26, 1671 to Feb. 4, 167$\frac{3}{4}$, rendered necessary through the controversy with the Lords on amendments to money bills. 'The Lords read [the Conventicle Bill] once, and divided for throwing it out, but it was retained by the odds of two voices.' Marvell, April 6, 1671. *Portland MSS.* iii., *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. ii. 322, 323.

[1] Burnet antedates this visit. On Nov. 21, 1670, Arlington wrote, 'The Prince of Orange hath been now there three weeks amongst us, much to the satisfaction of the king, and all

near being of full age: so he came over both to see how the king intended to pay the great debt that he owed him, which had been contracted by his father on his account, and likewise to try what offices the king would do in order to his advancement to the stadtholdership [1]. The king treated him civilly. He assured him he would pay the debt, but did not lay down any method of doing it: so these were only good words. He tried the prince, as he himself told me, in the point of religion: he spoke of all the protestants as a factious body, broken among themselves ever since they had broke off from the main body; and wished that he would take more pains, and look into these things better, and not be led by his Dutch blockheads. The prince told all this to Zulesteyn, his natural uncle. They were both amazed at it, and wondered how the king could trust so great a secret as his being a papist to so young a person. The prince told me that he never spoke of this to any other person till after his [the king's] death: but he carried it always in his own mind, and could not hinder himself from judging of all the king's intentions after that; nor did he, upon his not compliance with that proposition, expect any real assistance of the king, but general intercessions which signified nothing: and that was all he obtained. CHAP. XII.

| So far have I carried on the thread of the affairs of MS. 137.

that have seen him; being a young man of the most extraordinary Understanding and Parts, besides his quality and birth that makes him shine the better.' Arlington's *Letters*, ii. 311. Evelyn, on Nov. 4, says, 'He has a manly, courageous, wise countenance, resembling his mother and the Duke of Gloucester.' Reresby, 83, relates a curious incident of the visit. The king and Buckingham, it appears, did their best to make the prince drunk, and succeeded so far that 'amongst other expressions of his frolicsomeness he broke the windows of the chambers of the maids of honour, and had got into some of their apartments, had they not been timely rescued.' He returned to the Hague in February, 1671.

[1] And 'to pretend to the Lady Mary.' His letter of instructions, dated June 20, 1670, to his precursor Dr. Rompf, tells him to put himself into the hands of Arlington alone in the matter of the payment of the debt. There is nothing in them about the stadtholdership. *Original Letters of King William to Charles II, Lord Arlington, &c.*, 1704, p. 3.

CHAP. XII. England down from the peace of Breda to the year [16]70, in which the negotiation with the court of France was set on foot[1]. I am not sure that every thing is told in a just order, because I was all the while very much retired from the world and from company. But I am confident I have given a true representation of things, since I had most of these matters from persons who knew them well, and who were not like to deceive me.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ROYAL SUPREMACY IN SCOTLAND. FAILURE OF LEIGHTON'S ATTEMPT TO CONCILIATE THE COVENANTERS.

BUT now I return to my own country, where the same spirit appeared in the administration.

The king was now upon measures of moderation and comprehension: so these were also pursued in Scotland. Leighton was the only person among the bishops that declared for these methods: and he made no step without talking it over to me. A great many churches were already vacant. They fell off entirely from all the episcopal clergy in the western counties: and a set of hot fiery young teachers went about among the people, inflaming them more and more. So it was necessary to find a remedy for this[2].

[1] These negotiations had been going on since the Spring of 1668. They may be read in detail in Mignet's great work, *Négociations relatives, &c.*, already referred to. The treaty was, as Marvell expressed it, 'a work of darkness' (*Popery and Arbitrary Power*, Grosart, 266).

[2] The great increase in conventicles, which was now observed, 'hath been encouraged by the general report there is here of the avowdnes of conventicles in England and Irland . . . if there be slackning of the reignes there it will be hard for us to hold them strait here. . . . I am, in my private opinion, for a qualified toleration, but I wold have it given and not taken.' Kincardine to Lauderdale, March 2, 166$\frac{8}{9}$. Tweeddale writes on Feb. 23, 166$\frac{8}{9}$, in the same tone. 'The starting up to preach and conventicle was upon information . . . that it was now fitt to try if the State would suffer that liberty was given in England.'

Leighton proposed that a treaty should be set on foot, in order to the accommodating our differences, and for changing the laws that had carried the episcopal authority much higher than any of the bishops themselves put in practice. He saw both church and state were rent: religion was like to be lost: popery, or rather barbarity, was like to come in upon us: and therefore he proposed such a scheme as he thought might have taken in the soberest men of presbyterian principles; reckoning that if the schism could be once healed, and order be once restored, it might be easy to bring things into such a management, that the concessions then to be offered should do no great hurt in present, and should die with that generation. He observed the extraordinary concessions made by the African church to the Donatists, who were every whit as wild and extravagant as our people were. Therefore he went indeed very far to the extenuating the episcopal authority: but he thought it would be easy afterwards to recover what seemed necessary to be yielded at present. CH. XIII. 274

He proposed that the church should be governed by the bishops and their clergy mixing together in the church judicatories, in which the bishop should act only as president, and be determined by the majority of his presbyters, both in matters of jurisdiction and ordination: and that the presbyterians should be allowed, when they sat down first in these judicatories, to declare that their sitting under a bishop was submitted to by them only for peace sake, with a reservation of their opinion with relation to any such presidency: and that no negative vote should be claimed by the bishop: that bishops should go to the churches where such as were to be ordained were to serve, and hear and discuss any exceptions that were made to them, and ordain them with the concurrence of the presbytery: that such as were to be ordained should have leave to declare their opinion, if they thought the bishop was only the head of the presbyters. And he also

CH. XIII. proposed that there should be provincial synods, to sit in course every third year, or oftener if the king should summon them; in which complaints of the bishops should be received, and they should be censured accordingly. The laws that settled episcopacy and the authority of a national synod were to be altered according to this scheme. To justify, or rather to excuse, these concessions, which left little more than the name of a bishop, he said, as for their protestation, it would be little minded and soon forgotten: the world would see the union that would be again settled among us, and the protestation would lie dead in the books, and die with those that made it: as for the negative vote, bishops generally managed matters so that they had no occasion for it: but if it should be found necessary, it might be lodged in the king's name
275 with some secular person, who should interpose it as often as the bishop saw it was expedient to use it. And if the present race could be but laid in their graves in peace, all those heats would abate, if not quite fall off. He also thought it was a much decenter thing for bishops to go upon the place where the minister was to serve, and to ordain, after solemn fasting and prayer, than to huddle it up at their cathedrals, with no solemnity, and scarce with common decency. It seemed also reasonable that bishops should be liable to censure, as well as other people, and that in a fixed court, which was to consist of bishops and deans, and two chosen from every presbytery. The liberty offered to such as were to be ordained to declare their opinion, was the hardest part of the whole: it looked like the perpetuating a factious and irregular humour; but few would make use of it. All the churches in the gift of the king or of the bishops would go to men of other principles. But though some things of an ill digestion were at such a time admitted, yet, if by these means the schism could be once healed, and the nation again settled in a peaceable state, the advantage of that would balance all that was
MS. 138. lost by | those abatements that were to be made in the

episcopal authority, which had been raised too high, and to correct that was now to be let fall too low, if it were not for the good that was to be hoped for from this *accommodation:* for this came to be the word, as *comprehension* was in England. He proposed that a treaty might be set on foot for bringing the presbyterians to accept of those concessions. The earl of Kincardine was against all treating with them: they were a trifling sort of disputatious people, that loved logic and sophistry. They would fall into much wrangling, and would subdivide among themselves: and the young and ignorant men among them, that were accustomed to popular declamations, would say, here was a bargain made to sell Christ's kingdom and his prerogative. He therefore proposed, that since we knew both their principles and their tempers, we ought to carry the concessions as far as was either reasonable or expedient, and pass these into laws: and then they would submit to a settlement that was made, and that could not be helped, more easily than give a consent beforehand to any thing that seemed to entrench on that which they called the liberty of the church. Leighton did fully agree with him. But lord Lauderdale would never consent to that. He said, a law that did so entirely change the constitution of the church, when it came to be passed and printed, would be construed in England as a pulling down of episcopacy, unless he could have this to say in excuse for it, that the presbyterians were willing 276
to come under that model. So he said, since the load of what was to be done in Scotland would fall heaviest on him, he would not expose himself so much as the passing any such act must certainly do, till he knew what effects would follow on it. So we were forced to try how to deal with them in a treaty. I was sent to propose this scheme to Hutchinson[1], who was esteemed the learnedest man

[1] George Hutcheson, late minister at Edinburgh. He was among the 'outed' ministers who received permission to preach and exercise the other functions of their ministry by the indulgence of June 7, 1669. Wodrow, ii. 133.

CH. XIII. among them: but I was only to try him, and to talk of it as a notion of my own. He had married my cousin-germain, and I had been long acquainted with him. He looked on it as a project that would never take effect: so he would not give his opinion about it. He said, when these concessions were passed into laws, he would know what he should think of them, but he was one of many; so he avoided the engaging himself. The next thing under consideration was, how to dispose of the many vacancies, and how to put a stop to conventicles. Leighton proposed that they should be kept still vacant, while the treaty was on foot, and that the presbyterians should see how much the government was in earnest in the design of bringing them to serve in the church, when so many places were kept open for them. The earl of Tweeddale thought the treaty would run into a great length and to many niceties, and would probably come to nothing in conclusion: so he proposed the granting the outed ministers leave to go and serve in those parishes by an act of the king's Indulgence[1]. Leighton was against this. He thought nothing would bring on the presbyterians to a treaty so much as the hopes of being again suffered to return to their benefices; whereas, if they were once admitted to them, they would reckon they had gained their point, and would grow more backward. I was desired to go into the western parts, and to give a true account of matters, as I found them there. So I went, as in a visit to the duke of Hamilton, whose duchess was a woman of great piety and great parts[2]. She had much credit among them, for she passed for a zealous presbyterian, though she protested to me she never entered into the points of controversy, and had no settled opinion about forms of government; only she thought their ministers were good men, who kept the country in great quiet and order: they were, she said, blameless in their lives, devout

[1] See Lady Margaret Kennedy's letter of May 1, 1669 (Bannatyne Club).

[2] See *supra* 187.

in their way, and diligent in their labours. [a]The people were all in a phrenzy, and were in no disposition to any treaty. The furiousest men among them were busy in conventicles, inflaming them against all agreement: so she thought that if the more moderate presbyterians were put in vacant churches, the people would grow tamer, and be taken out of the hands of the mad preachers, that were then most in vogue. This would likewise create a confidence in them: for they were now so possessed with prejudices, as to believe that all that was proposed was only an artifice to make them fall out among themselves, and to deceive them at last. This seemed reasonable: and she got many of the more moderate of them to come to me, and they all talked in the same strain. CH. XIII. 277

A strange accident happened to Sharp in July [16]68. As he was going into his coach in full daylight, and the bishop of Orkney with him, a man came up to the coach, and discharged a pistol at him with a brace of bullets in it[1]; as the bishop was going up into the coach, he intended to shoot through his cloak at Sharp as he was mounting up: but the bullets stuck in the bishop of Orkney's arm, and shattered it so, that, | though he lived some years after that, they were forced to open it every year for a new exfoliation. Sharp was so universally hated, that, though this was done in full daylight, and on the high street, yet nobody offered to seize on the assassin. So he walked off, and went home, and shifted himself of an odd wig, which he was not accustomed to wear, and came out, and walked on the streets immediately[2]. But Sharp had viewed him that he believed was the person so narrowly, that he discovered him afterwards, as shall be mentioned in its proper July 11, 1668. MS. 139.

[a] *she said* struck out.

[1] July 11, 1668. Wodrow, ii. 115. See the account also by the Provost of Edinburgh. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 109. For the later proceedings against James Mitchell see Wodrow and f. 413.

[2] 'All imaginable industry is used and payns taken to discover it; yett the Archbishop whines still and speaks still of overturnings and revolutions.' Tweeddale to Lauderdale, July 21, 1668.

CH. XIII. place. I lived then much out of the world: yet I thought it decent to go and congratulate on this occasion. He was much touched with it, and put on a shew of devotion upon it. He said with a very serious look, My times are wholly in thy hand, O thou the God of my life! This was the single expression savouring of piety that ever fell from him in all the conversation that passed between him and me. Proclamations were issued out with great rewards for discovering the actor, but nothing followed on them. On this occasion it was thought proper that he should be called to court, and have some marks of the king's favour put on him. He promised to make many good motions, and he talked for a while like a changed man: and went out of his way, as he was going to court, to visit me at my parsonage house, and seemed resolved to turn to other methods. The king, as he had a particular talent that way when he had a mind to it, treated him with special characters of favour and respect: but he made no propositions to the king, only in general terms he approved of the methods of gentleness and moderation then in vogue.

278 When he came back to Scotland he moved in council that an indulgence might be granted to some of the Public Resolutioners, with some rules and restraints[1]; such as, that they should not speak or preach against episcopacy, and that they should not admit to either of the sacraments any of the neighbouring parishes without a desire from their own ministers; and that they should engage themselves to observe these rules. He knew that this proposition, for all the shew of moderation that was in it, could have no effect: for the Resolutioners and the Protestors had laid down their old disputes, and were resolved to come under no discrimination on that account; nor would they engage to observe any limitations that should be laid on them. They said the government might lay restraints on them, and punish them if they broke through them, and

[1] He was compelled to do this. *Lauderdale MSS.* 23,130, f. 42; 23,131, f. 26.

they would obey them, or not, at their peril. But they laid down this for a maxim, that they had received a complete ministry from Christ, and that the judicatories of the church had only power to govern them in the exercise of their function. If the king should lay any limitations on them, they might obey these, as prudence should direct: but they would not bind themselves up by any engagement of their own. Burnet and his clergy, (for the diocese of Glasgow is above the fourth part of all Scotland,) came to Edinburgh full of high complaints, that the churches were universally forsaken, and that conventicles abounded in every corner of the country. A proclamation was upon that issued out in imitation of the English act[1], setting a fine of 50*l.* upon every landlord on whose grounds any conventicle was held, which he might recover as he could of those who were at any such conventicle. This was plainly against law; for the council had no power by their authority to set arbitrary fines. It was pretended, on the other hand, that the act of parliament that had restored episcopacy had a clause in it recommending the execution of that act to the privy council by all the best ways they could think of. But the lawyers at the council-board said, that in matter of property their power was certainly tied up to the direction of the law: and the clause mentioned related only to particular methods, but could not be construed so far as this proclamation carried the matter. The proclamation went out, but was never executed. It was sent up to London, and had a shew of zeal; and so was made use of by the earl of Lauderdale, to bear down the clamour that was raised against him and his party in Scotland, as if they designed to pull down episcopacy. The model of the county militia was now executed: and about 20,000 horse and foot were armed and trained, 279
and cast into independent regiments and troops, who were all to be under such orders as the council issued out. All this was against law: for the king had only

Ch. XIII.

April 8, 1669.

[1] *scil.* the second Conventicle Act, *supra* 490; Wodrow, ii. 126.

CH. XIII. a power upon an extraordinary occasion to raise and march such a body of men as he should summon together, and that at his own charge: but the converting this into a standing militia, which carried with it a standing charge, was thought a great stretch of prerogative. Yet it was resolved on; though great exceptions were made to it by the lawyers, chiefly by sir John Nisbet, the king's advocate, a man of great learning, both in law and in many other things, chiefly in the Greek learning: he was a person of great integrity, only he loved money too much: but he always stood firm to the law[1]. The true secret of this was, that lord Lauderdale was now pressing to get into the management of the affairs of England, and he saw what the court was aiming at: so he had a mind to make himself considerable by this, that he had in his hand a great army, with a magazine of arms, and a stock of money laid up in Scotland for any accident that might happen[2]. So all his creatures, and lady Dysart more than all the rest, had this up in all companies, that none before him ever dreamt how to make Scotland considerable to the king: but now it began to make a great figure. An army, a magazine, and a treasure, were words of a high sound;

MS. 140. chiefly now that the | house of commons was like to grow so intractable, that the duke of Buckingham despaired of being able to manage them. He moved the dissolving the parliament, and calling a new one, and thought the nation would choose men less zealous for the church, who were all against him. But the king would not venture on it: he knew the house of commons was either firm to him by their own principles, or by his management they could be

[1] Nisbet succeeded Sir John Fletcher (*supra* 191, note) in 1664, and was in turn replaced by George Mackenzie of Rosehaugh ('Bloody Mackenzie') in 1677. Omond's *Lord Advocates of Scotland.*

[2] The Treaty of Dover was in prospect; it included a condition that Charles should sooner or later declare his conversion; and it was thought possible that civil war might ensue. But, if Charles ever really thought of using force, the idea speedily passed. *Quarterly Review*, April, 1884, 437. As early as February, 1670, the 'fear of the Scotch forces' was spreading in Parliament. *Verney MSS.*

made so, and therefore he would not run the risk of any new election. He had the dissenters much in his power, by the severe laws under which they lay at his mercy: but he did not know what influence they might have in elections, and in a new parliament: these he knew were in their hearts enemies to prerogative, which he believed they would shew as soon as they got themselves to be delivered from the laws that then put them in the king's power. Lord Tweeddale was then at London: and he set on foot a proposition, that came to nothing, but made so much noise, and was of such importance, that it deserves to be enlarged on. It was for the union of both kingdoms[1]. The king liked it; because he reckoned that, at least for his time, he would be sure of all the members that should 280
be sent up from Scotland. The duke of Buckingham went in easily to a new thing: and lord keeper Bridgeman was much for it. The lord Lauderdale pressed it vehemently. It made it necessary to hold a parliament in Scotland, where he intended to be the king's commissioner[2]. The earl of Tweeddale was for it on other accounts, both to settle the establishment of the militia, and to get some alterations made in the laws that related to the church: but he really drove at the union, as a thing which as he hoped might be brought about. Scotland was even then under great uneasiness, though the king knew the state of that kingdom: but when another king should

[1] King William told the Earl of Jersey, that it was a standing maxim in the Stuart family (whatever advances they pretended to make towards it), never to suffer a union between the two kingdoms, though in his opinion it would be an advantage; for it could not be done without admitting a good number of Scotch members into both Houses, who must depend upon the crown for their subsistence; but said he was not desirous the experiment should be made in his reign, for he had not the good fortune to know what would satisfy a Scotchman. D.

[2] See Mackenzie, *Memoirs*, upon this. The belief that Lauderdale wished for union does not seem tenable in the face of his own letters. He doubtless felt that in such a case, instead of being viceroy with almost unlimited power, he would become a mere official administrator. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. Both Charles and James wrote urgently in favour of union. *Id.* 159, 184, and *Webster MSS.*, Oct. 28, 1670.

CH. XIII. reign that knew not Joseph, (so he expressed it,) the nation would be delivered up to favourites, and be devoured by them. Rich provinces, like those that belonged to Spain, could hold out long, even under oppression; but a poor country would be soon dispeopled, if much oppressed. And if a king of deep designs against public liberty should caress the Scots, he might easily engage them; since a poor country may be supposed willing to change their seats, and to break in upon a richer. There was indeed no fear of that at present; for the dotage of the nation on presbytery, and the firmness with which the government supported episcopacy, set them so far from one another, that no engagement of that sort could be attempted. But if a king should take a dexterous method for putting that out of the way, he might carry Scotland to any design he thought fit to engage in. Lord Tweeddale blamed sir Francis Bacon much for laying it down as a maxim, that Scotland was to be reckoned as the third part of the island [1], and to be treated accordingly: whereas he assured me Scotland for numbers of people was not above a tenth part, and for wealth not above a twentieth part of the island.

The discourse of the union was kept up till it was resolved to summon a new parliament in Scotland; but then lord Lauderdale made the king reflect on the old scheme he had laid before him at the restoration, and he undertook to manage the parliament so as to make it answer that end more effectually than any before him had ever done. This was resolved on in the summer [16]69; and then it was that I being at Hamilton, and having got the best information of the state of the country that I could, wrote a long account of all I had heard to the lord Tweeddale, and concluded it with an advice to put some of the more moderate of the presbyterians into the vacant churches. Sir Robert Moray told me the letter was so well liked, that it was read to the king. Such a letter
281 would have signified nothing, if lord Tweeddale had not

[1] See *supra* 9, where this opinion is ascribed to James I.

been fixed in the same notion: he had now a plausible thing to support it. So my principles, and zeal for the church, and I know not what besides, were raised, to make my advice signify somewhat, and it was said I was the man that went most entirely into all Leighton's maxims. So this indiscreet letter of mine, sent without communicating it to Leighton, gave the deciding stroke; and, as may be easily believed, it drew much hatred on me from all that either knew it, or did suspect it. The king wrote a letter to the privy council, ordering them to indulge such of the presbyterians as were peaceable and loyal, so far as to suffer them to serve in vacant churches, though they did not submit to the present establishment: and he required them to set them such rules as might preserve order and peace, and to look well to the execution of them: and as for such as could not be provided to churches at that time, he ordered a pension of twenty pounds sterling a year to be paid to every one of them, as long as they lived orderly. Nothing followed on the second article of this letter. The presbyterians looked on this as the king's hire to be silent, and not to do their duty, and none of them would accept of it. But as to the first part of the letter, on the first council day after it was read, twelve of the old ministers were indulged: they had parishes assigned them: and about thirty more were afterwards indulged in the same manner: and then a stop was put for some time. With the warrants that they had for their churches, there was a paper of rules likewise put in their hands. Hutcheson, in all their names, made a speech to the council: he began Aug. 1669. with decent expressions of thanks to the king and to their lordships, and he said they should at all times give such obedience to | laws and orders as could stand with a good MS. 141. conscience[1]. And so they were dismissed. As for those of them that were allowed to go to the churches where they had served before, no difficulty could be made: but those

[1] See *supra* 499. For his 'Discourse to the Council,' see *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 193; Wodrow, ii. 133.

CH. XIII. of them that were named to other churches would not enter on the serving them, till the church sessions and the inhabitants of the parish met, and made choice of them for their pastors, and gave them a call (as they worded it) to serve among them. But upon this, scruples arose among some, who said the people's choice ought to be free, whereas they were now limited to the person named by the council, so that this looked like an election upon a *congé d'élire* with a letter naming the person, with which they had often diverted themselves. But scruples are mighty things when they concur with inclination or interest: and when they
282 are not supported by these, men learn distinctions to get free from them. So it happened in this case: for though some few were startled at these things, yet they lay in no man's way; for every man went, and was possessed of the churches marked out for them. And at first the people of the country run to them with a sort of transport of joy. Yet this was soon cooled[1]. It was hoped that they would have begun their ministry with a public testimony against all [that] had been done in opposition to what they were accustomed to call the work of God; but they were silent at this time, and preached only the doctrines of Christianity. This disgusted all those who loved to hear their ministers preach to the times, as they call it. The stop put to the indulgence made many conclude that those who had obtained the favour had entered into secret engagements. So they came to call them the king's curates, as they had called the clergy in derision the bishops' curates. Their caution brought them under a worse character, of *dumb dogs*, that could not bark. Those who by their fierce behaviour had shut themselves out from a share in the indulgence, began to call this Erastianism, and the civil magistrate's assuming the power of sacred matters. They said this was visibly an artifice to lay things asleep, with the present generation; and was one of the depths of

[1] The indulgence divided the Presbyterians, as intended by its true authors, Tweeddale and Kincardine. Cf. *supra* 499.

Satan, to give a present quiet, in order to the certain de- CH. XIII.
struction of presbytery. And it was also said, that there was a visible departing of the divine assistance from those preachers: they preached no more with the power and authority that had accompanied them at conventicles. So many began to fall off from them, and to go again to conventicles. Many of the preachers confessed to me that they found an ignorance and a deadness among those who had been the hottest upon their meetings, beyond what could have been imagined. Those that could have argued about the intrinsic power of the church, and episcopacy, and presbytery, upon which all their sermons had chiefly run for several years, knew very little of the essentials of religion. But the indulged preachers, instead of setting themselves with the zeal and courage that became them against the follies of the people, of which they confessed to my self they were very sensible, took a different method; and studied by mean compliances to gain upon their affections, and to take them out of the hands of some fiery men that were going up and down among them. The tempers of some brought them under this servile popularity, into which others went out of craft and a desire to live easy.

The indulgence was settled in a hurry: but when it came 283
to be descanted on, it appeared to be plainly against law. For by the act restoring episcopacy, none were capable of benefices but such as should own the authority of bishops, and be instituted by them. So now the episcopal party, that were wont to put all authority in the king, as long as he was for them, began to talk of law[1]. They said the king's power was bounded by the law, and that these proceedings were the trampling of law under foot. For all parties, as they need the shelter of law or the stretches of the prerogative, are apt by turns to magnify the one or the other. Burnet and his clergy were out of measure enraged at it. They were not only abandoned, but ill used by the people, who were beginning to threaten, or to buy them out

[1] Precisely as in England. Lady M. Kennedy, Sept. 24, 1669 (Bannatyne Club).

CH. XIII. of their churches, that they also might have the benefit of the indulgence. The synod of the clergy was held at Glasgow in October: and they moved that an address might be drawn up, representing to the king the miseries they were under, occasioned by the indulgence: they complained of it as illegal, and as like to be fatal to the church[1]. So this was, according to the words in some of their acts of parliament, a misrepresenting the king's proceedings, in order to the alienating the hearts of his subjects from him; which was made capital, as may appear by the account given in the former book of the proceedings against the lord Balmerino[2]. He that drew this was one Ross, afterwards archbishop, first of Glasgow, and then of St. Andrews; who is yet alive, and was always a proud, ill-natured, and ignorant man, covetous, and violent out of measure[3]. So it was drawn full of acrimony. Yet they resolved to keep it secret till advice should be taken upon it; and accordingly to present it to the privy council, or not. A copy of this was procured by indirect methods: and it was sent up to court, after the earl of Lauderdale was come off, and was on his way to hold the parliament in Scotland. Lord Lauderdale had left all his concerns at court with sir Robert Moray: for though, at his mistress's
MS. 142. instigation, he had used him | very unworthily, yet he had that opinion of his virtue and candour, that he left all his affairs to his care. As soon as the king saw the clergy's address, he said it was a new Western Remonstrance[4]: and ordered that Burnet should not be suffered to come to the parliament, and that he should be proceeded against as

[1] A copy of this address, and the decree of the Privy Council condemning it, Oct. 16, 1669, are in the *Sheldon MSS.* See Tweeddale's letter, Aug. 5, 1669, *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 196. 'Their smelling Erastianisme striks terrour in both partys, and the commons they say call it Rogischly Rascalisme.'

[2] See *supra* 32-39.

[3] Arthur Ross, Bishop of Argyll, 1675; Archbishop of Glasgow, 1679–1684; Archbishop of St. Andrews, 1684–1688, when he was ejected.

[4] 'This new unchristened Remonstrance' was Moray's phrase; 'the insolent, impertinent, Glasgow paper,' Lauderdale called it. See Charles's letter, *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 166. For the old 'Western Remonstrance' see *supra* 98.

far as the law could carry the matter. It was not easy to stretch this so far as to make it criminal. But Burnet being obnoxious on other accounts, they intended to frighten him to submit, and to resign his bishopric [1].

284 Oct. 19, 1669. The parliament was opened in November. Lord Lauderdale's speech run upon two heads. The one was, the recommending to their care the preservation of the church, as established by law, upon which he took occasion to express great zeal for episcopacy. The other head related to the union of both kingdoms. All that was done relating to that was, that an act passed for a treaty [2]: and in the following summer, in a subsequent session, commissioners were named, who went up to treat about it, but they made no progress; and the thing fell so soon, that it was very visible it was never intended in good earnest. The two first acts passed in parliament were of more importance, and had a deeper design [3]. The first explained and asserted the king's supremacy: but they carried it, as they are apt to do in Scotland, in such general words, that it might have been stretched to every thing. It was declared that the settling all things relating to the external government of the church was a right of the crown; and that all things relating to ecclesiastical meetings, matters, and persons, were to be ordered according to such directions as the king should send to his privy council: and that these should be published by them, which should have the force of laws. Lord Lauderdale very probably knew the secret of the duke's religion [4], and had got into his favour; so it is very [a] likely [a] that he intended to establish himself in it,

Nov. 16, 1669.

[a] substituted for *probable*.

[1] See his letters on this during 1668 in the *Sheldon MSS.*

[2] An Act passed in the English Parliament, for the same purpose, 22 Charles II, c. 9. O. But there is no record of an Act passing in the Scotch Parliament. See Lauderdale's letters, *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 143–167; and the full account in Mackenzie, *Memoirs*, 143–155; 184–211. *English Historical Review*, July, 1886.

[3] Nov. 16, 1669. *Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, vii. 554. Parliament was opened on Oct. 19.

[4] There is no evidence of this, or intimation that Lauderdale looked so far ahead. Charles succeeded by this Act in doing what he was trying

CH. XIII. by putting the church of Scotland wholly in his power; but that was yet a secret to us all in Scotland. The method he took to get it passed was this. He told all those who loved the presbytery, or that did not much favour the bishops, that it was necessary to keep them under by making them depend absolutely on the king. This was indeed a transferring the whole legislature as to the matters of the church from the parliament, and the vesting it singly in the king: yet, he told them, if this were done as the circumstances might be favourable, the king might be prevailed on, if a dash of a pen would do it, to change all of the sudden: whereas that could never be hoped for, if it could not be brought about but by the pomp and ceremony of a parliament. He made the nobility see they needed fear no more the insolence of bishops, if they were at mercy, as this would make them. Sharp did not like it, but durst not oppose it[1]. He made a long dark speech, copied out of doctor Taylor, distinguishing between the civil and the ecclesiastical authority, and voted for it: so did all the bishops that were present: some absented themselves. Leighton was against any such act, and got some words to be altered in it. He thought it might be stretched
285 to ill ends, and so he was very averse to it; yet he gave his vote for it, not having sufficiently considered the extent of the words, and the consequences that might follow on such an act; for which he was very sorry as long as he lived.

to do in England, completely shake off Church control.

[1] 'The Archbishop of St. Andrews acquiesced, but I found the old spirit of Presbytery did remain with some of the Bishops, so unwilling are churchmen, by what name or title soever they are dignified, to part with power.' Lauderdale to Moray, Nov. 2, 1669. This letter contains a brilliant description of the debate on the Act of Supremacy. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 151. Lauderdale and his friends held precisely the same view regarding episcopal, as regarding Presbyterian, assumption. In Bellenden's uncouth French 'le fardau d'un Prester et trop pisant pour mais epoles.' The Act was received with a chorus of approval by all who were in Charles's confidence. It was an encouragement to him to continue the struggle at home. 'What would King James have given for such an Act!' was Moray's exclamation. 'The King,' declared Lauderdale, 'is now master here in all causes and over all persons.'

But at that time there were no apprehensions in Scotland of the danger of popery. Many of the best of the episcopal clergy, Nairn and Charteris in particular, were highly offended at the act. They thought it plainly made the king our pope, as the presbyterians said it put him in Christ's stead. They said the king had already too much power in the matters of the church, and nothing ruined the clergy more than their being brought into servile compliances and a base dependance upon courts. I had no share in the counsels about this act. I only thought it was designed by lord Tweeddale to justify the Indulgence, which he protested to me was his chief end in it. And nobody could ever tell me how the word *ecclesiastical matters* was put in the act. Leighton thought he was sure[1] it was put in after the draught and form of the act was agreed on: so it was generally[2] charged on lord Lauderdale. And when the duke's religion came to be known, then all people saw how much the legal settlement of our religion was put in his power by this means. Yet the preamble of the act being only concerning the external government of the church, it was thought that *matters* were to be confined to the sense that was limited by the preamble.

The next act that passed was concerning the militia[3]: all that had been done in raising it was approved, and it was enacted that it should still be kept up, and be ready

Nov. 16, 1669.

[1] Nonsense. S.

[2] And rightly.

[3] Both Acts were passed the same day, Nov. 16. *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vii. 554. In order to carry them Parliament was carefully packed; and Lauderdale refused to allow 'the Presbyterian trick of bringing in ministers to pray and tell God Almighty news from the debate.' The meaning of the Militia Act was that *by Act of Parliament* an army of 22,000 men could be called upon to march at the king's bidding to any place of Scotland, England, or Ireland, and on any service that he might choose. The Militia, it must be remembered, had supplanted in 1667 the regular troops, which had been in Rothes's hands (cf. *supra* 434), and had been raised in direct contravention of the law. It was now legally secured to the king. Lauderdale was warmly congratulated by Arlington. 'In one word, and without flattery, your Grace hath played your part well; nothing but the proverb of "La mariée est trop belle" can be said against it.' *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 147, 164, 166.

CH. XIII. to march into any of the king's dominions, for any cause in which his majesty's authority, power, or greatness should be concerned; and that they should obey such orders as should be transmitted to them from the council-board, without any mention of orders from the king. Upon this great reflections were made. Some said, that by this the army was taken out of the king's power and command, and put under the power of the council: so that if the greater part of the council should again rebel, as they did in the year 1638, the army was by the words of this act bound to follow their orders. But when jealousies broke out in England of the ill designs that lay hid under this matter, it was thought that the intent of this clause was, that if the king should call in the Scottish army, it should not be necessary that he himself should send any orders for it: but that, upon a secret intimation, the council might do it without order, and then, if the design should miscarry, it should not lie on the king, but only on the council, whom
286 in that case the king might disown; and so none about him should be liable for it. The earl of Lauderdale valued himself upon these acts, as if he had conquered king-
MS. 143. doms | by them. He wrote a letter to the king upon it, in which he said all Scotland was now in his power. The church of Scotland was now more subject to him than the church of England was. This militia was now an army ready upon call: and that every man in Scotland was ready to march whensoever he should order it, with several very ill insinuations in it. But so dangerous a thing it is to write such letters to princes, that this letter fell into duke Hamilton's hands some years after, and I had it [a] in my hands for some days [b]. It was intended to found an impeachment on it. But that happened at the time when the business of the exclusion of the duke from the succession to the crown was so hotly pursued, that this, which at another time would have made great noise, was not so

[a] *from him* struck out. [b] *to show it to some of the house of commons, and to found* struck out.

much considered as the importance of it might seem to deserve. The way how it came into such hands was this. The king, after he had read the letter, gave it to sir Robert Moray, and when he died it was found among his papers. He had been much trusted in the matter of the king's laboratory[1], and had several of the chymical processes in his hands. So the king after his death did order one to look over all his papers for chymical matters: but all the papers of state were let alone. So this, with many other papers, fell into the hands of his executors; and thus this letter came into hands that would have made an ill use of it, if greater matters had not been then in agitation. This is not the single instance that I have known of papers of great consequence falling into the hands of the executors of great ministers, that might have been turned to very bad uses, if they had fallen into ill hands. It seems of great concern, that when a minister or an ambassador dies, or is recalled, or disgraced, all papers relating to the secrets of their employment should be of right in the power of the government. But I of all men should complain the least of this, since by this remissness many papers of a high nature have fallen in my way. CH. XIII.

By the act of supremacy the king was now master, and could turn out bishops at pleasure[2]. So this had its first effect on Burnet; who was offered a pension[3] if he would submit and resign, and threatened to be treated more severely if he stood out[4]. He complied, and retired to Dec. 24, 1669.

[1] See *supra* 167 and *infra* 556, note.

[2] It is questionable whether the language of the Act authorizes the Crown to deprive bishops of their sees; and it would appear that, to dispossess him, Burnet's own resignation of it was thought necessary. A copy of this resignation, subscribed at Edinburgh, Dec. 24, 1669, is preserved amongst the *Sheldon Papers*. [The original is in the *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 175.] It is stated, however, by our author, that an archbishop and bishop were displaced in Scotland in the next reign by the king's command. See f. 681. R.

[3] It was £300 a year out of the revenues of the see of Glasgow. R.

[4] 'My great crime was,' the archbishop says, in a letter addressed to Sheldon on the very day of his resignation, 'the information which I gave his majestie in your grace's hearing. Yet I bless God, most men

CH. XIII. a private state of life, and bore his disgrace better than he had done his honours. He lived four years in the shade, and was generally much pitied. He was of himself good-natured and sincere, but was much in the power of others[1]. He meddled too much in that which did not belong to
287 him, and that he did not understand; for he was not cut out for a court, or for the ministry: and he was too remiss in that which was properly his business, and that he understood to a good degree; for he took no manner of care of the spiritual part of his function.

At this time the university of Glasgow, to whom the choice of the professor of divinity does belong, chose me, though unknown to them all, to be professor there. There was no sort of artifice or management to bring this about: it came of themselves: and they did it without any recommendation from any person whatsoever. So I was advised by all my friends to change my post, and go thither. This engaged me both in much study and in a great deal of business. The clergy came all to me, thinking I had some credit with those that governed, and laid their grievances and complaints before me. They were very ill used, and were so entirely forsaken by their people that in most places they shut up their churches: they were also threatened and affronted on all occasions. On the other hand, the gentlemen of the country came as much to me, and told me such strange things of the vices of some, the follies of others, and the indiscretions of them all, that, though it was not reasonable to believe all that they said, yet it was impossible not to believe a great deal of it. And so I soon saw what a hard province I was like to have of it. Accounts of the state of those parts were expected from me, and were like to be believed. So it was

here think my integrity is my greatest crime.' R. The real reason was his opposition to Charles's policy of the Supremacy Act, and in especial the Glasgow Synod and the 'unchristened remonstrance.' Cf. *supra* 510, note.

[1] In all his letters to Sheldon he appears to recommend vigorous proceedings from his own opinion of their necessity, and not through the suggestion of other persons.

not easy to know what ought to be believed, nor how matters were to be represented: for I found lying and calumny was so equally practised on both sides, that I came to mistrust every thing that I heard. One thing was visible, that conventicles abounded, and strange doctrines were vented in them. The king's supremacy was now the chief subject of declamation. It was said, bishops were indeed enemies to the liberties of the church, but the king's little finger would be heavier than their loins had been. After I had been for some months among them, and had heard so much that I believed very little, I wrote to lord Tweeddale that disorders did certainly increase; but, as for any particulars, I did not know what to believe, much less could I offer to suggest what remedies seemed proper. I therefore proposed that a committee of council might be sent round the country to examine matters, and to give such orders as were at present necessary for the public quiet, and might prepare a report against the next session of parliament, that so proper remedies might be found out. CH. XIII.

| Duke Hamilton, lord Kincardine, Primrose, and Drummond, were sent to those parts. They met first at Hamilton, next at Glasgow: then they went to other parts, and came back, and ended their circuit at Glasgow. They punished some disorders, and threatened both the indulged ministers and the countries with greater severities, if they should grow still more and more insolent upon the favour that had been shewed them. I was blamed by the presbyterians for all they did, and by the episcopal party for all they did not; since these thought they did too little, as the others thought they did too much. They consulted much with me, and suffered me to intercede so effectually for all they had put in prison, that they were all set at liberty. The episcopal party thought I intended to make my self popular at their cost: so they began that strain of fury and calumny that has pursued me ever since from that sort of people [1], as a secret enemy to their interest, and an underminer of it. MS. 144. 288

[1] A civil term for all who are episcopal. S.

CH. XIII. But I am, and still was, an enemy to all force and violence in matters of conscience: and there is no principle that is more hated by bad, ill-natured clergymen, than that.

The earls of Lauderdale and Tweeddale pressed Leighton much to accept of the see of Glasgow[1]. He declined it with so much aversion that we were all uneasy at it. Nothing moved him to hearken to it but the hopes of bringing about the accommodation that was proposed; in which he had all assistance promised him from the government. The king ordered him to be sent for to court. He sent for me on his way, where he stopt a day, to know from me what prospect there was of doing any good. I could not much encourage him: yet I gave him all the hopes that I could raise my self to, and I was then inclined to think that the accommodation was not impracticable. Upon his coming to London, he found lord Lauderdale's temper was much inflamed: he was become fierce and intractable. But lord Tweeddale made every thing as easy to him as was possible. They had turned out an archbishop: so it concerned them to put an eminent man in his room, who should order matters with such moderation, that the government should not be under perpetual dis-
1670. turbance by reason of complaints from those parts. But now the court was entering into new designs, into which lord Lauderdale was thrusting himself, with an obsequious, or rather an officious, zeal. I will dwell no longer at present on that, than just to name the duchess of Orleans' coming to Dover, of which a more particular account shall be given,
289 after I have laid together all that relates to Scotland in the year 1670, and the whole business of the accommodation. Leighton proposed to the king his scheme of the accommodation, and the great advantages that his majesty's affairs would have, if that country could be brought into temper. The king was at this time gone off from the design of a comprehension in England. Toleration was

[1] 'The Bishop of Dunblane's exaltation would spare visitation.' *Lauderdale MSS.* 23,132, f. 150.

now thought the best way. Yet the earl of Lauderdale possessed him with the necessity of doing somewhat to soften the Scots, in order to the great designs he was then engaging in. Upon that the king, who seldom gave himself the trouble to think twice of any one thing, gave way to it. Leighton's paper was in some places corrected by sir R. Moray, and was turned into instructions, by which lord Lauderdale was authorized to pass the concessions that were to be offered into laws. This he would never own to me, though Leighton shewed me the copy of them. But it appeared probable, by his conduct afterwards, that he had secret directions to spoil the matter; and that he intended to deceive us all. Lord Tweeddale was more to be depended on; but he began to lose ground with lady Dysart, and so his interest did not continue strong enough to carry on such a matter. Leighton undertook the administration of the see of Glasgow, and it was a year after this before he was prevailed on to be translated thither [1]. He came upon this to Glasgow, and held a synod of his clergy; in which nothing was to be heard but complaints of desertion and ill usage from them all. Leighton, in a sermon that he preached to them, and in several discourses both in public and private, exhorted them to look up more to God, to consider themselves as the ministers of the cross of Christ, to bear the contempt and ill usage they met with as a cross laid on them for the exercise of their faith and patience, to lay aside all the appetites of revenge, to humble themselves before God, to have many days for secret fasting and prayer, and to meet often together that they might quicken and assist one another in those holy exercises: and then they might | expect a blessing from heaven upon their labours. This was a new strain to the clergy. They had nothing to say against it: but it was a comfortless doctrine to them, and they had not been accustomed to it. No speedy ways were proposed for forcing the people to come to church, nor for sending

CH. XIII.

MS. 145.

[1] *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 181, 182.

CH. XIII. soldiers among them, or raising the fines to which they were liable. So they went home as little edified with their new bishop, as he was with them. When this was over, he went round some parts of the country to the most eminent
290 of the indulged ministers, and carried me with him. His business was to persuade them to hearken to propositions of peace. He told them some of them would be quickly sent for to Edinburgh, where terms would be offered them in order to the making up our differences. All was sincerely meant: they would meet with no artifices nor hardships: and if they received those offers heartily, they would be turned into laws, and all the vacancies then in the church would be filled by their brethren. They received this with so much indifference, or rather neglect, that it would have cooled any zeal that was less warm and less active than that good man's was. They were scarce civil, and did not so much as thank him for his tenderness and care. The more crafty among them, such as Hutcheson, said it was a thing of general concern, and they were but single men. Others were more metaphysical, and entertained us with some poor arguings and distinctions. Leighton began to lose heart; yet he resolved to set the negotiation on foot, and carry it as far as he could.

Aug. 1670. When lord Lauderdale came down letters were writ to six of them ordering them to come to town [1]. There was a long conference between Leighton and them, before the earls of Lauderdale, Rothes, Tweeddale, and Kincardine. Sharp would not be present at it, but he ordered Paterson, afterwards archbishop of Glasgow, to hear all, and to bring him an account of what passed. Leighton laid before them the mischief of our divisions, and of the schism that they had occasioned: many souls were lost, and many more were in danger by these means: so that every one ought to do all he could to heal this wide breach, that had already let in so many evils among us which were like to make way to many more. For his own part, he was persuaded that episcopacy, as an order distinct

[1] Wodrow, ii. 178; *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 200.

from presbyters, had continued in the church ever since the days of the apostles; that the world had every where received the Christian religion from bishops, and that a parity among clergymen was never thought of in the church before the middle of the last century, and was then set up rather by accident than on design: yet, how much soever he was persuaded of this, since they were of another mind, he was now to offer a temper to them, by which both sides might still preserve their opinions, and yet unite in carrying on the ends of the gospel and of their ministry. They had moderators amongst them, which was no divine institution, but only a matter of order: the king therefore might name these: and the making them constant could be no such encroachment on their function, that the peace of the church must be broke on such an account. Nor could they say 291
that the blessing of the men named to this function by an imposition of hands did degrade them from their former office, to say no more of it: so they were still at least ministers. It is true, others thought they had a new and special authority, more than a bare presidency: that did not concern them, who were not required to concur with them in any thing but in submitting to this presidency: and as to that, they should be allowed to declare their own opinion against it, in as full and as public a manner as they pleased. He laid it to their consciences to consider of the whole matter as in the presence of God, without any regard to party or popularity. He spoke in all near half an hour, with a gravity and force that made a very great impression on all who heard it. Hutcheson answered, and said their opinion for a parity among the clergy was well known: the presidency now spoke of had made way to a lordly dominion in the church: and therefore, how inconsiderable soever the thing might seem to be, yet the effects of it both had been and would be still very considerable: he therefore desired some time might be given them to consider well of the propositions now made, and to consult with their brethren about them: and since this might seem an assembling together

CH. XIII. against law, he desired they might have the king's commissioners' leave for it. This was immediately granted. We had a second conference, in which matters were more fully opened, and pressed home on the grounds formerly mentioned. Lord Lauderdale made us all dine together, and came to us after dinner: but could scarce restrain himself from flying out, for their behaviour seemed both rude and crafty. But Leighton had prepared him for it, and pressed him not to give them a handle to excuse their flying off, by any roughness in his deportment towards them. The propositions offered them were now generally known. Sharp cried out that episcopacy was to be undermined, since the negative vote was to be let go. The inferior clergy thought that if it took effect, and that the presbyterians were to be generally brought into churches, they would be neglected, and that their people would forsake them: so they hated the whole thing. The bigot
MS. 146. presbyterians thought it was a snare, to do that which | had a fair appearance at present, and was meant only to lay that generation in their graves in peace; by which means episcopacy, that was then shaking over all the nation, would come to have another root, and grow again out of that. But the far greater part of the nation approved of
292 this design: and they reckoned, either we would gain our point and then all would be at quiet, or, if such offers were rejected by the presbyterians, it would discover their temper, and alienate all indifferent men from them, and the nation would be convinced how unreasonable and stubborn they were, and how unworthy they were of any further favour. All that was done in this session of parliament was the raising a tax, and the naming commissioners for the union with England. Two severe acts passed against conventicles.

There had been a great one held in Fife, near Dumfermline, where none had ever been held before. Some gentlemen of estates were among them, and the novelty of the thing drew a great crowd together; for intimation had been given of it some days before. Many of these came

in their ordinary arms. That gave a handle to call them the rendezvous of rebellion. Some of these were taken, and brought to Edinburgh, and pressed to name as many as they knew of their fellow conventiclers: but they refused to do it. This was sent up to court as the forerunner of rebellion. Upon which lord Lauderdale, hearing what use his enemies made of it, was transported almost to fits of rage. Severe acts passed upon it, by which their fines were raised higher, and they were made liable to arbitrary severities. The earl of Lauderdale with his own hand put in a word in the act that covered the papists, the fines being laid only on such of the reformed religion as went not to church. He pretended by this to merit with the popish party, the duke in particular; whose religion was yet a secret to us in Scotland, though it was none at court. He said to my self, he had put in these words on design, to let the party know that they were to be worse used than the papists themselves. All field conventicles were declared treasonable, and in the preacher they were made capital. The landlords on whose grounds they were held were to be severely fined: and all who were at them were to be punished arbitrarily, if they did not discover all that were present whom they knew. And house conventicles, crowded without the doors or at windows, were to be reckoned and punished as field conventicles. Sir Robert Moray told me that the king was very ill pleased with this act as extravagantly severe, chiefly in that of the preachers being to be punished by death. He said bloody laws did no good; he would never have passed it if he had known it beforehand. The half of the parliament abhorred this act; yet so abject were they in their submissions to lord Lauderdale, that the young earl of Cassillis was the single person that voted in the negative. He was heir to his father's stiffness, but not to his other virtues [1]. This passed

Aug. 13, 1670.

[1] 'This morning we finished a report of a clanking Act against Conventicles, where they are to be defined in all the degrees and soundly punished.' It was 'all that a law can doe, and past unani-

CH. XIII. 1693 in parliament so suddenly, that Leighton knew nothing of it till it was too late. He expostulated with lord Tweeddale severely about it: he said the whole complex of it was so contrary to the common rules of humanity, not to say Christianity, that he was ashamed to mix in councils with those who could frame and pass such acts; and he thought it somewhat strange that neither he nor I had been advised with in it. The earl of Tweeddale said, the late field conventicle being a new thing, it had forced them to severities that at another time could not be well excused: and he assured us there was no design to put it in execution. We wished, rather, that an act had passed upon such a disorder of less noise, but more proper to have its effect. Leighton sent to the western counties six episcopal divines, all, except my self, brought from other parts: Nairn and Charteris were two of them, the three others, Cook, Aird, and Paterson; all of them were the best that we could persuade to go round the country to preach in vacant churches, and to argue upon the grounds of the accommodation with such as should come to them. The episcopal clergy, who were yet left in the country, could not argue much for any thing, and would not at all argue in favour of a proposition that they hated. The people of the country came generally to hear us, though not in great crowds. We were indeed amazed to see a poor commonalty so capable to argue upon points of government, and on the bounds to be set to the power of princes in matters of religion. Upon all these topics they had texts of scripture at hand, and were ready with their answers to any thing that was said to them. This measure of knowledge was spread even among the meanest of them, their cottagers, and their servants. They were indeed vain of their knowledge, much conceited of themselves, and were

mously' on Aug. 13. 'I can, I dare say, [remove] any scruple against every title in it; the execution is left summarie without any process, and everybody concludes it will do the worke. I heard but one "No" to it, and that was the Earl of Cassillis according to the laudable custome of his fathers' [*supra* 89, 212]. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 200.

full of a most entangled scrupulosity; so that they found [or] made difficulties in every thing that could be laid before them. We stayed about three months in the country: and in that time there was a stand in the frequency of conventicles. But, as soon as we were gone, a set of those hot preachers went round all the places in which we had been, to defeat all the good we could hope to do. They told them the Devil was never so formidable, as when he was transformed into an angel of light. | The outed ministers had many meetings in several parts of the kingdom. They found themselves under great difficulties. The people had got it among them, that all that was now driven at was only to extinguish presbytery, by seeming concessions, with the present generation, and that if the ministers went into it they gave up their cause, that so they themselves might be provided for during their lives, and die at more ease. So they, who were strangely subdued by their desire of popularity, resolved to reject the propositions, though they could not well tell on what grounds they should justify it. A report was also spread among them, which they believed, and it had its full effect upon them: it was said the king was alienated from the church of England, and weary of supporting episcopacy in Scotland, and so was resolved not to clog his government any longer with it; and that the concessions now made did not arise from any tenderness we had for them, but from an artifice to preserve episcopacy: so they were made believe that their agreeing to them was really a strengthening of that government that was otherwise ready to fall with its own weight. And because a passage of Scripture according to its general sound was apt to work much on them, that of *Touch not, taste not, handle not*, was often repeated among them. So it was generally agreed on to reject the offers made them. The next debate among them was, about the reasons they were to give for rejecting them, or whether they should comply with another proposition which Leighton had made them, that if they did

CH. XIII.

MS. 147.

294

CH. XIII. not like the propositions he had made, that they would see if they could be more happy than he was, and offer at other propositions. In their meetings there was much sad stuff; they named in some of them two, to maintain the debate, *pro* and *con*. They disputed about the protestation that they were allowed to make: and *protestatio contraria facto* was a maxim that was in great vogue among them. They argued upon the obligation by the covenant to maintain their church, as then established, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government: and so every thing that was contrary to that was represented as a breach of covenant: and none durst object to that. But that they might make a proposition that they were sure would not be hearkened to, they proposed that among the concessions to be insisted on, one might be, a liberty to ordain without the bishop. When we heard what their reasonings were, papers were writ and sent among them, in answer to them. But it is a vain thing to argue, when a resolution is taken up not founded on argument, and arguments are only sought for to justify that which is already resolved on. We pressed them with this, that, notwithstanding their covenant, they themselves had afterwards made many alterations much more important than this of submitting to a constant moderator, named by the king. Cromwell took from them the power of meeting in general assemblies: yet they went on doing the other duties of their function; though this, which they esteemed the greatest of all their rights, was denied them. When an order came out to sequester the half of the benefices of such as should still pray for the king, they upon that submitted, though before that they
295 had asserted it was a duty to which they were bound by their covenant. They had discontinued their ministry in obedience to laws and proclamations, now for nine years: and those who had accepted the indulgence had come in by the king's authority, and had only a parochial government, but did not meet in presbyteries. From all which we inferred, that when they had a mind to lay down any

thing that they thought a duty, or to submit to any thing that they thought an invasion of their rights, they could find a distinction for it: and it was not easy to shew, why they were not as compliant in this particular. But all was lost labour. Hot men among them were positive, and all of them were full of contentious[1] logic. So two passages of scripture were generally applied to them. To one sort of them, that in the Proverbs, *The fool rageth, and is confident:* and to the other sort, that in Micah, *The best of them is as a briar, and the most upright* of them *is as a thornhedge*[1]. Duchess Hamilton sent for some of them, Hutcheson in particular. She said, she did not pretend to understand nice distinctions, and the terms of dispute: here was plain sense: the country might be again at quiet, and the rest of those that were outed admitted to churches, on terms that seemed to all reasonable men very easy. Their rejecting this would give a very ill character of them, and would have very bad effects, of which they might see cause to repent when it would be too late. She told me all that she could draw from him, that she understood, was, that he saw the generality of their party were resolved against all treaties, or any agreement: and that if a small number should break off from them, it would not heal the old breaches, but would create new ones; in conclusion, nothing was like to follow on this whole negotiation. We, who were engaged in it, had lost all our own side by offering at it; and the presbyterians would not make one step towards us. Leighton desired another meeting with them at Paisley, to which he carried me and one or two more. They were about thirty. We had two long conferences with them. Leighton laid out before them the obligations that lay | on them to seek for peace at all times, but more MS. 148. especially when we already saw the dismal effects of our contentions. There could be no agreement unless on both sides there was a disposition to make some abatements, and some steps towards one another. It appeared that we

CH. XIII.

[1] The word *contention* was substituted for this clause.

Ch. XIII. were willing to make even unreasonable ones of our side: and would they abate nothing in theirs? Was their opinion so mathematically certain, that they could not dispense with any part of it for the peace of the church, and for the saving of souls? Many poor things were said on their side, which would have made a less mild man than he was lose all patience. But he bore with all their trifling impertinences, and urged this question on them, Would they have held communion with the church of God at the
296 time of the council of Nice, or not? If they should say, not, he would be less desirous of entering into communion with them; since he must say of the church at that time, *Let my soul be with theirs:* if they said, they would; then he was sure they could not reject the offers now made them, which brought episcopacy much lower than it was at that time. One of the most learned among them had prepared a speech full of quotations, to prove the difference between the primitive episcopacy and ours at present. I was then full of those matters: so I answered all his speech, and every one of his quotations, and turned the whole upon him with advantages that were too evident to be so much as denied by their own party: and it seemed the person himself thought so, for he did not offer at one word of a reply. In conclusion, the presbyterians desired that the propositions might be given them in writing, for hitherto all had passed only verbally; and words, they said, might be misunderstood, misrepeated, and denied. Leighton had no mind to do it: yet, since it was plausible to say they had nothing but words to shew to their brethren, he writ them down, and gave me the original, that I still have in my hands; but suffered them to take as many copies of it as they pleased. At parting he desired they would come to a final resolution, as soon as they could; for he believed they would be called for by the next January to give their answer. And by the end of that month they were ordered to come to Edinburgh. I went thither at the same time upon Leighton's desire.

We met at the earl of Rothes's house, where all this treaty came to a short conclusion. Hutcheson, in all their name, said, they had considered the propositions made to them, but were not satisfied in their consciences to accept of them. Leighton desired to know upon what grounds they stood out. Hutcheson said, it was not safe to argue against laws. Leighton said, that since the government had set on a treaty with them, in order to the altering the laws, they were certainly left to a full freedom of arguing against them. These offers were no laws: so the arguing about them could not be called an arguing against law. He offered them a public conference upon them, in the hearing of all that had a mind to be rightly informed. He said, the people were drawn into those matters so far, as to make a schism upon them: he thought it was therefore very reasonable that they should likewise hear the grounds examined, upon which both sides went. Hutcheson refused this: he said he was but one man, and that what he said was in the name of his brethren, who had given him no further authority. Leighton then asked if they had nothing 297
on their side to propose towards the healing of our breaches. Hutcheson answered, their principles were well enough known, but he had nothing to propose. Upon this Leighton, in a long discourse, told what was the design he had been driving at in all this negotiation; it was to procure peace and to promote religion. He had offered several things which he was persuaded were great diminutions of the just rights of episcopacy: yet since all church power was for edification, and not for destruction, he had thought that in our present circumstances it might have conduced as much to the interest of religion, that episcopacy should divest itself of a great part of the authority that belonged to it, as the bishops' using it in former ages had been an advantage to religion: his offers did not flow from any mistrust of the cause: he was persuaded episcopacy was handed down through all the ages of the church from the apostles' days: perhaps he had wronged the order

CH. XIII. by the concessions he had made, yet he was confident God would forgive it, as he hoped his brethren would excuse it. Now they thought fit to reject these concessions, without either offering any reason for doing it, or any expedient on their side: therefore the continuance of our divisions must lie at their door, both before God and man: if ill effects followed upon this, he was free of all blame, and had done his part. Thus was this treaty broke off, to the amazement of all sober and dispassionate people, and to the great joy of Sharp, and the rest of the bishops; who now for a while seemed even pleased with us, because we had all along asserted episcopacy, and had pleaded for it in a very high and positive strain.

MS. 149. I hope this may be | thought a useful part of the history of that time. None knew all the steps made in it better than my self. The fierce episcopal men will see how much they were to blame for accusing that apostolical man Leighton, as they did on this occasion, as if he had designed in this whole matter to betray his own order and to set up presbytery. The presbyterians may also see how much their behaviour in this affair disgusted all wise and moderate men, how little sincere and honest they were in it, when the desire of popularity made them reject propositions, that came so home even to the maxims they had set up, that nothing but the fear of offending, that is, of losing the credit they had with their party, could be so much as pretended for their refusing to agree to them. Our part in the whole negotiation was sincere and open. We were acted with no other principle, and had no other design, but to allay a violent agitation of men's spirits, that was throwing us into great distractions; and to heal a breach
298 that was like to let in an inundation of miseries upon us, as has appeared but too evidently ever since. The [a]high[a] party, keeping still their old bias to persecution, and recovering afterwards their credit with the government, carried violent proceedings so far, that, after they had

[a] substituted for *episcopal*.

thrown the nation into [a] great [a] convulsions, they drew upon themselves such a degree of fury from enraged multitudes, whom they had oppressed long and heavily, that, in conclusion, that order was put down with as much injustice and violence as had been practised in supporting it, as shall be told in its proper place. The roughness of our own side, and the perverseness of the presbyterians, did so much alienate me from both, that I resolved to withdraw my self from any further meddling, and to give my self wholly to study. I was then, and for three years after that, offered to be made a bishop, but I refused it. I saw the counsels were altering above: so I resolved to look on, and see whither things would turn. CH. XIII.

My acquaintance at Hamilton, and the favour and friendship I met with from both duke and duchess, made me offer my service to them, in order to the search of many papers that were very carefully preserved by them: for the duchess's uncle had charged her to keep them with the same care as she kept the writings of her estate, since in these a full justification of her father's public actings, and of his own, would be found, when she should put them in the hands of one that could set them in order and in a due light. She put them all in my hands, which I acknowledge was a very great trust: and I made no ill use of it. I found there materials for a very large history. I writ it with great sincerity; and concealed none of their errors. I did indeed conceal several things that related to the king. I left out some passages that were in his letters[1]; 1671.

[a] substituted for *violent*.

[1] Salmon, in his *Examination*, i. 641, points out a passage in these *Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton*, 93, in which the bishop thus expresses himself: 'Because of an ambiguous word which was in the paper the marquis was to offer in his majesties name to the assembly, so strictly conscientious was his majesty (Charles I) that he wrote the sense of it in the following letter, which is here subjoined.' Speaker Onslow refers to 379 of the *Memoirs*, and in this page are

CH. XIII. in some of these was too much weakness, and in others too much craft and [a] anger [a]. And this I owe to truth to say, that by many indications that lay before me in those letters, I could not admire either the judgment and understanding, or the temper [b] of that unfortunate prince. He had [c] little [c] regard to law, and seemed to think that he was not bound to observe promises or concessions, that were extorted from him by the necessity of his affairs. He had little tenderness in his nature; and probably his government would have been severe, if he had got the better in the war. His ministers had a hard time under him: he loved violent counsels, but conducted them so ill, that they saw they must all perish with him. Those who observed this, and advised him to make up matters with his parliaments by concessions, rather than venture on a war, were hated by him, even when the extremities to which he was driven made him follow their advices, though generally too late, and with so ill a grace that he lost the merit of his concessions in the awkward way of granting them. This was truly duke Hamilton's fate, who in the beginning of the troubles went in warmly enough into acceptable counsels; but when he saw how unhappy the king was in his conduct, he was ever after that against the king's venturing on a war, which he always believed would be fatal to him in conclusion. I got through that work in

[a] substituted for *ill-nature*. [b] *or sincerity* struck out. [c] substituted for *no*.

---

the following words:—'Having proposed to myself nothing more in this whole work, than to let the world see the great piety and strictness of conscience that blessed prince carried along with him in all his affairs, and to publish such remains of his pen as had not formerly been seen or known, I shall therefore insert a copy of verses written by his majesty in his captivity.' R. On Burnet's *Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton* see Cockburn's *Remarks, &c.*, 47. He states that in an unpublished autobiography of Guthrie, Bishop of Dunkeld, there were some severe reflections on Duke James (now printed); that Sir James Turner was employed to write his memoirs in order to vindicate the duke; and that he succeeded so badly that Burnet promised to do it better, and was therefore allowed access to all the duke's papers. *Id.* 49.

a few months. When the earl of Lauderdale heard that I had finished it, he desired me to come up to him; for he was sure he could both rectify [a] many [a] things and enlarge on a great many more[1]. Upon which I went to court. His true design was to engage me to put in a great deal relating to himself in that work. I found another degree of kindness and confidence from him upon my coming up than ever before. I had nothing to ask for my self, but to be excused from the offer of two bishoprics; but whatsoever I asked for any other person was granted: and I was considered as his favourite. He trusted me with all secrets, and seemed to have no reserves with me. He indeed pressed me to give up with sir Robert | Moray: and I saw MS. 150. that upon my doing that, I would have as much credit with him as I could desire. Sir Robert himself apprehended this would be put to me, and pressed me to comply 299 with them in it. But I hated servitude, as much as I loved him: so I refused it flatly. I told lord Lauderdale, that sir Robert had been as a second father or governor to me, and therefore I could not break friendship with him; but I promised to speak to him of nothing that he trusted to me; and this was all that he could ever bring me to, though he put it often to me. I was in great doubt whether it was fit for me to see his mistress. Sir Robert put an end to that; for he assured me there was nothing in that commerce that was between them besides a vast fondness. Yet I asked lord Lauderdale how he had parted with his wife[2]. He gave me a better account of it than I expected. I knew that she was an imperious and ill-tempered woman. He said she herself had desired it, and that she owned she was not at all jealous of his familiarities with [b] lady Dysart [b], but that she could not endure it, because she hated her. I was thus persuaded to go to her,

CH. XIII.

[a] substituted for *some*. [b] substituted for *his mistress*.

[1] For an account of this, and of Burnet's first presentation to Charles, see Cockburn, 53.

[2] See *supra* 533.

CH. XIII. and was treated by them both with [a] an entire confidence. Applications [a] were made to me: and every thing that I proposed was done. I laid before him the ill state the affairs of Scotland were falling into by his throwing off so many of his friends. Duke Hamilton and he had been for some years in ill terms. I laid down a method for bringing them to a better understanding. I got kind letters to pass on both sides, and put their reconciliation in so fair a way that upon my return to Scotland it was for that time fully made up. I had authority from him to try how both the earls of Argyll and Tweeddale might return to their old friendship with him. The earl of Argyll was ready to do every thing, but the earl of Athol had proposed a match between his son and lady Dysart's daughter, and he had a hereditary hatred to the lord Argyll and his family: so that could not be so easily brought about. Lord Tweeddale was resolved to withdraw from business. The earl of Lauderdale had for many years treated his brother the lord Halton with as much contempt as he deserved; for he was both weak and violent, insolent and corrupt. He had promised to settle his estate on his daughter, when lord Tweeddale's son married her; but his brother offered now every thing that lady Dysart desired, provided she would get his brother to settle his estate on him [b]. So Halton
Nov. 1673. was now taken into affairs, and had so much credit with his brother that all the dependance was upon him [1]. And thus the breach between the earls of Lauderdale and Tweeddale was irreconcileable; though I did all I could to make it up.

As to church affairs, lord Lauderdale asked my opinion concerning them. I gave it frankly to this purpose: there

[a] originally *so entire a confidence that I was considered their favourite, so that applications.* [b] *Every thing she proposed was done* struck out.

[1] He was left in November, 1673, as Lauderdale's deputy, in succession to Kincardine, who had then broken with Lauderdale.

were many vacancies in the disaffected counties, [a] to which no conformable men of any worth could be prevailed on to go: [a] so I proposed that the indulgence should be extended to them all, and that the ministers should be put into those parishes by couples, and have the benefice divided between them [1]; and in the churches where the indulgence had already taken place, that a second minister should be added, and have the half of the benefice. By this means I reckoned that all the outed ministers would be again employed, and kept from going round the uninfected parts of the kingdom. I said, if this was done, either the parishes would by gratuities mend their benefices, that so the two who had only the legal provision of one might subsist; and if they did this, as I had reason to doubt of it, it would be a settled tax on them, of which they would soon grow weary; but if they did it not, it would create quarrels, and at least a coldness among them. I also proposed that they should be confined to their parishes; not to stir out of them without leave from the bishop of the diocese, or a privy councillor; and that, upon their transgressing the rules that should be set them, a proportion of their benefice should be forfeited, and applied to some pious use. Lord Lauderdale heard me to an end, and then, without arguing one word upon any one branch of this scheme, he desired me to put it in writing; which I did. And the next year, when he came down again to Scotland, he made one write out my paper, and turned it into the style of Instructions [2]. So easily did he let himself be governed

CH. XIII.

300

[a] substituted for *which were never like to be filled up by conformable men.*

[1] 'There is one thing in my present charge I am much concerned in and sollicitous about, 'tis ye supplying of ye vacant kirks in ye western part especially, for ye truth is wee have not men for them, and ye people in most of ye parishes would not receive angels, if they comitt ye horrid crime of going to presbyteries and synods.' Archbishop Leighton to Lauderdale, Dec. 1, 1671, *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 217.

[2] Sharp, on Nov. 23, 1671, wrote to Lauderdale: 'I have heard some discourses both before Mr. Gilbert Burnet his going to London and since of his meddling with church affairs, but I doe not give

CH. XIII. by those whom he trusted, even in matters of great consequence. Four bishops happened to die that year, of which Edinburgh was one. I was desired to make my own choice: but I refused them all; yet I obtained a letter to be writ by the king's order to lord Rothes, that he should call the two archbishops, and four of the officers of state, and send up their opinion to the king of the persons fit to be promoted: and a private letter was writ to the lords, to join with Leighton in recommending the persons that he should name. Leighton was uneasy [a], when he found that Charteris and Nairn, as well as my self, could not be prevailed on to accept a bishopric. They had an ill opinion of the court [1], and could not be brought to leave their retirement. Leighton was troubled at this: he said, if his
MS. 151. friends left the whole load on him | he must leave all to Providence; yet he named the best men he could think on, and, that Sharp might not have too public an affront put on him, Leighton agreed to one of his nomination. But now I go to open a scene of another nature.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TREATY OF DOVER. THE 'CABAL.'

1670. THE court was now going in to other measures. The parliament had given the king all the money that he had asked for repairing his fleet, and for supplying his stores and magazines [2]. Additional revenues were also given for

[a] substituted for *troubled.*

anie credit to them, you having been pleased to tell me he did not; and if he attempted any thing to my prejudice, who have done him some good offices, but never any ill [cf. *supra* 388], I forgive him,' &c. *Lauderdale Papers*, ii. 216; Cockburn's *Remarks*, 73. For the Acts of Council founded on this scheme, Sept. 2 and 3, 1672, and for the objections of the ministers, see Wodrow, ii. 203.

[1] For that very reason they should have accepted bishoprics. S.

[2] Bridgeman's speech, Oct. 24, 1670, named £500,000 as the normal annual cost in peace, and an

some years; and at their last sitting in the beginning of the year [16]70, it appeared that the house of commons was out of countenance for having given so much money, and seemed resolved to give no more. All was obtained under the pretence of maintaining the Triple Alliance. When the court saw how little reason they had to expect further supplies, the duke of Buckingham told the king, that now the time was come in which he might both revenge the attempt on Chatham and shake off the uneasy restraint of a house of commons: and he got leave from the king to send over sir Ellis Leighton to the court of France, to offer the project of a new alliance and a new war[1].

additional £800,000 was asked for on Oct. 24, 1670. The king's debts at this time were over £2,000,000. The preparations made in France and the Low Countries were named as the reasons for an increase in the forces, and the Triple Alliance as one of the leagues in force: although Charles was bound by the Treaty of Dover to assist in the attack upon the Dutch. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1670, 493, 498; *Parl. Hist.* iv. 456; Marvell, Nov. 1, 1670. From Arlington's *Letters* (1701), ii. 288, it appears that Charles tried in January, 16$\frac{6}{7}$, to obtain money from Spain for the support of troops to defend Flanders. On March 11, Arlington wrote to Sir W. Godolphin that new life had been given to the Triple League; and the deception was kept up until November, 1671. *Id.* 295, 299, 302, 311, 335. For the desperate efforts of the king to borrow money see Marvell, Nov. 28, 1670. He could, after the utmost efforts, raise no more than £20,000 from the City; but the 'fanatics of all sorts' gave him £40,000.

[1] This was at the end of 1668, and without the knowledge of Arlington, who was doing the same thing through Williamson. Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, iii. 56. Colbert had instructions to bribe both to secure their masters (Louis XIV to Colbert in Forneron's *Louise de Kéroualle*, 23), but Williamson proved incorruptible. Upon Arundel's mission in January, 1669, see Macpherson, i. 48, and Ranke, iii. 497. Ellis Leighton (*supra* 243, note) had become Buckingham's 'creature' in Scotland in 1650. Walker's *Journal*, 177. There is an interesting notice of him, referring to this time, in an undated letter of Lord Preston; *H. M. C. Rep.* vii. 402: 'They say that their king esteemed him more than the ambassador of our nation. That he had a most notable wit, and when I used to say I doubted he was a little atheistical, "So much the better statesman," say they, "we know well enough an abbey will not choke him." And effectually afterwards I understand he had a rich abbey given him by the King of France.' In 1677 he was imprisoned in France for corrupt practices. *Fleming Papers*, Aug. 1, 1677. See the *Lindsey MSS.*, *H. M. C. R p.* xiv. App. Part ix. 378. Pepys, March 27, 1667, mentions him as 'a wonderful witty, ready man for sudden answers and little tales.'

CH. XIV. 1670 Sir Ellis told me this himself; and was proud to think that he was the first man employed in those black and fatal designs. But, in the first proposition made by us, the subduing of England, and the toleration of popery here, was offered, as that with which the design must be begun. France, seeing England so inclined, resolved to push the matter further.

The king's sister, the duchess of Orleans[1], was thought the wittiest woman in France, but had no sort of virtue, and scarce retained common decency. The king of France had made love to her, which we had very readily entertained, and was highly incensed when she saw that this was only a pretence to cover his addresses to madamoiselle la Valliere, one of her maids of honour, whom he afterwards declared openly to be his mistress. Yet she had reconciled herself to the king, and was now so entirely trusted by him that he ordered her to propose an interview with her brother at Dover. The king went thither, and was so much charmed with his sister that it did not pass without the severest censures, every thing she proposed, and every

[1] The employment of the Duchess of Orleans, who maintained a constant correspondence with Charles and his ministers (Mrs. Ady, *Madame*, 258), was also Buckingham's idea, as early as November, 1668 (Mignet, *Négociations*, iii. 59). See his letter to her of Feb. 17, 166$\frac{8}{9}$, Dalrymple, i. 69. The proposal that she should visit Charles in England appears to have come from him. Colbert to Lionne, Nov. 17, 1669, Jan. 26, 16$\frac{6}{7}\frac{9}{0}$. It appears to have been genuine zeal for Catholicism, and consequent hatred of the Dutch, with a distinct genius for political intrigue, which informed her activity. Her husband refused to allow her to go further than Dover; and it is stated that the difficulty of settling questions of precedence between her and the Duchess of York was an additional reason for this limitation. *Verney MSS.*, May 11, 1670. The visit lasted only from May 30 to June 2. James, who objected to the war because he foresaw that the complications it would lead to would frustrate the Catholic design (Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 450), did his best to hinder the visit. Charles left him in London on the pretext of danger from the discontent of the Dissenters at the closing of their Conventicles on May 10; and he reached Dover too late to prevent the harm which he feared from the interview. *Id.* 449. Henrietta's part is acknowledged in the phrase by which the Treaty of Dover was known,—the 'Traité de Madame.'

favour she asked, was granted[1]: the king could deny her nothing. She proposed an alliance in order to the conquest of Holland. The king had a mind to have begun at home[2]; but she diverted him from that. It could not be foreseen what difficulties the king might meet with, upon the first opening the design: as it would alarm all his people, so it would send a great deal of wealth and trade, and perhaps much people, over to Holland: and by such an accession they would grow stronger, as he would grow weaker. So she proposed that they should begin with Holland, and attack it vigorously both by sea and land; and upon their success in that, all the rest would be an easy work. This account of that negotiation was printed twelve years after, at Paris, by one abbot Primi[3]. I had that part of the book in my hands in which this was contained.

[1] For the horrible charge hinted at here and on f. 612 by Burnet, by Ludlow, *Memoirs*, ii. 422, and by Andrew Marvell, *Historical Poem*, 67, and emphatically asserted in the *Secret History of Charles II*, 50, there is, as Fox observes in his *History of James II*, 71, not the slightest evidence. The intense and touching affection which Charles felt for his sister—perhaps the only person whom he ever really loved—which is so fully exhibited in Mrs. Ady's *Madame*, is probably alone accountable for the suggestion. Reresby, 82, is the only authority for the statement that she fell in love with Monmouth at this time. 'Before her death, it is said, that she sent for Mr. Ralph Mountague, the English ambassador, and discovered to him the object of her interview with her brother, swearing in the most solemn manner, that the suspicion of having entertained too familiar attachment to any of her own blood was utterly groundless.' Cunningham's *History of Great Britain*, translated by Dr. Thomson, from the Latin MS. vol. i. p. 25. For further refutation see Lansdowne's *Works*, ii. 253.

[2] I. e. 'to shake off the uneasy restraint of the House of Commons,' *supra* 537. This is, of course, only supposition. He did affect to wish to 'begin at home,' by declaring his conversion, about which Burnet knew nothing, but only because he was anxious to handle Louis's money without doing anything. Mignet, *Négociations*, iii. part iv. sect. i.

[3] See the whole account of this in the *Graham Papers*, *H. M. C. Rep.* vii. 267, 404. Primi's book was very accurate. There is a translation of this work in the State Tracts published after the Revolution. It appears to have been first written in Italian. Note to Lord J. Russell's *Life of Lord William Russell*, 110. It is clear that at the date of Preston's letter, July 22, 1682, the real story of the Treaty of Dover was quite unsuspected. See Montague to Charles II, Arlington's *Letters to Temple* (1701), 444.

CH. XIV. Lord Preston was then the king's envoy at Paris: so he, knowing how great a prejudice the publishing this would be to his master's affairs, complained of it, and the book was upon that suppressed, and the writer was put in the Bastille. But he had drawn it out of the papers of Mr. le Tellier's office: so there is little reason to doubt of the truth of the thing. She, as this book said, prevailed to have her scheme settled, and so went back to France. The journey proved fatal to her: for the duke of Orleans had heard such things of her behaviour, that he ordered a great dose of sublimate to be given her in a glass of [a] chicory water [a], of which she died in a few hours after in great torment: and when she was opened, her stomach was all ulcered [1]

Since I mention her death, I will set down one story of her, that was told me by Stouppe, who had it from some
302 who were well informed of the matter [2]. The king of France had courted madame Soisons, and made a shew of courting madame; but his affections fixing on madamoiselle

[a] substituted for *chocolate*, and *glass* for another word obliterated.

[1] Sir William Temple told me, the king employed him in searching into the truth of this report, but finding there was more in it than was fit to be known, unless he had been in a condition to resent it as a great king ought, advised him to drop the inquiry, for fear it should prejudice her daughters, who were afterwards married to the Duke of Savoy and King of Spain. D. The *procès-verbal* of the post-mortem examination, at which, besides Lord Salisbury, Ralph Montague, and James Hamilton, the English physician Chamberlain and a surgeon in Charles's service, Boscher, were present, refutes the idea of poisoning; though Temple, writing to Arlington on July 15, hints that the English doctors were not satisfied, and Montague believed throughout in foul play. See, too, the *Letters of Charlotte Elizabeth* (the Duke of Orleans's second wife), 234. The whole subject is fully discussed in Mrs. Ady's *Madame*, ch. xxvi. The death of Henrietta left Louis without any binding personal influence upon Charles; with the help of Colbert and Arlington he secured this in the person of Louise de Kéroualle. Henrietta left, besides a son who died young, two daughters; Maria, married to Charles II, King of Spain, and Anna Maria, who married Amadeus II, Duke of Savoy, and afterwards King of Sicily and Sardinia.

[2] Poor authority. S.

la Valliere, she whom he had forsaken, as well as she whom he had [a]deceived[a], resolved to be revenged: and they entered into a friendship in order to that. They had each of them a gallant: madame had the count de Guiche[1], and the other had the marquis des Vardes, then in great favour with the king, and a very graceful person. When the treaty of the king of France's marriage was on foot, there was an opinion generally received that the infanta of Spain was a woman of great genius, and would have a considerable stroke in all affairs: so, many young men of quality set themselves to learn the Spanish language, to give them the more credit with the young queen. All that fell to the ground, when it appeared how weak a woman she was[2]. These two were of that number. Count de Guiche watched an occasion, when a letter from the king of Spain was given to his daughter by the Spanish ambassador, and she tore the envelope, and let it fall. So he gathered up all the parcels of it, together with the seal. From these they learnt to imitate the king of Spain's writing; and they sent to Holland to get a seal graven from the impression on the wax. When all was prepared, a letter was writ, as in the name of the king of Spain, reproaching his daughter for her tameness in such an | MS. 152. affront as the king put on her amours, with reflections full both of contempt and anger upon the king. There was one Spanish lady left about the queen: so they forged another letter, as from the Spanish ambassador to her, with that to

CH. XIV.

[a] substituted for *abused.*

[1] [Reresby, 32, mentions this, 'if stories be true.' The Comte de Guiche was her husband's confidant. See *Madame, passim.* Mrs. Ady will allow nothing beyond imprudence in Henrietta's conduct.] There is extant, among other pieces, one called *Histoire Galante du Comte de Guiche et Madame*, 1667. But Cole refers to Lord Lansdowne's *Works*, vol. ii. p. 253, where this scandal, as he says, is wiped off. R.

[2] A story taken from an idle French Romance, called *Conquêtes Amoureuses, &c.*, and, I think, in Madame de Motteville's *History of Anne of Austria.* Cole. Mrs. Ady's *Madame* supplies the necessary corrections.

Ch. XIV. the queen inclosed in it, desiring her to deliver it secretly into the queen's own hand. And they made a livery, such as the Spanish ambassador's pages wore, and a boy was sent in it with the letter. The lady suspected no forgery; but fancied the letter might be about some matter of state; so she thought it safest to carry it to the king, who, reading it, ordered an inquiry to be made about it. The Spanish ambassador saw he was abused in it. So the king spoke to the marquis des Vardes, not doubting that he was in it, and charged him to search after the author of this abuse that was intended to be put on him. The ladies now rejoiced that the looking after the discovery was put in the hands of a man so much concerned in it. He amused the king long with the inquiries that he was making, though he was ever in a wrong scent. But in all this time madame was so pleased with his conduct, that she came to like his person; and had so little command of herself, that she told madame Soisons she was her rival.

303 The other readily complied with her; and, by an odd piece of extravagance, he was sent for, and madame Soisons told him, since he was in madame's favour, she released him of all obligations, and delivered him over to her. Marquis des Vardes thought this was only an artifice of gallantry, to try how faithful he was to his amours: so he declared himself incapable of changing, in terms full of respect for madame, and of passion for the other. This raised in madame so deep a resentment, that she resolved to sacrifice Des Vardes, but to save the count de Guiche. So she gave him notice, that the king had discovered the whole intrigue, and charged him to haste out of France. And as soon as she believed that he was in Flanders, she told all to the king of France; upon which Des Vardes was not only disgraced, but kept long a prisoner in Aigues Mortes, and afterwards he was suffered to come to Monpelier, and it was almost twenty year after before he was suffered to come to court. I was at court when he came first to it. He was much broke in his health, but was

become a[a] philosopher, and was in great reputation among all Des Cartes's followers. Madame had an intrigue with another person, whom I knew well, the count of Treville. When she was in her agony, she said, *Adieu Treville.* He was so struck with this accident, that it had a good effect on him; for he went and lived many years among the fathers of the Oratory, and became both a very learned and devout man. He came afterwards out into the world. I saw him often. He was a man of a very sweet temper, only a little too formal for a Frenchman; but he was very sincere. He was a Jansenist: he hated the Jesuits, and had a very mean opinion of the king, which appeared in all the instances in which it was safe for him to shew it.

Upon madame's death, as the marshal Bellefonds came from France with the compliment to the court of England, so the duke of Buckingham was sent thither on pretence to return the compliment, but really to finish the treaty[1]. The king of France used him in so particular a manner, knowing his vanity, and caressed him to such a degree, that he went in without reserves into the interests of France: yet he protested to me that he never consented to the French fleet's coming into our seas and harbours. He said he was offered 40,000*l.* if he could persuade the king to yield to it: and he appealed to the earl of Dorset for this, who was on the secret[2]. He therefore concluded that since,

[a] *great* struck out.

[1] See note *supra* 537 upon Buckingham's treaty. His journey to France in the summer of 1670 gave the first alarm to the Dutch. Temple to Arlington, Aug. 12, 1670, *Memoirs*, ii. 138.

[2] What Charles insisted upon was that no English admiral should be called upon to serve under French orders. The French fleet was to be regarded as auxiliary. See Lyttelton's letter to Hatton, May 20, 1673: 'The prince [Rupert] has a commission as well, and they say more absolute, from the King of France, to command M. d'Estrée, than that of the king to command the English fleete.' *Hatton Correspondence.* The complete ignorance of even well-informed politicians as to Charles's designs—'a work of darkness, which could never yet be understood or discovered but by the effects' (Marvell, *Popery and Arbitrary Power*, 266)—

CH. XIV. after all the uneasiness shewed at first, the king had yielded to it, that lord Arlington had the money. Lord Shaftesbury laid the blame of this chiefly on the duke of
304 Buckingham: for he told me that he himself had writ a peremptory instruction to him from the king to give up all treaty, if the French did insist on the sending a fleet to our assistance; and therefore he blamed him as having yielded it up, since he ought to have broke all further treaty, upon their insisting on this. But the duke of York told me, there was no money given to corrupt the king's ministers; that the king and he had long insisted on having all their supplies from France in money, without a fleet; and that the French shewed them it was not possible for them to find a *fonds* for so great an expense, unless we took a squadron of their ships; since they could not both maintain their own fleet, and furnish us with the money that would be necessary if we took not their squadron. It was agreed that the king should have 350,000*l.* a year during the war, together with a fleet from France that was to be under the command of the English admiral. With this fleet England was to attack the Dutch by sea, while the king of France should invade them by land with a mighty army. It was not doubted, but that
MS. 153. the States | would find it impossible to resist so great a force, and would therefore submit to the two kings. So the division they agreed on was, that England should have Zealand, and that the king of France should have all the rest, except Holland, which was to be given to the prince of Orange if he would come into the alliance: and it should

may be seen in Lyttelton's letters of Oct. 10, 20, 1670; *Hatton Correspondence*, i. 57. In March, 1671, Marvell writes, 'We have no fleet out . . . I believe he [the King of France] will attempt nothing on us, but leave us to dy a natural death. For indeed never had poor nation so many complicated, mortal, incurable diseases.' 'The greatest fear is that the King of France understands the King of England better than the King of England understands the King of France.' *Verney MSS.*, April 20, 1671. The deception was still maintained by Charles and Arlington in October, 1671. Arlington's *Letters*, ii. 335.

be still a trading country, but without any capital ships. Lord Lauderdale said upon that occasion to me, that whatsoever they intended to do they were resolved to do it effectually all at once; but he would not go into further particulars[1]. That the year [16]72 might be fatal to other commonwealths as well as to the States, the duke of Savoy was encouraged to make a conquest of Genoa[2], though he

[1] Burnet's account needs great modification. He was ignorant of the conditions of the real Treaty of Dover, containing the article regarding the king's conversion, which was not known until Dalrymple published his Memoirs (1771), though he had a general idea of the sham treaty from which this article was omitted, which Buckingham was allowed by Charles and his rival Arlington to conclude, and by which he, with Shaftesbury and the other Protestant ministers, were completely duped. Mignet, *Négociations*, iii. 256; Dalrymple, App. to ch. ii; Ralph, i. 185; Echard, 866; Lingard, xi. 220. In addition to the possibility of territorial gains from the States themselves, Charles and Arlington, the latter of whom proved himself a diplomatist almost of the first rank, were determined to secure, and did secure, very extensive commercial advantages from Louis. Mignet, *Négociations*, iii. partie iv. sect. 1; Dalrymple, i. 41; Ranke, iii. 496. In the paper which Sunderland and William Godolphin presented on the part of Charles to the Spanish minister Peñaranda on Jan. 26, 1672, Charles assumes that the initiative was his: 'And therefore resolving to right himself (God willing) by the force of arms . . . he hath induced the most Christian King . . . to assist him in making this war against the States General.' *Spanish Negotiations*, ii. 144. Upon Charles's preparations for using force in England, should there be opposition when in accordance with the treaty he declared his conversion, see Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 443; *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1671, 391, and his own letter to his sister, June 6, 1669: 'I am securing all the principal ports in this country, not only by fortifying them as they ought to be, but likewise the keeping them in such hands as I am sure will be faithfull to me upon all occasions, and this will secure the fleete, because the chiefe places where the ships lye are chattam and portsmouth.' Mrs. Ady's *Madame*, 288. It will be remembered that he was nominally secure of an army from Scotland of 22,000 men by Act of the Scotch Parliament (*supra* 513), and Ireland was safe under Berkeley. See Dalrymple, i. 89. In his letter of June 6, 1670, to Louis XIV, Colbert states that Charles hoped, by pressing the late Conventicle Act with the utmost severity, to drive the Nonconformists to such extremities as should serve him for a pretence for strengthening his forces. *Id.* i. 106. That Charles had any defined idea of using force is however contrary to his nature and to all probability.

Upon the connexion of this second Dutch war with the rising strength of Catholicism in Europe, see Ranke, iii. 493.

[2] Ludlow's *Memoirs*, ii. 437–439.

CH. XIV. afterwards failed in the attempt: and the king of Denmark was invited into the alliance, with the offer of the town of Hamborough, on which he had long set his heart. The duke of Richmond was sent to give a lustre to that negotiation, which was chiefly managed by Mr. Henshaw, who told me that we offered that king some ships to assist him in seizing on that rich town; but he was then in those engagements with the states of Holland, that even this offer did not prevail on him. Lockhart [1] was brought to court by lord Lauderdale, hoping that he would continue in an entire dependance on him, and be his creature. He was under so great a jealousy, that he was too easy to enter into any employment that might bring him into favour, not so much out of an ambition to rise, as from a desire to be safe, and to be no longer looked on as an enemy to the court: for when a foreign minister asked the king's leave to treat with him in his master's name, the king consented; but with this severe reflection, that he
305 believed he would be true to any body but himself. He was sent to the courts of Brandenburgh and Lunenburgh, either to draw them into the alliance, or, if that could not be done, at least to secure them from all apprehensions; but in this he had no success. And indeed when he saw into what a negotiation he was engaged, he became very uneasy: for though the blackest part of the secret was not trusted to him, as appeared to me by his instructions, which I read after his death, yet he saw whither things were going, and that affected him so deeply that it was believed to have contributed not a little to the languishing he soon fell under, that ended in his death two year after [2].

The war being thus resolved on, some pretences were in the next place to be sought out to excuse it [3]: for, though

[1] See *supra* 138, 155, 404.

[2] Lockhart was Ambassador to France from March, 167$\frac{3}{4}$ to May, 1675. See a synopsis of his despatches, *H. M. C. Rep.* iv. 237–242. He died March 20, 167$\frac{5}{6}$; f. 389.

[3] The alliance of Catholic despotism with a Protestant and parliamentary country was so glaringly absurd that expressions such as the following do not surprise us: 'I see not any probability of a war with the Dutch.'

the king of France went more roundly to work, and published that he was so ill satisfied with the conduct of the States, that it did not consist with his glory to bear it any longer, yet we thought it decent for us to name some particulars. It was said we had some pretensions on Surinam, not yet completely satisfied; and that the States harboured traitors that fled from justice, and lived in Holland: some medals were complained of that seemed dishonourable to the king, as also some pictures: and though these were not made by public order, yet a great noise was raised about them[1]. But an accident happened that the court laid great hold of[2]. The Dutch fleet lay off

Verney MSS. Dec. 14, 1671. 'I cannot think why the Dutch fleet should fight us or we them. We have no quarrel, sure, to the Prince of Aurange.' Lyttelton to Hatton, July 2, 1672, *Hatton Correspondence*, i. 93. 'The nations had been at war,' writes Temple later (*Works*, ii. 245), 'and the quarrel had been thought on bothe sides rather of the ministries than of the people.' He adds, 'No clap of thunder in a fair frosty day could more astonish the world than our Declaration of War against Holland in 1672.' *Id.* 255. James was opposed to the war, and foretold the troubles it would bring upon Charles. *Dartmouth Papers*, Nov. 12, 1681. But the most striking evidence is in some notes of Williamson, Nov. 11, 1671, *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1671, 563. 'Observe. We go into a Dutch war now with more disadvantage than the last. *Quare?* Now it is taken we go in for the sake of France, &c. He finds upon examination the merchants do not allow they are aggrieved by the Dutch, but think it is a French trick. Even the Cavaliers dread a war and ominate ill. . . . Disaffection among the seamen,' &c. For the contrast between this and the national feeling in favour of the war of 1664, see *supra* 389, note. See Temple's account of a remarkable interview with Clifford in November, 1670, *Works*, ii. 171.

[1] See *supra* 355, notes; Temple's *Works*, ii. 138; Evelyn, Aug. 28, 1670; Marvell, *Popery, &c.*, 282; and Shaftesbury's 'Delenda est Carthago' speech at the opening of the session of Feb. 4, 167$\frac{2}{3}$, in which all these matters are specially complained of. For the Peace of Breda, now broken, see *supra* 450, note. Some of the medals, are given in *Medallic Illustrations of British History*, i. 508-534. See also, on the occasion of the former war, Pepys, Nov. 28, 1663.

[2] See the details of this discreditable incident in Temple, ii. 177; Lyttelton's letter of Aug. 21, 1671, *Hatton Correspondence*, i. 66; Arlington's *Letters*, ii. 333; and *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1671, 426, 433, 437, 483. Thomas Crow, captain of the *Merlin* yacht, was sent to the Tower, Aug. 18, 1671, but released Sept. 15, for not pressing the matter still further and compelling the Dutch, by returning his shot, to break the articles of peace. Sir W. Temple was recalled in July, 1671, for 'a rougher hand,' e.g. Downing; but the

CH. XIV. the coast of England: and one of the king's yachts sailed by, and expected they should strike sail. They said they never refused it to any man of war: but they thought that honour did not belong to such an inconsiderable vessel. I was then at court: and I saw joy in the looks of those that were on the secret. Selden had in his *Mare clausum* raised this matter so high, that he had made it one of the chief rights and honours of the crown of England, as the acknowledgment of the king's empire in the four seas. The Dutch offered all satisfaction for the future in this matter, but they would not send their admiral over as a criminal. While France was treating with England, they continued to amuse the Dutch: and they so possessed De Groot[1], then the Dutch ambassador at Paris, or they corrupted him, into a belief that they had no design on them, that they were too secure, and depended too much on his advertisements. Yet the States entered into a negotiation, both with Spain and the emperor, and with the king of Denmark, the elector of Brandenburgh, and the dukes of Lunen-
306 burg[2]. The king of Sweden was yet under age: and the ministry there desired a neutrality. France and England sent two ambassadors to them, both men of great probity, Pomponne and Coventry[3], who were both recalled at the same time to be secretaries of state. Coventry was a man of wit and heat, and of spirit and candour. He never gave

latter returned without orders, Feb. 8, 167½, *re infecta*, 'having disappointed our expectations.' Arlington's *Letters*, ii. 335; Temple's *Works*, ii. 180.

[1] On Pierre de Groot see Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, ii. 109 He was the son of Hugues de Groot, better known as Grotius.

[2] Charles tried hard to induce Spain to enter the league against the Dutch (*Spanish Negotiations*, ii. 150), but 'His Majesty could not hear without the greatest admiration that the King of England should begin a war against his own ally ... and unite himself for that effect with his most Christian Majesty, who was the sole motive for establishing the Triple Alliance.

[3] Henry Coventry. He was 'an ancient member, and had the nice step of the House, and withal was wonderfully witty and a man of great veracity. And, what renders it more wretched [sc. that he should be thus employed in breaking the Triple Alliance which he had assisted to form] is that no man better than he understood both the theory and practick of honour, and yet could in so eminent an instance forget it.' Marvell, *Popery, &c.*, 274. Coventry was made Secretary of State on his return.

bad advices: but when the king followed the ill advices that others gave, he thought himself bound to excuse, if not to justify them [1]. For this the duke of York commended him much to me: he said in that he was a pattern to all good subjects, since he defended all the king's counsels in public, even when he had blamed them most in private with the king himself. He had accustomed himself too much to the northern way of entertainments; and this grew upon him with age. CH. XIV.

Our court having resolved on a war, did now look out for money to carry it on [2]. The king had been running in a great debt ever since his restoration. One branch of it was the pay of that fleet that had brought him over. | The main of it had been contracted during the former Dutch war. The king in order to the keeping his credit had dealt with some bankers, and had assigned over the revenue to them. They drove a great trade, and had made great advantage by it. The king paid them at the rate of 8 per cent.: and they paid those who put money in their hands only 6 per cent., and had great credit, for payments were made very punctually. The king had in some proclamations given his faith that he would continue to make good all his assignments till the whole debt should be paid, which was now grown up to almost a million and a half [3]. So one of the ways proposed for supplying the king with money was, that he should stop these payments 1672. MS. 154.

[1] The recognized principle upon which all the king's ministers acted. Thus Shaftesbury, writing to Locke on Nov. 23, 1674, while disclaiming any responsibility for the stop of the Exchequer, says: 'I hope it will not be expected by any that do in the least know me, that I should have discovered the king's secret, or betrayed his business, whatever my thoughts were of it.' Christie's *Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury*, ii. 62, 64.

[2] Parliament had been prorogued on April 22, 1671, and by further prorogations to Feb. 4, 167$\frac{2}{3}$, to give Charles and the Cabal a free hand. The stop of the Exchequer was on Jan. 2, 167$\frac{3}{4}$, the attack on the Smyrna Fleet March 13, 14, the Declaration of Indulgence on March 15, 167$\frac{4}{5}$, and the Declaration of War March 17, 167$\frac{4}{5}$.

[3] On June 18, 1667, after the Chatham disaster, when every one rushed to draw out their money, Charles issued a proclamation declaring the inviolability of the Exchequer both then and for the future.

Ch. XIV. for a year, it being thought certain that by the end of
Jan. 2, 167½. a year the king would be out of all his necessities, by the hopes they had of success in the war[1]. The earl of Shaftesbury was the chief man in this advice[2]. He excused it to me, telling me what advantage the bankers had made, and how just it was for the king to bring them to an account for their usury and extortion: and added that he never meant the stop should run beyond the year. He certainly knew of it beforehand, and took all his own money out of the bankers' hands, and warned some of his
Feb. 17, 167½. friends to do the like[3]. Lord Lauderdale did about this time marry lady Dysart upon his lady's death, and she writ me a long account of the shutting up the exchequer,

[1] The king obtained £1,328,526, of which £416,725 was owned by a single banker, Sir R. Vyner. No fewer than 10,000 depositors suffered from the stop. It was declared that the stop should be for one year only, and that interest should be paid at the rate of six per cent. No principal or interest however was paid until April, 1677, when Charles issued letters patent for a perpetual yearly payment of six per cent. with a clause for redemption when principal and arrears were paid off. The payment of interest was then duly made until Lady Day, 1683. In 1700 a decision was obtained by which, after Dec. 26, 1701, the hereditary excise was charged with an interest of three per cent. on the principal until half the debt should be paid. On the whole the loss to the bankers and their creditors amounted to nearly £3,000,000. Macleod, *Theory and Practice of Banking*, i. 368–374.

[2] No two facts are more directly and conclusively proved than that Ashley—he was not created Earl of Shaftesbury until April 23, 1672—so far from advising this step, opposed it with the utmost urgency, and that Clifford was its author. See the evidence from Temple, North, Evelyn, Dryden, &c., collected and dealt with by Christie, *Life of the First Earl of Shaftesbury*, 56–71; especially Shaftesbury's paper of 'Reasons against stopping the due course of payment in the Exchequer,' submitted by him to the king. Upon what evidence Burnet ascribes the inception of the measure to Shaftesbury—unless it be the letter from the Duchess of Lauderdale mentioned by him—cannot be ascertained.

[3] He told it to Sir Charles Duncombe, who had a very great sum of his own in the Exchequer, besides £30,000 of the Marquis of Winchester's, that he drew out before the stop; which was the reason the Duke of Bolton espoused his interest so zealously, upon his impeachment in King William's reign: and brought him off by one vote in the House of Lords; though it was generally thought, not without some charge to Duncombe: besides some engagements in relation to another affair, then depending between Carey and Bertie. D.

as both just and necessary. The bankers were broke; and great multitudes, who had trusted their money in their hands, were ruined by this dishonourable and perfidious action. But this gave the king only his own revenue again: so other ways were to be found for an increase of treasure[1].

By the peace of Breda it was provided, that, in order to the security of trade, no merchant's ships should be for the future fallen on, till six months after a declaration of war[2]. The Dutch had a rich fleet coming from Smyrna, and other parts in the Mediterranean, under the convoy of two men of war. Our court had advice of this; and, that at the same time they might be equally infamous at home and abroad, Holmes was ordered to lie for them, and to take them near the Isle of Wight with eight men of war. As he was sailing thither he met Spragge, who was returning from the Straits with a squadron of our ships; and told him he had sailed along with the Dutch most of the way, and that

[1] Arlington gives an account (*Letters*, ii. 349) of an interview between Charles and the bankers in which, by promises of immediate payment, he induced them to pay their depositors, 'and, upon it, the Discontent is already visibly appeased.' See Temple's note on the loss of credit to the Exchequer, with his reference to the seizure by Charles I of the money in the Mint in 1640, *Works*, ii. 232; Gardiner, *Hist. of Engl.* ix. 170. There is a curious passage upon one effect, or supposed effect, of the closing of the Exchequer in a letter of Lyttelton, *Hatton Correspondence*, i. 77: 'They begin already to find one good effect of breaking y^e^ banquiers in y^e^ countrie, for it makes money to be more plentifull there up on this account, that all receivers of publike, and allmost private, revenues that were considerable, sent up all the money they could make into a somme hither, which lay at interest; ... and now they have not that way, neither to secure it nor make the advantage, they are content to let it lie in the countrey; and undoubtedly, my Lord, it will inhance the value of Land everywhere.' Sir Ralph Verney held the same view; *Verney MSS.*, Jan. 5, 167½.

[2] See Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, ii. 261. Charles, who had already seized Dutch vessels in British ports, declared to Meerman, the Dutch Ambassador, his resolve to regard them everywhere as liable to seizure; and the attack on the Smyrna fleet took place two days later. Marvell, *Popery, &c.*, 277. The Dutch declared their intention of observing the terms of the treaty, mentioned by Burnet, and refused to retaliate. The declaration of war was published March 17. *Id.* 260. See Marvell's story of the council clock being put forward for the purpose, *Popery, &c.*, 282, and *id.* 277.

CH. XIV. they would pass within a day or two. Holmes thought he was much too strong for them; so he did not acquaint Spragge with his design: for if he had stopped him to assist in the execution, probably the whole fleet had been taken, which was reckoned worth a million and a half. When they came up, Holmes fell upon them: but their convoy did their part so well, that not only the whole fleet sailed away, while they kept him in play, but they themselves got off at last, favoured by a mist: and there were only two ships taken, of so small a value, that they were not worth the powder that was spent in the action. This was a breach of faith, such as even Mahometans and pirates would have been ashamed of: the unsuccessfulness of it made it appear as ridiculous as it was base. Holmes was pressed to put it on the Dutch refusing to strike sail; yet that was so false, and there were so many witnesses to it, that he had not the impudence to affirm it [1].

March 13, 14, 167½.

March 15, 167½. To crown all, a declaration was ordered to be set out suspending the execution of all penal laws, both against papists and nonconformists [2]. Papists were no more to be

[1] Every one concerned in this affair spoke of it afterwards with shame. See the opinions of Ossory and Sandwich as related by Evelyn, March 12, 167½, July 26, 1680; May 31, 1672; Sheffield's *Memoirs*, ii. 10. Danby, however, states that it was carried out 'by the concurrent view of us all.' *Danby Papers* (Brit. Mus. Add. MSS., 2,305), f. 25. Upon its 'unsuccessfulness,' see Marvell, *Popery, &c.*, 279: 'All the prize that was gotten sufficed not to pay the chirurgeons and carpenters.' In the *Verney Papers*, March 21, occurs the dry remark, 'Sir R. Holmes was beholding to the Dutch that they did not swallow him up at a bite.'

[2] In September, 1671, Owen and other Nonconformists were in consultation with the king, and a suspension of the penal laws was expected. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1671, 464, 554, 562, 581. Petitions, such as that of the Quakers of Nottingham, doubtless helped to form the king's resolution. *Id.* 594. See also his answer to the Justices of Lancashire in the *Kenyon MSS.*, *H. M. C. Rep.* xiv. App. iv. 95. In the eyes of strong churchmen like Reresby it was 'the greatest blow that ever was given, since the king's restoration, to the Church of England.' Daniel Fleming wrote on April 3, 1672: 'Nor find I any pleased therewith, after such a rate as the Papists run, and I thinke they'l so overdo their business as in turn they'l undo it. Its looked upon as great a Prerogative act as hath been done this good while. It's said to have been shot out of our grand minister's [? Shaftesbury] quiver.' *Fleming Papers*. Upon the

prosecuted for their way of worship in their own houses; and the nonconformists were allowed to have open meeting houses, for which they were to take out licenses, and none were to disturb those who should meet for worship by virtue of those licenses. Lord Keeper Bridgeman had lost all credit at court: so they were seeking an occasion to be rid of him, who had indeed lost all the reputation he had formerly acquired, by his being advanced to a post of which he was not capable. He refused to put the seal to the declaration, as judging it contrary to law. So he was dismissed [1], and the earl of Shaftesbury was made lord chancellor [2]. Lord Clifford was made lord treasurer: Arlington and Lauderdale had both of them the garter: and, as Arlington was made an earl, Lauderdale was made a duke: and this junto, together with the duke of Buck- 308
ingham, being called the Cabal, it was observed, that *Cabal* proved a technical word, every letter in it being the initial

effects of the Indulgence in Oxford, see Clark, *Life of Anthony Wood*, 244. To Marvell, who undoubtedly represented the popular feeling, indulgence of Dissent meant in the first place indulgence of Popery. See the remarkable passage in *Popery and Arbitrary Power*, 280–282, beginning, 'For it appears at first sight that men ought to enjoy the same propriety and protection in their consciences, which they have in their lives, liberties, and estates;' and Sheldon's letter to the king, quoted *supra* 350, note.

[1] Bridgeman did not surrender the seals until Nov. 17, 1672, eight months later. The cause was his refusal to sign commissions for martial law and to issue injunctions to stop suits against bankers by the victims of the stop of the Exchequer. North's *Life of Lord Guilford*, 115; *Examen*, 38; Charles Hatton to Lord Hatton, Nov. 19, 1672, *Hatton Correspondence*. On the refusal to put the seal to the declaration, see Ranke, iii. 526.

[2] 'Then came my Lord Shaftesbury, like the month of March, as they say, "in like a lion, out like a lamb." For he swaggered and vapoured what asses he would make of all the counsell at the bar; but was soon reduced, as is more fully declared in the Examen.' North's *Life of Guilford*, ed. Jessopp, 297. Arlington had hoped for the Lord Treasurership. Upon Clifford's double-dealing in the matter, see Evelyn for Aug. 18, 1673 and Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 482. With respect to Lauderdale, it is surprising to read in a letter of Courtin to Pomponne, Jan. 14, 1677, that he was then regarded, even by his enemies, as a man with clean hands so far as French money was concerned As, however, in the case of Arlington, the bribery seems to have been done through his wife. Forneron, *Louise de Kéroualle*, 136.

CH. XIV. letter of those five, Clifford, Ashley, Buckingham, Arlington, and Lauderdale. They had all of them great presents from France, besides what was openly given them: for the French ambassador gave them all a picture of the king of France set in diamonds, to the value of 3000*l.* Thus was the nation, and our religion, as well as the king's faith and
MS. 155. honour, set to sale, and sold[1]. | Lord Shaftesbury resolved to recommend himself to the confidence of the court by a new strain never before thought of. He said, the writs for choosing the members of the house of commons might be issued out in the intervals of a sessions; and the elections made upon them were to be returned into chancery, and settled there. So the writs were issued out; [a] and some elections were made upon them[2 a]. The house of commons intended to have impeached him for this among other things: but he had the foresight and skill both to see it and to prevent it. When the declaration for toleration was published, great endeavours were used by the court to persuade the nonconformists to make addresses and compliments upon it. Few were so blind as not to see what was aimed at by it.

The duke was now known to be a papist[3], and the

[a] substituted for *but whether any elections were made upon them, and returned, I cannot tell.*

[1] 'These five men agreed in wishing to strengthen the royal prerogative by moderating the Uniformity laws, with the help of France, and during the excitement caused by a foreign war; but otherwise they were attached to widely different principles.' Ranke, iii. 520. The fierce Catholicism of Clifford and the Catholic sympathies of Arlington were irreconcilable with the opinions of the other three. Ranke speaks of Lauderdale as a Presbyterian: but he had utterly repudiated the title from the moment that it was no longer necessary for his political prospects. The 'old Scotch Covenanter' had become 'the champion of the English hierarchy.' Marvell, *Nostradamus' Prophecy*, 31. The Catholic section of the Cabal was anxious to avoid Parliament, while Buckingham and Shaftesbury desired it to meet. Lauderdale was guided solely by the king's personal desires. The Cabal used to meet at his house at Ham.

[2] There were; but the persons were not admitted to sit, and other writs were ordered for those places by the House of Commons. O. *Parl. Hist.* iv. 507.

[3] His conversion was known to the king in 166$\frac{8}{9}$. Clarke, *Life of*

duchess was much suspected; yet the presbyterians came in a body, and Dr. Manton, in their name, thanked the king for it; which offended many of their best friends. There was also an order to pay the more eminent men among them a yearly pension, of fifty pounds to most of them, and of an hundred pounds a year to the chief of the party. Baxter sent back his pension, and would not touch it, but most of them took it. All this I say upon Dr. Stillingfleet's word, who assured me he knew the truth of it, and in particular he told me that Pool, who wrote the Synopsis of the Critics, confessed to him that he had fifty pounds for two years. Thus the court hired them to be silent: and the greatest part of them was very silent and compliant[1]. But now the pulpits were full of a new strain. Popery was every where preached against, and the authority of laws was much magnified. The bishops, he of London[2] in particular, charged the clergy to preach against popery, and to inform the people aright in the controversies between us and the church of Rome. This alarmed the court as well as the city and the whole nation. Clifford began to shew the heat of his temper, and seemed a sort of a enthusiast for popery. The king complained to Sheldon of this preaching on controversy, as done on purpose to inflame the people, and to alienate them from him and his government. Upon this, he called some of the clergy 309
together, to consider what answer he should make the king, if he pressed him any further on that head. Tillotson was

James II, ii. 440. James states (*id.* 441), that on Jan. 25 of the same year Charles declared himself of the same mind to Arundel, Arlington, and Clifford. Manton had been imprisoned under the Five Mile Act since 1670, *supra* 401, note. Upon Baxter's refusal to take the pension, see Hamilton, *Life of Baxter*, 355. See also Ranke, iii. 526. One notable prisoner, John Bunyan, gained his freedom now, May 8, 1672.

[1] Dr. Calamy, in the *Historical Account of My own Life*, ii. 469, complains of this reflection on the Nonconformists, if silence with regard to the Papists is intended by it, and because the writings of Pool, Clarkson, and the *Morning Exercise*, against Popery, printed in 1675, within three years of the time, show it, he says, to have been altogether unmerited. R.

[2] Henchman was Bishop of London from 1664 to 1675.

CH. XIV. one of these: and he suggested this answer, that, since the king himself professed the protestant religion, it would be a thing without a precedent that he should forbid his clergy to preach in defence of a religion which they believed, while he himself said he was of it. But the king never renewed the motion[1].

March 31, 167½. While things were in this fermentation, the duchess of York died. It was observed that for fifteen months before that time she had not received the sacrament, and that upon all occasions she was excusing the errors that the church of Rome was charged with, and was giving them the best colours they were capable of[2]. An unmarried clergy was also a common topic with her. Morley had been her father confessor: for, he told me she practised secret confession to him from the time that she was twelve year old: and, when he was sent away from the court, he put her in the hands of Blanford, who died bishop of Worcester[3]. He also told me, that upon the reports that were brought him of her slackness in receiving the sacrament, she having been for many years punctual to once a month, he had spoke

[1] Of the evasions of the king at this time from declaring himself a Roman Catholic, according to his own illusory proposal, for the purpose of obtaining money from France, before he should join them in a war with the Dutch, Dr. Lingard, in his *History of England*, xii, gives this entertaining account. 'A year later,' he adds, 'Louis returned to the same subject, and Charles objected religious scruples, which made him desirous of consulting some celebrated theologian, but a theologian also skilled in chemistry, that the subject of their conversations might be supposed to be his favourite science. [This was in March, 166⅝. The person sent was the Abbé Pregnani, *supra* 167, 350, notes.] Soon afterwards he determined to make the celebration of mass in English and the administration of the sacrament under both forms the indispensable conditions of his conversion. But Louis was then satisfied: he had obtained his purpose of drawing the king into the war, and therefore ceased to call for a declaration, which must have rendered him a useless and burthensome ally.' R.

[2] James had admitted her conversion to the king in December, 1670. Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 452. Cf. *supra* 299. For her 'motives for embracing the Catholic Faith,' Aug. 20, 1670, see *Fairfax Correspondence*, ii. 268. In the *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1670, 606, there are touching letters of remonstrance to her and to James from Clarendon.

[3] He was at that time Bishop of Oxford. R.

plainly to her about it, and had told her what inferences were made upon it. She pretended ill health and business; but protested to him she had no scruples with relation to her religion, and was still of the church of England; and assured him that no popish priest had ever taken the confidence to speak to her of those matters. He took a solemn engagement of her, that if scruples should arise in her mind she would let him know them, and hear what he should offer to her upon all of them. And he protested to me, that to her death she never owned to him that she had any scruples, though she was for some days entertained by him at Farnham, after the date of the paper which was afterwards published in her name. All this passed between him and me, upon the duke's shewing me that paper all writ in her own hand, which was afterwards published by Maimburg. He would not let me take a copy of it, but he gave me leave to read it twice; and I went immediately to Morley, and gave him an account of it, from whom I had all the particulars already mentioned. And upon that he concluded, that that unhappy princess had been prevailed on to set lies under her hand, and to pretend that these were the grounds of her conversion. A long decay of health came at last to a quicker crisis than had been apprehended [1]. All of the sudden she fell into the agony of death. Blanford was sent for to prepare her for it, and to offer her the sacrament. Before he could come, the queen came in and sat by her. He was modest 310
and humble even to a fault; so he had not presence of mind enough to begin prayers, which probably would have driven the queen out of the room; but that not being done, she, pretending kindness, would not leave her. The bishop spoke but little, and fearfully [2]. He happened to say he hoped she continued still in the truth: upon which she

CH. XIV.

[1] For one supposed cause of her death, see Marvell, *Advice to a Painter*, 42.

[2] He had just before been informed by the duke that she had been reconciled to the Church of Rome. See Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 453. R.

CH. XIV. MS. 156. asked, What is truth: and | then, her agony increasing, she repeated the word *truth, truth*[1], very often, and died in a few minutes, very little beloved or lamented. Her haughtiness had raised her many enemies. She was indeed a firm and a kind friend: but the change of her religion made her friends reckon her death rather a blessing than a loss at that time to them all. Her father, when he heard of her shaking in her religion, was more troubled at it than at all his own misfortunes. He writ her a very good and long letter upon it, inclosed in one to the duke; but she was dead before it came into England. And thus I have set down all that I know concerning the fatal alliance with France, and our preparations for the second Dutch war.

CHAPTER XV.

HISTORY OF THE DUTCH PREVIOUS TO THE SECOND DUTCH WAR.

BUT that I may open the scene more distinctly, I will give as particular an account as I was able to gather of the affairs of the States of Holland at this time; and because this was the fifth great crisis under which the whole protestant religion was brought, I will lead my reader through a full account of them all, since I may probably lay things before him that he may otherwise pass over, without making due reflections on them.

The first crisis was, when Charles V by defeating the duke of Saxony, and the getting him and the landgrave of Hesse into his hands, had subdued the Smalcaldick league, in which the strength of the protestant religion did then consist; that was weakened by the succeeding deaths of

[1] From a source usually accurate and well-informed on details of this kind we hear that her last words were: 'Duke, Duke, death is terrible, death is very terrible.' Dr. Denton to Sir R. Verney, *Verney MSS.*, April 6, 167½.

Henry VIII and Francis I. Upon that defeat, all sub- CHAP. XV.
mitted to the emperor: only the town of Magdeburg stood out. The emperor should either not have trusted Maurice, or have used him better; but it seems that he reckoned Maurice had neither religion nor honour, since his ambition had made him betray his religion and abandon his party. When he had got the electorate, he made himself sure of the army, and entered into an alliance with France, and the other princes of the empire, and made so quick a turn on the emperor, that he had almost surprised him at Inchsprick, and of a sudden overturned all that design upon which the emperor had been labouring for many years. This ended in the edict of Passau, which settled the peace of Germany for that time.

The second crisis was towards the end of queen Mary's 311
reign, when the protestant religion seemed extinguished in England; and the two cardinals of Lorrain and Granvell, then the chief ministers of the two crowns, designed a peace for that very end, that their masters might be at leisure to extirpate heresy, which was then spreading in both their dominions. But after they had formed their scheme queen Mary died, and was succeeded by queen Elizabeth in England. Soon after that the king of France was accidentally killed: so that kingdom fell under a long continuance of a minority and of civil wars. And the Netherlands felt from thence, and from England, such encouragement, that they made the longest and bravest resistance that is to be found in all history, which was in a great measure owing to the obstinate and implacable cruelty of Philip II, and his great distance from the scene of the war, and was past all possibility of being made up, by reason of his perfidious breach of all agreements, and his using those that served him well in so base a manner as he did both the duke of Alva and the prince of Parma[a].

The third crisis lasted from 1585 of that century to the

[a] *After a long and expenseful war, he was at last obliged to sue for a truce* struck out.

CHAP. XV. year 89. Then began the league of France[1]. The prince of Parma was victorious in the Netherlands; the prince of Orange was murdered; the States fell under great distractions; and Spain entered into a design of dethroning the queen of England, and putting the queen of Scots in her stead. In order to that, they were for some years preparing the greatest fleet that the world had ever seen, which came to be called the Invincible Armada. All Europe was amazed at these great preparations, and many conjectures were made concerning the design of such a vast fleet. Some thought of Constantinople; others talked of Egypt, in conjunction of the emperor of the Abissens [Abyssinians]; but that which was most probable, was that king Philip intended to make a great effort, and put an end to the war of the Netherlands in one campaign. At last the true intent of it was found out. Walsingham's chief spies were priests: he used always to say, an active but [a] vicious [a] priest was the best spy in the world. By one of these he had advice that the king of Spain had fixed on a resolution with relation to his fleet; but that it was not yet communicated to any of his ministers in foreign courts[2]. The king himself had indeed writ a letter about it to the pope, but it was not entered into any office: so this was all that the intelligence from Madrid could discover. Upon this one was sent to Venice, from whence the correspondence with Rome was held; and at Rome it was found out that one of the pope's
312 chief confidants had a mistress, to whom twenty thousand crowns were given for a sight and copy of that letter. The copy was sent over soon after Christmas, in the winter [15]86. By it the king of Spain had acquainted the pope, that the design of his fleet was to land in England, to

[a] substituted for *lewd*.

[1] The League was formed at Joinville on the last day of 1684. William of Orange was murdered July 10, 1584. Antwerp capitulated Aug. 17, 1585.

[2] See this story, somewhat differently told, in Welwood, *Memoirs*, 9–11.

destroy queen Elizabeth and heresy, and to set the queen of Scots on the throne. In this he had the concurrence of the house of Guise: and he also depended on the king of Scotland. This proved fatal to the queen of Scots. It is true king James sent one Stewart, the ancestor of the lord Blantyre, who was then of his bedchamber, with an earnest and threatening message to queen Elizabeth for saving his mother[1]. But in one of the intercepted letters of the French ambassadors then | in Scotland, found among Walsingham's papers, it appears that the king, young as he then was, was either very double, or very inconstant in his resolutions. The French ambassador assured him that Stewart had advised the queen to put a speedy end to that business, which way she pleased; and that for his master's anger, he would soon be pacified if she would but send him dogs and deer. The king was so offended at this, that he said he would hang him up in his boots, as soon as he came back; yet when he came back, it was so far from that that he lay all that night in the bedchamber[2]. As for the pompous embassy that was sent from France to protest against it, Maurier has told a very probable story of

CHAP. XV.

MS 157.

[1] A letter from the king to Archibald Douglas, dated in October, 1586, expresses great impatience, that he should earnestly exert himself in favour of his mother, declaring, that if her life should be taken, he would have no more to do with the instruments of her death. See Ellis, *Original Letters*, 3rd Series, 14, Let. 222. The 224th Letter is a long and importunate one from the king to Queen Elizabeth herself on the same subject, in which he seems to be aware, or at least fearful, that his wishes were misrepresented. For he thus concludes: 'But in case any do vaunt themselves to know further of my mind in this matter, than my ambassadors do, who indeed are fully acquainted therewith, I pray you not to take me to be a camelion, but by the contrary them to be malicious impostors, as surely they are.' R.

[2] Archbishop Spottiswoode, in his *History of the Church of Scotland*, says, that when Queen Elizabeth understood that her messenger, whom she had sent with a letter to the king, excusing the fact of his mother's death, 'was returned without audience, she laboured by her ministers, of whom she was ever well furnished, to pacify his mind, and divert him from the war he had intended. These working privately with the king's chief counsellors, and such of his chamber as he was known to affect, dealt so as they kept off things from breaking forth into open hostility, which was every day expected.' Book 6, 359. R.

CHAP. XV. Henry III's writing a letter with them to the queen, advising her to proceed with all haste to do that which the embassy was sent to prevent. He saw the house of Guise built a great part of their hopes on the prospect of their cousin's coming to the crown of England, which would cut off all the hopes the house of Bourbon had of assistance from thence. I have seen an original letter of the earl of Leicester's to the earl of Bedford, that had married his sister, and was then governor of Berwick, telling him that, how high soever the French ambassadors had talked in their harangues upon that occasion, calling any proceeding against the queen of Scots an open indignity as well as an act of hostility against France, since she was queen dowager of France, yet all this was only matter of form and decency, that was extorted from the king of France; and how high soever they might talk, they were well assured he would do nothing upon it. So that unfortunate queen fell at that time, by reason of the Spanish preparations to conquer England, under the pretence of setting her on the throne; and died much more decently than she had lived, in February [15]87[1].

But the court of England reckoned that if king Philip's
313 fleet was in a condition to conquer England, he would not abandon the design for her being put out of the way, and that he certainly intended to conquer it for himself, and not for another. So orders were given to make all possible haste with a fleet. Yet they were so little provided for

[1] There is one particular circumstance of her life, that I do not remember any of her advocates to have mentioned, which is, that during her being in England, which was from the twenty-sixth year of her age to the forty-fifth, there was not the least imputation upon her of any commerce of irregular amours here; though from the frequent accession of men to her, she was not without opportunities enough for it. The story of the Countess of Shrewsbury's jealousy of her husband's having that intercourse with her, was believed by nobody, and thought to be a piece of malice only in that strange woman. As to the necessity, and indeed justice, of the proceedings against the Queen of Scots, see the *Hatfield Papers*, especially the second volume, lately published. O. See *Cal. Hatfield MSS., H. M. C. Rep.*

such an invasion, that, though they had then twenty good ships upon the stocks, it was not possible to get them in a condition to serve that summer: and the design of Spain was to sail over in [15]87. So, unless by corruption or any other method, the attempt could be put off for that year, there was no strength ready to resist so powerful a fleet. But when it seemed not possible to divert the present execution of so great a design, a merchant of London, to their surprise, undertook it[1]. He was well acquainted with the state of the revenue of Spain, with all their charge, and all that they could raise. He knew all their *fonds* were so swallowed up, that it was impossible for them to victual and set out their fleet, but by their credit in the bank of Genoa. So he undertook to write to all the places of trade, and to get such remittances made on that bank, that he should by that means have it so entirely in his hands that there should be no money current there equal to the great occasion of victualling the fleet of Spain. He reckoned the keeping such a treasure dead in his hands till the season of victualling was over would be a loss of 40,000*l.*; and at that rate he would save England. He managed the matter with such secrecy and success that the fleet could not be set out that year. At so small a price, and with so skilful a management, was the nation saved at that time. This, it seems, was thought too great a mystery of state to be communicated to Cambden, or to be published by him, when the instructions were put in his hands for writing the history of that glorious reign. But the famous Boyle, earl of Cork, who had then a great share in the affairs of Ireland, came to know it, and told it to two of his children, from whom I had it. The story is so coherent, and agrees so well with the state of affairs at that time, that it seems highly credible; and if it is true, it is

[1] There is a tradition in the Charterhouse, that this was Thomas Sutton, esquire, the founder of that hospital, at that time the richest merchant in London. Bowyer's *MS. Note.* The same account is given in Dr. Bearcroft's *Life of Sutton*, 11, published in 1737. R.

CHAP. XV. certainly one of the curiousest passages in our whole English history. I return from this digression, which I hope will be no unacceptable entertainment to the reader. It is well known how the design of the Armada miscarried: and soon after that, the duke of Guise was stabbed: not long after, Henry III was also stabbed, and Henry IV succeeded, who broke the league, with which the great designs of Spain fell to the ground. So happily did this third crisis pass over.

314 The fourth crisis was from the battle of Prague to the
Nov. 8, 1620. year 1630, in which, as was told in the first book, not only the elector Palatine fell, but almost all the empire came under the Austrian yoke. All attempts to shake it off proved unsuccessful, and fatal to those who undertook it, till the young and great king of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, engaged in it. The wars of the Rochelle, together with
Nov. 1, 1628. the loss of that important place, seemed to threaten the destruction of the protestants of France. England fell under those unhappy jealousies, which begun a disjointing between the king and his people. And the States were
1625. much pressed by the Spaniards under Spinola. Breda was taken. But the worst of all was a quarrel that was raised between prince Maurice and Barneveld[1], that will require a fuller discussion than was offered in the former book. All
MS. 158. agree that William prince of Orange was one of the | greatest men in story, who, after many attempts for the recovery of the liberty of the provinces, was in conclusion successful, and formed that republic. In the doing it he was guilty of one great error, if he was not forced to it by the necessity of his affairs; which was the settling a negative in every one of the towns of Holland, in the matters of religion, of taxes, and of peace and war. It had been much safer if it had been determined that such a number as two thirds in the conclave must concur, by which the government would have been much stronger. Some thought that he brought

[1] Cf. *supra* 17.

in so many little towns to balance the greater, of whom he could not be sure; whereas he could more easily manage these smaller ones. Others have said that he was forced to it, to draw them to a more hearty concurrence in the war, since they were to have such a share of the government for the future. But as he had settled it, the corruption of any one small town may put all the affairs of Holland in great disorder. He was also blamed for raising the power of the stadtholder so high, that in many regards it was greater than the power of the counts of Holland had been; but this was balanced by its being made elective, and by the small appointments that he took to himself. It seems he designed to have settled that honour in his family: for after his death there were reversal letters found among his papers from the duke of Anjou when the provinces invited him to be their prince, by which he engaged himself to leave Holland and Zealand in the prince's hands. Before he died he had in a great measure lost the affections of the clergy: because he was very earnest for the toleration of papists, judging that necessary for the engaging men of all persuasions in the common concerns of liberty, and for encouraging the other provinces to come into the union. [a] This was much opposed by the preachers in Holland, 315
who were for more violent methods[a]. Those who but a few years before had complained of the cruelty of the church of Rome, were no sooner delivered from that than they began to call for the same ways of prosecuting those who were of the other side. This made that great prince lose ground with the zealots of his own side before he died. With him all their affairs sunk so fast, that they saw the necessity of seeking protection elsewhere. Their ministers did of themselves, without the concurrence of the States, send to queen Elizabeth, to desire her to take them under her protection, on such terms as she should prescribe; and though the States were highly offended at this, yet they

CHAP. XV.

[a] substituted for *There is a strange edge on the spirits of clergymen of all sorts and sides: they do always go into violent and cruel methods.*

CHAP. XV. durst not at that time complain of it, much less punish it, but were forced by the clamours of their people to follow an example that was so irregularly set them. This I had from Halewyn of Dort, of whom I shall have occasion to
Dec. 1585. write afterwards[1]. When the queen sent over the earl of Leicester, with a new title, and an authority greater than was either in the counts of Holland or in the stadtholder, by the name of supreme governor, he as soon as he landed at Flushing went first to church, where he ordered prayers to be offered up for a blessing on his counsels, and desired that he might receive the sacrament next day: and there he made solemn protestations of his integrity and zeal. This pleased the people so much, that Barneveld and the States at the Hague thought it necessary to secure themselves from the effects of such a threatening popularity: so they sent for the count, afterwards prince, Maurice, who was then at Leyden, not yet eighteen, and chose him stadtholder of Holland and Zealand. There had been no provision made against that in their treaty with the earl of Leicester, yet he was highly offended at it. I will go no further into the errors of his government, and the end that the queen put to it; which she did as soon as it appeared that he was incapable of it, and was beginning to betray and sell their best places.

Prince Maurice and Barneveld continued long in a perfect conjunction of counsels: till upon the negotiations for a peace, or at least for a truce, they differed so much, that their friendship ended in a most violent hatred, and a jealousy that could never be made up[2]. Prince Maurice was for carrying on the war, which set him at the head of a great army; and he had so great an interest in the conquests they made, that for that very reason Barneveld infused it into the States, that they were now safe, and needed not fear the Spaniards any more; so there was no reason for continuing the war. Prince Maurice, on the other hand,

[1] There are many notices of Halewyn later; see especially *infra* 586.

[2] Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 35 *et seq.*

said their persecuted brethren in the popish provinces wanted their help to set them at liberty. The work seemed easy, and the prospect of success was great. In opposition to this it was said, since the seven provinces were now safe, why should they extend their territories? Those who loved their religion and liberty in the other provinces might come and live among them. This would increase both their numbers and their wealth: whereas the conquest of Antwerp might prove fatal to them: besides that both France and England interposed. They would not allow them to conquer more, nor become more formidable. All the zealous preachers were for continuing the war, and those that were for peace were branded as men of no religion, who had only carnal and political views. While this was in debate every where, the disputes began between Arminius and Gomarus, two famous professors at Leyden, concerning the decrees of God and the efficacy of grace; in which those two great men, Maurice and Barneveld, went in upon interest to lead | the two parties, from which they both differed in opinion. Prince Maurice in private always talked of the side of the Arminians: and Barneveld believed predestination firmly; but as he left reprobation out in his scheme, so he was against the unreasonable severity with which the ministers drove those points, and he found the Arminians the better patriots as he thought. The other side out of their zeal were for carrying on the war, so that they called all others indifferent as to all religions, and charged them as favourers of Spain and popery. I will go no further into the differences that followed concerning the authority of the states general over the several provinces. It is certain that every province is a separated state, and has an entire sovereignty within itself, and that the states general are only an assembly of the deputies of the several provinces, but without any authority over them. Yet it was pretended that extraordinary diseases required extraordinary remedies: and prince Maurice, by the assistance of a party that the ministers made for him among the people,

CHAP. XV.

316

MS. 159.

CHAP. XV. engaged the states general to assume an authority over the province of Holland, and to put the government in new hands. A court was erected by the same authority, to judge those who had been formerly in the magistracy. Barneveld was accused, together with Grotius and some others, as fomenters of sedition, and for raising distractions
May 13, 1619. in the country. He was condemned, and beheaded: others were condemned to perpetual imprisonment; and every one of the judges had a great gold medal given them, in
317 the reverse of which the synod of Dort was represented, which was called by the same authority. I saw one of these medals in the possession of the posterity of one of those judges. King James assisted prince Maurice in all this: so powerfully do the interests of princes carry them to concur in things that are most contrary to their own inclinations. The prevailing passion of that king was his hatred of the puritans. That made him hate these opinions into which the others went with great heat: and he encouraged all that were of the Arminian persuasion in his own dominions; yet he helped to crush them in Holland [1]. He hated Barneveld upon another score, for his getting the cautionary towns out of his hands: and, according to the nature of impotent passions, this carried him to procure his ruin. After this victory that prince Maurice had got over the party that opposed him, he did not study to carry it much further. He found quickly how much he had lost the hearts of the people, who had before that time made him their idol, and now looked at him with horror. He studied to make up matters the best he could, that he might engage the States in the Bohemian war; but all that was soon at an end. It was plain that he had no design upon their liberty, though he could not bear the opposition that he began to meet with from a free state.

His death put an end to all jealousies, and his brother, prince Henry Frederick, quickly settled the disputes of Arminianism by the toleration that was granted them, and

[1] See *supra* 17, 20.

he was known to be a secret favourer of their tenets. He conducted their armies with so much success, and left them so much at liberty as to all their state affairs, that all the jealousies which his brother's conduct had raised were quite extinguished by him. The States made him great presents: he became very rich; and his son had the survivance of the stadtholdership, but he had more of his uncle's fire in him than of his father's temper. He opposed the peace of Munster all he could. The States came then to see that they had continued too long in their alliance with France against Spain, since France had got the ascendant by too visible a superiority; so that their interest led them now to support Spain against France. Prince William fell to be in ill terms with his mother[1]; and she, who had great credit with the States, set up such an open opposition to her son, that the peace of Munster was in a great measure the effect of their private quarrel. Prince William, being married into the royal family of England, did all he could to embroil the States with the new commonwealth, but he met with such opposition, that he, finding the States were resolved to dismiss a great part of their army, suffered himself to be 318
carried to violent counsels. I need not enlarge on things that are so well known as his sending some of the States prisoners to Lovestein, and his design to change the government of Amsterdam, which was discovered by the postboy, who gave the alarm a few hours before the prince could get thither. CHAP. XV.

These things, and the effects that followed on them, are but too well known: as is also his death, which followed a few weeks after, in the most unhappy time possible for the princess royal's[2] big belly. For as she bore her son a week after his death, in the eighth month of her time, so he came into the world under great disadvantages. The States were possessed with great jealousies of the family, as if their aspiring to subdue the liberties of their country was

Nov. 6, 1650.

Nov. 14.

[1] Amélie de Solms.

[2] Mary, daughter of Charles I. Cf. *supra* 300.

CHAP. XV. inherent, and inseparable from it. His private affairs were also in a very bad condition: two great jointures went out of his estate to his mother and grandmother, besides a vast debt that his father had contracted to assist the king.

MS. 160. And who could have thought that an | infant, brought into the world with so much ill health, and under so many ill circumstances, was born for the preservation of Europe and of the protestant religion? So unlike do the events of things prove to their first appearances. And since I am writing of his birth, I will set down a story much to the honour of astrology, how little regard soever I my self have to it. I had it from the late queen's own mouth, and she directed me to some who were of the prince's court in that time, who confirmed it to me. An unknown person put a paper in the old princess's hands, which she took from him thinking it was a petition. When she looked into it, she found it was her son's nativity, together with the fortunes of his life, and a full deduction of many accidents, which followed very punctually as they were predicted. But that which was most particular was, that he was to have a son by a widow, and was to die of the small-pox in the twenty-fifth year of his age. So those who were apt to give credit to predictions of that sort fancied that the princess royal was to die, and that he was upon that to marry the widow of some other person. It was a common piece of raillery in the court, upon the death of any prince, to ask what a person his widow was. But when he was taken ill of the small-pox, then the deciphering the matter was obvious, and it struck his fancy so much that probably it had an ill effect upon him. Thus was the young prince born; who

Jan. 166⅞. was some years after barred by the perpetual edict from all hopes of arriving at the stadtholdership.

319 The chief error in De Witt's administration was, that he did not again raise the authority of the council of state, since it was very inconvenient to have both the legislature and the execution in the same hands. It seemed necessary to put the conduct of affairs in a body of men, that should

indeed be accountable to the States, but should be bred to business. By this means their counsels might be both quick and secret; whereas, when all is to be determined by the States, they can have no secrets, and they must adjourn often to consult their principals; so their proceedings must be slow. During De Witt's ministry, the council of state was so sunk that it was considered only as one of the forms of the government. But the whole execution was brought to the States themselves. Certainly a great assembly is a very improper subject of the executive power. It is indeed very proper that such a body should be a check on those who have the executive power trusted to them. It is true De Witt found it so; which was occasioned by reason of the English ambassador's being once admitted to sit in that council. They pretend, indeed, that it was only on the account of the cautionary towns, which gave England a right to some share in their counsels. After these were restored, they did not think it decent to dispute the right of the ambassador's sitting any more there; but the easier way was the making that council to signify nothing, and to bring all matters immediately to the States. It had been happy for De Witt himself, and his country, if he had made use of the credit he had in the great turn upon prince William's death, to have brought things back to the state in which they had been anciently; since the established errors of a constitution and government can only be changed in a great revolution. He set up on a popular bottom: and so he was not only contented to suffer matters to go on in the channel in which he found them, but in many things he gave way to the raising the separated jurisdiction of the towns, and to the lessening the authority of the courts at the Hague. This raised his credit, but weakened the union of the province. The secret of all affairs, chiefly the foreign negotiations, lay in few hands. Others, who were not taken into the confidence, threw all miscarriages on him; which was fatal to him. The reputation he had got in the war with England, and the happy

CHAP. XV. conclusion of it, broke a party that was then formed against him. After that, he dictated to the States: and all submitted to him. The concluding the triple alliance in so short a time, and against the forms of their government, shewed how sure he was of a general concurrence with
320 every thing that he proposed. In the negotiations between the States and France and England he fell into great errors. He still fancied that the king must see his own interest so visibly in the exaltation of the prince of Orange, that he reckoned that the worst that could happen was to raise him to that trust; since England could not gain so much by a conjunction with France, as by the king's having such an interest in their government when his nephew should be their stadtholder. So he thought he had a sure reserve to gain England at any time over to them. But he had no apprehension of the king's being a papist, and of his design to make himself absolute at home. And he was amazed to find that, though the court of England had talked much of that matter of the prince of Orange when the States were in no disposition to hearken to it, and so used it as a reproach, or a ground of a quarrel, yet when it came more in view, they took no sort of notice of it, and seemed not only cold but even displeased with it. The prince was left much to himself in his education; he was soon let loose to that idleness to which youth is naturally
MS. 161. carried; | nor was he acquainted either with history or military matters; yet as his natural reservedness saved him from committing errors, so his gravity and other virtues recommended him much to the ministers and to the body of the people. The family of De Witt and the town of Amsterdam carried still the remembrance of what was passed fresh in their thoughts. They set it also up for a maxim, that the making of a stadtholder was the giving up their liberty, and that the consequence of it would be the putting the sovereignty of their country in him, or at least in his family. The long continuance of a ministry in one person, and that to so high a degree, must naturally

raise envy and beget discontent, especially in a popular government[1]. This made many become De Witt's enemies, and by consequence the prince's friends. And the preachers employed all their zeal to raise the respect of the people for a family under whom they had been so long easy and happy. CHAP. XV.

When he was of full age, it was proposed in so many places that he should have the supreme command of their armies and fleets, that De Witt saw the tide was too strong to be resisted. So, after he had opposed it long, he proposed some limitations that should be settled previous to his advancement[2]. The hardest of all was, that he should bind himself by oath never to pretend to be stadtholder, nor so much as to accept of it though it should be offered him. These conditions were not of an easy digestion; yet it was thought necessary that the prince should be once at the head of their armies: that would create a great dependence on him: and if God blessed him with success, it would not be possible to keep him so low as these limitations laid him. And the obligation never to accept of the stadtholdership could only be meant of his not accepting the offer from any tumultuary bodies of the populace or the army; but could not be a restraint on him, if the States should make the offer freely, since his oath was made to them, and by consequence it was in their power to release the obligation that did arise from it to themselves[3]. The court of England blamed him for submitting to such conditions; but he had no reason to rely much on the advices of those who had taken so little care of him during all the credit they had with the States, while the triple alliance gave them a great interest in their affairs[a]. As soon as he 1672. 321

[a] *and much credit with them*, struck out.

[1] For the vehement feeling against De Witt, as early as June, 1670, see Temple, *Works*, ii. 119.

[2] He swore to maintain the 'Perpetual Edict' of January, 166⅞ (Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, i. 508; *supra* 570), which secured the separation of the civil and military commands, and which was abrogated in July, 1672, in the Orange reaction which culminated in the murder of the De Witts.

[3] Bad casuist. S. See *infra* 583.

CHAP. XV. was brought into the command of the armies. he told me that he spoke to De Witt, and desired to live in an entire confidence with him. His answer was cold: so that he saw he could not depend upon him. When he told me this, he added that he was certainly one of the greatest men of the age, and he believed he served his country faithfully [1]. De Witt reckoned that the French could not come to Holland but by the Meuse, and he had taken great care of the garrison of Maestricht, but very little of those that lay on the Rhine and the Isel, where the States had many places, but none of them good. They were ill fortified and ill supplied; but most of them were worse commanded, by men of no courage, nor practice in military affairs, who considered their governments as places of which they were to make all the advantage that they could.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE DUTCH WAR IN 1672.

NOW I come to give an account of the fifth crisis brought on the whole reformation, which has been of the longest continuance, since we are yet in the agitations of it [2]. The design was first laid against the States, but the method of invading them was surprising and not looked for. The elector of Cologne was all his life long a very weak man: yet it was not thought that he could have been prevailed on to put the French in possession of his country, and to deliver himself with all his dominions over into their hands. When he did that, all upon the Rhine were struck with such a consternation, that there was no spirit nor courage left. It is true they could not

[1] Yet the prince contrived he should be murdered. S. It would be more correct to say that he took no step to prevent the murder; he subsequently protected and advanced the ringleaders.

[2] Under the queen and Lord Oxford's ministry. S.

have made a great resistance. Yet if they had but gained a little time, that had given the States some leisure to look round them, to see what was to be done. CH. XVI.

The king of France came down to Utrecht like a land flood. This struck the Dutch with so just a terror, that nothing but great errors in his management could have kept them from delivering themselves entirely up to him. Never was more applause given with less reason than the king of France had upon this campaign. His success was 322
owing rather to De Witt's errors, than to his own conduct. He shewed so little heart as well as judgment in the management of that run of success[1], that, when that year is set out, as it may well be, it will appear to be one of the most infamous of his life[2]; though, when seen in a false light, it appears one of the most glorious in history. The conquest of the Netherlands at that time might have been so easily compassed, that if his understanding and his courage had not been equally defective, he could not have miscarried in it[3]. When his army passed the Rhine, June 12, 1672.
upon which so much eloquence and poetry have been bestowed, as if all had been animated by his presence and direction, he was viewing it at a very safe distance: where he took the care that he has always done to preserve himself. When he came to Utrecht, he had neither the prince of Condé nor Mr. Turenne to advise with, and so was wholly left to his ministers. The prince of Condé was dangerously wounded as he passed the Rhine: and Turenne was sent against the elector of Brandenburg, who was coming down with his army, partly to save his own country of Cleves, but chiefly to assist his allies the Dutch. So the king had none about him to advise with, but

[1] A metaphor, but from gamesters. S.

[2] Bowyer's transcript has, *most infamous*.

[3] 'An operation of the fourth order,' is Napoleon's contemptuous phrase. *Mémoires de Napoléon*, v. 129; Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, iv. 11. One English regiment, that of Sir Harry Jones, was engaged. *Hatton Correspondence*, July 2, 1672. Condé's wound caused his retirement from the army.

CH. XVI. MS. 162.

Pomponne and Louvois. When the Dutch sent to him to know what he demanded, | Pomponne's advice was wise and moderate, and would in conclusion have brought about all that he intended. He proposed that the king should restore all that belonged to the seven provinces, and require of them only the places that they had without them [1]; chiefly Maestricht, Bois-le-Duc, Breda, and Bergen-op-zoom: thus the king would maintain an appearance of preserving the seven provinces entire, which the crown of France had always protected. To this certainly the Dutch would have yielded without any difficulty. By this he had the Spanish Netherlands entirely in his power, separated from Holland and the empire, and might take them whensoever he pleased. This would have an appearance of moderation, and would stop the motion that all Germany was now in; which could have no effect, if the States did not pay and assist their troops. Louvois, on the other hand, proposed that the king should make use of the consternation the Dutch were then in, and put them out of a condition of opposing him for the future [2]. He therefore advised that the king should demand of them, besides all that Pomponne moved, the paying a vast sum for the charge of that campaign; the giving the chief church in every town for the exercise of the popish religion; and that they should put themselves under the protection of France, and should send an ambassador every year with

June 30, 1672.

[1] I. e. outside the seven provinces, and known as the 'generality.'

[2] See the proposed conditions on both sides, June 30, 1672, in Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, iv. 33, and Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, ii. 417–422. Louis's own view is given in his memoir of the campaign of 1672. Rousset, *Histoire de Louvois*, i. 380. Louvois was 'un homme sans mesure et sans habilité, le plus grand et le plus brutal de tous les commis.' For the change in the policy and conduct of Louis after the death of the sagacious Lionne in 1671, see Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, Introd. lxii. No demand was made for the chief church in every town, but only for the free exercise and fitting support of the Catholic faith. Louis in this followed the example of the treaty made in the spring between the Protestant Elector of Brandenburg and the Catholic Count Palatine of the Rhine. See Lingard's note, xii. 255; Dumont, vii. 171–205. This article caused the bitterest feeling in England.

a medal acknowledging it; and should enter into no treaties or alliances but by the direction of France, or till his advice was asked and followed. The Dutch ambassadors were amazed when they saw that the demands rose to so extravagant a pitch. [a] One of them swooned away, when he heard them read: he could neither think of yielding to them, nor see how they could resist them. There was an article put in for form, that they should give the king of England full satisfaction; but all the other demands were made without any concert with England, though Lockhart was then following the court. CH. XVI. 1672 323

I say nothing of the sea-fight at Solebay[1], in which De Ruyter had the glory of surprising the English fleet, [b] when they were thinking less of engaging the enemy, than of an extravagant preparation for the usual disorders of the twenty-ninth of May, which he prevented, engaging them on the twenty-eighth, in one of the most obstinate sea-fights that has happened in our age; in which the French took more care of themselves than became gallant men; but it was believed they had orders to look on, and leave the English and Dutch to fight it out, while they preserved the force of France entire. Ruyter disabled the ship in which the duke was, whom some blamed for leaving his ship too soon; and then his personal courage began first to be called in question[2]. The admiral of the blue squadron May 28 / June 7 1672.

[a] *Beverning who was* struck out. [b] The whole passage (*when they . . . Sandwich* on p. 578) substituted for *before they had recovered the disorders of the 29th of May; he also burnt an admiral and a first-rate ship in which the earl of Sandwich* (&c.).

[1] For detailed accounts of this terrible battle, see Clarke's *Life of James II*, i. 457, &c., which should be compared with Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, ii. 317, &c. On its place in the history of naval warfare, see Mahan's *Influence of Sea Power in History*, 146. Rupert, whose sympathies were strongly opposed to France (upon this point see *Letters to Sir Joseph Williamson*, Camd. Soc. i. *passim*), had no command in this campaign. He, however, led the fleet in the last great battle off the Zealand coast, August 21, 1673. f. 352.

[2] Publicly, I suppose the author means: for see *supra* 391. O. Higgons, in his *Remarks*, 179, gives the following account of the Duke of York's behaviour: 'The duke's ship was so disabled, that she lay a wreck

CH. XVI.

was burnt by a fire-ship, after a long engagement with a Dutch ship much inferior to him in strength. In it the earl of Sandwich [b] perished with a great many about him, who would not leave him, as he would not leave his ship [1],

on the water, upon which he went into the boat; and though all about him most earnestly entreated that he would strike his flag, he would not consent; his courage surmounted his prudence; he displayed his colours, and with a triumphant bravery insulted the foe in his cockboat; this distinguished him to be there in person, and exposed him to the incessant fire from the whole line of the enemy, who endeavoured to sink him; but by a happy temerity he passed through them all, got on board a fresh ship, where he hoisted his flag, restored the fight, and renewed his dangers. Whereas, if he had continued in the disabled ship, he would have been towed out of the battle, and falling back behind the line, have remained in perfect safety.' This relation is confirmed by Sheffield, then Lord Mulgrave, afterwards Duke of Bucks, who was present at the engagement. His words are these: 'But the Duke of York himself had the noblest share in this day's action; for when his ship was so maimed as to be made incapable of service, he made her lie by to refit, and went on board another, that was hotly engaged, where he kept up his standard, till she was disabled also, and then left her for a third, in order to renew the fight, which lasted from break of day till sunset.' Duke of Buckingham's *Works*, ii. 14. Among the *Rawdon Papers* lately published, there is a letter written two days after Southwold, or Solebay, fight, in which it is related, that 'on Tuesday morning, about six of the clock, both the fleets engaged, and before ten of the clock the duke's ship, the *Prince*, had received sixty broadsides, and then being disabled, he went aboard the *Saint Michael*; there he stayed till four in the afternoon, and then went aboard the *London*, and there stayed that night. The fight continued till eleven next day, being Wednesday. He went aboard the *Prince* again, which was then mended in all she was disabled;' 252. Captain Carleton in his *Memoirs*, printed in 1743, who was himself on board the *London*, speaks of the gallantry of the duke's conduct. [Upon these Memoirs, which were first published in 1728, see the article by Col. Parnell in the *English Historical Review* for Jan. 1891, where they are proved to be a fraud. Col. Parnell gives his reasons for attributing the work to Swift. But in the *Academy* for May and June, 1893, vol. xliii, 393, 438, 461, 482, Mr. C. E. Doble has placed the authorship, almost beyond a doubt, upon Defoe.] And, finally, Sir William Coventry's account of his cool and excellent judgement in the midst of the dangers of war may be appealed to, and is worth reading in Pepys's *Diary*, June 4, 1664.

[1] Sandwich was drowned with his son. 'His body was found at least forty miles from the place of battle, floating upon the waters.' Lyttelton to Hatton, June 4, 1672, *Hatton Correspondence*. There is another account of the finding of his body near Harwich, with some curious details, in the *H. M. C. Rep.* ii. 22. In 'Captain Carleton's *Me-*

by a piece of obstinate courage, to which he was provoked by an indecent reflection the duke made on an advice he had offered of drawing nearer the shore, and avoiding an engagement, as if in that he took more care of himself than of the king's honour. [a]The duke of Buckingham came aboard the fleet: though it was observed that he made great haste away when he heard the Dutch fleet was in view. The duke (of York) told me, that he said to him, since they might engage the enemy quickly he intended to make sure of another world: so he desired to know who was the duke's priest, that he might reconcile himself to the church. The duke told him, Talbot would help him to a priest; and he brought one to him. They were for some time shut up together, and the priest said he had reconciled him according to their forms. Buckingham, who had no religion at heart, did this only to recommend himself to the duke's confidence[a]. Ch. XVI.

It may easily be imagined that all things were at this time in great disorder at the Hague[1]. The French possessed themselves of Noerden: and a party had entered into Muyden, who had the keys of the gates brought to them, but they, seeing it was an inconsiderable place, not knowing the importance of it, by the command of the water 324
that could drown all to Amsterdam, flung the keys in the ditch, and went back to Noerden. But when the consequence of the place was understood, another party was sent to secure it; but before their return, two battalions were sent from the prince of Orange, who secured the place, and by that means preserved Amsterdam, where all were

[a] All this passage is struck out, but Burnet has written in the margin afterwards, *What is here scored was by an error, so it is not to be left out.*

moirs' — see previous note — it is stated that the writer was on board the packet boat when the body was discovered through the flight of gulls hovering over it. For Sandwich's curious premonition of death, see Sheffield's *Memoirs*, 14. There is a strikingly favourable character of him in Evelyn, May 31, 1672. Cf. *supra* 397.

[1] Marvell, writing in June, 1672, says: 'No man can conceive the state of Holland in this juncture, unless he can at the same time conceive an earthquake, an hurricane, and the deluge.' (*Works*, ii. 400, Grosart's ed.)

CH. XVI. trembling, and thought of nothing but treating and submission. The States were very near the extremities of despair. They had not only lost many places, but all their garrisons in them. Guelder, Overyssel, and Utrecht, were quite lost, and the bishop of Munster was making a formidable impression on Groningen, and at last besieged it. All these misfortunes came so thick one after another, that no spirit was left. And, to complete their ruin, a jealousy was spread through all Holland, that they were betrayed by those who were in the government; that De Witt intended all should perish, rather than the family of Orange should be set up. Montbas, one of their generals, who married De Groot's sister, had basely abandoned his post, which
June 12, 1672. was to defend the Rhine where the French passed it: and when he was put in arrest for that, he made his escape, and went to the French for sanctuary[1]. Upon this the people complained loudly: and the States were so puzzled, that their hearts quite failed them. When they were assembled, they looked on one another like men amazed, sometimes
MS. 163. all in tears. | Once the Spanish ambassador came, and demanded audience. And when he was brought in, he told them, that out of the affection that he bore them, and the union of his master's interests with theirs, he came to blame their conduct. They looked sad: [a]and upon all occasions they looked like men despairing of their country. This quite disheartened their people: therefore he advised them to put on another countenance, to publish that they had good news, that their allies were in march; and to feed their people with probable stories, and so to keep up their spirits. They thought the advice was seasonable, and followed it. They sent two ambassadors, Dyckveldt[2] and

[a] *they never appeared in the Vorhaut in their coaches:* struck out.

[1] The Comte de Montbas was of French origin. His *Mémoires* were published at Cologne in 1673. Upon his failure to defend the passage of the Rhine see Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, ii. 296–299; and, upon his escape, *id.* 466. On De Groot, see *supra* 548.

[2] Everard van Dyckveldt, born 1626, died 1672. Cf. *infra* 585;

Halewyn, to join with Boreel, who was still in England, to try if it was possible to divide England from France. And the morning in which they were dispatched away, they had secret powers given them to treat concerning the prince of Orange's being their stadtholder: for lord Arlington had so oft reproached Boreel for their not doing it, that he in all his letters continued still to press that on them. When they came over, they were for form's sake put under a guard; yet Boreel was suffered to come to them, and was transported with joy when they told him what powers they had in that affair of the prince. And immediately he went to lord Arlington: but came soon back like one amazed, when he found that no regard was had to that which he had hoped would have entirely gained the court; but he was a plain man, and had no great depth. The others were sent to Hampton Court, and were told that the king would not treat separably, but would send over ambassadors to treat at Utrecht. They met secretly with many in England, and informed themselves by them of the state of the nation. They gave money liberally, and gained some in the chief offices to give them intelligence. The court understanding that they were not idle, and that the nation was much inflamed, since all the offers that they made were rejected, commanded them to go back. The duke of Buckingham and lord Arlington were ordered to go to Utrecht; and, to give the nation some satisfaction, lord Halifax was sent over afterwards, but he was not put on the secret [1]. The Dutch, hearing that their ambassadors were come over without making peace with England, ran together in great numbers to Maesland Sluice, and resolved to cut them in pieces at their landing; for they heard they were at the Brill. But as they were crossing the Maes, a little boat met them, and told them of their danger, and advised them

Ch. XVI.

June, 1672.

325

July, 1672.

Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, ii. 375. Upon Boreel see *supra* 146, note.

[1] Nor was Buckingham, though the ostensible head of the mission. An agreement was made with Louis for the continuance of the war until the places stipulated for England in the Treaty of Dover should be handed over. See Arlington's *Letters*, ii. 378; Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, 429.

CH. XVI. to land at another place, where coaches were lying to carry them to the Hague. So they missed the storm, that broke out fatally at the Hague the next day, where men's minds were in great agitation.

De Witt was once at night going home from the States, when four persons set on him to murder him. He shewed on that occasion both an intrepid courage, and a great presence of mind. He was wounded in several places, yet he got out of their hands, and one of them was taken, and condemned for it. All De Witt's friends pressed him to save his life; but he thought that such an attempt on a man in his post was a crime not to be pardoned, though as to his own part in the matter he very freely forgave it. The young man confessed his crime, and repented of it: and protested he was led to it by no other consideration, but that of zeal for his country and religion, which he thought were betrayed; and he died as in a rapture of devotion, which made great impression on the spectators. At the same time a barber accused De Witt's elder brother of practising on him, in order to his murdering the prince. There were so many improbabilities in his story, which was supported by no circumstances, that it seemed no way credible. Yet Cornelius de Witt was put to torture on it, but stood firm to his innocence. The sentence was accommodated rather to the state of affairs, than to the strict rules
326 of justice[a]. In the mean while, his brother had resigned his charge of pensionary, and was made one of the judges of the high court. Cornelius de Witt was banished; which was intended rather as a sending him out of the way, than as a sentence against him. I love not to describe scenes
Aug. 20, 1672. so full of horror as was that black and infamous one committed on the two brothers[1]. I can add little to what has

[a] *for he was banished* struck out.

[1] Upon the state of Holland after the murder, Henry Coventry writes thus to Essex, Aug. 29, 1672: 'Where since the tragedy of the De Witts there is hardly left what to call government, every man being affrayed to carry the name of a magistrate, much lesse to execute the duty or the authority of one.'

been so often printed. De Witt's going in his own coach to carry his brother out of town was a great error, and looked like a triumph over a sentence; which was unbecoming the character of a judge. Some furious agitators, who pretended zeal for the prince, gathered the rabble together. And by that vile action that followed they did him more hurt, than they were ever able to repair. His enemies have taken advantages from thence to cast the infamy of this on him, and on his party, to make them all odious; though the prince spoke of it always to me with the greatest horror possible[1]. The ministers in Holland did upon this occasion shew a very particular violence in their sermons and in some printed treatises; they charged the judges with corruption, that had carried the sentence no further than to banishment, and compared the fate of the De Witts to Haman's. CH. XVI.

| I need not relate the great change of the magistracy in all the provinces, nor the repealing the perpetual edict, and the advancing the prince of Orange to be stadtholder, after they had voided the obligation of the oath he had taken, about which he took some time to deliberate. Both lawyers and divines agreed, that those to whom he had made that oath had the power of relaxing the obligation of it, and that therefore he was no longer bound by it[a]. They also gave him for that time the full power of peace and war. All this was carried farther by the town of Amsterdam; for they sent a deputation to him, offering him the sovereignty of their town. When he was pleased to tell me this passage, he said he knew the reason for which they made it was, because they thought all was lost, and they chose to have the infamy of their loss fall on him, rather than on themselves. He added that he was sure the country could not bear a sovereign, and that they would MS. 164.

[a] *They were not contented to lodge that dignity in his own person, but made it hereditary to his issue male*, struck out.

[1] See *supra* 574, note.

CH. XVI. contribute more liberally to the war when it was in order to the preserving their own liberty, than for any prince whatsoever. So he told them, that, without taking any time to consult on the answer to be made to so great an offer, he did immediately refuse it. He was fully satisfied with the power that he had already lodged with him, and would never endeavour to carry it any further. The prince's advancement gave a new life to the whole country. He, though then so very young, and little acquainted either
327 with the affairs of state or war, did apply himself so to both, that, notwithstanding the desperate state in which he found matters, he neither lost heart nor committed errors. The duke of Buckingham and the lord Arlington tried to bring the king of France to offer them better terms; but in vain. That king was so lifted up, that he seemed to consider the king very little. While he was so high on the one hand, and the prince of Orange so steady on the other, the English ambassadors soon saw that all the offices they could do were ineffectual. One day the prince (who told me this himself) was arguing with them upon the king's conduct, as the most unaccountable thing possible, who was contributing so much to the exaltation of France, that must prove in conclusion fatal to himself; and was urging this in several particulars. The duke of Buckingham broke out in an oath, which was his usual style, and said he was in the right; and so offered to sign a peace immediately with the prince. Lord Arlington seemed amazed at his rashness. Yet he persisted in it, and said positively he would do it. The prince upon that, not knowing what secret powers he might have, ordered the articles to be engrossed, and he believed that if he could possibly have got them ready while he was with him, that he would have signed them. They were ready by next morning, but by that time he had changed his mind. That duke, at parting, pressed him much to put himself wholly in the king's hands: and assured him he would take care of his affairs as of his own. The prince cut him short: he said his country

had trusted him, and he would never deceive nor betray them for any base ends of his own. The duke answered, he was not to think any more of his country, for it was lost: if it should weather out the summer, by reason of the waters that had drowned a great part of it, the winter's frost would lay them open: and he repeated the words often, 'Do not you see it is lost?' The prince's answer deserves to be remembered: he said he saw it was indeed in great danger, but there [was] a sure way never to see it lost, and that was to die in the last ditch. CH. XVI.

The person that the prince relied on chiefly as to the affairs of Holland was Fagel[1]: a man very learned in the law, who had a quick apprehension, and a clear and ready judgment. He had a copious eloquence, more popular than correct: and was fit to carry matters with a torrent in a popular assembly. De Witt had made great use of him: for he joined with him very zealously in the carrying the perpetual edict, which he negotiated with the states of Friesland, who opposed it most: and he was made greffier, or secretary to the states general, which is the most beneficial place in Holland. He was a pious and 328
virtuous man: only he was too eager and violent, and out of measure partial to his kindred. He was vain, and too apt to flatter himself, and not ill pleased when others flattered him. He had much heart when matters went well, but had not the courage that became a great minister on uneasy and difficult occasions. Prince Waldeck was their chief general: a man of a great compass and a true judgment, equally able in the cabinet and in the camp[2].

[1] Gaspard Fagel (1629–1688); succeeded De Witt as Grand Pensioner (*infra*, f. 731), and co-operated with Temple in forming the Peace of Nimwegen in 1678. He drew the draft of William III's Declaration before the invasion of England. Cf. Macaulay, *Hist. of Engl.* ii. 81, 235.

[2] George Frederick, Prince of Waldeck (1620–1692); entered the service of the State of Holland, and subsequently that of the Emperor Leopold I, by whom he was made Field Marshal and Prince in 1682. He served under Sobieski in the great victory of Vienna over the Turks in 1683, and then returned to the Dutch service, when he was

CH. XVI. But he was always unsuccessful, because he was never furnished according to the schemes that he laid down. The opinion that armies had of him as an unfortunate general made him really so: for soldiers cannot have much heart when they have not an entire confidence in him that has the chief command.

Dyckveldt[1], on his return from [England[a]], seeing the ruin of the De Witts, with whom he was formerly united, and the progress the French had made in Utrecht, where his estate and interest lay, despaired too soon, and went and lived under them. Yet he did great service to his province: upon every violation of articles, he went and demanded justice and made protestations, with a boldness to which the French were so little accustomed that they were amazed at it. Upon the French leaving Utrecht, and on the re-establishing that province, he was left out of the government: yet his great abilities, and the insinuating smoothness of his temper, procured him so many friends, MS. 165. that the prince was prevailed on to receive | him into his confidence: and he had a great share of it to the last, as he well deserved it. He had a very perfect knowledge of all the affairs of Europe, and great practice in many embassies. He spoke as almost all the Dutch do, too long, and with too much vehemence. He was in his private deportment a virtuous and religious man, and a zealous protestant. In the administration of his province, which was chiefly trusted to him, there were great complaints of partiality and injustice.

Halewyn[2], a man of great interest in the town of Dort, and one of the judges in the court of Holland, was the person of them all whom I knew best and valued most, and was next to Fagel in the prince's confidence. He had a great compass of learning, besides his own profession, in

[a] *Holland*, by mistake.

made Marshal General. In 1690 he suffered defeat at Fleurus at the hands of Marshal Luxembourg.

[1] See *supra* 580.

[2] Corneille Terestein d'Halewyn. See *supra* 83, 566, 580.

which he was very eminent. He had studied divinity with great exactness, and was well read in all history, but most particularly in the Greek and Roman authors. He was a man of great vivacity: he apprehended things soon, and judged very correctly. He spoke short, but with great life. He had a courage and vigour in his counsels, that became one who had formed himself upon the best models in the ancient authors. He was a man of severe morals; and as he had great credit in the court where he sat, so he took care that the partialities of friendship should not mix in the administration of justice. He had in him all the best notions of a good patriot and a true Christian philosopher. He was brought in very early to the secret of affairs, and went into the business of the perpetual edict very zealously; yet he quickly saw the error of bringing matters of state immediately into numerous assemblies. He considered the States maintaining in themselves the sovereign power, as the basis upon which the liberty of their country was built; but he thought the administration of the government must be lodged in a council. He thought it a great misfortune that the prince was so young at his first exaltation, and so possessed with military matters, to which the extremity of their affairs required that he should be entirely applied, that he did not then correct that error, which could only be done upon so extraordinary a conjuncture. He saw the great error of De Witt's ministry, of keeping the secret of affairs so much in his own hands. Such a precedent was very dangerous to public liberty, when it was in the power of one man to have given up his country. Their people could not well bear the lodging so great a trust with one who had no distinction of birth or rank; yet he saw it was necessary to have such an authority, as De Witt's merits and success had procured him, lodged some where. The factions and animosities that were in almost all their towns made it as necessary for their good government at home, as it was for the command of their armies abroad,

329

CH. XVI. to have this power trusted to a person of that eminence of birth and rank, that he might be above the envy that is always among equals, when any one of them is raised to a disproportioned degree of greatness above the rest. He observed some errors that were in the prince's conduct: but after all, he said, it was visible that he was always in the true interest of his country: so that the keeping up a faction against him was like to prove fatal to all Europe as well as to themselves.

The greatest misfortune in the prince's affairs was, that the wisest and the most considerable men in their towns, that had been acquainted with the conduct of affairs formerly, were now under a cloud, and were turned out of the magistracy, or they thought it convenient to retire from business, and many hot but poor men, who had signalized their zeal on the turn newly made, came to be called the prince's friends, and to be put every where in the magistracy. They quickly lost all credit, having little discretion and no authority. They were very partial in
330 the government, and oppressive, chiefly of those of the other side. The prince saw this sooner than he could find a remedy for it, but by degrees the men of the other side came into his interests, and promised to serve him faithfully, in order to the driving out the French and the saving their country. He received them all, and brought them in as fast as could be into the magistracy, which made those that called themselves his party complain much, yet it gave a general content to the country. The chief of those were, Halewyn of Dort, Pats of Rotterdam, and Van Beuning of Amsterdam.

The last of these was so well known both in France and England, and had so great credit in his own town, that he deserves to be more particularly set out. He was a man of great notions, but talked perpetually, so that it was not possible to convince him, in discourse at least; for he heard nobody speak but himself. He had a wonderful vivacity, but too much levity in his thoughts. His

temper was inconstant, firm and positive for a while, but apt to change, from a giddiness of mind rather than from any falsehood in his nature. He broke twice with the prince, after he came into a confidence with him. He employed me to reconcile him to him for the third time: but the prince said he could not trust him any more. He had great knowledge in all sciences, and had such a copiousness of invention, with such a pleasantness as well as a variety of conversation, that I have often compared him to the duke of Buckingham: only he was virtuous and devout; much in | the enthusiastical way. MS. 166. In the end of his days he set himself wholly to mind the East India trade; but that was an employment not so well suited to his natural genius; and it ended fatally: for, the actions sinking of the sudden on the breaking out of the new war, that sunk him into a melancholy that quite distracted him. The town of Amsterdam was for many years conducted by him as by a dictator, and that had exposed them to as many errors as the irregularity of his notions suggested. The breaking the West India company, and the loss of Munster in the year 1658, was owing to that. It was then demonstrated that the loss of that town laid the States open on that side, and that Munster being in their hands would not only cover them, but be a fit place for making levies in Westphalia. Yet Amsterdam would not consent to that new charge, and fancied there was no danger of that side. But they found afterwards, to their cost, that their unreasonable managery in that particular drew upon them an expense of many millions, by reason of the unquiet temper of that martial bishop, who had almost ruined them this year on the side of Friesland: but his miscarriage in the siege of Groningen, and the taking Coevorden by surprise in the end of the year, as it was among the first things that raised the spirits of the Dutch, so both his strength and reputation 331 sunk so entirely upon it, that he never gave them any great trouble after that.

CH. XVI.

CH. XVI.

Another error, into which the managery of Amsterdam threw the States, was occasioned by the offer that Mons. d'Estrades, the French ambassador, made them in the year 1663, of a division of the Spanish Netherlands[1], by which Ostend and a line from thence to Maestricht, within which Bruges, Ghent, and Antwerp were comprehended, was offered to them, the French desiring only St. Omer, Valenciennes, Cambrai, and Luxembourg. And the dominions that lay between those lines was to be a free commonwealth; [a]as Halewyn assured me, who said he was in the secret at that time[a]. This was much debated all Holland over. It was visible that this new commonwealth, taken out of the hands of the Spaniards, must naturally have fallen into a dependence on the States, and have become more considerable when put under a better conduct. Yet this would have put the States at that time to some considerable charge; and to avoid that, the proposition was rejected, chiefly by the opposition that Amsterdam made to it, where the prevailing maxim was, to reduce their expense, to abate taxes, and to pay their public debts[2]. By such an unseasonable parsimony matters were now brought to that state, that they were engaged into a war of so vast an expense, that the yearly produce of their whole estates did not answer all the taxes that they were forced to lay on their people.

[a] Not in MS.

[1] This proposal was much older. It was put forward at the Treaty of Munster in 1648; but seems to have been suggested by Richelieu, if not by the Dutch, at even an earlier date. The two other French plans for dealing with the Spanish Netherlands were to erect them into a separate republic and to conquer them. Mignet, *Négociations*, &c., Introduction. See also *supra* 83.

[2] The true reason of the opposition made by the town of Amsterdam, was an apprehension that Antwerp, under a commonwealth, would soon recover her lost trade [lost at the Treaty of Munster, 1648; by which the navigation of the Scheldt was closed at the demand of the Dutch]; being much better situated for that purpose than they are, which in all likelihood would have drawn it back again to Antwerp; from whence they had it, upon the troubles in the Spanish Netherlands. D.

After the prince saw that the French demands were at this time so high, and that it was not possible to draw England into a separate treaty, he got them to call an extraordinary assembly of the States, the most numerous that has been in this age. To them the prince spake near three hours, to the amazement of all that heard him, which was owned to me by one of the deputies of Amsterdam. He had got great materials put in his hands, of which he made very good use. He first went through the French propositions, and shewed the consequence and the effects that would certainly follow on them; that the accepting them was ruin, and the very treating about them would distract and dispirit their people: he therefore concluded that the entertaining a thought of these was the giving up their country. If any could hearken to such a motion, the lovers of religion and liberty must go to the Indies, or to any other country where they might be free and safe. After he had gone through this for near an hour, he in the next place shewed the possibility of making a stand, notwithstanding the desperate state to which their affairs seemed to be reduced. He shewed the force of all their allies; that England could not hold out long without 332
a parliament, and they were well assured that a parliament would draw the king to other measures. He shewed the impossibility of the French holding out long, and that the Germans coming down to the Low Rhine must make them go out of their country as fast as they came into it. In all this he shewed that he had a great insight into the French affairs. He came last to shew how it was possible to raise the taxes that must be laid on the country to answer such a vast and unavoidable expense; and set before them a great variety of projects for raising money. He concluded, that if they laid down this for a foundation, that religion and liberty could not be purchased at too dear a rate, and that therefore every man among them, and every minister in the country, ought to infuse it into all the people, that they must submit to the present extremity,

CH. XVI. and to very extraordinary taxes, by this means, as their people would again take heart, so their enemies would lose theirs, who built their chief hopes on that universal dejection among them, that was but too visible to all the world. Every one that was present seemed amazed to
MS. 167. hear so young a man speak to so many things, with | so much knowledge and so true a judgment. It raised his character wonderfully, and contributed not a little to put new life in a country, almost dead with fear, and dispirited with so many losses. They all resolved to maintain their liberty to the last, and if things should run to extremities, to carry what wealth they could with them to the East Indies. The state of the shipping capable of so long a voyage was examined: and it was reckoned that they could transport above two hundred thousand people thither. Yet all their courage would probably have served them in little stead, if the king of France could have been prevailed on to stay longer at Utrecht: but he made haste to go back to Paris. Some said it was the effect of his amours, and that it was hastened by some quarrels among his mistresses. Others thought he was hasting to receive the flatteries that were preparing for him there; and indeed in the outward appearances of things there was great occasion for them; since he had such a run of success as was beyond all expectation, though he himself had no share in it, unless it was to spoil it by an indecent care of himself, and a want of heart to push forward that rapidity of success. He left a garrison in every place, against Turenne's advice, who was for dismantling them all, and keeping his army still about him; but his ministers saw so far into his temper, that they resolved to play a sure game, and to put nothing to hazard. Upon the elector of Brandenburg's
333 coming down, Mons. Turenne was sent against him: by which means the army about the king was so diminished, that he could undertake no great design with so small a force, and though the prince of Orange had not above eight thousand men about him, employed in keeping a pass

near Woerden, yet no attempt was made to force him from it. Another probable reason of his returning back so soon was a suggestion of the desperate temper of the Dutch, and that they were capable of undertaking any design, how black soever, rather than perish. Some told him of vaults under the streets of Utrecht, where gunpowder might be laid to blow him up, as he went over them: and all these were observed to be avoided by him. He would never lodge within the town, and came but seldom to it. He upon one or other of these motives went back; upon which the prince of Condé said, he saw he had not the soul of a conqueror in him, and that his ministers were the best *commis*, but the poorest ministers in the world, who had not souls made for great things, or capable of them. CH. XVI.

If the king had a mind to be flattered by his people, he found at his return enough even to surfeit him. Speeches, verses, inscriptions, triumphal arches, and medals, were prepared with a profusion and excess of flattery, beyond what had been offered to the worst of the Roman emperors, bating the ceremony of adoration [1]. But blasphemous impieties were not wanting, to raise and feed his vanity. A solemn debate was held all about Paris, what title should be given him. *Le Grand* was thought too common: some were for *Invincible*, others for *Le Conquerant*; some, in imitation of Charlemagne, for *Louis le magne*, others were for *Maximus*: but *Tres Grand* sounded not so well, no more did *Maxime*. So they settled on *Le Grand*; and all the bodies of Paris seemed to vie in flattery. It appeared, that the king took pleasure in it: so there has followed upon it the greatest run of the most fulsome flattery that is in history. Had the king of France left such a man as Turenne at Utrecht, it might have had ill effects on the resolutions taken up by the Dutch: but he left Luxembourg there, a cruel, impious, and brutal man, that had no regard to articles, but made all people see what was to be expected when they came under the tyranny of such a yoke, Aug. 1, 1672.

[1] Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, ii. 443.

CH. XVI. that was then so intolerable a burden, even while it ought to have been recommended to those who were yet free by a gentle administration. This contributed not a little to fix the Dutch in those generous resolutions they had taken up.

334 There was one very extraordinary thing that happened near the Hague and in sight this summer: I had it from many eyewitnesses, and no doubt was made of the truth of it by any at the Hague. Soon after the English fleet had refitted themselves, (for they had generally been much June 7. damaged by the engagement in Solbay), it appeared in sight of Scheveling, making up to the shore. The tide turned: but they reckoned that with the next flood they would certainly land the forces that were aboard, where they were like to meet with no resistance. So they sent to the prince for some regiments to hinder the descent. He could not spare many men, having the French very near him: so, between the two, the country was given for lost, unless De Ruyter should quickly come up. The flood MS. 168. returned, which they thought | was to end in their ruin. July 14, 1672. But to all their amazement, after it had flowed two or three hours, an ebb of many hours succeeded, which carried the fleet again out to the sea; and before that was spent De Ruyter came in view. This they reckoned a miracle wrought for their preservation[1]. Soon after that they escaped another design, that otherwise would very probably have been fatal to them.

The earl of Ossory, eldest son to the duke of Ormond, a man of great honour, generosity, and courage, had been oft in Holland, and, coming by Helvoetsluys, he observed it was a place of great consequence, but very ill looked to, the Dutch trusting to the danger of entering into it, more than to any strength that defended it, so he thought it might be easy to seize and fortify that place. The king approved this. So some ships were sheathed and

[1] Pontalis, *Jean de Witt*, ii. 447: he speaks only of a violent storm. But see Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, iv. 54; Basnage, *Annales*, ii. 262.

victualled as for a voyage to a greater distance. He was to have five men of war, and transport ships for twelve or fifteen hundred men; and a second squadron, with a further supply, if he succeeded in the attempt, was to follow. He had got two or three of their pilots brought out on a pretended errand, and these he kept very safe to carry him in. This was communicated to none but to the duke and to lord Arlington: and all was ready for the execution. Lord Ossory went to this fleet, and saw every thing ready as was ordered, and came up to receive the king's sailing orders. But the king, who had ordered him to come next morning for his despatch, discovered the design to the duke of Buckingham, who hated both the duke of Ormond and lord Ossory, and would have seen the king and all his affairs perish, rather than that persons whom he hated should have the honour of such a piece of merit. He upon that did turn all his wit to make the thing appear ridiculous and impracticable. He represented it as unsafe on many accounts, and as a desperate stroke that put things, if it succeeded, out of a possibility of treaty or reconciliation. The king could not withstand this. Lord Ossory found next morning that the king had changed his mind; and it broke out, by the duke of Buckingham's loose way of talking, that it was done by his means. So the design was laid aside; but when the peace was made, lord Ossory told it to the Dutch ambassadors, and said since he did not destroy them by touching them in that weak and sore part, he had no mind they should lie any longer open to such another attack. When the ambassadors wrote this over to their masters, all were sensible how easy it had been to have carried and secured that place, and what a terrible disorder it would have put them in; and upon this they gave order to put the place in a better posture of defence for the future. So powerfully did spite work on those about the king, and so easy was he to the man of wit and humour. The duke stayed long at sea, in hope to have got the East India fleet; but they came home sailing so

335

CH. XVI. near the German coast, that they had passed him before he was aware of it. So he came back after a long and an inglorious campaign. He lost the honour of the action that was at Solbay, and missed the wealth of that fleet which he had long waited for.

I will complete the transactions of this memorable year with an account of the impression that Luxembourg made on the Dutch near the end of it; which would have had a very tragical conclusion, if a happy turn of weather had not saved them. Stoupe was then with him, and was on the secret. By many feints they amused the Dutch so skilfully that there was no suspicion of the true design. All was prepared for an invasion when a frost should come. It came at last: and it both froze and thawed by turns for some time, which they reckon makes the ice firmest. At last a frost continued so strong for some days, that upon piercing and examining the ice, it was thought that it could not be dissolved by an ordinary thaw in less than
Dec. 26, 1672. two days. So about midnight he marched out of Utrecht towards Leyden, with about sixteen thousand men. Those of Utrecht told me that in the minute in which they began to march, a thaw wind blew very fresh; yet they marched on till day-light, and came to Swammerdam and Bodegrave, which they gained not without difficulty, where they stopt, and committed many outrages of crying lust and barbarous cruelty, and vented their impiety in very blasphemous expressions, upon the continuance of the thaw,
336 which now had quite melted the ice, so that it was not possible to go back the way that they came, where all was ice, but was now being dissolved about three foot of water. There were some causeways made, and they were forced to march on these. But there was a fort, through which they must pass, and one Painevine, with two regiments, was ordered to keep it, with some cannon in it. If he had continued there, they must all have been taken prisoners, which would have put an end to the war. But when he saw them march by him in the morning, he gave all for

lost, and went to Ter Gouw, where he gave the alarm, as if all was lost. And he offered to them, to come to help them by that [a] small [a] garrison to a better capitulation. So he left his post, and went thither. The French army, not being stopt by that fort, got safe home [1]. But their behaviour in those two villages was such, that, as great pains was taken to spread it over | the whole country, so it contributed not a little to the establishing them in their resolutions of not only venturing but of losing all, rather than come under so cruel a yoke. Painevine's withdrawing had lost them an advantage never to be regained. So the prince ordered a council of war to try him. He pleaded that the place was not tenable; that the enemy had passed it; so he thought the use it was intended for was lost: and if the enemy had come to attack him, he must have rendered upon discretion: and he pleaded further, that he went upon the desire of one of their towns to save it. Upon this defence he was acquitted as to his life, but condemned to infamy as a coward, and to have his sword broke over his head, and to be for ever banished the States' dominions. But an appeal lay, according to their discipline, to a council of war composed of general officers: and they confirmed the sentence. The towns of Holland were highly offended at these proceedings. They said, they saw the officers were resolved to be gentle to one another, and to save their fellow officers, how guilty soever they might be. The prince yielded to their instances, and brought him to a third trial before himself and a court of the supreme officers, in which they had the assistance of six judges. Painevine stood on it, that he had undergone two trials, which was all that the martial law subjected him to; and in those he was acquitted. Yet this was overruled. It was urged against him that he himself was present in the council of war that ordered the making that fort; and he knew that

CH. XVI. Dec. 31. MS. 169.

[a] *small*, word rather doubtful.

[1] Mignet, *Négociations, &c.*, iv. 128; Basnage, *Annales*, ii. 355. Luxembourg had only 5,000 men.

CH. XVI. it was not intended to be a place tenable against an army, but it was only meant to make a little stand for some time, and was intended for a desperate service in a desperate
337 state of affairs; and that therefore he ought not to have left his post because of the danger he was in. He saw the thaw begin, and so ought to have stayed at least till he had seen how far that would go: and being put there by the prince, he was to receive orders from none but him. Upon these grounds he was condemned and executed, to the great satisfaction of the States, but to the general disgust of all the officers, who thought they were safe in the hands of an ordinary council of war, but did not like this new method of proceeding.

They were also not a little troubled at the strict discipline that the prince settled, and at the severe execution of it. But by this means he wrought up his army to a pitch of obedience and courage, of sobriety and good order, that things put on another face: and all men began to hope that their armies would act with another spirit, now that the discipline was so carefully looked to. [a] It seems the French made no great account of them: for they released twenty-five thousand prisoners, taken in several places, for fifty thousand crowns [a].

Thus I have gone far into the state of affairs of Holland in this memorable year. I had most of these particulars from Dyckvelt and Halewyn, and I thought this great turn deserved to be set out with all the copiousness with which my informations could furnish me. This year the king declared a new mistress, and made her duchess of Portsmouth [1]. She had been maid of honour to Madame,

[a] This sentence is not in the MS.

[1] See Forneron's charming monograph upon Louise de Kéroualle. He speaks of the 'anarchy' among the women which preceded the 'reign' of Louise. She showed an embarrassing hesitation in accepting the rôle assigned her, and was at length told by Louis that the alternative was retirement in a religious house in France. The story of her surrender at Euston is well known; on Nov. 1, 1671, she received the formal congratulations of Colbert upon her appointment. There is

and had come over with her to Dover; where the king had expressed such a regard to her, that the duke of Buckingham, who hated the duchess of Cleveland, intended to put her on the king. He told him that it was a decent piece of tenderness for his sister to take care of some of her servants. So she was the person the king easily consented to invite over. That duke assured the king of France, that he could not reckon himself sure of the king but by giving him a mistress that should be true to his interests. It was soon agreed to. So the duke of Buckingham sent her with a part of his equipage to Dieppe, and said he would presently follow. But he, who was the most inconstant and forgetful of all men, never thought of her more, but went to England by the way of Calais. So Montague, then ambassador at Paris[1], hearing of this, sent over for a yaught for her, and sent some of his servants to wait on her, and to defray her charge till she was brought to Whitehall: and then lord Arlington took care of her. So the duke of Buckingham lost the merit he might have pretended to, and brought over a mistress whom his own strange conduct threw into the hands of his enemies. The 338
king was presently taken with her. She studied to please and observe him in every thing: so that he passed away the rest of his life in a great fondness for her. He kept her at a vast charge[2]; and she by many fits of sickness,

good reason to believe that she hoped to become formally what for many years she was virtually, Queen of England. Colbert to Louvois, Dec. 24, 1671. It is stated in the scurrilous and untrustworthy *Secret History of Charles II*, 23, that Charles married her with the ceremonies of the Church; and a mock marriage at Euston is often spoken of. See Evelyn, Oct. 15, 1671. The account of her courageous and finally successful struggles to maintain herself against the Duchess of Cleveland, Nelly Gwyn, and the Duchess Mazarin, is given in detail by Forneron; it was the triumph of refinement and skill.

'Montague told Sir William Temple, he designed to go ambassador to France. Sir William asked how that could be; for he knew the king did not love him, and the duke hated him. 'That's true,' said he, 'but they shall do, as if they loved me.' Which, Sir William told me, he soon brought about, as he supposed, by means of the ladies, who were always his best friends, for some secret perfections, that were hid from the rest of the world. D.

[2] She received at first £12,000

CH. XVI. some believed real, and others thought only pretended, gained of him every thing she desired[1]. She stuck firm to the French interest, and was its chief support. The king divided himself between her and Mistress Gwyn: and
MS. 170. had no other avowed amour[2]. | But he was so entirely possessed by the duchess of Portsmouth, and so engaged by her into the French interest, that this threw him into great difficulties, and exposed him both to much contempt and distrust.

CHAPTER XVII.

SCOTLAND IN 1672.

I DO now return to the affairs of Scotland, to give an account of a session of parliament, and the other transactions there in this critical year. About the end of May
1672. duke Lauderdale came down with his lady in great pomp. He was much lifted up with the French success, and took such pleasure to talk of De Witt's fate, that it could not be heard without horror. He treated all people with such scorn, that few were able to bear it[3]. He adjourned the

a year, shortly raised to £40,000. In 1681 no less than £136,000 passed through her hands; and Danby was constantly pestered by her for money. *H. M. C. Rep.* ix. 451. In March, 1674, she gave her support to Danby on condition that he found funds for a 'Necklesse of Pearle, £8,000 price, of a merchant, and a payre of diamond pendants, 3,000 guynyes, of elder Lady Northumberland, neither of whom will part with them without ready money.' *Essex Papers*, i. 199, Conway to Essex, March 31, 1674. In September, 1676, an advance on the Customs was secured by Charles, 'for Lady Portsmouth hath a new £30,000 debt must be paid at once.' *Rutland MSS.*, Sept. 10. The sums spent upon the other women, though vast, were comparatively meagre. In 1674 we find £4,000 a year settled upon Nell Gwyn's children; *H. M. C. Rep.* vi. 473. Cf. Pepys, Feb. 23, 166$\frac{3}{4}$ and *passim*.

[1] Lord Sunderland once stopt her going to the Bath, by asking of her, if she would be so silly as to show the king that he could live without her. D.

[2] Upon the later rivalry between the Duchess of Portsmouth, Nell Gwyn, and the Duchess of Mazarin, see Forneron, *Louise de Kéroualle*, ch. vii.

[3] On Nov. 24, 1671, he was made President for life of the Secret Council for Scotland. *Cal. St. P. Dom.* 1671, 583.

parliament for a fortnight, that he might carry his lady round the country, and was every where waited on and entertained with as much respect, and at as great a charge, as if the king had been there in person. This enraged the nobility, and they made great applications to duke Hamilton, to lead a party against him, and to oppose the tax that he demanded of a whole year's assessment[1]. I soon grew so weary of the court, though there was scarce a person so well used by him as I my self was, that I went out of town; but duke Hamilton sent for me, and told me how vehemently he was solicited by the majority of the nobility to oppose the demand of the tax. He had promised to me not to oppose all taxes in general: and I had assured duke Lauderdale of it. But he said this demand was so extravagant, that he did not imagine it would go so far: so he did not think himself bound by a promise in general words to agree to such a high one. Upon this I spoke to duke Lauderdale, to shew him the inclinations many had to an opposition to that demand, and the danger of it. He rejected it in a brutal manner, saying they durst as soon be damned as oppose him. Yet I made him so sensible of it, that he appointed the marquis of Athol to go and talk in his name to duke Hamilton, who moved that I might be present; and that was easily admitted. Lord Athol pressed duke Hamilton to come into an entire confidence with duke Lauderdale, and promised that he should have the chief direction of affairs in Scotland under the other. Duke Hamilton asked how stood the parliament of England affected to the war. Lord Athol assured him there was a settled design of having no more parliaments in England. The king would be master, and would be no longer curbed by a house of commons. He also laid out the great advantages that Scotland, more particularly the great nobility, might find in striking in heartily with the king's designs, and in making him absolute in

339

[1] For this, the first constitutional opposition to Lauderdale, graphically described by himself, see *Lauderdale Papers*, ii, iii, and Preface to iii.

CH. XVII. England. Duke Hamilton answered very honestly, that he would never engage in such designs: he would be always a good and faithful subject, but he would be likewise a good country man. He was very unwilling to concur in the land tax. He said Scotland had no reason to engage in the war, since as they might suffer by it, so they could gain nothing, neither by the present war, nor by any peace that should be made. Yet he was prevailed on, in conclusion, to agree to it; and upon that all the business of the session of parliament went on smoothly, without any opposition.

The duchess of Lauderdale [1], not contented with the great appointments they had, set herself by all possible methods to raise money. They lived at a vast expense: and every thing was set to sale [2]. She carried all things

[1] For the verses in her praise, ascribed to Burnet, see *Defence of Dr. Cockburn against the Calumnies and Aspersions of a Libel entitul'd 'A Vindication of the late Bishop Burnet'* (London, n. d.), 90–92; Maidment's *Catalogue of Scottish Writers*, 56, and *Scottish Pasquils*, 237. In the first-named work, it is stated that they 'were transcribed from a copy attested to be a true copy under the hand and seal of a great man, who declares that he had copied them, together with the solution of two important cases, from the originals written with Dr. Burnet's own hand, in the custody of Duke Lauderdale.' The 'great man' was clearly Paterson, afterwards Archbishop of Glasgow (*supra* 471, note). All search for the original has been vain; and Maidment does not state upon what evidence he gives the date 1677 for the presentation of the verses; it is, however, obviously wrong, since the total breach between Lauderdale and Burnet had occurred two years before. If Burnet wrote this atrocious nonsense, it must have been at an earlier date.

[2] In a letter of the Duke of York's, from Scotland, he says, 'I hear Duchess Lauderdale is very angry with me, for the removes which have been made in the sessions; I do not wonder at it, for some of them were her creatures, and she received the last register's pension, and some say, went a share in the perquisites of his place. That which vexes her is, that she sees she can no more squeeze this country, as she has done for several years past, and got very considerable sums of money for this country.' D. The letters from the Duke of York (to which Lord Dartmouth so frequently refers) were written by him to George Lord Dartmouth, father to the author of these notes, and are at present in the collection of the Earl of Dartmouth, at Sandwell. H. L. (Henry Legge.) They are printed in *H. M. C. Report*, xi. pt. 5. The rapacity of the duchess is simply expressed by Courtin to Pomponne, Dec. 28, 1676, 'Elle a envie de tout ce qu'elle voit.' Forneron, *Louise de Kéroualle*, 136.

with a haughtiness that could not have been easily borne from a queen. She talked of all people with an ungoverned freedom, and grew to be universally hated. I was out of measure weary of my attendance at their court, but was pressed to continue it. Many found I did good offices. I got some to be considered and advanced, that had no other way of access. But that which made it more necessary was, that I saw Sharp and his creatures were making their court with the most abject flattery, and all the submissions possible. Leighton went seldom to them, though he was always treated by them with great distinction. So it was necessary for me to be about them, and keep them right: otherwise all our designs were lost without recovery. This led me to much uneasy compliance, though I asserted my own liberty, and found so often fault with their proceedings, that once or twice I used such freedom, and it was so ill taken, that I thought it was fit for me to retire. Yet I was sent for, and continued in such high favour that I was again tried if I would accept of a bishopric, and was promised the first of the two archbishoprics that should fall. But I was still fixed in my former resolutions not to engage so early, being then but nine and twenty: nor would I come into a dependance on them. CH. XVII.

Duke Lauderdale, at his coming down, had expected that the presbyterians should have addressed themselves to him for a share in that liberty which their brethren had now in England; and which he had asserted in a very particular manner at the council table in Whitehall. One Whatley, a justice of peace in Lincolnshire, if I remember the county right, had disturbed one of the meeting houses, that had got a license pursuant to the declaration for a toleration, and he had set fines on those that met in it, conform to the act against conventicles. Upon which he was brought up to council, to be reprimanded for this high contempt of his majesty's declaration, | and some privy counsellors shewed their zeal in severe reflections on his proceedings. Duke Lauderdale carried the matter very 340 MS. 171.

CH. XVII. far: he said the king's edicts were to be considered and obeyed as laws, and more than any other laws. This was writ down by some that heard it, who were resolved to make use of it against him in due time. He looked on near two months after he came down to Scotland, waiting still for an application for liberty of conscience. But the designs of the court were now clearly seen into. The presbyterians understood they were only to be made use of in order to the introducing of popery. So they resolved to be silent and passive. Upon this he broke out in fury and rage against them. Conventicles abounded in all places of the country; and some furious zealots broke into the houses of some of the ministers, wounding them and robbing their goods, forcing some of them to swear that they would never officiate any more in their churches. Some of these were taken and executed. I visited them in prison, and saw in them the blind madness of ill-governed zeal, of which they were never fully convinced. Some of them seemed to be otherwise no ill men. One of them was a bold villain: he justified all that they had done, from the Israelites robbing the Egyptians, and destroying the Canaanites. That which gave duke Lauderdale a juster ground of offence, was that one Carstares[1], much employed since that time in greater matters, was taken in a ship that came from Rotterdam. He himself escaped out of their hands: but his letters were taken. They had a great deal writ in white ink, which shewed that the design of sending him over was, to know in what disposition the people were,

[1] William Carstares, afterwards the celebrated chaplain of William III, and his adviser upon the settlement of religion in Scotland; cf. f. 375. In March, 167⅘, he was apprehended in London on the ground of being joint author with James Stewart of the *Account of Scotland's grievances by reason of the Duke of Lauderdale's ministry, humbly tendered to his sacred Majesty.* He remained in prison for nearly five years. In 1684 he was again imprisoned, and tortured, on the ground of complicity in Argyll's treason and the events for which Russell and Sidney suffered, but was then allowed to go abroad. His *Letters* were published first in 1774 with a memoir by M^cCormick; and there is a *Life* by R. H. Story, published in 1874. See also the article in the *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

promising arms and other necessaries, if they were in a condition to give the government any disturbance. But the whole was so darkly writ, much being referred to the bearer, that it was not possible to understand what lay hid under many mysterious expressions. Upon this a severe prosecution of conventicles was set on foot, and a great deal of money was raised by arbitrary fines. Lord Athol made of this in one week 1900*l.* sterling. I did all I could to moderate this fury: but all was in vain. Duke Lauder- 341
dale broke out into the most frantic fits of rage possible. When I was once saying to him, was that a time to drive them into a rebellion? Yes, said he, would to God they would rebel, that so I might bring over an army of Irish papists to cut all their throats. Such a fury as this seemed to furnish work for a physician, rather than for any other sort of man. But after he had let himself loose into these fits for near a month, he calmed all of the sudden: perhaps upon some signification from the king; for the party complained to their friends in London, who had still some credit at court. CH. XVII.

He called for me all of the sudden, and put me in mind of the project I had laid before him, of putting all the outed ministers by couples into parishes: so that instead of wandering about the country, to hold conventicles in all places, they might be fixed to a certain abode, and every one to have the half of a benefice. I was still of the same mind, and so was Leighton; who compared this to the gathering the coals that were scattered over the house, setting it all on fire, into the chimney, where they might burn away safely. Duke Lauderdale set about it immediately, and the benefit of the indulgence was extended to forty more churches. This, if followed as to that of doubling them in a parish, and of confining them within their parishes, would have probably laid a flame, that was spreading over the nation, and was like to prove fatal in conclusion. But duke Lauderdale's way was to govern by fits, and to pass from hot to cold ones always in extremes. So this

CH. XVII. of doubling them, which was the chief part of our scheme, was quite neglected. Single ministers went into those churches, and those who were not yet provided for went about the country holding conventicles very boldly, without any restraint: and no care at all was taken of the church.

Sharp and his instruments took occasion from this to complain that the church was ruined by Leighton's means: and I wanted not my share in the charge. And indeed the remissness of the government was such, that there was just cause of complaint. Great numbers met in the fields: men went to them with such arms as they had, and we were blamed for all this. It was said that things went so far beyond what a principle of moderation could suggest, that we did certainly design to ruin and overturn the constitution. Leighton upon all this concluded he could do no good on either side: he had gained no ground on the presbyterians, and was suspected and hated by the episcopal
342 party. So he resolved to retire from all public employments, and to spend the rest of his days in a corner, far from noise and business, and to give himself wholly to prayer and meditation, since he saw he could not carry on his great designs of healing and reforming the church, on which he had set his heart. He had gathered together many instances out of church history of bishops that had left their sees, and retired from the world, and was much pleased with these. He and I had many discourses on this argument. I thought a man ought to be determined by
MS. 172. the providence | of God, and to continue in the station he was in, though he found he could not do all the good in it that he had proposed to himself, he might do good in a private way by his example and his labours, more than he himself could know: and as a man ought to submit to sickness, poverty, or other afflictions, when they are laid on him by the hand of Providence, so I thought the labouring without success was indeed a very great trial of patience, yet the labouring in an ingrateful employment was a cross, and so was to be borne with submission; and that a great

uneasiness under that, or the forsaking a station because of it, might be the effect of secret pride, and an indignation against Providence. He, on the other hand, said his work seemed to be at an end: he had no more to do, unless he had a mind to please himself with the lazy enjoying a good revenue. So he could not be wrought on by all that could be laid before him; but followed duke Lauderdale to court, and begged leave to retire from his archbishopric [1]. He would by no means consent to this. So he desired that he might be allowed to do it within a year. Duke Lauderdale thought so much time was gained: so, to be rid of his importunity, he moved the king to promise him that, if he did not change his mind, he would within the year accept of his resignation. He came back much pleased with what he had obtained, and said to me upon it, there was now but one uneasy stage between him and rest, and he would wrestle through it the best he could. CH. XVII.

And now I am come to the period that I set out for this book. The world was now in a general combustion, set on by the ambition of the court of France, and supported by the feebleness and treachery of the court of England. A stand was made by the prince of Orange and the elector of Brandenburg: but the latter, not being in time assisted by the emperor, was forced to accept of such conditions as he could obtain. This winter there was great practice in all the courts of Europe, by the agents of France, to lay them every where asleep; and to make the world look on 343
their king's design in that campaign as a piece of glory, for the humbling of a rich and proud commonwealth, and that as soon as that was done, suitably to the dignity of the Great Monarch, he would give peace to the world, after he had shewed that nothing could stand before his arms. But the opening the progress of these negotiations, and the turn that the affairs of Europe took, belongs to the next period.

[1] See his very touching letter in the *Lauderdale Papers*, iii. 75.

END OF VOL. I.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

Page 11, line 2 from end, *dele* [2]; the note should run on.
,, 17, note 2, last line but one, *add*, 'But see *infra* 301, note.'
,, 22, n. 1, line 3 from end, *for* fact *read* allegation
,, 41, l. 2, *for* Primerose, *read* Primrose
,, 44, n. 1, line 4 (ix. 179), *add* 'ed. 1884.'
,, 71, l. 2, transfer reference mark to 'Buchanan'
,, 78, l. 2, *for* Grimstone, *read* Grimston
,, 129, n. 1, and elsewhere, *for* Thurlow *or* Thurlowe *read* Thurloe
,, 138, n. 2, *after* 1652 *read* (*infra* 194, note)
,, 139, n. *for* 1676 (or 1677?) *read* March 20, 167$\frac{5}{6}$
,, 157, last l., and elsewhere, *for* Montague *read* Montagu
,, 177, l. 1, *for* Mountague *read* Montagu
,, 189, l. 1, *for* Somelsdyck *read* Sommelsdyck
,, 355, l. 3, *for* Wariston *read* Warriston, *and for* Hamborough *read* Hamburg
,, 365, l. 7 from end, *for* Midletoun *read* Middleton
,, 383, l. 3, and l. 12 from end, *for* Leightoun *read* Leighton
,, 533, n. 2, for *supra* 533 read *supra* 438 and *infra* 550
,, 541, l. 3 from end, *for* Stouppe *read* Stoupe
,, 542, ll. 18, 20, *for* Soisons *read* Soissons
,, 548, l. 7 from end, *for* Brandenburgh *read* Brandenburg
,, 555, l. 10, *add following note*: Pool, scil. Matthew Poole, or Pole, 1624-1679; one of the Presbyterian ministers who resigned their livings in consequence of the Act of Uniformity. His great work, the *Synopsis Criticorum aliorumque Sacrae Scripturae Interpretum* (5 vols., folio), was begun on the suggestion of Lloyd, Bishop of Worcester, in 1666, and occupied the severe and incessant labour of ten years. The first volume was published in 1669, the last in 1676. He was the author of a large number of religious and polemical works.
,, 557, l. 16, *for* Maimburg *read* Maimbourg. And *add following note*: Louis Maimbourg (1610-1686), a French Jesuit, who wrote a large number of works on religious history. Writing to Dr. Morley on June 1, 1681, Evelyn says:—'Father Maimbourg has had the impudence to publish at the end of his late *Histoire du Calvinisme* a pretended letter of the late Duchess of York,' *Diary and Correspondence*, iii. (1852), 255. It will be found, translated into French, on pp. 507-513 of the British Museum copy, *dernière édition*, 1682. See *infra* f. 358.

The following forward references, which were necessarily made to the folio edition, since the sheets to which they refer had not then been printed, are now replaced as far as possible by the corresponding references to the present edition.

Page 18, for f. 316 read *infra* 567.
,, 41, ,, f. 298 ,, *infra* 531.
,, 47, ,, f. 196 ,, *infra* 350.
,, 63, ,, f. 196 ,, *infra* 350.
,, 73, ,, f. 234 ,, *infra* 420.
,, 83, ,, f. 328 ,, *infra* 586.
,, 84, ,, f. 172 ,, *infra* 302.
,, 106, ,, f. 244 ,, *infra* 436.
,, 107, ,, ff. 214, 240, 288, 375 read *infra* 383, 429, 517, and f. 375.
,, 114, for ff. 187, 191, 253 read *infra* 332, 339, 454.
,, 157, for f. 323 read *infra* 578.
Page 139, for (f. 227), (f. 304), and (ff. 305, 389, 390, 394) read (*infra* 405), (*infra* 546), and (*infra* 546, and ff. 389, 390, 394).
,, 175, for f. 263 read *infra* 474.
,, ,, ,, f. 266 ,, *infra* 480.
,, 183, ,, f. 187 ,, *infra* 333.
,, 187, ,, ff. 239–246, read *infra* 427–441.
,, 212, for f. 292 read *infra* 523.
,, 239, ,, f. 288 ,, *infra* 518.
,, 332, ,, f. 253 ,, *infra* 454.

25/1/02

Clarendon Press, Oxford.

SELECT LIST OF STANDARD WORKS.

DICTIONARIES . . . . . page 1
LAW . . . . . „ 2
HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC. . . . „ 4
PHILOSOPHY, LOGIC, ETC. . . . „ 6
PHYSICAL SCIENCE, ETC. . . . . „ 7

1. DICTIONARIES.

A NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY
ON HISTORICAL PRINCIPLES,

Founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society.

Imperial 4to.

EDITED BY DR. MURRAY.

PRESENT STATE OF THE WORK.

			£	s.	d.
Vol. I.	A, B	By Dr. MURRAY	Half-morocco	2	12	6
Vol. II.	C	By Dr. MURRAY	Half-morocco	2	12	6
Vol. III.	D, E	By Dr. MURRAY / By Mr. HENRY BRADLEY . . .	Half-morocco	2	12	6
Vol. IV.	F, G	By Mr. HENRY BRADLEY	Half-morocco	2	12	6
Vol. V.	H—K	By Dr. MURRAY	Half-morocco	2	12	6
Vol. VI.	L—N	By Mr. HENRY BRADLEY.	L–Lap	0	2	6
			Lap–Leisurely . . .	0	5	0

The remainder of the work is in active preparation; the distribution of the letters into the volumes will be approximately as follows:

Vol. VII O P By Dr. MURRAY.
Vol. VIII Q–S By Mr. CRAIGIE.
Vols. IX, X S–Z

Orders can be given through any bookseller for the delivery of the remainder of the work either in complete VOLUMES or in *Sections* or in *Parts*.

SECTIONS. A single Section of 64 pages at *2s. 6d.* or a double Section of 128 pages at *5s.* is issued quarterly.

PARTS. A Part (which is generally the equivalent of five single Sections and is priced at *12s. 6d.*) is issued whenever ready.

Of the Part due now (Jan. 1, 1902) a double Section Kaiser–Kyx has already been issued at *5s.*; this Part is now completed by the issue of L–Leisurely at *7s. 6d.*

Nearly all the Parts and Sections in which Volumes I–V were first issued are still obtainable in the original covers.

FORTHCOMING ISSUE, APRIL 1, 1902. An instalment of L, by Mr. BRADLEY.

Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: HENRY FROWDE, Amen Corner, E.C.

A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of Gesenius, by Francis Brown, D.D., S. R. Driver, D.D., and C. A. Briggs, D.D. Parts I–X. Small 4to, *2s. 6d.* each.

Thesaurus Syriacus: collegerunt Quatremère, Bernstein, Lorsbach, Arnoldi, Agrell, Field, Roediger: edidit R. Payne Smith, S.T.P.

Vol. I, containing Fasciculi I–V, sm. fol., *5l. 5s.*
Vol. II, completing the work, containing Fasciculi VI–X, *8l. 8s.*

A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, founded upon the above. Edited by Mrs. Margoliouth. Parts I–III. Small 4to, *8s. 6d. net each.*

*** *The Work will be completed in Four Parts.*

A Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac as spoken by the Eastern Syrians of Kurdistan, North-West Persia, and the Plain of Moṣul. By A. J. Maclean, M.A., F.R.G.S. Small 4to, *15s.*

A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Etymologically and Philologically arranged, with special reference to cognate Indo-European Languages. By Sir M. Monier-Williams, M.A., K.C.I.E.; with the collaboration of Prof. E. Leumann, Ph.D.; Prof. C. Cappeller, Ph.D.; and other scholars. *New Edition, greatly Enlarged and Improved.* Cloth, bevelled edges, *3l. 13s. 6d.*; half-morocco, *4l. 4s.*

A Greek-English Lexicon. By H. G. Liddell, D.D., and Robert Scott, D.D. *Eighth Edition, Revised.* 4to. *1l. 16s.*

An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, arranged on an Historical Basis. By W. W. Skeat, Litt.D. *Third Edition.* 4to. *2l. 4s.*

A Middle-English Dictionary. By F. H. Stratmann. A new edition, by H. Bradley, M.A. 4to, half-morocco, *1l. 11s. 6d.*

The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon. By H. Sweet, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D. Small 4to, *8s. 6d. net.*

An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, based on the MS. collections of the late Joseph Bosworth, D.D. Edited and enlarged by Prof. T. N. Toller, M.A. Parts I–III. A–SÁR. 4to, stiff covers, *15s.* each. Part IV, § 1, SÁR–SWÍÐRIAN. Stiff covers, *8s. 6d.* Part IV, § 2, SWÍþ-SNEL–ÝTMEST, *18s. 6d.*

*** *A Supplement, which will complete the Work, is in active preparation.*

An Icelandic-English Dictionary, based on the MS. collections of the late Richard Cleasby. Enlarged and completed by G. Vigfússon, M.A. 4to. *3l. 7s.*

2. LAW.

Anson. *Principles of the English Law of Contract, and of Agency in its Relation to Contract.* By Sir W. R. Anson, D.C.L. *Ninth Edition.* 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

Anson. *Law and Custom of the Constitution.* 2 vols. 8vo.
Part I. Parliament. *Third Edition.* *12s. 6d.*
Part II. The Crown. *Second Ed.* *14s.*

Bryce. *Studies in History and Jurisprudence.* 2 Vols. 8vo. By the Right Hon. J. Bryce, M.P. 25*s. net.*

Digby. *An Introduction to the History of the Law of Real Property.* By Sir Kenelm E. Digby, M.A. *Fifth Edition.* 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Grueber. *Lex Aquilia.* By Erwin Grueber, Dr. Jur., M.A. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Hall. *International Law.* By W. E. Hall, M.A. *Fourth Edition.* 8vo. 22*s.* 6*d.*

—— *A Treatise on the Foreign Powers and Jurisdiction of the British Crown.* By W. E. Hall, M.A. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Holland. *Elements of Jurisprudence.* By T. E. Holland, D.C.L. *Ninth Edition.* 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Studies in International Law.* By T. E. Holland, D.C.L. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Gentilis, Alberici, De Iure Belli Libri Tres.* Edidit T. E. Holland, I.C.D. Small 4to, half-morocco, 21*s.*

—— *The Institutes of Justinian,* edited as a recension of the Institutes of Gaius, by T. E. Holland, D.C.L. *Second Edition.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

Holland and Shadwell. *Select Titles from the Digest of Justinian.* By T. E. Holland, D.C.L., and C. L. Shadwell, D.C.L. 8vo. 14*s.*

Also sold in Parts, in paper covers—

Part I. Introductory Titles. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Part II. Family Law. 1*s.*

Part III. Property Law. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Part IV. Law of Obligations (No. 1), 3*s.* 6*d.* (No. 2), 4*s.* 6*d.*

Ilbert. *The Government of India.* Being a Digest of the Statute Law relating thereto. With Historical Introduction and Illustrative Documents. By Sir Courtenay Ilbert, K.C.S.I. 8vo, half-roan. 21*s.*

—— *Legislative Forms and Methods.* 8vo, half-roan. 16*s.*

Jenks. *Modern Land Law.* By Edward Jenks, M.A. 8vo. 15*s.*

Markby. *Elements of Law considered with reference to Principles of General Jurisprudence.* By Sir William Markby, D.C.L. *Fifth Edition.* 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Moyle. *Imperatoris Iustiniani Institutionum Libri Quattuor,* with Introductions, Commentary, Excursus and Translation. By J. B. Moyle, D.C.L. *Third Edition.* 2 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. 16*s.* Vol. II. 6*s.*

—— *Contract of Sale in the Civil Law.* 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Pollock and Wright. *An Essay on Possession in the Common Law.* By Sir F. Pollock, Bart., M.A., and Sir R. S. Wright, B.C.L. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Poste. *Gaii Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quattuor;* or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius. With a Translation and Commentary by Edward Poste, M.A. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 18*s.*

Sohm. *The Institutes.* A Text-book of the History and System of Roman Private Law. By Rudolph Sohm. Translated by J. C. Ledlie, B.C.L. With an Introduction by Erwin Grueber, Dr. Jur., M.A. *Second Edition, revised and enlarged.* 8vo. 18*s.*

Stokes. *The Anglo-Indian Codes.* By Whitley Stokes, LL.D.
Vol. I. Substantive Law. 8vo. 30*s.*
Vol. II. Adjective Law. 8vo. 35*s.*
First and Second Supplements to the above, 1887–1891. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*
Separately, No. 1, 2*s.* 6*d.*; No. 2, 4*s.* 6*d.*

London: Henry Frowde, Amen Corner, E C.

3. HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.

Adamnani *Vita S. Columbae.* Ed. J. T. Fowler, D.C.L. Crown 8vo, half-bound, 8*s.* 6*d. net* (with translation, 9*s.* 6*d. net*).

Aubrey. *'Brief Lives,' chiefly of Contemporaries, set down by John Aubrey, between the Years* 1669 *and* 1696. Edited from the Author's MSS., by Andrew Clark, M.A., LL.D. With Facsimiles. 2 vols. 8vo. 25*s.*

Baedae *Historia Ecclesiastica,* etc. Edited by C. Plummer, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, 21*s. net.*

Bedford (W.K.R.). *The Blazon of Episcopacy.* Being the Arms borne by, or attributed to, the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales. *Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged.* With One Thousand Illustrations. Sm. 4to, buckram, 31*s.* 6*d. net.*

Boswell's *Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* Edited by G. Birkbeck Hill, D.C.L. In six volumes, medium 8vo. With Portraits and Facsimiles. Half-bound, 3*l.* 3*s.*

Bright. *Chapters of Early English Church History.* By W. Bright, D.D. *Third Edition. Revised and Enlarged.* With a Map. 8vo. 12*s.*

Bryce. *Studies in History and Jurisprudence.* By the Right Hon. J. Bryce, M.P. 2 Vols. 8vo. 25*s. net.*

Casaubon (Isaac), 1559–1614. By Mark Pattison. 8vo. 16*s.*

Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England.* Re-edited from a fresh collation of the original MS. in the Bodleian Library, with marginal dates and occasional notes, by W. Dunn Macray, M.A., F.S.A. 6 vols. Crown 8vo. 2*l.* 5*s.*

Earle. *Handbook to the Land-Charters, and other Saxonic Documents.* By John Earle, M.A. Crown 8vo. 16*s.*

—— *The Alfred Jewel:* An Historical Essay. With Illustrations and Map. Small 4to, buckram. 12*s.* 6*d. net.*

Earle and Plummer. *Two of the Saxon Chronicles, Parallel, with Supplementary Extracts from the others.* A Revised Text, edited, with Introduction, Notes, Appendices, and Glossary, by Charles Plummer, M.A., on the basis of an edition by John Earle, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, half-roan.

Vol. I. Text, Appendices, and Glossary. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. II. Introduction, Notes, and Index. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Freeman. *The History of Sicily from the Earliest Times.*

Vols. I and II. 8vo, cloth, 2*l.* 2*s.*

Vol. III. The Athenian and Carthaginian Invasions. 24*s.*

Vol. IV. From the Tyranny of Dionysios to the Death of Agathoklês. Edited by Arthur J. Evans, M.A. 21*s.*

Freeman. *The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First.* By E. A. Freeman, D.C.L. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 16*s.*

Gardiner. *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution,* 1628–1660. Selected and Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, D.C.L. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Greenidge. *The Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time.* By A. H. J. Greenidge, M.A. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Gross. *The Gild Merchant;* a Contribution to British Municipal History. By Charles Gross, Ph.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 24*s.*

Hastings. *Hastings and the Rohilla War.* By Sir John Strachey, G.C.S.I. 8vo, cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Hill. *Sources for Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars.* Collected and arranged by G. F. Hill, M.A. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hodgkin. *Italy and her Invaders.* With Plates & Maps. 8 vols. 8vo. By T. Hodgkin, D.C.L.
Vols. I–II. *Second Edition.* 42*s.*
Vols. III–IV. *Second Edition.* 36*s.*
Vols. V–VI. 36*s.*
Vol. VII–VIII (*completing the work*). 24*s.*

Le Strange. *Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate.* From contemporary Arabic and Persian sources. By G. Le Strange. 8vo. 16*s. net.*

Payne. *History of the New World called America.* By E. J. Payne, M.A. 8vo.
Vol. I, containing Book I, *The Discovery*; Book II, Part I, *Aboriginal America*, 18*s.*
Vol. II, containing Book II, *Aboriginal America* (concluded), 14*s.*

Johnson. *Letters of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.* Collected and Edited by G. Birkbeck Hill, D.C.L. 2 vols. half-roan, 28*s.*

——*Johnsonian Miscellanies.* By the same Editor. 2 vols. Medium 8vo, half-roan, 28*s.*

Kitchin. *A History of France.* With Numerous Maps, Plans, and Tables. By G. W. Kitchin, D.D. In three Volumes. *New Edition.* Crown 8vo, each 10*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. I. to 1453. Vol. II. 1453–1624. Vol. III. 1624–1793.

Kyd. *The Works of Thomas Kyd.* Edited from the original Texts, with Introduction, Notes, and Facsimiles. By F. S. Boas, M.A. 8vo. 15*s. net.*

Lewis (*Sir G. Cornewall*). *An Essay on the Government of Dependencies.* Edited by C. P. Lucas, B.A. 8vo, half-roan. 14*s.*

Lucas. *Historical Geography of the British Colonies.* By C. P. Lucas, B.A. Crown 8vo.
Introduction. With Eight Maps. 1887. 4*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. I. The Mediterranean and Eastern Colonies (exclusive of India). With Eleven Maps. 1888. 5*s.*
Vol. II. The West Indian Colonies. With Twelve Maps. 1890. 7*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. III. West Africa. With Five Maps. *Second Edition, revised to the end of* 1899, *by H. E. Egerton.* 7*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. IV. South and East Africa. Historical and Geographical. With Ten Maps. 1898. 9*s.* 6*d.*
Also Vol. IV in two Parts—
Part I. Historical, 6*s.* 6*d.*
Part II. Geographical, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. V. The History of Canada (Part I, New France). With Four Maps. 1901. 6*s.*

Ludlow. *The Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Army of the Commonwealth of England,* 1625–1672. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A. 2 vols. 36*s.*

Machiavelli. *Il Principe.* Edited by L. Arthur Burd, M.A. With an Introduction by Lord Acton. 8vo. 14*s.*

Morris. *The Welsh Wars of Edward I.* A contribution to Mediaeval Military History, based on original documents. With a Map and Pedigrees. By J. E. Morris, M.A. 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d. net.*

Prothero. *Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents, illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.* Edited by G. W. Prothero, M.A. Cr. 8vo. *Edition* 2. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Select Statutes and other Documents bearing on the Constitutional History of England, from* A.D. 1307 *to* 1558. By the same. [*In Preparation.*]

Ramsay (**Sir J. H.**). *Lancaster and York.* A Century of English History (A.D. 1399–1485). 2 vols. 8vo. With Index, 37*s.* 6*d.*

Ramsay (**W. M.**). *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia.* By W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.
Vol. I. Part I. The Lycos Valley and South-Western Phrygia. Royal 8vo. 18*s. net.*
Vol. I. Part II. West and West-Central Phrygia. 21*s. net.*

Ranke. *A History of England, principally in the Seventeenth Century.* By L. von Ranke. Translated under the superintendence of G. W. Kitchin, D.D., and C. W. Boase, M.A. 6 vols. 8vo. 63*s.*
Revised Index, separately, 1*s.*

Rashdall. *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.* By Hastings Rashdall, M.A. 2 vols. (in 3 Parts) 8vo. With Maps. 2*l.* 5*s. net.*

Rhŷs. *Studies in the Arthurian Legend.* By John Rhŷs, Principal of Jesus College, Oxford. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Celtic Folklore:* Welsh and Manx. By the same. 2 vols. 8vo. 21*s.*

Smith's *Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Edwin Cannan. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

—— *Wealth of Nations.* With Notes, by J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 21*s.*

Stephens. *The Principal Speeches of the Statesmen and Orators of the French Revolution,* 1789–1795. By H. Morse Stephens. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21*s.*

Stubbs. *Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History, from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Edward I.* Arranged and edited by W. Stubbs, D.D., late Bishop of Oxford. *Eighth Edition.* Crown 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

—— *The Constitutional History of England, in its Origin and Development. Library Edition.* 3 vols. Demy 8vo. 2*l.* 8*s.*
*** Also in 3 vols. crown 8vo. 12*s.* each.

—— *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Mediaeval and Modern History and kindred subjects.* Crown 8vo. *Third Edition, revised and enlarged.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum.* An attempt to exhibit the course of Episcopal Succession in England. By W. Stubbs, D.D. Small 4to. *Second Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Swift (F. D.). *The Life and Times of James the First of Aragon.* By F. D. Swift, B.A. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Vinogradoff. *Villainage in England.* Essays in English Mediaeval History. By Paul Vinogradoff, Professor in the University of Moscow. 8vo, half-bound. 16*s.*

4. PHILOSOPHY, LOGIC, ETC.

Bacon. *Novum Organum.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, &c., by T. Fowler, D.D. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 15*s.*

Berkeley. *The Works of George Berkeley, D.D., formerly Bishop of Cloyne; including many of his writings hitherto unpublished.* With Prefaces, Annotations, Appendices, and an Account of his Life, by A. Campbell Fraser, Hon. D.C.L., LL.D. New Edition in 4 vols., crown 8vo. 24*s.*

—— *The Life and Letters, with an account of his Philosophy.* By A. Campbell Fraser. 8vo. 16*s.*

Bosanquet. *Logic; or, the Morphology of Knowledge.* By B. Bosanquet, M.A. 8vo. 21*s.*

Butler. *The Works of Joseph Butler, D.C.L.,* sometime Lord Bishop of Durham. Divided into sections, with sectional headings, an index to each volume, and some occasional notes; also prefatory matter. Edited by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. 2 vols. Medium 8vo. 14*s.* each.

Campagnac. *The Cambridge Platonists:* being Selections from the writings of Benjamin Whichcote, John Smith, and Nathanael Culverwel, with Introduction by E. T. Campagnac, M.A. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d. net.*

Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fowler. *Logic;* Deductive and Inductive, combined in a single volume. Extra fcap. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Fowler and Wilson. *The Principles of Morals.* By T. Fowler, D.D., and J. M. Wilson, B.D. 8vo, cloth, 14*s.*

Green. *Prolegomena to Ethics.* By T. H. Green, M.A. Edited by A. C. Bradley, M.A. *Fourth Edition.* Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Hegel. *The Logic of Hegel.* Translated from the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. With Prolegomena to the Study of Hegel's Logic and Philosophy. By W. Wallace, M.A. *Second Edition, Revised and Augmented.* 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* each.

Hegel's *Philosophy of Mind.* Translated from the Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences. With Five Introductory Essays. By William Wallace, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature.* Edited, with Analytical Index, by L. A. Selby-Bigge, M.A. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 8*s.*

—— *Enquiry concerning the Human Understanding, and an Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals.* Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Leibniz. *The Monadology and other Philosophical Writings.* Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by Robert Latta, M.A., D.Phil. Crown 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Locke. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding.* By John Locke. Collated and Annotated, with Prolegomena, Biographical, Critical, and Historic, by A. Campbell Fraser, Hon. D.C.L., LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 12*s.*

Lotze's *Logic,* in Three Books —of Thought, of Investigation, and of Knowledge. English Translation; edited by B. Bosanquet. M.A. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 12*s.*

—— *Metaphysic,* in Three Books—Ontology, Cosmology, and Psychology. English Translation; edited by B. Bosanquet, M.A. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 12*s.*

Martineau. *Types of Ethical Theory.* By James Martineau, D.D. *Third Edition.* 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 15*s.*

—— *A Study of Religion: its Sources and Contents. Second Edition.* 2 vols. Cr. 8vo. 15*s.*

Selby-Bigge. *British Moralists.* Selections from Writers principally of the Eighteenth Century. Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 18*s.*

Spinoza. *A Study in the Ethics of Spinoza.* By Harold H. Joachim. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d. net.*

Wallace. *Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology and Ethics.* By William Wallace, M.A., LL.D. Edited, with a Biographical Introduction, by Edward Caird, M.A., Hon. D.C.L. 8vo, with a Portrait. 12*s.* 6*d.*

5. PHYSICAL SCIENCE, ETC.

Balfour. *The Natural History of the Musical Bow.* A Chapter in the Developmental History of Stringed Instruments of Music. Part I, Primitive Types. By Henry Balfour, M.A. Royal 8vo, paper covers. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Chambers. *A Handbook of Descriptive and Practical Astronomy.* By G. F. Chambers, F.R.A.S. *Fourth Edition,* in 3 vols. Demy 8vo.
Vol. I. The Sun, Planets, and Comets. 21*s.*
Vol. II. Instruments and Practical Astronomy. 21*s.*
Vol. III. The Starry Heavens. 14*s.*

De Bary. *Comparative Anatomy of the Vegetative Organs of the Phanerogams and Ferns.* By Dr. A. de Bary. Translated by F. O. Bower, M.A., and D. H. Scott, M.A. Royal 8vo. 22*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Comparative Morphology and Biology of Fungi, Mycetozoa and Bacteria.* By Dr. A. de Bary. Translated by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by Isaac Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. Royal 8vo, half-morocco, 22*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Lectures on Bacteria.* By Dr. A. de Bary. *Second Improved Edition.* Translated and revised by the same. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Fischer. *The Structure and Functions of Bacteria.* By Alfred Fischer. Translated into English by A. Coppen Jones. Royal 8vo, with Twenty-nine Woodcuts. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Goebel. *Outlines of Classification and Special Morphology of Plants.* By Dr. K. Goebel. Translated by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by Isaac Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. Royal 8vo, half-morocco, 21*s.*

—— *Organography of Plants, especially of the Archegoniatae and Spermaphyta.* By Dr. K. Goebel. Authorized English Edition, by Isaac Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., Part I, General Organography. Royal 8vo, half-morocco, 12*s.* 6*d.*

Miall and Hammond. *The Structure and Life-History of the Harlequin Fly (Chironomus).* By L. C. Miall, F.R.S., and A. R. Hammond, F.L.S. 8vo. With 130 Illustrations. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Pfeffer. *The Physiology of Plants. A Treatise upon the Metabolism and Sources of Energy in Plants.* By Prof. Dr. W. Pfeffer. Second fully Revised Edition, translated and edited by Alfred J. Ewart, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.L.S. Part I. Royal 8vo, half-morocco, 28*s.*

Prestwich. *Geology—Chemical, Physical, and Stratigraphical.* By Sir Joseph Prestwich, M.A., F.R.S. In two Volumes. Royal 8vo. 61*s.*

Sachs. *A History of Botany.* Translated by H. E. F. Garnsey, M.A. Revised by I. Bayley Balfour, M.A., M.D., F.R.S. Crown 8vo. 10*s.*

Solms-Laubach. *Fossil Botany. Being an Introduction to Palaeophytology from the Standpoint of the Botanist.* By H. Graf zu Solms-Laubach. Translated and revised by the same. Royal 8vo, half-morocco, 18*s.*

OXFORD HISTORY OF MUSIC.

Edited by W. H. Hadow, M.A.

The Polyphonic Period. Part I (Method of Musical Art, 330–1330). By H. E. Wooldridge, M.A. 8vo. 15*s. net.*

IN PREPARATION.

The Polyphonic Period. Part II. By H. E. Wooldridge, M.A.

The Seventeenth Century. By Sir C. Hubert H. Parry, M.A., D.Mus.

The Age of Bach and Handel. By J. A. Fuller-Maitland, M.A.

The Viennese School. By W. H. Hadow, M.A.

The Romantic Period. By E. Dannreuther, M.A.

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON, EDINBURGH, AND NEW YORK
HENRY FROWDE

o - of Louis XIV, Charles, & the Abbé Primaumont 167 & 350.

an action but vicious priest the betrays in the word.

James II's conversion was known unto King Charles 1668 -

207.8.9 Parliament & Lords of the articles -

184. Lauderdale -

186. Lord Crawford -

273. The old Earl of Eglinton & the "prince of repentance"

DA
430
B87
1897
PT. 1
V.1
C.2
ROBA

Burnet, Gilbert, Bp. of Salisbury
Burnet's History of my own time

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY