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VOL. II.

By John Foster, Esq. of the Inner Temple.
In giving the lives of the most prominent actors upon the great and awful stage of the Old English Revolution, the Author has thought himself justified in departing from the system observed by his predecessors, and, instead of the numerous individual sketches that, under other circumstances, are all that is necessary, devoting a whole volume at a time to but two or three of those eventful biographies which include the histories of minor contemporaries, and, indeed, the history of the age itself. For the times, awful as they were, were scarcely greater than the men; — the ideas of both present themselves to us at once, like shadowy and solid giants standing together, and hardly letting us discern which leads the other.

The life of Eliot is the first that has appeared. He did not survive to be an actor in the scene during the most obvious part of the great contest; and posterity has been so much occupied with those who did, that they are startled when they have leisure to look back, and see these older and not less noble shapes of its commencement, — these less bodily, yet hardly less visible, demi-gods, — who
were its first inspiring minds. Eliot was the greatest actor in the outbreak of the Revolution, though it became ultimately the more memorable part of his lot to think and to suffer; and the reader will see that he did both, with that mixture of force and delicacy, that prose of common sense and poetry of the heart, which so remarkably characterises the man of business in that age, and which is traceable, in the Author's opinion, to the effect which the chivalrous breeding of the reign of Elizabeth had upon the rising generation. The sons and daughters of the "Arcadia" were the parents of the men of Charles and Cromwell.

58. Lincoln's Inn Fields.
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SIR JOHN ELIOT.

1590—1632.

John Eliot was "a Cornishman born, and an esquire's son." His family, though new residents in that county, were of very ancient Devonshire descent. Prince alludes to them in his "Worthies," and Fuller has pointed out the name of Walter Eliot, one of his ancestors, in the sheriff's return of the gentry of the county of Devon, made in 1433, during the reign of Henry VI. Browne Willis, who may be considered a good authority on the subject, having married a lineal descendant of the family, states that this Walter Eliot allied himself to the family of Sir Richard Eliot, appointed a justice of the court of King's Bench by Henry VIII., but more illustrious as the father of one of the earliest of our vernacular writers, the famous Sir Thomas Eliot. The first of the family who settled in Cornwall appears to have been the great-uncle of sir

2 See Ducarel's "Life of Browne Willis."
John, who obtained from the family of Champernowne the priory of St. Germaines and its lands, in exchange for property possessed by him at Cutlands, near Ashburton. To this priory the name of Port Eliot was then given, which it bears to this day. Its large estates have descended with it from father to son, and form a considerable portion of the property of the present earl of St. Germaines.

At this seat of Port Eliot John Eliot was born, on the 20th of April, 1590. In his youth he was subjected to none of the restraints that should have been applied to a temper naturally ardent. His father was a man of easy habits, kept very hospitable house, flung it open to every sort of visitor, and never, it is to be presumed, troubled himself to consider the effect of such a course upon the uncontrolled disposition and manners of his son. It is to this lax education that we have to attribute a painful incident in the life of Eliot, of which the most treacherous advantage has been taken by his political enemies.

Archdeacon Echard, a notorious advocate of the Stuarts, and a most inaccurate historical writer, gave the first public account of it. After stating, most untruly (as we have seen), that Eliot was of a "new..."
family," this archdeacon proceeds: — "Within his own parish there lived one Mr. John Moyle, a gentleman of very good note and character in his country, who, together with his son, had the honour to serve in parliament. Whether out of rivalship or otherwise, Mr. Eliot, having, upon a very slight occasion, entertained a bitter grudge against the other, went to his house under the show of a friendly visit, and there treacherously stabbed him, while he was turning on one side to take a glass of wine to drink to him." 2 He states further: "Mr. Moyle outlived this base attempt about forty years, who, with some others of his family, often told the particulars to his grandson, Dr. Prideaux, and other relations, from whom I had this particular account." 3 We are here left uncertain, it will be seen, whether the account was received at fifth or sixth hand from gossiping relations, or from the respected and learned dean of Norwich. A late writer, however, has thought fit to assume the latter, and has insisted, with considerable and very obstinate vehemence, on the probable truth of the statement. 4 With the help of materials in a lately published work by lord Nugent 5, and guided by a fact I have discovered respecting sir John Eliot's father, I now present this singular incident in a new, and, it may be hoped, a final aspect.

It occurred, so far as there is truth in it, in the extreme youth of Eliot. That he should have earned for himself, at that time, the epithet "wilful," will scarcely appear surprising after what I have said of the habits and indulgences of his father. Mr. Moyle, who resided at Bake, a district of the parish of St. Germaine, close to Port Eliot, 6 took upon himself to warn old Eliot that

1 Ecbard's History, p. 494, folio, ed. 1780. Is this the "contemporary writer" to whom Mr. D'Israeli alludes, in vol. iv. p. 506, of his Commentaries? I can find no other.
2 Ecbard's History, p. 494. 3 Ibid.
5 Memorials of Hampden.
6 Notice Parlementaria. Browne Willis, the intimate friend of the Moyles, does not make the slightest allusion to this incident, as remen-
such was the disposition of his son. Miss Aikin, the historical writer, has now in her possession a letter, written by an ancestor of one of the most respectable families of Devonshire, wherein the cause and course of the quarrel which ensued are given, as described by the daughter of Mr. Moyle himself, a witness not likely to be unjustly partial to sir John Eliot. This is the statement of that letter.—Mr. Moyle having acquainted sir John Eliot's father with some extravagances in his son's expenses, and this being reported with some aggravating circumstances, young Eliot went hastily to Mr. Moyle's house and remonstrated. What words passed she knows not, but Eliot drew his sword, and wounded Mr. Moyle in the side. "On reflection," continues Mr. Moyle's daughter, 'he soon detested the fact; and from thenceforward became as remarkable for his private deportment, in every view of it, as his public conduct. Mr. Moyle was so entirely reconciled to him, that no person, in his time, held him in higher esteem.'

That this hasty ebullition of will occurred in extreme youth, I am now prepared to prove. I find, from documents of the time, that Eliot's father died in 1609. He was buried in the church of St. Germains, on the 24th of June in that year. Anthony Wood (the best authority on such a point, though on such only) tells us that young Eliot entered college in 1607, and continued there three years. It is evident, therefore, that at the time of the quarrel with Moyle, Eliot could not have been more than seventeen, or—assuming (which is most unlikely) that it occurred in a college vacation of his first year—eighteen years old. This will be considered as established beyond further doubt. It is con-

firmed still more by a remarkable document which has been found among the Eliot papers, "An apologie," addressed to Mr. Moyle by young Eliot, for the "greate injury" he had done him, and witnessed by names, some of which were afterwards greatly distinguished in the parliamentary history of the time. The terms of it are highly curious, and indicate the writer clearly. It is an atonement which marks the characteristic impulse of a young and generous mind, anxious to repair an unpremeditated wrong. "Mr. Moyle," so runs the apology, "I doe acknowledge I have done you a greate injury, which I wish I had never done, and doe desire you to remit it; and I desire that all unkindnesse may be forgiven and forgotten betwixt us, and henceforward I shall desire and deserve your love in all friendly offices, as I hope you will mine. Jo. Eliottte."

That this apology was honestly meant, and strictly redeemed, that the writer did desire the love of him whom he had hastily injured, and deserve it, and, moreover, obtain it — we are fortunately not without ample proof. In the volume of Eliot papers already referred to, exist two letters, written, many years after this event, by sir John to this very Mr. Moyle, granting him solicited favours. It was a saying of shrewd severity, that few natures exist capable of making compensation to those whom they may have injured, or even of ceasing to follow them with resentment. Assuredly, however, rare and virtuous as such natures are, John Eliot's was one of them. He held himself the constant and willing debtor of the man he had unwillingly offended. "I am sorry," he says, in one of his letters, after granting Moyle what he had asked, "this return is not better to the occasion you have given me; it may serve for an expression of my power, though my affection be beyond it. I can command corruption out of no man, but in

1 See lord Eliot's communication to Mr. D'Israeli, full of excellent feeling, and a proper concern for the memory of his great progenitor, "Commentaries," vol. iv. p. 575.
2 Eliot Papers, MS, Nos. 63. and 98.
mine own heart have a clear will to serve you, and shall faithfully remain your true friend." In the other, written some months after, in answer to an intercession by Moyle for an offending tenant of sir John's, the following passage occurs: — "In answer to your love, I will give orders to my servant Hill, at his return into the country, to repay him the money that's received, and so to leave him to his old interest for the tenement, in which he must acknowledge your courtesy and favour, for whose satisfaction it is done by your most affectionate friend." 1

Taken in connection with the statements I have given, this incident assumes, in my mind, a more than ordinary interest, and becomes, indeed, an important feature in the life of Eliot. It is the line drawn between his passing youth and coming manhood. Whatever may have been the turbulence of his boyhood, whatever the struggle of its uncurbed passions, this event startled him into a perfect and sober self-control. His "private deportment," says Mr. Moyle's daughter, was as remarkable ever after, as that of his public conduct. In the latter, his temper never ceased to be ardent for the general good, and against the wrongful oppressor. In private, it was ardent in kindness, in busy purposes and affections for those around him. To the "last right end," he stood

"A perfect patriot, and a noble friend." —
and so his biographer must delineate him, apart from all preconceived affections or prejudices.

Immediately after the quarrel with Mr. Moyle, it is probable that young Eliot left his home for the university of Oxford. Anthony Wood states that he “became a gentleman-commoner of Exeter college, in Michaelmas term anno 1607, aged 15.”¹ The same authority tells us that he left the university, without a degree, after he had continued there about three years.² That his time, however, was not misspent at that venerable seat of study, he afterwards well proved. He had naturally a fine imagination; and when, on the lapse of a few years, it burst forth in the house of commons, it was surrounded with the pomp of Greek and Roman learning. In the studies of his youth, in those invaluable treasures of thought and language which are placed within the reach of every scholar, he had strengthened himself for great duties. And more than this. In his youthful contemplation of the ancient school philosophy, he had provided for his later years the enjoyment of those sublime reveries, which, we shall have occasion to see, were his chief consolations in a dungeon. Little, probably, did he then imagine, as he was first making the acquaintance of Seneca, of Plato, and the Stagyrite, that they would stand him in the stead of friends, when prison bars had shut out every other.

The sudden interruption to his studies, at the expiration of three years, appears to have originated in his desire to obtain some acquaintance with the common law of England. This knowledge began then to be considered a necessary accomplishment for one who aspired to the honours of parliament, with the view of supporting the principles of the rising country party. Eliot was one of these; and, as Wood informs us, after leaving the university, “went to one of the inns of court, and became a barrister.”³ The lapse of a year

¹ Ath. Oxon. vol. it. p. 473. This is incorrect, however, as I have stated, in respect of Eliot’s age. He was seventeen.
³ Ibid.
or two introduces us to a new incident in his private life, of which a malignant advantage has, as usual, been taken by his political opponents.

His disposition, never less active than meditative, induced him to visit the continent. At precisely the same period, the discerning lady Villiers had sent her famous son to grace the beauty of his face, and the handsomeness of his person (his only birthright), by the advantages of foreign travel. Elliot and Villiers met, and the courtesies of English travellers in a foreign country ensued between them. They journeyed together; and it is not surprising that a generous warmth in the disposition of Elliot should have suited well with the bold address and sprightliness of temper, for which alone, at that time, George Villiers was remarkable. It is said they became intimate. In all probability they did so, if we may judge from a circumstance that shall in due course be noticed.

Meanwhile, I have another misrepresentation to clear away. After his return from the continent, Elliot married. It has been reserved for the writer before referred to—Mr. D'Israeli, whose ingenuity of research, and pleasant attractiveness of style, are only outstripped by his violent political tendencies, and his most amusing professions of philosophical impartiality—to fasten upon even this domestic, and most private, incident in the

1 Buckingham was a younger son, by a second marriage, of sir George Villiers, of Brookesley, in Leicestershire, whose family, though ancient, had hitherto been unheard of in the kingdom. His mother is reported to have served in his father's kitchen, but he, being struck with her extraordinary beauty and person, which the meanness of her clothes could not hide, prevailed with lady Villiers, not without difficulty, to raise her to a higher office; and on the death of that lady he married this her servant. As, however, the heir by a former marriage succeeded to the family estate, it became a grand object with lady Villiers, who had obtained the means through a second husband, whom she afterwards deserted, to accomplish her children for pushing their own fortune in the world. Hence her conduct to George, as I have noticed it above. See R. Coke, p. 74. Hacket's Life of Williams, part i. p. 171. Brodie's British Empire, vol. ii. p. 19, 19.

2 Echard's History, p. 424. Mr. D'Israeli claims the merit of having discovered this (vol. iv. p. 507; Pamphlet, p. 3.), — a claim on which his friends also insist (see Quarterly Review, No. xcv. p. 450), on what authority does not appear. Echard was the first discoverer, if there be any merit in it; nor would his statement have carried any weight, but that other circumstances have tended to confirm it.
life of Eliot, as another instance of what he is pleased to consider the turbulence and "ungovernable passion" of his "bold and adventurous character." Without quoting any authority, Mr. D'Iraeli states, that "when the house of commons voted 5000l. for a compensation to the family for his Eliot's 'sufferings,' they also voted another 2000l. part of four, for which he had been fined by the court of wards, by reason of his marriage with sir Daniel Norton's daughter." He then goes on to state that this indicates the violent carrying off of the lady by the turbulent Eliot. What possible authority Mr. D'Iraeli can bring forward for this statement, I know not. The only record in existence bearing on such a subject, so far as I am aware, is an entry in the earl of Leicester's journal, of unquestioned authenticity and correctness. It is most satisfactory on the point, as will be seen; and I will not suppose that this was the source from which Mr. D'Iraeli derived his statement. It is as follows:—"Monday, 18th January, 1646. The house of commons this day, according to former order, took into consideration the great losses and sufferings of many members, in the year tertio Caroli, for speaking (in parliament) in behalf of the kingdom. A report whereof was made to the house, from the committee to whom it was formerly referred; and the commons, upon debate, passed several votes for allowances to be given to such members, in recompense of theirs wrongs and sufferings, as followeth:" several names are then specified, and among them, "that 5000l. be allowed to sir John Elliotte's younger children; and his elder son's fine in the court of wards to be remitted."2

This "elder son," against whose turbulence the reproof of Mr. D'Iraeli ought to have been directed, was a youth of idle and riotous habits, very wild irregularities, which subsequently, as we shall show, proved a source

1 See Mr. D'Iraeli's Commentaries, vol. ii. p. 283.
2 Sidney Papers, pp. 2, 3. This early portion of the Journal is especially remarkable for its accuracy and precision. All of it was written for the author's private use.
of much anxiety and disquiet to his father. He was the exact person for the adventure maliciously fixed upon sir John. The latter married without violating the laws of any court, but was deprived of his wife by death, after she had presented him with two sons. The "younger children" alluded to in the passage quoted would seem to comprise the family of the second son.

Eliot's intercourse with Villiers was now resumed. A wonderful change had taken place in the interval. The base creature Somerset had been prosecuted at last, ostensibly for the murder of Overbury, but, in reality, to provide room for a fourth favourite, on whom the majesty of the day might lavish its shameless fondness. That new favourite was selected in the person of George Villiers. Well might lord Clarendon exclaim, "Never any man, in any age, nor, I believe, in any country or nation, rose in so short a time to so much greatness of honour, fame, or fortune, upon no other advantage or recommendation than of the beauty or gracefulness of his person." Among the successive honours showered in ridiculous abundance upon him, fell that of lord high admiral of England. With this office was connected the duty of appointing vice-admirals in the several counties; and it is probable, that, personal motives of acquaintance or even friendship quite apart, the name of Eliot was instantly suggested to the young favourite, as one that claimed on every ground a promotion of this sort. He possessed one of the largest paternal estates of any gentleman of the time, and had the command of much influence in his own and the neighbouring county. Accordingly we find that the lapse of a short time after that which saw Villiers promoted to the office of lord high admiral, saw Eliot made

1 This is evident from the Eliot Papers, M.S.
2 I avail myself of the opportunity which the mention of this name affords me, to remind the reader that sir Thomas Overbury, scarcely remembered but for his misfortunes, is deserving of a better and more grateful remembrance. He was an accomplished scholar, and adorned literature by many delicate writings. Some passages in the "Witty Characters" appended to his poem of "The Wife," are quite unequalled for simplicity and gentleness.
3 History of the Rebellion, folio ed. vol. 4, p. 9.
vice-admiral of Devonshire. He was also appointed chairman of the committee of stannaries — of his duties in which office he has left a manuscript report — and, at the same time, he received knighthood.

In accordance with the desperate and unwearied spirit of misrepresentation I have already had so many occasions to allude to, the political enemies of this illustrious person have seized on this change in his estate, to attribute it to those vile and vulgar motives, which alone they would seem to be acquainted with. Echard leads the way, connecting it, most unfortunately for his purpose, with the incident of Moyle.1 After giving the false account, formerly quoted, of that youthful anecdote, the archdeacon proceeds: "And now, supposing he had perfected his revenge, he immediately hastened to London to address himself to his sure friend the duke of Buckingham, in order to get his pardon: which, to his great disappointment, he could not obtain without advancing a considerable sum of money into the exchequer. But as soon as his pardon was sealed, and the money paid, he received intelligence that Mr. Moyle was unexpectedly recovered. Upon the happy assurance of this, he again applied himself to the duke, to procure the repayment of the money; but that being swallowed up in the occasions of the court beyond any recovery, all that he could obtain in lieu of it was to be knighted: which, though it might have allayed the heat of his ambition, was so heinously taken at the hands of a person once his equal, that after that he never ceased to be his mortal enemy, but helped to blow up such a flame in the house as was never extinguished." This monstrous account, which I have extracted partly for the amusement of the reader, has found its believers in the present day.2 It is idle to waste words on its refutation. At the period when, it is thus hardly asserted, the assassin Eliot hurried up

1 Echard's History, p. 424.
2 See Mr. D'Israeli's Commentaries, vol. ii. p. 270. — a passage which has not yet been retracted.
to his friend the duke, to crave protection from the laws he had outraged, that "assassin" was but a boy, and the "duke" plain George Villiers, with less power than his pretended suppliant.

But the inconsistencies of the candid "historians" and "commentators" do not end here. Mr. D'Israeli, who adopts the ridiculously false statement just quoted, has attempted to corroborate it by the production of a letter written in the year 1623 to the duke. That is to say, he adopts the statement that sir John repaid the protection and the knighthood given him by the duke with immediate and violent hostility; and proposes to corroborate that, by producing a letter written in courteous and deferential terms, by sir John to the duke, some considerable time after the period of the knighthood. The gross folly of this is apparent. I pass that, however, to consider the letter, and the position attempted to be established by its means, namely, "that in 1623 we find sir John a suppliant to, and at least a complimentary admirer of, the minister, and only two years after, in 1625, Eliot made his first personal attack on that minister, his late patron and friend, whom he then selected as a victim of state."2

With respect to the first part of this charge, the answer is short and obvious. The letter is not written in sir John's personal character, but as vice-admiral of Devonshire, to the lord high admiral of England. This is admitted even, in another place, by the author of the charge himself.3 The office of vice-admiral had proved extremely troublesome to sir John, involving him in many disputes concerning the wrecks on the coast, and saddling him with the expenses of various trials.4 Rather than submit to these, it would appear that, in one instance, Eliot preferred to subject himself to the inconveniences of arrest. Under such circumstances

2 Pamphlet, p. 6.
4 See Commons' Journal, 27th of February, 1623; and again, 2d of March in the same year.
it was most natural that he should seek some reparation for the injuries he had undergone in support of the office and rights of the duke of Buckingham. For this purpose the letter in question was written: its tone is expositatory, and, courteous as its terms are, it is even deficient in those elaborately complimentary phrases which were considered due, in that age, to the ceremonious observances of letter-writing. It is as follows.

"Right honourable,—With what affection I have served your grace, I desire rather it should be read in my actions than my words, which made me sparing in my last relation to touch those difficulties wherewith my letters have been checkt, that they might the more fully speak themselves. I shall not seek to gloss them now, but, as they have been, leave them to your grace's acceptance, which I presume so noble, that scandal or detraction cannot decline it. It were an injury of your worth, which I dare not attempt, to insinuate the opinion of any merit by false colours or pretences, or with hard circumstances to endear my labours, and might beget suspicion, sooner than assurance in your credit, which I may not hazard. My innocence, I hope, needs not these; nor would I shadow the least error under your protection. But when my services have been faithful, and not altogether vain, directed truly to the honour and benefit of your place, only suffering upon the disadvantage of your absence, I must importune your grace to support my weakness, that it may cause no prejudice of your rights and liberties, which I have studied to preserve, though with the loss of mine own. My insistence therein hath exposed me to a long imprisonment and great charge, which still increaseth, and threatens the ruin of my poor fortunes, if they be not speedily prevented. For which, as my endeavours have been wholly yours, I most humbly crave your grace's favour both to myself and them; in
which I am devoted. Your grace's thrice humble servant.

J. Eliot."

"Novemb. 8. 1628." 1

Now, not a single expression in this letter is inconsistent with the construction which I have placed on it, or justly appropriate to any other construction. The complimentary phrases fall evidently short of the notorious custom of the time. I am, indeed, surprised at the bareness of the language, considering the year in which it was written. Buckingham had just then managed to conciliate the country party, 2 and was bespattered with praise in all directions. The people, freed from the political panic that had been caused by the prospect of the Spanish match, in the suddenness of the escape showered applauses on the masked duke; and sir Edward Coke, leading the opposition in the house of commons, was betrayed shortly after into the very professional hyperbole of calling him the "saviour of his country." 3

Had the terms of Eliot's letter, therefore, been most adulatory, there would have existed little cause for wonder: we see that they are not so. Whether the letter was answered or not, appears uncertain; but the acquaintance of the parties did not cease here, as I shall have occasion to indicate hereafter. 4

One word more on this subject. Mr. D'Israeli, alluding to the date of this letter, calls it "the close of 1628," 5 which would intimate that parliament had already commenced its sitting; and then goes on to tell his readers, that the patriotism of Eliot was a "political revolution, which did not happen till two years after he had been

1 Cabala, ed. 1683, pp. 412, 413. The italics are my own. They show the independence of spirit which breaks through even this official complaining.
2 In the same volume of letters—the "Cabala"—p. 340 is a letter to the duke from a staunch and unaltered patriot, sir Robert Philips, on which a precisely similar charge to this we are now discussing might be as easily founded. Had Mr. D'Israeli overlooked this? He admits Philips to have been, emphatically, an independent country gentleman.
3 Clarendon, Hist. vol. i. p. 7.
4 At the duke's death a suit pended between them, and accounts still unsettled. Eliot MSS.
a suppliant to this very minister." 1 This is most untrue. The letter was written in the eighth month of 1628 (old style), two months before the assembling of parliament; and in that parliament the voice of Eliot was heard, in stirring accents of honest patriotism. Though none of his speeches at this period have been preserved in the parliamentary histories, I am prepared to prove, from the journals of the house of commons, and from manuscript records, that no "political revolution" ever occurred in his life; that he was consistent from the first; that his eloquence was often exerted in that last assembly of James's reign, and never but in support of the great party for whose rights and privileges he afterwards suffered death.

A few words may here be allowed to me, on the aspect of public affairs at the meeting of this parliament, which introduced Eliot to public life. 2 I shall always avoid, in these biographies, matters of general history or character, except so far as may be needed in illustration of individual conduct, or of those particular questions which called forth its distinctive energies. That individual conduct shall also be limited, as much as possible, to the subject of each life. Thus, in the present instance, I have nothing to do with the great men who laboured in the same cause with Eliot, except as their general policy and characteristics illustrate his exertions. I have nothing to do with the great questions they agitated, except in so far as they called forth his individual energies: what remains will be noticed in other biographies; nor shall I seek in vain the opportunity of observing upon any great incident of this great era of statesmanship. The first object will in all cases be, to carry light and life into general history, by particular details of character.

The ignominious defeat of the elector palatine by Spinola, and the circumstances which ought especially to have induced James to render assistance to his weak

2 For a sketch of the preceding parliaments, see the biography of Stratford.
but unfortunate son-in-law, belong to history. In not doing so, he subjected himself to the derision of Europe, and to the self-reproach (if he were able to have felt it) of having sacrificed the noblest opportunity of making himself popular in his own nation, and honoured everywhere, as the assenter of civil and religious liberty. But he was bound in the fetters of Spain, and had set his foolish heart on a match for the prince with the infanta. This was a politic bait thrown out by that wily country, and greedily seized by the king. It was intended as a means of dragging the pusillanimous James into the league with the house of Austria, for opposing the protestants, and invading the liberties of Germany. It succeeded. The people of England saw their brother protestants abroad hunted down by tyrants; they saw the evangelical league broken and discomfited by the Roman catholic union; themselves made parties to the wrong which they abhorred, and enemies to that holy cause of freedom and of conscience, on which, at home, they had staked all. Discontent rose to a frightful pitch, and the person of the king was even threatened. At this moment the tide of affairs was suddenly turned; and the man who had resisted the outrages of

---

1 See the various histories. Dr. Lingard has treated the subject very fully. See also some able reasoning on the general question in Bolingbroke's Remarks, pp. 285–306. 8vo edit. Mr. Brodie has stated the demerits of James's conduct with appropriate bitterness. There are also some very important communications relative to this in lord Hardwicke's State Papers; in the second volume of Somers' Tracts, by Scott; and in Howell's Familiar Letters. See Rushworth, vol. i. pp. 76–118; Hacket's Life of Williams; Heylin's Life of Laud; and Seupherson's James I. Mr. D'Israeli's "Secret History of the Spanish Match" is very pleasant and ingenious. See also Roger Coke's "Detection," a very honest book, if we set aside its plagiarisms.

2 From a curious volume, entitled "Truth brought to Light," we learn that, in Flanders, they presented in their comedies messengers bringing news that England was ready to send a hundred thousand ambassadors to the assistance of the palatinate. "And they pictured the king in one place with a scabbard without a sword; in another place, with a sword that nobody could draw, though divers persons stood pulling at it. In Brussels they painted him with his pockets hanging out, and never a penny in them, and his purse turned upside down. In Antwerp they pictured the queen of Bohemia like a poor Irish mantler, with her hair hanging about her ears, and her child at her back, with the king, her father, carrying the cradle after her." — Truth brought to Light. Introduction.

3 See a curious tract, "Tom Tell Truth," in the second volume of Somers' Collection.
an insulted nation, yielded to the peevish complaints of a haughty and offended minion.

Jealousy of Bristol's negotiations had resolved Buckingham to carry the prince to Spain; jealousy of the wily archbishop Williams now induced him to wish for home. Moreover, he had been neglected in that stately country, not to say insulted, for his levity and profligate bearing. A deadly jealousy had also risen between him and the Spanish minister, Olivarez; and he began to feel that, in proportion as the edifice of his power was lofty, it was unstable. He saw an expedient for securing it on a wider and more solid basis, and straightway seized it. He effected a rupture, and hurried the prince home, whither the welcome news of this new policy had travelled before, securing them an enthusiastic welcome. The unaccustomed acclamations wafted a new sense into the all-grasping soul of Buckingham; and, resolving to try the game of patriotism, he forced the king to summon a parliament. He threw himself into the arms of the (deceived) popular party, and drove the unhappy James from his boasted "kingcraft," into a declaration of war against Spain.1

The parliament assembled, with hopes never before entertained. The dissolution of the Spanish treaty was justly considered a great national deliverance; and the favourite of James, who had disrobed him of his inglorious mantle of peace, was now the favourite of the nation. At this extraordinary juncture, Eliot took his seat in the house of commons. It has been asserted by Wood2 and others, that he sat in the previous parliament; but this is certainly a mistake. He was returned now for the first time, with Mr. Richard Estcourt, for the borough of Newport, in Cornwall.

And now, from the first moment of his public life,

1 The keenest dissection, as it appears to me, of the conduct of Buckingham and the prince, throughout the whole of this Spanish affair, will be found in a work very recently published in the present series,—History of England, vol. iv., continued from Sir James Mackintosh.

2 Wood is seldom to be relied on in any date, except those which are furnished by the Oxford books:—Lord Nugent has inaccurately adopted his statement that Eliot sat in the parliament of 1691.
his patriotism began, — not from pique, or a spirit of opposition — for as yet he had no opponents, save those of his religion and his country. For be it ever remembered, that, in that day, politics were necessarily and intimately connected with religious doctrine. The Romish cause was the cause of the oppressor, while the protestant was that of the oppressed; and the English constitutional party saw no chance for good government, save in a root-and-branch opposition to the Roman catholic faith. Their cause of freedom at home was weakened by the success of popish tyranny abroad; and the great struggle going on between the protestant patriots of Bohemia, and the various Roman catholic powers leagued in extensive confederacy against them, seemed a not improbable shadowing forth of the future destiny of the popular party in England. So thought the leaders of this parliament, — "the greatest and the knowingest auditory," as a political adversary called them, "that this kingdom, or perhaps the world, afforded," and so they acted, confirming that great reputation.

Eliot at once distinguished himself, and was received as a leader of the country party. I have been at some pains to trace his conduct through this parliament, for it has not been mentioned by any historian; whilst advantage has been taken of the silence, to bear out the assertion of his having been, at this period, a mere undistinguished subserver to the duke of Buckingham. We shall see how far this is just.

The parliament met on the 12th of February, 1623. It was adjourned, however, until the 19th, when the speech was delivered, and the house further adjourned until the 23d. The three following days were occupied in arranging conferences with the lords, respecting the duke's intended "Narrative." On the 27th, Eliot arose. It was the earliest day of the session, and it was his first appearance in the house. He declared at once the cause he had entered to sustain; and, putting aside, as subordinate,

1 Hacket's Life of Williams, p. 178.
even the all-engrossing question of the war, raised his
voice for certain ancient privileges of the nation. On the
1st of March, he spoke on the question of the Spanish
treaties, in the high strain of popular feeling. He
alluded to war, as that "which alone will secure and
repair us;" and recommended the setting out of a fleet
"by those penalties the papists and recusants have
already incurred,"—means which would have been
especially odious to the court. But Eliot never waited
to trim his propositions by the court fashion, even in its
popular days, and we never discern in him the bated
breath, or the whispering humbleness. On that oc-
casion, also, he seems to have resented the long and
vacillating negotiations of the king and his secretaries.
"Fitter for us to do than to speak," he said, and most
justly said, at that crisis. On the 8th of the same
month, he opposed a hasty decision with respect to the
king's answer at Theobald's. It was not satisfactory,
owing to the immediateness of its demand for supplies.
He had been appointed one of the deputation; and,
alluding to "many strange reports," since their return,
he moves "to have some time each to take copies, and
then to deliberate and advise." This he carried.
On the 11th, he went up to the lords, on this same
subject, with some of the great leaders of the house—
Philip, Selden, Coke, Rudyard, Saville, Stroude—to
confer with them about his majesty's estate." This
conference elicited an assurance from the treasurer, the
following day, of "his majesty's resolution to call
parliaments oft, to make good laws, and redress public
grievances." From this may be well inferred the nature
of the previous day's remonstrance from Eliot and his
friends. Nor did this plausible assurance put those
faithful men off their guard. They answered the trea-
surer, "that we had no doubt here yesterday, as among

1 Commons' Journals, Feb. 27. 1623.
2 Journals of that date.
3 See the answer, Parl. Hist. vol. vi. p. 92. edit. 1763.
4 Commons' Journals, March 8. 1623.
5 Ibid. March 11. 1623.
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the lords. We fittest to relieve the king's particular wants, when we have enabled the subjects to do it, by removing their grievances." An explanation of the disputed passages in the answer was subsequently given, such as satisfied the house.

In the same spirit were all Eliot's speeches in the matter of this Spanish war. He never supported it but for the promotion of the popular cause, and always accompanied his approbation of the measure with an avowal of those greater ulterior objects, which he felt it ought to accomplish. I need not go through the numerous minutes of the journals, in which his name appears at this time. His attention to the business of debate, as to the committees, must have been most arduous, since it was unremitting. Besides the great number of private bills, in the management of which his name appears, he took part in all public questions; lent his aid to the best legal reforms; and generally formed one in the more learned committees appointed to consider disputed questions on the privileges of the universities. He opposed always, with watchful jealousy, any attempt to move from the constitutional usages of the house; and when the ministers proposed, through sir Guy Palmer, to have a committee to draw a bill for the continuance of all bills the next session in statu quo, that they might so "husband time," — the name of Eliot was found successfully opposed to this, in connection with his friends, Philips, Coke, and Digges. He was unceasing in his exertions against monopolies; and in reminding the house of the petitions — those "stinging petitions," as the king used bitterly to call them — "not to be forgotten against recusants;" but, when duty to the cause permitted it, he never pressed the letter of

1 Commons' Journals, March 12. 1623.
2 Ibid. passim. He was also very active in endeavouring to set the grants of crown lands on a better footing. Many instances will be found of his exertions in respect to the universities; as in the case of the Wacham and Magdalen Colleges: and he is often associated with Coke, Philips, and Gyles, in the forwarding of Cornish private bills.
3 Commons' Journals, April 29. 1624.
4 Ibid. April 7. 1624.
5 Ibid. April 8. 1624.
offence against any offender. Humanity came in rescue of the strictness of his judgments. When some of the popular party pushed hard against the under-sheriff of Cambridge, for a misdemeanor at the election, Eliot humanely interceded. He suggested that the custody the sheriff had already undergone, and the expenses he had been put to, were surely sufficient punishment, and recommended his immediate dismissal. The ever true and able sir Robert Philips seconded the suggestion. In no single respect can the enemies of Eliot taunt him with his conduct in this session; nor will they dare hereafter to use their equally dangerous weapon, the imputation of his silence, to prove that his patriotism was sluggish or inactive, or moving only at the will of others.

After the most anxious search, I can find no allusion from Eliot, respecting Buckingham, which indicates a feeling of any sort. His silence on this head is indeed remarkable, as the lauded name of the duke was then most frequently on the lips of other popular members; and yet, that it did not proceed from any vindictive feeling at an abrupt cessation of intercourse, I think I am enabled to prove. From a minute of the journals of the house, it appears that, on one of the debates respecting the Spanish treaties, some private letters of the duke of Buckingham were referred to, whereupon Eliot stated that he had that morning seen those letters. This is specially entered in the journals. No other member makes the remotest allusion to having seen them. This appears to me to offer a fair presumption that Eliot still continued to meet Buckingham in private intercourse. If this is admitted, then the amiable theory of those writers who have concluded that the letter to the duke, previously quoted, was the last of a series of unanswered applications, and that, from the time of its date, a vindic-

1 Commons' Journals, April 1. 1624. In no other place do I find the smallest allusion to Buckingham, not even at the close of the Spanish business, when thanks were moved by Eliot to "the prince, the king, and to God," for the result of the deliberations. Commons' Journals, April 24. 1624.
tive feeling had been awakened in the breast of the offended writer, — that Eliot's patriotism, in fact, was altogether a personal pique at Buckingham ¹, — has received another blow, prostrate as it was before.

And another, should any one chance to think another necessary, remains to be inflicted. In this parliament a question arose, on which I have discovered the note of a speech by Eliot, which could never have been delivered by him, if his character had not rested clearly free from all imputations of personal dependence or political subserviency. It occurred in a debate "at the close of 1623," the very period fixed by our modern commentators, from which to date their obstinate accusations. At that period, several committees were sitting on the various courts of justice, to investigate complaints against their mal-administration. Among many petitions presented to the house in consequence of these committees, was one from the wife of a person named Gryas, complaining of wrongs she had suffered from the court of chancery, and appealing against the long delays of that court. To this petition sir Edward Coke objected. The lawyer stood in the way of the redresser of grievances. He told the house that the woman was half distracted; that the wrong she complained of occurred in "Egerton's time;" that he was now gone; and that it was a most unusual thing to complain against the dead. After some discussion, it was at last resolved that the grievance in question, with others, should be argued by counsel before a sub-committee. This sub-committee was then about to be chosen, when sir John Eliot rose. He spoke, as was his custom ever, in concern for the wrongs of the oppressed. He warned the house to be careful in their choice, for he knew of what vast importance it was that the "cries of the vexed subject" should be heard by unbiased men. He implored them to "have a special care" that its members should "have

¹ Mr. D'Irless (passim); whose suggestions on this subject have been lately adopted by a distinguished writer. See Quarterly Review, No. 94, p. 471.
no dependence upon men in place;" he suggested that it would be better to have no lawyers upon it; that it were more just to "have countrymen, that have no dependence."

There are few who will disagree with me in thinking, that these are not the words of a follower of Buckingham. That they should have been spoken by one, who laboured under the very odium of what he so earnestly condemned, is, to a monstrous degree, improbable. Not on that occasion, nor on any other, did his opponents in the house dare to hint such a charge. I find the patriotic old lawyer replying to this earnest appeal, with a statement of "great inconveniences in having such a sub-committee," and an entreaty to "have it well considered of:"—but not a word of reproach on the motives of Eliot.

It is necessary that I should now advert to the terms on which Eliot and his friends in this parliament consented to furnish supplies for the Spanish war. On the gross abuse of these supplies, their subsequent bitter opposition was most justly founded.

Their earnest desire to see James's mean subserviency to Spain at once destroyed, never for an instant blinded them to the serious consequence of pressing the people by heavy subsidies. Nine hundred thousand pounds had been demanded. They granted three hundred thousand; promising more, if, in the right prosecution of the contest, more should become necessary. Over and over again they distinctly stated, that the country was not in a condition to hazard a general war; and, by many sharp stipulations, they restricted hostilities to one object, specific and defined. They seem, indeed, to have had some reason, before the final arrangement, to suspect the gross duplicity which had been practised on them by Buckingham, and to have resolved to defend their own policy at all events. They declared, that their object, in so earnestly promoting war, was the recovery of the Palatinate, and that alone: that hostilities with Spain,

1 Commons' Journals, March 17. 1623.
2 This will be alluded to shortly.
therefore, were to be entered into, only in so far as that branch of the house of Austria was expected to assist the others in retaining the territory of the elector palatine. Nothing could be more distinct than their stipulations on this point. They were recognised before the death of James. No war with Spain was proclaimed, though correspondence with its court was broken; and when Mansfield received his commission, with twelve regiments, for the service of the Palatinate, he was required "not to make any invasion, or do any act of war against the country or dominion," of the king of Spain. 1

How far this first condition was preserved, we shall shortly have occasion to see. Another condition there was, proposed by the king himself, that in order to insure the application of the grant to the purposes sought to be attained, it should be paid into the hands of commissioners, appointed by the house, who should expend the money upon that business alone, for which it was granted. 2 The rupture of peace was no headlong enterprise, plunged into by the parliamentary leaders, without regard to the issue, or the means of its attainment. 3

Meanwhile, during these negotiations, no popular grievance was lost sight of. Up to this period, a couplet familiar in the common mouth had embodied the history of parliaments:

"Many faults complained of, few things mended,
A subsidy granted, the parliament ended."

2 Hume calls this "unprecedented in an English monarch." (Vol. v. p. 98.) But though the practice had certainly then become unusual, it was common at a former period of English history. See Brodie's Hist. of British Empire, vol. ii. p. 39. That the king proposed this, however, under compulsion by his new tyrant Buckingham, and as a mere trick to deceive the commons, was soon evident. To the astonishment of all, on accepting the subsidies, he used this language: — "I desire you to understand, that I must have a faithful secret council of war, which must not be ordered by a multitude, for so my designs may be discovered before hand. One penny of this money shall not be bestowed but in sight of your committees; but whether I shall send 2,000 or 10,000, whether by sea or by land, east or west, by diversion or otherwise, by invasion upon the Bavarian or the emperor, you must leave that to your king." An ingenious method of rendering the check he had before submitted to for the purpose of procuring a liberal grant, void and effectless.
3 Commons' Journals, and Parl. Hist., passim.
With the exception of the subsidy bill of 1621, no bill had been allowed to pass for the space of thirteen years. Legislation was now at last resumed. Measures were passed to reform many grievances in the law, and in prevention of vexatious prosecutions. “Their long counsels, which had been weather-bound, came to a quiet road, and their vessel was lighted of statutes which are of immortal memory.”

The greatest of all these was that which abolished monopolies for the sale of merchandise, or for using any trade. It was nobly drawn up by Coke, Eliot, Philips, and other members, as a mere declaratory statute, reciting that such monopolies were already contrary to the ancient and fundamental laws of the realm. “It was there supposed,” says Hume, “that every subject of England had entire power to dispose of his own actions, provided he did no injury to any of his fellow subjects; and that no prerogative of the king, no power of any magistrate, nothing but the authority alone of laws, could restrain that unlimited freedom.”

Following upon this measure, and of an importance no less great, came the impeachment of the lord treasurer Middlesex. For two centuries,—with the single exception of the case of Bacon, too feeble to fix, with any certainty, the precedent,—that grand constitutional right had lain dormant. It was now asserted with eagerness by the commons, and promoted hotly by Buckingham, who had long hated the growing independence of the power of Middlesex, and as his caprice had raised him from obscurity, now turned to hunt him to disgrace. In vain

---

1 Hacket’s Scriinia Remerata (Life of Williams), part i. p. 200. He goes on, in his fashion, to say — “The voices all went one way, as a field of wheat is bended that’s blown with a gentle gale, one and all;” which proves that quaint old gentleman to have been a reader of Beaumont and Fletcher —

* * * “And the people,
Against their nature, are all bent for him;
And like a field of standing corn, that’s moved
With a stiff gale, their heads bow all one way.”

Phleacter.

2 History, vol. v. pp. 98, 99. See also lord Coke, on the subject of this great act, 3 Inst. 181.
the shrewdness of James remonstrated,—"By God, Stenny, you are a fool, and will shortly repent this folly; and will find that, in this fit of popularity, you are making a rod with which your own breech will be scourged." In vain he turned to the prince, and, with a bitterness of prophecy, like that of Bacon to Middlesex ("Remember that a parliament will come!"); told him that he would live "to have his belly full of parliamentary impeachments." The commons were suffered to proceed. They proved the guilt of the lord treasurer; and rescued from the disuse of centuries, and beyond the chance of recall, a vital parliamentary right against future ministers of the crown.

James never forgave this. Hacket tells us that, in reference to the matter, "he was quipt every day with ignominious taunts, that the kind correspondencies between him and the parliament began to have a cloud over them." There were other causes besides this. Further grievances remained to be discussed, and the house had entered upon them with unwearying zeal. The king then gave them to understand, that though they were to apply redress to some known grievances, they were not to go on seeking after more; and shortly afterwards, in discontent, prorogued them. He had failed in the object of his concessions. He fancied they would have put him in possession of more money and more power.

"He let fall some flowers of his crown," says the quaint Hacket, "that they might gather them up;

1 Clarendon, Hist. p. 20.
2 See the proceedings in the Parli Hist. Carte thought him clearly guilty, p. 116. It appears also that Nicholas Ferrar, a most conscientious person, was one of his four ardent accusers. Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography, vol. iv. See also Hallam, vol. i. p. 506. Clarendon, Hacket, and others, consider him to have been used as a sacrifice to Buckingham's resentment. Eliot acted on all the committees of this impeachment, with Sandys, Digges, Philips, Wentworth, Pym, &c. See Journals, April 12, 1684. &c. &c.
3 Life of William, part i. pp. 189, 190.
4 See Parli. Hist. vol. vi. p. 126. &c. Intimation having then gone abroad, of the new treaty of marriage carrying on at Paris, the commons had sent up what the king called a "stinging-petition" against the papists. See Rushworth, vol. i. p. 140. et seq.; also Roger Coke's Detection, vol. i. p. 183. Nothing could exceed the present duplicity of the king and his successor on this subject.
which, indeed, was no more than *defluvium pennarum*,
the moulting of some feathers, after which the eagle
would fly the better." 1 Much to the astonishment and
disgust of the eagle in question, however, measures
which had for their object the clipping of his wings,
the effectual marring of his royal flights, had appeared
to be ripening daily. Under these circumstances, on
the 29th of October, 1624, the day to which the par-
liament had been prorogued, the parliament was finally
dissolved.

The death of James, sudden and mysterious, fol-
lowed close upon this event; and the house of commons
was almost instantly challenged to a contest by his ill-
advised successor. They had prepared themselves for
it by their exertions of the last five and twenty years.
They had obtained little, it might be said, in respect of
distinct enactments; but they had fenced themselves
round with privileges, never to be questioned more, by
favourites or by monarchs. "They had rescued from
disuse their ancient right of impeachment; they had
placed on record a protestation of their claim to debate
all matters of public concern; they had remonstrated
against the usurped prerogatives of binding the subject
by proclamation, and of levying customs at the out-
posts; they had secured beyond controversy their ex-
clusive privilege of determining contested elections of
their members." 2 Vast rights remained yet to be as-
serted, oppressive wrongs to be redressed; but an in-
creasing energy in the nation gave new confidence and
strength to its representatives; and they assembled at
the summons of the new monarch, immediately after
his accession, more than ever proudly watchful of pri-
vilege, and more than ever sternly resolved on good
government. In this parliament, which met at West-
minster on the 18th of June, 1625, Eliot was again at
his post. He took his seat with a new colleague, Mr.

---

1 Life of Williams, vol. i. p. 186.
2 Hallam, vol. i. p. 503.
Ralph Specot, for the same borough as before—that of Newport.

It may be well, before we listen to the comments of Mr. D’Israeli, and of others from whom a more liberal consideration was to be expected, as to the severe conduct of this parliament to their young sovereign, to ask whether any reasonable foundation of confidence had been laid between them before their meeting this day? Had any symptoms of a new and better administration appeared in any quarter of the government? Did favouritism, intrigue, or corruption, seem to have abated a jot of their all-governing influence at court? Had oppression and injustice, even for the few little weeks of the new reign, ceased to harass the nation? But for so short a time, had the doctrine and the practice of absolute power and monarchy imprescriptable, been vailed before the presence of the people, as their new inheritor, with admirable hypocrisy, vailed his crown before that people’s representatives, on this day of their assembling? 1

The answer which history gives to these questions is a just warrant for the murmurs of distrust which, in his progress to his first parliament, already sounded in the ears of the monarch; which scattered the seeds of disaffection in all directions; and planted bitter thorns in the young crown, as yet scarcely settled on the temples of its wearer.

To the amazement of all, the statement made to James's last parliament by Buckingham, and corroborated by Charles, had been discovered to be one tissue of gross falsehoods. On that statement, it has been seen, the war with Spain was undertaken. We have Clarendon's authority for asserting that they knew it to be untrue. 2 “But yet,” says Rushworth, “the prince

1 Charles, on the day of this parliament's meeting, wore his crown, vailing it at the opening and the close of his speech, with a solemn and unusual deference.
2 Clarendon, Hist. of Rebellion, vol. 1. p. 19. folio ed. A reference to the proceedings on the mutual charges of Buckingham and Bristol, in Rushworth’s first volume, or in the sixth and seventh volumes of the "Parliamentary History," will supply very satisfactory means of judgment.
not only gave the testimony of his silence to these un-truths, but, on its being reported to the house the same day, approved thereof there also. The inevitable discovery of the truth, therefore, by the arrival of Bristol, now completely shattered all the popularity which Charles and Buckingham had acquired in the last reign, from the breach of the Spanish treaties. But it did more. It inflamed displeasure by the shame of imposition; and poisoned at once those fresh springs of public confidence, which a new king has, as it were, a right to claim as his own. Nor was this all. With an almost indecent haste, the king had entered into a marriage with a daughter of Roman catholic France; had consented to certain secret articles in the settlement of the marriage, in favour of her religion; had agreed to a suspension of the penal laws against the catholics; and, as an earnest of his promised indulgences, had already granted to several Romish priests a special pardon, without the formality even of a conviction, of all offences committed by them against the penal laws. In fact, of his own inconsiderate will, he had provoked in the English nation that precise shame of religious subjection, to avoid which they had been anxious to rush into a war with Spain. Nor was this the only religious wrong. Symptoms had shown themselves of an unholy bellum episcopale at home. Laud's celebrated schedule of ecclesiastics, branded with the letters O and P, as they happened to be orthodox, or suspected puritan, had already been discussed in the ministerial councils, and had been felt also in portentous signs of that exclusive system of church patronage, the subsequent effects of which were so terrible.

This parliament, therefore, shaped their determinations accordingly. Their first efforts were directed to
secure the future safety of the people by an enlarge-
ment of the basis of popular representation. On a
repetition of the king's demand for supplies, Eliot and
his friends went up to him with an address, respectfully
and cautiously worded, promising supplies, but claiming
the redress of grievances. The intemperate and threat-
ening answer of the king had no effect on the steady
purposes of these great men. They voted tonnage and
poundage for one year. The house of lords, disdaining
to accept it with such a limitation, rashly rejected the
bill. Still the commons were not alarmed. They pur-
sued their own course calmly; granted the king readily,
as they had promised, two subsidies; and were pro-
ceeding to votes of inquiry and censure into various
wrongs and grievances, when the plague suddenly broke
out in London. The major part of the members ob-
jected to continue at their post. “While we are now
speaking,” said one, “the bell is tolling every minute.”
An adjournment to Oxford was consequently proposed,
and, after a vast deal of squabbling between the king
and his two rival ministers, granted. Williams and
Buckingham, now coming fast to an open rupture, could
not but illustrate the truth of the old saying. Just as
the house was adjourning to Oxford, however, sir John
Eliot, with characteristic spirit, rose and made the fol-
lowing motion, — “An order, that within three days
after our next meeting, the house shall then be
adjourned to Oxford, however, sir John
Eliot, with characteristic spirit, rose and made the fol-
lowing motion, — “An order, that within three days
after our next meeting, the house shall then be called,
and the censure of the house to pass upon all such as
shall then be absent.”

1 See Glanville's Reports.  
3 A lively account (though sometimes over ingenious) of this notorius
quarrel will be found in Mr. D'Israeli's secret history of the king's first
ministers, “Commentaries,” vol. i. pp. 249—272. It was a Pearcham and
Lockit affair. “Never trust,” says that excellent moralist, Jonathan
Wild, “never trust the man who has reason to suspect you know he has
injured you.” The archbishop and the duke acted with decision on this
maxim. While the worthy prelate was intriguin deeply for the duke's
impeachment, the no less worthy peer was engaged in a similar plan for
the ruin of the bishop. See Brodie's Hist. of Brit. Emp. vol. ii. p. 81.
Heylin's Life of Lauz, p. 139. Hacket's Scriinia Reserata, part xi.
pp. 16, 17, 18. Rushworth, vol. i. In all their disputes, however, I think Wil-
liams has the decided advantage; and he must have startled Buckingham
not a little when he suddenly whispered in his grace's ear the memorable words,—

"No man that is wise will show himself angry with the people of England."
he would consent to no adjournment which had not some chance, in the sincerity of others, of answering the end proposed.¹

In the course of the proceedings before this adjournment, I should mention, that I have observed a circumstance which seems likely to have been the origin of sir Thomas Wentworth's dislike of Eliot. A feeling of bitterness unquestionably existed between them during the greater part of their parliamentary career.² Mr. D'Israeli does not fail to suggest, that Wentworth might have "disdained the violence and turbulence of Eliot³;" and he goes on to state all the malicious motives that have been suggested on both sides by Hacket and his hero. Even Mr. Hallam is betrayed, I think, on this point, into an unworthy admission. "Always jealous," he says, speaking of Wentworth, "of a rival, he contracted a dislike for sir John Eliot, and might suspect that he was likely to be anticipated by that more distinguished patriot in royal favours."⁴ Such a supposition, on Wentworth's part, supposes a possibility of its truth on Eliot's. I believe the dislike to have originated in no such matter; but, on the contrary, in Eliot's keen penetration and unswerving sense of justice. I find that, shortly after this first parliament assembled, a dispute upon the validity of air Thomas Wentworth's return for the county of York came before the house. Sir John Saville claimed a new election. This was opposed by the court party, who, for reasons best known to themselves and the intriguing archbishop Williams, supported Wentworth.⁵ Eliot, on the other hand, supported the

¹ Commons' Journals, July 11.
² One of Hacket's elegant sentences runs thus: — "Sir John Eliot of the west, and sir Thomas Wentworth of the north (the northern cock, as he afterwards calls him), both in the prime of their age and wits, both conspicuous for able speakers, clashed so often in the house, and cudgelled one another with such strong contradictions, that it grew from an emulation between them to an enmity." — Somnus Reservata.
⁵ I shall have occasion to allude to these more specifically, in the biography of Strafford. Eliot is never understood to have been in any way connected with Saville, whose character was not of that stamp to command either his public or private sympathy. His keen penetration had already pointed to the future earl of Strafford as a patriot who "rather looked to
claims of Saville; and impressed their justice so forcibly on the popular side of the house, that the election of Wentworth was declared void. From this I date the hatred of the future earl of Strafford towards one whom no court intrigue could influence, whom no friendship could persuade, to desert the great principles of public and of private justice. Wentworth was again returned; thenceforward opposed Eliot whenever he was able; and, when that great statesman had perished in the cause so basely forsaken by himself, he sneered at him as a "fantastic apparition;" and never ceased to spit forth venom to the creature Laud against his memory and glory.

Sir John Eliot, however, was on the eve of illustrating, by a more striking example, this great feature in his character. Though he still held the office of vice-admiral of Devonshire, he felt that the time had at last arrived, which left him no alternative of choice, with reference to the lord high admiral. Up to this period he had sustained, as is all but certain from the the proofs I have alleged, a personal intercourse with that nobleman, and was certainly still connected with him in office. His duty now required that this should cease. His youthful companion had long been lost in the pampered minister of kings, his superior in office; he now knew what a word to him, and such a letter would make an end of all." — Strafford's State Papers, vol. i. p. 10.

1 Commons' Journal, July 4. The motion of "Mr. Solicitor" for counsel for Wentworth, was defeated by a majority of thirty-nine. Wentworth at a new election was again returned.

was beneath him in public honesty. Both were abandoned. Sir John Eliot now saw, in the speedy destruction of Buckingham, the only destruction of that power behind the throne which was greater than the throne itself, and was daily becoming more and more fatal to the people. He had at last concentrated in his own person, and in those of his servile adherents, the most considerable offices of the crown, and in his single existence seemed to be content to involve the question of the privileges of the nation. Eliot, contented also with that issue, buckled himself to the destruction of the minister with terrible earnestness.

It is a striking tribute to the honesty of Eliot that the disloyal men of all parties declared themselves in turn against him. Archbishop Williams, in his abject paper of apology to the king, to disclaim all connection "with any of the stirring men," declared that about this time "Sir John Eliot, the only member that began to thrust in a complaint against me, was never out of my lord duke's chamber and bosom." This, one of the cringing falsehoods of that learned divine, simply proves that Eliot hated sycophancy in every shape, whether popular or aristocratic, and was equally opposed to the duke, and to Williams, the duke's mortal enemy. At the very moment when the lie was so hardly asserted, he had been appointed one of the secret managers to prepare an impeachment against Buckingham.

This charge is yet scarcely so preposterous as one of a similar character, belonging also to this period, gravely brought forward by Mr. D'Israeli. "That Sir John Eliot," says that writer, "was well known to the king, and often in the royal circle, appears by sir

1 "The whole power of the kingdom was grasped by his insatiable hand; while he both engrossed the entire confidence of his master, and held, invested in his single person, the most considerable offices of the crown."—Hume's History, vol. V. p. 137. "Who he will advance, shall be advanced; and who he doth but frown upon, must be thrown down."—Stratford Papers, vol. I. p. 28.

2 Serina Reserata, part i. This would have been better guessed, as I shall have occasion to show, of Wentworth. Still, it would have been incorrect.
John's complaint in the parliament at Oxford in 1625, of six Romish priests being lately pardoned, which the duke had prevailed upon the king to be done, in his presence, at Hampton Court." Whereupon Mr. D'Israeli concludes that "Eliot, like sir Dudley Digges, was in fact a great servant of the duke's."¹ This is an oddly emphatic instance of perverse misrepresentation, or I would scarcely hazard the reproach of tediousness in refuting it. Archdeacon Echard is Mr. D'Israeli's authority.² Roger Coke I discover to have been the only authority for archdeacon Echard. I quote the original passage. "When the parliament met at Oxford" (says Coke, plagiarising a previous statement by Hacket), "the speaker had no sooner taken his chair but a western knight enlarged the sense of his sorrow that he had seen a pardon for six priests bearing test July 12.; whereas but the day before it, when they were to part from Westminster, the lord keeper had promised in the king's name before them all, that the rigour against the priests should not be deluded."³ Oldmixon, quoting this account, makes the western knight sir Robert Philips of Somersetshire, and quotes it correctly enough.⁴ The archdeacon, on the other hand, takes for granted that the western knight must have been sir John Eliot of Cornwall; and, with his usual incorrectness, coupling the passage with a few words that go before it, stating that the king had signed the pardon in the presence and by the influence of Buckingham, tortures it into what Mr. D'Israeli has adopted. And Mr. D'Israeli consummates the series of misrepresentations by supporting upon their authority a charge of sycophancy against Eliot! I have now to state that whatever demerit attaches to the circumstance must be removed from Eliot, and from Philips also; for that the "western knight" who "enlarged the

² Echard's History, folio ed. p. 422.
⁴ Oldmixon's History, p. 78. ed. 1730.
sense of his sorrow" was Sir Edward Gyles, one of the Cornish members. 1

Eliot had more stirring game in hand. Scarcely had the parliament reassembled at Oxford when secret intelligence reached him that the loan of ships which had been promised to the king of France, at the close of the late reign, for the purpose of employment against the Spanish interest in Italy and the Valois, had been perverted, by the deliberate treachery of Buckingham and his minion the king, to the use of the French catholics against the huguenots of Rochelle. 2 He saw and seized his opportunity. He hurried down to the house, and implored them to grant no further supplies, for that there were heavy grievances to be considered. Charles having heard this, summoned the houses to meet him at the great hall in Christ Church, to "convince them of the necessity of considering his
business first." Under his direction, his ministers then detailed his wants; and to prevent the effect, so much dreaded, of the disclosure of the affair at Rochelle, secretary Cooke told the commons, with a cool and deliberate hypocrisy, that "the French king chose to sheath his sword in the bowels of his own subjects rather than declare war against the catholics." 1 After the conclusion of this conference, the members of the commons returned to their house, and sir John Eliot rose. He implored them to pause before they yielded up their only irresistible arguments for good government. "It is not usual," he said, "to grant subsidies upon subsidies in one parliament and no grievances redressed." He then boldly stated that the treasury had been misemployed, that evil counsels guided the king's designs, that the necessities of the nation had arisen through improvidence, and that they had need to petition the king for a strait hand and a better counsel to manage his affairs. 2 Next, he "desired there might an account be given for all the monies given in parliament since the 12th of king James, with some invectives against the commissioners, whom he called the pretending sparers of the king's purse; laying to their charge the loss of thousands of men's lives in our late expeditions by land and sea." 3 He reserved his heaviest blow for the last, aiming it with a deadly effect against Buckingham. "I desire to know," said Eliot, "whether the money designed for the Palatinate did not maintain the ships sent against Rochelle?" 4 The commons, inflamed by this address, threw out intelligible hints of impeaching Buckingham. The king, exasperated in the extreme, threatened a dissolution, while he urged once more his necessities. Cold and resolute was the answer of the commons. "Necessity is a dangerous counsellor, and is a continual argument of supplies in all parliaments. Those

2 See Oldmixon's History, p. 79. See also Rushworth, vol. I. p. 120.
3 Harleian Mss. 390. Letter of Mead to Sluettville.
who have put the king and kingdom into such a necessity and hazard ought to answer for it, whosoever they be.” 1 This ominous allusion more nearly alarmed the king, and an abrupt dissolution followed. Parliament was dismissed on the 12th of August. 2

It was speedily re-summoned; but disgraceful scenes had intervened. The king, under the advice of Buckingham, had openly dispensed with the law. Letters had been issued by order of council, under the privy seal, forcing loans from private persons 3, generally those who were connected with the popular party, for the mad purpose of carrying on the Spanish war; and the Spanish war was carried on, up to the disastrous, ill-concerted, and most wretchedly conducted, expedition to Cadiz. Parliament could then be warded off no longer, hated as was even its name. Buckingham, with an ominous foreboding of the future, strove to disqualify the leading men, by getting them pricked as sheriffs of their respective counties. Eliot, it is said, was the chief object of his anxiety on this head 4; but, in Eliot’s case, he found it impracticable. I think it probable, however, that the duke prevented his election for Newport. Here was only a means of greater

---

2 Mr. Hume, in one of the early passages of his history (which remains unequalled for its beauty of style and philosophical remark, though it is utterly worthless as a book of authority), describes this parliament with a strange mixture of truth and error. “It was necessary to fix a choice: either to abandon entirely the privileges of the people, or to secure them by firmer and more precise barriers than the constitution had hitherto provided for them. In this dilemma men of such aspiring genius, and such independent fortunes, could not long deliberate; they boldly embraced the side of freedom, and resolved to grant no supplies to their necessitous prince, without extorting concessions in favour of civil liberty. The end, they esteemed beneficial and noble; the means, regular and constitutional. To grant or refuse supplies was the undoubted privilege of the commons.” See the whole passage, vol. v. p. 138. quarto edit. 1705. See also Clarendon, vol. i. p. 6. folio edit.
3 Lord Nugent found one of these requisitions in the MS. collection at Stowe. It is addressed to Sir William Andrews, of Lathbury in Buckinghamshire, then a tenant of John Hampden’s, and afterwards one of the deputy lieutenants for that county under the parliament. It appears that for these contributions, exacted with the utmost severity and injustice, collectors were appointed, whose acquittance should be a sufficient warrant for repayment in eighteen months. “Put not your faith in princes!” Sir William Andrews’ acquittance remains appended to the requisition.
triumph. He presented himself to his native county of Cornwall, and was instantly returned by the electors. It was an age when the middle and lower ranks of the people shared a common enthusiasm, and were inaccessible alike to fear or to favour. It is striking, and even affecting, to mark the quiet calmness with which Eliot now sought to provide, that the risk and danger, to which he knew his conduct in the coming parliament must expose himself, might not fall heavily on his children. He assigned over every portion of his most extensive estates in trust to relatives for the benefit of his family. Having done this, he repaired to his place in the house of commons, resolved, at whatever hazard, to strike down the great traitor who had imperilled the liberty and the property of the kingdom.

At Westminster, on the 6th of February, 1626, this "great, warm, and ruffling" parliament assembled. Eliot had scarcely taken his seat, before his vehement eloquence, overflowing with embittered invective, was heard thundering against the doomed minister. In his style of oratory, a singular power of severity and keenness united itself with the clearest facility of detail, was adorned with the most pleasing classical allusion, and was directed against its object with such warmth and earnestness of passion as it is always most difficult to resist. The case of the chaplain Montagu was abandoned for the higher quarry; searching committees were appointed, and the defeats and disgraces of the nation were traced home to Buckingham. The rage of the king exceeded all bounds; and, under its influence, he sent an insolent message to the house. "I must let you know, that I will not allow any of my servants to be questioned among you, much less such as are of eminent place, and near unto me." I see you es-

---

1 Parliamentary History, and Commons' Journals.  
2 Harleian MS. No. 7600. Letter of Pory to Puckering. See also D'Israeli's Commentaries, vol. iv. p. 510. I shall have to advert to this hereafter.  
4 I shall have occasion to allude to this case in the biography of Pym.
peccially aim at the duke of Buckingham. * * I would you would hasten for my supply, or else it will be worse for yourselves; for if any evil happen, I think I shall be the last that shall feel it." 1 Eliot smiled at this impotent rage. "We have had a representation of great fear," he said; "but I hope that shall not darken our understandings. Our wills and affections were never more clear," he continued, "more ready, as to his ma-

jesty; but we are baulked and checked in our forward-

ness by those the king entrusts with the affairs of the kingdom." Again he inflamed the house by comments on the Spanish expedition. "The last action was the king's first action; and in this the king and kingdom have suffered dishonour. We are weakened in our strength and safety; our men and ships are lost." Then followed a bitter taunt against even the personal courage of Buckingham, who, it will be recollected, had left the command of the expedition to sir Edward Cecil. "The great general had the whole command, both by sea and land; and could the great general think it sufficient to put in his deputy and stay at home?" The orator next, taking advantage of the excitement of his hearers, thundered forth questions of a more fatal meaning. "Are not honours now sold, and made despicable? Are not judicial places sold? And do not they then sell justice again? Vender e jure potest — emerat ille prius." After some well-employed classical allusions, Eliot pro-

ceeded thus: — "I shall, to our present case, cite two precedents. The first was in the eleventh year of Henry III. The treasure was then much exhausted; many disorders complained of; the king wronged by ministers. Many subsidies were demanded in parlia-

ment, but they were denied; and the lords and com-

mons joined to desire the king to reassume lands which had been improvidently granted, and to examine his great officers, and the causes of those evils which the people then suffered. This was yielded unto by the king; and Hugh de Burgo was found faulty, and was

1 Whitlocke's Memorials, p. 3.
displaced; and then the commons, in the same parliament, gave supply. The second precedent was in the tenth year of Richard II. Then the times were such, and places so changeable, that any great officer could hardly sit to be warmed in his place. Supply was at that parliament required: the commons denied supply, and complained that their monies were misemployed; that the earl of Suffolk (Michael de la Pole) then overruled all; and so their answer was, 'they could not give;' and they petitioned the king that a commission might be granted, and the earl of Suffolk might be examined. A commission," Elliot continued, reserving himself for a closing sarcasm at Buckingham, "at their request was awarded; and that commission recites all the evil then complained of; and that the king, upon the petition of the lords and commons, had granted that examination should be taken of the crown lands which were sold, of the ordering of his household, and the disposition of the jewels of his grandfather and father. I hear nothing said in this house of our jewels, nor will I speak of them; but I could wish they were within these walls!" 1 The effect of this speech was complete, and in the midst of the general indignation excited, Dr. Turner's resolutions, that "common fame" was a good ground of accusation against Buckingham, were passed; and notice was sent to the duke of the proceedings against him. At the same time, in illustration of the good faith with which they acted, they announced that the king's immediate necessities should be relieved while his minister was brought to trial; and they redeemed this pledge by a vote for the grant of three subsidies and three fifteenths. 2 The king now felt more strongly than ever the imminent danger of his favourite. Again

1 Buckingham had raised money upon the crown jewels and plate, by the king's order, at the Hague. Strafford. State Papers, vol. i. p. 28. Ingram to Wentworth. Owing to a singular omission of the editors of the last great parliamentary history, we look vainly among the debates they have collected for this very remarkable speech. It is in Rushworth, however (vol. i. p. 220.), and in the Old Parliamentary History, vol. vi. p. 441. edit. 1763.
be interfered, and again his interference was defeated by the boldness of Eliot. "Remember," he said, "that parliaments are altogether in my power for their calling, sitting, and dissolution; therefore as I find the fruits of them good or evil, they are to continue or not to be." 1

The commons retired to deliberate this with locked doors, and the key placed in the hands of the speaker. What passed in that memorable sitting did not publicly transpire; but I can supply some portion of it at least from a manuscript letter of the time. "Sir John Eliot rose up and made a resolute (I doubt whether a timely) 2 speech, the sum whereof was, that they came not thither either to do what the king should command them, or to abstain where he forbade them; and therefore they should continue constant to maintain their privileges, and not do either more or less for what had been said unto them." 3 This ominous meeting with locked doors alarmed the king; negotiations were opened, explanations offered, every possible resource of avoidance attempted, but in vain. It was too late to dispute the right of impeachment after the precedents of Bacon and Middlesex; and the commons, after addressing the king in decorous language, impeached Buckingham on twelve articles. 4

Eight chief managers were appointed. To Pym,

2 Here the timid writer alludes to what was frequently urged against Eliot, the severe and unsparing character of his speeches. Clarendon was accustomed to the house of commons, and speaks differently. "Modesty and moderation in words," says that noble writer, "never was nor ever will be observed in popular councils, whose foundation is liberty of speech."

3 Harleian MSS. Letter of Mead to sir Martin Stuteville, dated April 8. In a subsequent letter of the same correspondent in this collection (dated April 28.), I find the first shadowing forth of the iniquitous dispersion of sir Robert Cotton's library—an event which that learned antiquary was unable to survive. "Sir Robert Cotton's books are threatened to be taken away, because he is accused to impair ancient precedents to the lower house."

Herbert, Selden, Glanville, Sherland, and Wandesford, was entrusted the duty of dilating upon the facts of the impeachment; to sir Dudley Digges the task of opening the proceedings in a "prologue" was committed; and for sir John Eliot the arduous duty was reserved of winding up the whole proceedings by one of his impressive perorations, that should serve as an "epilogue" to this mighty drama. They did not overestimate the value of his eloquence.

The speech delivered by him on this great occasion is an important chapter in his history. Sir Dudley Digges, a courtly patriot, had spoken the "prologue" in the highest prevailing style of ornate circumlocution and quaintly elevated metaphor. Professing to deliver himself in "plain country language, setting by all rhetorical affectations," the monarchy he compared to the creation, the commons to the earth, the lords to the planets, the king to the glorious sun, the clergy to the fire, the judges and magistrates to the air, and the duke of Buckingham to a comet, "a prodigious comet." All this was only a striking foil to the nervous and daring invective, the clear and gorgeous declamation, of Eliot. The proud minister, who had kept his seat during the harangue of Digges, insolently braving his accuser, and jeering his quaint expressions, was observed to leave the house when Eliot, on the following day, arose. It was well for himself that he had done so. Never was an attack made, in that or any succeeding time, so eloquent.

1 For the history of this impeachment, and reports of the various speeches, see Rushworth, vol. i. p. 308 et seq.; Parliamentary History, vols. vi. and vii.; History from Mackintosh, vol. v. p. 46. et seq. The thirteen articles of the impeachment were arranged under the following heads: -- Plurality of offices; buying the place or high admiral; buying the wardenship of the cinque ports; not guarding the narrow seas; unlawfully and corruptly staying a French ship; extorting 10,000l. from the East India merchants; putting English ships in the hands of the French, to be employed against the protestants of Rochelle (this embraced two articles); compelling lord Robert to buy his peerage; selling places of judicature; procuring honours for his poor kindred; malversation of the king’s revenue; giving physic to the late king.

2 The duke’s absence is marked by a letter in the Harl. MSS. 383. See also Rushworth. In Ellis’s Original Letters, vol. iii. p. 226. (second edit.), an account will be found of the duke’s "jeering and fleering insolence," and the spirited rebuke it at last provoked.
so bitter, so earnest, so disdainful. The orator excelled himself. He had summoned to his service all his literary accomplishments, and he closely enveloped his argument with a passion that was absolutely terrible.

He began by describing the ambition of "this man," as he disdainfully termed the duke, impeaching it by "the common sense of the miseries and misfortunes which the people suffer," and protesting in eloquent phrase against those high misdemeanors which "have lost us the regality of our narrow seas, the ancient inheritance of our princes." He then exposed, as "full of collusion and deceit," the "inward character" of the mind of Buckingham. "I can express it," said Eliot bitterly, "no better than by the beast called by the ancients stellionatus; a beast so blurred, so spotted, so full of foul lines, that they knew not what to make of it." He next presented to their lordships "the duke's high oppression" in all its strange extent, "not to men alone, but to laws and statutes, to acts of council, to pleas and decrees of court, to the pleasure of his majesty." The orator afterwards, having indulged some quiet sarcasms at Buckingham, his victims, and his extortions, "mathematically observed and exquisitely expressed,"—advanced to the most serious imputations, which he handled with a fearful severity. "That which was wont to be the crown of virtue and merit is now become a merchandise for the greatness of this man, and even justice is made his prey! The most deserving offices, that require abilities to discharge them, are fixed upon the duke, his allies, and kindred. He hath drawn to him and his, the power of justice, the power of honour, and the power of command,—in effect, the whole power of the kingdom, both for peace and war!" Eliot then painted a mournful picture of the result of the favourite's extortions in the present state of the kingdom, the "revenues destroyed, the fountain of supply exhausted, the nerves of the land relaxed," placing beside it, in vivid and indignant contrast, the gorgeousness of Buckingham's possessions. "He intercepts, consumes, and ex-
hausts the revenues of the crown, not only to satisfy his own lustful desires, but the luxury of others; and, by emptying the veins the blood should run in, he hath cast the body of the kingdom into a high consumption. Infinite sums of money, and mass of land exceeding the value of money, nay, even contributions in parliament, have been heaped upon him; and how have they been employed? Upon costly furniture, sumptuous feasting, and magnificent building, the visible evidences of the express exhausting of the state! And yet his ambition," proceeded Eliot, alluding darkly to more dreadful charges, "which is boundless, resteth not here, but, like a violent flame, bursteth forth, and getteth further scope. Not satisfied with injuries and injustice, and dishonouring of religion, his attempts go higher,—to the prejudice of his sovereign. The effects I fear to speak, and fear to think."

I end this passage, as Cicero did in a like case,—ne gravioribus utar verbis quam rei natura fort, aut levioribus quam causa necessitas postulat.”

The closing passage of Eliot’s speech was tremendous, and must have electrified the house.

"Your lordships have an idea of the man, what he is in himself, what in his affections! You have seen his power, and some, I fear, have felt it! You have known his practice; and have heard the effects. It rests then to be considered what, being such, he is in reference to the king and state—how compatible or incompatible with either? In reference to the king, he must be styled the canker in his treasure; in reference to the state, the moth of all goodness. What future hopes are to be expected, your lordships may draw out of his actions and affections. In all precedents I can hardly find him a match or parallel. None so like him as Sejanus, thus described by Tacitus:—Audax sui obtgens, in alios criminatos, justa adulator et superbus. My lords, for his pride and flattery it was noted of Sejanus that he did

1 We feel with Eliot on this point. The reader is referred to a forcible passage in Mr. Brodie’s History of the British Empire, vol. ii. pp. 43, 44. I have satisfied myself respecting Mr. Brodie’s proof, by referring to the MS. in the Ayscough Collection of the British Museum, No. 4691. p. 296.
SIR JOHN ELIOT.

clentes suas provinciis adornare. Doth not this man the like? Ask England, Scotland, and Ireland, and they will tell you! Sejanus's pride was so excessive, Tacitus saith, that he neglected all counsel, mixed his business and service with the prince, seemed to confound their actions, and was often styled imperatoris laborum socius. How lately, and how often, hath this man com­mixed his actions, in discourse, with actions of the king! My lords, I have done. You see the man! By him came all these evils; in him we find the cause; on him we expect the remedies; and to this we met your lord­ships in conference."

The rage of the king, when told of Eliot's speech, betrayed him. In a manuscript letter of the time the writer alludes to the unseemly anger displayed as "private news which I desire you to keep to yourself as your own, by separating this half sheet, and burning it or concealing it." The allusion to the death of his father, and to Sejanus, had strangely affected Charles. "Implicitly," he exclaimed, "he must intend me for Tiberius!" — and he hurried to the house of lords to complain of sir John Eliot. Then began those cruel persecutions which Eliot had foreseen, and prepared himself for, and which were only exhausted at last in the death of their illustrious object. He was that day committed close prisoner to the Tower; and, by an odd kind of chance, which may be worth noting for some of my readers, was flung into the dungeon which, after a few short months, received Felton, Buckingham's assassin, 2

1. "Eliot's Letter," in "Letters of History," edited by Ellis, p. 267. The writer says, "I have not heard whether this letter is now in the consideration of the public, though I have for some time past had it in my hands, as a piece of history of the greatest importance."

2. The editor of Eliot's letters, in his preface, says, "That he often mentioned the person of Felton, and the death of his father, is well known. I have elsewhere given the maxim that the Eikon Basilike is not the production of any one writer, though it is the work of an individual. The moment he was committed prisoner to the Tower, and Felton was in the Tower, the dying Felton was asked, 'Who was the author of this letter?' He answered, 'John Eliot.' The latter was beheaded, and the former was put into the Tower, where, after a few short months, he met his death."
Digges was also committed. The house of commons, on hearing of this gross breach of privilege (the first of that series of open and undisguised outrages which brought Charles to the scaffold), broke up instantly, notwithstanding a very heavy press of business before them; and, after dinner, many members met in Westminster Hall, "sadly communicating their minds to one another." The following morning they met in the house; but when the speaker reminded them of the business of the day,—"Sit down! sit down!"—was the general cry: no business till we are righted in our liberties! A sullen silence succeeded, which was broken by the memorable expostulation of Sir Dudley Carleton, the king's vice-chamberlain. Unadvisedly he let the court secret out! After complaining of the violent and contemptuous expressions resorted to by Eliot and Digges, he blurted forth as follows:—"I beseech you, gentlemen, move not his majesty with trenching on his prerogative, lest you bring him out of love with parliaments. In his messages he hath told you, that if there were not correspondence between him and you, he should be enforced to use new counsels. Now, I pray you to consider what these new counsels are, and may be. I fear to declare those that I conceive. In all Christian kingdoms you know that parliaments were in use anciently, until the monarchs began to know their own strength, and, seeing the tur-
bulent spirit of their parliaments, at length they, by little and little, began to stand upon their prerogatives, and at last overthrew the parliaments throughout Christendom, except here only with us. And, indeed, you would count it a great misery, if you knew the subjects in foreign countries as well as myself, to see them look not like our nation, with store of flesh on their backs, but like so many ghosts, and not men, being nothing but skin and bones, with some thin cover to their nakedness, and wearing only wooden shoes on their feet; so that they cannot eat meat, or wear good clothes, but they must pay and be taxed unto the king for it. This is a misery beyond expression, and that which yet we are free from.” ¹ Poor sir Dudley had scarcely delivered himself of this when his ears were saluted with loud and unwelcome shouts — “To the bar! to the bar!” He narrowly escaped the necessity of apologising at the bar on his knees.

Ultimately Digges, coy patriot, having consented to retract certain expressions complained of, was released. Eliot, on the other hand, coldly and sternly refused to listen to any proposals; and the king, unable to keep up the struggle, was obliged, after the expiration of eight days, to sign a warrant for his release. On his reappearance in the house, the vice-chamberlain, by his master’s command, repeated the charge of intemperate language; upon which sir John, instead of denying anything he had said, or meanly endeavouring to explain away the harshness of the terms he had made use of, in a remarkably eloquent and sarcastic speech avowed and defended every name he had applied to Buckingham. ² The spirit of this great man communi-

² Hastyell’s Precedents. For a report of sir John’s speech, see Rushworth, vol. i. p. 362.; and Part Hist. vol. vii. p. 165. The latter is more full and correct. I quote a striking passage: — “For the words, the man, he said, he spoke not by the book, but suddenly. For brevity’s sake he used the words, The man. He thought it not fit at all times to reiterate his titles; and yet thinketh him not to be a god.” In conclusion, Eliot touched with a modest and manly forbearance on the old charge against him. — For the manner of his speech, as having too much vigour and strength
cated itself to the house; and, by a unanimous vote, refusing even to order him to withdraw, they cleared him from every imputation.

Charles, nothing taught by this egregious failure, continued to play the minion to Buckingham, who had now resolved, by another dissolution, to throw for his only chance of safety. This was, indeed, a desperate step, and so Charles would seem to have considered it; but his fears, his consciousness of the injuries he was committing on his subjects, every thing sank before the influence of the favourite. "The duke being in the audience chamber, private with the king, his majesty was overheard (as they talk) to use these words: 'What can I do more?' I have engaged mine honour to mine uncle of Denmark, and other princes. I have, in a manner, lost the love of my subjects. What wouldest thou have me do?' Whence some think the duke moved the king to dissolve the parliament." Or, it may have been, the duke moved the king to get himself promoted to the chancellorship of Cambridge. Monstrous as it appears, a royal message was sent forthwith to the convocation, on the present occurrence of the vacancy, ordering them to elect the duke! Vain was every entreaty to postpone the election; at least until after the event of the impeachment were known. It was carried.

---

1 The entry in the Journals is remarkable: "Sir John Eliot of himself withdrew; the house refusing to order his withdrawing."

2 A letter in the Harleian MSS. Mead to Stuteville, dated May 13.

3 By means the most disgraceful, which after all only secured Buckingham a majority of three votes over lord Andover, hastily set up by the commons, In Ellis’s Original Letters, vol. iii. p. 231., we have a curious account of the contest. "My lord bishop labours; Mr. Mason visits for his lord, Mr. Cosens for the most true patron of the clergy and of scholars, Masters belabour their fellows. Dr. Maw sends for his, one by one, to persuade them; some twice over. . . . Divers in town got bucknies, and fled to avoid importunity. Very many—some whole colleges—were gotten by their fearful masters, the bishop, and others, to suspend, who otherwise were resolved against the duke, and kept away with much indignation: and yet for all this stirre the duke carried it but by three votes from my lord Andover, whom we voluntarily set up against him, without motion on his behalf, yes, without his knowledge. . . . We had but one doctor in the whole townse dutt (for so I dare speak) give us against the duke; and that was Dr. Porter of Queen’s."
and received the formal and elaborate approval of the king. The commons, then, after a stormy debate, in which Eliot took his usual warm and vigorous part, sent to crave audience of his majesty "about serious business concerning all the commons of the land." The king returned answer, that they should hear from him the next day. They did hear from him: the next day they were dissolved; and the rash monarch proceeded to try the effect of those "new counsels" which he and his servants had so often threatened.

These "new counsels" appeared in the shape of a naked despotism. Every thing short of the absolute surrender of the subject to the muskets of the soldiery was resorted to; and we learn, from a remarkable passage in Hume's history, good reason why the new counsels fell short of that. "Had he possessed any military force," says the philosophical apologist of Charles, "on which he could depend, 'tis not improbable that he had, at once, taken off the mask, and governed without any regard to parliamentary privileges. But his army was new levied, ill paid, and worse disciplined; nowise superior to the militia, who were much more numerous, and who were, in a great measure, under the influence of the country gentlemen." As it was, the mask was very clumsily kept on. The first thing attempted under it was to cover, by a bungling imposition, an outrageous stretch of power. The people were instructed by the agents of government that, as

1 It was he who proposed, and had the chief hand in framing, the celebrated remonstrance (Rushworth, vol. i. p. 421.) which every member of the house held in his possession on the day of the dissolution of this parliament. A proclamation was subsequently issued against it by the king. See Rushworth, vol. i. p. 421.

2 See also Sanderson's account in his Life of Charles, p. 58; and Rushworth, vol. i. p. 398.

3 History, vol. v. p. 151. Clarendon's account may be subjoined to this:—"Upon every dissolution, such as had given any offence were imprisoned, or disgraced; new projects were every day set on foot for money, which served only to offend and incense the people, and brought little supplies to the king's occasions; yet raised a great stock for extortion, murmurs, and complaints, to be exposed when other supplies should be required. And many persons of the best quality and condition under the peerage were committed to several prisons, with circumstances unusual and unheard of, for refusing to pay money required by these extraordinary ways."—Hist. of Rebellion, vol. i. p. 52.
subsidies had been voted in the last house of commons, they could not legally refuse to pay them, though parliament had been dissolved before the bill embodying them had passed; and they were levied accordingly! A commission to improve the revenues of crown lands went forth next on a mission of the grossest tyranny; and, following this, a commission to force the most enormous penalties against religious recusants. Privy seals for the loan of money were at the same time issued, in all directions, to men of reputed property, and an immediate advance of an hundred and twenty thousand pounds was insolently demanded from the city of London. Lastly, a levy of ships was ordered from the port towns and counties adjoining—a forecast of the memorable tax of ship money. As men grieved and wondered at these things, the news arrived of the defeat of the king of Denmark at the bloody battle of Luttern; and Charles seized the advantages of this disaster to his ally, to execute a measure he had long meditated, and of which all these oppressions we have named were but even the feeble foreshadowing. He sent commissioners into every quarter of the kingdom, with the most frightfully inquisitorial powers, to execute a general forced loan. He issued an

1 Rushworth, vol. i. pp. 411—472. Rymer, xviii. pp. 750—642. White-locke, pp. 7—8. In these authorities ample information will be found. See also Parl. Hist. vol. vii. pp. 330—338. In connection with these accounts it may be amusing to quote an anecdote from the office book of the master of the revels, "here entered," as he observes, "for ever, to be remembered by my son, and those who cast their eyes on it, in honour of king Charles my master." The king, reading a manuscript play of Massinger's, had stumbled on the following:—

"Monies: we'll raise supplies what ways we please,
And force you to subscribe to blanks, in which
We'll mulct you as we shall think fit. The Caesars
In Rome were wise, acknowledging no laws
But what their swords did ratify:"—

and, in the disgust of the moment, wrote a halting line against it:

"This is too insolent, and to be changed!"

Truly, nothing should be so disgusting to us, as a hideous likeness of ourselves!

2 It is worth while giving an extract from the private instructions of these commissioners. They were "to treat apart with every one of those who are to lend, and not in the presence, or hearing, of any other, unless they see cause to the contrary; and, if any shall refuse to lend, and shall
elaborate proclamation at the same time, excusing these new counsels by the exigence of the moment; and, in private instructions to the clergy, ordered them to use the pulpit in advancement of his monstrous projects. Reverend doctors, with an obedient start, straightway preached illimitable obedience, on pain of eternal damnation. Imprisonment of various sorts compensated for the inefficacy of religious anathemas. The poor who could not, or would not, pay were pressed into the army or the navy; substantial tradesmen were dragged from their families; men of rank even were ordered into the palatinate; large batches of country gen-

make delay, or excuses, and persist in their obstinacy, that they examine such persons upon oath, whether they have been dealt withal to deny, or refuse to lend, or make an excuse for not lending;—who hath dealt so with them, or what speeches or persuasions he or they have used to him, tending to that purpose? And that they shall also charge every such person in his majesty's name, upon his allegiance, not to declare to any other what his answer was."—Rushworth, vol. i. p. 419.

Laud, now bishop of Bath and Wells, drew these instructions up in the name of the king. (See Heylin's Life, p. 161. et seq.; and Laud's Diary.) "The dextrous performance of which service," says Heylin, "as it raised Laud higher in his majesty's good opinion of him, so it was recompensed with a place of greater nearness to him than before he had."

2 Sibthorp, vicar of Brackley, in Northamptonshire, and Manwaring, a king's chaplain and vicar of St. Giles's, made themselves most notorious in this plavish and criminal service. Extracts from the sermons of these men, of the most atrocious description, will be found in Rushworth, vol. i. pp. 422–423. They had excellent imitators. I find among the Sloane MSS. a letter descriptive of a sermon preached by the dean of Canterbury, from which the reader may take an extract:—"It was the speech of a man renowned for wisdom in our age, that if he was commanded to put forth to sea in a ship that had neither mast nor tackling he would do it. And being asked what wisdom that were, replied, the wisdom must be in him that hath power to command, not in him that conscience binds to obey." The question of the licensing these sermons for publication led to the suspension of Abbot from the see of Canterbury. Abbot, however, was no better than his brother Laud, probably a little worse, since the conduct of the former was at least intelligible. See History, from Mackintosh, vol. v. p. 70. The archbishop's Narrative in Rushworth, vol. i. pp. 454–457. Walpole's Royal and Noble Authors, art. Northampton, note by Park. Hallam's Const. Hist. vol. i. p. 570. note. 3

There is something so extremely natural and forcible in sir Peter Hayman's sturdy account of his experience in this particular, that I cannot forbear quoting it. After parliament had assembled, a debate arose on "Designation to Foreign Employment," whereupon sir Peter Hayman got upon his legs:—"I have not forgot my employment into the palatinate. I was called before the lords of the council, for what I knew not, but I heard it was for not lending on a privy seal. I told them, if they will take my estate, let them; I would give it up; lend I would not. When I was before the lords of the council, they laid to my charge my unwillingness to serve the king. I said, I had my life and my estate to serve my country and my religion. They told me, that if I did not pay I should be put upon
tlemen were lodged in custody; and as a punishment to some, more aggravated and horrible, probably, than any we have named, the remains of the disgraced and infamous troops that had survived the affair at Cadiz were quartered upon their houses, in the midst of their wives and children! And as these crimes had been sanctioned by the ministers of religion, so the vile slaves who sat in the seats of justice were ordered to confirm them by law. A voice or two that had hinted from the bench a feeble utterance of opposition were instantly stifled, and the conclave of judges remained

an employment of service. I was willing. After ten weeks waiting, they told me I was to go with a lord into the palatinate, and that I should have employment there, and means both living. I told them I was a subject, and desired means. Some put on very eagerly, some dealt nobly. They said, I must go on my own purse. I told them nemo militat suis expressit. Some told me, I must go. I began to think, what, must I? None were ever sent out in that way. Lawyers told me I could not be so sent. Having this assurance I demanded means, and was resolved not to stir but upon those terms; and, in silence and duty, I denied. Upon this, having given me a command to go, after twelve days they told me they would not send me as a soldier, but to attend on an ambassador. I knew that stone would hit me, therefore I settled my troubled estate, and addressed myself to that service." Eliot's comments on this usage were appropriately bitter. Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 403.

Some were brought up to London, and committed to rigorous confinement in the Fleet, the Gatehouse, the Marshalsea, and the New Prison. Eliot was one of these. The rest, as Sir Thomas Wentworth and others, were subjected to confinement, strict, but much less rigorous, in various counties. Hampden had been thrown into the Gatehouse at first, but was afterwards released and sent into Hampshire. One anecdote will illustrate the numberless instances of quiet and forbearing fortitude, practised by men recollected no longer, but who at this time shed lustre on the English character. George Catesby, of Northamptonshire, being committed to the Gatehouse as a recusant, alleged, among other reasons for his non-compliance, that he considered "that this loan might become a precedent; and that every precedent, he was told by the lord president, was a flower of the prerogative." The lord president told him that "he lied!" Catesby merely shook his head, observing, "I come not here to contend with your lordship, but to suffer." Lord Suffolk then interposed to entreat the lord president not too far to urge his Kinman, Mr. Catesby. The latter, however, waived any kindness he might owe to kindred, declaring that "he would remain master of his own purse." D'Irneri's Commentaries, vol. i. p. 9.

2 See a letter in Stafford's State Papers, vol. i. p. 40, and Rushworth, vol. i. pp. 419-430. "There were frequent robberies," says the collector, "burglaries, rapes, rapines, murders, and barbarous cruelties. Unto some places they were sent as a punishment, and wherever they came, there was a general outcry." From his place in parliament, Sir Thomas Wentworth afterwards denounced this: "They have sent from us the light of our eyes; enforced companies of guests worse than the ordinances of France; whitied our wives and daughters before our faces; brought the crown to greater want than ever it was, by anticipating the revenue! And can the shepherd be thus smitten, and the flock not be scattered?"

five recusants, who had brought their habeas corpus. 1

Sir John Eliot, at this moment, lay a prisoner in the Gatehouse. He had been foremost to refuse the loan, was arrested in Cornwall, brought before the council table, and thence committed to prison. In prison, and before the council table, as in his place in the house of commons, Eliot had the unfailing resource of fearlessness, and a composed vigour. Wherever circumstances placed him, he knew that, so long as they left him life, they left him able to perform its duties. From the Gatehouse, he forwarded to the king an able argument against the loan, which he concluded by a request, urged with a humble but brave simplicity, for his own immediate release. This document has been preserved. It commences with a protest against the supposition that "stubbornness and will" have been the motives

1 The case of sir Thomas Darrel, sir John Corbet, sir Walter Earl, sir John Nevetingham, and sir Everard Hampden, which is reported at great length in the State Trials, is an admirable illustration, among other things, of the character of the crown lawyers and judges of the time. There is an abridgment of the proceedings in Rushworth, pp. 458-462. Sir Randolph Crew, immediately before this case was argued, having, as Rushworth expresses it, "showed no zeal," (i. 420.) was removed to make way for sir Nicholas Hyde; and it is quite clear that two of the judges (Jones and Doddridge) who sat with the latter, having shown a decided leaning towards the prisoners during the argument, were brought to a better understanding with sir Nicholas before the decision. When the case was afterwards sent before the house of lords, and the judges were, so to speak, put upon their trial, judge Whitelock betrayed the secret. "The commons," he said, "do not know what letters and commands we receive." Beyond all praise was the conduct of the counsel employed for the prisoners on this occasion. The most undaunted courage excited the profoundest knowledge. The sober grandeur of Selden, and the rough energy of Noy, must have struck with an ominous effect on the court councils. It was here that Selden threw out, in a parenthesis, those remarkable words which, it has been judiciously observed (History, from Mackintosh, vol. v. p. 71.) are applicable to periods much later and of more pretension to liberty than that of Charles. They are yet, in fact, to be expounded. "If Magna Charta were fully executed, as it ought to be, every man would enjoy his liberty better than he doth." In connection with this remarkable case, too, sir Edward Coke (who argued it before the lords) presented, for the first time, to his astonished profession, the highest vigour of a noble and liberal thought, issuing, as it were, even out of the most formal technicalities of law. "Shall I have an estate for lives or for years in England, and be tenant at will for my liberty? A freeman, to be tenant at will for his freedom! There is no such tenure in all Littleton." The excited state of the public mind, during the arguments on this question, is vividly conveyed in a letter I have found among the Harleian MSS. "The gentlemen's counsel for habeas corpus, Mr. Selden, Mr. Noy, Sergeant Bramston, and Mr. Colthorp, pleaded yesterday with wonderful applause, even of shouting and clapping of hands: which is unusual in that place."
of the writer's recent recusancy. "With a sad, yet a faithful heart," Eliot continues, "he now presumes to offer up the reasons that induced him. The rule of justice he takes to be the law; impartial arbiter of government and obedience; the support and strength of majesty; the observation of that justice by which subjection is commanded." Through a series of illustrious examples the writer then advances to his position of strict obedience to the laws, in the duty of resisting their outrage. "He could not, as he feared, without pressure to these immunities, become an actor in this loan, which by imprisonment and restraint was urged, contrary to the grants of the great charter, by so many glorious and victorious kings so many times confirmed. Though he was well assured by your majesty's promise that it should not become a precedent during the happiness of your reign, yet he conceived from thence a fear that succeeding ages might thereby take occasion, for posterity, to strike at the property of their goods." He concludes by assuring the king, that he will never consent to "inconveniences in reason," or to the dispensation, violation, or impeachment of the laws. "No factious humour, nor disaffection led on by stubbornness and will, hath herein stirred or moved him, but the just obligation of his conscience, which binds him to the service of your majesty, in the observance of your laws; and he is hopeful that your majesty will be pleased to restore him to your favour, and his liberty, and to afford him the benefit of those laws which, in all humility, he craves." 1 Eliot probably never expected that this petition would be granted. Its publication effected his purpose in strengthening the resolutions of the people; and he quietly waited in his prison for the day of a new parliament.

This was precipitated by the insolent fury of Buck-

---

1 Rushworth, vol. i. p. 488. Whitlocke says that "Sir John Eliot took this way to inform the king what his council did not." — Memorials, p. 8. Anthony Wood oddly converts this into a statement that Eliot was obliged to write in this way to the king, because his (Eliot's) "counsel would not assist him otherwise."
ingham, who had consummated the desperate condition of affairs by a new and unprovoked war with France. At the suggestion of the duke's outraged vanity, Charles had dismissed the French servants of his young queen; she herself had been insulted; the remonstrances of the French court answered by a seizure of French ships; and an expedition for the relief of Rochelle undertaken by the very court whose treachery had so lately assisted to reduce it. Recollecting the bitter sarcasm of Eliot, Buckingham undertook the command of the present expedition in person; and, having concerted measures so wretchedly as to be obliged to disembark on the adjacent Isle of Rhé, he there suffered his army to be baffled by an

1 Clarendon distinctly assigns this as the motive:—"In his embassy in France, where his person and presence was wonderfully admired and esteemed (and in truth it was a wonder in the eyes of all men), and in which he appeared with all the lustre the wealth of England could adorn him with, and outshone all the bravery that court could draw itself in, and over-acted the whole nation in their own most peculiar vanities, he had the ambition to fix his eyes upon, and to dedicate his most violent affection to, a lady of a very sublime quality,"—but I will cut short the reader's impatience, and this interminable sentence, by saying at once that Buckingham fell violently in love with the young queen of France, Anne of Austria, declared his passion, and was listened to with anything but resentment. With what success the duke ultimately had urged his suit, it would be impossible to say, since great authorities differ; but it is certain that his purpose was abruptly foiled by the interference of Cardinal Richelieu, in whom he suddenly discovered a formidable rival. The mad desire to foal this great statesman and most absurd lover, and to be able to return to Anne of Austria in all the triumphs of a conqueror, now urged him to these extremities against France. The thing is scarcely credible, but so it certainly appears to have been. What is to be said of the wretched weakness of Charles? See Mémoires inédits du Comte de Brienne, i. Eclaircissements. Madame de Motteville, Mémoires d'Anne d'Autriche. Aikin's Court of Charles, vol. i. p. 67. Brodie's Hist. of British Empire, vol. ii. p. 129. Lingard's History, vol. ix. p. 361. Clarendon, vol. i. p. 31. Carte (vol. iv. p. 138.) has attempted to throw discredit on it by the production of dates from the Mercure Français, but unsuccessfully.

2 This is not an occasion to notice the personal disputes of the king and queen, nor the way in which, for his own purposes, they were secretly inflamed by Buckingham. Charles, like most unfaithful and decorous husbands, suspected his wife; and his wife, a woman of energy and spirited sense, despised him. Buckingham's insults to the queen are described by Clarendon, vol. i. p. 31., and other writers. See History, from Mackintosh, vol. v. p. 62. I may add, that the account of the young queen's reception of the news of the dismissal of her servants, as given in a letter of the day, is extremely characteristic of a quick temper redeemed by a ready self-command. "It is said, also, the queen, when she understood the designe, grew very impatient, and brake the glasse windows with her little fiste; but since I heare her rage is appeas, and the king and shee, since they went together to Nonsuche, have been very jocund together."—Hers. MSS. 383. Ellis's Original Letters, vol. iii. p. 329.

3 See p. 39. of this Memoir.
inferior force, and to be at length overthrown in a situation where valour was of no avail, and where death destroyed them dreadfully, without even the agency of an enemy. The result of this was in all respects frightful; mutiny proved the least of the dangers that followed; and the financial difficulties of the court became so urgent, that the last desperate and dreaded resource forced itself upon the king. The loan remonstrants were set at liberty, and writs for a new parliament were issued.

Unprecedented excitement prevailed at the elections. Sir John Eliot was triumphantly returned for Cornwall; and every country gentleman that had refused the loan was sent to the house of commons. "We are without question undone!" exclaimed a court prophet; and the king, agitated by fear and rage, prepared himself to "lift the mask." Secret orders were transmitted to the Low Countries for the levy of 1000 German horse, and the

1 See a letter of Denzil Hollis to Wentworth. Stafford Papers, vol. i. p. 42. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 465. Carte, vol. iv. p. 176 et seq. Many curious particulars, and especially the letters of Charles to Buckingham, connected with this affair, will be found in Hardwicke's State Papers, vol. i. p. 13. et seq. I shall have to advert to it again, in noticing one of Eliot's speeches.

2 Sir Robert Cotton was consulted by the lords of the council, and his advice is said to have determined the matter. It is melancholy to see, however, that this great scholar was tempted on this occasion (see his Paper in Rushworth, vol. i. p. 467.) into concessions extremely unworthy of him. It is probable that a rumour of this, coupled with his silence on the affair of the loan, led to his defeat at the Westminster election. Eliot was warmly attached to him. It was at the meetings held at his house, where all the eminent men of the day assembled, that Eliot's intimate friendship with Selden most probably commenced. See the Cottonian MSS. Jul. C. iii.

3 An extract from a manuscript letter, dated March 8, 1627, will present a lively notion of this excitement. It has quite a modern air: — "There was a turbulent election of burgesses at Westminster, whereof the duke (Buckingham), being steward, made account he should, by his authority and vicinage, have put in sir Robert Pye. It continued three days, and when sir Robert Pye's party cried 'A Pye! a Pye! a Pye!' the adverse party would cry 'A pudding! a pudding! a pudding!' and others, 'A lie! a lie! a lie!' In fine, Bradshaw, a brewer, and Maurice, a grocer, carried it from him by about a thousand voices, they passing by also sir Robert Cotton, besides our men and Mr. Hayward, who were their last burgesses, because, as it is said, they had discontented their neighbours, in urging the payment of the loan. It is feared (says mine author), because such patriots are chosen everywhere, the parliament will not last above eight days. You hear of our famous election in Essex, where sir Francis Barrington and sir Harbottle Grimston had all the voices of 16,500 men." — Sloane MSS.
purchase of 10,000 stand of arms, immediately to be conveyed to England.¹

This famous third parliament was opened by the king at Westminster, on the 17th of March, 1628, in a speech of insolent menace. If they did not do their duty, he told them, "I must use those other means which God hath put into my hands, to save that with which the follies of other men may otherwise hazard to lose. Take not this as threatening; I scorn to threaten any but my equals."² Wonderful was the temper and decorum with which the great leaders of that powerful house listened to this pitiful display. The imagination rises in the contemplation of the profound statesmanship which distinguished every movement of these men, and it is difficult to describe it in terms of appropriate praise. Conscious of the rigour of the duties they had to perform, for these they reserved their strength. Not a word was wasted before the time of action came, not an energy fell to the ground as too great for the occasion. A resolved composure, a quiet confidence, steadily shone from their slightest preparation;—and the court, who had looked to strengthen themselves by the provocation of outrage, were lost in a mixed feeling of wonder and doubt, perhaps of even hope. "Was it possible that the ‘new counsels’ had cooled the fire of patriotism?” Finch, a man known to be favourably affected to the court, was chosen speaker. "Was the

¹ There is no doubt of this. The pretence afterwards assigned was to defend the kingdom from invasion (Carte iv. p. 183); but the real object was to oversawe the house of commons. See Rushworth, vol. I. p. 474. A commission was issued at the same time (concurrent with the issuing of the election writs!) to certain privy councilors, to consider of raising money by impositions, or otherwise, "wherein form and circumstance must be dispensed with, rather than the substance be lost." These schemes were all defeated, but their discovery necessarily exasperated the commons. —Rushworth, vol. I. p. 616.

² Rushworth, vol. I. p. 477. The men to whom this foolish impertinence was addressed are thus described in a manuscript letter of the time by a very moderate politician. "The house of commons was both yesterday and to-day as full as one could sit by another; and they say it is the most noble and magnificent assembly that ever these walls contained. And I heard a lord intimate they were able to buy the upper house (his majesty only excepted) thrice over, notwithstanding there be of lords temporal to the number of 118: and what lord in England would be followed by so many freeholders as some of these are." — Letter, dated March 21. 1628, in Shandy’s MSS.
expediency of some compromise recognised at last?”

A resolution was passed to grant a supply, no less than five subsidies, and to be paid within twelve months!

“Was all this possible?”—“Were these the men who had been sent from every quarter of the country to oppose the court, to resent the wrongs of their constituents, and to avenge their own?” Old secretary Cooke hurried down with feeble haste to grasp at the subsidies. He was then quietly told that they could not be paid; that the bill for collecting them, indeed, should not be framed, until certain necessary securities were given by the king for the future enjoyment of liberty and property among the subjects of the kingdom. The crest-fallen ministers resorted to their hypocritical arts of evasion and refusal; the patriot leaders prepared for action. The consummated policy we have described had resolved the dispute into the clearest elements of right and wrong; and the position of the commons against the court was firmly and immovably determined.1 What they had resolved to do could now be done; and, the court policy once openly betrayed, the passionate eloquence of Eliot was heard, opening up to the public abhorrence the wounds that had lately been inflicted upon the liberties and laws.2

1 I refer the reader, for the only exact account of the proceedings of this parliament, to the journals and debates. Dr. Lingard has described the conduct of the leaders of the country party very faithfully. “They advanced step by step; first resolving to grant a supply, then fixing it at the tempting amount of five subsidies, and, lastly, agreeing that the whole should be paid within the short space of twelve months. But no art, no entreaty could prevail on them to pass their resolution in the shape of a bill. It was held out as a lure to the king; it was gradually brought nearer and nearer to his grasp, but they still refused to surrender their hold; they required as a previous condition that he should give his assent to those liberties which they claimed as the birthright of Englishmen.” —History, vol. ix. p. 379. See also Hume, vol. v. p. 160.

2 “Sir John Eliot,” says the writer of the Ephemeris Parlamentaria, “did passionately and rhetorically set forth our late grievances; he disliked much the violating of our laws.” This speech is unfortunately lost. “What pity it is,” observes Mr. Brodie, “that no copy has been preserved of Sir John Eliot’s speech upon the grievances! He appears to have been the most eloquent man of his time.” Echoing his regret, I am surprised that Mr. Brodie should have passed without mention a most remarkable speech of Eliot, which I shall have immediate occasion to allude to, delivered by him on the same subject in the present session, and admirably handed down to us from the MSS. of Napier. He had noble seconds on the occasion referred to in the text. “I read of a custom,” said Sir Robert Philips (rising after Eliot had ceased), “among the old Romans, that
The result, after many committees on the liberty of the subject, was a resolution to prepare the memorable petition of right. Sir John Eliot took part in all the debates; lifted them to the most vigorous and passionately determined tone; and now acted in all respects as the great leader of the house.

Charles's attempts to get hold of the subsidies continued to be unceasing, and every art was resorted to by his ministers. Buckingham, meanwhile, covered with his recent failures and disgrace, had hitherto kept himself out of view; and it is another proof of the noble policy we have characterised in every movement of the popular leaders at this time, that, intent upon their grander objects, they passed the subdued favourite, so long as he was not intruded before them, in contemptuous silence. The court party, however, rarely failed once every year they held a solemn feast for their slaves, at which they had liberty, without exception, to speak what they would, thereby to ease their afflicted minds; which, being finished, they severally returned to their former servitude. This may, with some resemblance and distinction, well set forth our present state; when now, after the revolution of some time, and grievous suffering of many violent oppressions, we have, as those slaves had, a day of liberty of speech; but shall not, I trust, be hereafter slaves, for we are free. Yet what new illegal proceedings our states and persons have suffered under, my heart yearns to think, my tongue falters to utter! I can live," passionately Philip continued, "although another, who has no right, be put to live with me; nay, I can live although I pay excises and impositions more than I do. But to have my liberty, which is the soul of my life, taken from me by power! and to have my body pent up in a goal, without remedy by law, and to be so adjudged! O unwise forefathers! to be so curious in providing for the quiet possession of our laws, and the liberties of parliament, and to neglect our persons and bodies, and to let them lie in prison, and that, durante benefacta, remediless! If this be law, why do we talk of liberties? Why do we trouble ourselves with a dispute about law, franchises, property of goods, and the like? What may any man call his own, if not the liberty of his person?" Sir Benjamin Rushard followed. "This is the crisis of parliament," he said; "by this we shall know whether parliaments will live or die!" To him succeeded the dark and doubtful energy of Wentworth, and the undimmed clearness of the venerable sir Edward Coke. "I'll begin," said the latter, after approving the proposed supplies, with a noble record. It cheers me to think of it! It is worthy to be written in letters of gold! Loans against the will of the subject are against reason and the franchises of the land, and they desire restitution. Franchise! What a word is that 'franchise!'" — Parl. Hist. vol. vii, p. 363. et seq. These men were indeed capable of the great duties that fell to them.

1 The grievances detailed before these committees were reduced to six heads: attendance at the council board — imprisonment — confinement — designation to foreign employment — martial law — undue proceedings in matters of judicature. These were severely debated, and Eliot spoke upon all of them with characteristic energy. The portions that remain of his speeches are sufficient to indicate this. — Parl. Hist. vol. vii, pp.363—405. &c.
to misconstrue conduct of this sort; and now, with a fatal precipitancy, presumed upon this silence. Cooke, the king's secretary, by way of an inducement to suffer him to touch the subsidies, assured the house that the king was very grateful for their vote; and, moreover, that Buckingham had implored his majesty to grant all the popular desires. An extract from a manuscript letter of the time will convey the most lively notion of what followed. "Sir John Eliot instantly leapt up, and taxed the secretary for intermingling a subject's speech with the king's message. It could not become any subject to bear himself in such a fashion, as if no grace ought to descend from the king to the people, nor any loyalty ascend from the people to the king, but through him only. Whereunto many in the house made an exclamation, 'Well spoken, sir John Eliot!' From a more detailed report I will give an extract of this speech, happily characteristic of Eliot's style, of the dignified phrase, not unmixed with a composed sarcasm, with which in the present instance the sharpness of his rebuke was tempered. "My joy at this message is not without trouble, which must likewise be declared. I must disburthen this affliction, or I cannot, otherwise, so lively and so faithfully express my devotion to the service of this house as I had resolved. I know not by what fatality or infortunity it has crept in, but I observe, in the close of the secretary's relation, mention made of another in addition to his majesty; and that which hath been formerly a matter of complaint, I find here still—a mixture with his majesty, not only in his business, but in name. Is it that any man conceives the mention of others, of what quality soever, can add encouragement or affection to us, in our duties and loyalties towards his majesty, or give them greater latitude or extent than naturally they have? Or is it supposed that the power or interest of any man can add more

2 Sloane MSS., 4177. Letter from Mr. Pory. Another account will be found among these manuscripts, in a letter from Mr. Mead, dated April 12, 1628.
readiness to his majesty, in his gracious inclination towards us, than his own goodness gives him? I cannot believe it! But, sir, I am sorry there is occasion that these things should be argued; or that this mixture, which was formerly condemned, should appear again. I beseech you, sir, let it not be hereafter; let no man take this boldness within these walls, to introduce it! It is contrary to the custom of our fathers, and the honour of our times. I desire that such interposition may be let alone, and that all his majesty's regards and goodnesse towards this house may spring alone from his confidence of our loyalty and affections."

The secretary remained silent, but the court remembered that rebuke bitterly.

Equally firm, however, against its threatening and cajoling, the commons persisted in their great purpose. Resolutions were passed declaratory of the rights of the people; and a conference appointed with the lords that they might concur in a petition to the throne—founded upon magna charta and other statutes; directed to the security of the person, as the foremost of all securities; strengthened on that point by twelve direct and thirty-one indirect precedents; completed by certain resolutions of their own, reducing those precedents to a distinct unity of purpose; and to be called a petition of right, because requiring nothing.

1 Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 433. In this speech also Eliot, referring to the king's thankful recognition of the vote of subsidies, and the honeyed words he had addressed to them through Cooke, expressive of his sense of their claims, threw out a remark in which there appears an ominous union of sarcasm and sternness. "I presume we have all received great satisfaction from his majesty in his present gracious answer and resolution for the business of this house; in his answer to our petition for religion, so particularly made; in his resolution in that other consideration concerning the point, already settled here, in declaration of our liberties; and for the parliament in general."

2 These resolutions were four in number, and had for their object the security of the subject from those infamous pretences of the court lawyers and court judges, which had been so remarkably exhibited in the case of the five members. See them in Rushworth, vol. i. p. 513. Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 407. The profound skill and judgment of the leaders of the commons, by setting down the old statutes thus, at once shut out every possible plea of silence or evasion from the corrupt judges, and struck from under them their old resource to antagonist enactments, judicial precedents, and exercises of prerogative.
save the recognition and direction of violated laws. The lords and commons met, and the constitutional lawyers stated their case with a startling clearness. "It lies not under Mr. attorney's cap," exclaimed sir Edward Coke, "to answer any one of our arguments." "With my own hand," said Selden, "I have written out all the records from the Tower, the exchequer, and the king's bench, and I will engage my head Mr. attorney shall not find in all these archives a single precedent omitted." The close of the conference elicited from the lords a series of counter-resolutions, which were immediately rejected by Eliot and his friends, as nothing more than an ingenious subterfuge. These resolutions, in point of fact, if agreed to, would, after recognising the legality of the precedents urged, have left the matter precisely where it was. The king's word was to be the chief security.

The lords, in truth, had been tampered with; and the court heedlessly betrayed this by proposing, a few days after, in a royal message, precisely the same security, with the addition of a piece of advice that one

---

1 See the reports of the conference in the Journals. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 597. et seq.; and Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 469. et seq. The legal research and vast ability displayed by the popular leaders in this conference, determined the lords to hear counsel for the crown. One of these, however, sergeant Ashley, having argued in behalf of the prerogative in the high tone of the last reign, was ordered into custody by their lordships, who at the same time assured the commons that he had no authority from them for what he had said. (See Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 47; for the offensive argument; and afterwards, p. 53. and p. 68.) This was a somewhat strong step to take against a king's counsel, employed at a free conference; and Mr. Hallam urges it (Const. Hist. vol. i. p. 533.) as a "remarkable proof of the rapid growth of popular principles." It is a compliment to the growing influence of the lower house, but certainly no proof of the popular principles of a body of men who, the very moment after they had thus seemed to condemn arbitrary doctrines, proposed to grant to the king in extraordinary cases, the necessity of which he was to determine, a power of commitment without showing cause! This was robbing Peter to pay Paul with a vengeance! See their five propositions, in Rushworth, vol. i. p. 546. An anecdote of one of their lordships, which occurred at this time, is worth subjoining. As the earl of Suffolk was passing from the conference into the committee chamber of the house, he insolently swore at one of the members of the commons, and said Mr. Selden deserved to be hanged, for that he had raised a record. This was immediately noticed about, and came to the ears of Eliot. He took up the matter with great warmth, in vindication of his regard for Selden, had the circumstances investigated by a committee, and proposed some stringent resolutions against the earl, "which were agreed unto by the whole house." See Commons' Journals, April 17. 1628; and Parl. Hist. vol. vii. p. 452.

SIR JOHN ELIOT.

regrets to see so evidently wasted. It would have been hailed with nods of such profuse delight by a parcel of Chinese mandarins. "The wrath of a king is like the roaring of a lion; and all laws, with his wrath, are of no effect: but the king's favour is like the dew upon the grass; there all will prosper!" Undoubtedly this was lost upon the present audience. Eliot, who was well read in literature, might probably have reminded Philips or Selden of the leonine propensities of the Athenian weaver, who aggravated his voice, however, to such an extent in roaring, that at last he came to roar as gently as a dove or a nightingale. Certainly no other notice was taken. The commons returned to their house, and quietly, and without a single dissentient, ordered their lawyers to throw the matter of their petition into the shape of a bill, that the responsibility of openly rejecting it might fall on the lords and the king.

Message succeeded message, but still the commons proceeded. Briefly and peremptorily, at last, Charles desired, through his secretary, to know decidedly whether the house would or would not rest upon his royal word? "Upon this there was silence for a good space." Pym was the first to break it; and Eliot hastened to relieve Pym from the personal dilemma in which his fearless acuteness threatened to place him. "I move," said he, "that this proposition be put to the question, because they that would have it do urge us to that point." The question was rejected. Charles instantly sent down another message peremptorily warning them not to encroach on that sould...

3 There is no mention of this in the debate, but I have it on the authority of a manuscript letter in the collection of Dr. Birch. I may take this opportunity of stating that that learned person had with his own hand transcribed for publication, from the Harleian and various other collections, a vast number of letters, illustrative of the reigns of James I. and Charles I.; but which remain to this day on the shelves of the Sloane collection, as the transcriber left them. Their arrangement and publication would confer a valuable service on history; yet I fear there is no prevailing encouragement for undertakings of this sort. It is to be regretted.
reignty, or prerogative, which God hath put into our hands," and threatening to end the session on Tuesday se'nnight at the furthest. "Whereupon," say the Journals, "sir John Eliot rose and spoke." He complained bitterly of the proposed shortness of the session. "Look," he exclaimed, "how many messages we have! Interruptions, mis-reports, and misrepresentations produce these messages. I fear," continued Eliot, "his majesty yet knows not what we go about. Let us make some enlargement, and put it again before him." An address for this purpose was instantly agreed to by the house, was presented by the speaker, and again the king found himself completely baffled. It would be too painful to follow his windings and doublings through their long and mean course, but that at every turn some new evidence arrests us, of the brilliant powers and resources of the great statesman whose character we seek to illustrate.

So clear and decisive was the last statement of the commons, that Charles fancied he had no resource now but to intimate his assent to the proposed bill; yet, even in doing this, he sought, by an insidious restriction, to withhold from the old statutes and precedents that unity and directness of purpose which the cementing resolutions of the house were, for the first time, about to give to them. "We vindicate," Wentworth had said, — "what? new things? No! our ancient, legal, and vital liberties, — by re-enforcing the laws enacted by our ancestors, by setting a seal upon them."

1 Parl. Hist. vol. viii. p. 99. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 555. In the address which was voted in consequence of Elliot's proposition, the king is advised distinctly of the nature of the resolutions they had passed, as I have above explained them. "They have not the least thought of straining or enlarging the former laws; the bounds of their desires extend no farther than to some necessary explanation of that which is truly comprehended within the just sense and meaning of those laws, with some moderate provision for execution and performance." — Parl. Hist. vol. viii. p. 162. Sir Benjamin Rudyard expressed the matter, in the course of the debate on this address, in a more homely way. "For my own part," he said, "I should be very glad to see that good, old, decrepit law of Magna Charta, which hath been so long kept in, lain bed-ridden as it were. — I should be glad, I say, to see it walk abroad again, with new vigour and lustre." The conclusion of his speech was a covered rebuke to Charles. "No man is bound to be rich, or great — no, nor to be wise. But every man is bound to be honest."
as no licentious spirit shall dare hereafter to enter upon them!" "I assent," said Charles, unworthily at the same moment seeking to evade this seal, "but so as that Magna Charta and the other six statutes alluded to may be without additions, paraphrases, or explanations." 1 The commons had not had time to spurn the proffered deceit, when, with a childish imbecility, the king sent down another message desiring that they should take his word. 2 The house was at this moment sitting in committee. Secretary Cooke, who brought the message, concluded with an earnest desire that "the debate upon it should be done before the house, and not before the committee." He had good reasons for this; for he knew what arguments might possibly be urged, and that the court had at least one security against them, in the secret commands which the king had already placed upon the timid speaker. 3 Sir John Eliot, conscious of the weakness of Finch, saw through the secretary's purpose, and effectually foiled it. With great energy he urged proceeding in committee as more likely to be honourable and advantageous. "That way," he said, "leads most to truth. It is a more open way. Every man may there add his reasons, and make answer upon the hearing of other men's reasons and arguments." 4 The house assented; the debate proceeded with closed doors; and the result was a plain and determined resolution by the commons, that they could only take the king's word in a parliamentary way. They passed their bill, and sent it up to the lords. 5

1 Speech of the lord keeper, Parl. Hist. vol. viii. p. 98. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 557. The miserable fatuity of consenting thus to their proceeding by bill, while he robs them of all the advantages they sought to achieve by that mode of procedure, is too apparent.


3 Finch had already commenced his bargain for promotion, by promising the king to discountenance, as much as possible, any aspersion of his ministers, and more especially of Buckingham. I have already suggested the only motive the commons could have had in electing this man as their speaker. They appear to have desired to impress the court, on their first meeting, with a sense of how little they were disposed to be actuated in their duties by any violent temper, or the resentment of individual wrongs. They committed an error, but a generous one.


5 In the interval between this and the first assent of Charles, the affair
To the lords the king now addressed a letter, stating that he could not, without the overthrow of his sovereignty, part with the power of committing the subject, but promising in all ordinary cases to obey Magna Charta, and not to imprison for the future "any man for refusing a loan, nor for any cause which, in his judgment and conscience, he did not conceive necessary for the public good." This letter was instantly sent to the lower house, and all the notice we find of it in their journals is given in four words,—"They laid it aside." Not so the lords, who, with customary pliancy, founded upon it a saving clause to reserve his majesty's "sovereign power," and—so weakened—sent down the bill. "Let us take heed," said Coke, on hearing the addition, "what we yield unto; Magna Charta is such a fellow that he will have no sovereign." Selden followed with a singular warning and precedent; the clause was generally condemned; and, after a conference, the lords consented to abandon it. The petition of right, of Dr. Manwaring was brought before the house. I shall have to allude to it in the biography of Pym.

3 The debate on this question was one of the most remarkable, for a display of ready knowledge and acute judgment. See especially Selden's speech, and that delivered by Glanvil before the lords. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 562—579. A precedent had been urged by the opposite party, from a petition in the reign of Edward I. Selden's all-wonderful learning never failed him. "That clause of 28th Edward I." he said, at once silencing his opponents. "was not in the petition, but in the king's answer." Then mark how triumphantly he turned the tables on them—the passage is in all respects remarkable. "In 28th Edward I., the commons, by petition or bill, did obtain the liberties and articles at the end of the parliament; they were extracted out of the roll, and proclaimed abroad. The addition was added in the proclamation; but in the bill there was no 'savant;' yet afterwards it was put in. And to prove this, though it is true there is no parliament-roll of that year, yet we have histories of that time. In the library at Oxford there is a journal of a parliament of that very year which mentions so much; as also in the public library at Cambridge there is in a MS. that belonged to an abbey: it was of the same year, 28th Edward I., and it mentions the parliament, and the petitions, and 'articulos quos postemunt sic confirmavit rex, ut in fine addederat, salvo jure coromar regis,' and they came in by proclamation. But, in London, when the people heard of this clause being added in the end, they fell into execration for that addition; and the great earls that went away satisfied from the parliament, hearing of this, went to the king, and afterwards it was cleared at the next parliament. Now there is no parliament-roll of this, of that time; only in the end of Edward III., there is one roll that recites it."
adopted by both houses, was now presented to the throne.

Charles, for two long months, had, by every sort of subterfuge, struggled to avoid this crisis. It had arrived, notwithstanding. On the one hand, want awaited him; on the other, the surrender of his darling power. Incapable of either, he sought a passage of escape through one perfidy more, and in this he might have succeeded — but for Eliot. He sent for the judges, and, with the most solemn injunctions to secrecy, put three questions to them respecting the proposed petition of rights: — "Whether the king may commit without showing a cause?" "Whether the judges ought to deliver on habeas corpus a person committed?" "Whether he should not deprive himself of such power of commitment by granting the petition of right?" The judges answered to the first and second questions, that the general rule of law was against him, but exceptive cases might arise; and to the third, they said that it must be left to the courts of justice in each particular case. Consoling himself with these assurances, he went to the house of lords in a sort of secret triumph, resolved to assent to the bill, yet in such terms as might still leave its construction to his convenient parasites on the bench. The commons hurried up to their lordships' bar.

So closed the debate on "sovereign power." I may add that upon this proposed addition, that notably bungling intriguer, bishop Williams, eminently distinguished himself. He professed to be an ardent promoter of the petition of right, yet he stood up mightily for the clause. The consequence was a meeting between himself and Buckingham, a perfect reconciliation, and, as we are told, "his grace had the bishop's consent with a little asking, that he would be his grace's faithful servant in the next session of parliament; and was allowed to hold up a seeming enmity, and his own popular estimation, that he might the sooner do the work." Such were the public men with whom Eliot had to deal, and upon the faith of such as these have attempts been made upon his character. See Hacket's Scrinia Reserata, p. 77. et seq.

1 The questions and answers were discovered at length in the Hargrave MSS. xxxii. 97. Hallam's Constitutional History, vol. i. p. 533. Eliot's Original Letters, new series, vol. iii. p. 250. History, from Mackintosh, vol. v. p. 92. Much unnecessary trouble, on the part of the king, appears through all these proceedings; for he afterwards proved himself quite as capable of openly violating a statute enacted in the regular manner, as of playing the game of evasion, with his duty and his conscience. But wounded vanity had clearly much to do with it.
"Gentlemen," he said, with a sullen abruptness, "I am come hither to perform my duty. I think no man can think it long, since I have not taken so many days in answering the petition, as ye spent weeks in framing it: and I am come hither to show you that, as well in formal things as in essential, I desire to give you as much content as in me lies." He then, to the surprise of his hearers, instead of the ordinary *soit droit fait comme il est désiré*, delivered the following by way of royal assent: — "The king willeth, that right be done according to the laws and customs of the realm, and that the statutes be put in due execution, that his subjects may have no cause to complain of any wrong or oppressions, contrary to their just rights and liberties, to the preservation whereof he holds himself in conscience as well obliged, as of his own prerogative."

The next meeting of the house of commons was a very momentous one. The singular treachery of the king had struck with a paralysing effect upon many of the members; it seemed hopeless to struggle with it further; it had continued proof against every effort; all the constitutional usages of parliament had fallen exhausted from the unequal contest; and already the house saw itself dissolved, without the achievement of a single guarantee for the liberty and property of the kingdom. The best and the bravest began to despair.

But then the genius of Eliot rose to the grandeur of that occasion; and, by its wonderful command over every meaner passion, by its great disregard of every personal danger, wrested the very sense of hopeless discomfiture to the achievement of a noble security. Knowing more thoroughly than others the character of the king, he knew that he was yet assailable. His conduct at this awful crisis has seemed to me to embody a perfect union of profound sagacity and fearless magnanimity, unsurpassed, perhaps unequalled, in the history of the most illustrious statesmen.

“On Tuesday, the 3d of June,” says Rushworth, “the king’s answer to the petition of right was read in the house of commons, and seemed too scant. Whereupon sir John Eliot stood up, and made a long speech, wherein he gave forth so full and lively a representation of all grievances, both general and particular, as if they had never before been mentioned.” But observe with what consummate policy. It was not a representation of the grievances alone, such as had been urged some months before: it was a pursuit of them to their poisonous spring and source; it was an exhibition beside them of their hideous origin; it was a direction of the wrath of the people against one oppressor, whose rank was not beyond its reach; it was, in one word, a fatal blow at Charles through that quarter where alone he seemed to be vulnerable—it was, in its aim and result, a philippic against the duke of Buckingham. Demosthenes never delivered one, more clear, plain, convincing, irresistible. It calls to mind that greatest of orators. Eliot’s general style was more immediately cast in the manner of Cicero, but here he rose beyond it, into the piercing region of the Greek. Demosthenic strength and closeness of reasoning, clearness of detail, and appalling earnestness of style, are all observable in the naked outline I now present. What may have been the grandeur and the strength of its complete proportions? I recollect a remark of Mr. Hazlitt’s, that the author of this speech might have originated the “dogged style” of one of our celebrated political writers. “There is no affectation of wit in it,” he continued, “no studied ornament, no display of fancied superiority. The speaker’s whole heart and soul are in his subject; he is full of it; his mind seems, as it were, to surround and penetrate every part of it;” nothing diverts him from his purpose, or interrupts the course of his reasoning for a

1 Rushworth, vol. i. p. 501. The indefatigable collector, however, only gives a brief outline of the speech. It may be worth notice also, that, owing to some confusion in his papers, a portion of this outline was printed in the wrong place, and still stands as a separate speech both in his work and the Parliamentary History. See the latter, vol. vii. p. 399.; and Rushworth, vol. i. p. 520.
moment. No thought of the personal loss, then frightfully incurred, no fear of the dangers that were sure to follow. His argument rose paramount, for it was the life of the nation's liberties.\footnote{1}

"Mr. Speaker," Eliot began, "we sit here as the great council of the king, and, in that capacity, it is our duty to take into consideration the present state and affairs of the kingdom. In this consideration, I confess, many a sad thought hath affrighted me; and that not only in respect of our dangers from abroad, which yet I know are great, as they have been often in this place prest and dilated to us, but in respect of our disorders here at home, which do inforce those dangers, and by which they are occasioned. For, I believe, I shall make it clear unto you, that, as at first the cause of these dangers were our disorders, so our disorders now are yet our greatest dangers. It is not so much the potency of our enemies, as the weakness of ourselves, that threatens us. That saying of the father may be assumed by us: \textit{Non tam potentia sua, quam negligentia nostrae}. Our want of true devotion to heaven, our insincerity and doubling in religion, our want of councils, our precipitate actions, the insufficiency or unfaithfulness of our generals abroad, the ignorance or corruptions of our ministers at home, the impoverishing of the sovereign, the oppression and depression of the subject, the exhausting of our treasures, the waste of our provisions, consumption of our ships, destruction of our men—these make the advantage to our enemies, not the reputation of their arms. And if in these there be not reformation, we need no foes abroad. Time itself will ruin us!"

It is a saying of May, the historian, in reference to this and other speeches, that "the freedom that sir John Eliot used in parliament, was by the people applauded, though much taxed by the courtiers, and censured by some of a more politque reserve (considering the times) among his own party, in that kind that Tacitus censures Thrasius Petus, as thinking such freedom a needless, and therefore a foolish thing, where no cure could be hoped by it. \textit{Sibi periculum, nec alia libertatem.} This is the old reproach of the timid and indifferent. I am about to show, in the present instance, that he incurred the danger, which soon after fell upon his life, in no spirit of idle forwardness, but for the achievement of a great practical purpose, \textit{which he did achieve}.\footnote{1}
A slight interruption from the ministers here appears to have given Eliot a moment's pause. With admirable address he appealed to the house. "You will all hold it necessary that what I am about to urge seems not an aspersian on the state, or imputation on the government, as I have known such motions misinterpreted. Far is this from me to propose, who have none but clear thoughts of the excellency of the king, nor can have other ends than the advancement of his majesty's glory. I shall desire," he continued, "a little of your patience extraordinary to open the particulars, which I shall do with what brevity I may, answerable to the importance of the cause, and the necessity now upon us, yet with such respect and observation to the time, as I hope it shall not be thought troublesome."

He then proceeded to open up the question of "insincerity and doubling in religion." He pursued it through many strong and terrible examples. "Will you have authority of books?" he asked, furnishing them with a series of the most striking passages from the recent collections of the committee that had been sitting on religious affairs. "Will you have proofs of men?" he continued. "Witness the hopes, witness the presumptions, witness the reports of all the papists generally. Observe the dispositions of commanders, the trust of officers, the confidence in secretaries to employments in this kingdom, in Ireland, and elsewhere! These all will show it hath too great a certainty; and to this add but the incontrovertible evidence of that all-powerful hand, which we have felt so sorely. For if the heavens oppose themselves to us for our impiety, it is we that first opposed the heavens."

Eliot next handled the "want of councils." "This," he said, "is that great disorder in a state, with which there cannot be stability. If effects may show their causes, as they are often a perfect demonstration of them, our misfortunes, our disasters, serve to prove it, and the consequences they draw with them. If reason be allowed in this dark age, the judgment of depend-
encies and foresight of contingencies in affairs do confirm it. For, if we view ourselves at home, are we in strength, are we in reputation, equal to our ancestors? If we view ourselves abroad, are our friends as many, are our enemies no more? Do our friends retain their safety and possessions? Do not our enemies enlarge themselves, and gain from them and us? To what counsel owe we the loss of the Palatinate, where we sacrificed both our honour and our men,—obstructing those greater powers appointed for that service, by which it might have been defensible? What counsel gave direction to the late action, whose wounds are yet bleeding—I mean the expedition to Rhée, of which there is yet so sad a memory in all men? What design for us, or advantage to our state, could that import? You know the wisdom of our ancestors, and the practice of their times; how they preserved their safeties! We all know, and have as much cause to doubt as they had, the greatness and ambition of that kingdom, which the old world could not satisfy. Against this greatness and ambition we likewise know the proceedings of that princess, that never-to-be-forgotten, excellent queen, Elizabeth, whose name, without admiration, falls not into mention even with her enemies! You know how she advanced herself, and how she advanced this nation in glory and in state; how she depressed her enemies, and how she upheld her friends; how she enjoyed a full security, and made them then our scorn, who now are made our terror!"

The principles of that policy by which Elizabeth had effected all this, Eliot now developed to the house, exhibiting beside them the singularly opposite and pitiful contrast of the prevailing policy. The passage is remarkable for its subtlety, no less than for its exactest truth. "Some of the principles she built on were these; and, if I mistake, let reason and our statesmen contradict me. —First, to maintain, in what she might, an unity in

1 The entire range of English oratory furnishes nothing finer in expression and purpose than this allusion to Spain.
France, that that kingdom, being at peace within itself, might be a bulwark to keep back the power of Spain by land. Next, to preserve an amity and league between that state and us, that so we might come in aid of the Low Countries, and by that means receive their ships and help them by sea. This table cord, so working between France, the States, and England, might enable us, as occasion should require, to give assistance unto others. It was by this means, the experience of that time doth tell us, that we were not only free from those fears that now possess and trouble us, but our names were also fearful to our enemies. See now what correspondence our actions have with this; square them by these rules. They have induced, as a necessary consequence, a division in France between the protestants and their king, of which we have had too woful and lamentable experience. They have made an absolute breach between that state and us, and so entertain us against France, and France in preparation against us, that we have nothing to promise to our neighbours—hardly to ourselves! Nay, observe the time in which they were attempted, and you shall find it not only varying from those principles, but directly contrary and opposite, ex diametro, to those ends! and such as, from the issue and success, rather might be thought a conception of Spain, than begotten here with us!"

Every word was now falling with tremendous effect upon Buckingham, and the ministers could endure it no longer. Sir Humphry May, the chancellor of the duchy, and one of the privy council, started from his seat, "expressing," as Rushworth states it, "a dislike. But the house ordered sir John Eliot to go on. Whereupon he proceeded thus: — "Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for this interruption, but much more sorry if there hath been occasion; — wherein, as I shall submit myself wholly to your judgment, to receive what censure you should give me, if I have offended; so, in the integrity of my intentions and clearness of my thoughts, I must still retain this confidence,—that no greatness shall deter
me from the duties which I owe to the service of my
king and country, but that, with a true English heart, I
shall discharge myself as faithfully, and as really, to
the extent of my poor power, as any man whose honours
or whose offices most strictly oblige him.'"

With admirable self-possession, Eliot then resumed
his speech at the very point of interruption, and con­tinued to urge the madness of breaking peace with
France at a time so emphatically unfortunate. "You
know," he said, "the dangers Denmark was in, and
how much they concerned us; what in respect of our
alliance and the country; what in the importance of the
Sound; (what an advantage to our enemies the gain there­
of would be!) What loss then, what prejudice to us, by
this disunion! we breaking upon France, France en­raged by us, and the Netherlands at amazement between
both! no longer could we intend to aid that luckless king,
whose loss is our disaster."

Here Eliot, having, as it
appears to me, reduced the matter ad absurdum, suddenly
turned round to the ministerial bench. "Can those,
now, that express their troubles at the hearing of these things,
and have so often told us, in this place, of their knowledge
in the conjunctures and disjunctures of affairs, say, they
advised in this? Was this an act of council, Mr. Speaker?
I have more charity than to think it; and, unless they
make a confession of themselves, I cannot believe it."

The orator now, under cover of a discussion of a
third division of his argument, "the insufficiency
and unfaithfulness of our generals," dragged Bucking­
ham personally upon the scene. For a moment, how­
ever, before doing this, he paused. "What shall I say?
I wish there were not cause to mention it; and, but
out of apprehension of the danger that is to come,

1 It would be easy to dilate this speech into a volume, so pregnant is
every word with meaning, so condensed are its views, yet so exact and
forcible. The reader who is best acquainted with the general history of
the time, will appreciate it best. The present is an allusion to the dis­
astrous defeat of the king of Denmark by count Tilly. The king of Eng­
land had precipitated the quarrel by his weak importunities, and then, by
this outrageous war with France, utterly disabled his own power of as­sistance.
if the like choice hereafter be not prevented, I could willingly be silent. But my duty to my sovereign, my service to this house, and the safety and honour of my country, are above all respects;—and what so nearly trenches to the prejudice of this, must not, shall not, be forborne.”

Then followed this bitter and searching exposure of the incapacity of Buckingham in his various actions. How much its effect is increased by the ominous omission of his name!

“At Cadiz, then, in that first expedition we made, when we arrived and found a conquest ready,—(the Spanish ships I mean, which were fit for the satisfaction of a voyage; and of which some of the chiefest then there themselves, have since assured me, that the satisfaction would have been sufficient, either in point of honour, or in point of profit,)—why was it neglected? why was it not achieved? it being of all hands granted, how feasible it was?

“After, when with the destruction of some of our men, and with the exposition of some others, who (though their fortunes since have not been such) by chance came off,—when, I say with the loss of our serviceable men, that unserviceable fort was gained, and the whole army landed;—why was there nothing done?—why was there nothing attempted? If nothing was intended, wherefore did they land? If there was a service, wherefore were they shipped again?

“Mr. Speaker, it satisfies me too much in this,—when I think of their dry and hungry march into that drunken quarter (for so the soldiers termed it), where was the period of their journey,—that divers of our men, being left as a sacrifice to the enemy, the general’s labour was at an end!”

“For the next undertaking at Rhée I will not trouble you much,—only this in short. Was not that whole action carried against the judgment and opinion of those officers that were of the council? Was not the first, was not the last, was not all, in the landing, in
the intrenching, in the continuance there, in the assault, in the retreat, without their assent? Did any advice take place of such as were of the council? If there should be made a particular inquisition thereof, these things will be manifest, and more! — I will not instance the manifesto that was made for the reason of these arms; nor by whom, nor in what manner, nor on what grounds, it was published; nor what effects it hath wrought, drawing, as it were, almost the whole world into league against us; — nor will I mention the leaving of the wines, or the leaving of the salt, which were in our possession, and of a value, as it is said, to answer much of our expense; — nor that great wonder which no Alexander or Caesar ever did, the enriching of the enemy by courtesies when our soldiers wanted help; nor the private intercourses and parleys with the fort, which continually were held; — what all these intended may be read in the success, and upon due examination thereof, they would not want their proofs!"  

Eliot passed to the consideration of "the ignorance and corruption of our ministers." "Where," he asked, "can you miss of instances? If you survey the court, if you survey the country; if the church, if the city be examined; if you observe the bar, if the bench; if the ports, if the shipping; if the land, if the seas, — all these will render you variety of proofs, and that in such measure and proportion as shows the greatness of our disease to be such, that, if there be not some
speedy application for remedy, our case is almost des-
perate."

Eliot here paused for a few moments. "Mr.
Speaker," he said, "I fear I have been too long in these
particulars that are passed, and am unwilling to offend
you; therefore in the rest I shall be shorter." As he
condenses his statements, it will be seen he becomes
more terrible.

"In that which concerns the impoverishing of the
king, no other arguments will I use than such as all
men grant. The exchequer, you know, is empty, and
the reputation thereof gone; the ancient lands are sold;
the jewels pawned; the plate engaged; the debt still
great; almost all charges, both ordinary and extraor-
dinary, borne up by projects. What poverty can be
greater? What necessity so great? What perfect En-
glish heart is not almost dissolved into sorrow for this
truth!

"For the oppression of the subject, which, as I re-
member, is the next particular I proposed, it needs no
demonstration: the whole kingdom is a proof. And for
the exhausting of our treasury, that very oppression
speaks it. What waste of our provisions, what con-
sumption of our ships, what destruction of our men,
have been! Witness that journey to Argiers. Witness
that with Mansfield. Witness that to Cadiz. Witness
the next. Witness that to Rhéé. Witness the last. (I
pray God we may never have more such witnesses!)
Witness likewise the Palatinate. Witness Denmark.
Witness the Turks. Witness the Dunkirkers. Witness
all! What losses we have sustained! how we are im-
paired in munition, in ships, in men! It is beyond
contradiction, that we were never so much weakened, nor
ever had less hope how to be restored."

Eliot concluded thus, with a proposition for a re-
monstrance to the king.

"These, Mr. Speaker, are our dangers; these are
they which do threaten us; and they are like the Trojan
horse, brought in cunningly to surprise us. In these do
lurk the strongest of our enemies, ready to issue on us; and if we do not speedily expel them, these are the signs, these the invitations to others. These will so prepare their entrance, that we shall have no means left of refuge, or defence. For if we have these enemies at home, how can we strive with those that are abroad? If we be free from these, no other can impeach us!

Our ancient English virtue, like the old Spartan valour, cleared from these disorders,—a return to sincerity in religion, once more friends with heaven, having maturity of councils, sufficiency of generals, incorruption of officers, opulence in the king, liberty in the people, repletion in treasure, plenty of provisions, reparation of ships, preservation of men—our ancient English virtue, I say, thus rectified, will secure us; but unless there be a speedy reformation in these, I know not what hopes or expectations we can have.

"These are the things, sir, I shall desire to have taken into consideration; that as we are the great council of the kingdom, and have the apprehension of these dangers, we may truly represent them unto the king: whereto, I conceive, we are bound by a treble obligation—of duty to God, of duty to his majesty, and of duty to our country.

"And therefore I wish it may so stand with the wisdom and judgment of the house, that they may be drawn into the body of a remonstrance, and in all humility expressed; with a prayer unto his majesty, that, for the safety of himself, for the safety of the kingdom, and for the safety of religion, he will be pleased to give us time to make perfect inquisition thereof; or to take them into his own wisdom, and there give them such timely reformation as the necessity and justice of the case doth import.

"And thus, sir, with a large affection and loyalty to his majesty, and with a firm duty and service to my country, I have suddenly (and it may be with some disorder) expressed the weak apprehensions I have; wherein if I have erred, I humbly crave your
SIR JOHN ELIOT.

pardon, and so submit myself to the censure of the house.”

Eliot’s purpose was already accomplished! Scarcely had he resumed his seat, when the effects he had laboured to produce broke forth. “Disaffection!” cried sir Henry Martin and others of the court party; “and there wanted not some who said that speech was made out of some distrust of his majesty’s answer to the petition;” — from the popular side, on the other hand, some stern and significant words were heard about the necessity of a remonstrance. The crisis had unquestionably come. The courtiers went off to tell their news at the council table — the patriots “turned themselves into a grand committee, touching the danger and means of safety of king and kingdom.”

The newsmongers discharged their duty faithfully. The next day a royal message came to the house, acquainting them that within six days the session would close, and desiring them not to touch upon any new matter, but to conclude the necessary business. The day following that brought another message, “commanding the Speaker to let them know, that he will certainly hold that day prefixed without alteration, and he requires them, that they enter not into, or proceed with, any new business, which may spend greater time, or which may lay any scandal or aspersion upon the state, government, or ministers thereof.” The scene that ensued

1 This speech was preserved in sir John Napier’s manuscripts, and will be found in the Old Parliamentary History, vol. viii. p. 155.
2 Rushworth, vol. i. p. 592. Eliot is said to have remarked on this, that he had for some time “had a resolution to open these last mentioned grievances, to satisfy his majesty her心, only he had stayed for an opportunity.” This reads like a sarcasm. Be that as it may, it is remarkable that Wentworth, upon this, is described to have stepped forward and “attested that averment,” saying that he had heard such to have been the determination of Eliot. This is the only appearance of courtesy, or, indeed, of any other feeling than a violent dislike, which it is possible to trace in the conduct of Wentworth to Eliot. And it might have been meant in the way of “damned good-natured friendship.” On the whole, however, I suspect it to have been simply another slip to the wavering negotiations of the court, which Wentworth was now waiting the issue of. Many communications had already passed through the medium of the Speaker and Weston. See Strafford’s State Papers, vol. i. p. 40.
was in all respects extraordinary. Sir Robert Philips was the first to rise. "I consider my own infirmities," said Philips, "and if ever my passions were wrought upon, now this message stirs me up especially. What shall we do, since our humble purposes are thus prevented?" Eliot here suddenly started up, and spoke with more than ordinary vehemence. "Ye all know," he said, "with what affection and integrity we have proceeded hitherto, to have gained his majesty's heart. It was out of the necessity of our duty, we were brought to that course we were in. I doubt a misrepresentation to his majesty hath drawn this mark of his displeasure upon us! I observe in the message, amongst other sad particulars, it is conceived, that we were about to lay some aspersions on the government. Give me leave to protest, sir, that so clear were our intentions, that we desire only to vindicate those dishonours to our king and country! It is said also, as if we cast some aspersions on his majesty's ministers! I am confident no minister, how dear soever, can—" A strange interruption stopped him. "Here," says the account in the Napier MSS., "the Speaker started up from the chair, and, apprehending sir John Eliot intended to fall upon the duke, said, with tears in his eyes, 'There is a command laid upon me, to interrupt any that should go about to lay an aspersion on the ministers of the state.'" Eliot sat down in silence.

Events, for passions include events, now crowded together to work their own good work; and the great statesman, the author, as it were, of that awful scene, may be conceived to have been the only one who beheld it from the vantage ground of a sober consciousness and control. Into that moment his genius had thrown a forecast of the future. The after terrors he did not live to see, but now concentrated in the present spot were all their intense and fervid elements. They struggled in their birth with tears. I do not know whether it

may not be thought indecorous and unseemly now for statesmen to shed tears, but I consider the weeping of that memorable day, that "black and doleful Thursday," to have been the precursor of an awful resolve. Had these great men entertained a less severe sense of their coming duty, no such present weakness had been shown. The monarchy, and its cherished associations of centuries, now trembled in the balance. "Sir Robert Philips spoke," says a member of the house, writing to his friend the day after, "and mingled his words with weeping; sir Edward Coke, overcome with passion, seeing the desolation that was like to ensue, was forced to sit down when he began to speak, through the abundance of tears; yea the speaker in his speech could not refrain from weeping and shedding of tears; besides a great many, whose great griefs made them dumb and silent." ²

A deep silence succeeded this storm, and the few words that broke the silence startled the house into its accustomed attitude of resolution and composure.—"It is the speech lately spoken by sir John Eliot which has given offence, as we fear, to his majesty."³—The irresolute men who hazarded these words at such a time little anticipated their immediate result. "Hereupon," says Rushworth, "the house declared, 'that every member of the house is free from any undutiful speech, from the beginning of the parliament to that day;' and ordered, 'that the house be turned into a committee, to consider what is fit to be done for the safety of the kingdom; and that no man go out upon pain of being sent to the Tower.'" The time for

---

¹ This expression is used in a manuscript letter of the day.
² This interesting letter will be found in Rushworth, vol. i. p. 609. It will be seen that in the commencement of it, the writer, Mr. Atured, distinctly conveys the impression that this extraordinary scene had been caused by Eliot's great speech of two days before. He gives a sketch of the speech, and afterwards describes the interference of the ministers. "As he was enumerating which, the chancellor of the duchy said 'it was a strange language;' yet the house commanded sir John Eliot to go on. Then the chancellor desired, if he went on, that himself might go out. Whereupon they all bade him begone, yet he stayed and heard him out."³ Rushworth, vol. i. pp. 606, 607. Parl. Hist., vol. viii. p. 192.
action had arrived. The speaker, in abject terror, "humbly and earnestly besought the house to give him leave to absent himself for half an hour, presuming they did not think he did it for any ill intention; which was instantly granted him." He went to the king. In the interval of his absence cheerful acclamations resounded once more through the house, for again Buckingham was fearlessly named as the "grievance of grievances;" and "as when one good hound," observes a member who was present, "recovers the scent, the rest come in with a full cry, so they pursued it, and every one came on home, and laid the blame where they thought the fault was, and were voting it to the question, 'that the duke of Buckingham shall be instanced to be the chief and principal cause of all those evils,' when the speaker, having been three hours absent and with the king, brought this message, 'that his majesty commands, for the present, they adjourn the house till tomorrow morning, and that all committees cease in the meantime.' What we shall expect this morning God of heaven knows."  

The king, it is evident, now shook with alarm. The clouds were gathering over his favourite thicker and blacker than ever. That morning, however, with a last vague hope, he sent a cozening message, and a wish for a "sweet parting." The only notice taken of it by the commons was the forwarding of a petition "for a clear and satisfactory answer in full parliament to the petition of rights," and the stern opening of an investigation into several high grievances, more especially the charge I have before mentioned of a design for introducing foreign troops into the kingdom. No alternative was

1 Rushworth, vol. i. p. 609.
3 "So, for this time," ran the close of the message, "let all Christendom take notice of a sweet parting between him and his people; which, if it fall out, his majesty will not be long from another meeting; when such grievances, if there be any, at their leisure and convenience may be considered." Parl. Hist., vol. viii. p. 197. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 610.
5 Burlemach, a naturalised Dutch merchant, was examined, and admitted that he had received 30,000£ from the treasury, for the raising of
left to Charles, and the commons were summoned the next day to meet him in the upper house.

"To avoid all ambiguous interpretations, and to show you there is no doubleness in my meaning, I am willing to pleasure you as well in words as in substance. Read your petition, and you shall have an answer that, I am sure, will please you."1 Such was Charles's speech to the members of the house of commons who crowded that day round their lordships' bar. The petition was read accordingly, and the usual answer was returned, — Soit droit fait comme il est désiré. "At the end of the king's first speech," says a memorandum on the lords' journals, "at the answer to the petition, and on the conclusion of the whole, the commons gave a great and joyful applause."

Charles the First, after he left the house of lords that day, stood in a different relation to the people from that he had occupied before. It is impossible to deny this fact.2 The commons had asserted it in cleaving so strongly to their resolutions, the king himself in striving so desperately to evade them. A certainty of direction and operation had been given to the old laws. Charles appeared, indeed, to sanction the notion of a great and vital change by the first step he took. He sent a message

German horse, which he had disbursed accordingly. He further admitted that 1000 horse had been levied in consequence, and arms provided for them in Holland, but that "he heard they were lately countermanded." Parl. Hist., vol. viii. p. 200. And see Rushworth, vol. i. p. 612.


2 Hume observes, "it may be affirmed, without any exaggeration, that the king's assent to the petition of rights produced such a change in the government as was almost equivalent to a revolution; and by circumscribing in so many articles the royal prerogative, gave additional security to the liberties of the subject. " Without going so far as this, it is quite certain that it materially altered Charles's position in a moral as well as legal sense. The petition of rights (it is given at length in Hume's History, vol. v. p. 171.) affirmed and confirmed expressly the enactments of the 9 Hen. III. chap. 29. (Magna Charta), that no freeman be deprived of his liberty or his property except by judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land; of the 28 Edw. III. chap. 33., that no man, of whatever estate or condition, should be taken, imprisoned, dispossessed, disquieted, or put to death, without being brought to answer by due process of law: and of the 25. 36. 42 Rich. II., with the 17 Rich. II. to the same intent. But it did even more than this, by its embodyment of the supplementary resolutions of the commons, which, as I have already observed, bound the judges to a strict letter of construction, and deprived them of the plea of antagonist enactments.

a 2
to the commons, desiring "that the petition of rights, with his assent thereunto, should not only be recorded in both houses, and in the courts of Westminster, but that it be put in print, for his honour, and the content and satisfaction of his people." 1

The commons, according to Rushworth, "returned to their own house with unspeakable joy, and resolved so to proceed as to express their thankfulness. Now frequent mention was made of proceeding with the bill of subsidies, of sending the bills which were ready to the lords, and of perfecting the bill of tonnage and poundage. Sir John Strange-wales expressed his joy at the answer, and further added, 'Let us perfect our remonstrance.'" 2 And such was their exact mode of procedure. The largest supplies that had been voted for years were at once presented to the king. The king's commission of excise was demanded to be cancelled under the new act of right. The bill for the granting of tonnage and poundage, which was already far advanced, was passed, but a protest voted at the same time, on the ground of its inconsistency with the new act, against Charles's old course of levying this imposition without consent of parliament. 3 A remonstrance was also voted and presented to the king, against certain proceedings of Buckingham. 4 These measures were not only in conformity with the petition, but were positively required to give it efficacy and completeness. No opportunity of concession or concord

3 The only plea advanced by the court lawyers against the conduct of the commons in this matter, worthy of notice, was founded on the iniquitous judgment of the court of exchequer in Bates's case during the last reign. But this plea had surely been barred by the resolutions I have so often named. Supposing it to be urged that the language of the petition was not sufficiently general to comprehend duties charged on merchandise at the outports, as well as internal taxes and exactions—a notion which was strongly contested by Eliot—it is quite certain that the iniquitous application of the statutes in Bates's case, that grossest of instances of 'judge-made law,' was distinctly foreclosed. Tonnage and poundage, like other subsidies, could thereafter only spring from the free grant of the people.
4 This remonstrance, drawn up by Selden and Eliot, is extremely able. It is impossible, after reading it, to question its necessity. See Rushworth, vol. i. p. 619.
was withheld from Charles, but no distinct right was foreborne. The grand committees that were then sitting, on the various heads of religion, trade, grievances, and courts of justice, were ordered to sit no longer. Every appearance of unnecessary opposition was carefully avoided.

But suddenly, in the midst of these measures, the commons were summoned by the king to the house of lords. After a long interview with the speaker, Charles had hurried there to close the session. "It may seem strange," he said, when they appeared at the bar, "that I come so suddenly to end this session before I give my assent to the bills. I will tell you the cause, though I must avow that I owe the account of my actions to God alone." This was a very proper commencement to his speech; for, after peevishly complaining of the remonstrance against Buckingham, he went on to inform them that he would have no interference with his rights over tonnage and poundage; and, further, that they had altogether misunderstood the petition of rights. "I have granted no new, but only confirmed the ancient liberties of my subjects." His concluding words were very remarkable. "As for tonnage and poundage, it is a thing I cannot want, and was never intended by you to ask, nor meant by me, I am sure, to grant. To conclude, I command you all that are here to take notice of what I have spoken at this time to be the true intent and meaning of what I granted you in your petition; but especially you, my lords, the judges, for to you only, under me, belongs the interpretation of laws." Parliament was then prorogued to the 20th of the following October.

The patriot leaders separated, it may be supposed, with many gloomy forebodings. New miseries and oppressions were about to visit the people. Yet had this immortal session strengthened the people's hearts.

1 Rushworth, vol. i. p. 613.
2 The reader, coupling this with Charles's previous consultation with the judges, will readily understand its significance.
for endurance, no less than it had sharpened their powers for resistance. The patriots had no cause to separate with any distrust of each other.

Eliot went immediately into Cornwall. I am fortunately enabled to follow him there. Among the manuscripts of sir Robert Cotton I have found a letter written to that learned antiquary some few days after his arrival. It is in many points of view interesting. It is a happy specimen of Eliot's style; and it proves, if such proof were wanting, that this great statesman had embraced the public cause with the deep fervour of a private passion.

"How acceptable your letters are," he writes, "and with what advantage they now come, I need not tell you; when, besides the memorie of my owne losses (which can have no reparation like the assurance of your favour), I but acknowledge the ignorance of these partes, almoste as much divided from reason and intelligence as our island from the world. That the session is ended we are gladd, because to our understandinges it implies a concurrence in the generall, and intimates a contynuance of the parliamen—having not the notion of particulars by which we mighte compose ourselves to better judgment. The soldiier, the mariner, the shipps, the seas, the horse, the foot, are to us no more than the stories of the poetts, either as thinges fabulous or unnescessarie, entertained now only for discourse or wonder, not with the apprehension of the least feare or doubte! Denmarke and the Sound are taken rather for wordes than meaninges; and the greatnesse and ambition of Austria or Spain are to us a mere chimera. Rochell and Dunkirk are all one. What friends we have lost or what enemies we have gained (more than that enemie which we have bredd our selves) is not soe much to us as the night shower or sunnes-shine! nor can we thinke of anie thinge that is not present with us. What they doe in Suffolk with their sojorners wee care not, while there are none billeted on us; and it is indifferent to our reasons, in the contestations which they have, whether the straunger or the
countryman prevale. Onlie one thing gives us some remembraunce of our neighbours, which is the greate resorte of Irish dailie comminge over, whoo, though, they begg of us, wee doubt maie take from others, and in the end give us an ill recompense for our charite. This is a bad character, I confesse, which I give you of my country, but such as it deserves. You onlie have power to make it appeare better, by the honor of your letters, which come nowhere without happinesse, and are a satisfaction for all wantes to me. Your affectionate servant, John Eliot."

Stirring events, however, soon reached Eliot in his retirement, such as must have moved even those stagnant waters, which he describes so well. The "self-bred" enemy of England was no more—Buckingham had fallen by the hand of an assassin. But the service of despotism which the king had lost promised to be replaced by a more dangerous, because a more able, counsellor. Wentworth had gone over to the court. Weston, a creature of the late duke's, had been created lord treasurer. Other changes followed. Laud was made bishop of London, and, with Laud's

1 Cottonian MSS. c. iii. p. 174.
2 Very interesting notices of this event and the circumstances which followed it, will be found in the third volume of Eliot's Original Letters, pp. 256–282. Second edition. The funeral of the so brilliant duke was the most melancholy winding up of all. The king had designed a very grand one, - "Nevertheless," says Mead to Stuteville, "the last night, at ten of the clock, his funeral was solemnised in as poor and confused a manner as hath been seen, marching from Wallingford House, over against Whitehall, to Westminster Abbey; there being not much above 100 mourners, who attended upon an empty coffin, borne upon six men's shoulders; the duke's corpse itself being there interred yesterday, as if it had been doubtful the people in their madness might have surprised it. But, to prevent all disorder, the train bands kept a guard on both sides of the way, all along from Wallingford House to Westminster Church, brailing up their drums loud, and carrying their pikes and muskets upon their shoulders, as in a march; not trailing them at their heels, as is usual at a mourning. As soon as the coffin was entered the church, they came all away without giving any volley of shot at all. And this was the obscure catastrophe of that great man." - Harr. MSS. 320.
3 Eliot, it may be presumed, was perfectly prepared for this event. The expression I have elsewhere used of Wentworth's having "basely abandoned" the popular cause, is somewhat hasty. I think I shall be able to show that he never in reality was attached to it. Pym appears to have thought so, but Eliot had watched more closely.
4 The memoir of Pym will be a more proper occasion than this for a detailed expression of the exact state of opinions in religion, and the nature of their influence on political questions.
elevation, arminianism reared its head formidably. Arminian prelates were the favourites of the court; the royal favour shone exclusively on arminian clergymen; and Montague, obnoxious as he had proved himself by the arminian tendency of his works, was raised to the bishopric of Chester. On this subject Eliot felt strongly. He had already from his place in the house of commons denounced the tendency of those arminian doctrines, whose essential principle he had justly described to be that of claiming for the king, as absolute head of the church, a power resembling the pope's infallibility,—an independent state supremacy—a power over the liberty and property of the subject. His acute perception had already detected in Laud that resolution towards new ceremonies in the protestant church which should raise her out of the apostolic simplicity to a worldly equality with the church of Rome; and in Laud's fervid sincerity on this point he saw the deepest source of danger. It was even now indeed in action, for further news soon arrived that Charles, as supreme governor of the church, had published an authorised edition of the articles containing the objectionable clause ("the church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and hath authority in matters of faith,)" and with an order that no doctrine should be taught that differed from those articles, that all controversies respecting outward policy should be decided by the convocation, and that no man should presume to explain the article respecting justification contrary to its plain meaning, or to take it in any other than the literal and grammatical sense. Nor was this all. The terrors of the Star Chamber and high commission had followed close upon Laud's new powers; and the cases of Burton, Pryne, and Gill, their zeal and their frightful sufferings, afflicted the country. The political application of these doctrines had received, at the same time, a fatal illustration in various flagrant violations of the petition of rights. A copy of the statute itself reached Cornwall, printed by the king's order (a shameless attempt at imposture, 1

which is scarcely to be credited), with the addition of his first and rejected answer. Tonnage and poundage had been recklessly levied. Richard Chambers, Samuel Vassal, and John Rolles, three distinguished merchants, the last named of whom was a member of the house of commons, had submitted to a seizure of their goods, rather than become parties to a violation of the public liberties, and the judges had refused them protection. 1 Such was the news that travelled day by day to the seat of sir John Eliot. To crown the whole, Richelieu, laying aside his hat for a helmet, had, by his personal appearance at Rochelle, finally reduced that ill-fated place and driven back the disgraced English fleet. 2

But now, bad news having spent itself, the time fixed for the parliament approached. Eliot left his home, to which he was never to return, and hurried up to London.

Parliament met, having suffered an intermediate prorogation, on the 20th of January, 1829. The spirit with which they reassembled was evidenced by their very first movement. They revived every committee of grievance. Sir John Eliot then moved a call of the house for the 27th, when vital matters, he said, would be brought into discussion. It was further ordered, on his motion, that "Mr. Selden should see if the petition of rights, and his majesty's answer thereunto, were enrolled in the parliament rolls and courts at Westminster, and in what manner." Selden having reported, almost immediately after, the gross fraud that had been practised, Pym rose and moved an adjournment of the debate "by reason of the fewness of the house, many being not then come up." Sir John Eliot's conduct was characteristic. "Since this matter," he said "is now raised, it concerns the honour of the

1 The conduct of the judges in this case showed how carefully they had attended to the significant suggestions of the king. "Vassal pleaded to the information the statute de pillagio non concedendo. The court of exchequer overruled his plea, and would not hear his counsel. Chambers sued out a reprieve to recover possession of his goods, on the ground that a seizure for tonnage and poundage, without grant of parliament, was against law; but the writ was superseded by the court of exchequer."

Br. Itatunin.

house, and the liberties of the kingdom. It is true, it deserves to be deferred till a fuller house, but it is good to prepare things; for I find this to be a point of great consequence. I desire, therefore, that a select committee may both enter into consideration of this, and also how other liberties of this kingdom have been invaded. I found, in the country, the petition of rights printed indeed, but with an answer that never gave any satisfaction. I desire a committee may consider thereof, and present it to the house; and that the printer may be sent for, to be examined about it, and to declare by what warrant it was printed." Eliot's influence with the house was paramount; what he proposed was instantly ordered, and the disgrace of the attempted imposition indelibly fixed upon the king. 1

Eliot followed up this blow. The seizure of the goods of Mr. Rolles came into question; some attempt was made to narrow the inquiry; and sir Robert Philips proposed to refer the matter to a committee. Sir John rose sharply. "Three things, sir," he said, "are involved in this complaint; first, the right of the particular gentleman; secondly, the right of the subject; thirdly, the right and privilege of the house. Let the committee consider the two former; but, for the violation of the liberties of this house, let us not do less than our forefathers. Was ever the information of a member committed to a committee? Let us send for the parties. Is there not here a flat denial of the restitution of the goods? Was it not also said that if all the parliament were contained in him, they would do as they did? Let them be sent for." 2 The sheriff of London, Acton, who seized the goods, was in consequence sent for, appeared at the bar on his knees, and was ordered to the Tower. The officers of the customs were, at the same time, punished. 3

The fiery decision of Eliot had its usual effect upon the court. The king sent a message to the house to

1 See Parliamentary Hist., vol. viii. pp. 245, 246. The proceedings of this session are but imperfectly reported in Rushworth's Collections.


Sir John Eliot.

desire them to forbear all further proceedings until he should have addressed both houses next day at Whitehall as he purposed. His speech was an entreaty that they should not be jealous of him, and an endeavour to impose upon them a self-evident absurdity—that he took tonnage and poundage, as a "gift of the people," but as a gift, forsooth, for his life, according to the custom of his predecessors; which he desired them, therefore, to embody in a bill, since they had no discretion to withhold it. This speech was not noticed by the commons.

The 27th of January, the day fixed for the call of the house on Eliot's motion, arrived. The house was in debate on religious grievances. I have already alluded to the encouragement given to arminianism by the court, and to the justifiable alarm it had been viewed with by the popular party. Sir John Eliot's present purpose was to break the power of Laud, and to this full house he now presented himself in all the confidence of an eloquence which worked its greatest influence on minds of the greatest order, which could sway them at will to high excitement or wrap them in deepest admiration. The reader will perceive with what a sober dignity the opening passages of this speech are conceived.

"Sir," he began, taking advantage of a rest in the debate which had been caused by Mr. Coriton, "I have always observed, in the proceedings of this house, our best advantage is in order; and I was glad when that noble gentleman, my countryman, gave occasion to stay our proceedings; for I feared they would have carried us into a sea of confusion and disorder. And now having occasion to present my thoughts to you in this great and weighty business of religion, I shall be bold to give a short expression of my own affection; and in that order that, I hope, will conduce best to the effecting of that work, and direct our labour to an end. To enter, sir, into a particular disquisition of the writings and opinions of divines, I fear it would involve us in a labyrinth that we shall hardly get out of; and perchance hinder that way, and darken that path, in which we must tread. Before

we know, however, what other men have declared, it is necessary that we should presently ourselves lay down what is truth. I presume, we came not hither to dispute of religion. Far be it from the thoughts of that church that hath so long time confessed it, now to dispute it. Shall posterity think we have enjoyed our religion fourscore years almost, and are we now doubtful of the defence? God forbid. It may be, however, sir, and out of some things lately delivered I have not unnecessarily collected, that there is a jealousy conceived, as if we meant so to deal with matters of faith, that did not perhaps belong unto us, as to dispute of matters of faith. It is our profession. They are not to be disputed. Neither will that truth be receded from, this long time held. Nor is that truth decayed. It is confirmed by parliament, because it was truth. And this, sir, before I come to deliver myself more particularly, give me leave, that have not yet spoken in this great cause, to give some apprehension I have of fear; for it is not in the parliament to make a new religion, neither, I hope, shall it be in any to alter the body of that truth which we now profess."

Eliot now alluded to the declaration which I have already described as published in the king’s name, but which had issued from the hand of Laud. "I must confess, sir, amongst all those fears we have contracted, there ariseth to me not one of the least dangers in the declaration, which is made and published in his majesty’s name: and yet, sir, this conclusion exclusively let me state, that I may not be mistaken,—whatever in this, or other things, shall appear to make mention of his majesty, we have not the least suspicion of jealousy of him. I hope it is by those ministers about him, which not only he, but all princes are subject to." The speaker then adduced various precedents which covertly aimed at Laud. "As it was in that," he continued, "so it may be in this. I speak to this end to draw it to this conclusion, that if there be any thing that carrieth the title of his majesty, it may be the fault of his ministers. Far be it from me to have suspicion of him. And now to
that particular, in that declaration; wherein, I confess, with me, is an apprehension of more fear than I have of all the rest; for in the last particulars we heard what is said of popery and arminianism. It is true our faith and religion have before been in danger; but it was by degrees. Here, sir, like an inundation, it doth break in at once. We are in danger at once to be ruined and overwhelmed. For, I beseech you mark, the ground of our religion is contained in these articles. If there be any difference of opinions concerning the sense and interpretation of them, the bishops and clergy in convocation have a power admitted to them here to do any thing which shall concern the continuance and maintenance of the truth professed; which truth being contained in these articles, and these articles being different in the sense, if there be any dispute about that, it will be in them to order which way they please; and, for aught I know, popery and arminianism may be a sense introduced by them, and then it must be received. Is this a slight thing, that the power of religion must be drawn to the persons of those men? I honour their profession and honour their persons; but, give me leave to say, the truth we profess is not men's, but God's; and God forbid that men should be made to judge of that truth!

This passage wrought upon the house; and Eliot, throwing out a sarcasm with his usual skill and effect, thus continued:—"I remember a character I have seen in a diary of Edward VI., that young prince of famous memory, wherein he doth express the condition of the bishops and clergy in his time, and saith, under his own handwriting, 'that some for sloth, some for ignorance, some for luxury, and some for popery, are unfit for discipline and government.' Sir, I hope, it is not so with us; nay, give me leave to vindicate the honour of those men that openly show their hearts to the truth. There are amongst our bishops such as are fit to be made examples to all ages, who shine in virtue, like those two faithful witnesses in heaven, of whom we may use that eulogy which Seneca did of Caius—that to their memories and merits, 'Nec hoc quidem obtet
quod nostris temporibus nati sint;' and to whose memory and merit I may use the saying, that the others' faults are no prejudice to their virtues; who are so industrious in their works, that I hope posterity shall know there are men that are firm for the truth. But, sir, that all now are not so free, sound, and orthodox in religion as they should be, witness the men complained of—and you know what power they have. Witness those men nominated lately—Mr. Montague, for instance. I reverence the order; I honour not the man. Others may be named as bad. I apprehend such fear that, should it be in their power, we may be in danger to have our whole religion overthrown.

"But," Eliot exclaimed, as he saw the excitement rising in the house, "I give this for testimony, and thus far do express myself against all the power and opposition of these men! Whencever any opposition shall be, I trust we shall maintain the religion we profess, for in that we have been born and bred—nay, sir, if cause be, in that I hope to die! Some of these, sir, you know, are masters of ceremonies, and they labour to introduce new ceremonies in the church. Some ceremonies are useful! Give me leave to join in one that I hold necessary and commendable,—that at the repetition of the creed we should stand up to testify the resolution of our hearts, that we would defend that religion we profess. In some churches it is added that they did not only stand upright with their bodies, but with their swords drawn! and if cause were, I hope, to defend our prince, country, and religion, we should draw our swords against all opposers!"

This speech, it has been remarked, was a light that fell into a well laid train. Its result was a "vow," made on the journals, that "the Commons of England claimed, professed, and avowed for truth, that sense of the articles of religion which were established in parliament in the 18th year of queen Elizabeth, which, by the public acts of the church of England, and
by the general and current exposition of the writers of that church, had been declared unto them; and that they rejected the sense of the Jesuits, Arminians, and of all others, wherein they differed from it." 1 Eliot did not fail to follow up this advantage. Some days afterwards he fastened upon Laud by name. "In this Laud," he exclaimed, "is contracted all the danger that we fear! and I doubt not but that his majesty, being informed thereof, will leave him to the justice of this house." 2 His majesty, meanwhile, was sending message after message to hasten the tonnage and poundage bill, every one of which, with admirable skill, was foiled by Eliot and his friends. 3 In vain the king continued his messages. Those were commands, they replied, and commands were inconsistent with their privileges. "The heart-blood of the commonwealth," added Eliot, "receiveth life from the privileges of this house." 4

The question of religion surrendered to a sub-committee,—the popular leaders had engaged themselves in a conclusion of the inquiry into the seizure of merchants' goods, with a view to the prevention of such future wrongs, by the infliction of some stringent punishment on the delinquents concerned in the present. The chancellor of the dutchy threatened the displeasure of the king, and a close to the parliament. Eliot, cutting short his threat, quietly observed, "The question, sir, is, whether we shall first go to the restitution, or to the point of delinquency. Some now raise up difficulties, in opposition to the point of delinquency, and talk of breach of parliaments. And other fears I met with, both in this and elsewhere. Take heed you fall not on a rock. I am confident to avoid this would be somewhat difficult, were it not

---

1 Rushworth, vol. i. p. 649.; Journal, Jan. 29. The 13th of Elizabeth was selected, because the legislature had then ordered the clergy to subscribe the articles, and to read them in the churches, yet neither the English nor the Latin edition of that year contained the clause respecting the authority of the ministers of the church.


3 Evidence of this will be found throughout the debates. On one occasion poor old secretary Cooke fell under a sharp rebuke from Eliot, and narrowly escaped a heavier censure. Parl. Hist., vol. viii. p. 279.

for the goodness and justice of the king. But let us do that which is just, and his goodness will be so clear that we need not mistrust. Let those terrors that are threatened us, light on them that make them. Why should we fear the justice of a king when we do that which is just? Let there be no more memory or fear of breaches; and let us now go to the delinquency of those men. That is the only way to procure satisfaction." 1
Upon this the king sent word that he was the delinquent, for that what the accused did, "was by his own direct orders and command." 2 This brought matters to a crisis, and the house adjourned itself for two days.

On the 25th of February, when they reassembled, the committee of religion had concluded its report, and a long list of formidable charges, levelled against Law, was agreed to be presented to the king. The question of the king's offence against the privileges of the house, in the seizure he had avowed, was thus judiciously avoided,—yet an opportunity given to Charles, by some redemption of the recently violated liberties, of receiving from the patriot leaders, without betrayal of their trust, a power of raising new subsidies. The king showed his appreciation of this conduct by sending an instant command to both houses to adjourn to Monday, the 2d of March. 3

Eliot now saw what was intended, and prepared for it with a fearless composure. He drew up a remonstrance concerning tonnage and poundage. In this able document, nothing that is essential to a just opinion of the conduct of the Commons respecting the bill that had been proposed, is omitted. The delay is shown to have been necessary, and the purposes of the leaders of the house are nobly vindicated. It concludes with a solemn statement, that "the commons had so framed a grant of subsidy of tonnage and poundage to your majesty, that you might have been the better enabled for the defence of your realm, and your subjects, by being secured from

all undue charges, be the more encouraged cheerfully to proceed in their course of trade; but not being, now, able to accomplish this their desire, there is no course left unto them, without manifest breach of their duty both to your majesty and their country, save only to make this humble declaration, that the receiving of tonnage and poundage, and other impositions not granted by parliament, is a breach of the fundamental liberties of this kingdom, and of your majesty's royal answer to the petition of rights."

Eliot, at the same time, drew up three articles of protestation, which ran thus:—

1. Whoever shall bring in innovation in religion, or by favour seek to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, or other opinions disagreeing from the true and orthodox church, shall be reputed a capital enemy to this kingdom and commonwealth. 

2. Whosoever shall counsel or advise the taking and levying of the subsidies of tonnage and poundage, not being granted by parliament, or shall be an actor or instrument therein, shall be likewise reputed an innovator in the government, and a capital enemy to this kingdom and commonwealth. 

3. If any merchant or other person whatsoever shall voluntarily yield or pay the said subsidies of tonnage and poundage, not being granted by parliament; he shall likewise be reputed a betrayer of the liberty of England, and an enemy to the same."

With these documents sir John Eliot entered the house of commons on the morning of the 2d of March 1629, for the last time.

He waited only till prayers had been said, and then arose. For the last time, on that fatal day, this great statesman struck, with daring eloquence, at a profligate courtier and a dishonest churchman. "Buckingham is dead," he said, "but he lives in the bishop of Winchester and my lord treasurer Weston!"

(Weston, it was understood, had been a party to the dis-


astrous advice by which, Eliot had anticipated too surely; they were now about to be dissolved. "In the person of the lord treasurer," the orator continued, amidst the interruptions of some, and the enthusiastic cheering of others, — "in his person all evil is contracted, for the innovation of religion, and for the invasion of our liberties. He is the great enemy of the commonwealth. I have traced him in all his actions, and I find him building on those grounds laid by his master, the great duke. He, secretly, is moving for this interruption. From fear, these men go about to break parliaments, lest parliaments should break them." Eliot concluded, as if by a forecast of the future, with these memorable words. "I protest, as I am a gentleman, if my fortune be ever again to meet in this honourable assembly, where I now leave, I will begin again!" Advancing to the speaker, sir John Eliot then produced his remonstrance, and desired that he would read it. The speaker refused. He presented it to the clerk at the table. The clerk also refused. With fearless determination Eliot now read the remonstrance himself, and demanded of the speaker, as a right, that he should put it to the vote. Again the speaker refused. "He was commanded otherwise by the king." A severe reprimand followed from Selden, and the speaker rose to quit the chair. Denzil Hollis and Valentine dragged him back. Sir Thomas Edmonds and other privy councillors made an attempt to rescue him, but "with a strong hand" he was held down in the chair, and Hollis swore he should sit still, till it pleased them to rise. The house was now in open and violent disorder. The speaker weepingingly implored them to let him go; and sir Peter Hayman in reply renounced him for his kinsman; — as the disgrace of his country, the blot of a noble family, and a man whom posterity would remember with scorn and disdain. Every moment increased the disorder, till at last it threatened the most serious consequences. Some members, involuntarily, placed their

hands upon their swords. Above the throng was again heard the voice of the steady and undaunted Eliot. "I shall then express by my tongue what that paper should have done!" He flung it down upon the floor, and placed the protestations I have described into the hands of Hollis. "It shall be declared by us," he exclaimed, "that all that we suffer is the effect of new counsels, to the ruin of the government of the state. Let us make a protestation against those men, whether greater or subordinate, that may hereafter persuade the king to take tonnage and poundage, without grant of parliament. We declare them capital enemies to the king and the kingdom! If any merchants shall willingly pay those duties, without consent of parliament, they are declared accessories to the rest!" Hollis instantly read Eliot's paper, put it to the house in the character of speaker, and was answered by tremendous acclamations. During this, the king had sent the serjeant to bring away the mace, but he could not obtain admission; and the usher of the black rod had followed, with the same ill success. In an extremity of rage, Charles then sent for the captain of his guard to force an entrance. But a later and yet more disastrous day was reserved for that outrage; for, meanwhile, Eliot's resolutions having been passed, the doors were thrown open, and the members rushed out in a body, carrying a king's officer that was standing at the entrance "away before them in the crowd." Such was the scene of Monday the 2d of March 1629, "the most gloomy, sad, and dismal day for England, that had happened for 500 years." The king instantly went down to the house of lords,
called the leaders of the commons "vipers" who should have their rewards, and dissolved the parliament. ¹

Two days afterwards, sir John Eliot received a summons to appear before the council table. This memorable scene closed his public life, and closed it worthily. He was asked "whether he had not spoken such and such words in the lower house of parliament, and showed unto the said house such and such a paper?" Keenly and resolvedly he answered, "that whatsoever was said or done by him in that place, and at that time, was performed by him as a public man and a member of that house; and that he was, and always will be, ready to give an account of his sayings and doings in that place, whenever he should be called unto it by that house, where, as he taketh it, it is only to be questioned; and, in the meantime, being now but a private man, he would not trouble himself to remember what he had either spoken or done in that place, as a public man." He was instantly committed; his study was entered by the king's warrant, and his papers seized. ²

Much time elapsed before his case was finally adjudged. I will present, however, in as few words as possible, the course of the proceedings that were taken. I am able to illustrate it by the help of letters of the time.

Eliot sued for his habeas corpus. An answer was

---

¹ Rushworth, vol. i. p. 661. The same was done with the studies of Selden and Hollis.
returned in the shape of a general warrant, under the king's sign manual. The insufficiency of this return was so clearly shown by Eliot's counsel in the course of the argument, that the judges, "timid and servile, yet desirous to keep some measures with their own consciences, or looking forward to the wrath of future parliaments," wrote what Whitelocke calls a "humble and stout letter" to the king, stating that they were bound to bail Eliot, but requesting that he would send his directions to do so. This letter was not attended to; the judges in consequence deferred the time for judgment; and Eliot was continued in custody. When the day at last arrived that judgment could no longer be deferred, the body of Eliot was not forthcoming. In vain his counsel called for judgment; the judges, in the absence of the prisoner, declined. Eliot had been removed by the king's warrant, the evening before the meeting of the court, from the custody of the keeper to whom his writ had been addressed! Some days after, however, Charles consented that he should be brought up for admission to bail, on condition that he presented a petition declaring he was sorry he had offended. The condition was spurned at once. The offer was repeated by the judges; but Eliot "would do nothing, but resolutely move for his habeas corpus. Whereat one of the judges said, 'Comes he to outface the court?' and the severity of his imprisonment was ordered to be increased. Some months passed away, and the question still remained unsettled. Charles then offered Eliot his privilege of bail, if he would give sureties for good behaviour. Eliot at once declared in answer, that he would never admit the possibility of offending the law by liberty of speech in parliament.

1 Whitelocke's Memorials, p. 14. The conduct of the judges was execrable; and notwithstanding the efforts of Whitelocke to exculpate his father, judge Whitelocke, (in which he succeeded with the Long Parliament,) it is impossible to discern a material difference between him and the rest.

2 Soane, M39. 4178. Various striking accounts of the proceedings, as they affected all the prisoners, will be found in this volume—one of those transcribed by Dr. Birch,—especially under dates June 10., June 25., June 32., and October 15. 1629. See also p. 92 of the same volume.
The judges are described upon this to have suggested to him the possibility of his remaining in prison even seven years longer. He answered that he was quite prepared; his body would serve to fill up the breach that was made in the public liberties as well as any other. The king now showed himself equally resolute; and, refusing an enormous sum that had been offered for his bail, ordered the attorney-general to drop the proceedings in the Star Chamber, and to exhibit an information against him in the King's Bench for words spoken in parliament. As member of a superior court at the period of the alleged offence, he pleaded to the jurisdiction, and thus brought in issue the great question of the privilege of the house of commons, — the question, in point of fact, upon which the character of the English constitution altogether depended. The battle was fought bravely by his counsel, but vainly. The court held that they had jurisdiction; Eliot refused to put in any other plea; and judgment was finally given, that he “should be imprisoned during the king's pleasure, should not be released without giving surety for good behaviour and making submission, and, as the greatest offender and ringleader in parliament, should be fined in £2000.”

This iniquitous judgment found Eliot cheerfully prepared. He immediately sent to the lieutenant of the Tower “to provide him a convenient lodging, that he might send his upholsterer to trim it up.” On being told of the fine, he smiled, and said, “that he had two cloaks, two suits, two pair of boots and galoshes; and if they could pick 2000l. out of that, much good might it do them.” (I have already mentioned the course he had taken to provide for the worldly welfare

1 Letter, dated 15th of October.
2 It is said by Mr. D'Israeli, on a private authority, that 10,000l. had been offered. This was vast indeed. Mr. D'Israeli doubts, however (Commentaries, vol. ii. p. 281.), whether any bail could be tendered, since Eliot was condemned to be imprisoned at the king's pleasure. Mr. D'Israeli forgets that the bail was tendered during the proceedings, and not at their close.
3 The arguments will be found in the State Trials, vol. iii.; and in Rushworth, vol. i. p. 679—691. The judgment was reversed by the Long Parliament.
of his sons. His extensive estates were at present held by relatives in trust for their use. 1) "When I was first committed close prisoner to the Tower," he added, "a commission was directed to the high sheriff of Cornwall, and five other commissioners, my capital enemies, to inquire into my lands and goods, and to seize upon them for the king; but they returned a nihil." 2 I could multiply the evidences of his easy, and even gay, humour at this moment. He is described, for instance, to have "laughed heartily" at receiving a message from the judges complaining of the "misbehaviour of his page and servant, who, with others, had been tossing dogs and cats in a blanket, in the open street of Southwark, near the King's Bench prison, saying, 'We are judges of these creatures, and why should not we take our pleasure upon them, as well as other judges upon our master?'" After some short delays, he was conducted to the Tower, where he had twice before undergone imprisonment, and from which he never stirred again. A man named Dudson, the under-marshall of the King's Bench, who guarded him there, appears to have considered his person the peculiar property of a dungeon. "Mr. lieutenant," he said, on delivering

1 Boscawen was one of the trustees. A letter to him, written by Eliot during his imprisonment, is preserved among the Eliot MSS. (vol. 56), and sets this beyond a doubt. "Having a great confidence in your worth, as I find you to have been selected by my father-in-law, I have presumed also for myself to name you in a trust for the management of that poor fortune which, through the disturbances of these times, I may not call my own. Your trouble will only be for the sealing of some leases now and then, upon compositions of my tenants; for which, as there is occasion, I have appointed this bearer, my servant, Maurice Hill, to attend you, to whom your dispatch in that behalf shall be a full satisfaction of the trust." Sir John continued, nevertheless, as this extract intimates, to manage his pecuniary affairs himself as long as he was able, and in the early part of his imprisonment he arranged with his own hand many of his tenants' leases. He was liberal in acts of kindness, and strict in matters of justice. He grants his eldest son 300l. a year for the expenses of travelling abroad, a very large allowance; and writes back his opinion on a request from one of his tenants to have a wall rebuilt, to which he (Sir John) was not liable, "There would be more charity than wisdom in this." Maurice Hill was an invaluable servant to Sir John in these extremities, and deserved the kindness with which the latter often subscribes himself "your loving master." Mr. D'Israeli has given these interesting circumstances from Lord Eliot's admirable communication. See Commentaries, vol. iv. p. 507. et seq. 3 I have derived the above from a letter in the Sloane collection. Dean to St. Pateville, dated Feb. 27, 1629—30.
Eliot, "I have brought you this worthy knight, whom I borrowed of you some few months ago, and now do repay him again."

A "convenient lodging" had not been prepared. The only accommodation that could be had was "a darke and smoaky room." But he was not denied the use of books, and writing materials were, upon his earnest solicitation, granted to him. Some of the letters written at this period from his dungeon have fortunately been preserved. A great philosophical work, on which he employed himself, has also come down to us.

These present Sir John Eliot, in this last scene of all, not simply unshrinking in fortitude, true to himself, magnanimous, and patient. All this he was;—but something yet greater than this. It would seem certain that, soon after his imprisonment, a secret feeling possessed him that his active life had closed. He did not acknowledge it to himself distinctly, but it is not the less apparent. Daily, under his confinement, his body was sinking. Daily, as his body sank, his soul asserted independent objects and uses. "Not alone," says the poet, whose genius has just risen amongst us.

"Not alone when life flows still do truth
And power emerge, but also when strange chance
Affects its current; in unused conjuncture
Where sickness breaks the body—hunger, watching,
Excess, or languor—oftentimes death's approach—
Peril, deep joy, or woe."

and now, as death approached Eliot—for, from the first month of his present imprisonment, it approached with the steadiest and surest step—a new world revealed itself, to be rescued and regenerated by his virtue; a new tyranny to conquer, which needed not the physical aid that had deserted him in his struggle with the old; a new government to establish which was within the control and accomplishment of all;—"the monarchy of

1 Mend to Stuverle, March 13, 1629-30.
2 Among the Eliot family papers.
3 It may be seen in the Harleian collection, No. 2998.
4 The author of Paracelsus, Mr. Robert Browning. There would be little danger in predicting that this writer will soon be acknowledged as a first-rate poet. He has already proved himself one.
man." He resolved to occupy the hours of his imprisonment with a work that should have for its object the establishment of the independence of man’s mind; of its power over the passions and weaknesses of humanity, of its means of wresting these to the purposes of its own government; — the illustration of the greatest good that could be achieved on earth, man’s monarchy over himself, a perfect and steady self-control. Such a plan, while it embraced the lofty thoughts that now sought freedom from his over-informed and sinking body, would enable him also to vindicate the course he had pursued in his day of strength and vigour; and, in leaving to his countrymen, finally, an unyielded purpose, an unquailing endurance, a still unmitigated hatred of oppression, would teach them, at the same time, that these great qualities had victories of their own to achieve, in which no worldly power could foil them; and that, supposing the public struggles of the time attended with disastrous issue, it was not for man, with his inherent independence, to admit the possibility of despair. If greater virtue, and beauty, and general perfectness of character, have at any time, in any age or country, been illustrated, I have yet to learn when, and by whom.

These thoughts and purposes of Eliot soon broke upon his friends. Hampden was watching his imprisonment with the most anxious solicitude. It is one proof of the virtuous character of this great man having already dawned, that Eliot had entrusted to him the care of his two sons. Soon after the commencement of his imprisonment, Hampden, who discharged this duty with affectionate zeal, received from Eliot a long letter of advice and counsel for them, which sufficiently indicated the studies that already engaged himself. The opening of it shows the last lingering of the struggle which was soon to settle to a perfect composure.1

"Sona," he begins, "if my desires had been valuable

1 All the extracts from letters that follow, unless otherwise specified, are from the Eliot family papers, already referred to.
for one hour, I had long since written to you — which, in little, does deliver a large character of my fortune, that in nothing has allowed me to be master of myself. I have formerly been prevented by employment, which was so tyrannical on my time, as all minutes were anticipated; now my leisure contradicts me, and is soe violent on the contrary, soe great an enemy to all action, as it makes itself useless; — both leisure and business have opposed me either in time or libertie, that I have had no means of expression but my prayers, in which I have never failed to make God the witness of my love, whose blessings I doubt not will deduce it in some evidence to you. And now having gotten a little opportunity (though by stealth), I cannot but give it some testimony from myself, and let you see my dearest expectation in your good.” He goes on to say with what delight he will always hear “of the progress of your learning, of your aptness and diligence in that, of your careful attendance in all exercises of religion, and the instruction and improvements of your minds, which are foundations of a future building.” Some of the philosophy of his own life he then presents to them. “It is a fine history, well studied, — the observation of ourselves.” He describes to them the many evils he has endured, the continuity of his sufferings, “of which there is yet no end. Should those evils,” he continues, “be complained? Should I make lamentation of these crosses? Should I conceive the worse of my condition in the study of myself that my adversities oppose me? Noe! I may not — (and yet I will not be so stoical as not to think them evils, I will not do that prejudice to virtue by detraction of her adversaries). They are evils, for I doe confess them, but of that nature and soe followed, soe neighbouring upon good, as they are noe cause of sorrow, but of joy; seeing whose enemies they make us,—enemies of fortune, enemies of the world, enemies of their children; and knowing for whom we suffer,—for him that is their enemy, for him that can command them whose agents only and instruments they-
are to work his trials on us, which may render us more perfect and acceptable to himself. Should these enforce a sorrow, which are the true touches of his favour, and not affect us rather with the higher apprehension of our happiness? Amongst my many obligations to my Creator, which prove the infinity of his mercies that like a full stream have been always flowing on me, there is none concerning this life, wherein I have found more pleasure or advantage, than in these trials and afflictions (and I may not limit it so narrowly within the confines of this life which I hope shall extend much further), —the operations they have had, the new effects they worke, the discoveries they make upon ourselves, upon others, upon all." Nobly and beautifully he subjoins, "This happiness in all my trials has never parted from me. How great then is his favour by whose means I have enjoyed it! The days have all seemed pleasant, nor nights have ever been tedious, nor fears nor terrors have possesst me,—but a constant peace and tranquillity of the mind, whose agitation has been chiefly in thanks and acknowledgments to him by whose grace I have subsisted, and shall yet I hope participate of his blessings upon you. I have the more enlarged myself in this, that you might have a right view of the condition which I suffer, least from a bye relation, as through a perspective not truly representing, some false sense might be contracted. Neither could I thinke that altogether unusefull for your knowledge which may afford you both precept and example. Consider it, weigh it duly, and when you find a signe or indication of some error, make it an instruction how to avoid the like; if there appears but the resemblance of some virtue, suppose it better, and make it a president for yourselves; when you meet the prints and footsteps of the almightie, magnify the goodness of his providence and miracles that makes such low descents; consider that there is a nature turns all sweetness into venom, when from the bitterest hearbs the bee extracts a honie. Industry and the habit of the soule give the effect and operation upon
all things, and that to one seems barren and unpleasant to another is made fruitful and delightful. Even in this, by your application and endeavour, I am confident may be found both pleasure and advantage. This comes only as a testimony of my love (and see you must accept it, the time yielding no other way of demonstration), and by this expression know that I daily praise for your happiness and felicity as the chief subject of my wishes, and shall make my continual supplication to the Lord, that from the riches of his mercy he will give you such influence of his graces as your blessing and prosperity may satisfy, and enlarge the hopes and comforts of your most affectionate father."

This is the nature which turns venom into sweetness. Hampden hastens to assure him that the present conduct of his sons is all he could desire. "If ever you live," he writes, "to see a fruit fit answerable to the promise of the present blossoms, it will be a blessing of that weight as will turn the scale against all worldly affections, and denominate your life happy." His affection had spoken with too generous a haste. The elder son, John Eliot, who had been sent, by his father's desire, to Oxford, fell into many irregularities, and greatly offended the superiors of his college. This was afterwards only slightly intimated to his father, but it cost him much pain. The younger boy, Richard Eliot, remained at Hampden's seat, and pursued his studies under Hampden's care. He appears to have interested his illustrious tutor extremely. Delicately, however, Hampden is obliged to intitate to his friend, at last, that even Richard is somewhat remiss in his studies. Eliot immediately writes to the boy. He begins by a slight reproach for his not having written to his father. "I had no little doubt, after so long a silence, where you were, or whether you were or no." He desires him to forego the temptations of his young acquaintance; to

1 This youth afterwards, as I have already noticed, "ran off" with a ward in chappelry. He became, ultimately, a hanger-on in the court of Charles II. Evelyn mentions him.
forego, indeed, all society for the present, "that extra
matorum, as Cicero calls it," and to retire wholly to
himself. "Virtue," he continues, "is more rigid than
to be taken with delights; these vanities she leaves, for
these she scorns herself; her paths are arduous and
rough, but excellent, and pleasant to those who once
have past them. Honour is a concomitant they have
to entertain them in their journey, nay it becomes their
servant, and, what is attended by all others, those who
travel in that way have it to wait on them. And this
effort of virtue has not, as in the vulgar acceptation; its
dwelling on a hill; it crowds not in the multitude, but
extra conspectum, as Seneca says, beyond the common
prospect." He illustrates this further by some quotations
from his favourite Tacitus. That there was no
pedantry in this habit is proved by such familiar resort
to it in an affectionate advice to his boy. At this time,
indeed, as I shall presently show, he was living in the
world of the illustrious thinkers of old, and had entitled
himself to it as his own. He concludes his letter with
the following eloquent and earnest remonstrance: "How
comes it that your tutor should complain you are care­
less and remiss? It cannot be, when there is true
affection, there should be indiligence and neglect; when
studie is declined the desires are alienated from the vir­
tue; for no ends are attained without the means, and the
neglect of that shows a diversion from the other. If it
be since my last, I must resume my fears, that though
your own judgment did not guide you, my cautions
should be lost. If it should be hereafter, when that
advise, those reasons, and the commands and authority
of a father (a father most indulgent to the happiness of
his child), which I now give you,—to redeem the time is
spent, to redeem the studies you have missed, and to
redeem yourself who are ingaged to danger, or that
hazard and adventure,—if these make no impressions,
and these must be read in the characters of your course;
if they work not an alteration; if they cause not a new
diligency and intention; an intention of yourself, and in­
ention of the object, virtue; an intention of the means, your study, and an exact intention of the time to improve it to that end;—I shall then receive that wound, which I thank God no enemy could give me, sorrow and affliction of the mind, and that from him from whom I hoped the contrary. But I still hope, and the more confidently for the promise which your letters have assured me. Let it be bettered in performance by your future care and diligence, which shall be accompanied with the prayers and blessings of your most loving father.

Ultimately Eliot, having been much entreated to it by his son John, consents that he shall go abroad, and writes to Hampden mentioning this, adding his desire, that, before the youth's departure, he should endeavour to obtain his "licence," or degree, at Oxford. He forwards at the same time a letter of advice and instruction, respecting a course and object in travel. He is particular in his directions as to the places to be visited, in what order, and with what purpose. He shows in this a lively knowledge of the state of politics on the Continent. "Be careful," he urges in conclusion, "in your religion, make your devotions frequent, seek the blessing from above, drawe your imitation to goode patternes, lett not vaine pedantries deceive you, prepare your estima­tion by your virtue, which your own carriage and example must acquire, wherein you have assistants in the most earnest prayers and wishes of your loving father." In the same communication to Hampden, Eliot sends an expression of his views respecting his younger son, Richard. He considers that the best mode of em­ploying with a good purpose his quick and vivacious humour, will be to send him to the Netherlands, to learn the art of war, in the company of sir Horace Vere. A passage from Hampden's reply on these points, which is charmingly written, will properly close this subject. "I ame so perfectly acquainted," he says, "with y: cleare insight into the dispositions of men, and ability to fitt them with courses suitable, that had you bestowed sonnes
of mine as you have done ye own, my judgmt durst hardly have called it into question, especially when in laying downe ye designe you have prevented the objections to be made agt it: for if Mr. Richard Eliot will, in the intermissions of action, add study to practice, and adorn that lively spirit with flowers of contemplation, he'll raise our expectations of another sir Edward [Horace] Vere, that had this character, all summer in the field, all winter in his study, in whose fall fame makes this kingdom a great loosier: and having taken this resolution from counsaille with the Highest Wisdom (as I doubt not but you have), I hope and pray the same Power will crown it with a blessing answerable to your wish.

It is a great privilege to be thus admitted to the private thoughts and conduct of such men as Eliot and Hampden. The secret of their public exertions is here expressed. It is by the strength and right direction of the private affections, that we are taught the duty of serving mankind. The more intense the faculty of enjoyment and comfort in the narrow circle of family regards, the more readily is its indulgence sacrificed in behalf of the greater family of man. The severity of Eliot in the house of commons is explained by the tender sweetness of these letters from the Tower.

Without a hope of release, Eliot's imprisonment continued. The whole county of Cornwall, I learn from a manuscript letter, petitioned the king for his freedom, but no answer was deigned. Sustained by the genius of Wentworth, Charles's tyranny was now open and undisguised; and, in a royal proclamation, he had forbidden even the name of parliament to pass the lips of

1 Mead to Stuteville, Sept. 26. 1629. M.S. letter. Nor was Eliot without the sympathy of men of learning, correspondents of sir Robert Cotton, in London, at the universities, and on the Continent. "I should gladly hear some cheerful news of sir John Eliot," writes the learned Richard James. "Will the tide never turn? Then God send us heaven at our last end!" Nor is it to be supposed that any possible exertion was wanting on the part of his friends. Sir Bevill Grenville, in a letter to his wife, "his best friend, the lady Grace Grenville," speaks of Eliot, as "being resolved to have him out of his imprisonment." (Nugent's Memorials.) Every exertion failed.
the people. 1 Eliot was not even suffered to remain quietly in his wretched lodging. He was removed from place to place, each one as "darke and smoaky" as the first. "The lodging which I had upon my first rem­move before Christmas," he writes to sir Oliver Luke, "being again altered, I may saie of my lodgings in the Tower as Jacob for his wages, 'Now, then, ten times have they chaunged it;' but, I thank God, not once has it caused an alteration of my mind — so infinite is that mercie which has hitherto protected mee, and I doubt not but I shall find it with mee." He concludes by referring to some "light papers" which seem to have engaged him in the intervals of his greater work. "When you have wearied your good thoughts with those light papers that I sent you, return them with the corrections of your judgment. I may one day send you others of more worth, if it please God to continue me this leisure and my health, but the best can be but broken, and in patches from him that dares not hazard to gather them. Such things, from me, falling like the leaves in autumn vary variously and uncertainly, that they hardly meet again — but with you I am confident what else my weakness shall present will have a faire acceptance." This allusion to his health was ominous. Sickness had already begun to threaten him.

Some days after this, he writes to his kinsman Knightley (whose son afterwards married one of Hampden's daughters), a description of what he conceives to have been the commencement of his disorder, the
colds of his prison. "For the present I am wholly at a stand, and have been soe for this fortnight by a sickness which it has pleased my master to impose, in whose hands remain the issues of life and death. It comes originally from my colds, with which the cough having been long upon me causes such ill effects to follow it, that the symptoms are more dangerous than the grief; it has weakened much both the appetite and concoction, and the outward strength; by that some doubt there is of a consumption, but we endeavour to prevent it by application of the means, and, as the great physition, seek the blessing from the Lord." Good humour and easy quiet, however, did not desert him, though his disease steadily advanced. A week after the date of the foregoing, he writes to Hampden, "Lately my business hath been much with doctors, so that, but by them, I have had little trouble with myself. These three weeks I have had a full leisure to do nothing, and strictly tied unto it either by their direction or my weakness. The cause originally was a cold, but the symptoms that did follow it spoke more sickness; a gradual indisposition it begot in all the faculties of the bodie. The learned said a consumption did attend it, but I thank God I did not feel or credit it. What they advised as the ordinance that's appointed I was content to use, and in the time I was a patient, suffered whatever they imposed. Great is the authority of princes, but greater much is their's who both command our purses and our wills. What the success of their government wills, must be referred to him that is master of their power. I find myself bettered, though not well, which makes me the more ready to observe them. The divine blessing must effectuate their wit — it is that medicine that has hitherto protected me, and will continue me amongst other affairs to remain your faithful friend." It is affecting to observe, even in his manner of writing, a characteristic of the fatal disorder that had seized him.

As his illness became more determined, the severity of
his imprisonment was increased. Pory the letter writer, indeed, remarked, about this time, “I beare sir John Eliot is to remove out of his darke smoakey lodging into a better;” but I can find no evidence of the removal. On the contrary, shortly before his last letter to Hampden, he had written to Bevil Grenville (who then opposed the court, but afterwards, with no suspicion of his virtue, died fighting for the king at Landsdowne) a statement of increased restraint. His friend had by letter alluded to some rumours that were then abroad, and on the faith of which Pory seems to have gossiped, as above, of his probable liberation. “The restraint and watch uppon me,” Eliot answers, “barrs much of my intercourse with my friends; while their presence is denied me, and letters are soe dangerous and suspected, as it is little that way we exchange; soe as if circumstances shall condemn me, I must stand guiltie in their judgments; yet yours, (though with some difficultie I have received, and manie times when it was knocking at my door, because their convoy could not enter they did retire again, wherein I must commend the caution of your messenger, but at length it found a safe passage by my servant)—made mee happie in your favour, for which this comes as a retribution and acknowledgment. For those rumours which you meet that are but artificial, or by chance, it must be your wisdom not to credit them. Manie such false fires are flyinge daillie in the ear. When there shall be occasion, expect that intelligence from frends; for which in the meene time you do well to be provided; though I shall crave when that dispute falls, properlie and for reasons not deniable, a change of your intention in particulars as it concerns myselfe,—in the rest I shall concur in all readiness to serve you, and in all you shall

1 These rumours prevailed strongly at one time. They arose out of whispers of a possibility of a parliament; and I find it stated in a letter among the Harleian MSS., 7000., dated Dec. 16. 1651-2, that “Sir John Eliot had lately been courted and caressed in his prison by some great men who are most in danger to be called in question.” If any such overtures were made to him, it is certain that he continued immoveable. Rapin, indeed, says distinctly (vol. x. p. 263. note), “Sir John Eliot had been tampered with, but was found proof against all temptation.”
command me who am nothing but as you represent." His concluding words are affecting. "My humble service to your lady, and tell her that yet I doubt not to kiss her hand. Make much of my godson."

Immediately after this, instead of any evidence of better treatment, I have to furnish proof of an accession of the most savage and atrocious severity. Eliot hitherto had been permitted, under certain restrictions, to receive visits from his friends. This poor privilege was now withdrawn, and— it is well that this is to be offered on the best authority, or I could not have asked the reader to give credence to it—the comfort of a fire, necessary to life in a damp prison, whose inmate already struggled with a disorder brought on by cold, was, in the depth of winter, wholly, or almost wholly, denied to Eliot! On the 26th of December, 1631, he thus writes to Hampden:—"That I write not to you anything of intelligence, will be excused when I do let you know that I am under a new restraint, by warrant from the king, for a supposed abuse of liberty, in admitting a free resort of visitants, and under that color holding consultations with my friends. My lodgings are removed, and I am now where candle-light may be suffered, but scarce fire. I hope you will think that this exchange of places makes not a change of minds. The same protector is still with me, and the same confidence, and these things can have end by him that gives them being. None but my servants, hardly my son, may have admittance to me. My friends I must desire, for their own sakes, to forbear coming to the Tower. You among them are chief, and have the first place in this intelligence. I have now leisure," he continues, with affecting resignation, "and shall dispose myself to business; therefore those loose papers which you had, I would cast out of the way, being now returned again unto me. In your next give me a word or two of note; for those translations you excepted at, you know we are blind towards ourselves; our friends must be our glasses;
therefore in this I crave (what in all things I desire) the reflection of your judgment."

Thus, in the midst of his worst sufferings, Eliot had the consolation and sustainment of the philosophical work in which he had engaged. His own study, as I have described, had been plundered of its papers and sealed up by the king; but his friends supplied him with books; and in this office, as in every other care and kindness, Hampden was most forward. Sir Robert Cotton's library would have proved of inestimable value to Eliot at this time, as some few years before it had served a kindred spirit, but the atrocious tyranny that now prevailed had reached its learned owner. Accused of having furnished precedents to Selden and Eliot, sir Robert Cotton's great library was seized and held by the king; and, unable to survive its loss, the great scholar died. I have spoken of a kindred spirit with that of Eliot. It is impossible, in describing Eliot's labours at this moment — when,

—active still, and unrestrain'd, his mind
Explor'd the long extent of ages past.
And with his prison hours enrich'd the world.

—not to recollect sir Walter Raleigh. Kindred they were, at least, in magnanimity of spirit and largeness of intellect. If it were worth while, I could point out other resemblances. Their faces, in portraits

1 I shall have a more proper opportunity (in the notice of Hampden) of eliciting a number of delightful personal characteristics from his present conduct to his friend.


3 The following extract from sir Symonds D'Ewes' diary is deeply affecting:—"When I went several times to visit and comfort him [sir Robert Cotton] in the year 1630, he would tell me, 'they had broken his heart, that had locked up his library from him.' I easily guessed the reason, because his honour and esteem were much impaired by this fatal accident; and his house, that was formerly frequented by great and honourable personages, as by learned men of all sorts, remained now, upon the matter, empty and desolate. I understood from himself and others, that Dr. Nelles and Dr. Laud, two prelates that had been stigmatized in the first [last?] session of parliament in 1638, were his sore enemies. He was so outworn, within a few months, with anguish and grief, as his face, which had formerly been ruddy and well colored, was wholly changed into a grim and blackish pallor, near to the resemblance and hue of a dead visage." Within a "few months" more he died.
I have seen, were strongly like. They were both of old Devonshire families; both were new residents in Cornwall; and, through the Champernownes, one of whom had given birth to Raleigh, their families were in a degree related. They both died victims of the grossest tyranny, but not till they had illustrated to the world examples of fearless endurance, and left, for the world's instruction, the fruit of their prison hours. In one particular here, or rather accident, the resemblance fails; for Raleigh's intention of benefit was fulfilled by the publication of his labours, while Eliot's have remained to the present day unpublished, disregarded, almost unknown. I shall shortly endeavour to remove from literature at least a portion of this reproach; and, in doing so, an opportunity will be given to Eliot himself to complete this allusion to Raleigh, by one of the finest tributes that has yet been paid to that gallant and heroic spirit.

The health of the imprisoned philosopher sank day by day. His "attorney at law," however, told Pory that he was the same cheerful and undaunted man as ever. His friends now appear to have resolved to make a desperate effort to save him. I quote from one of Pory's manuscript letters to sir Robert Puckering. On Tuesday was se'nnight, Mr. Mason of Lincoln's Inn made a motion to the judges of the King's Bench for sir John Eliot, that, whereas the doctors were of opinion he could never recover of his consumption until such time as he might breathe in purer air, they would, for some certain time, grant him his enlargement for that purpose. Whereunto my lord chief justice Richardson answered, that, although sir John were brought low in body, yet was he as high and lofty in mind as ever, for he would neither submit to the king, nor to the justice of that court. In fine, it was concluded by the bench to refer him to the king by way of petition. Eliot refused to do this, proceeded still with his

---

1 See a statement at p. 2. of this memoir; and Biog. Brit. vol v. p. 3467.
2 Sloane Mss. 4178.
treatise, and uttered no complaint. Hampden continued to send him books, and, with delicate good sense, rallies him to his labours. "Make good use of the bookes you shall receive from mee, and of your time; be sure you shall render a strict account of both to your ever assured friend." As the work progressed, it was sent in portions to Hampden, who criticised it, and, as I shall show, gave value to his praise by occasional objection. "And that to satisfy you, not myselfe, but that by obeying you in a command so contrary to my own disposition, you may measure how large a power you have over John Hampden." Very little political allusion passed in these letters. It was a dangerous subject to touch, for Eliot's correspondence was never safe from exposure. Some time before, he had mentioned this, as we have seen, to Grenville; and he wrote to Denzil Hollis a letter which bears upon political affairs, but only in dark hints, which he might not express more plainly. "Through a long silence," he says, "I hope you can retain the confidence and memoire of your frende. He that knows your virtue in the generale cannot doubt any particular of your charitie. The corruption of this age, if no other danger might occur, were an excuse, even in business .. for not writing. The sun, we see, begets divers monsters on the earth when it has beat and violence; time may do more on paper; therefore the safest intercourse is by harts; in this way I have much intelligence to give you, but you may divine it without prophesie."

Nearly four years had now passed over Eliot in his prison. Those popular leaders who had been subjected to confinement at the same time, had all of them, within the first eighteen months, obtained their release.  

1 Many of Hampden's most beautiful letters never reached him.
2 Before Valentine had obtained his bail, Eliot began to suspect him of juggling for release; and he writes of him to a friend, Thomas Godfrey, "This is all I can tell you of him, unless by supposition I could judge him in his reservations and retirement, knocking at some back door of the court, at which if he enter to preferment, you shall know it from your faithful friend." I could furnish many such proofs of the jealous care with which Eliot watched the virtue of his friends.
Eliot only was detained. After the conclusion of the treatise that had so long served to keep up his interest and attention, he appears to have sunk rapidly. Almost worn out by his illness, his friends at last prevailed upon him to petition the king. The account of his "manner of proceeding" is affecting to the last degree. I give it in the words of a letter from Pory to sir John's son.

"Sir, your judges have committed mee to prison here in your Tower of London, where, by reason of the quality of the ayer, I am fallen into a dangerous disease. I humbly beseech your majesty you will command your judges to sett mee at liberty, that for recovery of my health I may take some fresh ayer,' &c. Whereunto his majestie's answer was, 'it was not humble enough.' Then sir John sent another petition by his own sonne to the effect following: — 'Sir, I am hartily sorry I have displeased your majesty, and, having so said, doe humbly beseech you once againe to command your judges to sett me at liberty, that when I have recovered my health, I may returne back to my prison, there to undergoe suche punishment as God hath allotted unto mee,' &c. Upon this the lieutenant came and expostulated with him, saying, it was proper to him, and common to none else, to doe that office of delivering petitions for his prisoners. And if sir John, in a third petition, would humble himselfe to his majesty in acknowledging his fault and craving pardon, he would willingly deliver it, and made no doubt but hee should obtaine his liberty. Unto this sir John's answer was — 'I thank you, sir, for your friendly advise, but my spirits are grown feeble and faint, which when it shall please God to restore unto their former vigour, I will take it farther into my consideration.'"

That this is a perfectly correct account, cannot be doubted. Pory collected the particulars after the death of Eliot, and gives us his authority. "A gentleman," be

---

1 Harleian MSS. 7000.
says, "not unknown to sir Thomas Lucy, told me from lord Cottington's mouth, that sir John Eliot's late manner of proceeding was this." Moreover, in one of lord Cottington's own despatches to Wentworth, the savage satisfaction with which the court had received, and with which they knew lord Wentworth would also receive, the assurance of the approaching death of the formidable Eliot, is permitted to betray itself. "Your old dear friend sir John Eliot," observes the chancellor of the exchequer to the lord deputy of Ireland, winding up a series of important advices with this, the most important of all, "is very like to die."

Within two months from that date lord Cottington's prediction was accomplished. Eliot, however, had yet a duty of life left, which he performed with characteristic purpose. He sent for a painter to the Tower, and had his portrait painted, exactly as he then appeared, worn out by disease, and with a face of ghastly paleness. This portrait he gave to his son, that it might hang on the walls of Port Eliot near a painting which represented him in vigorous manhood,—a constant and vivid evidence of the sufferings he had unshrinkingly borne, "a perpetual memorial of his hatred of tyranny."

These pictures are at Port Eliot still. I have been favoured with a loan of the earlier portrait, by the courtesy of lord St. Germaine. It represents a face of perfect health, and keenly intellectual proportions. In this respect, in its wedge-like shape, in the infinite majesty of the upper region, and the sudden narrowness of the lower, it calls to mind at once the face of sir Walter Raleigh. Action speaks out from the quick keen eye, and meditation from the calm breadth of the brow. In the disposition of the hair and the peaked beard, it appears, to a casual glance, not unlike Van-dyke's Charles. The later portrait is a profoundly melancholy contrast. It is wretchedly painted, but it expresses the reality of death-like life. It presents Eliot in a very elegant morning dress, apparently of lace, and

1 Strafford's State Papers, vol. 1. p. 73., dated October 18. 1632.
bears the inscription of having been "paint a few
days before his death in the Tower."

In the last moments of his life, Eliot presented the
perfect pattern of a Christian philosopher. I quote the
last of his letters to Hampden.—"Besides the ac-
knowledgment of your favour that have so much com-
pasion on your frend, I have little to return you from
him that has nothing worthy of your acceptance, but
the contestation that I have between an ill bodie and
the aer, that quarrell, and are friends, as the summer
winds affect them. I have these three daies been
abroad, 1 and as often brought in new impressions of the
colds, yet, body and strength and appetite, I finde my-
self bettered by the motion. Cold at first was the
occasion of my sickness, heat and tenderness by close
keeping in my chamber has since increast my weakness.
Air and exercise are thought most proper to repaque it,
which are the prescription of my doctors, though noe
physick. I thank God other medicines I now take not,
but those catholicons, and doe hope I shall not need
them. As children learn to go, I shall get acquainted
with the aer, practice and use will compasse it, and now
and then a fall is an instruction for the future. These
varieties He does trie us with, that will have us perfect
at all parts, and as be gives the trial he likewise gives
the ability that shall be necessary for the worke. He has
the Philistine at the disposition of his will, and those that
trust him, under his protection and defence. O! infinite
mercy of our master, deare friend, how it abounds to us,
that are unworthy of his service! How broken! how
imperfect! how perverse and crooked are our waies in
obedience to him! how exactly straight is the line of
his providence to us! drawn out through all occurrents
and particulars to the whole length and measure of our
time! how perfect is his hand that has given his sonne

1 The precincts of his prison, it is unnecessary to add, enclosed the
abroad of Eliot. The air and exercise he afterwards mentions, as
having somewhat "bettered" him, were only what he could win from a
few narrow paces within the walls of the Tower. It is easy to conclude
from this, that a sight of his native county, the greeting of one healthful
Cornish breeze, would almost instantly have restored him.
unto us, and through him has promised likewise to give
us all things — relieving our wants, sanctifying our
necessities, preventing our dangers, freeing us from all
extremities, and dying himself for us! What can we
render? what retribution can we make worthy soe
great a majestie? worthy such love and favour? We
have nothing but ourselves who are unworthy above all,
and yet that, as all other things, is his. For us to offer
up that, is but to give him of his owne, and that in
far worse condition than we at first received it, which
yet (for infinite is his goodnesse for the merits of his
sone) he is contented to accept. This, dear frend,
must be the comfort of his children; this is the physic
we must use in all our sicknesses and extremities; this
is the strengthening of the weake, the nuriching of
the poore, the libertie of the captive, the health of the
diseased, the life of those that die, the death of the
wretched life of sin! And this happiness have his saints.
The contemplation of this happiness has led me almost
beyond the compass of a letter; but the haste I use
unto my frends, and the affection that does move
will I hope excuse me. Frends should communicate
their joyes: this as the greatest, therefore, I could not
but impart unto my frend, being therein moved by the
present expectation of your letters, which always have
the grace of much intelligence, and are happiness to
him that is trulie your's."

I add to this an extract from one of Pory's letters,
dated November 15. 1682. — "The same night,
Monday, having met with sir John Eliot's attorney in
St. Paul's Churchyard, he told me he had been that
morning with sir John in the Tower, and found him
so far spent with his consumption as not like to live a
week longer." 1

He survived twelve days. On the 27th of November,
1682, sir John Eliot died. Immediately after the
event, his son (Richard, as I presume, since he did
not go abroad as he purposed) "petitioned his majesty

1 Harleian MSS. 7000.
once more, he would be pleased to permitt his body to be carried into Cornwall, there to be buried. Whereunto was answered at the foot of the petition, "Let sir John Eliot's body be buried in the church of that parish where he dyed." This attempt to wreak an indignity on the remains of Eliot was perfectly in accordance with Charles's system. A paltry piece of heartless spite on the lifeless body of a man, appropriately closes a series of unavailing attempts to reduce his living soul. What remained of the great statesman was thrust into some obscure corner of the Tower church, and the court rejoiced that its great enemy was gone.

Faithful and brave hearts were left to remember this, and the sufferings of Eliot were not undergone in vain. They bore their part in the heat and burden of the after struggle. His name was one of its watchwords, and it had none more glorious. His sufferings, then, have been redeemed. The manner of his death was no more than the completion of the purposes of his life. Those purposes, and the actions which illustrated and sustained them, I have described in these pages, for the first time, with fidelity and minuteness. In doing this, I have also endeavoured to exhibit his personal and intellectual qualities so fully, that any reiteration of them here might be tedious, and is certainly unnecessary. In estimating his character as a statesman, our view is limited by the nature of the political struggle in which he acted. We have sufficient evidence, however, to advance, from that, into a greater and more independent field of achievement and design. His genius would assuredly have proved itself as equal to the perfect government of a state, as it showed itself supreme in the purpose of rescuing a state from misgovernment. As a leader of opposition, he has had no superior in history, probably no equal. His power of resource in cases of emergency was brilliant to the last degree, and his eloquence was of the highest order.
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moral structure of his mind was as nearly perfect, as that of the most distinguished men who have graced humanity. It ranks with theirs.

Yet this is he, whose memory has been insulted by a series of monstrous slanders flung out against it by political opponents with a recklessness beyond parallel! The time for such slanders, however, has happily passed away, and the name of John Eliot may now be preserved, unsullied, for the affection and veneration of his countrymen.

What remains to be said of this great person, I shall subjoin as an appendix to this memoir. I am about to examine his philosophical treatise for, I believe, the first time. It has been mentioned certainly by more writers than one, and about twenty lines have been quoted from it; but this is the utmost extent of appreciation it has received. No one has yet shown any evidence of other than the most superficial glance at its contents; none of its passages of mingled sweetness and grandeur have been quoted; no attempt has even been made to describe them. I am about to remove this reproach from literature, and to enrich it with several specimens of thought and style, which might give an added lustre to the reputation of our loftiest writers in prose — to a Hooker, or a Milton.
APPENDIX.

Some Account of an unpublished Philosophical Treatise,
ENTITLED

THE MONARCHY OF MAN,

WRITTEN BY SIR JOHN ELIOT DURING HIS LAST IMPRISONMENT.

A CONSIDERATION of such affecting interest is so immediately and vividly excited in looking at the first page of this manuscript, that I have had it carefully copied for the reader. It presents at once the scene of Eliot's imprisonment, and the lonely and weary hours this cherished work may have lightened. The pure exaltation of the philosopher is approached most nearly by the simplicity of a child; and how touching is the child-like care and interest, which, to while away the lingering time, has so elaborately wrought itself within every letter of this exquisite title! Crouching under the T and the M, two faces will be detected—rather ungain indeed, but still sufficient to remind the solitary prisoner of the more "human face divine." I leave the rest to the imagination of the reader, which is, in many respects, silently and deeply appealed to. I will only add, that the omission of the word "fecit," in the truly and touchingly noble motto, appears to me to be in the highest taste. It reads, as it stands, like an abridged motto on a shield,
chivalrous and significant. It is no proof of the judgment of the only two writers who have given the title of this treatise, that they undertake to repair Eliot's omission in this respect.

The

Monarchie of Man.

Treatise Philosophical and moral wherein some questions of the Politicks are obviously discuss.

By

S. John that Ke. Prisoners in the Tower

Deus nobis hae otia.

Virt.

This wood-cut, it is to be observed, is very considerably reduced from the original, which is of a folio size. The Treatise itself occupies two hundred and forty folio pages, which
are written over with extreme closeness, and by no means so legibly as the specimen before the reader. Eliot was fond of abbreviations; and the key of his style, in that particular, has grown something rusty, and tries the patience.

The Treatise opens with a general proposition in favour of what Eliot calls the covenant of monarchy. The example of man's monarchy follows, the monarchy of the mind, as the greatest of those covenants, after that of the government of nature, of God.

"Of all covenants, kingdoms are the best, answering to the first and highest, both of institutions and examples, either in the policie of man or the president of his maker. Next to that great monarchie and kingdom, quod sub Iove nomen habet, in which the microcosme, the whole world, is comprehended, is the monarchie of man, that little world and microcosme, coming the nearest, both in order and proportion, for excellency of matter and exquisitnes of forme. In tyme and order nothing makes to question it; it beinge the instant and immediate successor of that greater, wherein, the Creation being accomplisht, man was made a gouernour. In excellency and proportion what parallell may it have?—what similitude can be given it? its forme beinge like the disposition of the heavens, soe geometricall and exact, that each part, each orbe, hath his owne motion, in his own tyme, to his owne ends, genuine and proper."

The course of each "orbe and member" is pursued in terms of exalted eulogy, and the "matter" is next handled. By this is meant the subject matter of the proposed government, which embraces nothing extraneous, nothing connected with creatures that are inferior, in point of grandeur, to man himself.

"The excellence of the matter likewise does appear, in that it is not an invention of humanitie, a fabrike of art, but of a substance heavenly, the perfection of all creatures, the true image of the Deity. 'Twere too lowe, too narrow, for he founder to reduce the government to beasts and to confine it to that compasse, which yet likewise was cast within mans will, and those things submitted to his use. This were unworthy the originall, that transcendent greatness from whence this excellence is derived, to apply it onely to such things. And
much more were it unworthy the ends, the glory and the honor, of that greatnes which reflects from purer objects. 'Tis larger, 'tis better. 'Tis of man chiefly this government consists. Man, to be the governour of himselfe, an exact monachie within him, in the composition of which state, nothing without him may have interest, but all stands subservient to his use, bee only to his maker."

Eliot then proposes to consider the component parts of this monarchy, and the relative duties they sustain.

"In this monachie of man, to make the excellence conspicuous, first is requisite a description of the parts, then the knowledge of there duties; — that, every member being scene, and the office it sustains, it may then appear of what use and advantages they are, what several merits they imply, both in degrees and simple, what conference they have, of how much importance to the general, what correspondence and relations with themselves.

"In the parts, the minde doth sitt as soveraigne, in the throne and center of the heart, the station of most aptnes both for intelligence and comand. Two sorts of servants doe attend him, daily administering in that court; — the one for use and businesse, as Plutarke has it of Craterus, friends and servants to the King; — the other, like Hephestion, for pleasure and delight, friends and servants unto Alexander. These, the rationall and brute facultiS ef the soule, are both necessarie in theire kinds, both usefull to their soveraigne, though differing in their service, and differing in the way.

"Of the first a senate is compos'd, a solid body for counciill and advice, still intent on the government. Such are memorie, judgement, fancie, and theire like. These are the waiters and followers, which respect not the affaires, but the presence, of theire king, as the will and affection that accompanie him. Subservient to these, and according to these principles, all other things are mov'd, every part and member in his place; the great officers being the senses; and ministers subordinate, the organs; the subject, the body, in which all these subsist, — and though the most unactive part it be, yet it is truely called the center and foundation of the rest."
"This is the frame and constitution of this monarchie, and of these parts it does consist."

The question follows of the several offices and duties of these various parts, and, "On this point," Eliot observes, with an allusion of extreme elegance, "wee shall endeavour to express, as young painters doe rare beauties, some lines and slight resemblances, though, in the exactness, wee come short of the true figure and perfection."

"There is one common duty of them all, to which all are equally obliged; prince as well as subiects, subiects as their prince; all offices are directed to this end, and all are accountable for that trust; proportionably indeed to the qualities they are in; geometrically, and ad pondus, though not arithmetically and alike. The greater and more dignified, for more, as more advantage has been given them; the lesse, and all, for somewhat to the capacities they have. Which is for the conservation of the whole, the publike utility and good, wherein all endeavours must conterminate as theire absolute and true end."

"And the reason is binding in this point. For if the whole fabrike be desolved, how can a part subsist? Be it the chamber of the councill, the head; or the king's throne, the heart; or yet, which is more excellent, what they both containe, the king himself and counsell, the mind and faculties of reason; —what subsistence can they have, or what being can they hold, without that frame and body of which they are king and counsell? A father is soe called, but in relation to a child; and if that childhood cease, he ceases to be a father. It is ignorance, madness, to think that in a disjuncture they can stand; either the prince or the subject; when the prince is such but in reference to the subject, and the subject has not being without the subsistence of the state. Adeo manifestum est (as an emperour speaks in Tacitus) neq; perire neq; salvos esse, nisi et al. The coniuncture is so strict, that in the dissolution of the generall, noe particular can be fast; and, without preservation of the members, the body cannot stand; therefore each part must strive for the conservation of the whole, and that whole intend the preservation of the parts."

Eliot then reduces to two heads, the division and limitation of their respective duties. The passage is striking.
The king is to command; the subject to obey. Both, however, with like readiness in their places; and like affection to each other. The subject must not make his center in himself, and direct onely his endeavors to that end as if there they were to terminate; but they must alwayes be with respect unto his sovranigne, and to the publike good, therein inclining his will. As the king is to answer this observance in correspondency thereof, he must not retire his thoughts to private purposes and designes,—respects that are particular, peculiar interests of his owne;—but his authority must move as it has been appointed, in ordine, for his subjects, for the common use and benefit, for the safety and tranquillitie of the state, for the singular advantage of each member, and the universal happiness and good.

The treatise now flows naturally into an examination of the analogies of civil government.

"And in this, generally, this monarchie is agreeable to all others, of the same frame and constitution; and what is true in them is conclusive upon this, their reasons being alike; as conversively from this, may be argued to the rest. Wee will therefore consider them together, to see how the authority does arise, and what powers and judgments have been given them. That done, wee will descend to exercises and corruptions, with the effects and consequences that are incident, from whence, by comparison, the knowledge will be easie. Where the advantage rests, that shall be an evidence to justify the right. Even the fruite and profit shall be made arguments to prove it. Wherein, notwithstanding all disguises to the contrary, the true wil shall be seen, like the helioprium, that beautie of the gardens, always converting to the sunne, the Asemadum, to which it shuts and opens, as that is present or removed."

The original of civil monarchy Eliot seeks for in the heavens. From the solitude of his dungeon, into that clear region, "above the thunder," it was some consolation to pass!

"To finds out the originall of these excellencies, the beginning of these monarchies and monarchs, wee must first search the heavens, and, by ascending thither by thought and speculation, bring down the knowledge of that truth. Wee shall there see them, from before all eternitie, written in the counceills of
the court, the great ruler there having so decreed it, in conformity to his government. From his own excellence and perfection was their idea taken, the pattern and example being himself, the worke his owne, the institution and invention his, and the end and scope for which it was ordained. Soe thence wee shall finde their originals derived; there they haue beginning; from thence they haue continuance; there both their Genesis and Exodus are insroll'd. All their degrees, periods, and revolutions, their remissions, and intentions, are guided by this influence. *Inde est imperator*, (saith Tertullian), *unde et homo: inde potestas, unde et spiritus*. The same power which first created man gave their original to princes. He who of nothing gave being unto all things, — be that to man whilst he was yet but clay, that unactive piece of element, infused a spirit and fire to give him life and motion,—from him proceeds this power."

Aristotle, Dion, Plato, and Pliny give the strength of their authority to the writer; and, pursuing various monarchical analogies, in a manner much resembling that of Sydney's treatise, through families, cities, and so on, he arrives at the government of the "great globe itself," in considering which, he says, the reason sinks, for, since it cannot ascend up to "nature, which is but the daughter of the world," much less should it compass "the world, the universall mother of all nature." Eliot then exclaims, with a passing eulogy on Cicero, which, considering the many points of literary resemblance between them, is very interesting—"Without a maker the world had not been at first, without a ruler it would haue no continuance. The varieties and contrarieties that are in it, beyond the understanding of weake man, so reconciled to order and agreement, give it a full expression. O the height of this gradation, which none but Cicero could climbe!" And thus he proceeds through a laboured praise, considering the accomplished Roman in all his aspects, "resorting to the person from the cause, from the client to the advocate," till he knows not, as he expresses it, "whether his truth or eloquence be more admirable."

The next passage I shall quote, is beautiful and characteristic. Eliot proposes to examine the authority of princes, their powers and judgments, with their controlling rules and limits. In the
course he lays down towards this, I recognise an admirable sense of the proprieties in argument, with a feeling of the probable public appearance of his labours; a glance at the strange aspect of the times, and an endeavour to save his work, as it were, from the severities that had fallen on himself;—which will not be read without much interest. It is full of delicate beauty. I subjoin to this the commencing passages of the argument which follows it, bespeaking toleration for the objects and intentions of man, on the ground of the wretched dependency and infirmity of his acts.

"Thus then we see how the authority does rise, and from whence princes have original, both in particular, for ours, and generally, for all nature, therein assenting. Our next view must be of the powers and judgements that are given them; wherein likewise there is community. Then their rules and limits we will touch, with some notes of advantage and disadvantage from the use. Which done, we will draw the application to ourselves, to our own monarchy, the mind, and shew the propriety of that; handling by the way the questions most in controversy, touching the exercise of that power; which we will take, as they are emergent from our subject, and arise naturally in discourse; not compelling, not coveting, any that does not voluntarily come in, and readily accost us; nor balking those which the occasion shall present, for any fear or difficulties. Only this favor we petition, which candor will allow us for our encouragement in the worke, that no prejudice may impeach us in the censure of our reason,—if it tide contrary to the times, if it oppose the stream and current we are in, either in dilating or contracting the interests and pretentions, superior or inferior. We shall impartially deliver it, if not to the truth of the cause, which may exceed our judgement, yet to the truth and identity of our sense; and if in that we fail, though it be an error, 'tis not a crime unpardonable, uncapable of remission. Yet we shall be careful to avoid it, and are not unhopefull in that point, having our affections on a right level, so equally disposed as nothing but ignorance can divert them.

"First then, to take the just height and latitude of this power, we must begin our consideration at the end—the end and scope—for which it was ordain'd, which is the perfection of all worke.
and the first thing always in intention. Acts may have diverse inclinations and effects, from the accidental intercurrence of new causes contrary to their institution and design, whereon no sound judgement can be grounded. To an act of virtue there may be a concurrency of vice, through the corruption and infirmity of the object. A charity may be interverted to ill uses, as not seldom happens thro' the depravity of men, and so lose the fruit of virtue. The council of Achitophel may be follie, though an effect of wisdom. Equity may be converted to iniquity. Justice into injury, or into cruelty of extremity. No virtue, indeed, in operation is so sacred, but circumstance may corrupt it, diverse effects may follow it, as from new causes and intentions intervenient. Thus we see it in the motion of the spheres, the perfection of whose course revolves from east to west, and yet all the lesser and lower orbs run a counter course to that, turning from west to east. Their natural motions and inclinations are irregular, *ad raptum*. So, in the acts of virtue, oblique intentions may occur to corrupt it in particulars, though the virtue be the same. Therefore, as the intention must be the indication of the act, the end must shew the intention. For as a good act may be ill done in respect of the intention, so the intention of what purity soever may be corrupted by the end. If our descent and end shall terminate in the east; if our horoscope and ascendant shall be placed in the period of the west; if we shall then, as Strato saith, seeke the sunne itself rising in the west,—we cannot conclude properly, or right. For the end of the great workman must direct us, not the effect and operation of the worke. *Finis operantis*, the end and the proposition of the first mover, the maker of those powers; not *finis operis*, the practice and exercise of man, who, like those lower orbs, has no regularity, but *ad raptum*.

The authority to be committed to princes, with the assistance of their deliberative and executive governments, and the duties required of them, are then treated by Eliot. He tempers the apparent remoteness of such an authority by many familiar analogies, and illustrates the dangers that beset a prince in the example of the pilot of a ship:—"The leaks," he says, "are infidelity and treachery in ministers; the rocks, inequality and distemper in the government; the sands and synks, are factions.
and divisions; the winds and waves, the attempts and invasions of the enemy; the pyratts are the false and subtil underminers, that would rob and steal away all law, liberty, and religion."

A singular passage follows, but it is too long for my present purpose. Eliot takes up the power to be given to ministers as a thing to be limited, invariably, and in all things, by rule; "secundum artem, according to certainty;" that it should be, in fact, a principle, or the man to whom it is entrusted will turn, as he says, "a sophister and impostor." He then ranges through several chemical analogies, combining and condensing them, with a rich facility and skill. He that desires to have "the gold and quintessence" at last, must search laboriously from "metal to metal, element to element;" and so, in the view of Eliot, must the course of that man be laid, who seeks the true understanding of government, "emergent and resultant from the world." Government, he proceeds to reason, is called "supreme," but it is only so "for the good and welfare of the subject. The latter part of which definition, though it be not expressly in the words, is included in the sense, as the end and object of all such authority and power. And it follows likewise by inference and reason, if the use and interest be not sever'd. For, as Cicero says, respublica is but respopuli; and if the right and interest be the people's, so should the benefit and use." This supreme power of the state Eliot now reduces to two divisions; "the first concerning the exercise of that power as it is distributive to others," the ministers of princes, - which he ties down, with much strong sense and argument, to a strict obedience of the laws; "the other reflecting particularly upon princes, and the privilege and prerogative of their persons," which, when he comes to discuss, he introduces with a melancholy application to himself. Nothing, at the same time, can be more quiet or firm. I have not found, indeed, in the whole of this remarkable work, one touch of querulous impatience. "The next thing that comes to meet us in our way is the second question we expounded, whether the laws have an operation upon princes. And this with more difficulties is involved, as lying within that mysterie, the prerogative of kings, which is a point so tender as it will hardly bear a mention. We may not therefore handle it with any roughness, lest it reflect some new
beam of terror on ourselves; but with what caution we may, yet without prejudice to truth;—that in what freely we have undertaken we may faithfully be delivered, and safely render the opinion which we gave without suspect of flattery.”

In the next sentence Eliot sets such a suspicion at rest! With a sudden and indignant sense that the claims set up for princes in that day are even too absurd for argument, he exclaims—

“It falls not into question whether laws have an influence on kings, but conclusive and in right! It is to question how far such persons should be subject to the laws, what bounds and circumstances they have given them, and in what compass and degrees they ought to be limited and confined.”

He then continues (following up a precedent passage of elaborate eulogium on the law, which I ought to have mentioned, and which is so nobly carried out in Pym’s great speech against Strafford, that I cannot help imagining Pym to have been admitted to some knowledge of the composition of this treatise by his imprisoned friend)—“Two things occur in this—the laws, and privileges, of each country, in both which the subject has like interest. By the privilege the prince is free from all things but the law; by the law he craves in all things to be regulated. By the privilege he has a propriety of consent in the sanction of all laws; by the laws he has a certain rule and level by which to square his actions. By the privilege all approved customs are received in the strength and vigour of the lawes; by the lawes no actual repetitions shall create a custom, without acceptation and allowance. The law is rex omnium, as Pindarus says, the king and governor of all things; the other is regi similis, something like unto a king, as Bodin has it,—as absolute, though less known.”

Eliot, in the next passage, brands the slavish sycophancy of his time. “Of these laws and privileges,” he says “(which we shall join together, making but one joint subject of this question), the discussion will be easier if we turn our disquisition, and thus state it. What power the king has upon them? Wherein there is such a confluence of flattery, conducing to our prejudice;—such labour to make monarchie unlimited, an absoluteness of government without rule; — so much affection, or corruption rather, specified; — such distortion and perversion of authorities
to that end; — learning made prostitute to fallacy; — religion turned to policy; — heaven brought down to earth; — light transformed to darkness; — to attempt against it, is now to row against the tide! against the stream and current of these times to seek a passage unto truth!" Not the less did the philosophic patriot seek it, and he could afford pity; from his dungeon, to the hollow meanness of the slaves whose doctrines kept him there. "Some would insinuate," he says, pointing to the sermons of Sibthorp and Laud, "from the dehortation of the Israelites, a warrant and authority for the extention of that power. What then was said in terror, they now make it a conclusion of the right! Others infer from the confession made by David, 'Against thee only have I sinned,' that princes offend not men, and therefore have a liberty upon them to do what acts they please. Which judgements we shall rather pity than contest! The heathens, likewise, both Greeks and Latins, have been search't to have their attestations for this sense;—but how truly we shall, in a few general instances, soon shew!" Eliot then brings up to his aid what Prynne would have called "squadrons" of authorities. "Plinie shall be first, who in direct terms aver, non est princeps supra leges, sed leges supra principem,—noe prince is without the regulation of the laws, but they are far above the authority of princes. We know in what time and state that author wrote, where monarchie and empire had not their meanest exaltation. No princes had a power beyond the authority of the Romans—no Romans greater than the princes of that age. Yet of them he speaks it, who were the masters of all others, that the laws and statutes of their country had a mastery upon them. And so Tacitus does expresse it, of the first laws at Rome." Valentinian follows, and Plato, and all are shown to be emphatic assertors of the great principle, that "nothing but ruin can be the fortune of that kingdom where the prince does rule the laws, and not the laws the prince. Aristotle, in the same way, and with the same spirit and wisdom, does confirm it, speaking of the miseries and fatalities of those states which happen, as he says, where kings endeavour more than is fitting in the government." A very sharp and masterly dissection of a disputed passage in Aristotle follows, when Eliot shows that the "court
parasites" of the day have basely abused the text. Several fine quotations from various parts of Cicero are next brought forward, which, as if exultingly, Eliot exclaims, "make it against the law and principles of nature for one man to act his pleasure on another! 'To detract any thing from any man' (says he), 'and this man to draw a benefit to himself from the hurt and prejudice of that, is more contrary to nature than all poverty and sorrow, than whatever can happen to the body, not death itself excepted, or to the outward condition of a man.'

What more fully or more plainly can be spoken? What greater authority can be had, either for the persons or the reasons? The Greeks, the most excellent of them, and from whom the contrary is insinuated (but how truly have we observed by the way), the Latins likewise, and not the meanest of their kind, whose judgements no posterity can impeach,—we have really and actually on our side. Princes and emperors consenting! We may confirm it by the examples of some others, if number be more valuable than weight; yet not such as shall lessen the esteem; for if no other were produced, their worths might serve for a counterpoise to all opposites."

I do not know if every reader will agree with me, but, in this picture of a great mind, forcing itself, as it were, in obedience to the sad necessity of the time, to appear to need satisfaction for the penetration of its own genius in the authority and reverence of past ages, I recognise an object of very deep and affecting interest. The treatise, indeed, is scarcely so remarkable to me for the power it exhibits, great and truly valuable as that is, as for the evidences of a wider power which it restrains. It will be seen, however, as Eliot emerges from the fetters of political discussion, into what beauty and grandeur he ascends, mastering, moulding to his immortal purpose, and impregnating with his own intellectual power, his variously fine attainments. I may with propriety furnish the reader at this moment with a passage of the criticism of Hampden, written on receiving the first rough draft of this portion of the treatise. "When you have finished the other part, I pray think mee as worthy of the sight of it as the former, and in both together I'll betray my weakness to my friend by declaring my sense of them. That I did see is an exquisite nosegay, composed of curious flowers, bound together with as fine a
But I must in the end expect honey from my friend. Somewhat out of those flowers digested, made his owne, and givinge a true taste of his own sweetnesse. Though for that I shall awaite a fitter time and place.” And again, of other extracts from this portion of the manuscript, with no less delicate expression, Hampden says, “This I discerne, that ’tis as complete an image of the patterne as can be drawne by lines; a lively character of a large mind; the subject, method, and expressions, excellent and homogeniall; and, to say truth (sweete heart), somewhat exceeding my commendations. My words cannot render them to the life; yet (to show my ingenuousness rather than wit) would not a lesse model have given a full representation of that subject? Not by diminution, but by contraction, of parts. I desire to learn; I i.e. not say. The variations upon each particular seem many; all, I confesse, excellent. The fountain was full; the channel narrow; that may be the cause. Or that the author imitated Virgil, who made more verses by many than he intended to write, to extract a just number. Had I seen all his, I could easily have bidd him make fewer; but if he had badd mee tell which he should have spared, I had bine apposed. So say I of these expressions.” It is very truly and beautifully said, and, as we advance, the reader will see ample reason for the more exalted and enthusiastic praise, which Hampden afterwards bestowed on his friend’s labours. Meanwhile, he will pardon this digression.

Eliot, producing his examples of princes who have willingly ranged themselves on his side, in acknowledgment of the supremacy of law, proceeds: — “Plutarche relates it of Antiochus, that great king of Asia, the third of his name, but the first in honour and accomplishment, that he, in conformity of this duty, sent despatches to his princes for prevention of the contrary;—intimating that if any letters or commands should be brought in his name, adverse or incongruous to the laws, they should believe that (ignorar e) they were given without his knowledge and consent, and therefore that no other obedience should be yielded, than was challenged by that rule. For which Gratian, on the like occasion, gives a reason, and thereupon reduced it to a law.” The words of Gratian are
then given. I may here observe that Eliot is scrupulously exact in his method of quotation; that where the words of the original authority are used in the text, the book and chapter are carefully written down in the margin; and that where the sense only of the authority is employed in the treatise, a note generally supplies the exact quotation and its reference. He must have had at least the companionship of many books in his prison. The majority of his extracts from Plato and Aristotle are given in Latin, evidently to help himself on the faster, for the original editions are always referred to, and when he uses the Greek letters he writes them with too much neatness and labour to have permitted himself their constant use. Other authorities follow Gratian; and the writer then triumphantly appeals, to the opinion of a master among "both emperors and civilians,"—to an edict of prince Theodosius.

"By him it was thus written for posterity. 'It is the majesty of him that governeth to confess his bound to the laws; so much doth authority depend on law, and so much is submission to the laws greater than authority. And that we will not to be unlawful, we shew it unto others by the oracle of this present edict.' In this," Eliot continues, "a conclusion is laid down, not only that all princes are subject to the laws, but that it is their majesty, their honor and exaltation, so to be! And the reason follows it, that the law is the ground of authority, all authority and rule a dependant of the law. This edict was not only an edict for that time, but for the generations of succeeding ages, and for all posterity to come. Rightly, therefore, and most worthily, stiled an oracle. And in correspondence to this, is the moderne practice of these times. Almost in all the states of Europe, princes at the assumption of their crowns, assume and take an oath for the maintenance and observation of the laws. So, if we look either into authority or example, the use and practice of all times, from the moderne to the ancient, the reason is still clearer, without any difficulty or scruple, de jure, in right, that princes are to be regulated by the laws, and that the laws have an operation on the prince."

"Yet two things," Eliot observes in a passage of much interest, and which illustrates an opinion I have expressed
above, "we are told, do oppose, and are made arguments against this: — the honor and the profit of the king, which are said to have some prejudice by this rule. Many pretensions there are made, by those that are enemies to law, to inculcate this doctrine unto princes, which in particular to convince were not a task of hardness, if the danger exceeded not the trouble. But the infection of these times is incompatible of such labours, when scarce the least disease is curable. We shall therefore follow them as wee did in the strength and assistance of authorities, which, in point of profit, do conclude that there is no fruit or advantage in injustice. *Ubi turpitudo, says Cicero, ibi utilitas esse non potest* — where shame and dishonesty inhabit, there profit cannot sojourn. And that dishonestie be put for the violation of a dutie. Againe, *nihil utile quod non idem honestum, et nunquam potest utilitas cum honestate contendere.*"

Some historical examples, very graphically told, are now ad­duced in illustration of the last noble maxims, and Eliot hints at the contrast they present to the examples of modern days. "And yet how much more should those conventions be ob­served, which are ratified by oath, and made with friends and citizens, fellow-citizens and brethren, of the same mother!" He then handles the question of the position in which a king is placed by having the authority of the law upon him; whether or not it is a failure of dignity. The following is subtilly expressed. "In reason first, how can it be dishonour to a king to be subject to himself? No man repines at the motions of his will; no man thinks those actions dishonorable which flow from his own intentions; nor holds that phisicke vilifying which works his health and safety. Yet all these must be granted to infer dishonor from the laws. Physicke that works a safety must have a vilified reception; actions free and voluntary must be in antipathy with our thoughts; affections must displease; and so, too, the inclinations of the will (not as they are depraved, but simply as affections); and kings must hold it base to be governed by themselves, before it be concluded that there comes dishonor by the laws; — which are but the promulgations of royaltie; the proper motions and dispositions of that power; the special acts of princes; their own
influences and intentions; a health-giving composition of their own, either made actually by their hands, or prepared for them by their fathers, their predecessors, and accepted by themselves, so that they become their own;—and in being subject unto them they are but subject to themselves, which cannot be dishonorable. No man can be said to be inferior to himself, yet this must he granted in this case. Upon this honorable punctilio, kings must become inferior to themselves, and a loyal king must be less than an illegal. Yet all power has root but in the wills of men. *Vis omnis imperij in consensus obedientium constat,*— all empire and authority rests in the obedience of the subject, and the true forme of all obedience is comprehended in the lawes. For those services are false, imposed by fear and terror, and so is that maxim that procures them— *Odorius dum metuant! *Let them hate so that they fear. That *versus execrabitis,* as Seneca calls it! for he gives it this operation on a prince, and therefore it is well termed execrable. By it he is driven from extremity to extremity. He is hated because feared, and will maintain that fear because he is so hated."

The greater value of love, far beyond this, is next shown, in the example of an affectionate people. Eliot then looks back upon his arguments; and, in summing them up, enforces them again with new authorities, and shows great learning in the Fathers. He also refers to the great text book of constitutional law in that day, the famous treatise of Fortescue. "Fortescue, that learned chancellor of England, calls it impotencie and non-power to do things contrary to the laws; and therefore the laws, he says, are no restriction to power, for to do contrary to them is no act of power; as it is no power to sinne, or to do evil, or to be sick, or old; for all these are instances that he gives, and in these respects he says they are contingent unto men. Men are less perfect than the angels, who have not libertie in those, and therefore those laws that regulate the will cannot be dishonourable. Comines, that wise Frenchman, has also a question to this purpose, upon the restraint of Lewis XI., when in the distraction of his sickness."

Before closing this branch of his subject finally, Eliot devotes some space to an exposure of the false constructions
that had been placed upon writings of authority by various prerogative-men. I regret that I cannot give an extract, as it exhibits a very searching vigour. With the following severe similitude he closes.

"He that governs not after the laws and customs of his country, is to be held a tyrant. To him Tacitus has applied the fable, Quod quisquis viscera humana, sum aliam victria-rum viscibis forte gasteret, lupus fieri cogitur. That whoever shall taste the interior of a man, though but by chance in the mixtures of the sacrifices, he transforms into a wolf. Those human entrails in the moral are but the public rights and privileges;—the devouring whereof, though but by mixture and confusion, is like that cruelty in the proverb, Homo homini lupus, man a wolf to man, a transformation of humanity into the beastly nature. In the psalms it has an expression that is higher, to which no aggravation can be added, no accumulation can be given. And that likewise proceeding from a king, who, enumerating some acts of oppression and injustice (which are the effects of an arbitrary and unlimited dominion, a tyranny, as elsewhere he does call it)—accepting of persons, not defending of the poore, destroying of their rights, want of preservation and protection to the people,—for these, he says, all the foundations of the earth are out of course! as if the whole frame of nature had a dependance upon justice, and that the violation of the one threatened the dissolution of the other!"

The next division of the treatise is devoted to a consideration of the power of government, and the qualities necessary for its legitimate exercise. Here, under one of many heads, a severe education is insisted on, with great force, as absolutely necessary to a prince. Eliot contrasts vividly Cyrus and his sons. "But the accession of Cyrus to the crown was from a harder fortune, which fitted him with virtue. His sonnes had a softer education, being brought up by women, eunuchs, and the like, who infused principles of weakness, and with their flattery and adulations taught nothing but the doctrine of greatness. No man was suffered to oppose them in any exercise or purpose; but all was praising and commending of all they said or did; (as who dares yet do otherwise in the
familiarity of princes!"

Dismissing this, however, Eliot proceeds to argue—with something like an uneasy sense of the absurdities in abstract reasoning, which are unquestionably connected with the monarchical principle—that taking kings at the very best, as models of temperance and fortitude, they must be allowed to need something more. "Princes might have that plenitude of temperance as should restrain them from all license, and exorbitance. That likewise should be accompanied with a fortitude to manage and subdue all loose appetites and affections, and make them impenetrable in that part. Yet there would be wanting one thing more necessary to perfection, nay, most necessary for the perfection of a king,—which is a kind of all knowledge and omniscience, a vast and general comprehension of all things in his government, with their several incidents, emergents, and contingents, their conjunctures, disjunctures, relations, and dependencies."

This is a formidable list, and the passage which follows it is striking. Eliot revives, from his favourite author, the image of that Roman tyrant, which at the impeachment of Buckingham had struck such dismay into Charles, for the purpose of proving that there have been princes in the old time, who, affecting a love for parliaments, were wont to commence projects by that authority, and to carry them on without it! "In this we have the confession of Tiberius, not the unwisest, though not the best, of princes, who saith, non posse principem sua conscientia cuncta complecti,—a prince cannot have that universality of science to comprehend all things in his braine. A senate therefore was thought necessary to be auxiliar and assistant, wherein that emperor did concurce. With all the wisdom of his elders, squaring his profession out to justice, though his actions spake the contrary. Cuncta per consules incipierat, says Tacitus,—he begun all things by the consist. In relation to the senate, indeed, and in a publick oration to that court, he did declare the necessity of their counsell, saying, experiendo didicisse quam arduum, quam subjectum fortunae, regendi cuncta onus,—that by experience he had found the danger and difficulty of sole government." The hypocrisy of Tiberius is afterwards shown, and at the same time wrested to a finer purpose in argument than sincerity itself could have
The nature of parliaments themselves, granting the necessity of their existence, is next examined. The powers which were granted them among the Jews at their sanhedrin, at Athens, in Ætolia, at Rome, in Carthage, and Sparta, are alluded to. The base purposes of those men who poison the ears of princes with jealousy of parliaments, are bitterly exposed, and some of the doctrines of Machiavell held up to scorn. A vast number of authorities are quoted, and much use is made of the arguments of Philip de Comines. Eliot, in his course, speaks highly of the genius of Sallust, and bursts into a fine eulogium at the mention of Aristotle, "that stupendum hominis, that wonder and miracle of reason!" He closes with some general arguments out of Bodin, and, winding up his parallel between a tyrant and a king, strikes heavily at the recent exactions of royalty. "This feeds on the affection of his subjects, the other on their fears. This has his fears principally for them; the other has them for the objects of his fears. This takes nothing from his subjects, but on publick warrant and necessity; that drinks, carouzes in their blood, and does fatt him with their marrow, to bring necessity upon them." The entire subject of the civil government of man is then wound up in the following broad and satisfactory proposition. "Monarchy is a power of government and rule for a common good and benefit; not an institution for private interests and advantage. To this runs the confluence of all authority and reason, either grounded on the end, or the definition and examples of the order."

Eliot now advances to the grander purpose of his treatise, — the consideration of the monarchy of the mind. He opens with some general comparison of the civil with the metaphysical relations in this government. He treats of the "councillors of the mind," and carries them up to their final aims, "the end and perfection of all empire, the bonum publicum of the politicks; that summum bonum of philosophers, that ne ultra in felicitie." From this inquiry, however, he intimates that we must exclude at once the vanity of ambition, with its "heapings of Pelion on Ossa;" and, in working the inquiry out, we must be prepared for the weaknesses of man in many points,
since even the wisest men, the philosophers of the old time, have not been able to agree. This carries Eliot into an interesting expression of their differences. He describes them by the fable of Menippus.

"He found nothing but confusion upon earth, nothing but uncertainty with men. Doubt and ambiguity in some; dissent and contradiction among others; difference and disagreement amongst all. Then see the philosophers, at least their sects in controversy, if not the particulars of all kinds, yet the kinds of all particulars. The Stoicks and Epicureans opposed. The Peripateticke varying from both. The Academickes differing from all. And these divided between the old and new, the Eretrians, Megarians, and Cyrenians, all in opinions separate and distinguished. Like Heterogenialla, rather, and things contrary; not as professors of one science, masters of philosophy, lovers of truth and wisdom!"

This is well said. In their differences, however, Eliot discerns elements of the truth. He proposes therefore to examine them. "It may be we shall draw some advantage for the information of ourselves, by contraction of their fancies; as was thought by a concursion of the atoms, towards the making and creation of the world. We will therefore take a short survey of them, and try what they will yield; judging, not by number but by weight, what estimation may be given them. And as we find their true worth and value, so will we rate them in our book, casting the profit which they bring in the account of our own endeavours. To which we shall add what in reason or authority we shall find necessary for the opening of this secret; this end of all our labour; this scope and object of our hopes; — that sumnum bonum in philosophie, that bonum publicum in our policy, the consummation and perfection of our happiness!"

In accordance with this design Eliot plunges at once into the various schools of ethics that prevailed among the ancients, describes them all, and discusses their respective doctrines. At every step he gives proof of the profound scholar, of a man of wide compass of thought, and of that peculiar power in the application of learning, which stamps it with the creative genius. A trail of light runs along the track of the old systems as we
follow them in his pages. The Peripatetics first appear, the Academicks next, and the Stoicks follow, with the thunder of Aristotle striking down their systems from beyond. The Eretrians are afterwards introduced, and to them the Epicureans, in open opposition. And thus we follow all in turn, the genius of Eliot quickening these dead systems into an active present knowledge. Suddenly he exclaims, "But let us draw nearer to the light, and dispel those mists that shadow and obscure it, by the beams and radiance of the sun, that so we may find the **sumnum bonum** which we look for."

"**Seneca,** *Romani nominis et sapientiae magnus sol,* as Lipsius stiles him, 'that great glory of the Roman name, and wisdom,' thus compounds it:—'Ex bona conscientia, ex honestis consiliis ex rectis actionibus, ex contemptu fortituarum, ex placido viva et continuo tenore, uam prementis viam.' 'Of a knowledge and intentions uncorrupted, of council liberal and just, of actions rectified and exact, of scorn of accident, of a propitious and even course and constance of life, its diameter and straightness kept without reflection or transition.' Where these are met in a true diagram and mixture, where these ingredients are consolidate, there he makes that **sumnum bonum,** that great happiness, the term of man’s perfection, the true end and object of his hopes."

Following up the principle of this moral system, Eliot defines with an exquisite clearness the relations of virtue. In the midst of this, while borrowing an illustration from Seneca, he breaks into a magnificent eulogy of the **wisdom and sublimity of his ethicks.** His speculations in philosophie," exclaims Eliot with an intense fervor and beauty of expression, "doe preach divinitie to us, and his unbeliev may indoctrinate our faith! Is it not shame," he afterwards asks, "that we that are professors in the art, should have less knowledge than those that never studied it?—that their ignorance should know that of which our knowledge is still ignorant? at least in the exercise and practice!" In the following I recognize the sublimity and sweetness of Hooker. "In this he puts that **sumnum bonum,** and chiefe good, *Deo parre,* to be obedient unto God, to be obsequious to his will. Hoc fac, ut vives, as was the motto of the law. Doe this and live. Live in all happiness and fe-
licity; in all felicity of mind, in all felicity of body, in all felicity of estate! For all these come from him; he only has the dispensation of these goods; and he that serves him shall have the fruition of them all. This was the notion of that Heathen, which, what Christian can heare and not admire it? It strikes a full diapason to the concord of the Scriptures, and concents with that sweet harmony! O let us then apply it to ourselves, and make his words our works! Let us endeavour for the benediction in the gospel, knowing these things to be blessed, that we do them!"

Suddenly Eliot checks himself:—"But to return to our own charge and province, that we be not taxed for usurpation in intruding on another; to resume the disquisition we intended for the end and object of our government, the perfection of our monarchy; — which our divine Seneca doth determine in that axiome and theorem, Deum acuie." Several neat touches of statement and description succeed, with the object of a wider direction to Seneca's maxim, after which Eliot remarks:—"We will now endeavour, upon all that has been said, to extract a quintessence from the variety of expressions and opinions which we have mentioned; — to make one solid globe, one entire and perfect conclusion." In the course of this, the moral and physical relations of the world are surveyed, and from them is shown, the possibility of the attainment of a firm and independent position for the mind.

"This habit and position of the mind, to constitute perfect happiness, must be both clear and firm; — clear without cloud or shadow to obscure it; and firm in all constancy. Immoveable like the centre! Add then to this that it does come from God — that it is munus Dei, his free gift and largesse — and then we see what is this choice happiness and good, that munus bonum in philosophy, that bonum publicum in our policy, the true end and object of the monarchy of man! It is a clear and firm habit and position of the mind by knowledge, rectifying all the actions and affections to the rule and conformity of reason. It is to be happy. Not in greatness, and honor, riches, or the like, but in any state or quality, that elixir may be found. From the most simple being of mankind, that quintessence may be drawn. The mind being
brought to that quality and condition, the faculty working on
the object, not the object on the faculty, there is in any state,
how mean or low soever, an equal passage and ascent to that
great height and exaltation!

The elements by which the proposed monarchy of the mind
may be constructed having been thus established, and the
possibility of its construction shown, Eliot mentions with
exultation the great virtues which, once it is constructed,
shall tend to its immortal sustainment. But then he restrains
himself. Before we triumph, we must subdue. Through
sorrow, it may be necessary to advance to joy. "We must
do as Æneas did with Dido, through sad stories of tragedies
and disasters make a transition unto love. As mariners in
rowing look contrary to their courses, so we, in the search
of happiness and felicity, must have our eyes upon the
subject of our misery. Those we must first behold which
are enemies of our state, and from them make a passage to
our government. Wherein if, by knowledge of the adver-
saries, we can find means to conquer and subdue them,—
if, by the strength and opposition of the virtues, we can over-
come and subjugate the affections,—then we may triumph
in our victorie, and in all security and peace erect that trophy
of felicity, that sumnum bonum and chief happiness of
man."

The impediments to man's happiness are accordingly
treated, and, from this onwards, with such a union of power
and sensibility, of sweetness and grandeur, as I do not
think has ever been surpassed by the best prose writers in
our language. It is the privilege of true intellectual great-
ness to glorify itself in what the world calls adversity, and
never did it employ a means more noble than this of Eliot's.
Rewarded with a prison for the service of active years devoted
to his country; the tyranny apparently triumphant, to oppose
which, he had surrendered fortune and freedom; a disease
induced by the foul air of his dungeon making rapid strides
upon his life, yet only in its prime;—it is impossible to detect
in this illustrious person the quailing of a single nerve. He
rises superior to all extremities, in simply continuing equal to
himself. The philosopher of the Tower is no more and no less
than the statesman of the house of commons. The essential object of his exertions is in both cases the same, and I look upon these exalted meditations as only a continuance, in intense expression, of the active energies of his life. The steady invasion of disease forbade him to hope that the latter could ever be renewed; and, thus excluded from the sphere of virtuous public action, he left an example of even greater value to the world,—an example to console them in temporary defeat, to carry ardour and enthusiasm unhurt through trial,—an example that should multiply their powers of action and resistance, by strengthening their moral purposes. I see no unnatural contrast therefore in any portion of Eliot's life. I recognize his old brave fearlessness, in his present inculcation of a perfect restraint and self-command; I trace the rapid grandeur of his younger days, in the composed magnanimity of morals which sustains him through this "last scene of all."

Through the impediments that obstruct man's happiness in self-government, Eliot, as I have said, proceeds. Hemmed in as the mind is shown by him to be, he undertakes to point out the passage of escape from this "bondage and captivitie." The first impediment he notices is "feare." He goes through the various chances that may occasion it, with a pregnant personal reference; he describes the "effects of power, sudden, various, and fearful; wherein imprisonment, wounds, and death, and that in a thousand forms, are threatened; in which both sickness and poverty are involved:" but in none of these, he says, is there real cause of fear. He concludes his masterly examination thus: "Feare must yield to happinesse, or happinesse to feare."

Eliot then passes to what he calls, "the next link of this chaine of our unhappinesse, another part of the fetters that we beare," to that "inexplicable piece of vanity, our hope." This he considers in many respects a great evil. "But not to be mistaken," he says, "for want of some distinction in this case, all hopes are not like, nor all enemies of our government, though all have one incertainty, by the trouble of expectation, and the dependance upon time. All have this vanity and weakness, that their rest is upon others, not in themselves, and in that respect they are obnoxious unto fortune. Yet all have
not a participation in the evil; all are not sharers in the guilt; some are natural, and have their principles in nature." The exceptions are occasionally treated, and with a prodigious mass of learned allusion. In conclusion, Eliot dwells with much intenseness on the perpetual agitations in which hope keeps a man; the fear to lose, the jealousy, the satiety; and all the incidents that fall to it.

Sorrow approaches next, and this is described as the worst and least excusable of the impediments yet named. For yet, Eliot says, fear has some resource of safety, hope has some desire of happiness. "These," he strikingly continues, "have somewhat for justification and apology, at least for excuse and extenuation of their evils. But sorrow only is inferior to them all. No argument can be made for her defense; she can pretend neither to happiness, nor safety, nor to what might be subservient to either. As the professed enemie to both, her banners are displayed. She fights against all safety, and bids defiance unto happiness. Her ends, her arts, are in contestation of them both. Reason has nothing to allege why sorrow should be used; it propounds no advantage in the end, no advantage in the act, but the mere satisfaction of itself, the sole expletion of that humour; therefore is it the most improper of all others, as incomparably the worst, and that likewise the effects and consequence on the body will show." The conclusion of the subject is a subtle treatment of the selfishness of sorrow. It is not called forth, he says, by the misfortunes of our friends, for that feeling is pity; nor by the triumphs of our enemies, for that is envy. "Sorrow is selfishness." For the "privation of whatever we hold dear, of whatever is in a tender estimation," Eliot suggests nobler and better remedies.

Pleasure follows. "And thus we see how these enemies doe threaten us. Fear does anticipate, hope divert, sorrow overturn, the happiness we look for; or, rather, they fight against the happiness itself; fear secretly undermining, hope circumventing, sorrow charging it at full. But, above all, the most dangerous is behind,—pleasure!" The reason of the peculiar danger that attends the indulgence of pleasure, is then shown to consist in the so false resemblance it bears in itself to happiness, that it is like to steal through all the
"guards and watches" that we keep, into our strongest "retreats and strongholds." Nothing, Eliot observes, in the course of much splendour of eloquence and reason, "nothing is so petulant and refractory, so exorbitant and irregular, as pleasure. No rule, no law, no authority can contain it; but, like Semiramis, admit her government for a day, she usurps the rule for ever."

Having considered these impediments to happiness, these obstructions to the monarchy of man, Eliot indulges a speculation on the design of Providence, in thus appearing to have opposed, by the creation of such unworthy passions, its own vast and pure design.

"But here an objection or wonder may be made, how, from one fountain, such different streams should flow; how, from the self same head, such contraries should derive themselves; and that greater wonder may arise, how the great architect and workman, who gave being to all things in his divine wisdom, did so create the mind by the infusion of such principles, that the contrariety of their motions should threaten the destruction of his work! For faction and division imply this, and the dissension of the parts hazards the confusion of the whole. It's a great cause of wonder, in the thing, that it is so, but of far greater admiration in the reason. That he, thus wise, thus willing, thus able to give perfection to his art, should, in the masterpiece thereof, in his own portraiture and image, leave it with imperfection! This is enough for wonder and admiration (if it were so). But yet the next has more the inscrutability of that reason;--which turns these imperfections to perfections; which in these contrarities makes agreement; by these differences, these divisions, these dissensions, works unity and concord! This is a cause of wonder and admiration so transcendent, as human capacity cannot reach. O! the incomprehensible glory of the wisdom, by which such secrets are disposed! We may see it almost in every thing, as the effect gives illustration to the cause; and so in fact confirm, though we cannot penetrate, the reason itself. All things, almost generally, will demonstrate it. If we look into the universality of the world, or the concurrence of its parts, are there
more contraries than in the common materials they consist of? Can there be more antipathy than the elements sustain? What greater enemies than fire and water can be found? What more violent than their wars? And so with the air and earth. Dryness and moisture are opposed; than which no things can be more different; yet amongst these what a sweet league and amity is contracted! What mutual love and correspondency they retain! Fire agrees with water, earth with air, the latter with the former, each severally with other, and so respectively with all! and that which is the perfection of them all, the composition which they make, the frame of those materials, the body so compounded, has its being and existence by the very mixture and diagram of these! Nay, by the want of either, their dissolution is enforced. So necessary is the contrariety of the parts, and the opposition which they make, that, without it, the whole cannot subsist. As thus as in the generals, so in the particulars from thence. In the immense infinitie of creatures, amongst the dead or living, are their antipathies to be numbered? Can arithmetic define the contrarities they have? Stone opposing stone, metal against metal, plant against plant; all war! And animate beasts contrary to beasts, fowls against fowls, fishes against fishes; in hate, in cruelty opposed, killing and devouring each other; and yet all made serviceable to man! Amongst men, too, what contestations are there extant; what wars, what quarrels, what discontents! Nation in antipathy with nation, kindred opposed to kindred, family against family, man against man! And, besides, how infinite is their difference and variety in temper, in affection, in condition; so that reconciliation seems impossible, and, without it, their subsistence. Yet in the revolution of that wisdom these things are so turned, in the divine wheel of providence their conversions are so made, that all move directly to one end! The alloy and contestation of the parts work the conservation of the whole."

Eliot now sums up the character and objects of the monarchy he seeks to establish; ranging against it its various impediments, that he may enlarge on the means of their removal. This is beautifully done, by an exhibition of the utter vanity of the causes to which, in general, they owe
their existence. Poverty, for instance, he begins with, as a thing which provokes fear, but in which there is no essential cause for fear. He treats this at great length, and with much fervor. Don Guzman himself never said finer things in behalf of poverty. "Are riches," he asks, "of that virtue that their want should seem so terrible? How many have they sold to misery and unhappiness! What worlds of men have they corrupted and betrayed! Corrupted in manners and affections, betrayed of their liberties and lives!" Out of these reflections he plunges into a praise of poverty. He tells the poor what they escape. He sums up the diseases of the rich, famous for their excruciating pains; and contrasts with them the "privileges of poverty, the immunities of want." He then draws forth from antiquity a long list of illustrious poor; he speaks of the lives of Fabricius, Curio, Menenius, Valerius, and Seneca; and holds them up as the best of all examples to comfort and to teach. "Who more valiant than Miltiades?" he exclaims; "who more wise than Cimon? who than Aristides more just? who more temperate than Phocion? Yet all these the poorest as the best of all their times!"

Sickness is treated of by Eliot next, as no just cause of fear. From sickness,—suggested by his own sufferings, he advances through the various effects of power, to imprisonment, to death, but in none can he find "just cause of fear." He acknowledges their aspects to be startling. "To dispel the fear of that which power and greatness may impose, requires a harder labour, because the dangers seem far greater, and are more various, and more sudden. For—not to reflect on poverty and sickness as incidents to this (which wounds and confiscations do imply), those too frequent and two known effects of power—but to look forward and to view it in the other issues, which it has; disgrace, imprisonment, death, and those in all their ugliness and deformity. This last is that tyrant which our apprehensions do so fear; that monstrum horrendum informe, which strikes us with such terror; this is that dire aspect, at which our resolutions do so fly; this is that traitor that makes such sedition in our government, and which we must the more carefully oppose for the vindication of our happiness. In this
place, therefore, we will only deal with it, and with the rest hereafter."

Into these passages respecting death Eliot throws all his eloquence: — "Death," he says, "has its consideration but in terror; and what is assum'd from that, is like the imaginations of children in the darke, a mere fancie and opinion." With a melancholy fondness, the anticipation of their approaching intimacy, he defends death as a friend might be defended. It has been slandered, he says, by those who cannot have known it, "most untruly, most unjustly slandered." "For either happiness it contains, or it repels calamity, or gives satiety and weariness an end, or does prevent the hardness of old age! A conclusion 'tis to all; to some their wish; but to none more meriting and deserving, than to whom it comes uncalled for! It frees from servitudo, dissolves the chains of captives, sets all prisoners at liberty, and restores the banished to their country. All their sorrows and disasters have termination in this point. It has been called humanis tempestatibus portus, the harbour of human miseries, the sedation of our troubles. Implying thus the comparison of our life to a fluctuation on the seas, we as poor mariners sailing in the weak vessels of our nature and fortune, the wind tossing us by the continual agitation of her tempests, trouble being instant and upon us, danger most iminent and before us, hope fled, safety nowhere to be found.—Death only is the haven to receive us, where there is calmness and tranquility, where there is rest from all these storms and tempests! In that port all fluctuations of our life are quieted and composed; nor winds nor seas have power upon us there; fortune and time are excluded from that road; there we anchor in security, without the distractions of new troubles; there without danger or hazard do we ride."

With a slight shade of humour, such as issues so naturally out of a subject of this sort, and suits with it so well, Eliot next calls for the evidence of men who have themselves died, as to the character of death. "No great variety," he observes, "can be looked for in this strange kinde of proof, men so seldom returning from the dead." This is simply an introduction to the story of that Athenian whom Plato raised to speak of the terrors below the earth. Such terrors were only
for "the oppressors of mankind, such as had made their wills
their laws, tyrants, Arides and his followers, whom hell
itself abhorred!" Far different was the lot of the good, "the
servants unto virtue." Life is afterwards beautifully presented
by Eliot, in contrast with its dark neighbour, as only "an
ine to rest in, a lodging for the night, an hostelry in our
travels, in our continual journey to the mansion of our
fathers!" Nay, life itself, he exclaims, taken at the best, is
only made up of various deaths, one passion dying, another
succeeding but to die. "So that our whole life is but an exercise
doing, and all the changes and vicissitudes of nature, death,
in a measure and degree! Why then should death be thought
so terrible? where is the reason of that fear?" Rather, he
afterwards suggests, should it be made a matter of triumph
and of glory. "What martyrs have there been even in the
work of dying! More joying, more rejoicing, than in all the
acts of life! The glory of the Deity, the incarnate majesty of
the Son, those incomprehensible mysteries of divinity, then
appearing to them, by revelation to their sense, or by illumina-
tion of the fancy, — the heavens opening to give free passage
to their view, — these as it were descending unto them, giving
them the possession here of that happiness, that eternal hap-
niness and felicity, which is the chief object of all hopes; —
not that happiness we treat of, the maximum domum of this life,
the domum publicum of our monarchy, but the supernatural
felicity to come, the transcendant happiness hereafter!"

Nor will Eliot rest at these examples of the victorious ago-
dies of martyrdom, since they are sustained as it were by
the divine presence. There is a bravery which comes nearer
to his own, a grandeur of moral courage which needs no
miracle to help it. "I will resort," he says, "to patterns of
morality. Then, to see the confidence in them, the willingness
and cheerfulness of dying, — take it from those Grecians,
those three hundred at Thermopolis, who, for their country,
opposed themselves to all the power of Xerxes — to those many
millions of the Persians, whose thirst scarce seas could satisfy,
not whole regions for one day find provisions for their hunger!
Yet unto these, those Grecians could expose themselves, so few
against so many, for the safety of their mother. The clouds
of darts that fell on them, they tear'm'd an umbrell for the sunne; their danger they made glory; their death they thought their life; so far from terror was it that they made it the subject of their hopes. O happy men! thus for their country to have died! Most happy country, to have brought forth such men! whose death became the character of her life, and was to her and them a patent of immortality! Among the crowding thoughts of many examples of this kind, Eliot kindles into a greater fervour, and he fills the solitary recesses of his dungeon with men of Rome, of Athens, and of Sparta, — "fellows, whom death itself might fear, sooner than be fearful unto them. Mirrors of men," he finely continues, "are chronicled for a free acceptance of that fate; women did scorn their children that did not scorn to file it!" And as Eliot thus recalls the past, an example nobler than all the others rises up, because completer in the elements of moral grandeur, in the perfection of self-control, the monarchy of man. The philosopher Ramus stands before him, "who died not as Cato, to avoid the dying by his enemies, nor suddenly, to prevent the torment of the time, nor as those Grecians, in the heat of blood and danger, when death does come unthought, — but giving it all leave of preparation, admitting all circumstance of terror, in that form which his enemies had cast, to the extremity of their malice, — so he encounters, so he receives and meets it, even in its very contemplation! His speculations were upon it, it was the subject of his thoughts, and in that he valued it more precious than his life."

To this illustrious shadow of the past, sir Walter Raleigh succeeds! His image, indeed, had scarcely vanished from those dark walls that now surrounded Eliot, and his spirit remained in the magnanimity of Eliot's soul. "Shall I not add, as parallel to this, a wonder and example of our own? such as if that old philosopher were yet living, without dishonor he might acknowledge, as the equal of his virtue. Take it in that — else unmatched — fortitude of our Raleigh! the magnanimity of his sufferings, that large chronicle of fortitude! All the preparations that are terrible presented to his eye — guards and officers about him — fetters and chains upon him — the scaffold and executioner before him — and then the axe, and
more cruel expectation of his enemies! And what did all this work on the resolution of this worthy? Made it an impression of weak fear? or a distraction of his reason? Nothing so little did that great soul suffer! but gathered more strength and advantage upon either. His mind became the clearer, as if already it had been freed from the cloud and oppression of the body; and the trial gave an illustration to his courage, so that it changed the affection of his enemies, and turned their joy to sorrow, and all men else it filled with admiration; — leaving no doubt but this, whether death were more acceptable to him, or he more welcome unto death!"

How nobly expressed this is! The style of Eliot, uncramped by the authorities to which he chose at times to link it, was as free and grand as his own free thoughts. These his friend Hampden, as the treatise advances, alludes to with a profound deference. "Your apprehensions, that ascend a region above those clouds which shadow us, are fitt to pierce such heights; and others to receive such notions as descend from thence; which, while you are pleased to impart, you make the demonstrations of your favour to become the rich possessions of your ever faithful friend."

Eliot betrays a melancholy reluctance to let the subject of death pass from him. Assuming that these examples of fearlessness in dying are of too exalted a character for the emulation of all men, that all have not the same motives, or means, of sustainment, he very beautifully says: "There is no affection within man but has given examples in this case. Hope, joy, sorrow, fear itself, has conquered it, the weakest of all others! Fear of death has forced men to act the thing they fear." And, after some very subtle reasoning to this point, he proceeds: "therefore, that truth so known, we may in a generality conclude, that death and fear are conquered both by love. Sorrow can do as much. And we have it in the inmost of her daughters, pity, which is the tenderest of all thoughts, yet that subdued this fear, as Tacitus notes it of the multitudes after the fall of Otho." Yet Eliot concludes not even here. Still he lingers on the praise and the privilege of death. "I shall then no more be sick; I shall then no more be bound; I shall then leave off to fear; I shall then not die again. If
death were an evil at the first, then it shall be no more. All the crosses and disasters, all the calamities and affictions, all things that are fearful and evil in this life, then shall I be free from! No death shall thenceforth be an interruption to my happiness, therefore why should I fear it? But if death have all these priviledges, why then do we live? why do we not, as Cleombrotus, having read Plato’s discourses of the immortality of the soul, precipitate ourselves? hasten to that excellence? press to that rich magazine of treasures? why do we hear such miseries in life, there being such felicity in death? and the transition in our power, so facile and so ready? The answer with the ethicks is emergent: "non debet _fuga_ actionum, sed _actio_." Death must not be a flight from action, but an action. Subterfuge is the property of a coward; blows and wounds are the honor of a soldier. Dangers must not affright, but harden him, where the cause requires his hazard.

And through much eloquence he proceeds, impressing over again, and with an increased fervour, the necessity of subduing fear, "though the sun itself should tremble — though the immense fabric of the world should shake;" and at last concluding by praying of all men, in all cases, "expect calmly that issue which time and virtue have appointed. Thus we must look for death; not as an enemy, but a friend; which in his own hours visits us, expects no invitation, may not be compelled, but has a free liberty before him. When he comes, he comes attended by many priviledges, decked with flowers of happiness, rest, and sweetness, and exemption of all the evils of life. Therefore there is not the least cause to fear it, or to raise that jealousy and distraction in our government."

The duty of opposing the desires is the next matter discussed. Eliot, after a delicate handling of the bodily passions, points out the jealousy and restless irresolution of desire, agitated between the doubt of attainment and the doubt of loss, hindering even its own satisfaction, and joined with sorrow. "Shall this, then," he asks, "have entertainment in the heart, where happiness and felicity should dwell? That it is a vanity and mere nothing, either the act or the consequence do prove it; for, in itself, what is it more than an imagination and light fancy? In the effect and consequence, does any man
conceive there is the least advantage in the thought? Does the most affectionate in this case think that the object is drawn nearer by his wish? 'Tis true, of faith 'twas said, 'believe and then thou hast,' but never of this desire. We may desire and want; nay, that want is but desire. 'Desire does make the want. As it is nothing in itself, nothing but want does follow it—a vain and fruitless issue, like the mother. Nor is this all for which wisdom does oppose it, that it is, thus, a vanity and mere nothing. No! as an evil likewise she contests it; nay, as the ground and root of all our miseries, the spring and fountain of calamity!" Wielding, then, vast knowledge with the most perfect ease, giving freshness to old truths, and binding together by living ties the rude materials of dead learning,—Eliot goes through the dangers that are in desire; "the cares, anxieties, and doubts; the thousand troubles and distractions, which men in hope and men in love are charged with; for these in the notion are but one, though distinguished in the expression. Pardon me, Love," interposes Eliot here, "that soe hardly I have matched thee! it is my reason, not my affection, that does speake it." He passionately continues, —"What theatre or amphitheatère will serve to represent the tragedies it has acted? In tragic scenes of blood, what executions have been done by the hand of this affection! Man a butcher upon man, acquaintance on acquaintance, familiar on familiar, friend upon friend, kinsman upon kinsman, brother upon brother, father upon son, the son upon the father! drinking up blood like leaches; nay, making sacrifices of themselves, to eternal horror and confusion; and, with their own hands, forcing a passage to that darkness, which even hell itself does tremble at! What numberless examples of this kind have love, covetousness, ambition, and their like, almost every day exhibited, and are still contriving, to threaten, as it were, the destruction of mankind!"

In accordance with his general plan of showing in the profoundest view the vanity of the particular passion, by showing the objects that usually excite it to be vain, Eliot now treats the ordinary motives to love. In a portion of his previous discussion of it, he had reduced it simply, in its voluptuous form, to "what is pleasant;" and "pleasure" he had
shown to be unworthy. "The felicite we look for is an action: not a thought, not a dream, or imagination of the fancie; it is an action of virtue!" As of one of the motives to the passion, he then speaks of the vanity of beauty. "What," he asks, "can be found in beauty — the object that love has — so to possess the affection of the mind, and cause a defection from reason? The description that was given it by that unfortunate piece of merit, who died where now I live, may be a resolution in this point, who has it in that idea of his wife, that —

"— carnal beauty is but skin deep,
But to two senses known;
Short even of pictures, shorter liv'd than life,
And yet survives the love that's built thereon!"

"wherein there is such a latitude of sense, such a perspicuity of truth, that if all other fancies were collected, this might be the judgment of them all. Here, in an abstract, is a full comprehension of their natures, with all plainness, yet elegantly, rendered."

The name of this "unfortunate piece of merit" may have already suggested itself to the reader. It is sir Thomas Overbury. Keen was Eliot's sympathy for oppression in all cases; and here,—in his love of literature (which Overbury's writings, as I have before had an opportunity of saying, had, in that age, most delicately adorned), and in some circumstances of his own condition,—much conspired to sharpen even that sharp sympathy. He dwells for some time with fondness on this quotation from Overbury's poem, and then, in a passage of lively interest, apologises as it were to the reader. "Let it not," he says, "seem a wonder that I write this fancy for authority, being so new, and borne amongst ourselves. I must confess my ignorance, if it be so. I esteem it not the less as begotten in this age, and as it is our own I love it much the more. 'Tis truth which I do look for, and the propriety of expression to endear it, not only to the judgment, but the affections. Making an insinuation also by the language for the sense and reason of the thing. This I find here, in this Theoreme, in as great fullness, and as succinctly rendered, as the exoticks can pretend. Why then we should not value it to the truth and
merit which it bears, is a wisdom past the apprehension of my weakness. I must declare my folly in that point. As it is of my country, I honour it the more; and as it was the production of this place, my admiration is the greater, that in such solitude and darkness, where sorrow and distraction mostly dwell, such happy entertainments and such minutes were enjoyed."

I am not acquainted with any passage in the language which expresses, in a few admirable words, a sounder canon of criticism than is to be observed in the course of the above. It is unnecessary to direct the reader's attention to the deep meaning of the closing lines. I may add, that the feeling so strongly intimated here, of opposition to a prevalent fashion of that age, — a fashion which belongs, perhaps, to the literary coxcombry of all ages, — is in many other parts of his work emphatically urged by Eliot.

Another object of desire — riches — is now discussed. The passage is a beautiful companion to that of the deprecation of poverty as an object of fear. His opening reasons against the avarice of wealth are strongly stated. "Preposterous and absurd," are the mildest epithets he affords to it at last. He describes riches to be "deceitful in their nature — whereas we think them somewhat, when truth does speake them nothing; deceitful in their qualities — being fitting and uncertain, without any constancie or stabilitie, always wing'd, and flying from one subject to another; deceitful in their use — as we take them to be helpeful to our happiness, though working the contrary by continuall anxieties and cares! Why should we then desire them, being no way to be trusted, but in all consisting of fallacie and frauds?" Very beautiful are the series of questions that follow. "Hast thou worth or merit that might challenge them as due? That is a mysterie to them. They cannot discerne it. The worthless and the worthy are equal in their sense." "They are the maine occasion," he continues, "of all differences, the ager contentiosus, as it were, the field of quarrel and contention, as that anciently neare Berwicke to the English and Scotch nations." Nobly Eliot sums up their high demerits. "If these be their proprieties, how can we then desire them? If they be but
serviceable to these, — if they have no fellowship with honesty — if they dissolve the powers of reason and of virtue — if they be distractive and contentious — blind, mad, deceitful, and uncertain, — what is it that should make that attraction in our hearts, and disturb our self-sovereignty and command?" The subject is closed with a very fine allusion to the only one mode of converting the dress of riches into true gold, by the alchemy of virtue. You may have riches, Eliot says, you may desire them, if your purpose is to convert them to good. "But how is that?" he asks; "by what means must it be done?" The poet does express it —

"divitas probem
Virtutis instrumenta faciit. Sic
Boni credimus, et vitam bestiam
Deberes potestis!"

"Make riches instruments of virtue, let them be servants to that mistress. See you may live happily and well."

Honour is the next subject treated by Eliot as an object of desire. This, in the worldly acceptation, is regarded by him with an extreme scorn. "Something still may be said for beautie and for riches; but the honour and glory that the world so names, have noe reality or substance, noe solide being or existence, but are suppositious and imaginarie, like those essences of philosophers, qua quasi sunt, as they say, which are but as if they were." "Let the description of that author," Eliot continues, having indulged a severe censure upon the worldly cause or honours, "let the description or that author speake the nature of the subject. Let Fame, from which honour is deduced, shew what this Honour is, it being the daugbter or that mother. In that mother, take the qualitie of the daughter. Of which Virgill thus:

"Ilam Terra parent, tra invita deorum,"
.Extremam, ut perhibent, Caco Enceladique sororem
.Progenuit, pedibus celerem, et perniciibus alia.
.Monstrum horrendum, ingens : cul, quot sunt corpore plume,
.Tot vigiles oculi suiter, mirabile dicta,
.Tot lingue, tosidem ora sonant, tot sufragit auris.
.Nocta volat coelum medio terraque, per umbram
.Stridens, nec dulci decilhati lumina sonno.
.Luce sedet castor, aut summii culmine telli,
.Terribus aut alia, et magnae terrae cerva :
.Tam acti pravique ramex, quam nuotia veri."
— which Eliot translates with freedom) — "First, as sister to the Gyanta, the Earth produced it in malice of the Gods,—swift-footed, light-winged, a huge and horrid monster; having that strange thing to be told under each feather of her body, a prying watchful eye; and unto that both ears and tongues as many; and mouths not fewer; — always in sound, and motion. All night it flies through the middle of the heavens, and divides the darkness, giving no place to rest. And in the day, it sits on the supreme tops of houses, or in high turrets, a terror to whole cities, being as well the herald of lies and mischiefs, as a reporter of the contrary! This Virgili makes both her nature and descent."

Adopting the suggestion of the Latin poet, Eliot now works out a very fine contrast between the huge, but incapable, energies of the Titans, and the calm accomplishing grandeur of the Gods. In the eyes of the latter, he says, and to the perceptions of philosophy, fame is nothing. The following passage succeeds. It is a masterly dissection of one of the things denominated honour, in shape of an inquiry into the claim of hereditary rank; which, for sober satire, joined to exalted reason, could with difficulty be excelled. It calls to my memory some forcible and eloquent things, which are urged in a style precisely similar, by one of the most original thinkers of this or of any age; Mr. Walter Savage Landor, in his delightful "Examination of Shakspere for Deer-stealing." "And now to see," says Eliot, "whether this 'honor' be confined within an order, limited to persons and degrees, or left promiscuously to all, as their worths and qualities shall deserve it? Wherein let reason be the judge. Is it the reward of virtue or of fortune they would make it? Let them answer who so magnify this pretence. Do they apply that honor to their houses or themselves? Is it the distinction of their families, or the reward of their merits? If they will take it for distinction, 'tis but a name, and the poorest. The basest have as much, and small cause there is to glory in that subject. If it be the distinction of their families, the character of their houses, though it once implied a glory, what can it be to them more than treasures are to porters? But they will say, it is the glory of their ancestors, the acquisition of their virtues, 'and from them it does descend hereditarily to
us." So may the porter say. That treasure is his master's, and by his will imposed upon his shoulders; but to whose use, and in whose right, has he received it? in his owne, or to his owne profit and advantage? Masters would take this ill, if their servants should usurp it; and all men would condemn them, both of falsehood and ingratitude. So is it, in the other, an injury to their ancestors, if they pretend that honor to be theirs. They can but carry it to their use, as a monument of their virtues that acquired it, not in their own interest and right, to the glory of themselves; may, not without their shame, whose purchase cannot equal it, being but the sole inheritors of the fortune, not the worth. But if they waive their families, and reduce it to themselves,—between their virtues and their fortunes, how will they divide it? If fortune do appropriate it,—then the most vicious, the most ignorant, the most dishonorable, may be honorable; slaves, and they, may be equal in this kind; for not seldom have they tasted the liberality of fortune, and this honor none will envy them. If virtue be the lodestone that procures it, where is it? Let them shew it in the effect, and then I hope they'll grant, that all so qualified may be honorable. All men that have the virtue may participate. Where, then, is the propriety they challenge? where is that peculiar interest they claim? Certainly not in this. This honor will not bear it, which is the crown of virtue! All persons, all orders, all degrees extant, may be capable thereof. They are without exception or exclusion, and, for such other honors as are fancied, let them enjoy an immunity therein, I shall rather pity than malign them!"

After this, as it were to while away the time, Eliot brings up in aid of the general question new "squadrons of authorities;"—disputing some, exalting others. "In one word," he subsequently says, "honor is no other than to follow goodness. To be a servant unto virtue, is to be master of true honor, and without that service no honor can be had. Therefore the Romans, those most honorable above all men, in the temples which they dedicated, joined those of virtue and honor to each other, and to that of honor left no entrance or accession but through the gate of virtue; shewing by that symbol where true honor rests, and how it is attained, which is by following virtue. But how
is that? how is virtue to be followed? in a fair and easy pace? will that conduce to honor? can honor be so had?" Eliot answers these questions with elaborate care, and closes the subject,—after a strong reiteration of his protest against the hereditary claim, that honour should not be "appropriated to any order or degree, as is pretended," for that "to be gotten and descended even of princes is an accident,"—with an allusion to those enemies of Roman tyranny, whose honour, because it was true, outshone the worst envy of the times. Eliot had a peculiar right to call to mind these men, for in his own nature he presented some of their noblest qualities — the fiery energy of Cassius, and Brutus' brave philosophy. "Tacitus," he says, "notes it upon the funeral of Junias, where so many famous images were exhibited, the glory of their families, that Brutus and Cassius being omitted through the envy of those times, they outshined the rest because their statues were not seen. "Eo ipso quod effigies eorum non visentur praefuletant," as he has it. They being so concealed, their glory was the greater. Which shews that honor is most had, when it is least affected. Why, then, should this disturb us with ambition? why should it make a faction in our government? why should it cause the distraction of our hopes? Ambition cannot purchase it, the hope thereof is vain; no art, no practice, can acquire it, but by the rule of virtue. And so only, as the virtue is intended, let virtue be our aim. Leave that desire of honor. Let it not be a worke of our affections, for in that case we must fight with honor as with enemies."

The reader will have remarked with what a steady purpose, in how close a vice of logic, the main object and argument of the treatise is kept. Eliot now examines his position.—"And thus we see from the several objects of desire, how little cause there is for that disturbance and impulsion. Honor contains no reason, being rather an enemy than friend to that affection, flying and not following it. Beauty has as little, consisting but of vanity. Riches much less, that are but instruments of corruption. Also for fear, poverty, death, sickness, and the like, which have as small warrant and authority for that passion. Let us now search what more there is in Pleasure, that coun-
terfeit of happiness, and apply our laws to that. For, being the most dangerous of our adversaries, it must the more cautiously be dealt with." To the subject of pleasure, accordingly, Eliot reverts, with the intention of impressing more emphatically in that regard the duty of self-restraint. A vast number of authorities are brought to bear upon it, and Eliot takes occasion to express the most exalted admiration of Homer. He calls him a "prophet and a poet." He amuses himself at the same time with notices of Lucian's comments upon Homer, and pursues at great length the analogy between the resistance of Ulysses to the Syrens, and a perfect self-restraint in man. He bound himself, he says, he restricted his liberty. "But wherewith was that done? What were the obligations he incurred? How shall this come to us? Most properly and most readily, if we will endeavour but that means, if we will use the example of that worthy. The same safety is for us, which was then wrought to him, and that, that great prophet has delivered, with all sincerity and fulness. You know he makes Ulysses then on ship board. And that much experienced man, most curious of all knowledge, would needs add to that the musick of the Syrens, the perception of that excellence, though not trusting to himself for the resistance of their powers, in which both danger and destruction were implied. To avoid this, he feigns to be fastened to the mast; his men, meanwhile, do intend their labours, having their senses stopped (vulgar appetites being not capable of such dainties). Now, as this musick was but pleasure, those Syrens the occasion, so the virtues were the cords that did restrain and bind him, reason the mast to which he was so fastened, philosophy the ship in which he sailed and went; — and in this ship, thus fastened to that mast, having had both the occasion and delight, he escap't the danger threatened, and in that preserved the safety of his course. But what was that? the same that is our government, — the way to happiness and felicity! — this was his Ithaca, this was that course intended, and with these helps, notwithstanding all the difficulties, this be accomplished and performed! Now is not this a plain direction unto us? Is not our remedy, our deliverance from this danger, aptly expressed in this mirror and example? Our syrens are not more, their harmonies not
stronger; the same ship we have, with the same tackle; the same ropes, the same mast, continue still. Cannot our course, then, be the same? Is not the same safety yet before us? If we doubt that tackle will not hold us against those strong enchantments, let us stop our senses, as Vlyseus did with his men, and first avoid the occasions. Nothing is lov'd, not known. Let us, then, stint our curiosity herein, and the desire will leave us. But how is that? how shall that work be done? Is it to shun all pleasure, all occasions? That cannot be, nor is it requisite to this. For virtue in the concrete is not absolute, nor to be so expected in our monarchy."

All this is subtly and well expressed; and its deep spirit of philosophy has further vent in the following remarkable passage: — "We daily see it in experience, that those who have least affections are most violent (least, I mean, extensively, in respect of number, and the object); their passions being impetuous as contracted to that narrowness, and masterless in that. As Tacitus notes it in Tiberius, who, being most reserved and hidden unto all men, to Sejanus yet was open and incautious. So it is likewise unto others. The heart, being straightened by some objects, growes more violent in those passions; the affection does inlarge, as the scope thereof is lessened. Therefore we thus expose that precept of division. That pleasures may be a remission to the mind, not an intention — that we may taste, not swallow them — that the appetition may be obtemperate to reason, wherein only true pleasures doe consist."

Carrying out his plan of reverting to the more dangerous impediments in the way of man's monarchy, Eliot now resumes the subject of sorrow: — "Sorrow," he again insists, "is a perfect enemy, standing in such antipathy with happiness, that it is irreconcilable for our government. Therefore, to this also we must oppose all the resistance we have; for this moves most violently against us; and, if it get possession of our hearts, if it once enter on that fort, all our happiness is gone; our monarchy is subverted! For it destroys the end, the felicity we look for, and then the means is useless. It dissolves it in the principle, and so brings it to confusion. For where sorrow is, no felicity can be, and a mind so affected
can have no taste of happiness. To encounter it, therefore, as physicians do diseases, we will first meet it in the cause; for, if that can be removed, the effect forthwith will follow it. The object being gone, the affection must fall after it." Eliot then points out, with renewed earnestness, the fallacy and folly of supposing, that things which assume at times the aspects of sorrow are in reality sorrowful. He argues the great principle of the poet of nature, that "There's a Providence that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will." Above all, however, he impresses the virtue of opposing whatever appears in sorrow's shape. The exercise, he says, will be great, a discipline of humanity, and an invaluable example to others. "For, are not soldiers sometimes heightened in their courage by the valour of their fellows? Do not the valiant often receive new fortitude and spirits by the acts of magnanimity of others? Has not admiration, has not emulation, this effect, to work the likeness of that virtue which it has seen before it? To reduce to act the image of that idea, which the apprehension has conceived, and, from the excellence of the pattern, to draw an antitype thereof. Wherefore were exhibited those bloody spectacles at Rome — those butcheries of men — those tragic representations to the people — but to inure them to blood, to harden them in dangers, to familiar them with death? And shall not better acts, to better ends directed, have the like power and operation? Shall not divinity, by the works of divine men opposing their afflictions, have as great force in precedent and example, as these Romans had by that fighting with beasts, or contesting one another, to harden, to encourage, the minds of the more virtuous, against all difficulties, all dangers?"

Eliot, further, after remarking on Plato's noble commentary of the inscription on the Delphic oracle, γελόι ουκ αὐτός, urges this consideration: — "It is required of man, that he should profit many. It is a common duty of mankind, as far as ability may extend, still to do good to all, or, if not that, to some, as opportunity shall be granted him. Or, if he fail in that, yet to his neighbours, or at least unto himself. But here, here, in this act of passion and wrestling with calamities, there is advantage given for all. In this contestation of those things
we call miseries, there is a performance of all these. First, to thyself, thou profittest through the favor of the Gods, that give thee this instruction, this education, this trial, this knowledge of thyself, this confirmation of thy virtue. Then to thy neighbours, and all others, thou art profitable by thy precedent and example. Thy fortitude adds courage unto them, stout and valiant. How, then, - how, in this excellence of duty, in this great duty of advantage — of advantage to ourselves, of advantage to our neighbours, of advantage unto all — we should repine and sorrow, as 'tis a prejudice to our happiness, it's a wonder unto reason!" With much beauty, Eliot afterwards disposes of the last and best plea that would seem to remain for sorrow — a friend at the grave of his friend. "Let me first ask this question of the sorrower. For whose sake that passion is assumed? For his that is so lost, or for thine own that lost him? Answer to this, and make a justification for thyself. If thou wilt say for his, where is the evil that he suffers? Wherein lies the reason of that grief? Design it out; give it some character to express it. Is it in that he is dead? in that he has made a transition to the elders? That cannot be; for death contains no evil, as our former proofs have manifested; but is a priviledge of immortality, an eternity of happiness. Is it for that he is not? that he is not numbered with the living? That were to lament, but because he is not miserable. Thou canst not but acknowledge the distraction of thy fears, the anxiety of thy cares, the complexion of thy pleasures, the mixture of thy sorrows! With all these, and upon all, no rest, no quiet, no tranquility, but a continual vexation of thy thoughts, a servile agitation of thy mind from one passion to another! And wilt thou grieve for him, that has his freedom, his immunity from these? On the other side: is that sorrow for thyself, that thou hast lost a friend, — the sweetness, the benefit of his friendship — thy comfort in society — the assistance of thy business — the sublensation of thy cares — the extenuation of thy griefs — the multiplication of thy joys — thy castle — thy counsel — thy sword — thy shield — thy store — thy health — thy eye — thy ear — thy taste — thy touch — thy smell — the catholic of thy happiness (for all these are attributes of friendship)? — consider, first, whether
friendship may not change, whether a breach and enmity may not follow it, as not seldom happens in the most strict conjunctions, with which then no enmity may compare! Then 't were better thus to have lost it, that evil being prevented, and the obligation, the virtue, kept entire! But, if that doubt prevails not; if thou supposes a perpetuity in that friendship, an assurance of that love; is it not envy in thee, and unworthiness thereof, for these respects, those temporary benefits to thyself, to grudge at his happiness and felicity, which is infinite and celestial? Justice may resolve how far this is from friendship, how unworthy of that name!" This sorrowing, Eliot afterwards observes, is variously applied. "Marcellus wept when he had taken Syracuse; Alexander, to have no more worlds to conquer." Concluding with the phrase of the Ethicks, that to conquer what might be fancied real calamities "not only makes a man a conqueror, and wise, but equal, nay superior, to the Gods." —Eliot, in a passage of great eloquence, banishes sorrow from his government.

Having thus disposed of the impediments to the monarchy of man — of the obstructing passions — Eliot now turns to the elevation of the monarchy itself, to the virtues by whose exercise and operation, condensed into two great purposes, the structure is to be raised. "Our next care must be how to obtain the virtue, how to possess the means, which must procure that end. And if that can be acquired, then is our felicity complete, then we have that perfection of our government, the summum bonum in philosophy, the bonum publicum in our policy, the true end and object of the monarchy of man. Two parts it has — action and contemplation. Of which the first divides itself into two branches, as the virtue agendo and dicendo, doing and saying, both which concur to action. By doing, is intended those travels and motions of the body that are necessary in the performance of those works which the duty and office of our callings require; — by saying, is meant that expression of the tongue, whereby the intelligence of the heart is made communicable to others, and the thoughts are conveyed to the understanding of the hearers. In these two all action does consist, and so that part of the virtue and perfection. Both these have a rule, and level, and di-
reaction, which we did touch before, as the common duty of mankind. In that duty their office is implied, which is that it be profitable to many. In the general good and benefit it must be extended, first to all, then, after, to ourselves." Here Eliot interposes in a parenthesis this valuable reminder:—"For all right of office is destroyed by the inversion of this order. To reflect first upon ourselves, our own particular interests, and then upon the general, is the contrary of duty, the breach of office and relation. Therefore to the publick, both our words and actions must first move, without respect, without retraction, for our private. They must first intend the common good and benefit, and so descend by degrees unto ourselves. For as members are in bodies for the perfection of the man, so men in bodies politicke, as parts of these societies, and for the conservation of the whole, and to that end their chief endeavour must incline." Eliot then, with a noble fervour, inculcating the practice of his own life, thus resumes: — "Here some questions will arise; — how far this shall engage us? what latitude it imports? what cautions and exceptions it admits? Difficulties may occur, and then involve us in anxieties, with troubles and perplexities disturbing our tranquillities, distracting the quietness we are in. And shall we forsake that sweetness? shall we neglect that fatness of our peace (as the fig and olive said of old) for the publick use and service? for the profit and commodity of others? Yes! no difficulties may retard us, no troubles may divert us, no exception is admitted to this rule! but where the greater good is extant, the duty and office there is absolute, without caution, or respect. That greater good appearing, nothing may dissuade us from the work — no respect of ease, no respect of pleasure, no respect of the troubles we may meet, — but in performance of that duty, in accomplishment of that office, our troubles must seem pleasant, our labours must seem facile, all things easy, all things sweet therein; — for the rule is, Officium non fructum sequi, to observe the duty, not the benefit, to seek that end which is propounded in the general, not to propound an end and reason of our own. But dangers may be incident? it may betray our safeties, and expose our fortunes, expose our liberties, expose our lives, to hazard? —
and shall we, then, adventure upon these? — shall we forsake our safeties? shall we incur those dangers, for foreign interests and respects, for that which concerns but others, which is foreign unto us? Yes, — this likewise we are bound to, our obligation lies in this. No danger, no hazard, may deter us. The duty and office stand entire."

In this first division of material for Elliot's grand structure, the reader will recognise the old principle of the ancients, in their separation of the characteristics of wisdom. The one, which we have just seen described, comprehending the beginning and end of all things to be done, φάντασις, prudentia; the other, which Elliot is now about to subjoin, compassing the manner and ways conducing to those ends, σοφία, sapientia. "The rest," he says, describing the latter, "all, follow this, and are but servants to this mistress,—several operations of this faculty having their appellations from their works. If we would ask what fancy does intend, what is the signification of that name, the answer is, 'Tis wisdom, — the divine spirit, of that faculty, that hunts out all intelligence. If we may enquire what memory does import, the same answer serves, 'Tis wisdom, the influence of that faculty. For where the fancy cannot keep all things upon intention, memory is suggested for supply of that defect, and so makes up the wisdom. If we would know what judgment does imply, the resolution is the same. 'Tis but an act of wisdom, the operation of that power. Therefore in this consists the perfection of all theory, the sum of all contemplation, and so that other part of virtue." Very beautiful is the passage that follows: — "But how may this wisdom, then, be had? Where may we seek and find it? The answer is most obvious, — in the doctrines of philosophy. For philosophy is the introduction to this wisdom; so both the word and reason do import; for by the word is signified only a love of wisdom, a love of that wisdom which we speak of; and that love will be accompanied with an endeavour to attain it, which is intended in the common sense and notion. For that science of philosophy is but a guest of wisdom, the study of that excellence. And so Plato gives it in his gradations unto happiness. Philosophy is the first step he makes, as the desire of wisdom; — to which he adds the study, and contempla-
tion to attain it. From that study and speculation he arises unto wisdom, from that wisdom unto happiness. So that philosophy is the principle. Wisdom does there begin, which has its end in happiness, and happiness in this order is the production of philosophy. In sum, all contemplation is but this, but this study of philosophy. If it ascend the heavens to view the glory of that beauty, philosophy does direct it. If it descend to measure the centre of the earth, philosophy goes with it. If it examine nature and her secrets, philosophy must assist it. If it reflect on causes or effects, that turn is by philosophy. The contemplation of all ends, all beginnings, all successes is propounded by philosophy. So that philosophy, in contemplation, is as prudence in the virtues, the architect and chief workman, that gives motion and direction to the rest. Great is the excellence of philosophy, as it is chief in contemplation, and the accomplishment of that virtue. Greater much it is, as it is a principle to wisdom, and an instructor to the counsel. But beyond all comparison it is greatest, as it is the first degree to happiness, as it leads on to that perfection of our government! No words can sufficiently express it, nor render a true figure of that worth. Being in contemplation, contemplation only must conceive it!"

The question then occurs — Which of these great divisions of the virtues is to be considered the highest and most perfect? — And Eliot answers it. As an exercise of the faculties, in pure and single grandeur, he pronounces at once in favour of philosophy, of contemplation; but is careful to modify this immediately after, by pronouncing no wisdom complete without the active practices of virtue. Speaking on the first head, he urges the superior greatness of the contemplative philosopher, in regard that his thoughts are fixed on the final intelligence: — "And he that levels at that mark, though he come short, yet shoots higher than he that aims but at man. Besides, there is this advantage in it; that nothing can be contracted from the president to prejudice or corrupt it, which lower examples may induce; but much perfection may be added, by the elevation of the mind. As chemicks in the disquisition of the elixar, though the wonder be not
found, yet have extracted great varieties by that labour, excellent demonstrations by that work. It is the way in part to resume the image we have lost, for that was not an outward figure, but a resemblance in virtue. If that similitude was laid in virtue, it cannot so aptly be repaired as by the imitation of the Deity, in whom the exactness of all virtue does remain. This help philosophy does give us in the speculation of eternity;— and likewise it derives to our present view and prospect the knowledge of all antiquity, in what their happiness consisted, what were the ingredients of that compound, and how it was lost at first, whence the judgement may resolve, what is true happiness to us.” On the second head, however, Eliot immediately subjoins: — “But if so,— if philosophy and contemplation have this fruit,— that these degrees of happiness be in them, and so direct a way to happiness itself,— how is it that we involve us in such toils, such anxieties and perplexities, to acquire it? It is a vanity, and folly, by such hard labour to effect, when a less trouble, a less travail, comes so near? If philosophy and contemplation can procure it,— those sweet and gentle motions of the soul,— what need the co-operations of the body, those actions and those passions, which virtue does require, and which so often force distraction, nay, destruction upon men? Yet they are needful, for without virtue, true happiness cannot be, and these compose the other half of virtue. For contemplation and action make the whole. Virtue consists only in both, and in part there is no perfection. Therefore to contemplation, action also must be joined, to make a compleat virtue, and by that virtue only true happiness may be had.” And, careful not to be misunderstood in what he had said before of the supremacy of contemplation, he adds (with an intimation that he will discuss the matter more fully in a future treatise—a project stopped by death!) that contemplation must be considered the chief of contemplation is the beginning of all action, the principle of that motion: action but a derivative of that, and no derivation can be equal to the primitive, no second comparable with the first. All actions are but the emanation of the will, and the will receives her instance from the apprehension of the mind. But still,” he adds, “both must
be concurrent. Virtue is a composition of them both. Contemplation must prepare the matter of our happiness, action dispose, and order it."

Eliot's great purpose now accomplished, he closes his labours with an exalted eulogy on the Independence and Superiority of the Mind. I present it to the reader entire. It is worthy to have closed a work of such nobility in conception, and power in execution.

"This makes up that perfection of our monarchy — that happiness of the mind, which, being founded upon these grounds, built upon these foundations, no power or greatness can impeach. Such is the state and majesty, that nothing can approach it, but by the admission of these servants; such is the safety and security, that nothing can violate or touch it, but by these instruments and argus; such is the power and dignity, that all things must obey it. All things are subject to the mind, which, in this temper, is the commander of them all. No resistance is against it. It breaks through the orbs and immense circles of the heavens, and penetrates down to the centre of the earth! It opens the fountains of antiquity, and runs down the streams of time, below the period of all seasons! It dives into the dark counsels of eternity, and into the abstruse secrets of nature! It unlocks all places, and all occasions are alike obvious to it! It does observe those subtil passages in the air, and the unknown paths, and traces, in the deeps! There is that great power of operation in the mind, that quickness and velocity of motion, — that in an instant it does passe from extremity to extremity, from the lowest to the highest, from the extremest point of the west, to the horoscope and ascendant in the east. It measures in one thought the whole circumference of heaven, and by the same line it takes the geography of the earth. The air, the fire, all things of either, are within the comprehension of the mind. It has an influence on them all, whence it takes all that may be useful, and that may be helpful in its government. No limitation is prescribed it, no restriction is upon it, but in a free scope it has liberty upon all. And in this liberty is the excellence of the mind,—in this power and composition of the mind, is the perfection of the man,—in that perfection is the happiness we look for,—when in all
sovereignty it reigns, commanding, not commanded,—when at home, the subjects are subject and obedient, not refractory and factions,—when abroad, they are as servants, serviceable and in readiness, without hesitation or reluctance,—when to the resolutions of the council, to the digests of the laws, the actions and affections are inclined,—this is that summum bonum, and chief good, which in this state and condition is obtain'd! The mind for this has that transcendence given it, that man, though otherwise the weakest, might be the strongest and most excellent of all creatures. In that only is the excellence we have, and thereby are we made superior to the rest. For in the habits of the body, in all the faculties thereof, man is not comparable to others, in sense and motion far inferior to many. The ancients suppose it the indiscretion of Epimetheus, having the first distribution of the qualities, to leave us so defective, when to the rest he gave an excellence in their kinds. As swiftness and agility to some, strength and fortitude to others; and whom he found weakest, these he made most nimble, as in the fowls and others it is seen; and whom he found most slow, to these he gave most strength, as bulls and elephants do express it; and so all others in their kinds have some singularity and excellence, wherein there is a compensation for all wants; some being armed offensively and defensive, and in that having a provisional security. But man only he left naked, more unfurnished than the rest: in him there was neither strength nor agility, to preserve him from the danger of his enemies—multitudes exceeding him in either, many in both—to whom he stood obnoxious and exposed, having no resistance, no avoidance for their furies! But in this case and necessity, to relieve him upon this oversight and improvidence of Epimetheus, Prometheus, that wise statesman, whom Pandora could not case, having the present apprehension of the danger by his quick judgement and intelligence, secretly passes into heaven, steals out a fire from thence, infuses it into man, by that inflames his mind with a divine spirit and wisdom, and therein gives him a full supply for all! For all the excellence of the creatures he had a far more excellence in this. This one was for them all. No strength nor agility could match it. All motions and abilities came short of this perfection. The most
choice armes of nature, have their superlative in its arts. All the arts of Vulcan and Minerva have their comparative herein. In this divine fire and spirit, this supernatural influence of the mind, all excellence organical is surprast; it is the transcendant of them all; nothing can come to match it; nothing can impeach it; but man therein is an absolute master of himself; his own safety and tranquility by God (for so we must remember the Ethicks did expresse it) are made dependant on himself. And in that self-dependance, in the neglect of others, in the entire rule and dominion of himself, the affections being composed, the actions so directed, is the perfection of our government, that summum bonum in philosophy, the bonum publicum in our policy, the true end and object of this Monarchy of Man."