

Introduction.

Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and the Civil Wars in England ⁽¹⁾ is one of the best known works on the English Civil War. It has been the focus of discussion by many historians some of whom I am indebted to in my own work. In particular, Martine Watson Brownley's consideration of the History as literature ⁽²⁾ has provided me with much interesting background. George Miller's comprehensive coverage of Clarendon's History ⁽³⁾ from various aspects has stimulated my thoughts on the work, and the renowned Charles Harding Firth's three articles in the English Historical Review of 1904, ⁽⁴⁾ have not only given me valuable information, but also ideas to follow in my research. His articles in the Dictionary of National Biography, ⁽⁵⁾ as well as those of other historians in the same work have been used extensively for biographical information for both well-known and more obscure writers, whose works are included in my thesis. The topic of my thesis was suggested by Royce Macgillivray who considers Clarendon's work as a history of the rebellion, and who notes that Charles I, one of the main protagonists in the war, emerges from the History of the Rebellion as 'a dim figure'. ⁽⁶⁾ This interesting comment provided the starting point for my own research. That is, I set out to find out if I too found Charles I a 'dim figure' in Clarendon's work, and if so, why this should be, given his life-like portraits of other figures on both sides of the rebellion, and his close association with the King over a number of years.

I begin my thesis by presenting a selection of contemporary writings on Charles I, the Royalists, Henry Wotton, John Arnway, Hamon L'Estrange, Peter Heylyn and Sir Philip Warwick as well as the King's Book, the authorship of which has been attributed

¹ W. D. Macray ed. The History of the Rebellion and the Civil Wars in England, by Edward, Earl of Clarendon, 6 vols., Clarendon Press, Oxford, reprint from 1st. edition, 1958. This edition will be used throughout the thesis.

² M. W. Brownley, Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1985.

³ G. E. Miller, Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, Twayne Publishers, Boston, 1983.

⁴ C. H. Firth, 'Clarendon's "History of the Rebellion"', English Historical Review, 19, 1904. Hereafter cited as E.H.R.

⁵ Dictionary of National Biography, 22 vols., Oxford University Press, London, 1949-50. Hereafter cited as D.N.B.

⁶ R. Macgillivray, Restoration Historians and the English Civil War, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1974, p. 216.

to Charles I himself. This is followed by the work of William Lilly which has anti-Monarchistic trends, though he claims to be fair-minded to Charles I in the work. I then present the stridently anti-Monarchistic writings of Anthony Weldon and Edward Peyton. Finally I conclude this discussion with the work of the Republican writer Lucy Hutchinson. Each writer's background will be discussed, together with his or her reasons for writing, (7) the aim being to see if any pattern emerges. If so, this will be used as a template by which Clarendon's work, and particularly his portrait of the King can be compared. However, none of these writers had the same opportunity to write such a realistic character of Charles I as Clarendon. Therefore we would expect that none of these portraits offer the readers such understanding of the King as Clarendon's History does.

Clarendon's life and political experiences were conducive to both understanding Charles I's motives, aims and objectives, and for setting these down for his readers to share this understanding. He was an active participant in many of the events he wrote about, both before and during the Civil War. He served in the Parliament during a time of crisis for the Royal government, then served the King for three years (1642 to 1645) before accompanying the Prince of Wales to safety on Jersey. The King sent him on various missions on his behalf, and he was a member of the Privy Council. He also wrote most of the propaganda for the Royalist cause in the war of words between the King and Parliament. He took an interest in the writing of history, and in his fellow man. Further, as the History of the Rebellion itself shows, he was skilled in writing pen pictures of men he knew who shared the difficult times he wrote about in his work. Thus the expectation must be that Clarendon would offer his readers a view of Charles I which would be considerably more revealing on his character than others who also wrote on the King. Clarendon's treatment of Charles I will be the subject of chapters five, six and seven, following directly on from a short discussion on the Clarendonian 'character', which is the focus of chapter four.

Chapters eight and nine of my thesis discuss the reasons for which Clarendon wrote the History of the Rebellion. His motives however were different in both stages of the work's writing. In 1646, he wished to set down for posterity, an explanation of why

⁷ See chapters one, two and three.

the rebellion took place, and to remind his readers that not all Englishmen were guilty of rebellion against their King. He also sought to memorialize those men who served Charles I faithfully, and to provide an example of virtuous behaviour for men to follow. Another expressed aim of writing was to consider the mistakes of the past, hopefully to ensure a happier future. The History of the Rebellion then was intended to have a didactic purpose, that of instructing the King and his ministers on future conduct. In the later stage of the work's writing Clarendon claimed he began the work for the vindication of Charles I. However he also hoped the work would earn him literary fame. While these aspects of the History's writing will be considered, it is my contention in this thesis that Clarendon wrote the History of the Rebellion mainly for his own vindication. When writing in the years between 1646 and 1648, he sought to absolve himself from blame for the King's failures because his name was so closely associated with Charles's policies. He also sought to justify his apparent change of sides from reformer in the Parliament to supporter of the Royalist cause. In the years of his second exile when he completed the work, he wrote to remind his second Royal master Charles II of his faithful service to both Stuart kings, and hopefully to be allowed to return to England to spend his last days with his family. Thus the History of the Rebellion was at both stages of its writing written for a cause, the cause being the needs of Clarendon himself, whether of vindication of his actions or hope of reward.

Finally I will look at other factors which may have influenced Clarendon's 'character' of Charles I. These include the reality of Clarendon's association with the King, and his perceptions of Charles I in such attributes as his attitude to his duty, his piety and devotion to religious worship, and his faithfulness in personal relationships. My contention is that Clarendon's political and personal life experiences provided the dominating factors in his treatment of Charles I in the History of the Rebellion.

In this thesis, I intend to show that all the writers in my survey followed the model of the 'good' prince found in traditional princely literature. Royalist writers in presenting the King as a virtuous, pious and honourable king, fitted him closely to the model as it existed. Anti-Monarchists followed the same pattern, but in denying the King any virtue they presented Charles I as a tyrant oppressing his people and deserving of his fate. It would seem that Clarendon's political experiences, close contact with the King, and

literary abilities, particularly in regard to drawing lively pen pictures of men he knew in the History of the Rebellion would ensure a more realistic portrait of the King than his contemporaries presented. However as I will demonstrate, when the relevant aspects of Clarendon's life are considered in more depth, then it is perhaps inevitable that his portrait of the King should be a non-portrait of Charles I, and that he too followed the model of the 'good' prince, despite having opportunities and abilities denied his contemporaries who also wrote on the King.

Chapter 1

Contemporary Royalist Writings on Charles I.

One of Clarendon's contemporaries who also wrote on Charles I was Sir Henry Wotton. His work, A Panegyrick of King Charles ⁽¹⁾ was originally written in Latin, its title then being Ad Regem Scotia è reducem Henrici Wottonij Plavsvs et Vota..... ⁽²⁾ It was however translated and published in 1649. Wotton's work is of a somewhat different nature from the other works surveyed here in that it was written during the years of Charles's early reign. Further it provides an example of a particular mode of writing, that which was written to gain, or keep, the goodwill of one who could confer favours on the author. Both its style and content reflect the need of a patron. Born in 1568 (d.1639), Sir Henry Wotton spent many years in the diplomatic service in the reigns of both Elizabeth and James. He survived the fall of the rebel Essex to whom he was secretary, and he gained, lost, and then regained favour under James I. After long periods in the service of his country in Venice he returned to England to settle in 1624. ⁽³⁾ He was then aged fifty-five, in poor health, and had large sums of money owing to him (reportedly over three thousand pounds). ⁽⁴⁾ Through the influence and intervention of James's favourite, the Duke of Buckingham, he secured the Provostship of Eton, but not before he had surrendered his own valuable reversions. ⁽⁵⁾ With no means of support other than a meagre pension, Wotton applied to Charles I to honour James's promise of a Deanery. While this was not granted, his pension was raised from two hundred to five hundred pounds to enable him to write a history of England. ⁽⁶⁾ This history did not progress beyond the accumulation of a few notes on the characters of William I and Henry IV, but he did write works other than this panegyric to Charles I, including the Life of the Duke of Buckingham. ⁽⁷⁾ The Panegyrick of King Charles was written on the return of the King from Scotland after his coronation. It is addressed to Charles I personally, and its tone is one of unabashed flattery. The following extract gives a clear

¹ H. Wotton, A Panegyrick of King Charles, London, 1649

² S. Lee, D.N.B. Vol. XXI, p.971.

³ ibid., Vol. XXI, pp. 966-971.

⁴ L.P. Smith, The Life and Times of Henry Wotton, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1966, p.205.

⁵ Smith gives a fascinating account of the negotiations which took place to placate the other aspirants to the post, ibid., p.200

⁶ Lee, op. cit., Vol. XXI, p. 969.

⁷ ibid., Vol. XXI, pp. 969-971.

indication. Here Wotton tells the King that he should ‘admit all men’s eyes into the inward closet of his heart [because] nothing would there appear but the splendour of goodness, and an untroubled serenity of virtues.’ (8) The work contains only fleeting references to Charles’s personal qualities from which only a vague idea of the King emerges. Wotton does refer to Charles’s early weakly nature, but is quick to remind the reader that this changed as Charles grew to manhood. He refers to ‘that firm vigour which we now behold with joy and admiration.’ (9) Wotton includes what he calls a ‘true portraiture in little’ (10) in the work. In this, he refers to the King’s stature as of ‘just proportion’, (11) and his body as ‘erect and agile’.(12) Charles’s hair colour is described as ‘nearer brown than yellow’, (13) and his gestures were ‘free from affectation’.(14) The rest of the description of the King’s physical attributes gives the reader of to-day, and probably of Wotton’s day no clear picture of Charles I. The flowery phrases aim at flattering the King, rather than at revealing either his appearance or personal characteristics. The following gives a good indication: ‘your brow proclaimeth much fidelity [and] a certain verecundious generosity graceth your eyes.’ (15) Wotton also speaks of Charles’s ‘composed demeanour, and purposes and promises unremoveable.’ (16) Charles was also ‘a lover of truth, a hater of vice, just, constant, courageous [and] knowingly good.’(17) Wotton also refers to the King’s piety,(18) his affection for his people, (19) his chastity and temperance, (20) and his fidelity to the Queen. (21) But these comments do nothing more than fit Charles I in some quite large degree to the model of the ‘good prince’, as an ideal perpetuated from very early times,(22) rather than show him

8 Wotton, *op. cit.*, p.16

9 *ibid.*, p. 46.

10 *ibid.*, p.109.

11 *ibid.*

12 *ibid.*, p.110.

13 *ibid.*

14 *ibid.*, p. 111.

15 *ibid.*, p. 110.

16 *ibid.*, pp. 111-112.

17 *ibid.*, p. 112.

18 *ibid.*, p. 51.

19 *ibid.*, p. 54.

20 *ibid.*, p. 69.

21 *ibid.*, p. 93.

22 A history of princely literature, and the qualities most often found in the ideal prince is presented in L. Born, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, Columbia University Press, U.S.A., 1968.

as a living figure with whom Wotton was acquainted. Wotton's frequent references to ancient times and ancient heroes reinforces this feeling of the ideal king. Indeed the work is simply what the title indicates, a panegyric. It was not intended to convey information about the King himself, or events of the time. It was written simply to flatter Charles I. No attempt is made to explain circumstances, and there is only one point at which some personal note is introduced to impinge on the constant flattery. Wotton refers to the King's love of artworks, both pictures and sculptures with which Charles adorned his palaces. (23) He refers particularly to the works of Raphael, Titian and Careggio. (24) Wotton himself was mainly occupied during his second term of service in Venice with purchasing artworks for James I and the Duke of Buckingham. (25) The Panegyrick contains a relatively long portrait of the Duke of Buckingham whose appearance and spirit are highly praised. (26) Since Wotton is so obviously intent on pleasing Charles I in this work, the favourable portrait he paints of the Duke infers Charles's affection for him. There is however, no hint of the influence which the Duke is generally supposed to have exercised over Charles I, but this should not surprise the reader given the lack of depth in the work as a whole. The content of the work and the manner of expression clearly reflect what Wotton no doubt learned in his diplomatic experience, wherein to please a master was of paramount importance. Charles had been a source of patronage before the work was written, hopefully he would be so again. This work is indeed what the title tells us, a panegyric to the King.

Wotton was of course not the only writer of his age (or other times, earlier or later) to present a work of praise to the King as the work of John Arnway illustrates. But Arnway's The Tablet or Moderation of Charles I, Martyr (27) was written after the death of the King. However, the reason for its writing remains obscure. The work carries a dedication to Charles II, and the introduction suggests the difficulty in presenting a work favourable to Charles I at this particular time. It says, 'I here present to your Royal Highness, as an earnest solution rather than starve in exile, than change my allegiance'.

(28) A debt to the classics is evident in the work's frequent references to figures from the

23 Wotton, op.cit., p. 103.

24 ibid., p. 105.

25 Lee, op.cit., Vol. XXI, p. 968.

26 Wotton, op. cit., pp. 63-64.

27 J. Arnway, The Tablet or Moderation of Charles I, Martyr, London, 1649.

28 ibid., Dedication.

ancient world, and in the Greek and Latin phrases. To the modern reader, the language seems verbose and circumlocutious. (The same can be said of Wotton's work, but the fact of its translation from Latin may obscure the extent to which the original was easier to understand.) Like Wotton, Arnway's fulsome praise of Charles I is couched in the language familiar in the genre of traditional princely literature, though in Arnway's work, the phrases conform even more closely to the model than do Wotton's. Charles I is described as 'stout yet staid, just yet merciful, patient and resolute, chaste and sober, sweet and gracious, mild and gentle.'⁽²⁹⁾ While there is some reference to the King's personal qualities, to his 'able body',⁽³⁰⁾ and his being perfect in 'all his parts and faculties, especially intellectuals',⁽³¹⁾ there is no indication in the work that the author knew Charles personally, or even that he was acquainted with anyone who could give him first-hand knowledge of events in the reign. But Arnway's biography reveals otherwise. He was born in Shropshire in 1601, became a commoner of St. Edwards Hall at Oxford, and in 1635 rector of Hodnet and Ightfield. He was promoted to Archdeacon at Coventry, and held the prebendary of Wolvey. He repaired to Charles I at Oxford in 1642,⁽³²⁾ and thus he had at least some acquaintance with the King's affairs at this time. His considerable estate was sequestrated, and he was imprisoned until after the King's death when he was exiled and went to The Hague in either 1649 or 1650. He died in Virginia in 1653.⁽³³⁾ Arnway would have been familiar with some of the more dramatic events in Charles's reign, but the focus of the work is the King himself, with the drama of the time serving only as a background to the author's vindication of Charles I. His partisanship is clear throughout, but is nowhere more evident than in regard to the Civil War. He tells the reader that Charles was 'forced to draw his sword in defence of religion against heresy, monarchy against anarchy, plenty against scarcity, the Church against sacrilege',⁽³⁴⁾ and other evils including 'the liberty of subjects against slavery.'⁽³⁵⁾ He tells us also that Charles preferred 'honour before his head [and would] rather die a good king than live subjected against law and conscience.'⁽³⁶⁾ Thus Charles is the martyr of

²⁹ *ibid.*, p. 16.

³⁰ *ibid.*, p. 18.

³¹ *ibid.*, p. 9.

³² R.C. Browne, *D.N.B.* Vol. I, p. 594.

³³ *ibid.*

³⁴ Arnway, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

³⁵ *ibid.*

³⁶ *ibid.*, p. 36

Arnway's title. There is some information given in the work, but it is presented only in the context of portraying the King's righteousness, rather than as a description or explanation of the circumstances. Arnway mentions ship-money but the King's action in this matter is inevitably justified. The emphasis here is on the legality of Charles's action, with the judges 'in open court, best knowing the justice or injustice of it'.⁽³⁷⁾ The Queen is briefly brought into the picture, but only to allow the reader to know of Charles's faithfulness: 'he ever kept the troth first plighted, held to his first choice, continued his first love.'⁽³⁸⁾ Charles's death was brought about by 'clamorous malcontents.....[who] envied the grapes themselves.....who thought nothing could go well, where they sat not at the helm.'⁽³⁹⁾ The conclusion of the work seems to indicate a genuine feeling of distress at the events surrounding the end of Charles's reign. Arnway says, 'my amazed pen drops from my trembling hand while I think of the cruel retribution of his righteous carriage'.⁽⁴⁰⁾ He is at a loss to understand why this 'most just judge [was] made a common barretour, Princeps Paces [was made] the author of an unjust war, the sole protector of men's estates [was made] the spoiler'.⁽⁴¹⁾ Arnway, like Wotton, was not concerned to write a 'history' in the sense that his own or future generations could learn about, and understand the events and circumstances of his time.⁽⁴²⁾ His concern was to vindicate Charles I. Though the dedication to Charles II suggests hope of a preferment at a later time, it is not clear why Arnway would write a work in praise of the late King at this particular time. The explanation may well be at least partly with the wave of sympathy for Charles I which his execution brought forth. Certainly it was a catalyst for an expression of Royalist sentiment in politically dangerous times, though this was often more muted than is found in Arnway's work, as the next example shows.

Hamon L'Estrange whose work The Reign of King Charles,⁽⁴³⁾ was first published in 1655, clearly falls into this category. That is, though his views are still discernible as favourable to Charles I, his is not the eulogy of Arnway's writing. Indeed

37 *ibid.*, p. 41.

38 *ibid.*, p. 20.

39 *ibid.*, p. 40.

40 *ibid.*, p. 43.

41 *ibid.*

42 This definition of 'history' is based on that given by F.S. Fussner in The Historical Revolution, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1962, Introduction, xiv.

43 H. L'Estrange, The Reign of King Charles, London, 1956.

L'Estrange's work was attacked for its 'impartial spirit',⁽⁴⁴⁾ by another theologian of more distinct Royalist views, Peter Heylyn, whose work will be discussed below. The clue to L'Estrange's more muted royalism can be found in his biography. He was born in Norfolk in 1605. His father (also named Hamon) was a member of Parliament for Norfolk in 1630, and Governor of Lynne in 1643, at which time he attempted to deliver the town to the Royalist army. Hamon junior took the King's side in the Civil War, and is reported to have been a Colonel in the King's army.⁽⁴⁵⁾ However he later demonstrated less dedication to the Royalist cause than his earlier background would suggest. After his estate was sequestrated, he wrote to the Earl of Manchester asking for assistance, and telling him that he now 'reconciled his opinion to the sense of Parliament'.⁽⁴⁶⁾ From 1651 to his death in 1660 he lived quietly, mostly in Suffolk, reportedly in comfort, and continued his writing.⁽⁴⁷⁾ His other works apart from The Reign of King Charles, are of a religious nature, except for his answer to Heylyn's challenge to his views presented in this work.⁽⁴⁸⁾ His history of Charles's reign covers only the period from the Spanish venture to Strafford's execution. Its main interest for this topic lies in the background it presents for the time before the more dramatic events in Charles's life. However it is not without value for any study of the King himself, because L'Estrange does at times place Charles within the context of the circumstances to which he refers.⁽⁴⁹⁾ He begins the work with a comparison between Charles and his deceased elder brother, the 'incomparable'⁽⁵⁰⁾ Henry. Charles's studious nature is contrasted with Henry's 'forward and enterprising [nature]',⁽⁵¹⁾ and Charles's earlier physical weaknesses are noted. Charles, he says, overcame his 'bodily feebleness',⁽⁵²⁾ but not his stammer, but a stammer he notes is a mark of wisdom - for fools 'very rarely, if ever, stammer'.⁽⁵³⁾

44 Quoted in W. A. Shaw, D.N.B. Vol. XI, p. 995.

45 ibid., pp. 994-995.

46 ibid., p. 995.

47 ibid.

48 Heylyn's work is called Observations on the History of King Charles, London, 1656.

L'Estrange's reply is The Observation Observed, London, 1656.

49 A notable feature of L'Estrange's writing lies in his recognition of important aspects of the writing of history. This topic is unfortunately outside the parameter of my thesis, but I note that he says that some historians report what others have seen and heard as 'undeniably true', whereas his information comes from records, only once removed from the originals. He also notes that history without its idiom truth, is 'mere romance'. L'Estrange, op. cit., Preface A2-A4.

50 ibid., p. 1.

51 ibid.

52 ibid.

53 ibid., p. 2.

Charles intellectual ability is drawn to the reader's attention: he refers to the very good account of it which Charles gave at the Spanish Court. ⁽⁵⁴⁾ The background to the Spanish venture is interesting, but Charles is not the focus of discussion. This is also the case with other events in the early part of the reign, though these do give insight into the dissensions which existed even before the more turbulent later times, this despite the inclusion of a 'set piece' on the glory that was England's in her days of peace.⁽⁵⁵⁾ There appears to have been controversy about Charles's coronation oath, wherein Dr. Williams, Dean of Westminster and the Bishop of Lincoln were set aside for Laud. But L'Estrange denies that the coronation oath itself was altered. This he says was a 'vulgar error thrown about in pamphlets.' ⁽⁵⁶⁾ He also records that Charles did not ride to Westminster 'after the ancient fashion', ⁽⁵⁷⁾ but travelled privately by water. The possible reason he gives is that Charles feared for his safety. Thus we see the implication of a less than peaceful kingdom which Charles inherited, but L'Estrange also notes that he saved a large sum of money, reportedly fifty thousand pounds. ⁽⁵⁸⁾ That Charles was short of funds is recognized by L'Estrange. He refers to James leaving his successor 'a crown of thorns from an empty purse', ⁽⁵⁹⁾ this, plus the enmity of Spain – seen by L'Estrange then, as James's fault. But a greater misfortune to Charles stemmed he says, from his marriage to 'a lady of disbelief'. ⁽⁶⁰⁾ While he does not express it as his own opinion, it is suggested by his noting that 'others passionately ascribe England's calamities to those internuptuals, and fetch that ireful stroke of divine justice upon his late Majesty [from his marrying a Catholic]'. ⁽⁶¹⁾ L'Estrange's theological background is more clearly evident in his long discussion of Archbishop Laud's policies. The Archbishop whose excessive zeal in both moral and church reform according to L'Estrange, brought not only dissension and apprehension to religious sections of the community, but to the nobility as well. ⁽⁶²⁾ His encouragement of Roman Catholics made the Court unpopular, (though L'Estrange does

54 ibid.

55 Here he praises the Church, the Court, the Arts and Sciences and reports the wealth of both city and country, with 'a universal peace on every side', ibid., p. 143.

56 ibid., p. 20.

57 ibid.

58 ibid.

59 ibid., p.6.

60 ibid., p. 8.

61 ibid.

62 ibid., p. 187.

note that it was the Romish faction, and not the faith itself which Laud favoured).⁽⁶³⁾ But since Laud had the King's trust and confidence, ⁽⁶⁴⁾ Charles himself is implicitly censured here. Laud never really had the influence with Charles which the Duke of Buckingham exercised. L'Estrange recognizes Buckingham's influence and its unfortunate nature. He notes particularly Charles's determination to protect his favourite from Parliament's wrath, telling the reader that the rupture of Parliament resulted directly from the King's affection for the Duke, ⁽⁶⁵⁾ surely an implicit criticism of Charles I. L'Estrange is particularly critical of Buckingham's accumulation of honours, offices and wealth for himself and his relations, but does not believe the story circulating after the Duke's murder, that is, that Charles was pleased to be rid of him. ⁽⁶⁶⁾ L'Estrange skirts the question of blame for the war with France, but takes particular care to exonerate the King from charges made against him, concerning ships lent to the French, and then used against the English fleet. The ships he says were misemployed by France, because France had been expressly cautioned not to so use them. However since the ships were promised by James, Charles only performed what his father had promised. ⁽⁶⁷⁾ Thus he becomes the dutiful son, rather than the perpetrator of an action against his own country. Discussion of the country of Charles's birth, Scotland, is quite a feature of L'Estrange's work. He says that Charles went reluctantly to Scotland to be crowned, and points out that he was crowned King of Scotland and not King of Scots, this due to the disaffection which had sprung up against him. ⁽⁶⁸⁾ He does however make it clear that much of this disaffection had arisen in James's time. Indeed he finds no fault in Charles's actions there, seeing Charles as both pious and gracious, whereas the Scots (for whom he makes his dislike quite clear) are a race 'most perfidious'. ⁽⁶⁹⁾ The King who had observed the negligent and indecent worship of God in Scotland, sought only to reform their worship. But the Scots were afraid of Episcopacy, likening it to Popery, ⁽⁷⁰⁾ and the turbulent malevolents among them, made the nation combustible. ⁽⁷¹⁾ When Charles realised that he had awoken this slumbering discontent, he showed himself willing to placate them.

⁶³ *ibid.*, p. 187, p. 189.

⁶⁴ *ibid.*, p. 187.

⁶⁵ *ibid.*, p. 50

⁶⁶ *ibid.*, p. 51.

⁶⁷ *ibid.*, p. 93.

⁶⁸ *ibid.*, p. 130.

⁶⁹ *ibid.*, p. 129.

⁷⁰ *ibid.*, p. 131.

⁷¹ *ibid.*, pp. 130-131.

However those disruptive spirits which nothing could content were determined to deny him affection. Not even Charles's 'most gracious and debonair mind' (72) could overcome this disaffection. Thus they began the war against him while pretending to preserve both religion and the King's person, but in fact intending their destruction. (73) The coverage of Scottish affairs covers quite a large part of the work, but it is concerned with the King himself in his role of a reasonable reformer. Indeed it is the main vehicle for showing the King in a favourable light. Strafford's trial is also covered at length, but in the main, it consists of the charges against him, and the Earl's reply. Charles is brought into the picture in regard to his action in the Bill of Attainder. This he signed only with 'great reluctance' (74) and was remorseful of his action. (75) L'Estrange excuses the King, giving the reasons for his signing as the importunity of the nobles, the opinion of the judges and the need to satisfy his people. (76) The King he says, was 'infinitely distracted between a people and a conscience, both malcontent, both equally clamorous, one for mercy the other for justice', (77) and justice won. L'Estrange does question the political wisdom of Charles asking whether the King lost or gained by his acquiescence. (78) (He does not provide the answer.) But the moral question is decided in Charles's favour, when he says that the King was determined to preserve 'his natural disposition to mercy [for which] he had a passion most vehement'. (79) The King's letter delivered by the Prince of Wales to the Lords asking for mercy for Strafford, is presented as 'evidence' for the King's merciful nature. However its request for mercy, that is, to moderate the severity of the law by sending the Earl to prison for life rather than to his death, is surely negated by the expressed wish that Parliament not oppress Charles's own conscience. (80) The postscript of this letter which is presented without comment by L'Estrange, provides a chilling example of Charles I's lack of concern for the fate of a trusted servant. It says 'if he must die, it were a charity to reprieve him till Saturday'. (81)

72 *ibid.*, p. 130.

73 *ibid.*, p. 155.

74 *ibid.*, p. 267.

75 *ibid.*

76 *ibid.*, p. 265.

77 *ibid.*

78 *ibid.*, p. 267.

79 *ibid.*, p. 268.

80 *ibid.*

81 *ibid.*

In this discussion of Strafford's fate, L'Estrange has presented Charles as both just and merciful, though some of his readers will surely question this view. That L'Estrange wished to present Charles I as a just king is also seen in his discussion of ship-money. Here Charles is portrayed as a respecter of justice, who would neither be flattered into, nor frightened from his belief in the legality of the measure. (82) But Charles was also merciful in his treatment of Lord Balmerino. This Lord whose actions against the King are presented as treacherous, was sentenced to be hanged drawn and quartered, and his estate confiscated. But Charles pardoned him, showing on this occasion, 'a clemency most transcendent'. (83) Thus L'Estrange in this work has shown Charles I just and merciful, as these last examples illustrate, pious, gracious and reasonable, as his treatment of the Scots shows, and dutiful in fulfilling his father's promise of lending ships to the French. So despite the somewhat more muted Royalist sentiment than is found in either Wotton's or Arnway's work, L'Estrange has presented Charles I in a quite favourable light. Since his only outright criticism concerns political not moral actions, he also has fitted his subject to quite some degree to the model of the 'good' prince. This 'modest vindication of the King', (84) as expressed in his intention in the Preface to the work, is not really written in the 'impartial spirit' for which it was attacked by Peter Heylyn.

Peter Heylyn was an Arminian clergyman and historian. He was born in 1600, son of a country gentleman. He took the degrees of B.A. at Oxford in 1617 and M.A. in 1620, then proceeded to B.D. in 1629 and D.D. in 1633. (85) As an historian, his best-known work is his life of Archbishop Laud published in 1668, (86) but it is his work called A Short View of the Life and Reign of King Charles (87) which is the focus here. Royce Macgillivray describes Heylyn as a 'Royalist extremist devoted to the idea of a powerful monarchy', (88) and the earlier years of his life would seem to provide an understanding of this view. He became one of Charles's chaplains in 1631. He soon

82 *ibid.*, p. 246.

83 *ibid.*, p. 139.

84 *ibid.*, Preface A3.

85 M. Creighton, D.N.B. Vol. IX, p. 771.

86 P. Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus: or the History of the Life and Death of.....William.....Archbishop of Canterbury, London, 1668.

87 P. Heylyn, A Short View of the Life and Reign of King Charles, London, 1658.

88 Macgillivray, op. cit. p. 34.

made himself 'an instrument of royal vengeance',⁽⁸⁹⁾ in firstly helping Noy prepare the case against Prynne for the publication of Histriomastix, and then in playing an energetic and sometimes vindictive role in the struggles between the Arminians and their opponents.⁽⁹⁰⁾ In 1636 on the King's orders he wrote A History of the Sabbath to answer Puritan challenges.⁽⁹¹⁾ He was handsomely rewarded for his zeal in church preferments, including the treasurership for the chapter of Westminster, after Bishop Williams was suspended by the Star-Chamber in 1637. Heylyn had been active since 1631 against Williams whom Charles I was anxious to discredit,⁽⁹²⁾ but life changed dramatically for him when Williams emerged from the Tower. Together with Prynne, he made life impossible in London for Heylyn, who retired to Alresford. When the Civil War broke out his arrest was ordered, but he narrowly escaped and joined the King at Oxford.⁽⁹³⁾ Heylyn was ordered to chronicle current events in the Mercurius Aulicus, and act as war historian. This literary activity led to him being declared a delinquent, and his house was stripped of its contents, and his library dispersed.⁽⁹⁴⁾ After experiencing considerable hardship, he settled in Winchester and lived quietly with his wife until the town was taken in 1646. He then moved to Minster Lovel, Oxfordshire, at which time he compounded for his estate and was able to continue writing until 1653, when he moved closer to Oxford to be able to use the library there.⁽⁹⁵⁾ However a quiet life did not suit Heylyn, and one of the controversies he entered into came with his attack on Hamon L'Estrange's life of Charles I discussed above. Though Heylyn published anonymously, L'Estrange guessed the authorship of Heylyn's work called Observations on Mr. Hamon L'Estrange's Life on Charles I,⁽⁹⁶⁾ and replied. Heylyn also attacked the writings of other fellow Royalists including William Sanderson's history of Charles I.⁽⁹⁷⁾ However, these controversies were laid aside with the restoration of Charles II. Heylyn was present as sub-dean at the coronation in April 1661, and his views were represented in the proceedings of the ecclesiastical restoration. However, he died soon

⁸⁹ Creighton, op.cit., Vol. IX, p. 771.

⁹⁰ ibid.

⁹¹ ibid.

⁹² ibid.

⁹³ ibid., p. 772.

⁹⁴ ibid.

⁹⁵ ibid.

⁹⁶ Heylyn was mainly concerned with proceedings of the Laudian Clergy.

⁹⁷ W. Sanderson, A Complete History of Charles I from the Cradle to the Grave, London, 1658.

after, in May 1662, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. ⁽⁹⁸⁾

These excerpts from Heylyn's life would incline one to the view of him as a controversialist never afraid to express his opinion. They certainly show him as a supporter of the Monarchy who suffered at Parliament's hands. Thus we could expect his history to be ardently Royalist. It is not the eulogy of the simple praise-writer, but it is little more revealing on Charles's character than other works in this survey are, despite Heylyn's actual contact with the King. Some picture of Charles I does emerge, but the reader is conscious of Heylyn's Royalist bias, at times seeing Charles in a different light from that which Heylyn's words seem meant to convey. The work is a comprehensive, if uneven and selective account of events covering the full period of Charles's life. Thus my discussion of it will be longer than the previous works which cover either a shorter period in the King's life, or particular aspects which highlight Charles's virtuous nature. Heylyn's work begins with discussion of a topic not dealt with in other works in my survey. He seeks to refute the views put forward in the book Antinormanism, and various pamphlets circulating at the time. Their theme was that in executing Charles I the English people had done nothing more than free themselves from the Norman yoke. Heylyn however, traces Charles's lineage back to the last surviving Saxon prince, and thus 'proves' his claim to the throne, 'was in no part borrowed from the Norman conqueror'. ⁽⁹⁹⁾ Thus Heylyn's Royalism is announced at the beginning of the work, which then follows his Royalist contemporaries in the now familiar topic of Charles's early weakness, and his later overcoming this problem by his own efforts. ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Heylyn says that in his infancy Charles was thought so unlikely to live, that his christening was performed in haste without performing 'those solemnities which are accustomedly used at the baptism of such princely infants'. ⁽¹⁰¹⁾ He refers to James's physician being sent to Scotland to restore Charles to health, the Prince being left behind when James and his Queen travelled to England with Henry and Elizabeth in 1603. ⁽¹⁰²⁾ But by the age of ten, Charles though still retired and studious, was exceedingly advanced in his letters. He later took up all manner of manly exercise, becoming the best marksman and horseman in all three kingdoms. ⁽¹⁰³⁾ Interestingly however, Heylyn breaks his praise of Charles's

⁹⁸ Creighton, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 773.

⁹⁹ Heylyn, op. cit., p. 3.

¹⁰⁰ ibid., p. 4.

¹⁰¹ ibid., p. 8.

¹⁰² ibid., p. 10.

¹⁰³ ibid., p. 13.

efforts to improve himself to report a temper tantrum of his early years. It seems likely that this story was well-known, and that Heylyn includes it simply to address the unfavourable comments on Charles's nature which it must have aroused. He reports that Charles as a child was being teased by his elder brother Henry because of his studious nature. When Henry promised to one day make him Archbishop of Canterbury, Charles removed the Archbishop's cap which Henry had placed on his head, threw it on the ground, and trampled on it. When Henry died the Church hierarchy recalled this story with dismay, appalled that such a person was now heir-apparent. ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ But Heylyn quickly reminds his readers that when King, there was never a more generous patron of the Church, than Charles I, and further he was always a 'resolute champion on behalf of the hierarchy'. ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Heylyn refers to Charles's wilful nature, but again only to contrast this with his later good humour. He says that while in his early years Charles was inclined to perverseness, (excused by Heylyn on the grounds of his disabilities), ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ Charles later overcame that bad humour, and then there was no man to be found 'of evener temper, more pliant to good counsel, or less wedded than he to his own opinion'. ⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Thus he is portrayed as the temperate prince in the tradition of the 'good' prince of princely literature. That he was dutiful is also pointed out by Heylyn in his discussion of James's conferring honours and offices on his favourites. ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ Charles accepted this situation with understanding and prudence, though Heylyn notes that Charles's acceptance of the situation was seen by some as showing a faint-heartedness and lack of spirit. Yet more knowing men he says, saw Charles's behaviour as showing wisdom. ⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ So Heylyn has added prudence and wisdom to the list of 'good' qualities which were part of Charles's character. Equanimity was also part of his nature according to Heylyn. When his mother died, (and she was reportedly fonder of Charles than of her other children, and thus indulgent to him), Charles did not spend much time in womanish lamentation, ⁽¹¹⁰⁾ but instead showed great equanimity and evenness of spirit, exhibiting only such grief as was appropriate. ⁽¹¹¹⁾ Similarly in his report of Charles's reaction to

104 *ibid.*, p. 10.

105 *ibid.*, p. 11.

106 *ibid.*, p. 12.

107 *ibid.*, p. 13.

108 *ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

109 *ibid.*, p. 15.

110 *ibid.*, p. 17.

111 *ibid.*

Buckingham's death, Heylyn says 'such was the constancy of the King's temper, and the known evenness of his spirit, that there was little or no stop in the proceedings [in the war with France]'. (112) Buckingham's influence on Charles is recognized. Heylyn instances the beginning of the war with Spain, wherein he says Charles became the instrument to persuade his father to take action against Spain. (113) He recognizes that this was politically unwise. The Prince was influenced more by the Duke's passion, and pleasing the Commons, he says, than either his own or the regal interest, 'there being nothing more unsafe than for a King of England, to cast himself on the necessity of calling Parliaments'. (114) Heylyn's story of Buckingham's report to Parliament on the treatment Charles had received in Spain is revealing. The Duke told Parliament, that the Spanish had not treated Charles well, putting 'delays and indignities upon him'. (115) However Heylyn says that what Buckingham claimed against Spain, was 'more to the disadvantage of Spain, than there was just grounds for'. (116) Yet he does not censure either Buckingham for exaggeration of Charles's difficulties, or Charles himself for standing quietly by and not refuting the claims. But if the suspicious reader could here doubt Charles's honour, Heylyn's account of Charles's wooing of the Infanta should leave no doubt in his mind that the prince was capable of deceit when his own interests were involved. Considering himself to be in possible danger after an alliance was not made with Spain, Charles, he says, 'showed himself a more passionate lover [to the Infanta] than ever formerly', (117) giving his proxy to marry the Spanish princess. However when out of the perceived danger, Charles commanded that the proxy be withheld, (118) and this action from a prince of whom Heylyn says, it was his constancy to his religion which prevented the marriage. (119) So while the discerning reader may not feel able to add honour to Charles's character, Heylyn does not here question it, and adds piety to his princely qualities.

Indeed Charles's piety is paraded for the reader in Heylyn's account of the Scottish

112 *ibid.*, p. 51.

113 *ibid.*, p. 32.

114 *ibid.*

115 *ibid.*, p. 31.

116 *ibid.*

117 *ibid.*, p. 29.

118 *ibid.*, p. 30.

119 *ibid.*, p. 27.

troubles. Heylyn points to the year 1633 as the turning point in the reign, when sedition which had lain quietly in the ashes of contentment broke out, and inflamed first Scotland, and then England. ⁽¹²⁰⁾ This was the year in which Charles sought to implement various reform measures including religious practices, which his father had either intended or begun to introduce. Charles on going to Scotland to receive his crown, found opposition to his proposals. Nevertheless he pressed on with what he considered appropriate worship, ⁽¹²¹⁾ despite opposition to the measures. Heylyn's account here is similar to that of L'Estrange. This is not surprising since both were Anglican churchmen who could be expected to support Charles's reforms against the Scottish Presbyterian faction. The Presbyterians Heylyn says, 'insinuated into the mind of the common people that [Charles's] design was to subject the pure Kirk to the superstitious rites and ceremonies of the Church of England'. ⁽¹²²⁾ Indeed Charles's dealings with the Scots are seen in the context of the 'good' king being opposed by the proud and insolent Scots, or perhaps more correctly, the pious king standing against the disaffected factions who wished neither his person or his government well. ⁽¹²³⁾ The Scots are blamed for the war which followed, but Charles is censured for his lack of political wisdom. Heylyn says that he thought that the terror of his going against them would reduce them to obedience without bloodshed. ⁽¹²⁴⁾ Since he also comments that all the King's action did achieve was the creation of a greater reputation for the Scots, both at home and abroad, ⁽¹²⁵⁾ he has thus by implication shown us a picture of a king out of touch with the real situation. But his picture of the 'good' king remains intact, as is the case when he discusses Charles's dealings with Parliament. These discussions lack detail, though the reader is left with the impression that Parliament is the aggressor. The brief lesson he gives at the beginning of the work clearly indicates his position. He says that the King of England, by calling Parliament, only makes himself obnoxious to the humour of the Commons, and this lessens his reputation at home and abroad. Further, they will seldom part with the money unless 'they have paid themselves well for it out of the prerogative'. ⁽¹²⁶⁾ The only

¹²⁰ *ibid.*, pp. 55-56.

¹²¹ Measures such as kneeling to receive Communion, the wearing of robes in Church service and celebrating Holy days. *ibid.*, p.61.

¹²² *ibid.*, p. 64.

¹²³ *ibid.*, p. 65.

¹²⁴ *ibid.*, p. 74.

¹²⁵ *ibid.*, p. 75.

¹²⁶ *ibid.*, p. 32.

incident discussed concerning Charles's dealings with Parliament, is the Five Members Incident in which Heylyn sees Charles's action as justified since he had proof of their treason. (127) But the Commons was determined not to be satisfied, no matter how Charles acted. (128) In general, it is his choice of words rather than the presentation of particular events or circumstances which quite clearly show where Heylyn's sympathy lies. Phrases like 'the Commons were not contented [by Charles's act of grace towards them]', (129) and 'they vented their passions [against him]'¹³⁰ put him definitely on the King's side. Indeed Parliament forced the war on the King, by conspiring to 'disturb the peace and happiness of this flourishing kingdom.' (131) Heylyn mentions ship-money wherein some of the 'discontented members of Parliament..... stubbornly opposed the payment of that imposition, in which the honour, wealth and happiness of the kingdom was so much concerned'. (132) In this matter, Charles proceeded against them in a legal way, rather than make use of any arbitrary power. (133) Thus we can now add a concern for justice to the King's 'good' qualities. However in general, Heylyn's treatment of Charles's actions in regard to government, whether Parliamentary acts or otherwise, is not covered in sufficient depth for the reader to make his own judgement on the King. This applies also to the impeachments of both Archbishop Laud and Strafford. These events are dealt with in a manner which does not recognize their importance as major events in Charles's reign. While Laud's case was put aside until Charles himself was in a difficult position, Strafford's prosecution came at a time when the King was in a situation to save his minister. Heylyn praises Strafford for his eloquent pleading, and the manner in which he went to his death. (134) But of the King's part in giving his consent to the Bill of Attainder which amounted to Strafford's death sentence, we are told only that the Commons first forced the Lords 'by tumults, and afterwards the King, by their importunities to pass that unhappy bill'. (135) Indeed his coverage of the circumstances of Strafford's execution is even less complete than L'Estrange has presented. The suspicious reader may be tempted to ask whether Heylyn is here demonstrating his

¹²⁷ *ibid.*, p. 88.

¹²⁸ *ibid.*, p. 32.

¹²⁹ *ibid.*, p. 50.

¹³⁰ *ibid.*, p. 53.

¹³¹ *ibid.*, p. 71.

¹³² *ibid.*

¹³³ *ibid.*

¹³⁴ *ibid.*, pp.81-82.

¹³⁵ *ibid.*, p. 82.

loyalty to the King by omitting discussion of events which may reflect unfavourably on Charles I.

There is however most likely a different explanation for Heylyn's lack of detail in his coverage of the Civil War. Heylyn was living at Oxford for much of this time, engaged in actually writing about the war, producing several 'relations' on it. ⁽¹³⁶⁾ Since this activity reduced him to poverty through Parliament's enmity, ⁽¹³⁷⁾ it is reasonable to assume that since his history was produced before the Restoration, Heylyn did not wish to again draw criticism from his opponents. While I am not conscious of the fact that any major aspect of the war has been overlooked, there is no feeling conveyed of the author having a personal knowledge of these events. Even the most important battles are given the briefest and vaguest treatment, never sufficient to allow any understanding of the circumstances. Of Edgehill, Heylyn says only that 'the fight [was] terrible for the time, no fewer than five thousand men slain upon the place, the prologue to a great slaughter, if the dark night had not put an end unto that dispute'. ⁽¹³⁸⁾ This battle he says 'went clearly to the King's side'. ⁽¹³⁹⁾ Indeed Charles is usually presented as the victor. However Heylyn's omitting or blurring of details, does not allow the reader to decide the accuracy of any claim. In fact Charles seems so surely master of the country, that when he finally faces defeat, and is forced to flee to the Scots, the reader is quite surprised, being totally unprepared for the King to lose the war. The King himself stands remote from the action. Even the most careful reading of the work gives no idea how often Charles took the field himself, or issued direct orders. Heylyn provides only one example of the King's direct involvement in any campaign, and it is a trivial affair, seemingly included only to show us the 'good' king in action. On the march back to Oxford from Cropredy bridge, (where he 'obtained a signal victory'), ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ Charles was caught in a storm. He was urged to shelter in the nearby village, but he refused, being resolved not to forsake his cannon upon any occasion. Some about the King, marvelled at the patience he showed in this extremity, but Charles answered that as 'God had given him afflictions to exercise his patience, so he had given him patience to bear his

¹³⁶ Creighton, *op. cit.*, Vol IX, p. 772.

¹³⁷ *ibid.*

¹³⁸ Heylyn, *op. cit.*, p. 93

¹³⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ *ibid.*, p. 106.

afflictions'.⁽¹⁴¹⁾ Heylyn's comment here shows his admiration of the King. He says that this was 'a speech so heavenly and divine, that it is hardly to be paralleled by any of the men of God in all the Scripture'.⁽¹⁴²⁾ Thus we have a picture of a brave and pious king, steadfast in resolve, these qualities to be added to those of the 'good' prince formerly presented. It is disappointing however that no real picture of the King as a war leader emerges in Heylyn's work, particularly as he was one of the few to write about the war from a position so close to it. Some of the details would have been available to him, albeit from reports coming in to Oxford from the campaigns in the field. Yet this lack of detail is not extended to all circumstances in Charles's reign. One particular event occurring in the earlier days of Charles's life is reported at length, and it seems to be a trivial affair when compared with the momentous events of those later days. Both L'Estrange and Heylyn place considerable importance on aspects of Charles's coronation. But since L'Estrange only takes his history to Strafford's death, it is easier to understand why such an event as the King's coronation would assume more importance in his work than it would in Heylyn's full length account of the reign. On the other hand, perhaps it is reasonable to expect any clergyman to be interested in affairs of religion or religious ceremony. Certainly they both point out that the sacred part of the coronation oath was the same as that of Charles's predecessors,⁽¹⁴³⁾ with both writers referring to pamphlets circulating at the time which denied this. Both writers refer to the King omitting his triumphant ride through the city, for which Heylyn gives frugality as the reason.⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ The coronation prayers were not altered according to Heylyn, except that one clause permitted from the time of Henry VI, was added.⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ The inclusion of these details, though of interest to an Arminian clergyman do stand at variance with Heylyn's vague references to the King in regard to dealings with Parliament, or in his capacity as leader in war. For the latter he could not plead lack of knowledge or material, since at the time he was actually writing about its events. This however may be why his references to Charles's imprisonment on the Isle of Wight, and the treaty terms there, are relatively brief. The trial and execution are only mentioned briefly, though he does record the story

¹⁴¹ *ibid.*, p. 107.

¹⁴² *ibid.*

¹⁴³ *ibid.*, p. 43.

¹⁴⁴ Heylyn says the King saved sixty-five thousand pounds, *ibid.* L'Estrange's figure is fifty thousand, L'Estrange, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

¹⁴⁵ Heylyn, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

of the soldier who spat in the King's face, ⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ which Charles 'suffered with his wonted patience'. ⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ For Heylyn, Charles died a martyr, because he would not betray 'the liberty of the English subject to any arbitrary and lawless power'. ⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ During his imprisonment on the Isle of Wight Charles took up meditation, and according to Heylyn composed the book titled 'Eikon Basiliké, or The Portraiture of his Sacred Majesty in his Solitudes and Sufferings'. ⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ This portraiture, Heylyn sees as preserving Charles's memory as a pious king, a monument to the king he describes, as a devout observer of the Church of England, a resolute patron and defender of it to the last. ⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ This is undoubtedly the most important facet of Charles's character to an Arminian clergyman. His 'character' of the King which follows is very short and adds little. He says, 'thus fell Charles, the meekest of men, and the best of princes'. ⁽¹⁵¹⁾ He left behind him 'an example of Christian fortitude in patiently suffering the blow which he did not deserve'. ⁽¹⁵²⁾ Charles's death, he tells the reader was lamented openly by few, though men were 'bleeding inwardly from the hearts, when their eyes durst not express outwardly what grief they felt'. ⁽¹⁵³⁾ He adds here a sentence, which may explain why some aspects of the reign are not dealt with in such detail as would allow a clearer picture of Charles's character. He says, 'so dangerous were the times.....that men's very sighs were registered, and kept upon account toward the undoing of many in the time to come'. ⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ But if he has been careful of offering praise of Charles I despite his obvious Royalist position, Heylyn clearly reveals himself as a devoted Monarchist in the work, as might be expected from one whose own situation was dependent on the Monarchy as an institution. At the end of the work, Heylyn reminds his readers that Charles I was murdered a long time before his death, when the Presbyterians deprived him of his crown, his sword and his sceptre. ⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ Their actions not only deprived him of those prerogatives which placed him above his people, but by wresting the militia from him, they left him unable to protect his people. They also divested him of the power to call

146 ibid., p. 150.

147 ibid.

148 ibid., p. 138.

149 ibid.

150 ibid., p. 161.

151 ibid.

152 ibid.

153 ibid., p. 162.

154 ibid.

155 ibid., p. 160.

Parliaments, and thus he was unable to make those laws by which he could govern 'all estates of men under his dominance'. ⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ This recognition of the Parliament's invasion of the King's prerogative, (though expressed by Heylyn the Arminian Clergyman, as the 'Presbyterian invasion'), allows Heylyn to excuse those of Charles's political mistakes which so lessened his own reputation, and gave his political opponents an advantage. His view of the King's reign is presented as the 'good' king, being opposed by those who wished neither his person or his government well. This much is obvious to the reader. However what is not clear is what Heylyn thought about the King himself. At the end of the work the reader finds only that he has seen a model, constructed by Heylyn, wherein Charles's 'good' moral qualities are on show. Charles may have been inept in political terms but despite some incidents which suggest moral failings, Heylyn has not recognized these. Thus like his Royalist contemporaries, Heylyn has invested his portrait of the King with many of the qualities of the traditional 'good' prince. This indeed could have been a picture drawn by a man who never had any personal contact with the King, whereas in this survey so far, Heylyn's was the closest connection to Charles I.

¹⁵⁶ ibid.

Chapter 2

Consideration of the Works of Two Royalist Writers Who Had a Close Association with the King.

There is one work on Charles I, for which the author is thought by some to have the closest connection with his subject that could be imagined. I refer here to the work Eikon Basiliké, known as The King's Book.⁽¹⁾ Although present day opinion does not see Charles I as undisputed author of the work, it seems he did have some input into the published version. It appears that Charles I made notes while he was in captivity, and some of what he wrote forms part of the work. Debate on the book's authorship began shortly after the King's death. The Governor of Carisbrooke Castle where Charles was imprisoned, from November 1646 until he was removed to Hurst Castle a year later, is reported to have said that 'part if not the whole [of the book] was writ when he was my prisoner, [and I] read at several times, most of that book'.⁽²⁾ He claims that Charles had nothing more than his Bible, pen, ink and paper, and that he saw the work with the ink still wet on the paper.⁽³⁾ However John Gauden, (1605-1662), Dean of Bocking in Essex, claimed authorship of the work in 1660 shortly after the Restoration. Almack whose 1907 edition of The King's Book contains several interesting statements from various parties with input into the authorship controversy, presents the cases for both Charles I and Dr. Gauden as author of the work. His conclusion is that the King himself was the author. His 'evidence' presented in the Appendices to the work, does constitute a persuasive argument for this view. Almack cites the claim by Dr. Mew, Lord Bishop of Winchester, who is reported to have seen torn pieces of the Eikon Basiliké written in the King's hand, after the battle of Naseby.⁽⁴⁾ Charles I's chaplain, Rev. Dr. Gorge who was also present at the battle, is reported to have told Dr. George Bull (later Bishop of St. Davids), that the King asked him to retrieve papers lost at the time, and these papers contained matter later printed in The King's Book.⁽⁵⁾ Almack also includes two

¹ The edition I have used is E. Almack ed., Eikon Basiliké or The King's Book, Chatto and Windus, London, 1907. Almack says that the work was issued 'within a few hours of' the King's execution, Preface xxii.

² ibid., Preface x.

³ ibid., Preface xi.

⁴ ibid., pp. 283-284.

⁵ ibid., p. 284. Almack says that these papers were later retrieved from the 'Conqueror with difficulty', ibid.

statements by William Levet, Page of the Bedchamber to the King. Both of these statements refer to his viewing the manuscript of Eikon Basiliké while the King was a prisoner on the Isle of Wight. Levet's statements also refer to the imprisonment by Cromwell of the work's printer, Richard Royston, because he would not deny that Charles I was the author. ⁽⁶⁾ But Levet also refers to the work being taken to the printer by a 'divine' ⁽⁷⁾ who unfortunately is not named. A more recent entrant in the debate on authorship of The King's Book is H. R. Trevor-Roper. He says that this 'divine' was the Rev. Edward Simmons, the King's servant, and since the manuscript was delivered to the printer by the servant of Charles I, the printer did not doubt that the King had written the work. ⁽⁸⁾ Trevor-Roper's view is that the idea for, and execution of, The King's Book, were due to John Gauden, but that he used manuscript notes compiled by the King as raw material. The King he thinks, corrected Gauden's draft of the work, and agreed to the change of name from Suspiria Regalia, The Sighs of a King, to The King's Book. ⁽⁹⁾ Trevor-Roper also expresses the opinion that the literary style of the work is that of Gauden. ⁽¹⁰⁾ It seems then that no exclusive solution as to who wrote The King's Book is satisfactory. Probably then we should see Gauden more in the nature of an editor, rather than composer of the work. Whatever the truth of his claim to authorship, John Gauden was rewarded with the Royal Chaplaincy and the Bishopric of Exeter for being the work's author. The interspersed prayers between all but one of the chapters of the Eikon may incline belief in some input from a minister of religion. On the other hand, Charles's devotion to his Church and his piety are well known, and a reading of the work does reinforce this view of Charles I as pious. I have covered the authorship debate on The King's Book in quite some detail, (though considerably less than could have been said), because of the possibility of the insight the work might provide into the King's character, particularly if it could be established that Charles I actually wrote the work. If we could accept that the Eikon Basiliké was actually in the main the work of

⁶ At the Restoration, Charles II granted Royston a monopoly on printing the works of Charles I, apparently as a testimony of his loyalty, and for losses and troubles in publishing the Eikon Basiliké, *ibid.*, Preface xxi.

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 286.

⁸ H. R. Trevor-Roper, '“Eikon Basiliké”: The Problem of the King's Book', Historical Essays, Macmillan, London, 1957, p. 218.

⁹ Gauden supposedly borrowed the manuscript from Simmons who was his neighbour in Essex, copied it, elaborated on it, and then sent it to the King at Newport through the Marquis of Hertford. *ibid.*, p. 219

¹⁰ *ibid.*, pp. 216-217.

Charles I, then it must be the most 'Royalist' of all works presented here.

But what does the work itself reveal? The most notable impression which the work conveys, is of Charles I as a noble martyr, who died for his people; a righteous king sinned against. It presents a model of kingly 'goodness' with which Charles's followers could identify. While his execution brought a wave of sympathy for him, the printing of The King's Book provided a catalyst for the expression of Royalist sentiment, in what were for Royalists, politically dangerous times. It was most likely the potent force in creating the legend of Charles I as the 'martyr king'. It was political propaganda: an apology for the King's policy and a vindication of his religion. The new government was sufficiently concerned by the Eikon's popularity to commission Milton to write a work to counteract it. ⁽¹¹⁾ The Eikon Basiliké presents the major aspects of Charles's reign 'explained' from the King's point of view. An example here is the Five Members Incident, about which the author says Charles went to the House of Commons, only to demand justice and with no thought of revenge against the wrong-doers. ⁽¹²⁾ The tone of most of the work (which is written in the first person), is both self-congratulatory and self-righteous. In regard to the calling of the last Parliament of the reign, the author speaks of the largeness of his own heart towards his 'peoples' good and just contentment'. ⁽¹³⁾ He also speaks of his own willingness to forgive his enemies, ⁽¹⁴⁾ and his patience and his charity towards them. ⁽¹⁵⁾ The King's integrity and honour are paraded as in a panegyric written by an admirer. Charles I is throughout the work a good and Godly king, with his adversaries portrayed as men of evil intent – the basic Royalist position par excellence. There is however one point in the work, the chapter on Strafford's death, which seems to indicate that the King's conscience did trouble him. The words of prayer which follow reinforce this view. They say 'O God of infinite mercies, forgive me in that act of sinful compliance, which hath greater aggravations upon Me than any man'. ⁽¹⁶⁾ This is the only part of The King's Book where the veil of

¹¹ Milton's spirited defence of the King's execution, Eikonoklastes, (Image Breaker) was published in October 1649, W. and A. Durant, The Story of Civilization, 33 Vols., Simon and Schuster, New York, 1963, The Age of Louis XIV, p. 184.

¹² Almack ed., op. cit., p. 26.

¹³ ibid., p. 2.

¹⁴ ibid., p. 129.

¹⁵ ibid., p. 131.

¹⁶ ibid., p. 11.

virtue slips, and then there is only a hint of any fault on the King's part, not an outright admission of guilt.

The author's personal knowledge of events he describes is obvious, yet the feeling of the unfolding drama is never vividly conveyed. It is vastly disappointing that any insight into the turbulent events of the time is not provided in this work, because whatever the merits of later historians' work, the immediacy of the situation can never be recaptured. We come no closer to understanding Charles I as a man in this work. The portrait of the King is a 'larger than life' picture of an unfailingly virtuous ruler, this being reinforced by repeated disclaimers of fault on his part. It is a totally unbelievable picture of righteousness as the following extracts illustrate: 'neither life nor liberty are so dear to me as the peace of my conscience, the honour of my crowns, and the welfare of my people', (17) and 'if my captivity or death must be the price of their redemption, I grudge not to pay it'. (18) The mood of indignation of his unjust treatment is prominent in most of the work, but a note of resignation does creep in towards the end of the work. At this point where Charles is preparing for his death probably at the hands of his own subjects, though he is still the good and Godly king who expects his reward in Heaven, a certain kingly dignity is glimpsed, and the reader's sympathy is aroused. If the other Royalist works presented here show a model of the good king, the Eikon Basiliké surpasses them all in its display of virtue. It is however more by the tone of the work rather than by actual flattering references, that this becomes apparent to the reader. It is unfortunate that we cannot be sure who actually composed the work. Yet whoever the author, the work throws little light on the details of the dramatic events of the time, nor on the character of the King himself. The main aim of the work appears to have been to justify those actions for which the King's enemies sought to darken his name. Though its content is disappointing, as a work of propaganda it was highly successful. (19) It also fits the model of the 'good' prince more closely than any other Royalist work.

While we cannot be sure just how close the author of The King's Book was to Charles I, there is however, one writer on his times, whose contact with Charles I is

17 ibid., p. 213.

18 ibid.

19 Within the first year of its issue, forty-six editions had been printed in English and translations made in French, Dutch, German and Latin. ibid., Preface xxii.

known to be of a quite personal nature, if only for a short period of time. That is, he was closer to the King than any other writer in this study except Clarendon. Philip Warwick's Memoires ⁽²⁰⁾ is a work written by a man who was able to observe the King during the Civil War, and he also had personal conversations with Charles I during the King's imprisonment on the Isle of Wight. Some of what he observed and was told by Charles I while he was at the King's side at Carisbrooke Castle, has been recorded in his work. Thus while Warwick's Memoires contains similar material to that of his contemporaries, he does provide a more intimate view of Charles I near to the end of his life, and at a time when the King realised that he would probably soon die. This factor should make Warwick's work of particular interest as regards his portrait of Charles I. Consequently, at least part of his work will be discussed in more detail than other works in the survey, except for Clarendon's history of the Civil War.

Sir Philip Warwick was born on December 12, 1609. He was the son of Thomas Warwick, organist at Westminster Abbey, and the Chapel Royal. He was educated at Eton and travelled in Europe before becoming secretary, first in 1636 to Lord George Goring, and later, in 1638 to the Lord Treasurer Juxon. In the same year he became Clerk of the Signet, and was admitted to Gray's Inn. ⁽²¹⁾ He represented Radnor in the Long Parliament, and was one of the fifty-six who voted against the Bill of Attainder which took the Earl of Strafford's life. ⁽²²⁾ The Commons voted to deprive him of his seat in 1644, two years after he had joined Charles I at Oxford. ⁽²³⁾ He served as a volunteer in the King's army, being a member of the Royal Guard at Edgehill. ⁽²⁴⁾ During the war, Charles I sent him on missions to the Marquis of Newcastle (on two occasions), and later to Fairfax to negotiate the terms of the capitulation of Oxford. ⁽²⁵⁾ In 1647 he became one of the King's penmen, and was present at the discussions concerning the Treaty of Newport. The King dictated the progress of these negotiations to him, this despatch then being sent to the Prince of Wales. ⁽²⁶⁾ However, at the time when Charles was moved from Carisbrooke Castle to Hurst Castle Warwick was absent on personal business. He

²⁰ P. Warwick, Memoires of the Reign of King Charles I, London, 1702.

²¹ C. H. Firth, D.N.B. Vol. XX, p. 894.

²² Warwick, op cit., p. 161.

²³ Firth, loc. cit.

²⁴ Warwick, op. cit., p. 231.

²⁵ Firth, loc. cit.

²⁶ Warwick, op. cit., p. 325.

learned the details of the King's trial and execution from Juxon who had attended Charles I in the last days of his life. (27) Warwick did not leave England after Charles's death, and was forced to compound for his estate. On his return from exile Charles II knighted him, and secured for him the post of Secretary to the Lord High Treasurer, the Earl of Southampton. He was returned as M.P. in the Parliament of 1661, this time for Westminster. His Memoires is thought to have been written between 1675-7, but the work was not published until 1701-2, many years after his death in 1683. (28) This brief biography should place Philip Warwick firmly in the Royalist camp and his work does clearly reflect his loyalty to Charles's cause, and his support for the principles of Monarchy as a form of government.

Though titled Memoires, Warwick did apparently intend his work to be more than a recollection of events. In some respects it is what the continuation of the title, Reflections upon the Reign of King Charles I, suggests it will be. He does indeed reflect on the troubles faced by Charles throughout his reign, and at times attempts to understand the reasons for them. He divides Charles's reign into five stages. The first is from 1625 to 1628, discussed as 'what befell him', (29) the second, from 1628 to 1637 is concerned mainly with the Scottish rebellion against the King, (30) and in the third, he reflects on 'what brought on the two Parliaments, both begun in 1640'. (31) These stages are followed by 'the irreconcilable and never to be satisfied appetite unto a change in government in the long Parliamentbegun in 1640', (32) and then, the war begun in 1642, and what happened until the time when 'this good Prince was most barbarously and traitorously murdered by his own subjects'. (33) Thus at the beginning of his work, Warwick clearly shows the reader where his sympathy lies, and he is only a few more pages along in his story when he announces his strong Monarchistic views. He says, 'As shall be shown hereafter.....the King is singly sovereign, and no power co-ordinate with him'. (34) He sees neither of the Houses of Parliament as having more authority,

27 ibid., p.331, p. 342.

28 Firth, D.N.B., Vol. XX, p 894.

29 Warwick, op. cit., p. 7.

30 ibid.

31 ibid., p. 8.

32 ibid.

33 ibid.

34 ibid., p. 75.

than to advise and consent to what may be beneficial to the subject, or the public generally. (35) Indeed the major theme of the work is Charles I, the ‘good’ king opposed by those firstly in Scotland, unhappy with his reforms, and then, by those in Parliament determined to destroy the Royal prerogative, the King’s ‘sovereign authority [being] vested in him by law’. (36) Warwick portrays Charles I as forced by attacks of the popular faction to defend his sovereignty, the King himself being ‘so unapt to have made any invasion upon the liberty or property of his subjects’. (37) He was ‘a Prince of most excellent temper, and strength of understanding, having no transports into any vice, but endowed with habits of knowledge and piety’. (38) However there is relatively little discussion of Charles’s actual dealings with Parliament, though this task is in general presented by Warwick as being to curb the innovating humour of ambitious men who made way for their own greatness, ‘by making Parliamentary authority rival Regal [authority]’. (39) These men ultimately achieved their aim by ‘much craft and violence’, (40) and they are clearly to blame for the Civil War, the catalyst being, according to Warwick, the publishing of the Nineteen Propositions. (41) But the Court is also censured. In what appears to be a lesson, he says,

how little the best princes can think themselves secure, if some leading men in their own Courts fall into faction, and infect those out of their verge, and spread jealousies, and nourish disaster and stop it not, till it poison the populacy or multitude. (42)

Warwick is particularly critical of that faction in the Court which persuaded ‘such an intelligent person as the King was’, (43) to divest himself of the power which his passing the Act for Perpetual Parliaments meant. He describes their action as ‘treachery’, (44) but excuses Charles on the grounds that ‘wisdom often quits a man when

35 *ibid.*

36 *ibid.*, p. 48.

37 *ibid.*, p. 1.

38 *ibid.*

39 *ibid.*, p. 62.

40 *ibid.*, p. 213.

41 *ibid.*

42 *ibid.*, p. 9.

43 *ibid.*, p. 181.

44 *ibid.*, p. 182.

misfortune hath led him to extremities'. (45) The Queen is included here in Warwick's criticism, for her 'great persuasions' (46) on the King in this matter. He also blames her for giving 'a disturbance to Strafford' (47) by using her powerful influence on Charles to have Sir Henry Vane, an enemy of Strafford's, made Secretary. (48) The outcome of this was fatal for Strafford, and unfortunate for Charles himself. Warwick's discussions of Strafford's fate includes the accusations against him, and the proceedings which brought about his fall. (49) However, the only reference to the King's part in sealing the Earl's fate, is Warwick's brief reference to the 'great weight and disturbance this single act gave unto the good King, even unto his end'. (50) He does not discuss Charles's act in signing the Bill of Attainder, though he implies some action on the King's part, by saying that Strafford himself acquitted the King of his death. (51) It does appear that there is some glossing over situations where Charles I could have been criticized, Strafford's fate being only one of these. There seems to be a similar case, when earlier in the *Memoires*, Warwick discusses the events leading to the dissolution of Parliament on June 15, 1626. At this time, the intended impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham, along with other grievances brought about Charles's resolve to dismiss Parliament. Warwick's story concerning this begins with James's favourite's 'great ascendancy' (52) over his new master after James's death. Here Warwick acknowledges Buckingham's faults, in the excesses of favours and fortune which he accumulated for himself and his family under Charles's graciousness to him. This allowed Buckingham to rise too quickly. Warwick recognizes the result, in the jealousy felt by the ancient nobility of both England and Scotland against the Duke, now Charles's favourite. He says that this discontent spilled over and fed 'the peccant humours of [both] the City and the Country', (53) and the resulting displeasure the favourite incurred soon lessened the duty and reverence which were the King's due. (54) Warwick has by implication blamed Charles for what he

45 *ibid.*

46 *ibid.*

47 *ibid.*, p. 141.

48 *ibid.*

49 *ibid.*, pp. 157-159. In the work, Warwick does mention that he was one of the fifty-six who voted against the Bill. *ibid.*, p. 161.

50 *ibid.*, p. 163.

51 *ibid.*, p. 162.

52 *ibid.*, p. 19.

53 *ibid.*, p. 5.

54 *ibid.*

speaks of as ‘the sour humour of the nation’,⁽⁵⁵⁾ at the time when the young Prince took the throne. Yet he says that Charles was ‘a most excellent Prince in himself, and in his disposition’.⁽⁵⁶⁾ Of the incident in which the Earl of Bristol, (the former Ambassador to Spain), and the Duke of Buckingham charged each other with treason, only the fact of it occurring is reported. That is, unlike other Royalist writers, Warwick does not provide any details which would allow the reader to even consider Charles’s culpability in the matter. This stands in contrast to Peter Heylyn’s account of the Spanish venture. Heylyn provides the background to the treason charge against Bristol, wherein Charles’s proxy to the Infanta was given to the Earl, but with a request to hold it until Charles was safely out of the country.⁽⁵⁷⁾ But whereas Heylyn exonerates Charles, Warwick does not even mention what appears to have been a well-known story at the time. Of the war with Spain, Warwick blames Buckingham, saying that he was ‘too great an enterpriser to succeed in what he unadvisedly undertook’.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Further, he ran the young King into a war he knew the Crown’s treasure could not cover.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Charles, needing money called Parliament, but when he dissolved it to save the Duke, he left ‘affairs in disorder and persons in passion’.⁽⁶⁰⁾ After the Duke’s murder, Warwick says that it could be expected that the next session of Parliament would have found those jealousies which so prejudiced Charles’s honour to be dead. But Tonnage and Poundage proved a stumbling block to good relations between the King and Parliament. The Parliament he says aimed ‘more at mastery [of] than accommodation [with the King]’.⁽⁶¹⁾ This situation Warwick says ‘bred a very inward dislike in him [the King], towards Parliaments’,⁽⁶²⁾ and the third Parliament of Charles’s reign was then dissolved.⁽⁶³⁾ Warwick is most understanding of Charles’s needs to raise funds by whatever means were available to him, after Parliament denied him. He excuses Knighthood fines as an ancient and legal right, though he does note that other less warrantable projects did creep in.⁽⁶⁴⁾ Ship-

⁵⁵ *ibid.*, p. 6.

⁵⁶ *ibid.*, p. 7.

⁵⁷ Heylyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.

⁵⁸ Warwick, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

⁵⁹ *ibid.*

⁶⁰ *ibid.* p. 19.

⁶¹ *ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

⁶² *ibid.*, p. 44.

⁶³ This was the occasion on which the Speaker was held down in his chair until the votes were taken against certain religious measures, and those concerning Tonnage and Poundage being Parliament’s prerogative. *ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

⁶⁴ *ibid.*, p. 49.

money is discussed briefly. The reasonableness of this demand is acknowledged; he says that the danger of invasion extended over all the land, not just to the maritime counties. (65) When this measure was contested, Warwick tells his readers that Charles gave ‘as uninterrupted and free course and trial of law, as ever was betwixt man and man’. (66) Further he says the King kept the money so raised apart from his own Exchequer, and added to it from his own treasure. (67) Warwick supported the Star-Chamber, referring to it as ‘that most wholesome court’. (68) He saw it as existing to prevent ‘immoderate might and power in great men, and disorders of multitudes in the populacy’. (69) Likewise, the High Commission is accepted as necessary to obviate the Recusants whose actions he said, ‘threatened the peace and sovereignty of the Crown’. (70) So in the area of government, the King’s actions were justified, as were the means by which Charles supported his prerogative. Apart from some disputes between the King and Parliament, Warwick presents a most favourable picture of England, which Charles I ruled before the Civil War. He says that no nation in the world enjoyed more peace and plenty, that justice prevailed with learned and upright judges, and with very low taxes compared with neighbouring countries. (71) The King himself was the ‘happy instrument’ (72) who allowed his subjects such enjoyment in their lives. Yet says Warwick, Charles lacked the ‘rigid policies that are necessary for a good Prince towards contumacious and innovating spirits’. (73) A Prince he says, must sometimes depart from his own good nature in order to curb those who are ‘determined to wound the Kingly government’. (74) Thus we have the ‘good’ king wishing only to protect his rightful authority, but whose own good nature prevented him from acting against those who would harm the Monarchy. According to Warwick, Charles never intended any absolute or arbitrary power ‘separate from the laws in being’. (75) But he did allow some political ineptitude in the King’s actions, particularly in regard to the Scots. He says ‘the good King was not

65 *ibid.*, p. 52.

66 *ibid.*

67 *ibid.*, p. 53.

68 *ibid.*, p. 57.

69 *ibid.*

70 *ibid.*

71 *ibid.*, p. 62.

72 *ibid.*, p. 46.

73 *ibid.*

74 *ibid.*

75 *ibid.*, p. 48.

sufficiently resolute to [the] hazard of the Scots going to war against him. (76) In his discussion of the Scottish troubles, Warwick, like L'Estrange, notes that Charles's difficulties arose in his father's time, (77) and he recognizes the Scottish fear of Popery existing when Charles went to Scotland. (78) In his discussion of the events leading to the Scottish war, Warwick's work lacks the detail on religious reforms which so concerned the Anglican churchmen L'Estrange and Heylyn. Though like these two writers, he makes his dislike of the Scots clear to the reader, speaking of the 'falsity and impudence' (79) of their actions, and their deceit and treachery in undermining the King's position. (80) Warwick's is the now recognized Royalist view, of the 'good' King trying by all means possible to allay Scottish fears, and satisfy their grievances, but to no avail. Those Scots who opposed their King, he sees as leaving him as devoid of honour as of power, by the boldness and disloyalty of their demands. (81) But in what is undoubtedly criticism of at least one of the King's choice of men to serve him, Warwick tells the reader that in choosing Hamilton to travel to Scotland to mediate, the King 'sent oil to extinguish flame'. (82) Further he is openly critical of Charles's choice of army commanders in the ensuing war, seeing it as a mistake to appoint the Earl of Holland rather than Essex as General of the Horse. (83) The war itself was the fault of the Scots, who Warwick says raised 'a rebellious army against the Sovereign', (84) so no blame attaches to Charles because it eventuated.

Warwick makes only brief reference to incidents in the war with the Scots. But since he was personally involved with the King during the Civil War, his readers could expect to learn something of Charles I as a leader in war time. In fact there are references to the King in this role, most notably at Edgehill, where Warwick himself, being in the

76 *ibid.*, p. 135.

77 See Chapter 1, pp. 13-14

78 Warwick, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-101.

79 *ibid.*, p. 126.

80 *ibid.*, p. 127.

81 *ibid.*, p. 126.

82 *ibid.*, p. 128. Warwick was personally acquainted with the Marquis and his less than favourable 'character' of him appears pp. 102-3. His suggestion of Hamilton's treachery appears on p. 133.

83 *ibid.*, p. 135.

84 *ibid.*, p. 130.

King's guard 'had the honour of being engaged in the first charge'.⁽⁸⁵⁾ He records that the King himself was 'Generalissimo', and recalls the King giving direct orders regarding the cannon.⁽⁸⁶⁾ He gives a mainly favourable account of most of the battle commanders, except for Wilmot, of whom he says, 'contrary to all discipline of war [he] left the King and his foot so alone, that it gave Essex a title unto victory that day'.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Goring is also criticized. Although Warwick sees him as a good soldier in the Western campaigns, he 'turned wantonness into riot'.⁽⁸⁸⁾ In general, the King is not shown as active in war campaigns, and this may well reflect the reality of the situation, but Warwick's *Memoires* does not reveal the extent of the King's involvement. The retreat from Oxford is presented as being Charles's own decision,⁽⁸⁹⁾ but Warwick is critical of his not accepting Goring's counsel to join forces with him. This action he says, 'might have made one day the decider of the whole controversy'.⁽⁹⁰⁾ He also indicates that he thinks that the battle of Naseby may either have been avoided, or have had a better result had Charles brought Goring into a position where he could support Prince Rupert's troops.⁽⁹¹⁾ Naseby being lost 'the King's whole party fell into convulsive fits.....which were indications of a dying body'.⁽⁹²⁾ Warwick's coverage of the Civil War has not allowed the reader to see Charles I in the role of war leader, except in the choice of men to serve him. Though Warwick praises individual leaders in particular campaigns⁽⁹³⁾ he did not see their efforts as actually serving the King's cause. He says, 'I fear our chief commanders so little loved one another, that they were not fitted for conjunction.'⁽⁹⁴⁾ Since he also refers to confusion on the battlefield⁽⁹⁵⁾ he has drawn the reader's attention to Charles's lack of ability to either inspire or control his commanders. His implicit criticism extends to his relations with those closer to him when he refers to the 'ill

85 *ibid.*, p.231. Warwick speaks of himself as 'the most inconsiderable person there', this referring to the value of the estates of the troops involved in the charge. *ibid.*

86 *ibid.*, p. 229.

87 *ibid.*, p. 230. Warwick's view was that Wilmot was better suited to being a peace umpire 'than a decider of contest by the sword'. *ibid.*

88 *ibid.*, p. 273.

89 *ibid.*, p. 284.

90 *ibid.*, p. 285.

91 *ibid.*, p. 286.

92 *ibid.*, p. 287.

93 Such as General Ruthen, *ibid.*, p. 227, and Prince Rupert, *ibid.*, p.226.

94 *ibid.*, p. 285.

95 Particularly at Naseby, *ibid.*, pp. 286-287.

understanding' ⁽⁹⁶⁾ between Lord Digby and Prince Rupert. But he continues, the King was 'so gracious and just' ⁽⁹⁷⁾ that he excused both of them from any charge of disloyalty. So again the picture of the 'good' King rises above that of the inept.

Since Warwick not only served in the King's army but personally knew some of the officers on the King's side, ⁽⁹⁸⁾ it is disappointing to find that the reader is not given a better chance to see Charles I in his role of war leader. However, the major interest in this work stems from Warwick's personal contact with the King during his imprisonment on the Isle of Wight. Despite their relative stations in life, Charles I at times spoke personally to Warwick, and some, if not all of these conversations are reported in the Memoires. Since there are so very few recorded comments made by this King, it seems appropriate to consider these in quite some detail. Of a more general interest, Warwick provides some background to events which have been the subject of conjecture, such as Ashburnham's part in Charles's flight from Hampton Court, and his subsequent imprisonment in Carisbrooke Castle. ⁽⁹⁹⁾ Charles told Warwick that he did not believe that Ashburnham had been unfaithful to him, but that he lacked courage. ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Warwick recalls that Charles had given his word to Cromwell and his gaoler Colonel Whalley, that he would not escape. But he also notes that a few days before his flight the King discharged himself from this undertaking through Ashburnham, because of his fear for his safety. ⁽¹⁰¹⁾ This story is retold without comment, so it is not possible to see whether Warwick himself may have suspected the King of lack of faith in deciding to retract his promise. He does however note that though Cromwell and his officers showed kindness to Charles, they never gave him any promise of security before witnesses. ⁽¹⁰²⁾ Thus he appears to be exonerating Charles here.

Warwick's next view of the King comes at the time of the subsequent treaty at

⁹⁶ ibid., p. 288.

⁹⁷ ibid., p. 289.

⁹⁸ He mentions some under whom he served such as Captain-Lieutenant Turberville, ibid., p. 291, and others he knew such as Sir Jacob Ashly who fought at Edgehill, ibid., p. 229.

⁹⁹ Clarendon in his history, devotes several pages to the subject of the possible disloyalty to the King by Ashburnham and Sir John Berkeley, Macray ed., op. cit., Vol. IV, pp.266-273.

¹⁰⁰ Warwick, op. cit., p. 306. Warwick thought that this referred to Ashburnham being unwilling to stay with Governor Hammond while Legge returned to the King with a message, ibid.

¹⁰¹ ibid., p. 308.

¹⁰² ibid..

which he names those present including himself. ⁽¹⁰³⁾ He reports that because the King was not allowed contact with his advisers, he had to manage the entire proceedings himself. But Warwick was impressed with Charles's ability to do so, recording that the King was 'very conversant in Divinity, Law and good reason'. ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ He recalls some of the words which Charles spoke to the commissioners at this time. The King reminded them that he had granted most of their propositions, but that they had not been honest with him, for they had not revealed that they had no authority to treat with him. ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Warwick saw this as shrewdness on the King's part, in that he was capable of discerning Parliament's real intentions towards him. He was however still the virtuous king, and Warwick sets down the speech Charles made so that the reader may see the King's 'eminent Christian virtues'. ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ He recalls the King telling him that in earlier negotiation on the matters now discussed in the Isle of Wight treaty, he had been mistaken in seeking advice. Had he consulted no-one else he said, he would have been more positive in not complying with those terms presented to him. He told Warwick that 'with Job, I would willingly have chosen misery [rather] than sin'. ⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Some of Warwick's readers may wonder whether the King was trying to absolve himself from blame. That is, he only accepted the terms because his advisers told him to accept them, but Warwick does not see it this way. He immediately shows his sympathy for the King, relating that Charles was so distressed at the time of these words, that he shed tears, 'the biggest drops that I ever saw fall from an eye'. ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ But the King quickly turned away, being 'loathe to be discerned' ⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ by those in the room. This is an unusually close encounter between Charles I and one who was to write about him. It is unusual in that an historian, particularly a Royalist one, has recorded something pertaining to Charles as a man, rather than in his capacity as King. Warwick again shows Charles I in this unusual light, when he recalls the King pointing out to him 'a little old crumpling man' who had made up his fire for him. He told Warwick, 'I show you him because that was the best companion I had for three months'. ⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Warwick expresses the opinion that Charles's comment

103 *ibid.*, p. 322.

104 *ibid.*, p. 324.

105 *ibid.*

106 *ibid.*, p. 326.

107 *ibid.*

108 *ibid.*

109 *ibid.*

110 *ibid.*, p. 329.

showed ‘the King’s disteem of the common Court-vice’.⁽¹¹¹⁾ However the telling of this incident follows closely on Charles’s complaints to Warwick that he was not offered good wine while in captivity, nor linen for his needs.⁽¹¹²⁾ It is possible then to construe the King’s pointing out of the fire-setter as being his best companion, as an example of being denied what Charles saw as company more suited to his station. Warwick here takes the charitable view. However the King’s meaning does seem to be clearer in regard to the conversation he had with Warwick concerning his dog Gipsy, a greyhound. Warwick reports that he said to Charles, ‘Sir, I perceive that you love a greyhound better than a spaniel’. The King replied, ‘Yes for they equally love their masters, yet do not flatter them so much’.⁽¹¹³⁾ Warwick informs his readers that he set down these conversations, so that it will be seen that Charles was ‘a Prince of those eminent virtues which usually gain not a king renown’.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ Should Warwick’s readers still doubt it, this comment clearly indicates that he was devoted to Charles I. This view is reinforced by his words that when he thinks of dying, it is one of his comforts that in the next life ‘he would meet King Charles and all those faithful spirits, that had virtue enough to be true to him, the Church and the Laws unto the last’.⁽¹¹⁵⁾

Warwick took leave of the King to look after his personal business at the time Charles was seized by Rolph and removed to Hurst castle, of which he says ‘I repented heartily since’.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ Nevertheless although he did not witness the most dramatic events in Charles’s life, that is his trial and execution, Warwick does present aspects of these in quite a vivid way, with his references to Charles’s accusers clearly reflecting his position on this. Charles’s accusers were vile men and the President insolent, with solicitor Cook, ‘babbling and brazen-faced’,⁽¹¹⁷⁾ and those who actually passed sentence on him were ‘nefarious men who thirsted after the King’s blood’.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Charles he said, smiled at the foul appellations heaped on him, and disowned the authority of the commission which tried him.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ Warwick repeats Heylyn’s story of the soldier spitting in the King’s face,

111 *ibid.*

112 *ibid.*

113 *ibid.*, pp. 328-329.

114 *ibid.*, p. 329.

115 *ibid.*, p. 331.

116 *ibid.*, p. 333.

117 *ibid.*, p. 337.

118 *ibid.*

119 *ibid.*

(120) and adds more details to the scene, which heightens the atmosphere. (121) The King's deportment was 'very majestic and steady', (122) despite being reviled by some of the army. Bishop Juxon who attended Charles just prior to the execution, reported that the King was never discomposed in his mind, and that his stammer left him in his last few days. (123) Charles himself was cheerful according to Juxon, and spoke of forgiveness to those who were about to take his life. (124) Warwick was especially pleased that the King spoke of him to Juxon, as 'a useful and honest man unto me', (125) and he reports this in his Memoires with obvious pride. He also reports some of the circumstances of Charles's last days, such as sleeping soundly on the night before the execution. (126) On the day of it, when Mr. Herbert who combed his hair for him took less care than usual, Charles requested that he took pains with it, for he said, 'I am to be a Bridegroom to-day and must be trim'. (127) Warwick reports that on the morning of the execution Juxon had to persuade the King to eat, lest he should faint on the scaffold, which would please his murderers. The King ate half a piece of bread and drank a glass of wine. (128) He was allowed a brief time for his devotions but was disturbed by some 'bold-faced ministers who sought to pray with him'. (129) Juxon reported the King's comments on this to Warwick, wherein Charles told him to tell them that they may pray for him, but never with him. (130) Warwick, by including these snippets of conversation which the King held with those around him in the last hours, does bring the scene very much alive. He relates part of Charles's speech which referred to free people, who were so, not by being sharers in the government, 'but by the due administration of the laws of it'. (131) He then reports that the King showed considerable interest in the engines which his executioners had made to put him down violently should he not submit willingly. But Charles, he says smiled as if to show the world the barbarity of his enemies' natures, and

120 ibid., p. 339.

121 He reports 'the rabble cried out for justice', and the comment of one honest soldier who said 'God bless you Sir' and his captain caned him, ibid.

122 ibid.

123 ibid.

124 ibid.

125 ibid., p. 341.

126 ibid., pp. 342-343.

127 ibid., p. 342.

128 ibid., p. 344.

129 ibid., p. 345.

130 ibid., p. 343.

131 ibid., p. 345.

the equanimity of his own. ⁽¹³²⁾ The King then ‘laid down his head, stretched out his hands, as the sign, and the executioner let drop the hatchet which severed it from his body’. ⁽¹³³⁾ Warwick is the only Royalist writer in this survey to actually describe this last scene, the most dramatic event in Charles I’s reign, even though he did not personally witness it. Yet the scene is quite vividly portrayed. We are indebted to Bishop Juxon for relating the circumstances of Charles’s last hours to Warwick. But something of the apparently genuine respect which Warwick felt for the King carries over to his description of these dramatic days.

Much of the Memoires is written in similar vein to that of other Royalist writers. Descriptions are often vague on particular events, with details not given on subjects in which the King is a major player. However, from the time when Warwick became one of Charles’s penmen on the Isle of Wight he seems to have developed a personal affection for the King. Though long being a Royalist and a Monarchist, he is prone to put the most favourable interpretation on Charles’s words. Further, because of his relatively lowly station, he may well have been flattered to find himself the King’s confidant. Nevertheless at this juncture, the reader comes close to seeing Charles I the man, as opposed to Charles I in his kingly role. By describing the scenes in which the King himself speaks, Warwick has focussed attention on the person. Because the conversation at times deals with matters of relative unimportance, the scale of events is reduced, and the King inevitably is then seen in a different light. In his last hours, the details of what he ate and how he slept ⁽¹³⁴⁾ bring the Monarch to the level of everyman. This personal view stands in contrast to Warwick’s short ‘character’ of Charles at the close of the work, wherein he speaks of ‘Providence making him glorious, great and good minds honouring him, and the ignorant not discerning him’. ⁽¹³⁵⁾ These abstract words destroy the earlier mood which allowed the reader a more intimate view of Charles I. Yet we are indebted to Warwick for the personal details he does include in his Memoires. Nevertheless, despite this brief personal glimpse of the king, Warwick too has presented a model of the ‘good’ prince in the Royalist mode which follows the traditional princely literature pattern.

132 *ibid.*

133 *ibid.*, pp. 345-346.

134 *ibid.*, pp. 341-344.

135 *ibid.*, p. 347.

Chapter 3.

Contemporary Anti- Monarchist Writers on Charles I.

The Royalist works in my survey have all followed the same pattern of the ‘good’ prince found in traditional princely literature. Anti-Monarchic writers followed the same pattern as their Royalist counterparts, but found that Charles’s personal qualities were the antithesis of those which Royalists bestowed on him. The work of the author William Lilly is somewhat more difficult to classify than other works presented in this chapter. It must however be seen as Anti-Monarchical in regard to the King’s policies, despite offering some favourable comment on Charles’s personal abilities. Lilly’s tract Several Observations on the Life and Death of Charles, Late King of England ⁽¹⁾ was published in 1651. The reference in the title to the ‘late’ king indicates that the work was written after Charles’s death. Lilly was two years younger than Charles I being born in 1602, in Leicestershire. ⁽²⁾ He was an astrologer of note during the King’s reign, and had some contact with Charles I through predictions he made for him. His most famous work is called The Starry Messenger ⁽³⁾ which is concerned with astrology, but he was also interested in political affairs. Some of the political sentiments expressed in his writings brought him into conflict with the authorities, and he seems to have particularly displeased the Presbyterians in Parliament. He was imprisoned briefly (for thirteen days) in 1653, but was rescued by his Parliamentary friends who had become clients in his successful astrology practice. (These friends included Denzil Hollis and Bulstrode Whitelocke). ⁽⁴⁾ In his earlier years, Lilly described himself as more Cavalier than Roundhead, but from 1645 he turned more towards Parliament’s cause, though he still retained some affection for Charles I and for the Monarchy. ⁽⁵⁾ He attended the King’s trial with Hugh Peters, (later executed as a regicide for his sermons and pamphlets supporting Charles’s execution). ⁽⁶⁾ Lilly reports that at his trial the King spoke

¹ This has been taken from a reprint titled Several Tracts Relating to the Civil Wars in England in the Reign of Charles the First, R. Wild, London, 1815.

² R. Parker, Familiar to All, William Lilly and Astrology, Jonathan Cape, London, 1975, p. 16.

³ W. Lilly, The Starry Messenger, London, 1645.

⁴ Parker, op. cit., p. 87.

⁵ K. Briggs, ed., The Last of the Astrologers, Mr. William Lilly’s History of his Life and Times from the Year 1602 to 1681, The Folklore Society, London, 1974, p. 57.

⁶ ibid., p. 58.

‘excellently well.....without impediment [in his speech]’.⁽⁷⁾ Lilly appears to have been shocked by the King’s execution, and quickly became disillusioned with the new government’s lack of reform which it had promised. By 1652 he was of the view that Parliament was growing ‘odious to all good men’,⁽⁸⁾ with justice being neglected because of the quarrels between the Presbyterians and the Independents. It was now controlled he said by ‘a rabble of dunces’.⁽⁹⁾ Lilly made his peace with Charles II after he had suffered financial loss at the Restoration when his Fee-Farm rents were seized, and he was twice taken into custody and imprisoned for his suspected knowledge of the identity of the executioner of Charles I.⁽¹⁰⁾ In his last years, Lilly’s interest in political affairs and astrology waned, and he took up the practice of ‘Physick’. He died at Hersham in 1681.⁽¹¹⁾ Lilly then was a man of experience of first Monarchy, then the Commonwealth, and finally Monarchy again. However when the work discussed here was written around 1651, (only its publishing date is known), the Commonwealth had just replaced the King’s rule. Lilly appears to have had some contact with Charles I claiming to have made predictions for the King. He says that in 1647 he advised Charles that he should escape from Hampton Court, he would be safe in Essex, at a spot about twenty miles from London.⁽¹²⁾ Charles not heeding this advice went to the Isle of Wight where he was taken prisoner. It seems unlikely however that Lilly ever dealt with the King on a personal basis, and no actual conversation or correspondence between him and Charles I is reported in Lilly’s autobiography, in which his friendships with well-known figures of the time are a prominent feature. Nevertheless, he was at the fringe of the political scene in the turbulent years of Charles I’s reign, and reference to his predictions for the King, indicate his interest in the King himself. In the work discussed here, he notes that he was a witness to the events he describes.⁽¹³⁾ But much of its interest here lies in the fact that Lilly’s work is neither a wholehearted endorsement of Charles I as in Royalist writings, nor a vilification, which is the main feature of those writers who were on the opposing side in the Civil War. It does however have more in

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 62.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 64.

⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰ This he did not reveal, but he says in his autobiography that it was Lieutenant-Colonel Joyce, *ibid.*, pp. 84-85.

¹¹ *ibid.*, pp. 101-103.

¹² *ibid.*, p. 57.

¹³ W. Lilly, Several Observations on the Life and Death of Charles, Late King of England, p. 130.

common with Anti-monarchist works than with Royalist writings.

Lilly begins his writing on Charles I by saying that several ‘characters’ have already been written on the King. Some he says, ‘do too much magnify him, while others as much vilify him’.⁽¹⁴⁾ The assumption which the reader would make then, is that Lilly will not follow either path. Indeed his overall portrait of Charles I while not a favourable one, does mention the King’s abilities. But the main theme in this work is that Charles I is a man not to be trusted. Lilly begins by saying that Charles was noted to be very wilful and obstinate by his mother, and others around him,⁽¹⁵⁾ and that the Queen herself thought him a ‘dissembler’.⁽¹⁶⁾ Later in the work, he says that it was ‘a most difficult thing to hold him close to his promise or word; he was apt to recede unless something therein appeared compliable either to his own will, profit or judgement’.⁽¹⁷⁾ Further, foreigners did not like him, not the Spaniards, the French or Germans, nor the Danes, Swedes, Hollanders or the Turks.⁽¹⁸⁾ He was held in low esteem by both friends and enemies alike, and was very covetous and sparing with his treasure, a feature of character ‘not commendable in a King’.⁽¹⁹⁾ Further, he rewarded the impudent and the bold, but slighted the virtuous.⁽²⁰⁾ He did not care for his people seeing them as only there to serve him, and he showed no sorrow at their slaughter in war.⁽²¹⁾ Lilly saw Charles himself as responsible for the losses at Rochelle, saying that he did not send the ships when needed.⁽²²⁾ He refers to Charles’s affection for Buckingham but touches on this only briefly.⁽²³⁾ He is more forthcoming in regard to the King’s relationship with the clergy, saying that he had a great love for them, and as a result they grew insolent. Yet he thought that Charles advanced them for his own purpose, rather than to propagate the Gospel.⁽²⁴⁾ Lilly does not support his comments and opinions with any evidence, he simply makes a statement and it stands without explanation. But although he is critical of

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 137.

¹⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶ *ibid.*, p. 139.

¹⁷ *ibid.*, p. 143.

¹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 178.

¹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 141.

²⁰ *ibid.*, pp. 141-142.

²¹ *ibid.*, p. 144.

²² *ibid.*, p. 151.

²³ *ibid.*

²⁴ *ibid.*, p. 140.

Charles I, the King had some personal qualities Lilly did praise. He said that Charles was an excellent horseman, and could shoot well. He was good at Mathematics and Music, and well read in Divinity and History. He also knew the laws and statutes of the Nation, had a quick and sharp conception, and could write his mind singularly well in good language and style. ⁽²⁵⁾ He says that at times Charles spoke freely, but at other times he stuttered and could hardly get a word out. However at his coming before the High Court of Justice, the first occasion on which Lilly says he heard him speak, Charles ‘stammered nothing at all’, ⁽²⁶⁾ but spoke very distinctly with much courage and magnanimity. He was never obscene in his speech, ⁽²⁷⁾ was sober in appearance and temperate in his diet, ⁽²⁸⁾ and could be a good friend. ⁽²⁹⁾ He rarely frequented illicit beds, and Lilly says that he had not heard of more than one or two natural children that were his. ⁽³⁰⁾ (This remark is surprising, since other writers speak of Charles’s faithfulness to Henrietta Maria, though it is possible that Lilly was referring to associations Charles had before his marriage.) For Lilly then Charles had some redeeming features. His overall opinion of Charles I is best summed up in his own words in the work itself. He says ‘in general, he was not vicious; and yet whoever shall say he was virtuous extremely errs; he was a medley betwixt virtue and vice’. ⁽³¹⁾ Yet on later reflection Lilly thought that Parliament ‘did no other thing but justice in cutting off the King’s head, ⁽³²⁾ thus implying that he thought him a tyrant. However, when writing his auto-biography several years later (1668), Lilly says that at the time of the King’s execution, he doubted that Parliament would be able to find any Englishman so barbarous that he would personally put the King to death. ⁽³³⁾ This is probably the result of Lilly’s own disappointment with the new government, of which in 1652 he said, the members had become ‘insufferable in their pride, covetousness, self-ends, laziness, minding nothing but how to enrich themselves’. ⁽³⁴⁾ By this time his disenchantment was such that he commented, ‘my soul began to loath the very name of Parliament, or

²⁵ *ibid.*, p. 138.

²⁶ *ibid.*, p. 141.

²⁷ *ibid.*, p. 142.

²⁸ *ibid.*, p. 145.

²⁹ *ibid.*, p. 139.

³⁰ *ibid.*, p. 142.

³¹ *ibid.*, p. 145.

³² *ibid.*, p. 182.

³³ Briggs (ed.), *op. cit.*, p.62.

³⁴ *ibid.*, p. 64.

Parliament men'.⁽³⁵⁾

The rest of Lilly's Observations refers to events in Charles's reign, but little detail regarding the King himself is given. The journey to Spain to woo the Infanta is mentioned, but without comment on Charles's part here. He refers to James's death, and his comment here is interesting, though because no evidence is presented it lacks credibility. Lilly may perhaps been repeating a rumour. He says that James was poisoned by a plaster applied to his stomach by the Duke of Buckingham's mother, and that both Buckingham and Charles may have known of it.⁽³⁶⁾ Like L'Estrange and Heylyn, he refers to Charles's coronation, but whereas they both refute the story,⁽³⁷⁾ Lilly says that Laud did alter the coronation oath.⁽³⁸⁾ He refers to Buckingham's death reporting that Charles did not seem troubled by it.⁽³⁹⁾ The disturbances in Scotland are mentioned, but without any reference to the situations pertaining to religion or the existing social scene which Charles ostensibly upset by his attempted reforms. Lilly says only that there were some disturbances in Scotland after the introduction of the new service book, and that he heard that an old woman began the quarrel by casting her stool at the priest who read from the book.⁽⁴⁰⁾ The tumults in London are mentioned, but here Lilly says that no incivility was offered to his Majesty so whoever reported it in The King's Book was a liar, nor was the King's life ever in danger.⁽⁴¹⁾ Lilly was not of the opinion that Charles himself was the author of the work. He says that Dr. Gauden wrote it, and that it was delivered into the King's hands while he was on the Isle of Wight.⁽⁴²⁾ But again he provides no evidence for this contention. Macgillivray speaks of Lilly's work as 'primitive history'.⁽⁴³⁾ While I am not sure what he means by this, I do realize that Lilly makes no attempt to understand events or Charles's place in these. He provides no examples to support any claims he makes about the King's character, and at times seems to be simply repeating current rumours. Nevertheless, as a contemporary of Charles I who was close to the political scene, Lilly gives some insight into what he understands of

35 ibid.

36 Lilly, op. cit., p. 148.

37 See Chapter I, p. 11, p.22.

38 Lilly, loc. cit.

39 ibid., p. 152.

40 ibid., p. 156.

41 ibid., p. 172.

42 ibid., p. 143.

43 Macgillivray, op. cit., p. 16.

the circumstances of his time, but his picture of Charles I is little more revealing as to his character than that of his contemporaries, despite his recognition of some of the King's abilities. Lilly had the same model in mind as his contemporaries, in that those of Charles's personal qualities which he does discuss, are those which are associated with the 'good' prince. He sees the King as dishonourable in that he did not keep his word, nor did he rule for the benefit of his people. His affection for the Church was not due to piety but designed to support his own prerogative. Further Lilly considers that Parliament was justified in executing him. So we can see that Lilly does follow the Anti-Monarchical pattern, despite his work lacking the vilification of the King which is the most prominent feature of other Anti-Royalist writers.

Indeed it could be said that the vilification of both Charles I and his father, was the main aim of the next writer whose work is presented here. Anthony Weldon's work The Court and Character of King James, Whereunto is Added the Court of Charles I Continued unto the Beginning of these Unhappy Times,⁽⁴⁴⁾ was published in 1651, after the author had died (probably in 1649).⁽⁴⁵⁾ His father, Sir Ralph Weldon, knighted in 1603, was Clerk of the Green Cloth to Queen Elizabeth and James I, and his uncle Clerk of the Kitchen. He succeeded both of them in these offices on their resignations in 1604 and 1609 respectively, and was himself knighted in 1617.⁽⁴⁶⁾ He accompanied James I to Scotland in the same year, but was reportedly dismissed from his post at Court, in consequence of the discovery of his authorship of a libel against the Scottish nation.⁽⁴⁷⁾ However he still kept friends at Court, as letters to Secretary Windebank written in 1624 indicate. Other letters however including a scheme for better assessment of ship money, and a complaint against the gun-powder monopoly, show signs of hostility to the government of Charles I.⁽⁴⁸⁾ During the Civil War, Weldon energetically supported the authority of Parliament during the insurrections which took place in his home county of Kent, in 1643 and 1648. He was rewarded for his faithful service to Parliament in 1648, with a grant of five hundred pounds.⁽⁴⁹⁾ Two of his sons

44 A. Weldon, The Court and Character of King James, Whereunto is Added the Court of Charles I, Continued unto the Beginning of these Unhappy Times, London, 1651.

45 C. H. Firth, D.N.B. Vol XX, p. 1073.

46 ibid.

47 ibid.

48 ibid.

49 ibid.

Ralph and Anthony served in Waller's army, and the former also served under Fairfax in the New Model Army. ⁽⁵⁰⁾ From these comments on Weldon's life and family, the reader of his work on James I and Charles I would not expect to find many, if any expressions of affection for either king. Indeed the work is described by Firth as 'a collection of scandalous gossip about the two kings and their ministers and favourites'. ⁽⁵¹⁾ The first part of the work which is concerned with James's reign, is both more detailed and interesting than the second part on Charles I. It also conveys the feeling that the author was closer to the events described. However the concern here must be with what Weldon has to say about the son, not the father. The introduction to the work states that the discourse 'is by the author's own observation, who was either an eye or an ear witness, or from such as were actors in them [the events], from their own relation'. ⁽⁵²⁾ This claim suggests that the reader can believe what is written in the work, and Weldon reinforces the view that this will be so, with the words that it 'treads too near the heels of truth and these times to appear in public'. ⁽⁵³⁾ Who brought the work forward for publication after Weldon's death is not known. However his comments about the truths in the work being unsuited to publication appear to be more applicable to the earlier part of the work on James's Court, than on what Weldon reveals about Charles I. The second part of the work on Charles I is relatively short, and begins with the proclamation of his Kingship and ends with Strafford's death. Reflecting what was reportedly the reality of Charles's early rule, Weldon makes much of the Duke of Buckingham's influence on the young King. Buckingham is portrayed as dominating Charles, both personally and in foreign affairs. The inheritance by Charles of his father's favourite was according to Weldon, 'the worst omen of all [for the kingdom]'. ⁽⁵⁴⁾ The Duke reigned 'like an impetuous storm, bearing down on all before him who stood in his way, ⁽⁵⁵⁾ with his unbridled ambition being the cause of the various disasters associated with the Continental wars. His murder Weldon says was 'just judgement'. ⁽⁵⁶⁾ Not only was he insolent, but his counsels were stupid. ⁽⁵⁷⁾ Strafford on the other hand is pronounced an

50 *ibid.*

51 *ibid.*, p. 1074.

52 Weldon, *op. cit.*, Epistle Dedicatory.

53 *ibid.*

54 *ibid.*, p. 177.

55 *ibid.*, p. 199.

56 *ibid.*

57 *ibid.*, p. 188.

able minister, but is castigated for making Charles I 'an absolute arbitrary monarch'.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Charles himself is portrayed as a person who is most difficult to like. Weldon's 'character' as given in the second part of the work, presents him as an ill-natured person, both in childhood and as an adult. These two statements will illustrate the point: Weldon says that in his infancy, Charles was 'so subject to that wilful humour [which later was] still possessing him'.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Further, he 'ever expressed an ill-nature by taking delight to do ill offices to his father's servants, as well as his own'.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Weldon gives the example of the young Charles causing both his tutor, and his religious adviser to lose their positions by bringing them into disgrace by his own 'perfidious disposition'.⁽⁶¹⁾ He remarks on Charles untrustworthy nature in the business of Rochelle, wherein he says Charles 'gave fair promises which he betrayed'.⁽⁶²⁾ His actions in this respect, if performed by one of his subjects would 'have been called treachery'.⁽⁶³⁾ The wars themselves and the conduct of them however are blamed on Buckingham. His hatred of Spain brought about this war, and in the war with France, England lost all the honour the nation ever had.⁽⁶⁴⁾ Charles is seen as having a poor and ignoble spirit, otherwise he would never have suffered Buckingham's insufferable insolence.⁽⁶⁵⁾ Further he said 'Amen', to every point of accusation made by the Duke in Parliament against the Earl of Bristol, for what occurred in Spain in regard to the Infanta. Buckingham's claims against Bristol according to Weldon had no truth in them.⁽⁶⁶⁾ With Buckingham later unpopular with Parliament, Charles dissolved it to protect his favourite. According to Weldon, Charles never understood Parliament, nor treated the members fairly. They were 'more loving than a wife [to him]',⁽⁶⁷⁾ and all they wished in return, was the enacting of good laws. But the King repaid them by breaking their privileges. This naturally bred ill-will in them towards their Sovereign, and in him to them, such as produced 'an epidemical infection'.⁽⁶⁸⁾ Weldon touches on the ways Charles used to raise money after Parliament denied

58 *ibid.*, p. 211.

59 *ibid.*, p. 215.

60 *ibid.*, p. 217.

61 *ibid.*, p. 218.

62 *ibid.*, p. 219.

63 *ibid.*

64 *ibid.*, pp. 181-183.

65 *ibid.*, p. 221.

66 *ibid.*, p. 220.

67 *ibid.*, p. 179.

68 *ibid.*

him, ⁽⁶⁹⁾ and notes that the king was so frustrated by the situation that he made a vow never to call Parliament again. ⁽⁷⁰⁾ Charles's ministers are blamed for the unhappy state of the country, Noy for sweeping away all the subjects' privileges, ⁽⁷¹⁾ and Weston for impoverishing them in 'illegal ways'. ⁽⁷²⁾ After Buckingham's murder, Weldon thought that the nation would fare better, but whereas Charles was earlier ruled by one, now many tyrants appeared: only the former favourite's power had restrained them. ⁽⁷³⁾ The Star Chamber and the High Commission became 'scourges and torturers by imprisonments and mutilations'. ⁽⁷⁴⁾ They were bodies of tyranny with the judges their slaves. ⁽⁷⁵⁾ The Clergy is also castigated. They preached away the subjects' liberties. Thus between the law and the gospel, the people were 'ejected out of [their] lands, liberties and lives at pleasure'. ⁽⁷⁶⁾ The state of the nation as portrayed by Weldon, was not the happy, prosperous one the Royalists painted. His view of the country is one of suffering under the various abuses of power, which Charles allowed by not curbing his ministers' tyrannical actions. The King's own character as Weldon saw it, is best summed up by his words, 'he seldom loved any but would serve his turn, and would himself serve a turn to do any mischief'. ⁽⁷⁷⁾ He allows no compensating abilities in his picture of the King. At the time of his writing, it seems that the Civil War had begun. He says that it was God's justice, that what Charles had meted out to others, in the unwarrantable wars forced on him by the appetite of his favourite, was now being repaid 'even fuller, pressed down and running over'. ⁽⁷⁸⁾ That he knew the King's rule, if not his life to be under threat, is shown by the words that he reports Charles's mother said. She, who Weldon says loved her son dearly, said 'he was a fool and wilful, which would hereafter endanger him the loss of his crown'. ⁽⁷⁹⁾ This sad censure of the King Weldon says, seemed 'prophetical'. ⁽⁸⁰⁾

⁶⁹ Impositions on tobacco, and other duties, and various patents, *ibid.*, p. 197.

⁷⁰ *ibid.*, p. 194.

⁷¹ *ibid.*

⁷² *ibid.*, p. 196.

⁷³ *ibid.*, p. 201.

⁷⁴ *ibid.*, p. 203.

⁷⁵ *ibid.*, p. 205.

⁷⁶ *ibid.*, p. 208.

⁷⁷ *ibid.*, p. 210.

⁷⁸ *ibid.*, p. 222.

⁷⁹ *ibid.*, p. 216.

⁸⁰ *ibid.*, p. 217.

Why Weldon wrote this work is not apparent from the work itself, though he does say to Elizabeth Sedley to whom the work was dedicated, ⁽⁸¹⁾ that it was written in a ‘melancholy humour’ ⁽⁸²⁾ ‘for the perusal of herself only, and some good friends’. ⁽⁸³⁾ Whether the work was written from observation of both kings cannot be judged from its contents. Weldon knew James I well, and it can be expected that he knew Charles also. In his picture of Charles I he presents only those characteristics which reflect unfavourably on his character. That is for Weldon Charles has no redeeming features. As a ruler, we see only a weak man, in his early years dominated by his favourite, Buckingham, and after the Duke’s death, unable or unwilling to interfere to stop the oppression of his subjects by his ministers. Weldon does support some of his claims about Charles’s nature by providing illustrations, but offers no real evidence. Thus the reader cannot judge how accurate Weldon’s portrait of Charles is. What is interesting is the degree to which he, like the Royalists, has used the model of the ‘good’ prince by which to judge Charles I. However, his model presents the tyrant ruling oppressively over an unhappy kingdom, the opposite of the portrait of the ‘good’ prince, which is typical of Royalist writings.

Nor do we find any aspect of the ‘good’ prince in the work of the next writer, Edward Peyton (1588?-1657). Peyton took Parliament’s side both before and during the Civil War. He was born in Isleham in Cambridgeshire, and educated at Bury school and Cambridge. He was knighted in 1611 and admitted to Gray’s Inn in the same year. ⁽⁸⁴⁾ In 1621, he was elected M.P. for Cambridgeshire, and he sat for this constituency until the dissolution of the second Parliament in Charles’s reign (1626). Around 1627, he was deprived of the office of Custos Rotulorum for the county of Cambridgeshire, by the Duke of Buckingham, this despite the office being held under the Broad Seal. ⁽⁸⁵⁾ The reason for his removal is reported to be his ‘intemperate displays of Puritan zeal’.⁽⁸⁶⁾ Peyton himself refers to the incident in the work to be discussed here, The Divine

⁸¹ From whom it was reportedly stolen. D. N. Smith, Characters of the Seventeenth Century, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1929, p. 260.

⁸² Weldon, op. cit., Epistle Dedicatory.

⁸³ ibid.

⁸⁴ Lee, op. cit., Vol. XV, p1020.

⁸⁵ ibid.

⁸⁶ ibid.

Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts,⁽⁸⁷⁾ but though his indignation is quite apparent,⁽⁸⁸⁾ he does not offer any explanation. However from the time of this incident Peyton's opposition to Charles I, his Court, and the established Church became obvious. He is reported to have been a man of violent temper, and was summoned before the Star Chamber in 1632, on the charge of waylaying his neighbours and provoking a fight.⁽⁸⁹⁾ Not surprisingly Peyton attacks this institution in his work.⁽⁹⁰⁾ In 1643, his name was placed on a list of names of those whom the King proposed to impeach. This followed his active role on Parliament's side, in the war of pamphlets during the years 1641-2, which preceded the final breach between the King and Parliament. His contribution to this war of words included the work, The King's Violation of the Rights of Parliament published in 1641.⁽⁹¹⁾ When the Civil War broke out, Peyton took up arms against the King, and claims to have fought at the battles of Edgehill, Newbury and Naseby.⁽⁹²⁾ Parliament however did not reward his services on its behalf. He was forced to compound for part of his estate in 1651, most likely because his son Thomas who controlled much of the property had fought on the King's side.⁽⁹³⁾ His daughter Amy married Henry Lawrence, President of Cromwell's Council of State. Nevertheless, as he complains in The Divine Catastrophe, Cromwell never restored to him, property which was confiscated by the Royalist army, and later recovered by Cromwell himself.⁽⁹⁴⁾ It is likely that Peyton's work, The Divine Catastrophe was intended as a propitiatory offering to the rulers of the day. The reasons for seeing the work in this light, are firstly, that Peyton apparently hated the Stuart family, and relished the opportunity to castigate them publicly. Secondly, he appears to have thought that the sentiments expressed in the work in regard to the notion of God's support for the present government would be likely to gain him personal favour with its members.

Peyton's work, The Divine Catastrophe has two basic but connected themes. The main theme is the justification for the execution of Charles I. This Peyton sees as divine

⁸⁷ E Peyton, 'The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts, or a Short History of the Rise, Reign and Ruin Thereof', in Sir Walter Scott ed., The Secret History of the Court of James I, J Ballantyne, Edinburgh, 1811.

⁸⁸ ibid., p. 441.

⁸⁹ Lee, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 1020.

⁹⁰ E. Peyton, p. 316.

⁹¹ Lee, loc.cit.

⁹² ibid. Vol. XV, p. 1021.

⁹³ ibid. .

⁹⁴ Peyton, op. cit., p. 306.

retribution on a king unfit for office, because of his and his family's wicked deeds. The secondary theme applauds Parliament's role in the Civil War. Peyton presents this as righteous, because of the tyranny of Charles I. Interwoven between these themes are references to personal slights and indignities, which the author saw himself as suffering from the actions of both sides. Examples of these are the previously mentioned deprivation of office by the King's favourite, Buckingham, and the loss of property never restored by the parliamentary side. Thus Peyton may have had other motives for writing the work than merely as a propitiatory offering. Alternatively, he may well have been a man who was not prepared to suffer silently, whether or not he expected that his complaints would bring the desired results. Anthony Wood has described Peyton's work as 'most despicable and libellous.....full of lies, mistakes and nonsense'.⁽⁹⁵⁾ The work is chiefly a catalogue of scandalous accusations against the Stuarts, James I, his Queen, Charles I and his wife, but with no evidence presented for the statements made. Peyton provides the reader with a litany of vices, which in his words 'demonstrate and delineate the just judgement of God on this family of Stuarts for [their] cruelties and murders'.⁽⁹⁶⁾ Because of their evil ways 'the almighty hand of God determined their extirpation'.⁽⁹⁷⁾ Peyton regales his readers with stories of James's mother's supposed lovers, and Charles's certain illegitimacy. This 'fact' was made known to Peyton by Mr. Beeley, a Dane, who claimed to be Charles's natural father.⁽⁹⁸⁾ Most of his tales of the Wicked Stuarts concern James I,⁽⁹⁹⁾ but one of interest here concerns James's death. Whereas Lilly thought that the Duke of Buckingham's mother poisoned James,⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Peyton attributes the murder to the Duke himself. He claims that this was one of the crimes for which Buckingham was to be impeached, and that Charles suspecting his guilt dissolved Parliament to save him.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ Peyton is even more direct in regard to Charles's sexual morality, saying that he bed his intended bride at Dover 'without the ordinary religious form of uniting',⁽¹⁰²⁾ and that he took mistresses after he was married to Henrietta Maria. Peyton produces no evidence, but does present two long stories about married

95 A. Wood, 'Athenæ Oxonienses', pp. 320-321, cited in Lee, *op. cit.*, Vol. XV, p. 1021.

96 Peyton, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

97 *ibid.*

98 *ibid.*, p. 139.

99 He refers particularly to James love of males including his 'tumbling and kissing Sir George Villiers as he would a mistress', *ibid.*, pp. 346-348.

100 Lilly, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

101 Peyton, *op. cit.*, p. 362.

102 *ibid.*, p. 367.

ladies at Court, and the intrigue related to Charles's removal of their husbands to other countries. ⁽¹⁰³⁾ But then Charles's queen was supposedly in love with the Earl of Holland, and refused to return to the Royal bed until he was brought back to favour at Court. ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Further, she was not circumspect in her behaviour with Harry Jermine, being found sitting on a bed with him. For this offence Peyton says she should have been either punished or divorced. ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Sidney Lee says that Peyton's work provides some useful details of Court life, ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ but it is difficult to see what use these snippets of gossip are, except to justify Peyton's apparent hatred of the Stuarts, though they do make his claims of divine retribution easier to understand. Charles is throughout the work seen as the 'bad' king standing opposed to the 'good' Parliament – directly the reverse of the Royalist view. Parliament was justified in raising an army against the King to subdue his power, because he was a tyrant resolved to go against 'the stream of pious rule'. ⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ He 'raised ungodly burdens to enthral the nation by arbitrary sway'. ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ He adhered 'too much to his own unbridled will', ⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ and was 'a destroyer who failed to protect his people'. ⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Peyton likens him to a murderer who kills his own children. ⁽¹¹¹⁾ Indeed had Parliament not opposed him, 'God would have been revenged on it [for not doing so]. ⁽¹¹²⁾ Charles's greatest crime however was that he attempted to destroy the Commonwealth. For this offence Peyton thunders, 'there is no satisfaction but a block or gibbert'. ⁽¹¹³⁾ As 'evidence' for Charles's attempted destruction of the Commonwealth, Peyton instances the Five Members Incident. He echoes Parliament's own cry, that in going to the House with an armed guard, Charles violated the rights of Parliament, this action being 'a high breach of privilege'. ⁽¹¹⁴⁾ Much of the work is simply a tirade against Charles I, expressed in emotional language. Peyton speaks of Charles as 'an enemy of the state', ⁽¹¹⁵⁾ who in waging war on his subjects had 'his hands in the blood

103 *ibid.*, p. 400.

104 *ibid.*, pp. 339-400.

105 *ibid.*

106 Lee, *op. cit.*, Vol. XV, p. 1021.

107 Peyton, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

108 *ibid.*, p. 319.

109 *ibid.*, p. 410.

110 *ibid.*, p. 420.

111 *ibid.*, p. 431.

112 *ibid.*, pp. 415-416.

113 *ibid.*, p. 411.

114 *ibid.*, p. 425.

115 *ibid.*, p. 433.

of hundreds of thousands'.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ Only in regard to religion, does the author even point to specific incidents rather than simply rage at this wicked King. He records Charles's imposition of the Common Book of Prayer on the Scots, but when they opposed the measure, they found the King wilfully determined to subdue them 'to his unbridled pleasure'.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ Archbishop Laud shares the blame here, for he wished to bring Scotland to episcopal government in order to 'unite the Kingdom in one form of church agreeable to Rome'.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Charles himself was a Papist at heart according to Peyton, partly because of the Queen's persuasions, but also because it was more conducive to regality.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ Peyton also claims that while in Spain to court the Infanta, Charles clearly showed his intention to set up Popery in England and had secret negotiations with the Pope to do this.⁽¹²⁰⁾ Peyton's abhorrence of Popery was no doubt genuine. In the work he refers to such practices as kneeling for the sacrament, and bowing at the name of Jesus as 'heresies of Rome'.⁽¹²¹⁾ These references are made in the context of vilifying Charles I, but they provide much of the real interest in Peyton's writing, in that they reveal something of what a staunch Puritan of that day would find so offensive about the established Church. Other aspects of Peyton's work, such as Charles's tyrannical rule may have been presented to some extent to please the present government. The idea of a divine retribution against the wicked Stuarts may well have been a heartfelt cry from Peyton. No doubt it was not original, but its use in the work, does serve to bolster Parliament's legitimacy in the war, and for Charles's execution. As to the various scandals involving the Stuart family, they may well titillate the reader, however since 'proof' is conspicuously lacking, (indeed no evidence at all is offered), it can be concluded that they were included in Peyton's work, mainly to support his role in standing against the King, both before and during the Civil War. But the idea that Peyton hoped for some personal favour from the current rulers cannot be ruled out. What we see in Peyton's work is an extreme example of the model of Charles I as a tyrant oppressing his people. Yet his portrait of Charles as a tyrant is only to be expected from a writer of Peyton's background. He seems to have included every possible 'wicked' trait in his

¹¹⁶ *ibid.*, p. 418.

¹¹⁷ *ibid.*, p. 321.

¹¹⁸ Laud supposedly was wishing to ingratiate himself with the Pope, in order to gain a Cardinal's cap. *ibid.*, pp. 320-321.

¹¹⁹ *ibid.*, p. 314.

¹²⁰ *ibid.*, p. 376.

¹²¹ *ibid.*, p. 373.

portrait of Charles I, to impress upon the reader that his execution was not only justified, but desired by God himself.

While not so vehemently expressing the idea that Charles's execution was divine retribution, Lucy Hutchinson, another anti-Royalist writer, also saw it as God's will. In her work Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson,⁽¹²²⁾ she expresses the view that since God himself delivered the King into the hands of his judges, then he must have required his death.⁽¹²³⁾ But then Lucy's husband was one of the regicide judges. Lucy Hutchinson's work is not primarily concerned with Charles I or his reign. What she provides for her readers is a view of Puritan life in the seventeenth century, with a specific focus on the Civil War in Nottinghamshire. However she does present a picture of the King as viewed from a Republican perspective. She was the daughter of Sir Allen Apsley, Lieutenant of the Tower of London, where she was born in 1620. She was well-educated for her time, and the worship and service of God were part of her upbringing.⁽¹²⁴⁾ While her early religious views were liberal, by her late twenties, her views had become more rigid, and she adopted the tenets of the Baptist faith.⁽¹²⁵⁾ She married John Hutchinson in 1638. He represented Nottinghamshire in the Long Parliament, and took Parliament's side in the conflict between King and Parliament. He was a kinsman to Ireton, and was commissioned as Lieutenant-Colonel in the Civil War on Parliament's side. Later he was appointed Governor of both the town and castle of Nottingham.⁽¹²⁶⁾ Although both her brother and father were devoted to the King, Lucy found no problem in supporting the Parliamentary side in the war.⁽¹²⁷⁾ Her work Memoirs, was written after her husband's death in 1664, and to some extent it is an account of the difficulties attendant in his Governorship of Nottingham. As such much of the work is outside the parameter of my thesis. However in that part of the work where she does refer to Charles I, and to incidents in which he plays a part, hers is not a personally vindictive view as appears to be the case in the work of the two former writers. Though not painting a favourable picture of Charles I, Hutchinson does not rant against the King in the manner

¹²² L Hutchinson, Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, ed. E. Rhys, J. M. Dent, London, 1968.

¹²³ ibid., p. 267.

¹²⁴ ibid., pp. 13-14.

¹²⁵ C. H. Firth, D.N.B. Vol. X, p. 341.

¹²⁶ ibid. Vol. X, p. 339.

¹²⁷ Hutchinson, op. cit., Introduction vii.

Peyton does. Yet what little she does approve about him tends to stand in contrast to how she sees his less attractive father. In James's courts she says, every imaginable vice was practised, and he himself was a persecutor of the religious. ⁽¹²⁸⁾ Charles however was temperate, chaste and serious, and in his court, 'fools and bawds, mimics and catamites grew out of fashion'. ⁽¹²⁹⁾ In his reign men of learning came to be esteemed, and the arts were encouraged. Charles himself she says was an excellent judge of artworks, and this interest replaced the bawdiness and profanity which was the main feature of James's court. ⁽¹³⁰⁾ However here Charles's favourable qualities end. He was an even greater encroacher on the civil and spiritual liberties of the people than his father had been. ⁽¹³¹⁾ He married a Papist, and thus set a bad example to his subjects. In allowing the Queen to practice her own religion Catholics were encouraged, and Puritans were persecuted to a greater degree than in the previous reign, because of her influence on the King. They were, Hutchinson avows, 'tormented in the Bishops' Court, whipped, pilloried, imprisoned and suffered to enjoy no rest, so that death was better than life for them'. ⁽¹³²⁾ Charles thought himself no Monarch, as long as his will was confined within the bounds of law. He was a most obstinate man, self-willed and bent on being an 'absolute, uncontrollable sovereign'. ⁽¹³³⁾ He was a prince who had no faith, truth, justice or generosity in him. ⁽¹³⁴⁾ Nor was he devoted to his church: his adherence to prelacy was for political not religious reasons. He protected the bishops in their pomp, pride and insolent practices, in the mistaken belief that kingly government in the state could not stand without episcopal government in the church. ⁽¹³⁵⁾ He allowed the favourite, the Duke of Buckingham to influence him unduly, even protecting him from the impeachment by Parliament for the death of King James and other misdemeanors. ⁽¹³⁶⁾ She repeats the story of Buckingham's mother applying a plaster to James on his death bed – she says 'to the wrist', ⁽¹³⁷⁾ whereas Lilly says it was to the stomach. ⁽¹³⁸⁾ Hutchinson may have

¹²⁸ In James's court she says, there was 'murder, incest, adultery, drunkenness, swearing, fornication and all sorts of ribaldry', *ibid.*, p. 62.

¹²⁹ *ibid.*, p. 67.

¹³⁰ *ibid.*

¹³¹ *ibid.*

¹³² *ibid.*, p. 68.

¹³³ *ibid.*

¹³⁴ *ibid.*

¹³⁵ *ibid.*

¹³⁶ *ibid.*, p. 69.

¹³⁷ *ibid.*

¹³⁸ Lilly, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

been repeating a well-known story here, despite the variation in detail. Indeed she does not offer any evidence for her claims against Charles I, but merely reports what she may have either heard or read. She follows Weldon in castigating Noy and the King's other ministers who she says helped him in his design to enslave the people. Laud and Strafford, together with the proud and profane clergy, all were corrupt she says. (139) But more powerful than these, and the instigator of the King's 'own violent purpose' (140) was the Queen, whose influence on Charles proved fatal to the Kingdom. She enslaved the King's affection to promote her own ambition, to root out the Godly in the land. (141) Hutchinson's anti-Papist sentiments are noticeable throughout the work, but it is nowhere clearer than in her references to Henrietta Maria, who constantly through her priests advanced her own religion 'to subvert all others'. (142) Hutchinson mentions the Spanish journey to court the Infanta only in the context of a Catholic plot, wherein Papists at home would gain advantages. (143) Likewise the Irish rebellion provides an opportunity for the reader to see her fear and abhorrence of Catholics. Parliament was right she says to act against the Irish rebels, because their only desire was to subvert the Protestant religion. Indeed had God not come to the rescue of the Protestants in preventing the surprise of Dublin Castle, 'there would not have been any remnant of the Protestant name left in the country'. (144) Charles and Henrietta both obstructed Parliament's efforts to provide relief in Ireland, and he was reluctant to proclaim the Irish murderers, as 'rebels'. When forced to do so, he issued only forty proclamations, and then took care to see that they were not widely dispersed. (145) Hutchinson is the only writer in this survey to refer to Ireland. The reason for this may well be that she wrote several years after they did, at a time when war in Ireland was of greater historical importance to England. Like her contemporaries, she discusses events in Scotland during Charles's reign. It was in Scotland, that according to Hutchinson God protected the Protestants from subjugation to Rome. The Scottish resistance to the King's attempted reforms led to the National Covenant, and ultimately the war against England, the

139 Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

140 *ibid.*, p. 71.

141 *ibid.*

142 *ibid.*, p. 72.

143 *ibid.*, p. 67.

144 *ibid.*, p. 75.

145 *ibid.*

Bishops' War. ⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ But the ordinary people of England did not oppose the Scots because they recognized that they fought only to claim their just liberties. In Hutchinson's words, the Scottish action is described as resisting the 'prelatical innovators who had forced them to defend their religion and liberties'. This claim is familiar from the anti-Royalist writings, but stands in direct contrast to the views of the Royalists, particularly the clergymen L'Estrange and Heylyn. For them Charles I was a religious reformer, the Scots determined to deprive him of his power. For Hutchinson Charles was the aggressor whose only support came from some of the nobility and gentry, but mainly from the prelates.

Charles was again the aggressor in his action in the Five Members Incident. Here, Hutchinson says that he went to the House of Commons with his extraordinary guard of about four hundred men, to demand the five men accused of treason. She does not discuss the charges against the men, and her story of the incident seems designed to portray the King as a deceitful bully. She recalls that after Charles's 'extraordinary guard of Cavaliers wounded some poor unarmed men, that passed by his house at Whitehall', ⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Parliament requested a guard for its protection. This the King refused, saying that his own guard would be sufficient for its safety. This she said was a 'false message'. ⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ He then marched on the Parliament, which had no guard of its own. She does mention Parliament's claim of the 'high breach of privilege' the King's action brought, but does not elaborate. In fact there is relatively little coverage of Parliamentary action, though Hutchinson does briefly mention the abolition of the Star Chamber, and the High Commission, and the act for Triennial Parliaments. ⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ She does mention the discord which existed between the factions in Parliament, but if she was aware of the effect of any of the measures taken by Parliament which affected the King's administration, she does not mention them, although her husband was a member of the Long Parliament. She reports that Charles left London because he was offended by the bringing of petitions to Parliament by the people. He then sent Henrietta Maria to the Continent to sell the Crown jewels, so that he could procure arms to use against Parliament. At this point according to Hutchinson, the King had decided to wage war on

146 *ibid.*, p. 72.

147 *ibid.*, p. 76.

148 *ibid.*

149 *ibid.*, p. 74.

Parliament. However, it was not until three months later that Parliament held itself to be ‘bound in the duty of God and the people’s trust in them, and by the fundamental laws, to employ their utmost care and power for securing the Parliament and preserving the Kingdom’s peace’.⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ Thus was the King obviously the aggressor. Of the war itself in as far as it involved Charles I, there is very little coverage. Hutchinson’s focus is the narrow one of Nottinghamshire. But it is notable more for her account of the personal rivalries and conflicts which her husband had to deal with in his Governorship, than it is as a history of the war itself.⁽¹⁵¹⁾ Even well-known battles like Edgehill and Naseby are only mentioned briefly, though she does record the capture of the King’s letters at Naseby. These letters she says ‘manifested his falsehood’,⁽¹⁵²⁾ for although Charles had professed otherwise, he had tried to bring in the Danes, the Lorraines, and the Irish rebels to subdue the English, and to be governed by the Queen in all affairs of both state and religion.⁽¹⁵³⁾ Charles I as pictured by Hutchinson so far, has been lacking in the personal qualities of the ‘good’ prince which the Royalist writers were anxious to convey. However she saw his action in fleeing to the Scots as a political mistake. Parliament at this time, she says was so wrought with faction, that had Charles gone to London and cast himself upon it, he would in ‘all probability have ruined them’.⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ (She is referring here to the differences between the Presbyterians and the Independents.)⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ Further, in putting himself in Scottish hands, she says that Charles showed such a hatred of the English nation, that it turned against him many who otherwise would have given him their support.⁽¹⁵⁶⁾

Hutchinson’s coverage of the King’s trial and execution is brief despite her husband’s part in this. She does say that Charles refused to plead, and heard the charges with disdainful smiles. He was not sorry for any blood shed during his reign, his only regret was that his opposition had not been eliminated.⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ She does however note that the Earl of Strafford’s death troubled the King, but she offers no explanation for this

¹⁵⁰ *ibid.*, p. 88.

¹⁵¹ However Firth says that her account of the Civil War in Nottinghamshire is ‘full and accurate’, C. H. Firth, *D.N.B.*, Vol. X, p. 341.

¹⁵² Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

¹⁵³ *ibid.*

¹⁵⁴ *ibid.*, p. 232.

¹⁵⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁵⁶ *ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ *ibid.*, p. 266.

contention. Nor does her brief coverage of Strafford's trial offer any enlightenment. What she does say is that 'the King against his own mind, to serve his own ends, gave him up to death'.⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ But how she came to this view, is not revealed to the reader.

In general, important events in Charles's reign do not feature in Hutchinson's work. (Firth notes that 'her remarks on the general history of the times are of little value').⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ Only those events or circumstances where Charles is seen in an unfavourable light are included in the work. However she is not only critical of Charles I and his father because of their personal failings, she stands against the institution of Monarchy. Perhaps though it is more correct to say she was an ardent Republican. She speaks of the Parliament which assembled after Charles's execution, as 'that glorious Parliament',⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ but after Cromwell took the reigns of power, she saw him as exercising such arbitrary power that 'the whole land grew weary of him'.⁽¹⁶¹⁾ She gives the impression in the work that she had access to some of Parliament's printed papers, and she refers her readers to these for information on what she calls 'the righteousness of Parliament's cause'.⁽¹⁶²⁾ She seems to have been familiar with May's History of the Long Parliament,⁽¹⁶³⁾ but she tells her readers that much of what she wrote was from recollection. However despite her close contact with the turbulent events of the time, the major figures in the drama are not key players in her work. She wrote to commemorate her husband, and she does capture the feeling of what it was like to be part of a garrison during the Civil War, at least as far as the incidents and trials of his life were concerned. The work is less satisfactory for the reader when Hutchinson is dealing with matters in which she was not personally involved. Where she does consider aspects of Charles's reign, she does not include any information or put forward any views which give a clearer picture of the King, than do other anti-Royalist writers, though she does allow that he had fewer vices than his father. However it is the religious aspect which dominates her thinking on Charles. That is because of her own religious faith; she was particularly concerned that Catholic influence did not lead to persecution of her own kind. As such,

¹⁵⁸ *ibid.*, p. 73.

¹⁵⁹ C. H. Firth, D.N.B. Vol. X, p. 341.

¹⁶⁰ Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

¹⁶¹ *ibid.*, p. 258.

¹⁶² *ibid.*, p. 78.

¹⁶³ *ibid.* Firth says that parts of Hutchinson's work are simply paraphrases of May's history, C. H. Firth, D.N.B. Vol. X, p. 341.

her work is an interesting example of Puritan beliefs and fears during the mid-seventeenth century. But the picture of the King himself, is the recognized one of the tyrant oppressing his subjects, with the help of his ministers and the clergy, which other anti-Royalist writers show. Hutchinson was writing many years after the King's death and the lack of evidence provided could mean that she was simply repeating the view of Charles I current in Republican times. Yet this view was no doubt her own view of the King, as well as the one common to anti-Monarchist writers.

While Hutchinson is less antagonistic personally to Charles I than either Weldon or Peyton, seeing him as having less faults than his father, she nevertheless portrays him as a tyrant whose death was justified. While the Royalist writers in my survey have constructed a model of the 'good' prince familiar from traditional princely literature, anti-Royalists including Hutchinson, and even the purportedly fair-minded William Lilly have used the same model. However in the case of anti-Monarchist writers, Charles I does not live up to the model, being a tyrant who oppressed his people and deserved his fate. None of these writers in the survey had such a close and lengthy contact with the King as would allow them to write a revealing portrait of him. This however could be expected from the historian who is the subject matter of this thesis, Edward, Earl of Clarendon.

Chapter 4

Clarendon's Art of Portraiture.

Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and the Civil Wars in England is one of the best known works on the Civil War. However, it is not only a history of the turbulent events of Clarendon's time, it is a history of one of the chief protagonists in the war, Charles I. None of the works surveyed so far in my thesis give the reader any real understanding of the character of Charles I. This includes Warwick's Memoirs, which towards its close does allow a brief glimpse of Charles I as a man, because Warwick draws the King in relation to himself. But from Clarendon, we could expect a more realistic portrait of the King than his contemporaries provide. His life and political experiences were more conducive to both understanding Charles's actions, and to writing about them in a manner in which his readers might share this understanding. Clarendon was an active participant in the times he wrote about, both before and after the Civil War. From April 1640 he was a member of the Short, and then the Long Parliaments. At first he actively opposed many features of the Royal government. Later, when he thought his allies in this opposition to the King's government threatened the Royal prerogative, he began to support Charles I instead of the reformers. He joined the King at Oxford in May 1642, and became Royalist spokesman in the war of words between the King and Parliament. The King also sent him on various missions on his behalf. So from May 1642 until March 1645 when Charles I sent him to the west of England with the Prince of Wales, he had considerable opportunity to observe the King, often quite closely. This experience, added to his familiarity with Charles's dealing with Parliament, meant that he was competent to write about the King's actions in both peacetime and war. The History of the Rebellion reveals him to be an historian with considerable interest in his fellow man. Therefore it could be expected that he would have quite some understanding of the King's motives in a wide range of circumstances from at least 1640 to 1645. The History also reveals Clarendon's skill in presenting lively pen pictures of figures on both sides of the conflict. Thus the reader of the History could expect a realistic portrait of Charles I to emerge in the work. Clarendon's treatment of Charles I will be the subject of my next three chapters. Here I will be concerned with those factors which make Clarendon's

characters in the History of the Rebellion both convincing and lifelike. I will also offer for later comparison with Clarendon's portrait of the King, portraits of two men who found themselves caught up in the rebellion.

While Clarendon's characters do exhibit distinctive characteristics, they are not types but real personalities. Yet his characters are measured against a consistent and explicit set of values. This reflects what Clarendon saw as one of the principal aims of history. In the History itself, he says that one of the principal ends or duties of history is to celebrate the memory of eminent and extraordinary persons, and to transmit their virtues for posterity to imitate. (1) Virtues where they exist are commended, but vices are exposed as well. Those guilty of such vices as disloyalty, greed, pride and vanity are to be charged with their own evil actions. (2) Clarendon also condemns the lack of social graces such as rudeness or moroseness, the lack of intelligence or good judgement, the lack of control in regard to women, drink, or excesses in spending, irresolution and unbridled ambition. (3) But above all he condemns the person who puts self above loyalty, fidelity, integrity and conscience. These qualities are the ones which even a cursory reading of Clarendon's autobiography reveals were those on which he most prided himself. The attributes of industry, generosity, honesty and courage are also highly regarded in the Clarendon character. He praises the social qualities of manners, courtesy and affability, and the intellectual qualities such as wit, eloquence and understanding. He notes family, especially if ancient, noble or distinguished. He also notes education, travel and experience in government or military service. Clarendon seldom mentions physical characteristics, so it is not through the visual image of the person that his reader gain a sense of the individual. G. E. Miller makes an interesting contrast with Clarendon's pen pictures, and that of the Earl of Lauderdale in Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Times. Burnet says of Lauderdale, ' He made a very ill appearance. He was very big : his hair red hanging about him. His tongue was too big for his mouth, which made him bedew all that he talked to.' (4) But although Clarendon does not present a visual image of the person, he manages to convey the sense of the

1 Macray ed. op. cit., Vol. III, p.178.

2 ibid., Vol. IV, p.2

3 See also G. E. Miller, Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, Twayne Publishers, Boston, 1983.

4 Bishop Burnet, ' History of His Own Times' cited in ibid ,p.101.

individual by other means. He considers both the person's psychological traits and moral values, in conjunction with the particular circumstances which confront the individual. He understands not only the complexity of the individual, but also the complexity of the problems he faces. This allows a critical assessment of that person's failures or achievements. This gives a deeper understanding of the individual than any description of features or qualities can. Clarendon's pen pictures in the History are sophisticated, offering a perceptive analysis of character set against a background of rebellion, often at a time of crisis for the individual. Martine Watson Brownley notes that as an author Clarendon tended to be biographically orientated. ⁽⁵⁾ His first work was a comparison of George, Duke of Buckingham and Robert, Earl of Essex, which is reported to have so impressed Charles I that he wanted Clarendon to write a life of Buckingham. ⁽⁶⁾ While the character sketches Clarendon drew of successive popes in Religion and Policy are according to Brownley, 'wooden and lifeless', ⁽⁷⁾ these men were not personally known to Clarendon, nor were they part of the world with which he was familiar. ⁽⁸⁾ If writing about his own time, and on individuals whom he knew, Clarendon could have been a quite brilliant biographer had he chosen this form of history. I have selected two portraits presented in the History of the Rebellion to illustrate his understanding of individuals caught in the crisis of their and his time. These 'characters' clearly show Clarendon's grasp of the essence of the man and the immediacy of their dilemmas. These men are Sir John Hotham and the Earl (later Marquis) of Newcastle.

Sir John Hotham was a reluctant Parliamentarian who refused Charles I entry to the port of Hull in 1642. He first appears in the History of the Rebellion during the attack on the Earl of Strafford, when Hotham and other men who had been disobliged by the Earl drew attention in Parliament to Strafford's supposed misdemeanours. This is expressed in the History as their 'bitter inveighing and ripping up the course of his life.' ⁽⁹⁾ This attack on Strafford led ultimately to his being charged with treason. By his

⁵ Brownley, op. cit., p.146.

⁶ ibid.

⁷ ibid.

⁸ At Montpellier in April 1669, Clarendon wrote biographical sketches of three of his enemies, the Earl of Bristol, Lord Berkeley and Lord Arlington. These were apparently written as an agreeable literary exercise, 'for the gratification of his feelings and as a trial of skill.' C.H. Firth, 'Clarendon's "History of the Rebellion"', E.H.R., 19, Part II - The 'Life' Of Himself, p. 257.

⁹ Macray ed., op. cit., Vol. I, p.225.

words, and by noting that Hotham's reason for attacking the Earl was merely that he had been disobliged by him, Clarendon suggests pettiness as well as vindictiveness in Hotham's character. But we see another side of Hotham after he had been appointed Governor of Hull by Parliament, this in order to keep the munitions held there out of Royalist hands. At this time Clarendon acquaints his readers with Hotham's reluctant Parliamentarianism. He says that Hotham was not in agreement with Parliament's principles, even though he had concurred with its violent ways : he was well affected to both the Church and State. It was firstly his malice towards Strafford, and later his fear of Parliament which motivated him to take Parliament's side. Yet Parliament itself was so unsure of his loyalty that the leaders of the Commons sent his son, of undoubted loyalty to them, to spy on him. ⁽¹⁰⁾ So here we see a picture of a man whose motivation to act against his own judgement was malice and not conviction. Hotham was to prove a man in whom neither side of the conflict could place absolute trust. When the King sought entry to the port of Hull in 1642, Hotham could not make a definite decision for the King though he wished him well. His state of mind was utter confusion, the conflict being between wishing to allow Charles entry to the port, and fear of Parliament's retribution. Clarendon at this point in the History offers his first character sketch of Hotham. He says that he was 'of fearful nature and perplexed understanding, and could better resolve on deliberation than on a sudden'. ⁽¹¹⁾ But Clarendon also thought that Charles I would have been more successful had Hotham been 'prepared dexterously and in confidence.' ⁽¹²⁾ So the theme of divided loyalty is brought out, to be added to the qualities of indecisiveness and lack of resolution. The reader is also at this time made aware of Hotham's fortune and ancient family, ⁽¹³⁾ these attributes being frequently mentioned in a person's character in the History (and in the Life). Clarendon ends this sketch with Hotham excusing himself to the King, falling on his knees before him. But Charles proclaimed him a traitor. This act Hotham received with expressions of 'undutifulness and contempt.' ⁽¹⁴⁾ So now the reader sees yet another feature of Hotham's character. His reply to the King's censure indicates behaviour which Clarendon would clearly see as unfit for a gentleman. But of greater significance than Hotham's behaviour, is that of his

¹⁰ ibid., Vol. I, p.524.

¹¹ ibid., Vol. II, p.47-48.

¹² ibid., Vol. II, p.49.

¹³ ibid.

¹⁴ ibid., Vol. II, p.50.

actions in a time of particular difficulty for him. One of the themes in the History is of men whose characters the rebellion found wanting. That is, in times of crisis their stock of courage, or ability, loyalty or moral 'goodness' was not sufficient to cope with the situation they faced. Hotham is a prime example of this theme. In Hotham's case, he was again placed in a situation beyond his capabilities, when in July 1642, Lord Digby was his prisoner. Digby, by flattery and cajoling, embroiled Hotham in a scheme to hand Hull over to the King. Clarendon says that Digby 'by degrees amused and terrified him.....[and] enlarged upon the honour and glory [that he would have].'⁽¹⁵⁾ He also told Hotham that the King would reward him with many preferments, and that his name would be known to posterity as the 'preserver of his country'.⁽¹⁶⁾ Hotham though tempted, would not declare openly for the King but secretly told Digby that he did desire to serve Charles I. But at the same time he wished to appear to support Parliament. Clarendon is unable to decide whether Hotham's subsequent failure to openly declare a stand for either party, and act on his decision, was from want of courage, or lack of ability to deliver what he appeared to have promised.⁽¹⁷⁾ In either case, Hotham's personal qualities were not suited to a time of particular difficulty for him. During his re-telling of this part of the rebellion, Clarendon offers a 'character' of Hotham. He says

Hotham was by his nature and education, a rough and rude man; of great covetousness, of great pride, and great ambition; without any bowels of good nature, or the least sense or touch of generosity; his parts were not quick and sharp, but composed, and judged well; he was a man of craft, and more like to deceive than to be cozened.⁽¹⁸⁾

Yet he did not deceive Parliament. He and his son were later executed (in 1645), the principal charge against the father being that he let Digby and Ashburnham free. Clarendon again points out that Hotham was a man of unquestioned affection for both the Crown and Church, who foolishly exposed himself and family (noted as a 'very ancient family and well allied')⁽¹⁹⁾ to Parliament's designs, despite not being of its conviction. It was his particular animosity against the Earl of Strafford, and his own

¹⁵ ibid., Vol. II, p.264.

¹⁶ ibid.

¹⁷ ibid., Vol. II, p.267.

¹⁸ ibid., Vol. II, pp.261-263.

¹⁹ ibid., Vol. II, p.49.

vanity, ambition and desire for honours which led him to go further than his judgement did. (20) We finally see Hotham on the scaffold, a broken man, so dispirited that he could barely speak. (21) Hotham's death is described by Clarendon as a 'woeful tragedy', (22) an indication that Clarendon felt some sympathy for him, despite Hotham showing many of the characteristics which Clarendon condemned. He saw him as a man of no more than average capability, who had reasonably good intentions, who had tried with increasing desperation to satisfy two masters who stood opposed to each other. Clarendon has developed the human as well as the historical dimensions of Hotham's story. Hotham was a misguided and confused man whose personal qualities were not suited to a time of crisis. Indeed we can speculate that in more normal times, his stock of courage and ability would not have brought the disaster which was his ultimate fate. However by bringing out both the complexity of the situation and man's nature, we come to understand the man himself.

The second portrait chosen for illustration of Clarendon's understanding of the complexity of human nature is that of the Earl of Newcastle. Again we find a man of good intentions, but who failed the ultimate test, because his abilities were not suited to the demands made on him in a time of particular difficulty. Newcastle was an ardent Monarchist who failed the King in a time of crisis, despite his obvious desire to serve him well, and a long record of having done so up to the point of his desertion. The first occasion on which we meet the Earl in the History, is when Charles I made his journey to Scotland in 1633. The King and Court passed through Nottinghamshire, and were entertained by Newcastle in such a manner, according to Clarendon, as had not been known before in England. (23) Thus right at the beginning of the character Clarendon is constructing, the Earl's fortune and generosity are brought to the readers attention. We again meet Newcastle in 1639, after he had become Governor to the Prince of Wales. We are told that his contribution to the King's army was a two hundred strong troop of horse, consisting of the best gentlemen in the North, and that he was one of the 'most valuable

20 ibid., Vol.III, pp.527-528

21 ibid., Vol.III, p. 529

22 Brownley also makes this point in Clarendon and the Rhetoric of Historical Form. She also discusses Hotham, but from a different point of view, pp. 174-176

23 ibid., Vol. I, p.104.

men in the Kingdom, in his fortune and his dependencies and his qualifications.' (24) The reader of the History now has a good understanding of Newcastle's background – a rich and generous man, of considerable standing in the Kingdom, and with undoubted affection for the King's cause. His loyalty to Charles I is drawn to the reader's attention when in 1642, Parliament called for his return to London from Hull, where he had been sent by the King. But Newcastle did not leave his post until he had first obtained Charles's permission to attend Parliament, thereby putting himself in a position to earn its likely disfavour. (25) His loyalty is again brought to the fore when Parliament required that he be removed from the Governorship of the Prince of Wales. The leaders in the Commons, along with the Earls of Essex and Holland, knew that it was not possible to lessen his affection for the King. They were afraid that he would infuse the Prince with designs not suited to their cause.(26) Later, when the Queen sent arms from abroad, it was to the Earl at Newcastle, which port he had secured, that Charles directed them to be sent. (27) Although Charles had little choice of a port, this decision nevertheless does show that the Earl was firmly attached to the King's cause. In the History there are several sketches of the Earl. In the first he is described as a 'well-bred person, of full and plentiful fortune..... being a man of great courage and signal fidelity to the Crown.' (28) These are all qualities generally praised by Clarendon. However another side of Newcastle's character emerges, when in 1643 he was forced to inform the King that he was unable to carry out his command. Since Newcastle's loyalty was not in doubt, some other factor must have been operating, and this provides the first pointer to what is to be his ultimate downfall. That is, he was no leader of men. His men refused to march into the counties which had associated themselves with Parliament as Charles had ordered, informing him that they knew better than he did, what measures were likely to be effective. (This included the taking of Hull before leaving the area.) (29) Thus the reader has an inkling of Newcastle as unsuited to command in war, never having acquired any knowledge of warfare.(30) We see the result of this lack of ability during the battle of

24 ibid., Vol. I, p.164.

25 ibid., Vol. I, p. 523.

26 ibid., Vol. I. p. 563.

27 ibid., Vol. II, p. 212.

28 ibid., Vol. II, p. 533.

29 ibid., Vol. III, p. 145.

30 ibid., Vol. III, p. 382.

Marston Moor, when both Prince Rupert (for whom lack of knowledge of warfare could not be the reason), and the Marquis of Newcastle left the field. Newcastle left the Kingdom, a matter which Clarendon surprisingly attempts to excuse. Since loyalty was such an important quality in Clarendon's favourable portraits, he is unusually kind to Newcastle in regard to his desertion of the King. He points somewhat sadly to a misunderstanding between the Prince Rupert and Newcastle, saying that had any persons of honour and discretion interposed, the two commanders might have reached an understanding and they might have changed their minds. (31) Of Newcastle himself, Clarendon says

All that can be said for the Marquis is, that he was so utterly tired with the condition and employment so contrary to his humour, nature, and education, that he did not at all consider the means or the way that would let him out of it, and free him forever from having more to do with it. and it was a great wonder that he sustained the vexation and fatigue of it so long, than that he broke from it with so little circumspection. (32)

Clarendon continues with praise of Newcastle as a very fine gentleman, courageous and accomplished in horsemanship, dancing and fencing 'which accompany good breeding.' (33) Newcastle however was indulgent in his pleasures, so much so, that after a day's action in the field he retired to what Clarendon calls 'his softer pleasures', (34) and would not be interrupted even by his second in command, General King. Because of this, Clarendon says 'many inconveniences fell out.' (35) But his honour was such, that when at the beginning of the war Newcastle saw the King in great distress, and abandoned by those who were more obliged to Charles I than he was, he gave the King much of his fortune and personal service.(36) He enjoyed the pomp and authority of being a general, but he was suited to it only in acts of courtesy, affability, bounty and generosity. However he knew nothing of the strategies of warfare. Before the actual fighting began he had seemed competent enough, but he did not understand the

31 *ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 380.

32 *ibid.*, Vol. III, pp. 380-381.

33 *ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 381.

34 *ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 383.

35 *ibid.*

36 *ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 381.

conditions or tactics of battle. Yet on the battlefield he gave many instances of 'invincible courage and fearlessness in danger.' (37) Clarendon has presented a cumulative portrait of a man of undoubted affection for the King. His loyalty was never in doubt, and he spent generously in providing troops for Charles's cause. But military life was not one he would have ever chosen for himself, despite his courage. The pleasures of delightful company and music and poetry, in which 'he indulged the greatest part of his time' (38) were his preferred way of life. A time of particular crisis on the battlefield at Marston Moor, found him wanting, his abilities being insufficient for such a situation. Like Hotham, in more normal times his honour would not have faced such a stringent test as a time of rebellion set for him. But whereas for Clarendon, Hotham had few redeeming features in his character, Newcastle had many of the qualities Clarendon admired. Indeed Clarendon seems embarrassed to report Newcastle's desertion of the King. Whether this is because he had served Charles I so well until his ultimate test, despite being unsuited to the task, can be debated. Alternatively, Clarendon's kindness to him may be a reflection of the sympathy he possibly felt for one who like himself, was an outsider to Court circles. (39) But what the reader of the History does come to understand, is the complexity of Newcastle's personality, set against the unusual demands made of him (and so many others) in times of rebellion.

Clarendon had a grasp not only of the complexity of man's character, but also of the unusually difficult circumstances of his times, being himself caught up in the conflict. He saw men such as the Earl of Holland serve one side, switch to the other, then turn back again. He recognized that for many, the times themselves were responsible for behaviour which would most likely not be exhibited in different circumstances. In this context, Clarendon portrays men as prisoners of their circumstances. In a later chapter, I discuss Clarendon's theme of men as determiners of events, their actions being responsible for even quite momentous results. While at first this may seem contradictory, on reflection it can be seen as a recognition of Clarendon's own understanding of the complexity of the problems both he, and others caught up in rebellion, faced. That he

37 ibid., Vol. III, p. 382.

38 ibid., Vol. III, p. 381.

39 I recognize that the part of the History concerned with Newcastle's desertion may have been written in 1671 when Clarendon was in his second exile. Nevertheless I think his perception of his and Newcastle's positions would have been the same as in 1646-1648.

recognized that Charles I also faced unusually difficult circumstances in his reign is recognized by Clarendon, and as well that the King may have escaped his fate in less turbulent times. In the History, he expresses this when he says, 'there were so many miraculous circumstances contributed to his ruin, that men might well think that heaven and earth conspired it, and that the stars designed it.' (40) But whether his understanding of the King's character, as expressed in the History of the Rebellion matches that of the lesser figures in the conflict, such as Hotham and Newcastle remains to be seen. That Clarendon could write effective characters can be seen from these two examples. Thus his skill is apparent, in both appraising and setting down the essence of personality. His contact with the King in varying circumstances provided considerable opportunity to recognize what motivated Charles I, and what his weaknesses and strengths were. It will be interesting here to see whether Clarendon's was a more realistic and life-like portrait, than those of his contemporaries, who did not have the biographical skills or close contact with the King that he had.

⁴⁰ Macray ed., op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 491.