

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

V. *Missions of British Roman Catholics.*

	From abroad and other sources.	From Invest- ments.	British Contribu- tions.
	£	£	£
76. Society for the Propagation of the Faith	8,686
77. St. Joseph's Missionary Society and Col- lege of the Sacred Heart (Mill Hill, Hendon)	2,224
Total Roman Catholic Contributions			£10,910



ART. VI.—MR. GARDINER'S CHARLES THE FIRST.¹

MR. GARDINER is well known to all historical students as the writer who has made the period of the first two Stuarts upon the English throne his special province. As the reader refers to Freeman for all that appertains to the Norman Conquest, to Stubbs for a knowledge of our early constitutional charters, to Froude for the period of the Reformation, to Macaulay for the incidents in the lives of James the Second and William the Deliverer, or to Stanhope for the deeds of the House of Hanover; so does he who desires to make himself familiar with the latest revelations as to James the First, as to Charles the First and Buckingham, and as to the personal government of the "martyr monarch," study the volumes of Professor Gardiner. Our author is a believer in original research, and does not content himself with second-hand references. Busying himself amid the mine of wealth contained in our national archives, he has consulted the State Papers to no little purpose, and has produced historical works which are models for accuracy and sound judgment. Mr. Gardiner lacks the picturesque style of several of his contemporaries, but we feel as we peruse his volumes that we are in the hands of an earnest, a painstaking, and in the main an unprejudiced historian, and these gifts are sufficient to cover any defects as to style that may be apparent in his narrative. The work before us is a continuation of the volumes dealing with the personal government of Charles the First. Here we quit Prerogative for Parliament.

The causes which led to the fall of the monarchy of our first Charles are not difficult to discover. In the summer of the year

¹ "The Fall of the Monarchy of Charles I." By S. Rawson Gardiner L.L.D. Two Volumes. Longmans. 1882.

1637, the date from which the events recorded in these volumes begin, more than eight years had passed away since a Parliament had met at Westminster. During those years, in spite of threats of war which Charles had neither the nerve nor the means to carry out, peace had been maintained, and with the maintenance of peace, in spite of the despotic acts of the Sovereign, the material prosperity of the country had been largely on the increase. But the higher aspirations of the nation remained unsatisfied. England had been without a Government, in the best sense of the word, as truly as she had been without a Parliament. The events of this period divide themselves under three heads: the ecclesiastical policy of Laud, the fiscal policy of the King, and the resolute conduct of Strafford.

The character of Laud is well known. He was an arrogant, petulant, and fussily-active leader of the sacerdotal party, a bitter politician, a trusted and determined counsellor. Like many men whose talents are not conspicuous for their breadth or brilliancy, he was incessant in the labours he set before him. His energy, says a contemporary, was "miraculous." He would come fresh from the composition of a State Paper to discuss with the dons at Oxford the best means of putting down the irregularities of undergraduates. At one moment he would be sitting as presiding judge in the Star Chamber or High Commission Court, and the next he would be keenly tracking out the disobedient Nonconformists. "We took another conventicle of separatists," he writes to his secretary, with all the glee of a successful sportsman, "in Newington Woods, on Sunday last, in the very brake where the King's stag should have been lodged for his hunting the next morning." Now, he would busy himself with suppressing wakes, or making suggestions for the embellishment of his favourite Oxford; and then he would be hard at work meddling with the churches of the English residents in Holland, with the affairs of Protestant refugees in England, or with the national worship north of the Tweed. "Nothing was too lofty, too distant, or too mean to escape his regulating hand." The chief feature in his policy, however, was his harsh and narrow conduct as an ecclesiastical reformer. He was determined to put down, at all costs, legally or by arbitrary methods, the "puritanical" element which was then leavening the Church of England. He gave orders for the removal of the holy table from the centre of the aisle, that it might be placed as an altar at the east end of the church. He had no favour for the clergyman who refused to teach the doctrine of the Real Presence, and to uphold the Apostolical Succession; and his punishment for the violation of a ceremonial rubric was severe. He was equally strict in regard to the congregations, exacting—and for this none can blame him—reverent behaviour during

the hours of divine worship : men were not to laugh or talk, or to wear their hats during the prayers, or to receive the consecrated elements non-kneeling. Worshippers were to bend their heads canonically, and to turn to the East at the proper moments.¹ Among the State Papers is a document which certainly deserves attention. It is alluded to by Mr. Gardiner, but not so fully as our readers might desire. Sir Nathaniel Brent, the vicar-general, was commissioned by Laud to furnish a report of the result of the visitations he had made throughout the dioceses of Norwich, Peterborough, Lichfield, Worcester, Gloucester, Winchester, and Chichester. Sir Nathaniel's report gives us an insight into the condition of the country, and of the Church; the offences complained of, and the punishments inflicted, are of the most curious interest. At Norwich we read that "the cathedral church is much out of order, the hangings of the choir are naught, the pavement not good, the spire of the steeple is quite down, the copes are fair, but want mending;" that "many ministers appeared without priests' cloaks, and some of them are suspected of nonconformity, but they carried themselves so warily that nothing could be proved against them;" and that the mayor and his brethren were "convented" for "walking indecently in the cathedral church every Sunday in prayer time before the sermon." At Lynn the report states that the three churches were exceeding fair and well kept, but that "there were 'divers Papists' who spoke scandalously of the Scriptures and of our religion," "they are already presented for it," says Sir Nathaniel, "and I have given order that they shall be brought into the High Commission Court." At Bungay, Mr. Fairfax, a curate, was "charged with divers points of nonconformity," but he renounced all upon his oath, and "faithfully promised to read the King's declaration for lawful sports." Mr. Daines, lecturer of Beccles, "a man of more than seventy years of age did never wear the surplice nor use the cross in baptism." At Ipswich, "I suspended one Mr. Cave, a precise minister of St. Helen's, for giving the sacrament of the Eucharist to non-kneelants." At St. Edmund's Bury, which was "formerly infected with Puritanism, but now is well reformed," the licence of a young curate was taken away "in regard to his great ignorance, being not able to tell me what *ecclesia* did signify." At Stamford "the ministers were generally in priests' cloaks, and they, with the laity, were all the time of Divine service uncovered, and still bowed at the pronouncing of the blessed name of Jesus." At Oundle a canonical admonition was given to the schoolmaster "for expounding the ten commandments out of the writings of

¹ The feeling of irritation against Laud's meddlesome interference with habitual usage, says Mr. Gardiner, was almost universal.

a silenced minister." In the town of Derby several of the clergy were suspended for drunkenness, and for "making very many foul clandestine marriages to the great offence of the country." At Worcester complaint was made of the state of the cathedral, and of the much walking about during the hours of divine service. The vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon was suspended "for suffering his poultry to roost, and his hogs to lodge in the church, for walking in the church to con his sermon in time of divine service," and other misdeeds. At Gloucester it was complained people were "much given to straggle from their own parishes to hear strangers." Thus, in the pages of this report, we see Laud not only zealous in rebuking irreverence and disorderly proceedings, but in encouraging the proper repair of churches and cathedrals. So far so good; but the Archbishop did not stay his hand at irreverence and building frailties; he was resolved to crush evangelicism of all kinds, and to force both clergy and laity to adopt the narrow and intolerant Anglicanism which he was pleased to call the "Catholic" religion. How he carried his views into effect we have but to study the prosecutions he instituted against Peter Smart, Alexander Leighton, Henry Sherfield, William Prynne, and others; which are common facts of history, and which are carefully related by Mr. Gardiner in his volumes upon this period. We think, however, his accounts of these prosecutions would have been more complete had he made more use of the original minute books of the proceedings of the High Court of Commission to be found among the State Papers. In the pages of these minute books occur many curious charges. For example, we read how certain vestrymen were fined ten pounds for their misconduct in publishing a new table of church fees; how one Nathaniel Barnard was fined the sum of one thousand pounds for seditious preaching at Cambridge; how the Lady Eleanor Touchet was fined three thousand pounds for publishing fanatical pamphlets; how John Laverock, clerk, was imprisoned in Bridewell, for preaching in London without a licence. We read further of the punishments inflicted upon men guilty of contempt of court; of preaching after deposition and degradation; of building houses upon consecrated land: we read of cock-fighting taking place before a crowd in church; of persons circulating Popish tracts, and the like. It must be admitted that many of the ecclesiastical reforms which Laud effected were beneficial, but the people saw that the spirit which prompted the Reformer and the Judge was not so much the remedying of abuses, as the right of asserting sacerdotal interference, and the desire to reduce the laity to that state of clerical bondage from which the Reformation had emancipated them. The nation rebelled; and ecclesiastical grievances, complained of but not redressed, were one of

the chief causes which led to the overthrow of the monarchy of Charles.¹

As was the clerical policy of the bigoted Archbishop of Canterbury, so was the financial policy of the Sovereign. In the one instance the Church was to be supreme, in the other so was the prerogative. Obstinate, narrow-minded, but sincere, Charles resolved to render himself independent of all control. The counsels of his own resolve—of Laud and of Strafford—should be his Parliament, and he needed no other. He would fill his empty Exchequer by a system of direct taxation proceeding from the Crown. He dwarfed all his other exactions by the issue of his memorable writs for ship-money. The servile judges silenced opposition by giving their verdict in favour of the Crown. Crawley declared that it was a royal prerogative “to impose taxes without common consent of Parliament.” “The law,” said Berkeley, “recognized no king-yoking policy; the law is of itself an old and trusty servant of the king’s—it is his instrument and means which he useth to govern the people by. I never read nor heard that *lex* was *rex*, but it is common and most true that *rex* is *lex*, for he is *lex loquens*, a living, a speaking, an acting law.” This bias of the bench did not, however, convince the nation. Voices were raised on every side declaring that ship-money was utterly illegal; it was a tax, and the ancient customs of the realm, recently embodied in the Petition of Rights, had announced with no doubtful tone that a tax could only be levied by consent of Parliament. If the king could raise ship-money without consent of Parliament he need not, it was said, ever summon a Parliament again. The question thus became narrowed to this issue:—Did Parliament form an integral part of the Constitution, or did it not? The nation asserted that it did, and their belief on this point was the second cause which ushered in the fall of the monarchy. The legality which Englishmen then cherished was the legality of a nation which had hitherto preserved unbroken the traditions of self-government. Spoken or unspoken—beneath all the technicalities of the lawyers, beneath all the records of the antiquaries, there remained an under-tone of reliance upon the nation itself. Parliaments had been established to gather into a focus the national resolve. It was a new thing that a

¹ Mr Gardiner writes:—“The notion that Laud and Strafford were leagued together in a conspiracy to lay England at the feet of the Pope is so entirely in contradiction with the facts of the case, that a modern reader is tempted at once to treat the charge as a fiction, deliberately invented to serve the ends of a political party. To give way to this temptation would be to commit the greatest injustice. The conviction was shared not merely by Pym and Hampden, who afterwards opposed the King, but by Falkland and Capel, who afterwards supported him, and its existence, as a conscientious belief, can alone explain the vehemence of anger which it produced.”

king should treat the policy and religion of the nation as if they concerned himself alone. If Englishmen opposed such a sentiment because it was strange, they opposed it still more because it was degrading.

And now a new difficulty arose. By his arbitrary interference in religious matters, his illegal impositions, his unconstitutional courts of law, Charles had aroused a dangerous spirit of disloyalty in the nation. Worked upon by the mischievous suggestions of Laud, the king had resolved to carry out the ecclesiastical policy in Scotland which his father before him endeavoured to establish. He would crush the independence of Presbyterianism north of the Tweed, and force every kirk and assembly from Wick to Berwick to accept the hated Five Articles which James had drawn up. And now, in July, 1637, an order was issued from the Privy Council that an English liturgy was henceforth to be used in all churches and cathedrals of Scotland. The storm of indignation with which the order was received is well known. The congregations refused to listen to the formal words of prayer, and in such places where the minister insisted upon using them he was mobbed and his church half wrecked by the angry assembly. At the cathedral church of St. Giles', in Edinburgh, the dean ascended the pulpit to read prayers; shouts of disapprobation from the women drowned his voice. "The mass," cried one, "is entered among us." "Baal is in the Church," said another. Opprobrious epithets were applied to the dean. Then the Bishop of Edinburgh rose up to still the tumult; he begged the noisy zealots to desist from their profanation of holy ground, but his words conveyed an idea which was utterly abhorrent to the Puritan mind, and the clamour waxed all the louder under the ill-judged exhortation. A stool was aimed at his head, and grazed the shoulders of the dean who sat behind him. At this final insult the magistrates were called upon to clear the church of the rioters, and it was with difficulty the building was emptied. What happened in Edinburgh happened in every town in the northern kingdom. Riots everywhere ensued, and the people, led by the aristocracy and their chief ministers, banded themselves together, and openly opposed the hated innovation. The clauses of the Covenant were framed, and eagerly subscribed to. Resistance so determined created considerable consternation in the Council Chamber at Whitehall. Charles was ready to make concessions, but the stern Covenanters declined to enter into any compromise. They assumed the aggressive. "We are busy here," writes a Mr. Craig, from Edinburgh, to Lord Stewart, "preaching, praying, and drilling; and if his majesty and his subjects of England come hither they will find a harder welcome than before unless we be made quit of the

bishops." To conquer this insubordination Charles, in March, 1639, marched the forces he had collected against the "traitorous Scots." On arriving at Berwick, however, the king thought it more prudent to come to terms with his foes. The treaty of Berwick was signed, but its terms were regarded as null and void by the Covenanters. The Scots refused to obey its clauses, to dismantle their forts, to dismiss their unlawful meetings, or to recognize the royal authority over their proceedings.

The king now applied for counsel to one whose advice was seldom given in vain; he wrote to Wentworth. He wished, he said, to consult the Lord Deputy touching the army; "but I have much more," he added, "and indeed too much, to desire your counsel and attendance for some time, which I think not fit to express by letter more than this—the Scots Covenant begins to spread too far." Across St. George's Channel, Wentworth had ruled the people as they had never been ruled before. He quelled all opposition by the vigour of his punishments; he re-organized the army; he freed commerce from the pirates that had infested the Irish coasts, he levied fines, he raised taxes, he established monopolies, he planted new districts, he introduced the general cultivation of flax; he raised the fortunes of the Emerald Isle to a high pitch of prosperity. Within four years the produce of the customs rose from £12,000 a year to £40,000, and in the fifth year of his power he wrote home that the annual revenue would exceed the expenditure by 60,000 pounds.

My lord deputy of Ireland [writes Sir Thomas Roe to the Queen of Bohemia] doth great wonders, and governs like a king, and hath taught that kingdom to show us an example of envy by having parliaments, and knowing wisely how to use them.

Wentworth, in November, 1639, arrived in London, after a stormy passage across the St. George's Channel, and at once became the most prominent member of that secret Council, composed of Charles, Laud, and the Marquis of Hamilton, which now managed the affairs of the nation. He had been opposed to the first campaign against the Scots, but when the conduct of the Covenanters, subsequent to the Treaty of Berwick, was laid before him he declared for war. His assistance was no lukewarm aid. He advised the king to assemble a parliament; he pledged himself to bring over a large subsidy from Ireland; he proposed a loan in England, and subscribed to it by way of example the enormous sum of 20,000 pounds, equal to £100,000 of our present money. These promises, as Earl of Strafford, he carried out, but Nemesis was swiftly weaving her toils, and soon the king and his mischievous advisers were to fall victims to her vindictive wiles. Parliament met—known in

history as the "Short Parliament"—and was soon dismissed. The House of Commons demanded redress for the grievances it had sustained at the hands of the king; Charles demanded twelve subsidies, and declined to comply with the wishes of the popular Chamber; in return the Commons refused to grant the necessary supplies; and in a hasty fit of passion the king dissolved the Houses. The Short Parliament sat for three weeks, and, so far as actual results were concerned, it accomplished nothing at all. Yet its work was as memorable as that of any parliament in our history, for what it proposed was nothing short of a complete change in the relations between the king and the nation; it announced that Parliament was the soul of the Commonwealth, and asserted what the Revolution of 1688 afterwards carried out, that the House of Commons was the central force of the State. Raising funds as best he could Charles pushed on the war with Scotland; Strafford went north as lieutenant-general, but on reaching Durham he heard of the rout of a detachment of the king's troops at Newburn, and was forced to fall back upon York. Then the end came; a peace was entered into with the victorious Scots; the nation was indignant with the excesses and failures of the prerogative, and the famous Long Parliament was summoned to meet at Westminster.

Upon the subject of the illegal taxation introduced by Charles the volumes of Mr. Gardiner, who is more favourable to the Cavalier cause than several of our modern historians, throws much new light. The outcry against ship-money was undoubtedly one of the main reasons which led to the Civil War. Yet, says Mr. Gardiner, "no unprejudiced person can deny that the existence of a powerful fleet was indispensable to England's safety." The sum demanded by Charles for the equipment of the Royal Navy was no more than the case required; and the charge which "has so frequently been brought against him of spending the money thus levied on objects unconnected with its ostensible purpose is without a shadow of foundation." It is perfectly certain that though the grant of tonnage and poundage was originally made in order to provide the Crown with the means of guarding the seas, the expenses of government had so far increased that if tonnage and poundage had been applied to that purpose on the scale that had then become necessary, the exchequer would soon have been in a condition of bankruptcy. But the question of the hour, as we have remarked, was not whether ship-money was necessary or not, but whether the king had the right, of his own mere motion, to levy the tax. If he had, then the right assumed by him was fatal to the parliamentary constitution of England. The royalists asserted that he had; Hampden and his followers maintained the contrary; and hence the discontent which terminated in civil war. Ship-

money was peculiarly adapted, says Mr. Gardiner, to bring into a focus all the political dissatisfaction which existed in England. The incidence of the tax was felt by all but the very poorest, and the question at issue was capable of being summed up in a few terse words, which would fix themselves on the dullest understanding. As was however to be expected, the grievance of ship-money did not stand alone. "Other complaints," writes our author, "were heard of mischiefs inflicted for the most part on special classes or special localities which were each of them separately of less importance than that caused by the ship-money, but which, taken together, were sufficient to cause a considerable amount of irritation." And these "mischiefs" were as numerous as they were harassing. Ever since 1634 the Forest Courts had been unusually active in punishing those persons who it was alleged had offended against the law by infringing upon the royal forests. The fines set were enormous, and in many cases the boundaries of the forests had been greatly enlarged. The bounds of Rockingham Forest had been reckoned as measuring six miles in circumference; they were now to measure sixty. It was true that the fines paid into the Exchequer were small when compared with the original demands; but they were large enough to cause considerable discontent in the minds of those who believed themselves to be buying off on compulsion a purely imaginary claim. The spirit of monopoly was also everywhere vigorous. The Privy Council of Charles not only believed itself empowered by law to establish new corporations with the sole right of trade, but to regulate trade in every possible way. The making of bricks, the shipping of coal, the manufacture of soap, the production of salt, the building of houses, the business of the brewers and maltsters, vintners and starch-makers, were all in the hands of the few, with the inevitable consequence that the articles, in the absence of healthy competition, were both expensive and inferior. The King, however, received a heavy tax on all production, and he was content.

Mr. Gardiner deals kindly with the character of Charles, and with his estimate of the ill-starred Sovereign, since it is always wise to hear both sides of the question, we conclude our criticism of the volumes before us:—

From whatever side Charles's conduct is approached [writes Mr. Gardiner] the result is the same. He failed because morally, intellectually and politically he was isolated in the midst of his generation. He had no wish to erect a despotism, to do injustice or to heap up wealth at the expense of his subjects. If he had confidence in his own judgment, his confidence was not entirely without justification. He was a shrewd critic of other men's mistakes, and usually succeeded in

hitting the weak point of an enemy's argument, though it often happened that, taken as a whole, the argument of his opponents was far stronger than his own. Especially on theological questions he was able to hold his own against trained disputants. On all matters relating to art he was an acknowledged master. His collection of pictures was the finest and most complete in Europe. He had that technical knowledge which enabled him instinctively to distinguish between the work of one painter and another. He was never happier than when he was conversing with musicians, painters, sculptors and architects. He treated Rubens and Vandyke as his personal friends. But the brain which could test an argument or a picture could never test a man. Nothing could ever convince him of the unworthiness of those with whom he had been in the long habit of familiar intercourse. Nothing could ever persuade him of the worthiness of those who were conscientiously opposed to his Government. There was no gradation either in his enmity or his friendship. An Eliot or a Pym was to him just the same virulent slanderer as a Leighton or a Bastwick. A Wentworth and a Holland were held in equal favour: and some who were ready to sacrifice their lives in his cause were constantly finding obstacles thrown in their path through the king's soft-heartedness to gratify the prayers of some needy courtier. In his unwarranted self-reliance Charles enormously under-estimated the difficulties of government, and especially of a Government such as his. He would have nothing to say to "thorough," because he could not understand that thoroughness was absolutely essential. He would not get rid of slothful or incompetent officials, would not set aside private interests for great public ends, would not give himself the trouble to master the details of the business on which he was engaged. He thought that he had done everything in ridding himself of Parliaments, though in reality he had done but little. He did not see that parliaments had roots in the local organizations of the country, and that as long as these organizations remained intact they would be ready to blossom into parliaments again at the first favourable opportunity.



Short Notices.

The Church Quarterly Review. No. 29. October, 1882.
Spottiswoode & Co.

IN this number appear some ably-written articles; all are worth reading, as we think, though here and there, while we read, we are constrained to make a private protest. The article on Mozley's "Reminiscences" would seem to be the work of an eminent ecclesiastical layman, known as well in the House of Commons as on Church Congress platforms. "The Social and Religious Condition of Wales" contains some striking quotations; and those of our readers who were interested in the articles by Canon Powell Jones on the proposed Educational legislation for the Principality may be glad to read this *Quarterly* paper. In regard to the new Greek text, the *Church Quarterly* replies to Canon Cook's volume