

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_216891

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 942.062/17428 Accession No. 30806

Author *Mathew Gervie*

Title *Social Structure in Caroline*

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

THE
SOCIAL STRUCTURE
IN
CAROLINE ENGLAND

THE FORD LECTURES
DELIVERED IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
IN MICHAELMAS TERM 1945

BY
DAVID MATHEW

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1948

Oxford University Press, Amen House, London EX

EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

WELLINGTON BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS CAPETOWN

Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY CHARLES BATEY, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

P R E F A C E

THE following chapters include the substance of the six lectures delivered in Michaelmas Term 1945. They form an attempt to estimate and suggest certain trends in the development of the social structure in England during the years of the personal rule of Charles I. It is hoped that these pages may serve to indicate some fields that still await exploration. This study owes everything to the method and approach learned from my masters A. L. Smith and H. W. C. Davis.

D. M.

September 1947

CONTENTS

- I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PERIOD**
- II. A SURVEY OF THE MATERIAL**
- III. THE INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN POLICY .**
- IV. THE STRATIFICATION OF THE GENTRY .**
- V. THE EMERGENCE OF A PROFESSIONAL CLASS**
- VI. THE LAUDIAN AND PURITAN INFLUENCE**
- VII. THE MIDDLE CLASS AND CASUAL LABOUR**
- VIII. CONCLUSION.**

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PERIOD

THE conception of English history as divided sharply into chronological compartments is now seen as increasingly inexact. The origin of customs, habits of thought, and social trends can be traced very far into the past. On the other hand, a new balance or rearrangement of social forces is often almost crystallized before its character obtains due recognition. To give an example, the Revolution of 1688 did not witness the beginning of an oligarchic polity in England; on the contrary it only served to set the seal upon a slowly matured development in the English structure which had at length become apparent fact. The shift and displacement of political and economic forces was very gradual; for several generations the moulding of an oligarchy had proceeded through the length and breadth of England almost insensibly.

The changes in both Houses of Parliament and the slow building up and manipulation of those types of political 'interest' which marked the eighteenth century have masked to some extent more fundamental alterations in the social structure. In this connexion some examination is required into the circumstances of the emergence of the bureaucratic class, which would in time prove to be one of the norms of the English polity. It was characteristic of the writers of the Victorian period to give concentrated study to the legislature rather than to the administration. Yet it was the bureaucratic class, constantly shifting in its form and emphasis and varying in its method of recruitment, that was to provide an element of continuity in the social structure. The bureaucracy, in fact, became in time the residuary legatee of all these forces through whom the power of ruling had been expressed. For these reasons the beginnings of the modern bureaucratic milieu, considered as a cohesive unit, require close study, for its origins are relatively uncharted and it is not easy to discover how the grouping was built up in the early stages.

Inevitably the growing and the fading social forms existed side by side. Under this aspect dates are significant not so much as endings and beginnings but as revealing the continued

existence of older forms or as marking the point at which some novel element in the social structure seems for the first time to be seen clearly. It is manifest that the value of using dates for such a purpose lies in the ease with which such landmarks can be shifted. As we move across a territory which is only partially explored, conclusions must be tentative and subject to continual revision.

As an example the Essex Rising of 1601 may be held to have importance. It was not what was achieved nor even what was intended by this abortive conspiracy that remains upon the memory; the real significance resides in the light that is thrown on surviving custom in a circle that still retained political prestige. The Essex Rising is of particular interest as the last point at which a late medieval nexus in English politics seems still discernible.

By such a late medieval nexus is implied that relationship which involved an intermediate loyalty, the sense in which a soldier conceived himself as a sworn man to another of the queen's subjects. This seems clearly to have been the relationship in which Sir Gelli Meyrick, for instance, stood to Robert Devcreux second earl of Essex. Life on the great Welsh manors changed very little between the time of Owen Glendower and the last days of the sixteenth century. In fact the Reformation had broken upon the remote counties when the social unit still retained a predominantly medieval character-

In a fashion rather different to that of Wales a similar pattern was discoverable in those parts of the border country which were still subject to a few great families. The Northern Rising of 1569 reflects this undisturbed conservative way of life. The period of the war of the Roses had left its mark upon the old high seignorial stocks and it is difficult to imagine their power in active exercise except within a medieval setting. The method of the destruction of this paramount control was noteworthy. The former position of the Percies finally crumbled when the ninth earl of Northumberland was confined after 1605 to the south of England. This weakening feudal nexus could not survive Lord Northumberland's permanent separation from his northern castles and his native lands.

The household of Robert earl of Essex perhaps provides the last example of a military service in which a complete career

could be envisaged within the retinue of a single powerful subject. Around the Devcreux there clustered those gentlemen who still felt that their own knightly rank was only strengthened by the fact that they served Lord Essex in a brotherhood of the sword. This conception, which lingered in Wales until the close of the Elizabethan period, was vanishing in the English counties.

A comparison has never been established between the entourage of Lord Essex and that of his stepfather, the earl of Leicester. In fact the household and alliance of this great lord has never been the object of serious study. It would be interesting to discover to what extent the Welsh elements in Leicester's household, associated with the lordship of Denbigh, were responsible for its especial and somewhat antiquated character. A very definite change would seem to have come about after the breaking up of these two great entities.

Difficult as it is to assess the variations of the Elizabethan period it is clear that by the early years of the seventeenth century the county officials throughout England and Wales provided the fulcrum for administrative action. It is true that these appointments depended sometimes upon London but more often upon a knot of gentry wielding local influence. It was, of course, the strength of the squires that they parcelled out among their own number both the administrative and judicial posts. Not only was the commission of the peace filled from their ranks, but they also provided the captains and lieutenants of the royal castles, the vice-admirals, and comptrollers. In the counties, therefore, the official world was not in general bureaucratic in character. Rather it was composed of the members of that body of the squires which itself was the expression in terms of rural life of that emerging Leviathan, the great Whig oligarchy. At the same time in the towns the grouping of officials did take on the semblance of a nascent bureaucracy; such bureaucratic elements developed in the image of the administrative milieu in the capital which had been strengthening throughout the previous half-century. Outside London these groups were shadowy, insubstantial, and in no way self-contained; but the fact that they were present even in outline is significant.

It is necessary to consider the distinguishing marks of a bureaucratic society and these may be held to consist in a system of

graded preferment within an office constituted by the sovereign authority. This was a system very long familiar in Venice, a state which seventeenth-century Englishmen tended to regard with sympathy. In England the legal offices, that of the six clerks in chancery, for instance, had long partaken of this bureaucratic character. A great extension of this particular element in English life marked the whole Tudor period and culminated in the reign of Elizabeth. This development was particularly noticeable among the least influential and less well-paid sections. The position of the clerks of the Ordnance Office provides an example of these matured changes.

At the same time there was an ordered improvement in status in the higher ranks of the London bureaucratic class. The disappearance of the clergy from many sections of what was now almost a government service was not without its influence; the hereditary element among the office holders also shows an increase. In the formation of this official grouping we can trace both the cool thought and the lucid calculating practice of Thomas Cromwell. Not only was he in some respects the father of modern bureaucracy, but he also gave a clear expression to the patron-client relationship.

The relation between patron and client is of such consequence in the early-seventeenth-century social structure that it requires some preliminary comment. It is of the essence of the relationship in its political aspect that both patron and client should serve the State. It stands in contrast with that older situation still surviving in the Elizabethan period in which men trust themselves to some great lord and rise and fall with him. Difficult as it is to be exact, there would seem to be a contrast between the status of the men who were dependents of Robert earl of Leicester and those who were the friends, even if they were the propitiating dependent friends, of Sir Francis Walsingham. Broadly considered the household of the earl of Leicester absorbed men's energies, perhaps for all their lifetime. There was an element of the hierarchic at Leicester House, a grading in the retinue and a fixed place. Walsingham, on the other hand, as secretary of state had many clients on whose services he placed a constantly varying and different value. It is difficult to press these contrasts and each instance requires qualifying clauses. It may, however, in general be said that the

patron-client relationship was in the last resort flexible, transitory, and capable of adaptation. It was entirely free from the formidable immutability of earlier concepts. To take a practical example, Cromwell was not destroyed in the fall of his master Cardinal Wolsey.

In one direction at least it is necessary to qualify these observations. The matter of patronage in art and letters was a separate question; this is a relation which can be traced back far into the Middle Ages. Certainly by the beginning of the Stuart epoch we can perceive the multifarious forms which the conception of a patron-client relationship had taken on. In this period there was a special note attached to the* church patron and to the patron, or rather backer, in financial enterprises. By contrast a Renaissance element can be detected in the protectors of those who practised art and letters. On the one hand this seventeenth-century relationship tended to derive from that of the *miigtijuo*: Thomas earl of Arundel, for instance, fulfilled in some respects the Renaissance idea of the magnificent man who would take many human activities into his care. This was a line that in England went back through Robert earl of Essex to Sir Philip Sidney. All three belonged to the era of unspecialized patronage, princely and carefree, which was conceived as the rewarding of many diverse forms of human excellence. It was characteristic of this situation that the patron was considered as generous and the protegee as grateful.

This was, in fact, a spilling over of Renaissance preferences and was perhaps never really acclimatized in English life. In its origin it was continental and in its emphasis Italianate; it was seen in its late flowering in the cardinalitial patrons of Bernini and the Baroque world. The English grandees were too insular to accept a view of patronage that was so warm in temper and so elaborated in expression. The post-Elizabethans were affronted by each display of unrestrained magnificence; there was something to them old-fashioned in the courtly ideal that largesse should be poured away like sunlight.

With the exception of this Renaissance-Elizabethan strain one can detect a cool, almost a sedate, quality in English patronage. The patron-client relationship was one that came to be considered as eminently practical, creditable to the donor and useful to the recipient; it was in its earlier period sensible and

free from bitterness. In its English form it was thoroughly unemotional and cemented by such loyalty of view and integrity of character as the beneficiary could muster. Sir Robert Walpole would be the master of a patron-client relationship of just this character. Aided by a relationship so comprehensible the English governing circle moved out of the Stuart period into the coldness and sagacity of the eighteenth century.

These elements, however, developed gradually through a widening experience; they were not present in the experimental years of the reigns of the first two Stuart sovereigns. At that time the conception of a wide circle of dependent friends manoeuvring about the person of the king had come to characterize the royal circle. One aspect of the court life of this period is revealed in the career of Endymion Porter, a man who was above all useful, prepared to collect *objets d'art* for his patrons or carry through financial transactions or purchase land. Men of Mr. Porter's type would perform all those services with which a gentleman would oblige his superiors; this was a tradition that would last until the Industrial Revolution came to broaden and transmute the world of privilege.

It may be suggested that the generation to which Charles I belonged was the first in which one finds this combination of the amenities of a polite society with a sharp activity in financial matters. This was an amalgam which could endure as long as capitalism; hitherto, however, the merchant and the courtier had as types kept more distinct. It is, perhaps, the monopolies launched during the reigns of the first Stuart kings which reveal the presence of the *amateur* financier.

This phenomenon was itself the consequence of a fluidity in investment which a hundred years earlier would have been unimaginable. Its emergence was aided by the fact that the financial basis of the office-holding class in London was now beginning to take shape. The purchase of reversions to places of profit seems quite suddenly to have become a common practice. The definitive possession of an office of profit would in time breed the sinecure; reversions and sinecures would remain characteristic of the higher ranks of Georgian bureaucracy. These methods would flourish unimpaired until Charles Greville's generation; they would go down before the iron improvers of Victorian England. So many facets of English

oligarchic society can be traced back to the beginning of the Stuart period.

A most important factor in this field was the absence of any pension system. The practice of purchasing reversions and constituting sinecures was bound up intimately with the existence of this lacuna. Offices for life whose functions could be performed by deputy (the meaning of a sinecure) were the means of providing a stable income terminated only by the holder's death. This was one fashion in which a man of standing might lay out his new-found capital.

The absence of a pensions system gave an added keenness to the competition among retired public servants for such posts as the provostship of Eton. The forms of application for this prize would not vary very greatly between the reign of James I and that of George III. As has already been noted, we have reached the stage of numerous claimants each with his individual patron or patrons. There is here a contrast to the practice of the Elizabethan period which was in this as in so many other respects transitional in character. The idea of 'friendship and alliance', conceived of in terms of dependence on some great lord like Leicester or perhaps upon Lord Burghley and his family, had given place to the more equal rivalry of many men. It may be said that the structure of the official world in Elizabethan times was still pyramidal, while the early Stuart generation felt towards some aspects of equality within the circle of privilege which was now emerging. The broad zones of a new officialdom were very gradually becoming clear.

There is in all this period, and rather surprisingly, a note of freshness. Many reasons are responsible for this impression. On the one hand there was in the circle of the court a relaxation of tension as compared with that half-sophisticated lethal rivalry which the old queen's courtiers had displayed with so much courage. There was a pastoral element which Herrick rendered, and a certain quiet persisting courtesy. After the dramatized and public life of the Elizabethans privacy came breaking in like a slow tide. With this there went a certain sense of ease since privilege is mellow before it hardens. It was only in the high eighteenth century that bitterness crept into a patron-client relationship which had frozen in the hard Augustan calm. The feeling of Dr. Johnson towards Lord

Chesterfield was characteristic of the later time. It is well just to suggest this vernal quality, the English oligarchy in its brief swift springtime.

Within the general social structure the diverse elements were being moulded which would in time form themselves into a ruling class. The development of a grouping of professional financiers had made more progress than is often realized. Thus the fashion in which Lionel Cranfield, later lord treasurer and first earl of Middlesex, handled his manifold interests, both in the commercial and the financial sphere, presupposes a high degree of expert knowledge. Both the landed and mercantile classes were essentially fissiparous and sections of both were weighted with the deadwood of old-fashioned practice. In the higher-income levels the efficiency of management was normally in direct proportion to the accessibility of new capital. The old cumbered landed estate, that haphazard assemblage of manorial property, was most likely to pass over to insolvency in these changed times. It was no accident that the great broken-down fortunes of this period, those of the earls of Bath and Sussex for example, belonged to families of feudal tradition into whose chests and coffers no new capital had been injected. It was, perhaps, the vigorous stock of acquisitive Hcnrican landowners who now appear, from a financial point of view, to best advantage. The descendants of Sir William Cavendish or Sir William Petre benefited by their grandparents' shrewd bargaining in monastic property. In this field, too, Thomas Cromwell had shown himself a master.

With the new fluidity of capital there came the lineaments of that landed property which would retain its character until the mid-Victorian age. The Bedford Accounts, edited from the Woburn MSS., show that an era had been reached marked in its essentials by providence and management. Those great estates were growing which would not be altered in essentials until the coal seams were worked beneath them and the factories and the long industrial streets had come to modify the face of England. There was now in the early Stuart period a deliberate choice exercised in purchasing a manor and its farms. Amenities were for the first time examined and sometimes a fine mansion would change hands with only so much land as might ensure the maintenance of dignity. This practice was more common

in the home counties where men of wealth were attracted by the notion of a country house that was accessible to their friends who rode in summer-time across the shires. In this connexion in the lettered circle hospitality took on a note that was consciously civilized, those gatherings under Lord Falkland's aegis at Great Tew which mirrored certain aspects of Castiglione's // *Cortegiano*.

An example of the modern practice of the almost casual purchase of a large mansion is afforded by the sale of Bramshill to the second earl of Antrim in 1637. It is worth noting that the house was not altered in any way by its new owner. In this instance the purchase price was £14,000 and just sufficient land was bought to yield a rental of £400. A still closer parallel with what would be the established Hanoverian custom is provided by Lord Gottington's acquisition of Fonthill House in Wiltshire. The following letter to Lord Deputy Wentworth will convey the quality of the new type of purchaser, moneyed and a planner, anchored to the land only by preference:

'It is', wrote Mr. Garrard,¹ 'a noble place both for seat and all things about it, downs, pasture, arable, woods, water, partridge, pheasant, fish; a good house of freestone, much better for some additions he [Lord Cottington] hath new made to it. For he hath built a stable of stone, the third in England, Petworth and Hurlcigh-on-the-Hill only exceed it. . . £2,000 land a year he hath [purchased] about it; and whilst 1 was there his park wall of square white stone, a dry wall only coped at the top, was finished, which cost him setting up £600 a mile, but it is but three miles about.'

This surely approaches to the Victorian type of property, the stone stabling and the great park wall which carried with it the first rudimentary conception of the demesne. There now emerges that combination of recently established wealth with luxury and privacy.

Under one aspect the significance of the period may be held to lie in a landed economy already crystallized, within which were moving different sections whose stresses tended to the emergence of the larger unit. At the same time a bureaucracy was forming and the Elizabethan capitalist class was taking a clearer shape. It is roughly accurate to state that the wealthier

¹ Letter from George Garrard to Lord Deputy Wentworth, dated 9 October 1637, *Strafford Letters*, ed. W. Knowler (1740), ii. 118.

segments of both these groups, the new bureaucrats and the merchant capitalists, took to the land. A social amalgam in the narrow sense was slowly forming which would include all persons whose fortune could be described at least in part in terms of landed property. It was precisely in this quality of land ownership that the English secular sense of worth found its expression. It was here that Englishmen placed their true stability, in the landed men of property, not in the court.

After this brief survey of certain seventeenth-century trends one comment on religion is perhaps required to indicate in very general terms the way in which this factor held its place between the shifting interests. The lines of social cleavage divided those who broadly accepted the Established Church from the sections who rejected her in favour of free Protestant interpretations. In so far as social contacts are concerned the unbridgeable gulf between the groupings was that which separated the upper- from the lower-middle class. A religious enthusiasm, essentially literate in character, for it turned upon a deep perusal of the Bible, pervaded that section of opinion which was far from the promised land where justices of the peace exercised their recognized prerogatives. There were two variants of Puritanism, but in its fiery zeal it would reflect the religious approach of the unenfranchised. It would seem, in fact, that an element of social inequity and religious discrimination were required to keep that flame alive. The Puritan expression in its perfect form had little in common with that class religion professed by the French Calvinists of Coligny's persuasion or in Scotland by the Presbyterian lords. This point is only touched on superficially to indicate that the religious division when it came would lie between a high Genevan doctrine and a Puritan enthusiasm.

Following upon this introduction the lectures deal successively with an examination of the documentation bearing on this subject, with the court of Charles I which had its curious, diluted, and evanescent influence, with the stratification of the gentry and the new professional class, and with the town life in its different sections, the merchants and their employees, and the artisans. The Laudian and Puritan conceptions are examined and the specific Caroline emphasis in letters. The next chapter therefore contains a survey of the material.

II

A SURVEY OF THE MATERIAL

IN any consideration of the nature of the social structure at a given period the mass of informal documents, private letters, memoranda, notes, assumes a crucial significance. It is from such material that a view of the contacts between various sections of the community and of the political and economic interactions of different groupings can best be gained. The documentation bearing on this subject is extremely varied and no satisfactory survey of the field has as yet been attempted. It is perhaps simplest to provide a general examination of the evidence considering this class by class.

The first group of papers may be described as private informal correspondence. Under this heading would be placed all personal letters except those from men holding office writing in their official capacity. The quantity of such letters known to survive and dating from the first seventeen years of the reign of Charles I is considerably greater than that from any earlier period of similar length. In this respect the reign of James I is less well documented than that of his son, but the early Stuart decades considered together are in their turn incomparably richer in such material than the Elizabethan period.

The reasons for preserving correspondence were at this time gradually changing. The cases are now more numerous in which the intimate correspondence of husband and wife have come down to us; this was rare in the sixteenth century. The letters written by Robert Sidney first earl of Leicester to his wife Barbara Gamage are an outstanding example; in this instance they were kept among the great mass of the Penshurst Papers.¹ Under the Stuarts a filial piety, intertwined with a sense of dynasty, was itself a sufficient motive for such preservation. The quality of the papers retained was now less exclusively utilitarian. On the other hand the type of correspondence that has been preserved from the Elizabethan period is seldom with-

¹ This very long correspondence is in part calendared. The printed portion begins with an undated letter of 1587, *Cal. De Lisle and Dudley MSS.*, ii. 100, and concludes with a letter dated 29 October 1611, *ibid.* iv. 297.

out a more or less direct bearing on the family property. Thus it seems likely that even the most diffuse and extravagant letters, like those by Sir Thomas Tresham among the Clarke Thornhill MSS.,¹ have only been saved from destruction on account of the intrinsic value of their business data. The type of correspondence that has remained from the rich Elizabethan grouping is usually composed of letters to agents, stewards, or tutors, and those exchanged between the head of a family, his wife's male relations, and his uncles or brothers.² Papers of this kind with their details of payments and rents and leasehold properties had a certain continuing value for the successors to an estate.

In the first half of the sixteenth century a great mass of personal papers rarely survived except as a consequence of the writer's political downfall. In such a case letters might be confiscated by the royal officials and thereafter preserved. The classic example is the collection of documents, including many short notes, written by or to the Viscountess Lisle.³ The early Tudor work is as vivid as that produced under the Stuarts, but it is very much rarer. This point has still more force when applied to the question of memoranda and casual jottings. The planning of the private house bears upon this matter of preservation. Informal documents, especially when incomplete, depend for their survival on the existence of cupboards and, later, of closets. If we examine even a smaller manor of the period, like Great Maydekin in East Kent, so central to the composition of the *Oxinden Letters*, it is clear how papers could be hoarded in the peaceful years of the seventeenth century.

This said, it is worth noting that the more sustained and spontaneous series of private correspondence appear to emanate from the ranks of the established gentry rather than from the world of the peerage. One of the factors contributing to this situation may be found in the crowded character of the muni-

¹ *Cat. Clarke-Thornhill MSS., Hist. MSS. Comm.; Var. Coll.*, iii. 23-148.

² Cf. Rutland Papers, correspondence of Roger Manners with successive earls of Rutland. The letters of Dr. John Jegon to Elizabeth countess of Rutland are an early example of a series addressed by a cleric to his patroness, *Cal. Rutland MSS.* i. 249-63.

³ The bulk of this immense correspondence is listed in *Letters and Papers, Henry VIII*, viii. 15-xv. 1030. For an estimate of their value cf. A. L. Rowse, *Tudor Cornwall*, pp. 844-6.

ment rooms of the great families and the priority given there to official or quasi-official letters. Another factor is the destruction of private papers, as opposed to actual title-deeds, which seems on occasion to have taken place on the extinction of a male line.¹ Finally there are certain cases, that of Robert Carr earl of Somerset being the most notable, in which almost the whole of the private papers of some leading figure seem to have perished. In this instance the Overbury trial appears to have been the cause and perhaps also the occasion of systematic and careful destruction.

On the whole, letters coming from the homes of the gentry have a more general interest and a wider reference than those written in the great houses. This is partly due to the fact that the letter-writers, always allowing for filial reverence, are generally on more equal terms. There is a touch of freedom in letters exchanged between a father and his undergraduate son or between a small squire and his clerical brother. Among printed series of correspondence the *Oxinden Letters*² probably give the most comprehensive view of the broad social life of any one family. A wider interest attaches to the great mass of notes and letters written by or to Sir Edward Nicholas and now preserved in the Public Record Office.³ A certain remoteness from political issues is characteristic of both these groupings. By contrast the *Gawdy Letters*, which have been calendared,⁴ possess a more parliamentary bias; they reveal one point that is curious: the first beginning of what would in time be called the Country Party.

A difficulty in assessing this type of correspondence is due to the fact that it is usually, although not invariably, one-sided. In this period it is rare in the case of purely private letters to have

¹ It appears that no considerable body of papers survives belonging to the following families: Bourchier earls of Bath (ext. 1654), Danvers earl of Danby (ext. 1643), Wentworth earls of Cleveland (ext. 1667), Goring earls of Norwich (ext. 1672), Weston earls of Portland (ext. 1688), with the exception of the letters in the Record Office written by the first earl, and Ratcliffe earls of Sussex (ext. 1641).

² *The Oxinden Letters 1607-1642 being the correspondence of Henry Oxinden of Barham and his circle*, ed. Dorothy Gardiner.

³ From the point of view of the English social structure the most interesting section of these letters deals with the period when Nicholas was secretary of the Admiralty in 1625 and succeeding years. The four volumes of the Nicholas Papers printed by the Camden Society deal with the period after 1641. This also applies to the correspondence preserved at Wotton.

⁴ In addition the letters of Philip Gawdy (died 1616) have been edited by J. H. Jeayes for the Roxburghe Club.

both the original draft and the reply. Drafts, however, are sometimes found, especially in letters of importance relating to the sale or purchase of land. The letter book,¹ so characteristic a feature of eighteenth-century life, is still a rarity.

One other point may be noted. Already the women of the family had begun to take a part in the correspondence much greater than had been the case during the Elizabethan period. It is perhaps for this last reason that it is easier to detect references to religious opinion. Thus the Harley Correspondence, calendared among the Portland MSS., throws a light on certain Puritan points of view owing to the preoccupation of Brilliana Lady Harley² with these matters. Lady Harley's ideas are also set out in a series of letters to her son printed in a volume of the Camden Society.³ It is interesting to contrast the approach thus revealed with that of George Herbert's correspondence in reference to the help given by the Duchess of Lennox in building the steeple at Leighton Ecclesia.⁴

A subdivision of informal correspondence rather different in character from that previously considered covers the newsletter. This again may be entirely private or intended for the use of a wider circle. The need and, in fact, the fashion for the kind of regular information that a newsletter conveyed had developed in the early years of the seventeenth century. The most useful series, which contained a copious account of a certain type of current event, were compiled by John Chamberlain⁵ and sent to Sir Dudley Carleton in his various embassies. Such material is of its nature much more likely to be preserved since it has a clear bearing on public affairs; it has become accessible early. Certain letters from Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville and from John Pory to Sir Thomas Pucker-

¹ In this connexion cf. Professor Andrew Browning's comments on the so-called 'letter book' of Sir John Resesby preserved in the Bodleian, Rawlinson MSS. D. 204, introduction to *The Memoirs of Sir John Resesby*, pp. xvii-xviii.

² Brilliana, daughter of Edward first Viscount Conway, married Sir Robert Harley of Brampton Bryan in 1623; cf. *Cal. Portland MSS.*, iii. 17-117.

³ *Letters of Lady Brilliana Harley*, ed. T. T. Lewis, Camden Society, 1854. These letters are dated between 1625 and 1643.

⁴ Cf. letter from George Herbert to Nicholas Ferrar printed in *The Ferrar Papers*, ed. B. Blackstone, pp. 77-8.

⁵ The whole body of Chamberlain's letters were written between 1598 and 1625. The bulk of the originals are preserved in the Public Record Office. Many letters were printed in *The Court and Times of James I*, ed. R. F. Williams, and published as early as 1848.

ing, which had found their way into the Harleian collection, were printed¹ as far back as 1827. It may be said of this type of document that its value is often in inverse proportion to the general political significance of the affairs of which it treats. Thus certain of Mead's letters have an especial value just because they provide a glimpse of Christ's College, Cambridge. In general, newsletters of this kind deal with fashionable London, with the progress and decline of royal favourites, with marriages, settlements, deaths, and bequests. Sometimes they shed a light on the question of competition for various offices. An example of a purely private series is that preserved among the North Papers² in the Bodleian Library. It can be said that in general the whole purpose of this type of letter is to provide friends with the last new rumour; the normal tone is unescapably trivial.

The second category of material can be described as official and quasi-official correspondence. Collections of this nature can be grouped under two headings, the correspondence of members of the gentry holding high official rank and the papers of great officers of state. To the first group belong the immense mass of letters written by and to Sir Edward Conway and the similar very complete but smaller collection of the papers of Sir John Coke. Both men held the office of secretary of state. It is worth noting that there is no comparable body of personal papers belonging to Sir Dudley Carleton, who succeeded Conway, and that the records left by Sir Francis Windcbanck seem very scanty.³ We are still in a period of very unequal documentation.

It may be mentioned that both Sir Edward, later first Viscount, Conway and Sir John Coke left substantial properties;

¹ In *The Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, ed. Henry Ellis, the Mead letters are printed in the second series, vol. iii, pp. 233-40 and 263, while the Pory letters occupy pp. 266-78 of the same volume.

² The most interesting of these letters in which Sir John North retails the news of the court for the benefit of his family at Kirtling Tower are those written at different dates between 11 December 1635 and 6 September 1638.

³ The secretaryship of state was occupied as follows: Sir Edward Conway 1623-30, Sir John Coke 1625-39, Sir Dudley Carleton 1630-2, and Sir Francis Windcbanck 1632-40. Carleton left a mass of official papers, but very little of a private description. Sir Albertus Morton, who was secretary for a few months in 1625, appears to have left practically nothing. The Public Record Office holds an extensive documentation of the career of Sir Henry Vane the elder in the years before he became secretary.

there were opportunities for the arrangement of documents. It seems probable that many of Conway's letters now in the Public Record Office were brought to London when the papers of the second Viscount Conway were impounded. The Coke Papers are in the possession of Lord Lothian at Melbourne Hall,¹ where Sir John Coke originally placed them. He was at work on this matter during the years following his withdrawal from office. The notion of a retired statesman building up his private material seems to belong in a special fashion to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. '

The papers of great officers of state present quite a distinct problem. In the early Stuart, as in the Elizabethan, period, the papers of great ministers, whether private or official, were normally preserved in their own muniment chambers. It is in this way that the incomparable wealth of the Cecil archives has been safeguarded at Hatfield House.

Such collections inevitably differ from those of the squires' families. They have their own rules and their own methods; we are at times conscious of guiding principles. This is particularly noticeable when going through the endless letters of the first earl of Salisbury. The secretary has set all to rights and one does not seem to come upon the unpremeditated letter. At the same time the purely private documentation has been crowded out. No light is thrown upon the personal relationship between Lord Salisbury and his wife and son.

The whole character of the Hatfield Papers changes on the death of Lord Salisbury in 1612. They quite suddenly cease to be a primary source of serious value,² Nevertheless, they set an example of self-conscious documentation. Regarded in this light the first earl of Cork's *Lismore Papers*³ distantly recall the Hatfield collection. Lord Strafford's correspondence is singu-

¹ They form the bulk of the first two volumes of Ca/. *Cowper MSS.* published in 1888-9 when Melbourne belonged to the seventh Earl Cowper. Comparison with the originals shows that many of the letters were printed *in extenso*.

² The disorganized personal correspondence of the second earl of Salisbury (d. 1669) throws some light on the duke of Buckingham's position and more on the circumstances leading to the downfall of the first earl of Suffolk. The calendars have only reached 1605; there are transcripts in the Public Record Office.

³ Ten volumes of papers left by Lord Cork (d. 1643) and preserved at Lismore Castle were edited by A. B. Grosart and privately printed for the seventh duke of Devonshire in 1886-8. It may be noted that much good work was done at this period of the nineteenth century.

larly complete¹ and we come across in the Laud-Strafford letters the use of a simple numeral cypher. Occasionally the correspondence of great ministers has vanished almost completely; a mass of papers relating to Lord Treasurer Dorset was destroyed when Dorset House in Fleet Street was burned to the ground in the Great Fire of 1666.

In the period under review the Penshurst Papers come to a certain extent to fill the place occupied by the Hatfield collection. They have the very rare merit of being continuously rich over a period of almost a century. Without the clear political implications of the Hatfield Papers, they give the sense of the orderly long-term functioning of a great house. They are especially valuable on the financial side. Both Collins's and Blencowe's *Sydney Papers*¹ contain extracts from these Penshurst MSS., but the calendaring by the Historical Manuscripts Commission has not yet extended beyond 1612, the date reached by the fourth volume of the *De Lisle and Dudley MSS.* published in 1942.

Robert Sidney second earl of Leicester, who was ambassador extraordinary to France from 1636 to 1641, is a characteristic figure in this period and his correspondence is particularly valuable in view of the detachment of the whole Penshurst grouping from the court. The letters printed by Collins give perhaps the most balanced appreciation of the developing crisis of 1640-1 as seen from the rich and unimaginative circles of privilege. Such letters cannot avoid the defects of their qualities; there is a sense of arrangement.

It is a mark of these great collections that they seldom provide an entirely fresh angle as far as the correspondence contained in them is concerned. For the most part they have been dug across in a search for biographical details of such leaders as Strafford. In the eighteenth century there was a keen desire for personal letters; it is a new type of evidence that now awakens our interest. A note of unexplored novelty attaches to the third category of material which may be placed under the heading of commercial correspondence.

¹ Cf. *Letters and Dispatches*, ed. W. Knowler, 1739-40.

² *Letters and Memorials of State*, ed. A. Collins, 1746, and *Sydney Papers*, ed. R. W. Blencowe, 1825. The earlier publication is usually called 'Sydney Papers'. It is remarkable how much material for a judgement of Strafford's career had been printed before the end of the reign of George I I.

This class of evidence is comparatively rare and proportionately valuable. Correspondence of this kind is occasioned by business transactions but inevitably serves to throw light upon social conditions. In examining material of the type just described, attention should be drawn to the letters sent from Bilbao and addressed by Prestwick Eaton, an English factor, to his brother-in-law George Wellingham, who carried on business at the sign of the 'Golden Anchor' in St. Swithun's Lane. As in most other cases only one side of the correspondence has been preserved,¹ but the letters extant give a vivid picture of the life and tastes of the younger men in the central grouping of the middle class. Events and customs are judged in the light of London opinion; there is an apparently complete lack of interest in politics. One element appears clear. It seems likely that those who were placed at the economic level of the writer of the Eaton-Wellingham Letters would seldom maintain a continuous correspondence except to record commercial transactions.

The tastes of the wealthier section of the same world of the London citizens are reflected in the letters sent to Lionel Cranfield by his father-in-law Richard Sheppard, a grocer resident in the city parish of St. Christopher by the Stocks, and preserved among the still unexplored treasures of the Sackville MSS.² These papers, and particularly this second series, lack the reticence which marks those from the squires' houses. Debt, drunkenness, and family scandal are all set out. It is natural that the candour of their tone should be one of the reasons which made the preservation of such papers unlikely. Certainly only a very small selection appears to have survived. In town houses the muniment chest is of signal importance; it is evident that the only letters which are likely to have come down to us are those from families whose circumstances were financially on the up-grade.

The fourth and last category in this rather arbitrary division of the letters remaining from the time of Charles I is that which

¹ These letters, now in the Public Record Office, were written at intervals between 1631 and 1642. The first, dated 31 January 1631, describes Eaton's departure from England, *State Papers, Dom., Charles I.*, clxxxiii. 48.

² The whole body of the Cranfield Papers which passed to Lord Sackville as heir general to the dukes of Dorset and to Lionel earl of Middlesex are on loan at the Public Record Office.

may be called for want of a more exact expression domestic correspondence. Under this heading are included letters written by stewards and domestic middlemen to their employers. The value of this type of evidence, in so far as it does not come under the heading of memoranda, depends upon the information provided as to the standards and way of life of those in subordinate employment. An example of such material already printed is the correspondence of Nathan Walworth, who was steward to the earl of Pembroke at Baynard's Castle; these letters, however, were addressed to a colleague.¹ The most interesting series consists of letters written by and to Richard Harvey, who was steward and general factotum to the family of Sir William Calley of Burderop in Wiltshire. Richard Harvey's brother Roger Harvey was a weaver at Taunton and his correspondence provides a rare glimpse of lower-middle-class life.² The impecunious relatives of Richard Harvey probably belonged to the poorest cross-section of the population who were accustomed to put pen to paper in any consecutive letter writing. It is worth noting that in these cases much more information is provided about the employer's family than about the writer's own relations. Further, such papers nearly always owe their preservation to the family of landed gentry to whose head they are addressed.

It may be said that regarded as evidence all letters have certain characteristics in common. They are marked by an element of reticence and by the formalism of their period, however varying may be the manner in which this quality is expressed. They presuppose a knowledge of the world from which they issue. Further, a certain amount of letter-writing is affected by the added caution derived from the realization that this material may be preserved; this last consideration is in particular applicable both to the more or less political correspondence and also to the purely business items.

¹ *Correspondence of Nathan Walworth and Peter Seddon*, Chchtham Society, 1880.

² The more interesting section of this correspondence covers the period between 27 November 1637 and 2 September 1639, *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, ccclxxii. 63-ccccxxviii. 12. The last letter of the series gives the financial standing of the family. It is addressed by Roger Harvey to his brother. 'My mother has been very dangerously sick and doth yet so remain. She has devised all the goods to her daughter Jane and her husband so secretly that I only obtained knowledge of it through our minister Mr. Godwin. The inventory of the goods came to £7 odd.'

Journals, diaries, and autobiographies have an analogous character except that all autobiographical writing is intended for a widening circle, even if only for the writer's descendants. Diaries in this period are often sketchy in character and are sometimes bound up with expense sheets, a form of evidence to be considered later. The valuable journal of Adam Eyre¹ is a work of this kind, more closely related to farm accounts than to the formal diary of the type composed by John Evelyn. Another class of diary, the political journal constructed by a member of parliament, has seldom any direct bearing on the changes and form of the social structure.

There is in the broadest sense of that term a literary quality which is common to the categories of material that have been mentioned. With the exception of certain diaries which are continuous but rough,² there is a form of finish that has been given to all these manuscripts. The whole body of documentation is shaped and ordered, superscribed, and carefully traced out: it is in letter form. On the other hand, a quite novel impression of the structure of English life is obtainable from the mass of fragmentary and often inchoate material.

We here reach a method, which, though it was known in the mid-nineteenth century,³ was only co-ordinated in recent years. It may be described as the examination of the social structure by the sinking of shafts through different levels. Certainly this fragmentary material throws a light on the actual grouping from which it emanates, but its principal value is that it reaches to those who live at a lower wage-rate than that to which literary evidence reaches.

The natural subdivisions of this great body of papers would

¹ *Catalogue of all my actions and expences from the ist of January 1646-7 till 26 January 1648-9*, by Adam Eyre, printed by the Surtees Society in 1877. This has a particular value on account of the writer's social background. He is described as 'yeoman' in deeds and in his will as *generosus*. Journals kept by Adam Eyre from 1642, when he was serving under Ferdinando second Lord Fairfax, appear to have perished.

² The first of the eleven MS. volumes of the diary of John Greene was written in 1635 when he was aged nineteen and keeping terms at Lincoln's Inn. It is a rare example of a boy's unpremeditated jottings. Cf. 'Notes' by E. M. Symonds, *E.H.R.* xliii. 385-9.

³ The four remarkable volumes of the stewards' house and farm accounts of the Shuttleworths of Smithills and Gawthorpe covering the period from September 1582 until October 1621 were edited by John Harland for the Chetham Society in 1856-8.

seem to include the inventory and will, the catalogue (especially of books) and general memoranda. The inventory is of much importance; it is normally found in conjunction with a will, but is sometimes entirely separate. The practice of inventory-making apart from the requirements of probate appears usually to be confined to the very rich, whose stewards would schedule the many effects in their large town-houses. It seems that the motive for such compilation was the desire to secure the rights of the heirs on the decease of the great personage whose gear is thus enumerated. While all inventories are chiefly of value for the way of life and habits of the men by whose orders they are prepared, a certain indication is sometimes given as to the furnishing of the living-quarters of the servants in big establishments.¹ The more remarkable specimens of this type of document tend to date from a rather earlier period than that which we are now considering. Thus the great inventories dating from 1583 and 1588 of the property and household gear of Robert Dudley earl of Leicester are probably among the most perfect specimens of their kind. The inventory relating to Kenilworth Castle is printed almost entire in the first volume of the *Calendar of De Lisle and Dudley MSS.*² and that relating to Leicester House in the seventy-third volume of *Archaeologia*.

The inventories of movables preserved among the uncalendared Wardour Castle MSS.³ give a detailed view of the situation of a landed family which would receive a peerage from James I. At the end of the period under survey we find two important inventories which can act as a comparison and a control for the changes of habit in the richest classes; the inventory taken at Worcester House in the Strand⁴ and that of the goods in the unnamed residence of the Dowager Countess

¹ Careful distinction is necessary between the status of stewards, dependants often related to or connected with the family, and servants in the Victorian sense. Cf. for a discussion of the position of Nan Kudd and Luce Sheppard in the household at Claydon, *Memoirs of the Verney Family*, ed. Frances Parthenope Lady Verney, i. 295 and ii. 175-7, 225-30, 265.

² The chief items are printed in *externa*, *CaL De Lisle and Dudley MSS.*, pp. 278-98.

³ 'An inventory of all the ornaments and household stuff in Wardour Castle, Anstye House and Shaston House taken ye xth of August 1605', no. 239, Arundell of Wardour MSS.

⁴ Inventory of Worcester House printed in *Archaeologia*, xci. 170-80.

Rivers;¹ both date from 1644. It may be noted that the value of the objects described is seldom given and that it is not easy to trace the descent of any particular movable.² It is likewise very rare for the provenance of an object to be mentioned;³ this is more likely to be set out in a will than in an inventory. As an example, when horses passed by will in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods details of their former ownership are sometimes supplied.⁴

Inventories of the kind under discussion appear to be most common among the very rich and also among the established commercial middle class where they could be used to assist in stock-taking. For a man of some substance not connected with trade an inventory would seem to have been something of a luxury. With the exception of the brief inventory taken for the purpose of probate,⁵ this type of document appears to be relatively rare among the papers left by families who belonged to the medium or to the lesser gentry.

On the other hand, the will has long been recognized as a most useful source for determining the character and extent of the household and other movable goods in the hands of the general body of the country gentry or of the wealthier section among yeoman farmers. Owing to the mass of material,

¹ An inventory of the goods of the Dowager Countess Rivers at some house not named taken on 28 June 1644, *Rep. Verulam MSS.*, pp. 35-51.

² Occasionally some rare curio can be traced. The crystal and silver chessmen at Kenilworth seem to have passed to Sir Orlando Bridgeman before 1674.

³ i.e. 'in the great p'lor [parlour] one great foote carpett . . . bought of Sir Wm Claveir, Arundell of Wardour MSS.

⁴ Cf. details of the will of Sir Matthew Arundell witnessed in 1598, P.C. (12 Kidd), 1508-9, "To Lord William Howard £100 and the gelding which I had of Dick Brooke. To Captain Davis my white mare which came from Sir John Peters (Petre)."

⁵ A cross-section of one aspect of north-country life can be obtained from the inventories preserved in the Registry of Durham and printed by the Surtees Society, vol. 142, 1929. These include the inventories taken in September 1618 of the goods of Thomas Chaitor kept at Batterby or in his house at Durham. One of the most detailed inventories is that of Sir Arthur Gray of Splindleston taken on 1 June 1636: it gives a list of the bonds in his possession including one of Sir William Fenwick's for £500. John Shafto of Swalwell, miller, tenant to Mr. Arthur Shafto, represents the least prosperous element in Durham life covered by this survey. An impression of the condition of the domestic staff is given in the inventory of Robert Milott of Whithill. After detailing the contents of the nursery, the white chamber, and the gallery chamber, there comes this entry: 'in another little chamber to the north of the gallerie, three truckle bedds with bedd clothes for servantes, 6s. 8<1/2>', pp. 85-6, 268, 259-60, 159.

already prepared and uniform in style, it is a much simpler task to correlate data preserved in wills than to reach conclusions based solely on inventories and rough memoranda.

An impression of one aspect of cultural development can be obtained from a study of book catalogues examined with care. Here again a formal catalogue resembles a detailed inventory in being seldom found in connexion with libraries in private ownership except in the very wealthiest households. Thus there are catalogues dating from about 1660 of the books then comprised in the libraries at Penshurst Place and Naworth Castle. Libraries in the possession of corporate bodies naturally present fewer difficulties; the rich field of the episcopal libraries awaits exploration. As far as college libraries are concerned, the annotations in the volumes in the Perne Library at Peterhouse are very valuable. This library was founded in 1589 on the death of Dr. Perne, master of Peterhouse. Between that date and 1646 notes are entered of the names of donors of fresh volumes and the time that the books were received. In this connexion the diary of Thomas Grosfield, a fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, has an interest in regard to books kept by the tutors in their own rooms.¹ There is shrewd commentary in this diary on events in the years between 1630 and 1638. Any accessions register dealing with a college or episcopal or capitular library in the period before the Civil war is bound to yield material of value.

In addition to a study of reading matter it is possible to make a valuation of other cultural factors operating in the reign of Charles I. Thus some light can be thrown on portrait painting both from the detailed type of inventory and also more especially from that class of general memoranda which is about to be described. Occasional notes provide the names and charges of visiting painters in the Home Counties² and at the other end of the scale there are certain lists of purchases for the duke of Buckingham or for the royal collection. Lists of paintings given room by room are very rare until the eighteenth century. An instance is the description of the portraits in the bishop of

¹ Cf. for Otho Nicholson's catalogue and the books in Mr. Gerard Langbaine's chamber, *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield*, ed. F. S. Boas, pp. 60 and 68.

² Cottington, a picture drawer, came to our Island [Wight] in February 1632*, *The Commonplace Book of Sir John Oglander of A'unweli*, ed. Francis Bamford, p. 86. And for Kent, *The Oxinden Letters and Peyton*, p. 168.

Durham's gallery at Bishop Auckland which occurs in the *Journal of Sir William Brereton*.¹ In regard to sculpture the notes of the commissions obtained for and the prices charged by Hubert le Sueur would make an interesting subject for investigation.

A curious point may be made. The formal journal or diary has another and perhaps unexpected lacuna; it seldom provides information of the cultural background. The very fact that such a document often concentrates upon commercial or political matters is itself the reason why reference to the amenities so rarely appears. There is, however, one quality found in parliamentary journals; they sometimes throw a sharp light on surviving or emergent expressions.²

A source of information, which strikes much deeper roots than those just now enumerated, is provided by what can best be termed general memoranda. It is by no means easy to bring this class of material under exact headings, but attention may be drawn to two subdivisions, accounting for purpose of trade and the construction of expense sheets. The former type of document has its own specialized significance, but our investigation is concerned with noting changes in the social structure. The classic example of a great body of material of this general character is the Sackville collection now on loan at the Public Record Office. Quite apart from technical economic history these manuscripts are invaluable for a study of the daily life and its complex trends. They contain the mass of papers of Lionel Cranfield first earl of Middlesex with their almost unique presentation of the trading ventures of a London mercer with strong hereditary connexions in Hamburg, Lubeck, and Stade. The element of an admixture of classes can be traced in the partnership between Cranfield and Sir Arthur Ingram of Temple Newsam on the one hand and their joint relationship with the peers whom they agreed to accommodate

¹ 'Here [at Bishop Auckland] are 3 dining roomes: a faire matted gallerye: wherein there was placed on both sides these pictures: Jo: Huss: Hierom of Prauge: Luther: Zuinglius: . . . Bucer: etc. and none butt of this straine', *Journal of Sir William Brereton*, Surtees Society, vol. 124, 1915, p. 10.

² Cf. a sentence in Mr. Thomas Crew's speech made in the House of Commons on 26 November 1621. 'It were excellent that we might crop the House of Austria, and stop the Indies from him. Every one would give with a swift and open hand', anonymous journal, *Commons Debates*, ed. Wallace Notestein, etc., ii. 451. Here is an expression of the time of Raleigh now seen as outmoded.

with loans.¹ Many of the strands in a capitalist-oligarchic composite are already discernible, but it is worth noting that in this particular mixed grouping all the members had a certain initial financial strength. The way to capitalist influence was as yet hardly open to one who began his career without resources and as a mere adventurer.

The Cranfield Papers are especially rich both in general memoranda and in expense sheets. A comment may be made upon this second category of material. Both forms of documentation exist in great quantities, seldom co-ordinated and as yet only very imperfectly explored. The variety is considerable and includes both elaborately kept weekly or monthly expense sheets and also casual jottings on half-sheets of paper. Manuscripts of this description are to be found among most collections of a mixed² character which have survived from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Perhaps the particular importance of this class of document lies in the light thrown upon the economic situation of sections of the population quite remote from the world of privilege and unaffected by official price regulation. Here is one of the few shafts that can be sunk to reach the life of the great mass of the under-servants and those workers who depended on casual gifts rather than on their low fixed wages. There are many examples of this type of material, the most important body of papers surviving from this period being perhaps the elaborate expense sheets of the second Viscount Conway. These, together with the less valuable series relating to the affairs of Endymion Porter, are preserved with the rest of the impounded Royalist documents in the Public Record Office. They give a view of the whole world of the parasites of the rich, a view which in its detail has no parallel from the Elizabethan times. An ordered study of the living conditions and rates of pay of under-servants would have much value.

This survey does not include within its scope any legal or administrative enactments for these form a framework which

¹ Lord Howard of Effingham, who had dealings of this character with Cranfield, is mentioned as a financially embarrassed peer by Professor R. H. Tawney in 'The Rise of the Gentry', *The Economic History Review* (1941), p. 10.

² Cf. *The Household Books of Lord William Howard at Naworth Castle*, ed. Rev. George Ormsby, Surtees Society, 1878. In this instance the period covered is the first forty years of the seventeenth century, but the style of living is Elizabethan.

has been long familiar. For other reasons there has been no examination at this stage of documents that appear to have been composed with a view to publication. In this matter it is, however, difficult to lay down an exact rule for such an idea may have been present in the mind of some of the writers of newsletters. It seems simpler to take stock of contemporary published writing in the course of a consideration of the general political and social scene which precedes a survey of the shifting impact of the different classes.

III

THE INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN POLICY

IN a broad sense the first period of the reign of Charles I can be held to last from his accession to the throne on the death of his father James I on 27 March 1625 until the setting up of the royal standard at Nottingham on 12 August 1642, a date generally accepted as the beginning of that confused period the Civil wars. As far as the king's personal life is concerned there is good reason for marking as a critical date 23 August 1628 when there took place the assassination of the duke of Buckingham, who was at once his chief minister and the sole confidant of his solitary spirit. From a constitutional point of view a special character attaches to the eleven years of the king's rule in which no recourse was had to the Lords and Commons between the dissolution of the third Parliament of the reign on 10 March 1629 and the meeting of the Short Parliament on 13 April 1640. Very different in its implications from Buckingham's murder, there is reason to call attention to the earl of Strafford's impeachment, which was opened before the House of Commons on 23 March 1641. These, therefore, are the salient dates and the limits in time of the present study.

All divisions of time have an arbitrary character and such changes as occurred in the structure of English life as a consequence of the Civil wars did not manifest themselves until after the royal defeat at Naseby and the king's surrender to the Scots at Newark in June 1646. Inevitably the purge came earlier to Cambridge¹ than to Oxford, but the effects of proscription were very gradual.² On the other hand, in the first part of the period there are no landmarks which either impeded or defined the slow shift and balance of forces. At the same time the peculiar stillness which characterized the years between 1629 and 1640 make them an admirable vantage-point from which to survey the social field. The fact that during this decade there was no Parliament to vote supplies prevented the possibility of the sovereign undertaking foreign wars.

¹ Richard Crashaw was ejected from his fellowship at Peterhouse in 1643.

² Robert Herrick was ejected from his living at Dean Prior in 1647.

One general observation has, perhaps, a certain justice. There is a parallel, not yet adequately examined, between the situation in England and France during the reigns of Charles I and Louis XIII.¹ The position to which Strafford was attaining under his own king was not altogether unlike that which Richelieu actually achieved² in the French state. Neither man was a favourite; they were great authoritarian ministers with a high concept of the role of monarchy. It is possible that this parallel between the two polities may be brought forward a little farther since it seems that a resemblance can be traced between the early stages of the Civil war in England and the French wars of the Fronde. Under one aspect they can both be considered as manoeuvres by segments of the property-holding classes. The matters which united the Parliamentary and the Royalist peers were much more considerable than anything that divided them.

Into this rather unreal and Fronde-like quality of the Edgehill and Chalgrove Field phase of the conflict there was injected a wholly novel element: the emergence and creation of the new model army, what is roughly known as Cromwell and his Ironsides. The power of the army, which from 1644 was the victorious and dominating factor, was something which no one had envisaged when Charles I raised his standard at Nottingham. It was this power of the army which made possible expressions of opinion like that of the Levellers and the Diggers; in this way layers of experience were uncovered which otherwise would not at that time have found means of expression. Such military power emerged as insular in its conceptions and was unique in its method of application; it was inevitably short lived.

¹ The brothers-in-law were almost exact contemporaries; Charles I was born in 1600 and Louis XIII in 1601. The French king's effective rule may be dated from the death of the due de Luynes in 1621. Strafford was born in 1593 and Richelieu in 1585. Louis XIII died in 1643 and Richelieu in 1642.

² In this connexion a parallel between Laud and Richelieu has interest as showing the hold that the great cardinal had upon the imagination of his contemporaries; Sir Thomas Roe is writing on 5 April 1635 to the queen of Bohemia giving a character of the new primate: 'Small requests repeated, and for others, abate the finest edge, and his [Laud's] nature would rather do one great service than twenty trifles for upon less than great actions he is not set. Being now so great he cannot be eminent and show it to the world by treading in beaten paths and the exploded steps of others, but he must choose and make new ways, to show he knows and can do more than others. This only has made the Cardinal Richelieu so glorious.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cclxxxvi. 34.

The note of insularity, which would not be present in Cromwell's foreign policy, has been remarked upon by observers as a characteristic of English thought in the peaceful decade of King Charles's reign. We lose the assistance of the series of letters in the Salvetti correspondence¹ in December 1628 but the Venetian transcripts in the Public Record Office bear on this point. 'That great kingdom,' wrote² Vincenzo Gussoni in the annual relation on the affairs of England sent to Venice on 13 April 1635, 'overconfident perhaps in its position, interests itself but little in the present troubles of Europe, and even less in those which may arise.'

The early years of the reign had been adventurous. There had been the short war with France, the expedition to the Isle of Rhé to help the Huguenots, the martial projects of the duke of Buckingham. With the favourite's death the desultory hostilities with France lost all their meaning. The dissolution of Parliament in 1629 made war impracticable. The peace concluded between Louis XIII and the Huguenots deprived the conflict of its purpose. On 24 April 1629 the French war was closed by the Treaty of Susa. In November of the following year the Treaty of Madrid ended the state of hostilities with Spain which had lasted for years without actual battle.

A solitary object of foreign policy was the restoration of the king's brother-in-law the Elector Frederick V to his hereditary lands, the Upper and Lower Palatinate, which had been lost when he had been expelled from Bohemia whose crown he had accepted. These territories were now garrisoned in the case of the Upper Palatinate by Bavarian, and in the case of the Lower Palatinate by Spanish and Imperial, forces. In so far as he had a persisting purpose in foreign affairs, King Charles desired to regain the Palatine dominions for his sister's family. Still it was not possible to construct a serious foreign policy if the Crown was determined not to have recourse to war in any set of circumstances which could normally be envisaged. The next

¹ These letters, known as the Skrine MSS., were translated by Heath Wilson from the originals in the Archives of Florence and printed in 1887 in the eleventh report, Part I, of the Hist. MSS. Commission, pp. 1-184. Transcripts of the whole of the official correspondence of Amerigo Salvetti (formerly Alessandro Antelminelli), a native of Lucca who was the representative of the grand dukes of Tuscany at the English court, are preserved in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 27962.

² *P.R.O. Venetian Transcripts*, xxiii. 460.

Venetian ambassador underlines this element in the situation. 'They (the English)', wrote Anzolo Correr¹ in his relation dated 24 October 1637, 'do not seem to take an interest in anything apart from themselves unless it be so far as the interests of the Palatine compel them to do so.'

It is clear that this note of relative if involuntary political isolation did not characterize all sections of English life for not only the Elizabethan inheritors but also the dominant section among the Puritans possessed a strong feeling for the Protestant elements in the contemporary continental scene. At the same time in order to define the influence of the court on the English social structure it is necessary to observe that if the king's *entourage* was culturally open to foreign, and especially French, influence, it was politically isolationist in the then financial stringency. This gives a shadowy quality to the king's efforts in the matter of the Palatinate and severely restricts the meaning of the terms 'French' and 'Spanish' which were applied to rival political trends.

Both these expressions were normally used of rivals² and neither was accepted by those political figures who held or were presumed to hold the point of view indicted. It need hardly be explained that in the popular mind a particularly unpleasant flavour was attached to the label 'Spanish', connoting as it did the aims of Philip II and the Armada, the Spanish pensioners in the reign of James I, and the ramifying affiliations of the then Spanish ambassador Count Gondomar.

In actual fact the so-called Spanish party included a wide range of political opinion always within the framework of a certain unemotional attachment to the Stuart dynasty. Strangely enough, in the court circles it was the hall-mark of those who were determined to avoid a foreign war; the standpoint appealed to men whose whole approach was insular. Thus the Spanish grouping included those who favoured peace and retrenchment as well as those who were temperamentally attracted to a policy of spun-out negotiation. This standpoint appears to have proved congenial to the mind of the practising

¹ P.R.O. *Venetian Transcripts*, xxiv. 329.

² Cf. Letter from Lucy countess of Carlisle to her husband, then in Venice, written in the latter part of 1628 apparently on 22 December. The writer explains that Lord Carlisle is 'thought hugely Spanish', *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cxxiii. 6.

official actually in employment and perhaps especially to those who were anxious to obtain a term of peaceful years in which to carry through administrative measures. The more serious leaders of the Spanish party were eminently practical; Strafford maintained this view throughout his career in the royal service. It was at the core of extra-parliamentary Royalism for the group which favoured an alliance with or rather a benevolent neutrality towards Spain admitted that force could not be used upon the Continent for the time being. Such men recognized that the king would be dependent upon Parliament if ever he were once involved in war. The old and the new servants of the Crown found themselves at this point in agreement. Carlisle and Portland came to this policy as much as Cottington or Strafford. Laud, in so far as he was concerned with foreign matters, took the same view, a standpoint which was equally constructive and unpopular.

It may be said that the chief supporters of this party were isolationists in effect. They did not forget that the financial situation was inevitably precarious; they were undramatic, sober, and realist. The position was, however, complicated by the fact that among the adherents of this line of policy there were certain men who had a real flair for tortuous and sustained negotiation. Sir Henry Vane the elder was an example of this type of politician. It may be remarked that with the exception of Sir Tobie Mathew there were no busy Catholics among the active members of the 'Spanish' party. Nevertheless the names mentioned indicate that this point of view belonged to those who were familiar with the royal *entourage* and official circles. Some were attached to a regalian theory and a few might be repelled by court extravagance. It seems reasonable to suggest that it was a standpoint which did not percolate beyond that area of opinion which the court directly touched. Before discussing the 'French' party it is necessary to make a comment on the queen's position.

At this point the influence of Queen Henrietta Maria need only be considered in so far as it affected the trends in foreign policy. Still, perhaps to put the matter in this way would be to over-state it. Effective action being in fact impracticable it was rather a question of influencing the fashion in which continental preferences in foreign affairs were envisaged. The queen's

political action has been examined and re-examined, but at least in the first period of the reign it can hardly be said to have possessed significance. Her knowledge, even of the English language, was never adequate, and her interventions seem always guided by a very rigid opportunism. She had come to England as a bride of sixteen and was married in the year of the king's accession. Her father *Henri Quatre* she never knew; her mother was a trial to her. A mind apparently little interested in any theory of politics was yet governed by a French sense of the royal autocracy which was reinforced by Austrian values. She was the first and only English queen to inherit in a near degree the blood of the house of Austria. She was profoundly loyal to the interests of her brother Louis XIII as she conceived them. Her character was compact of strong antagonisms and she never cared for Cardinal Richelieu.¹

At the same time King Charles's sister, the queen of Bohemia, favoured the general line² of the French policy since this was opposed to the Hapsburg power in Austria and Spain by which her husband Frederick V had been despoiled. For these reasons the 'French' interest was a very complex one. All those who were light-mindedly attached to Henrietta Maria favoured it as did to a less degree the queen of Bohemia's earnest men. It had behind it the driving power of anti-papal sentiment and the party of action. In consequence all those who favoured intervention on the Protestant side in the Thirty Years war inevitably supported it. The alliance between Cardinal Richelieu and the king of Sweden meant that those who saw Gustavus as a deliverer were 'Trench' in outlook. The inheri-

¹ Cf. an instruction for the comte d'Estrades on leaving for England dated at Ruel 12 November 1637. The original of this document attributed to Cardinal Richelieu appears to be lost. Copies survive in the Medici and Imperial Vienna archives, Foscarini collection. 'Et arm que le comte d'Estrades soit informe de toutes choses, pour mieux exlcuter les intentions du roy, il sgaura que madame de Chevreuse ayant aigri l'esprit de la royne d'Angleterre contre moy ... il faudra pressentir en quels sentiments la royne d'Angleterre sera pour moy avant de se declarer.' *Lettres, instructions diplomatiques et papiers d'Etat du Cardinal de Richelieu*, ed. G. Avenel, vol. v, 1635-7, P- 887.

² This statement needs some qualification, for the queen and her adviser Sir Thomas Roe would have preferred if possible to act without French aid. In writing to Sir Robert Anstruther on 29 October 1630 Roe gave it as his opinion that any 'papist-blinded estate(s) are Egyptian reeds'. On 5 April 1635 he told the queen of Bohemia that it was an argument of her great wisdom rather to suffer than choose the French. *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, clxxiv. 101, and cclxxxvi. 34.

tors of the Elizabethan tradition, which had remained entrenched among the envoys, desired to see a vigorous Trench* policy implemented. Both Secretary Dorchester, with all his caution, and Sir Thomas Roe were of this mind. It went with hostility to Spain and a desire for action on the Continent.¹

In this broad sense the policy thus advocated was widely popular in circles stretching far beyond the court through both the older and the younger generations of the gentry. It is interesting to note that on two different flanks this policy attracted those who were not in any specific sense doctrinally Royalist. Thus a number of those who were among Queen Henrietta's intimates and the strongest adherents of a Trench' policy came in time to give at least a qualified support to the rebellious Parliament. In this connexion the names of Lord Holland and Basil Feilding and the members of the Petworth circle, Northumberland and his brother-in-law Leicester and his sister Lady Carlisle, all come to mind. Excepting always the case of Lady Carlisle, a common denominator may be found among this grouping. The peers just indicated had very great vested interests in England. They were not king's men in the sense that this term can be employed when speaking of Laud, Juxon, Windebank, Cottington, or Portland. They had their own strong links with Parliament when both houses should be called together. They had no wish that the king should rule indefinitely without consulting the Lords and Commons. Even if they were, like Holland, queen's men, they could not be among the ultra-royalists.

At the same time Trench' views found favour among sections of opinion which were wholly without contact with the courtiers' private secluded world. Thus Sir Thomas Roe, who stood in all this matter for the Elizabethan school, commanded a respect among that body of the greater gentry who were from the first opposed to the king's proceedings in governing without recourse to Parliament. Here what was almost an opposition

¹ This mood was also associated with an emphasis on past maritime greatness. Thus Sir Thomas Roe writing to Lord Holland from Stamford on 20 September 1630 explained that he had heard from Holland that the English ambassador had moved the States to make peace with Spain. He described this proposition as unseasonable and impolitic. It put him in mind of the king of Denmark. 'We can make no fruitful confederacy but in the north, nor recover our reputation but in our own element the sea.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I., clxxiii.* 49.

foreign policy¹ fused with that section which would form the parliamentary opposition.

In this world which stood over against the court a religious emphasis was often integral to the approach to foreign policy. This matter will be considered in more detail later; here it need only be remarked that both Charles I and Archbishop Laud had a sharp appreciation of Lutheran and Calvinist distinctions. These differences were often somewhat blurred in the minds of those who demanded an aggressive and Protestant foreign policy. It is true that Gustavus Adolphus was a Lutheran and in consequence an upholder of that theology of the *Confessio Augustana* for which King Charles possessed a distant and insular appreciation. Still beyond the circles of the court it was the Calvinist rather than the Lutheran element upon the Continent which found support. It should be noted that this applied to many of those within the Church of England; they regarded the Calvinists as the party of action. To the king action in itself made small appeal; it was doctrine by which he lived. This factor has a bearing on the fortunes of the queen of Bohemia. In both the Upper and Lower Palatinate it was not the pastors of the Augsburg Confession but the Calvinistic ministers who would gain by the Elector Frederick's restoration.

As these points indicate, any detailed appreciation of foreign developments was inevitably confined to a small circle, the envoys and courtiers. Beyond this grouping the newsletters would convey their information and their tales of wars and sieges, but the outer world was in fact envisaged in simple terms. It is at this point that the role of the court in foreign policy should be examined.

¹ Cf. for elements in this opposition foreign policy two comments by Sir Thomas Roe in regard to Gustavus Adolphus. 'We will not\ he wrote to Sir Edward Horwood from Bulwick on 28 May 1632, 'give the king of Sweden leave to conquer like a man by degrees nor human ways, but we look he should fight battles and take towns so fast as we read them in the Book of Joshua, whose example indeed he is.* *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cexvi. 92. 'He [King Gustavus]', wrote Roe to Sir Robert Carr on 28 October 1629, 'is a prince highly ambitious of glory and dominion and hath no object before him but the war of Germany, whither a little reall encouragement from England would transport him', 'Sir Thomas Roe's Mission to Gustavus Adolphus', documents printed in *Camden Miscellany*, vii. 49 seq. The policy here indicated would require recourse to a parliamentary subsidy. 'I may say', explained Roe to Charles I, 'I have seen a brave king and a glorious capteyne that hath high Pyrrhean thoughts which he will be ready to act in your Majesty's and the public service', letter dated 30 September 1629, *ibid.*, p. 45.

The character of the court of Charles I was in marked contrast to that of Elizabeth for it was the policy of the Tudor sovereigns to maintain a certain public element in each manifestation of their regal life. The progresses were regular and many; the ruler and the court were made accessible; the image of the monarch was imprinted on the people's mind. On the other hand, with Charles I and Henrietta Maria we come for the first time to a note of privacy and modernity. The court is represented in a dignified and slightly formal fashion as a gathering of friends.¹ The language of devotion used by the courtiers towards the queen has a light touch² and a private manner in contrast to the laden Jacobean imagery or the prolix Elizabethan splendours. It may be hazarded that foreign affairs were regarded along the lines of personal intercourse; established routes of travel were now laid down. These led always through Paris, often through Brussels, sometimes through the Hague. In contrast to the Italianate influence of preceding generations³ there was discernible and possibly for the first

¹ Letters patent dated 13 August 1629 and conveying lands to the queen in augmentation of her jointure detail the seven principal officers of the queen's household, Henry carl of Holland, high steward, Edward carl of Dorset, lord chamberlain, Thomas Viscount Savage, chancellor, Sir Robert Aiton, principal secretary, Sir Richard Wynne, treasurer, Sir Thomas Hatton, surveyor, and Sir John Finch, attorney general. *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cxlviii. 56. These gentlemen remained attached to the queen's interests throughout the reign; Lord Savage was the only Catholic.

² Cf. a letter written by Lord Goring, then at Greenwich and in waiting upon the queen, to Sir John Coke. It is dated 18 May 1633: 'AH I can say from hence is that, since our blessed Master left our incomparable Mistress, she is in sad extremity which we that are of little other use, must strive to divert, though never hope to expel till that happy return.' With this may be placed another letter dated at Greenwich on 22 June and belonging to the same series: 'May she be pleased', wrote Lord Goring of the queen, 'not to use her needle so much as of late she hath done, which gives her overmuch leisure to muse, and whereof I said I would complain by you, Si; to His Majesty, had she not feed me with a coronation piece of gold.' *Cal Coke MSS.*, ii. 10, 22 (*Hist. MSS.*, twelfth report, part ii).

This approach may be compared with that revealed in a letter from William Murray, groom of the bedchamber, written to Sir Henry Vane from Whitehall on 18 December 1631. The court is described as like the earth, naturally cold, and reflecting no more affection than the sunshine of their master's favour beats upon it. *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cciv. 72.

³ i.e. Sir Henry Wotton was accustomed to interlard his correspondence with Italian phrases. In a letter to Sir Dudley Carleton dated 9 September 1616 he wrote: 'He [the duke of Savoy] did at Turino . . . publicly protest that he would either "uscire di vita o di questi travagli di Spagnuoli" ', *Life and Utters of Sir Henry Wotton*, by Logan Pearsall Smith, ii. 103. Writing to his colleague Sir Walter Aston on 19 January 1622, Wotton signed himself *certissimo servidore*, *ibid.*, p. 225.

time an element of the cosmopolitan. A link was now forged with the court of France and Navarre which would endure through all the stylized wars until the Revolution came to liquidate that pivotal great entity.

The personal quality of mid-Stuart court relationship¹ was notable for two reasons. In the first place this deprived the currents in the queen's *entourage* of any real significance. The element of giving pleasure to their sovereign drew Goring and Holland to French interests just as the ladies of the court were drawn to sympathize with the queen's religion. In the second place the personal quality served to emphasize the division between the courtiers and those who stood outside that circle. This leads us to a consideration of the extent and composition of the court world, a matter which is difficult to determine.

There was certainly a clear relationship between the court and the public service, especially in its foreign aspect. Secretarial employment at home or abroad, which in its most responsible sphere included the two secretaries of state and the foreign envoys,² brought contact with the person of the sovereign. In this sense no one who had ever represented the king abroad could wholly be forgotten. Linked with these men were those whose journeys pivoted upon the royal representation at foreign courts. This category included both the king's servants who were sent abroad upon their master's private business³ and the great lords who set out across Europe in their chariots. The

In a letter to his nephew Sir Edmund Bacon, dated January ? 1629,^{nc} concluded 'I rest // *svisceratissimamente vostro*, Henry Wotton'. British Museum Add. MSS. 34, 727 f. 53 printed in Logan Pearsall Smith's *Life*, p. 320.

¹ A letter from Sir Henry Wotton to his colleague Sir Walter Aston throws light on the relationship of the English envoys with one another: 'Besides our own private friendship, we are now consociates in the public service. And between the places of our residence [Venice and Madrid] there is as much relation as jealousy can breed—for that is a relative as well as love. This I bring as an argument to ground a frequent intercourse of letters between us', printed *ibid.*, p. 213.

² The capitals at which resident English envoys were maintained included Paris, the Hague, Vienna, Venice, and Constantinople. The post at Madrid was sometimes kept vacant. Brussels, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Turin received attention from time to time. Portugal was still under Spanish rule as was the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. The States of the Church were technically hostile territory. There was no regular resident at the court of Tuscany.

³ Cf. *Salveti Correspondence* printed in Historical Manuscripts Commission's eleventh report, part I, for views and rumours as to Endymion Porter's journey to Brussels and Madrid: 'Mr. Endymion Porter . . . is to be sent in the first place to Italy as a purchaser of pictures for His Majesty', dispatch dated 12 July 1628, p. 156.

fourteenth earl of Arundel was perhaps the most considerable of such peers voyaging abroad for private pleasure.¹ There were, too, the young men of rank initiating that practice of the grand tour which would for so long remain in fashion, the dukes of Lennox² and Hamilton, Lord Carlisle's heir.

The question now arises as to the relationship between the body of the peers and the court considered as the assembly of the sovereign's servants and attendants. In the first place there was no necessary nexus between the king and those rural lords who were often the decayed heirs of early Tudor peerages.³ In a similar fashion there was no reason to predicate a link between the court and the new peers whose titles had been purchased in the reign of James I. The court circle can in fact be confined to those who held some office there or were constant in their attendance. And it was a mark of that closed world⁴ that constant attendance was in most cases rewarded by some place about the person of the sovereign or in the households of the royal children.

There was, however, one unusual factor, the presence of 'opposition' lords, peers of high standing who from different periods of the reign had deliberately avoided the royal service. Still there was a certain unity, if not of sentiment then of experience, between the possessors of great wealth. Such rich men of position had more in common with the court, towards which they were polarized by mild disfavour or a sharp dislike, than they had with the general body of the gentry.⁵ This may be held to apply both to detached moderates like the leaders of

¹ Arundel's journey to Vienna in 1636 had, however, an official character.

² 'In the spring time he [the duke of Lennox] intends the *Tour de France* and in the end of summer to go into Italy', letter from Edward Dacres to Lord Dorchester dated at Paris 22 November 1630, *State Papers, Dom., Charles I.*, clxxv. 83.

³ Such peers as Darcy of Aston, Kure, Montcagle, Sandys, Stafford, and Willoughby of Parham.

⁴ Those who belonged to the court world were conscious of this enclosed quality. In a letter dated from Eton on 10 July 1627, Wotton writes of the attitude of the public towards Buckingham: 'The Duke . . . is departed with the soldier[s] and from the Coast, as beloved a man, and with as many acclamations there, as imprecations within the land. Such a floating thing is the vulgar.' Wotton, *Letters*, ii. 303.

⁵ A comment made by Gervase Holies in describing his cousin the first earl of Clare bears on this point: 'He was of a most courteous and affable disposition, yet preserved exactly the grandeur and distance of his quality.' *Memorials of the Holies Family 1493-1656*, by Gervase Holies, ed. A. C. Wood, Camden Society (1937), p. "3-

the Petworth circle and to declared opponents such as the second earl of Warwick and the third earl of Essex. It seems accurate to state that all men in the groups under discussion shared a certain unequal but inherent knowledge of the Continent. As courtiers they were in a measure townsmen. Beyond them lay the poor country lords and that great stay-at-home class the English gentry.

IV

THE STRATIFICATION OF THE GENTRY

THE conception of a squirearchy constituted a unifying element in the shifting strata of a class of gentry based technically on the right to coat armour and in practice on a combination of landed property with a certain standard of social custom. It can hardly be said that the greater gentry were at this date in any serious respect distinct from the country peers who shared their outlook and their economic interests. It is true that the peers possessed a seat in the House of Lords, but attendance registers would reveal that this was seldom occupied by those who lived in the distant counties.¹ The new possibility of a town house seems to have been confined to those who held office in court and government and to a very restricted number of rich men dwelling in the south of England. The distinction between these sections among the richer landowners was further blurred by the practice initiated by James I and continued by his son of granting Irish peerages to members of the wealthy English gentry.² Such honours carrying no seat, save that in the Irish House of Lords which was, in fact, unoccupied, provided a purely titular differentiation.

The difference in life and in approach came rather between the lesser peers, who ranked with the gentry, and the heads of those great houses which possessed an inevitable political significance. This division was in the last resort based upon economic factors and on a certain breadth of political and financial

¹ Thus Henry fifth earl of Huntingdon wrote to the Lord Chamberlain from Donington on 15 February 1626 excusing himself from attending Parliament because of his indisposition of health to travel in winter. He also alleged that the sending of his eldest son to Cambridge would be chargeable and that a great burden of debt lay on him. Lord Huntingdon had also excused himself from attending the coronation, *Cal. Hastings MSS.*, ii. 69, 68.

² Irish peerages of this character granted between 1620 and 1629 include those of Viscount Beaumont of Swords, Viscount Fairfax of Emley, and Viscount Molyneux of Maryborough. From the same years date Scottish peerages for Englishmen like Viscount Dunbar and Lord Ashton of Forfar. The number of recusant or partly recusant families in this list is perhaps significant. On the broader issue these grants appear to be early examples of a practice which, at least in regard to the peerage of Ireland, was widely accepted in the eighteenth century.

operation. The head of a newly ennobled stock, like that of the earls of Clare, would thus take his place by virtue of his wealth¹ alongside the inheritors of the great Elizabethan fortunes. Intermarriage still linked even the richest peers with the body of the established gentry. The suggestion made apparently by Lord and Lady Leicester that Edmund Waller was not a sufficient match for *Saccharissa*¹ implies an approach that belonged essentially to the next century.

It is more interesting to consider the methods of entering the class of the gentry from less privileged positions. There were two roads, the entry of those who had made commercial fortunes and had settled in the country and the graduation of those who were already living on the land. The first tendency was long established, but the practice of setting up as a country gentleman, whether the fortune originated from scrivener's work or in commerce, was not an especial note of the reign of Charles I. It can be said that the attorney who moved from the small town to the status of a country gentleman in his own neighbourhood was a type that belonged rather to the Hanoverian period.

A more characteristic experience was the graduation of yeoman stocks into the ranks of the gentry, a process which was sealed by the attainment of a place in the commission of the peace. Examples of this change can be found in any study of the principal clients of the old great families. Such development can be studied in the career of John Smyth of Nibley, who left the celebrated manuscript history of his master's family, which was printed in 1883 under the title of *Lives of the Berkeleys*. He was steward of the hundred of Berkeley and of all the Gloucestershire manors of the Lords Berkeley; he was born in 1567 and after leaving the free school at Derby came at seventeen into the immediate service of the Berkeley household at Callowden. It had been customary at that period for the heir

¹ 'He [John Holies first earl of Clare] had an inheritance worth five thousand poundes a yeare. ... He ... purchased the one halfe of Princes Street by Drury Lane. And he caused to be erected those edifices called Lowches Buildings, with the most part of Clements Inn Lane, Blackamore Street by Drury Lane, and a part of Clements Inne Fields', *Memorials of the Holies Family 1493-1636*, by Gervase Holies, PP. 94-5-

² Cf. *Col. State Papers, Dom.*, 1638-9, preface, pp. xxxiv-xli, for an account of Edmund Waller's courtship of Lady Dorothy Sidney.

of a great house to be accompanied to the university by one or more attendants¹ who benefited by the education. In this case John Smyth entered Magdalen with the young Lord Berkeley and later completed his legal studies at the Middle Temple at his master's expense. By the end of his life Smyth had hoisted his relations into the lower range of the privileged class; his son became a justice of the peace and founded a minor county family.

It may be noted that the rickety financial condition of such families as the Berkeleys had a double effect. It meant that this method of development was already old-fashioned in the reign of Charles I, and that the new family once established was no longer within the orbit of the patron-stock. One characteristic may be predicated of the grouping just considered. A legal training, however acquired, gave a special mark to a whole range of families, mainly among the lesser gentry who contributed to the strengthening of the nascent governmental class from a new angle.

A broad distinction can be made between the old wealthy stocks whose cadets might find full-time employment under government and the smaller families whose head was himself in government employ. Sir Henry Wotton may stand as an example of the older type, a grand-nephew of the old marchioness of Dorset and linked with those Henrican official stocks like Carew and Pointz, whose members Holbein painted. Sir Edward Nicholas, who was secretary of the Admiralty and secretary of state under Charles I, is a representative of the newer type; his experiences were those of a wide grouping.

Sir Edward's father John Nicholas belonged by birth to the stratum which John Smyth reached after much striving. He was born in 1566² and had qualified in the law, having a place in early life in the Six Clerks Office. Until his death he retained chambers in the Middle Temple,³ although he did not use them in his later years. In 1633, the year in which the more detailed

¹ When Robert Sidney matriculated at Christ Church in 1575 he was accompanied by Griffith Whitfield and Rowland White, both of whom are described as *famulus Alagistri* . . . Sidney, *Register of the University of Oxford*, ii, part I, p. 389.

² Letter from John Nicholas to his son Edward about his approaching seventieth birthday dated 15 March 1636, *State Papers, Dom.*, Charles I, ccexvi. 27.

³ Letter from Richard Swayne to John Nicholas dated at Wimborne 22 October 1635, *ibid.* ccc. 29.

portion of the Nicholas Papers in the Public Record Office opens, he had lived for nearly half a century at Winterbourne Earls, a village on the road from Salisbury to Andover. He seems to have resided in the parsonage house which he rented, together with the manor, from the see. At one time for the sake of his son's education he had lived in the town of Salisbury itself, dwelling in the Deanery. A schoolmaster living in Sir Laurence Hyde's house had taught eight boys, most of whom were members of the Hyde family.

It was characteristic of men in his position that such legal and administrative employments as he could exercise in Wiltshire should come through the patronage of neighbouring great landowners, in this case the earls of Pembroke.¹ This may be described as intermediate as opposed to royal patronage and in practice tended to bind the recipient to the interests, if not to the service, of a single family. Such patronage was in a measure independent of the Crown and as a consequence the holders of this type of office were only affected indirectly by the Civil wars. John Nicholas was steward of the Herberts' Wiltshire lands and held the escheatorship of Clarendon.²

In this stratum the hereditary element in office-holding was apparent. Thus, in 1633 Nicholas secured a new grant of the post of escheator to himself and his son Edward and to the survivor, a device resorted to in order to avoid the practice of reversions to which Lord Pembroke was opposed. At the same time his grandson's name was put in the bond for the lease of the Winterbourne parsonage.³ There are certain indications of the financial basis on which his life rested. Thus an idea was mooted that Mr. Nicholas might purchase from Mr. Barnes the living of Winterbourne which would yield £40 per annum.⁴ In the fire at Winterbourne, which took place in the late evening of 20 March 1634, John Nicholas lost a rick with nearly thirty loads of wheat, his carts, and all provision of beer and

¹ Letter from John Nicholas to Edward Nicholas dated 4 April 1631, *State Papers, Dom.*, Charles I, vol. clxxxviii. 14.

² Cf. letters from John Nicholas to Edward Nicholas dated 2 April 1632 and 31 December 1632, *ibid.* ccxv. 3 and ccxxvi. 76.

³ Letter from John Nicholas to Edward Nicholas dated 19 July 1631, *ibid.* ccxvi. 93.

⁴ Letter from John Nicholas to Edward Nicholas dated 9 September 1633, *ibid.* ccxlv. 18.

malt and about twenty quarters of pure seed barley. His total loss, including the value of the farm buildings, was put at rather over one thousand pounds.¹

The educational detail is interesting and much in character. The two young grandsons were at school at Dinton boarding with Mr. Pinckney² who charged £4 a quarter for each child. This seems to have been a moderate figure. Gifts often shillings to Mr. Pinckney and of five shillings each to Mrs. Pinckney³ and the usher seem to indicate the size of the establishment. In May 1637 Sir Edward's brother the Rev. Matthew Nicholas, then rector of West Dean, visited Winchester and persuaded the schoolmaster⁴ to board his elder nephew John for an inclusive annual charge of £20. The master had promised that John should be in the fifth book. That winter John Ashburnham reported unfavourably⁵ on Ned Nicholas's master and the boy was sent to Winchester to join his brother.

The picture here presented is that of a section of the gentry whose stock-in-trade may be said to have been their education. Edward Nicholas and his brother Matthew had both been Wykehamists; it was their tradition to qualify for the law and for the public service. In that grouping the link with the landed property was not as yet enduring; they would thus merge all the easier into that professional class which was now growing. They had a conception of status⁶ without any considerable established fortune. It is worth noting that their property was in leaseholds, perquisites, and fees, and not in freehold land.

¹ Letters from Matthew Nicholas and John Nicholas to Edward Nicholas, *ibid.*, cexxiv. 78 and eclxiii. 44. The letter from John Nicholas is dated 25 March 1634. The letter from Matthew Nicholas is placed in the volume under 31 March 1633, which appears to be a mistake of one year in the dating.

² Letter from John Nicholas to Edward Nicholas dated 22 September 1633, *ibid.*, ccxvi. 58.

³ Letter from John Nicholas to Edward Nicholas dated 11 January 1630, *ibid.*, ccxi. 49.

⁴ Letter from Matthew Nicholas to Edward Nicholas dated 8 May 1637, *ibid.*, ccclv. 143.

⁵ Letter from John Nicholas to Edward Nicholas dated 12 March 1638, *ibid.*, ccclxxxv. 66.

⁶ Cf. a letter from Dr. Matthew Nicholas to Edward Nicholas dated at St. Nicholas Harnham, 29 July 1633. The writer hears no speech of any husband or sweetheart towards his sister Betty or any of the rest. He gives it as his opinion that their father must make a public profession of greater portions or else bring his unmarried daughters down to a lower rank in their habit and fashions, *State Papers, Dom., Charles I.*, ccxliii. 45.

Such families would benefit by the fact that an ordered schematic education was an asset whose value was then constantly increasing.¹

At the same time it is important not to overstress the significance of this grouping and also to bear in mind that its members were as likely to decline in financial status as to become wealthy. Eton and Winchester had at this time the *cachet* of a certain royal interest and were perhaps principally valued as avenues to the universities, and naturally especially to King's and New College. Yet, quite apart from royal favourites and those who depended on them, the higher public service was often entered by those who had qualified at the Inns of Court.² The tendency is probably to exaggerate rather than to understate the role of the two universities regarded as the prelude to secular employment.

The normal way of passing over into the category of the gentry was quite unconnected with education; the approach was by wealth alone, the heavy yeomen who bought their way into the administrative class in their own locality. A case heard before the court of High Commission in April 1639 throws light on a remote area where the clergyman was mingling with the agricultural labourers and a rich grazier had become the focus of the local economy. The cause was promoted by Peter Woodcock, a butcher turned grazier, who alleged that the vicar of Liddington-cum-Caldecott in Rutland had neglected his duties and created a disturbance by preaching against him. It is the preamble to the sentence that is interesting:

'For these forty years past',³ so runs the statement, 'Rudd has

¹ The early age at which boys were entered in the college books must have tended to preclude in these cases any formal pre-university education. In particular this applied to youths of rank. The two sons of the fourth earl of Pembroke, Charles Lord Herbert of Shurland, and Philip later fifth earl of Pembroke matriculated at Exeter College in 1632 aged thirteen and eleven years of age respectively. Edward Hyde later first earl of Clarendon entered Magdalen Hall in 1622 aged thirteen. On the other hand, John Hampden and Sir Henry Vane the younger were both aged sixteen when they entered Magdalen College and Magdalen Hall. Hampden had completed his course at Thame Grammar School. A study of the reasons behind the different age of matriculation might yield material of interest.

² Thus, Lord Treasurer Portland had followed his father Sir Jerome Weston to the Middle Temple without being entered at a university. Cottington does not seem to have possessed any academic or legal training.

³ Sentence of the court of High Commission dated 2 May 1639, State Papers, Dom., Charles I, ccccxx. 16.

been and still continues vicar of the said church (of Liddington) and is tied to serve the church or chapel of Caldecott. Yet for sundry years past he has omitted to read divine service in Caldecott . . . and has refused or neglected to wear the surplice, but only one old thread-bare coat with four skirts, and to the further disgrace of his priestly function has busied himself in sordid employments, and served a thatcher with straw, and helped the thatcher to "sowe" his house, and thereby acquired good skill in that faculty.'

This is an example of the absence of any squire-parson relationship in which wealth would in time close the gap. Another method by which families of non-armigrous origin entered the ranks of the squirearchy was as a result of civic service in the county town¹ or by means of a fortune based on large-scale trading.

There was also an easy contact between the established gentry in the Home Counties and the London merchant class. Younger sons of squires of good position were bound as apprentices in order to make them eligible for a partnership. 'Be sure',² wrote Sir John Oglander in his commonplace book after binding his son apprentice to a mercer,³ 'to give all thy sons a vocation, and God will bless thee and them.' There is reason to suppose that such apprenticeships rarely led to fortune.⁴ On the other hand, in Kent in particular the social contact was close between

¹ Cf. *Memorials of the Holies Family* for instances in Grimsby and district. An account is given by Gervase Holies of his wife's family: 'From this family [the Kirketons of Kirketon] my wife's father would pretend a descent and had a coat of armes allowed by the Heraldcs as a variation from the other, namely barry of eight pieces, crmyn and gules; but in truth lie had no authority for either. His grandfather Thomas Kirkton was no other than a wealthy yeoman in Lincolnshire and so I have seene him written in sevrall dcedes. Yet he purchased the Mannour of Ledenham and other landcs to a good value in Navenby and elsewhere in the same county, and married the daughter of Kigges who was a gentleman (although *minoris notae*). By hir he had William Kirkton his soine and heyre. . . . This William solde the Mannour of Ledenham with all the rest of his inheritance, reserving only an annuity of fowerscore poundes yearly during the lives of himselfe, his wife and his sonne', *ibid.* 232.

² *Commonplace Book of Sir John Oglander*, ed. Francis Bamford, p. 235.

³ 'To bind my son Richard (Oglander) as prentice to Mr. Taylor at the sign of the "Hen and Chicken" in Paternoster Row, a mercer £70', *ibid.* 235.

⁴ A letter from Valentine Pettit to Richard Oxinden dated 9 June 1628 refers to the latter's cousin Richard apprenticed to Mr. Newman, a cloth merchant of Fish Street. 'Mr. Newman beinge buisie above stayers with a Customer, I had som speech with his prentsses and afterwards with my cousin Richard . . . I must needes say that, both by my Cousin Richard's words and also by his fellowes, I perceve that the Master is much altered since hee hath beene marryed', *The Oxinden Letters*, p. 40. Later, Richard Oxinden joined the army.

the landed and mercantile groupings, the latter established in the city of London. Intermarriage was not uncommon¹ and there seems to have been a tendency to consult the friend or relative in business concerning matters which at a later date would fall within the province of the family solicitor.

In all this question of contact between different groupings the influence of locality is of much importance. Thus, it is doubtful to what extent the merchants of Bristol, York, or Norwich supplied these offices for their country neighbours. It is possible that London gave the lead in such close contact, but the subject has not yet been studied in sufficient detail to enable a clear conclusion to be formed.

Investments in house property in London, and perhaps also in the country towns on the roads leading from the capital, are found at a relatively early stage among the assets of wealthy landed families. As a result, in addition to the legal aspects of apprenticeship such questions as the valuation, purchase, and management of house property would be the subject of discussion between the more enterprising squires and those London merchants who possessed their confidence and friendship. The experience of men of business had its value since speculation in house property was in the first place associated with the financial ventures of the merchant grouping. In this connexion the lease of inns has a special interest, and it is noticeable that this form of property is found not only among Cranfield's investments² but also in those made by such a characteristic East Anglian squire as Nicholas Timperley of Hintlesham.³

¹ Mrs. Katherine Oxinden of Barham lived partly at Denton and partly at the sign of the Maidenhead in Cheapside, the home and place of business of her son-in-law Thomas Barrow, a mercer. Adam Oxinden was apprenticed to Mr. Brookes, a mercer in partnership with Barrow. 'I also', wrote Mrs. Oxinden to her son-in-law in an undated letter apparently belonging to 1636, 'did speake to my sonn [Henry Oxinden] aboute Addam, and hee dooth say hee will geive but fifty pounes, too new sutes an a klope', *The Oxinden Letters*, p. 117.

² Indenture or counterpart of agreement dated 8 March 1598 whereby Lionel Cranfield covenants to sell to his brother Randall Cranfield for the sum of £140 the 'Greyhound' inn at Ware with certain closes of pasture and also a common marsh in the parish of Much Amwell, Herts. These he received under the will of his late father Thomas Cranfield, citizen and mercer. 'Cranfield Papers 1551-1612' printed in *Cal. Sackville MSS.*, i. 25.

³ On the death of Nicholas Timperley of Hintlesham in Suffolk on 1 January 1624 the 'Red Lion' inn at Staines passed to his youngest son Michael Timperley. Chan. Inq. p.m. (ser. 2), 408, no. 109, and *Timperley of Hintlesham* by Sir Gerald H. Ryan and L. J. Redstone, p. 59.

There was thus an ease of social contact smoothed by mutual advantages, but it would be a mistake to overstress the amity. In certain instances this relationship between the country gentry of the Home Counties and the city merchants developed according to the familiar pattern of creditor and moneylender. In cases where intermarriage had occurred between the groupings, such matters were most often kept within the family circle. Besides, the country gentry seldom moved within the sphere of great financiers; it was the old embarrassed fortunes of the higher peerage that Cranfield and his companions came to succour.¹

This is well understood if we examine the close nexus of the Home Counties, but the influence of London as a centripetal force was already very strong. It is remarkable from what distances the country gentry would then travel to the capital. As an example, Nicholas Assheton in his journal for 1617-18 describes his ride to London to brief Mr. Sherfield in a cause in the Court of Wards and to visit his brother Alexander, a linen draper dwelling in St. Paul's Churchyard.² This Nicholas Assheton had inherited the manor of Downham in Lancashire from his grand-uncle Richard Assheton, receiver-general of the duchy of Lancaster, who had purchased it in 1558. Here is an interesting case of a family not yet established in its landed status and linked by blood with the far-off London mercantile world. It was in keeping with such an insecure position³ that Assheton's only sister should be married to a natural son of Sir Richard Sherborne of Stonyhurst. It is London contacts

¹ Cf. for a survey of the relationship between Cranfield and his creditors the earl of Nottingham and Lord Howard of Effingham, introduction to the 'Cranfield Papers', *Sackville MSS.*, p. xxii. f.

² 'Nov. 10. To London, the *Chequer* in Holborne. Nov. 19. Rctcyned my counsell Mr. Shierfield.' *The Journal of Ralph Assheton*, ed. Rev. F. R. Raines, Chetham Society (1848), p. 114.

³ It is interesting that in the account of his ride Mr. Assheton mentions the names of some of the landlords, which implies a measure of social contact. 'Nov. 4. Towards London, abt the hearing agst Midleton, in Cur. Ward, for the tenure of his land. To Manchester, Bull's Head, Helliwells [Richard Halliwell, landlord and vintner]. To Castle: Mr. Shaw's, Eagle and Child; Sir Cuthbert Halsey ther. Nov. 6. Wee to Midleton, Mr. Bartlct's, The Saracens Head.' *Ibid.*, pp. 110-13. Later entries include: 'Nov. 8. We away to Stonie Stratforde, Mr. Greenes, the Cocke. Nov. 9. Wee to Barnet, the Rose and Crowne Mr. Lennoy.' *Ibid.*, p. 114. This may suggest the greater freedom of the north as opposed to the stiff southern practice. Sir Edward Nicholas, for instance, never gives the names of the inn-keepers in mentioning where he spent the night on his rides into Wiltshire.

maintained from such a distance that make generalizations based on the solidarity of the Home Counties influence so very precarious.

At the same time there was during this period a change in the character of the long-established relationship between the country gentry and the richer citizens of the major county towns. The residence at York of both the lord president of the Council of the North and the northern primate gave a certain viceregal quality¹ to that city. Now the increased use of inns enabled the squires and their servants to put up for short periods in York and other centres and there to form a contact with the merchant class which bore no resemblance to the London pattern. Thus there was a corporate element in such associations very different from the purely personal links that bound the families of the landed interest to individual London merchants. In the smaller unit the mayor and the burgesses had by right of office a familiar intercourse with the neighbouring land-owners as these rode in for the assizes or on private business. An account in John Aston's journal of his ride to York to attend Charles I as a privy chamberman extraordinary in April 1638 throws a light on the busy contacts of the type of town society which would prove a forcing bed for Whig or Jacobite opinions in later times. 'Nevertheless', wrote Aston² in an entry under the heading York, 'there were excellent ordinaries: *i8d.* the master and *6d.* servants at the Talbot (a very faire inn) especially. At Ousemans, the poast master, the signe of the Dragon, for *12d.* and *8d.*, at the Bell in Thursday-Markett, for *8d.* and *6d.*,³ with many other places.' At such houses the gentry came and went, some staying for the night and others riding back before nightfall to their manors.⁴ The strengthening economic

¹ Cf. a reference to 'the nobles and gentles of North Brittain' in a letter from Tobias Mathew, archbishop of York, to the earl of Cumberland dated 17 May 1617, and printed from the Bolton Abbey MSS. in *The History and Antiquities of the Deanery of Craven*, by T. D. Whitaker, ed. 3, p. 370.

² *Journal of John Aston*, Surtees Society (1910, North County Diaries), p. 5.

³ The basic charges for the ordinaries for masters and men argue a closer approximation in fare offered than might have been expected. In this list the fashionable inn the 'Talbot' is an exception.

⁴ Thus, in the Isle of Wight there was an ordinary where the gentry met. 'This Island was beyond compare, Anno Domini, 1630: so full of knights and gentry that I have seen 12 knights at the Ordinary at Newport', *Commonplace Book of Sir John Oglander*, p. 112.

status of the Anglican clerical body gave a special place in this society to clergymen of some position. In Yorkshire in particular¹ the prebendaries and town incumbents were a factor in the amalgam of the prosperous elements in civic life with those country gentry who lived within a certain radius of the town or city.

Again, in certain towns the connexion between the established gentry and civic office was very close. This seems especially to have been the case at Newcastle-upon-Tyne where the list of apprenticeships in the Merchants' company² indicates the interest taken in this commerce by the squires in Northumberland. The same concern is reflected in the roll of mayors and sheriffs of Newcastle-upon-Tyne set out in the document known as the Carr manuscript. In the period between 1603 and 1634, the year in which this list seems to have been compiled, only one mayor and one sheriff are mentioned without record of their arms.³ The recusants of necessity held aloof, but the rest of the gentry in the southern part of the county appear to have competed for the posts of sheriff and mayor.⁴ Families without landed property rarely figure in these positions; it must, however, be admitted that the state of affairs in Newcastle was exceptional.

¹ Cf. *Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby*, ed. Rev. D. Parsons, *passim*.

² An analysis of the detailed records of the enrolment of apprentices in the company of merchant adventurers of Newcastle gives the following result: 125 apprentices were enrolled during the first 10 years of the reign of Charles I between 27 March 1625 and 27 March 1635. In 5 cases the occupation or status of the father is not given. 42 apprentices are described as sons of yeomen, 40 as sons of gentlemen, and 6 as sons of clerks. In 1 case the father is described as a knight and in 10 cases as esquire. In 4 cases the father is described as a merchant, in 4 cases as a cordiner, and in 3 cases as a master mariner. The following occupations appear once only in the list: baker and brewer, blacksmith, burgess, clothier, joiner, notary public, preacher, shipwright, tanner, and weaver. John Langhorne is given as the son of Thomas Langhorne of Carlisle, master of arts, *Records of the Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle-upon-Tyne*, ii, 244-55.

³ The cases in which personal arms are not mentioned, leading to the presumption that the official in question was not armigerous, are: '1617. William Boner—sheriff. Shield left blank. 1622-3. William Jackson—sheriff. No shield given', Carr manuscript printed in *Archaeologia Aeliana* (1940), ed. C. H. Hunter Blair, pp. 53, 54.

⁴ Thus, Sir George Selby was sheriff in 1594, mayor in 1600, 1606, 1611, and 1622; Sir Thomas Liddell was sheriff in 1592, mayor in 1597 and 1609; James Clavering was sheriff in 1599, mayor in 1607 and 1618; Sir Thomas Riddell was sheriff in 1601, mayor in 1604 and 1616; Sir Peter Riddell was sheriff in 1604, mayor in 1619 and 1635. Sir Nicholas Tempest, first baronet of Stella, was sheriff in 1620. Recusant connexions as opposed to actual recusancy were thus no bar.

The vital trade in sea coal provided a link with the capital and the old-established Merchants' company gave Newcastle a faint resemblance to the type of social polity that characterized the towns of the Hanseatic League. Under another aspect there was a link with that prosperous part-landed and part-civic interest which had come to support the Virginia Company and other ventures.

Still, as these suggestions indicate, during the first half of the seventeenth century uniformity in the social framework had not yet been achieved, nor probably was it then desired. In all this matter there was a fluidity and an absence of precision of status. Such precision may be held to be a mark of an oligarchy approaching its perfection; thus this uniform and static quality would only become apparent to those who had been bred up beneath the Restoration order. Roger North, who was born in 1653, was among the first to discern a series of relationships whose customary form was by then perceptible. By the time that he wrote the *Lives of the Norths* and his own autobiography, the social stratum of the county town had folded into its layers.¹

It might be maintained that such a stratified society only became a possibility when political affiliations along party lines coloured each element in the social structure which could be held to possess the faintest influence in the franchise. As the oligarchy strengthened so did the social-economic placing harden. The unco-ordinated vagueness which marked the situation in the reign of Charles I was in a measure the consequence of the fact that there were no clear lines of party political allegiance. Such conflict of opinion in the political sphere as then existed was directly related to the calling of a Parliament at Westminster. In the years following 1629 an air of lassitude was noticeable among the possessing classes because Parliament was not summoned and Westminster was far away.

¹ The following sentences throw a light on barristers going circuit in 1682-5: 'In short we were very welcome in the west, and my brother [Lord Keeper Guilford] was extremely caressed in all places, because he was the first clear loyalist of a judge that had come amongst them since the wars. The cathedral towns were our greatest refreshment, for there were good company, and the clergy were our friends.'..., 'This was the age of Tory and Whig, the former were our friends, and much addicted to the bottle.' 'Autobiography of Roger North', printed in *Lives of the Norths*, ed. Rev. A. Jessopp, iii. 133, 135, and 172.

The divergences were as yet unresolved and the moods of opposition unfocused.

Elements surviving from the Elizabethan polity still obscured the lines of that practical and oligarchic order which was now emerging. The idea of the accretion of landed wealth had come down from earlier centuries and was still a principal factor in the more sober counsels of every gentleman.¹ On the other hand the elaborate households of such cavaliers as the marquesses of Worcester and Newcastle were the fruits of the Tudor idea of splendour crossed by the conceptions of obligation to a countryside. They are mentioned at this point because this way of life of some great peers found a reflection among the gentry.

If we consider the segments into which the class of the squires may be divided, one method of differentiation is according to the elaboration of the household maintained. The greater households were as self-subsistent as was practicable. They were not in general created by the richest squires; they were the mark of a family whose head was patriarchal, old-fashioned, and home-keeping. An example of this type of squire was Sir Henry Slingsby whose illuminating diary opens in 1638. His establishment at the Red House in Yorkshire was very considerable. 'The number we are... in household', wrote Sir Henry,² 'is thirty persons, whereof sixteen are men servants, and eight women, besides ourselves.' His life was concentrated there for he had no house in London until he entered Parliament for Knarcsborough, when he rented one from Mr. Sandwith. It stood in Lincoln's Inn Fields by the Temple Court and he paid £22 rent³ for the first quarter. Later he took this house on a lease terminable at short notice paying at the rate of twenty-two shillings a week. Sir Henry also held the ancestral seat of his family 'that rotten house at Scriving'⁴ [Scriven]; but by 1638 it had neither bed nor furniture, except the pieces which belonged to the tenants and were used to make my Lord

¹ In the life of Lord Keeper Guilford, Roger North gives an instance of this tenacity. 'His lordship's father [Dudley fourth Lord North of Kirtling, b. 1602] designed some skirts of his estate to be sold, to raise £1500 a-piece for their [his daughters'] portions; but no proffer <of marriage> falling the land was unsold.' *Lives of the Norths*, ed. Rev. A. Jessopp, i. 401.

² *Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby*, ed. Rev. D. Parsons, p. 26.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 42, cf. pp. 43-5.

Northumberland's chamber ready whenever Sir Henry rode across there.

Such an establishment as the Red House gave much employment and it is interesting to note how far afield the orders for decoration were placed.

'John Gowland a carpenter dwelling at Popleton', explains Slingsby,¹ 'is working for me a frame for a Bell to hang in Moore-Mounton Church, ye which I bestow'd on ye parish, as I did ye brick that built ye Steple, and they were part of those bricks I burnt to build my new Parlor . . . John Gowland is likewise framing a Roof for a Smythye, which I began to build upon ye moor, near ye windmill. . . Edward Horsey a Painter in York is now painting² ye lodging chamber above ye new Parlour, in colours sutable to those hangings I have bought to hang it with all. Ye hangings I bought of Peter Pope in Bednall [Bethnal] Greene.'

It is worth noting that the carriers were trustworthy and not too slow as they brought the tapestry for the withdrawing room and the design of the nine Muses for the new parlour from Bethnal Green to the West Riding. There was in a household of this character a custom of long service. In a note on the death of his gardener Peter Clark, a man who was Tor no curiosity³ in gardening, but exceeding laborious in grafting, setting and sowing', Sir Henry comments that he had been in his employment for twelve years. As a result of the ample accounting of a big establishment details can be obtained of the professional class which served the gentry, the doctors, and the scriveners. One point may be mentioned in conclusion. The attraction of London was very evident; its fashions and its prices were a standard of reference. The eyes of the country gentry were fixed on the royal capital.

It was, perhaps, in youth that local influences were felt at their greatest strength. Education in the neighbourhood of the manor house was in accordance with a favourite practice. Sir Henry Slingsby, the heir to a Jacobean baronetcy, learned for nine years at the free school near his home kept by the parson of Foston, Mr. Otby.⁴ He seems to have left Yorkshire for the

¹ *Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby*, ed. Rev. D. Parsons, pp. 4, 5. ² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³ Entry under 30 October 1640, *ibid.*, p. 64.

⁴ 'November ye 19 [1638] I gave a presentation to Mr ffish of ye rectory of Staveley. He succed'd his grandfather Phatuell Otby wth wm I was brought up

first time when he rode away from the Red House to go up to the Queens' College at Cambridge. Variations of wealth did not affect this general experience.¹

The system of education adopted had a strictly practical character, however this might be disguised in compilations like Peacham's *Compleat Gentleman*. As far as the great families were concerned the fact that King Charles presided over a cultivated court influenced them in the direction of providing foreign travel for their heirs. This circumstance tended to increase the number, qualifications, and salary of the relatively new group of travelling tutors. But between the youths of high rank, who were served in this fashion, and the children whose fathers were like Edward Nicholas, in official employment, there stretched the many different groupings of home-keeping gentry. In this circle the boys would learn from the local parson or schoolmaster in the next village or attend the grammar school in the neighbouring town. In the village there would be found a sprinkling of the children of the gentry learning with those of yeoman status, while in the town the burgher element would predominate among the scholars.

One element was excluded on religious grounds from this common education. While there would seem to have been no actual test which would have prevented attendance at free and

at School from ye age of six until I was 15 years old. He was at yt time Parson of Foston.' *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹ Cf. *E.H.R.* (1943), lviii. 217-19. 'Wealth of Royalist Peers and Baronets during the Puritan Revolution', by Edith L. Klotz and Godfrey Davies. The authors give a valuable analysis of the position. It is explained that the five volumes of the Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding 1643-60 provide sufficient material to study the wealth of forty-one peers. 'The total value of the forty-one peers' estates was approximately £1,241,906, which gives an average value of £30,290. Sixteen peers were above the average, the earl of Thanet leading with an estate worth £150,000, being followed by the earl of Westmoreland; worth £90,000, and the duke of Richmond and Lennox, a Scot, worth £73,575. Contrasting with these men of large fortunes, the earl of Norwich, worth £3300, Viscount Ogle of Catherlough, worth £1800, and the earl of Marlborough, £340, represented the poorest.'

'The total value of the ninety-three baronets' estates was approximately £1,033,588, making an average value of £11,114, thirty-four baronets being worth more than the average and fifty-nine less. The three largest estates were those of Sir William Portman worth £60,000, Sir Thomas Littleton, worth £45,000, and Sir John Baker, worth £37,500. Of the nine estates worth less than £1000, the two lowest are Sir William Courtenay, £600, and Sir Henry Moody, "less than £200"; Sir John Trelawney's £135 would have been the smallest but for a windfall from his deceased sister, worth "scarce £150" ', p. 219.

grammar schools, the sons of Catholic recusants were for the most part brought up at home.¹ With this sole exception the educational system cut across each social grouping in the literate section of the population. An analysis² of John Evelyn's early education will serve to indicate the variety of his youthful companionship. He was born at Wotton in Surrey in 1620 and entered Balliol as a fellow-commoner at the age of seventeen.

'1624. I was not initiated into any rudiments till neere four yeares of age, and then one Frier taught us at the church porch of Wotton.

'1628—I was put to learne my Latine rudiments, and to write ... of one Citolin, a Frenchman, in Lewes. I was put to schoole to Mr. Potts, in the CliiTe at Lewes. . . .

'1630. I went to the free-school at Southover, near the town [of Lewes], of which one Agnes Morley had been the foundress, and now Edward Snatt was the master, under whom I remained till I was sent to the University.'

The sense of neighbourhood was very strong; as far as the boys were concerned the county bred them. Thus London was

¹ The information as to secret Catholic schools at this period is very scanty. On 8 October 1635 Mr. Lumley sent an information to Archbishop Laud respecting a seminary or school for the education of gentlemen's sons kept at Stanley Grange near Derby, at the house of Anne Vaux, sister to Lord Vaux. There were twelve or thirteen children at the school including Lord Abergavenny's grandchild and one of Mr. Fossiter's sons, *State Papers, Dom., Charles I., cxcix.* 36. A similar investigation was made in regard to a school kept in Mr. Leveson's house two miles from Wolverhampton. Some details were given of the pupils when these establishments were broken up. The names are given of three boys * brought up in Leveson's house under a priest or Jesuit: John Stanford, son of William Stanford of Puryhall, co. Stafford, and grandson of Sir John Peshall of Horseley; William Andrew, being about 12 years of age, son of William Andrew of Denton and nephew of Sir William Wilmer of Sywell, both in Northamptonshire; John Atwood, being about 11 years of age, son of Antony Atwood of Acton, co. Worcester. It would seem that John Stanford was the oldest of these boys since Sir John Fitzherbert of Norbury undertook to present him to the bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. Among the State Papers there are two other entries relating to pupils at these schools. On 23 December 1635 John Blomfield, a youth of 14 years brought up at Mr. Leveson's, was ordered to be sent to Sir Ralph Done of Dutton, co. Chester, to remain with him as a servant. This suggests that Blomfield's parents were not in a position to pay for him at Mr. Leveson's. On 31 December 1635 Richard Wakeman, son of Edward Wakeman of Beckford, co. Gloucester, and nephew of Sir Christopher Nevill of Newton St. Loe, was given to Sir Christopher on his undertaking to place him in the university of Oxford. Wakeman was a pupil at Stanley Grange. He was a grandson of the eighth Lord Abergavenny, *ibid.* ccciii. 73 and 88, ccv. 5, and ccv. 70.

² *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, ed. William Bray, p. 4.

an experience of adult life¹ for nearly all those whose homes were placed in agricultural England. Into this world of farm and manor there would come an element which was destined to strengthen itself perpetually: what can best be described as the professions.

¹ Evelyn, who was brought up by his grandmother at Lewes, first visited London for one night when he was thirteen. He does not seem to have been in London again until he went up to Balliol, *ibid.*, pp. 5, 9, 12.

THE EMERGENCE OF A PROFESSIONAL CLASS

THE marks of a professional class may be held to be dependence on an income derived from private or public sources and paid in respect of services rendered, these services presupposing a form of training and a certain corporate standard. In England the members of professions were in general without any income-bearing landed property, nor did they derive any substantial portion of their assets from commerce or trading.

This class, and the phrase is exact since the members of the group were broadly speaking of the same economic level, was in part recruited from the gentry and in part from solid burgess stocks. A section of this new body thrived in a dependent status (almost as parasites) within the privileged world of the greater peers and squirearchy. From this section there would derive those who in the Hanoverian period ministered to, and sometimes advised, their oligarchic patrons. These were the men of skill and confidence, the class which maintained standards of erudition, and formed the base inevitably created for itself by any aristocratic polity.

From another angle the professional class can be considered in its relation to the governing groups in which during the reign of Charles I only the highest ranks of the legal profession were as yet incorporated. For the rest it was a character of the professional milieu that it possessed in varying degrees some form of dependence on the classes that it served. In addition to those who had dependent status, the estate agents and secretaries and private tutors, there were wide groups, like the doctors and lawyers, who derived the bulk of their income from the squirearchy and the rich middle class. Outside these sections, but allied to them in status, were the civil servants whose income was derived from public sources, while their promotion depended to some extent upon the world of patrons. This bureaucratic element was paralleled in the position of the clergy of the Established Church.

As yet no real cohesion existed between the groups **that have been** described. In fact this could **not** develop **because the**

oligarchy, which would give to them **the** carefully graded placing that marked the eighteenth century, was still in process of formation. Obviously some groups were old established; thus no great change came over legal life or practice during these years before the Civil war. In contrast the work of secretaries and tutors was only reaching to the level at which it could be organized on a group basis. There was novelty in the idea of the short-term contract which would now be offered by a patron to a man applying for the post of travelling tutor. In the newly formed group of such dependents there was an ease of lateral movement from the service of one employer to that of another of equal rank.

At the core of the whole system stood the two universities, which tended to replace the Inns of Court as the finishing school for the landed gentry. In many families the practice of attending the university was now established. At the same time the men who wished to enter the old and new professions streamed through its gates. At the head of those who represented the new tendencies stood the range of clerical-academic families whose founders had occupied the bishoprics and deaneries under Elizabeth. With rare exceptions, where the sons were established in the court world, the episcopal and decanal stocks settled in the rank of the minor gentry. In these circumstances they were accustomed to combine an appreciation of academic life and an awareness of clerical preferment with a traditional contact with the neighbouring merchants. The Huttons of Marske, who were established on that Yorkshire property by Archbishop Hutton,¹ were a typical example of such a stock.² They are of

¹ A note written in 1758 by the Rev. Andrew Cootee Ducarel gives the view that was long held as to the propriety of such provision: 'Some have blamed our Archbishop for granting this fthe lease of Nether Popleton], and the leases of other estates, to his sons, but very unjustly; for, since all estates must, according to law, be lett for three lives or twenty-one years, why should not a Bishop have the liberty to leave some of them to his family, if he doth not violently or unjustly take them from any one? Surely, it is the voice of Divine Revelation as well as of nature, that if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel', *The Correspondence of Dr. Matthew Hutton*, Surtees Society (1843), P. 45-

² The archbishop of York died in 1606 leaving Sir Timothy Hutton of Marske who died in 1629. Sir Timothy had five sons who reached manhood, the eldest and the third being undergraduates at Cambridge: Matthew succeeded to Marske, Timothy was a merchant in Leeds, Philip a clergyman, and Thomas one of the **staff** of the Six Clerks' Office.

particular interest owing to the insight that we obtain into the Cambridge life of two of the archbishop's grandsons, Matthew and Philip.

Among the papers preserved at Marske were accounts¹ left by these brothers relating to their university expenses. Philip was a member of Trinity; Matthew's college is not mentioned. One is struck by the ease of movement that had now developed. They came from a Yorkshire home and visited their kinsmen around Ely;² their younger brother John was sent away to school at Winchester.³

Their background was learned,⁴ but the books they purchased seem the ordinary undergraduate stock-in-trade. No great sums were wasted⁵ on them. In Matthew Hutton's case there is a reference to the furnishing of rooms in college, the purchase of a desk, the hiring of a chair and table, and the putting up of shelves and the renewal of the paintwork.⁶ The most expensive item is £2 'to the tennis court'. Matthew's tuition was £1 a term and Philip's 13s. 4s.; the charge for rooms was 7s. 6d. and

¹ These consist of Matthew Hutton's accounts for Michaelmas Term 1614 and for Trinity Terms in 1615 and 1616. There is also a note of debts due in February 1617. These are followed by Philip Hutton's accounts for Hilary and Trinity Terms 1620 and for Hilary Terms 1621, 1622, and 1623. They also include accounts for periods between Midsummer and Michaelmas in 1620 and 1622, *The Correspondence of Dr. Mattlew Hutton*, Surtees Society (1843), pp. 210-33.

² The archbishop had married Beatrice Fincham of Owtwcl, in the Isle of Ely, when he was master of Pembroke Hall; cf. Hutton's accounts, *ibid.*, pp. 223-4.

³ John Hutton's expenses included a psalter, Nowell's Catechism, and 'a sett of Ovids' 5s. 4d., 'Tullie's Offices' 1s. 2d., 'a Tusc. Quaest., Cambden, and Greek Test.' 4s. 1d., and 'a Lucan' 2s. A chest cost 9s. and three lb. of candles 15s. Clothes were extremely expensive, 'a suite of apparrell with a single galowne lace' £2. 11s. 2d., *ibid.*, pp. 237-44.

⁴ Cf. the archbishop's will dated 20 November 1605: 'Item, I gyve and bequeath unto Mr. Phyllip Foorde, parson of Nunburnholme, those books hereafter named, viz. the wrytyngs or works of St. Augustine, St. Hierome, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, Gregorie, Tertullian, Basyll, Gregorie Nazianzine, Clemens Alexandrinus, Clemens Romanus, Justine Martyr, Irenaeus, with soe many bookes or partes as I have of Bewcer, Calvin, Marloot, Musculus, and two Greek Lexicons', printed *ibid.*, p. 180.

⁵ Matthew Hutton purchased 'Aristoteles his Ethicks, with Magmas' comment' 4s., 'Aelian in Greek, and Latin' 1s. 6d., 'a Greeke and Latine Testament and psalter' 4s. 6d., 'Rider's Dictionarie' 5s., 'Manutius's Phrases' u., 'Keckerman his logicke' 2s. 6d., 'Isocrates in Greeke and Latine' 2s. 6d., 'Seneca his tragedies' 15s. 6d., and the most expensive item 'Tullie's workes' 13s. 4d. Philip Hutton purchased 'Ursine's Catcchisme' 2s. 10d., 'Bradshaw upon the Sacrament' 1s. 6d., and books unspecified 5s. 6d., *ibid.*, pp. 210-n, 214, 223, 227, and 307-8.

⁶ The expenses of this furnishing amounted to £14s. 2d.; and there was also a costly item, 'my part for sealinge of my chamber' £2. 5s. 0d., *ibid.*, p. 212.

55. respectively. The sizar received 13J. 4*% and there were the customary vails.¹ Two points seem worth remarking. Matthew Hutton went down owing his tutor £9. 16s. *id.* and Philip spent a relatively large sum on his physician.² The impression left on the mind is that of an elegant and purposeful existence.

The sums spent on clothes would seem to indicate that there was not much economy admissible among all those who wished to be regarded as young men of consideration.³ The Naples lace, the Spanish silk, the points and garters, the hat and cuffs and bands were all *de rigueur*. Philip Hutton, the future clergyman, invested⁴ in 'a new suite of apparel of water'd paragon'.

The expense of medical attendance has been remarked upon, and through this period the economic standing of the doctors was growing stronger. The prestige of scientific knowledge was increasing; Robert Boyle, the natural philosopher who invented Boyle's Law, was born in 1627. William Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood,⁵ was physician extraordinary to Charles I.

Just as a corporate body of the higher clergy was now gradually forming, so, too, a hierarchy was manifest in medicine whose practitioners already comprised a grouping marked by steadily increasing status and remuneration. This link between the higher medicine and the major churchmen was assisted by the fact that these groups stood outside that landed interest which they both served. A phrase in Archbishop Hutton's will⁶ expresses very clearly this mutual social ease: 'Item, I gyve to my ancient good friend, Mr. Christopher Myllcr, physician, *Paradox Medicorum*, set forthe by Fuchius.'

It is a characteristic of any privileged and dominant class

¹ Matthew Hutton paid 'to the butlers for my admission' 2v., to the porter *is.*, to the laundress 2J. Philip Hutton paid to the laundress and bedmaker 5*. There is a curious entry in Matthew's accounts of 2s. for the head lecturer. He also paid 5J. for the Freshman's feast, *ibid.*, pp. 210-14, 223, and 307.

² The following sums appear considerable. 'In his sickness given to his physitian, &c in part' 15J., 'his diett in his sickness' £1. 35. *id.* 'for phisicke, and given to the physitian' £1. 95. 4*%, *ibid.*, pp. 230, 232.

³ In June 1615 Matthew Hutton's tailor's bill amounted to £16. 11s. *od.*, *ibid.*, p. 215.

⁴ Accounts between Ladieday and Midsummer, 1620. The suit cost £2. 4*% *od.*, *ibid.*, p. 224.

⁵ Harvey published *Exercitatio Anatomica de Motu Cordis et Sanguinis in Animalibus* at Frankfort in 1628.

⁶ Printed *Hutton Correspondence*, p. 181.

that it draws towards itself and suitably rewards those members of the learned callings who are brought into immediate contact with the way of life of the governing circle. A striking passage in the *Slingsby Diary* concerning doctors indicates how far this tendency had already developed; it also serves to emphasize the pull of the metropolis. The picture is very carefully built up. For some time Sir Henry Slingsby's wife had been in failing health suffering from what is described as 'cholick¹ in ye *Cardiaca Passio**. The doctors from York had been called in, Dr. Parker and Dr. Micklethwaite. Then Dr. Fryars, a 'Physician² of London', was known to be in York and he in his turn was brought out to the Red House. 'This man',³ noted Sir Henry, 'is of great fame for his skill and cures, which he doth not a little brag off, who tells you of his £50 and £100 cures; how he had been with ye King at Barrick.'⁴

After this, in December 1639, a journey to London was undertaken for the purpose of consulting Dr. Fryars. Improvement not being maintained there were visits to Dr. Baskerfield and Mr. Ruthin, and at length Lady Slingsby became a patient of Sir Theodore Mayernc,⁵ the king's physician. It is at this point that the diary contains a most interesting description of Dr. Maycrne's consulting-room which should be quoted at some length to establish the position of the heads of the medical profession.

'Usually', so begins this entry,⁶ 'I went in a morning for his [Sir Theodore's] advice, about 7 of ye clock, where I us'd to find him set in his study which was a large room furnish'd with books & Pictures; & as one of ye chieftest, he had ye picture of ye head of Hyppocrates that great physitian; & upon his table he had ye proportion of a man in wax, to set forth ye ordure & composure of every part; before his table he had a frame with shelves, whereon he set some books, & behind this he sat to receive those that came for his advice, for he seldom went to any, for he was corpulent and

¹ Entry under 10 September 1639, *Slingsby Diary*, p. 39.

² *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁴ Berwick.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁵ 'At last after some tryalls wth Dr. Baskerfield & Mr. Ruthen a Scottish gentleman of ye family of ye Ld. Cowers, who had made it his study in ye art of Physick to administer help to others, but not for any gain to himself, at last she was a patient of Theodorie Meene..., ye King's Physitian', *ibid.*, p. 48. The name of Baskerfield appears to be a phonetic rendering of Sir John Baskerville.

* *Ibid.*, p. 70.

unweildy; & again he was rich, & ye King's Phycitian, & a Knight, which made him more costly to deal withall.'

It may be held that this is a merely literary description relating to a man high in court favour, a foreigner whose way of life had little bearing on English custom. There was indeed a touch of bravado which he shared with Sir Balthasar Gerbier the court sculptor. At the same time the doctorate of medicine from the university of Montpellicr, which Sir Theodore had obtained, was paralleled by the same degree which William Harvey and others had sought at Padua.

In this connexion it is fortunate that the admissions register of Gonville and Caius College, to which William Harvey belonged, is so detailed and complete since it provides material for a judgement from another angle. A brief analysis of entries will suggest the links which already bound together the medical and clerical groupings. The second founder of the college, Dr. John Caius, was not the originator but rather an example of the medical associations of Gonville Hall. Sir William Butts, physician to Henry VIII, had preceded Caius as a member of that house. In the reign of Charles I there appeared among senior Caius men the names of William Harvey and Francis Glisson,¹ the latter occupying the chair of physic. Still, it is not so much these greater figures who arouse interest in a consideration of the social structure as the humdrum men who went out from this Cambridge college to work as doctors in East Anglia; these were among the founders of the parson doctor relationship in the old boroughs. Thus the Buckenham, father and son, were practitioners in Bury St. Edmunds² for three-quarters of a century while in Norwich there was established a former fellow of the college, Dr. Rant. The three sons of this Norwich

¹ Francis Glisson and William Goddard were both admitted to the scholars' table in 1617. The former became regius professor of physic in 1630 and the latter took the degree of M.D. at Padua. Notes to admissions register printed in *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College*, by John Venn, i. 236-7.

² John Buckenham, 'practitioner in phisick', son of John Buckcnham, yeoman, entered Gonville and Caius College in 1581 and died at Bury St. Kdmunds in 1620. Dr. Buckenham's son Thomas was born at Rishanglcs in Suffolk and was admitted to the scholars' table on 15 April 1629 aged sixteen. He practised medicine in Bury St. Edmunds until his death in 1682. He married into a minor landed family and his pedigree was matriculated at the Visitations in Suffolk in 1664. This is an interesting example of a steady increase in economic status, *ibid.*, p. 288.

doctor were all born and bred in that city, receiving education in the school kept by the Rev. Matthew Stonham, a well-known Gaius man. All three proceeded to their father's college.¹ William, the eldest, followed in his father's footsteps but moved to London, where he built up a successful practice.² The second son became a member of the Bar and died as Sir Thomas Rant, M.P. As a family they typified that provident tenacious grouping which secured the best incomes in the professions.

Such cases of increasing material prosperity are of their nature exceptional and a more characteristic career is that of another of Dr. Rant's schoolfellows. Christopher Ludkin was the son of an ironmonger resident in the parish of St. Peter in Norwich. At the age of thirteen he was sent to the school at St. Peter's then under a master whose name has not survived. At sixteen he was transferred to Mr. Stonham's charge with a view to entering the university. Two years later, in 1633, he gained a scholarship at Gonville and Caius College³ at an age which was then considered late for beginning academic studies. Ludkin became a doctor and settled down in practice at Ipswich. His contemporary at Caius, Henry Buckenham,⁴ passed a long life as a doctor at Norwich, surviving until 1696. Men of this calibre laid the foundations of the medical grouping in the county towns and the country districts.

The question of the status of the teaching profession is another matter that awaits examination. Here again there is a crucial distinction between the higher and the lower grades, a distinc-

¹ Dr. William Rant, senior, was born at Norwich and entered the college in 1581 aged seventeen. He died at Norwich on 26 May 1627. His eldest sons William and Thomas were admitted as pensioners on 1 May 1619 aged sixteen and fifteen respectively; each had spent five years at school at Norwich under Mr. Stonham. His third son John Rant was admitted to the scholars' table on 14 June 1626 aged sixteen, after spending three years at Mr. Stonham's school, Venn, op. cit. i. 245 and 276.

² '1635. But my dear mother being now dangerously sick, I was, on the 3rd September following, sent for to Wotton.... Though her physicians, Dr. Meverall, Dr. Clement, and Dr. Rand, had given over all hopes of her recovery, and Sir Sanders Duncombe had tried his celebrated and famous powder, yet she was many days impairing.' *Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. Austin Dobson, pp. n-12.

³ Details from admissions register printed in Venn, op. cit. i. 309-10.

⁴ Henry Buckenham was born in 1618 and entered Caius in 1634. He obtained an M.D. of Utrecht and established himself at Norwich in 1657. The date at which he gave up his practice is not recorded, admissions register, *ibid.*, p. 314.

tion which seems to have turned chiefly on the degree of effective contact maintained by the schoolmaster with the university. In this connexion a glimpse of the life-work of Mr. Stonham, who had taught Dr. Rant and Dr. Ludkin, will reveal a number of points of interest.

Matthew Stonham, whose father was a Norwich man described in the admissions register as *mediocris fortunae*,¹ came up to Gonville and Caius with a Norfolk scholarship in Michaelmas Term 1587. He was then aged sixteen and had been taught by Stephen Limbert or Limbrey, who between 1570 and 1599 prepared many Norwich boys for the university.² After taking Orders he returned to his native city and not later than 1600 opened a private school which for nearly forty years would continue to provide scholars for his own college. Judging by the admissions register this connexion seems to have been mainly local in character, linking his school with the neighbouring clergy and burgesses of consideration. Contacts with the Flemish Church in Norwich were very cordial.³ In the majority of cases the boys seem to have begun their studies between the ages often and thirteen.⁴ Stonham's own two sons were educated with the other pupils and went up to his old college.⁵ He continued his work until close on seventy; the last of the undcr-

¹ Matthew Stonham is described as son of Robert Stonham, *mediocris fortunae*, citizen of Norwich, *ibid.*, p. 13a.

² In most years there was at least one entry to Cains College from among his pupils. In 1598-9 one of his pupils Edmund Cooke, son of John Cooke, perfumer, of Norwich, was admitted to the scholars' table. The previous year was exceptional. Among twenty-one undergraduates entering the college in 1507-8, four were Mr. Limbert's pupils. These included one pensioner and two scholars and an undergraduate who became sizar to his surety Mr. Slookes, *ibid.*, pp. 1GG-7.

Matthew Stonham became vicar of St. Stephen, Norwich, in 1602 having married Cicely Smith of Norwich in 1597. His first recorded pupil was Robert Peachie, son of Robert Peachie, minister (vicar of Surlingham), who was admitted to the scholars' table aged seventeen on 14 July 1601. The connexion between Mr. Stonham's pupils and Mr. Limbert's is not clear. *Ibid.*, pp. 132 and 176.

³ Theophilus Elison son of John Elison, minister of the Flemish Church, Norwich (whom he succeeded). Born there. At school under Mr. Stonham five years. Admitted 14 May 1625, *ibid.*, p. 270.

⁴ An exceptional case is that of John Cruso, a Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, ejected at Christmas 1644. He was son of John Cruso, merchant of Norwich. 'At school, under Mr. Stonham, five years. Age 14 [when] admitted 27 March 1632 as sizar of his surety, Mr. Moore', *ibid.*, p. 304.

⁵ Both Nicholas and Matthew Stonham came up to Caius aged fifteen in 1617 and 1624 respectively. This appears to have been the normal age for well-advanced pupils, *ibid.*, pp. 235, 267.

graduates who came up from his school was admitted to Gonville and Caius in 1639.¹

Among the varying trends of educational practice one finds at least in East Anglia a marked emphasis on locality.² This was in part due to the many schools of the wealthy counties, but the prevalence of direct clerical control may be regarded as a contributory factor. The free schools in particular were often conducted by the local clergy and there was in consequence an emphasis upon the parish unit. Care was needed to avoid an invasion of rights. It was a result of this system that a school in quite a small village, like that kept by Mr. Gilbert at Soham Tony, might send up a number of scholars to the university. Considering only the undergraduates at Caius, a typical prosperous Cambridge college, we can obtain a view of many different forms of education. There was the staple provided by the large established schools, like Merchant Taylors' and St. Paul's,³ and the opportunity for the sons of Cambridge townsmen that the Perse School offered. In addition we can examine the two extreme types, those who appear to have come up with very little formal teaching and those others who had been instructed in their own manor houses by a private tutor.

In regard to the first group it is difficult to reach definite conclusions, but it would seem that the chances of a country boy reaching the university, if his father was below yeoman status, depended almost entirely on the presence near his village of a successful schoolmaster.⁴ In the towns the position was a little easier and the Perse School, for instance, gave an avenue

¹ James Oakcs son of Richard Oakes, gent., attorney-at-law of the parish of St. Stephen, Norwich. Born there. At school under Mr. Stonham six years. Admitted 30 January 1639, Venn, *op. cit.* i. 333.

² Robert le Neve, later rector of Yaxham, was the son of a small squire at Aslacton, some distance from Norwich. He, however, came to Mr. Stonham aged eighteen and went up to Caius aged twenty, *ibid.*, p. 295.

³ Such undergraduates were often attracted by the idea of medicine. The well-known physicians Dr. Edmund Smith and Sir Charles Scarborough entered Caius from Merchant Taylors' and St. Paul's respectively, *ibid.*, pp. 224 and 308.

⁴ Joseph Driver son of John Driver, blacksmith, of Docking in Norfolk, was admitted on 4 July 1628 aged seventeen as sizar to his surety Mr. Fitling. No details of education are given. It seems that he may have been taught by the Rev. Edward Fitling (son of John Fitling, husbandman) who had recently been chaplain and tutor in the family of Sir Robert Mordaunt, Bt., at Little Massingham, some ten miles from Docking, *ibid.*, pp. 285 and 292.

which would admit the sons of college upper servants to the scholars' table.¹ Towards the other end of the financial scale stood the group of those who came to the university from their own homes where their fathers' chaplain had instilled the rudiments of polite learning. Such a custom was not necessarily indicative of great wealth. On the contrary, it was chiefly favoured by the old-fashioned type of squire, Anglican in sentiment and traditional in outlook, who maintained a chapel and a chaplain as appurtenances of rank. Thus Sir Robert Mordaunt's heir came up to Caius after this preparation.²

When considering the practice of the richest stratum the actual method of education is bound up with the question of retinue. The Elizabethan custom by which the heirs of great landowners and peers were accompanied through adolescence by attendant servitors and tutors was hardly modified in Stuart times.³ There was, however, already a tendency for the tutor's status and salary to rise and for the number of attendants to diminish. Yet it was perhaps the knowledge that their sons would be surrounded by these insignia of privilege that reconciled many peers to the acceptance of the novel idea of allowing them to commence studies at Eton.⁴ The effect of

¹ William Ellis son of John Ellis, cook of King's College, was educated at the Perse School and admitted to the scholars' table on 19 March 1627-8. He became Fellow in 1634. Thomas Conway son of George Conway, butler of Jesus College, was admitted to the scholars' table from the Perse School on 20 July 1641. FIC was later vicar of Kilton in Somerset from 1661 till 1683, *ibid.*, pp. 283 and 345.

² Charles Mordaunt son and heir of Sir Robert Mordaunt, Bt., of Little Massingham, Norfolk, is described as 'educated at home, by Mr. Fitlingc. Age 15. Admitted fellow commoner 3 Aug. 1629. Surety, Mr. Fitlinge', *ibid.*, p. 292.

³ Cf. for an account of the tutors and servants of Lord Cork's sons at Eton, *Boyle's Works*, i. 7-9, which contains a sketch by Robert Boyle of his own childhood, and *Lismore Papers*, ed. A. B. Grosart, vol. ii, chapter III *pamm*.

⁴ William, later sixth Lord Paget, entered Eton with his younger brother Thomas in 1621, Francis fourth Lord Willoughby of Parham in 1623, Philip, later fourth Lord Wharton, and his younger brother Thomas in 1624, Francis and George Fane in 1627, James Lord Compton, later second earl of Northampton, with his younger brothers Charles, William, and Spencer Compton between 1633 and 1636, Francis and Robert Boyle in 1635, Henry Lord Mordaunt, later second earl of Peterborough, with his younger brother John in 1635. The school found favour with the Villiers family. John Viscount Grandison and his brothers Edward and George entered in 1629 and Charles second earl of Anglesey some ten years later. Towards the end of the reign of James I heirs of Catholic peers had been sent to Eton by royal command to be brought up as members of the Church of England, David first earl of Barrymore in 1617 and Robert second Lord Dormer and Francis Browne, later third Viscount Montagu, in 1621. The Barrymore

this new development on the salary of ushers still awaits examination.

The beginning of anything resembling a stream of fashion normally depends upon the personal factor; this was notably the case both in regard to Eton, where Sir Henry Wotton's provostship seems the determining element,¹ and to the private school in Goldsmiths Rents whose reputation was then at its zenith. This last venture was a proprietary² school in the exact sense. It was created by Thomas Farnaby, a former postmaster of Merton College, who after an adventurous career had settled down to the profession of teaching.³ He was fifty years of age at the accession of Charles I and transferred his school from London to Sevenoaks in 1636 on account of the plague which raged in that year. Anthony a Wood, himself a postmaster at Merton, has left an account of Goldsmiths Rents.

'His distresses', he writes⁴ in an account of Mr. Farnaby, had 'made him stoop so low, as to be an abcdarian, and several were taught their hornbooks by him. After he had gotten some feathers at Martock (teaching in the grammar school), he took his flight to London, and taught a long time in Goldsmiths Rents in Cripplegate parish behind Redcross Street, where were large gardens and handsome houses, and great accommodations for the young noblemen and other generous youths, who at one time made up the number of three hundred or more.'

As to academic qualifications, Mr. Farnaby, a celebrated Latinist, was made a master of arts in the university of Cambridge and then incorporated at Oxford with that degree. In the higher teaching, as in medicine, qualification was

experiment seems responsible for the Boyle connexion, *The Eton College Register*, ed. Sir Wasey Sterry, pp. 82-237.

¹ Sir Henry Wotton was provost from 1624 until 1639 and Sir Henry Savile from 1586 until 1622. The more expensive element among the commensals at second table began to appear towards the end of Savile's provostship. The grouping of officials was established earlier and included Sir Dudley Carleton the younger and Wotton's nephew Sir Albertus Morton.

² Cf. *Autobiography of Sir John Bramston*, ed. Lord Braybrooke (Camden Society), 1845. Bramston was born in 1611 and was a pupil in Goldsmiths Rents.

³ Lady Fanshawe thus describes the education of her husband Sir Richard: 'His mother, my lady, designed him for the law, having bred him first with that famous schoolmaster, Mr. Farnaby, and then under the tuition of Dr. Beall, in Jesus College, in Cambridge', *Memoirs of Lady Fanshawe*, ed. Charles Robert Fanshawe, pp. 38-9.

⁴ *Athenae Oxonienses*, iii. 213-14.

important;¹ we are passing away from the world of quacks, astrologers, and charlatans. Mr. Farnaby is said to have given regular employment to three ushers,² a staff which would seem insufficient were it not necessary to accept with caution the number of pupils given in *Athenae Oxonienses*. It would be interesting to find Mr. Farnaby's account books, to see who were his assistant masters and what he paid them. This could be paralleled by a study of Eton masters in the seventeenth century.

Already teachers would take certain boys with them when they moved from one headmastership to another and in such a case the personal factor was quite crucial. Gervase Holies in his *Memorials* gives an example³ of the practice. At this point it may be remarked that the relationship between the parent and schoolmaster was closest where there was no chaplain or private tutor to act as an intermediary. There was here a resemblance between the outlook of rich town families and that of the prosperous and consciously evangelical group to be found in the ranks of landed gentry. Mrs. Hutchinson's account of her husband's education bears on both these matters.

Before giving the passage it should be explained that John Hutchinson and his brother were the sons of Sir Thomas Hutchinson of Owthorpe near Nottingham by his first wife Margaret, a daughter of Sir John Byron of Newstead.

'When', we are told,⁴ 'it was time for them to go to schoole, both the brothers (then in the charge of their uncle Sir John Byron) were sent to board with Mr. Theobalds, the master of the free schoole att

¹ Cf. for a comment of another character the following note on the private school at Enfield Chase to which Sir John Reresby was sent in 1649: 'The Blew Hous, a then famous school for gentlemen's sons, wher Latin, French, writing and dancing were severally taught in soe good a method that they seemed noe hindrance one to another', Reresby family history printed in *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby*, ed. Andrew Browning, p. 2.

² *Athenae Oxonienses*, iii. 214.

³ William Holies, the eldest son of Captaine Francis Holies, was borne at Barwicke upon Twede . . . in . . . 1621. . . . Being yet a childc he was brought by his father into Nottinghamshire where he went to scholc first at Mansfield and after at Newarke upon Trent, when Mr. Poynton was removed to y^e schoole. From thence he was sent about 14 ycares of age to Pembroke Hall in Cambridge under the oversight of Dr. Lany, his kinsman, the then Maister', *Memorials of the Holies Family*, p. 186.

⁴ *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, by his widow, Mrs. Lucy Hutchinson, ed. Rev. Julius Hutchinson, ed. 3, 1810, i. 70-1.

Nottingham, who was an excellent scholar, but having no children, some wealth, and a little living that kept his house, first grew lazie, and after left of his schoole. Sir Thomas then remooved his sons to the free schoole at Lincoln, where there was a master very famous for learning and piety, Mr. Clarke, but he was such a supercilious pedant, and so conceited of his own pedantique forms, that he gave Mr. Hutchinson a disgust of him, and he profited very little there.'

An impression is then given¹ of the arrangements made for the boys at Lincoln.

'The greate encouragement Sir Thomas had to trust his sons in this towne, was, because, att that time, a gentleman inhabited there who had married his uncle's widow. . . . Sir Thomas Grantham, the gentleman of whom I am speaking, . . . had only two sons, whereof the eldest was a fine gentleman, bred beyond the seas;. . . the other was a foolish youth, schoolfellow with Mr. Hutchinson, who every Saturday night was fetcht from schoole to Sir Thomas Grantham's, and returned again the Munday morning.'

A final sentence will give² another aspect of this schooling. 'There being very many gentlemen's sons there an old low-country soldier was entertain'd to train them in arms . . . which instruction was not useless in a few years after to some of them.' These sentences were written under the Restoration by the strong-minded and devoted wife of Hutchinson the regicide. They are worth examining for they are surely marked by a sense of responsibility, which had come to characterize the prosperous and progressive classes whether Parliamentary or Royalist. There is an exact care and a sober and ambitious preparation that has little in common with the many Tudor attitudes. There is here perceptible a resolved God-fearing determination on advancement; this owed something to the understanding, if not the practice, of high commerce and something also to the Reformation. Throughout these Memoirs there is a conception of advancement, with its twin emphasis on personal responsibility and on trusteeship, which was to mark the outlook of the English professional world within the framework of capitalism.

It need not be said that a professional class is inevitably separated from and not answerable to the lower orders. For these reasons the spirit of the *Hutchinson Memoirs* possessed a

¹ *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, i. 72 and 73-4. ² *Ibid.*, p. 75.

unifying quality within the ranks of men of property; in the future this outlook would assist the men who followed Monck to understand the more sober of those who held to high Royalist principles. It was a note that would be echoed in those rich households which had now come to furnish the more Erastian elements in the Caroline episcopate.

An approach to the idea of a professional class can be made from another angle. It is unsafe to generalize, but in a broad sense it may be held that the squires, both great and small,¹ had planted out their children in the law and in the foreign service. The yeoman and the lower burgess grouping had seeped into medicine and teaching and had coloured the large mass of the clergy. On the other hand certain key examples show that the great burgess stocks moved into the high places of the Church.

This, of course, cannot be said without qualification. Under Charles I the episcopate contained the occasional cadet of a good house,² a number of sons of the clergy,³ and a sprinkling

¹ The rich squires sent their younger sons to the professions, while the small squires sent their heirs. Cf. *Cat. Coke ATSS.*, i., *passim* for detailed material on the career and background of Sir John Coke, secretary of state from 1625 until 1639.

² Richard Senhouse, a younger son of John Senhouse of Netherhall in Cumberland, became bishop of Carlisle in 1624. James Montagu, a younger brother of the first earl of Manchester, died as bishop of Winchester in 1618. William Lucy, the fourth son of Sir Thomas Lucy of Charlecote, was made bishop of St. Davids in 1660; but this seems to have been a case of a strongly Royalist clergyman receiving the reward of a Welsh see. Such promotions were commoner under the Restoration; Herbert Croft, who had been a Catholic in early life, was made bishop of Hereford in 1661, Henry Feme, the youngest son of Sir John Feme, secretary to the council of the north, became bishop of Chester in 1662. George Morley, a nephew of Sir John Denham the judge, was made bishop of Worcester in 1660. Morley belonged to Lord Falkland's circle. Bishops Lucy and Feme had entered the university as fellow commoners at Caius College and St. Mary's Hall respectively. The solitary promotion from this grouping made by Charles I was that of Sir John Coke's brother Dr. George Coke to the see of Bristol in 1633.

³ The close relationship by blood and marriage which had characterized the Barlow grouping of the Elizabethan episcopate had no parallel in Stuart times. Dr. Henry King, who became bishop of Chichester in 1642, was a son of Bishop King of London who died in 1621 and Dr. Humphrey Henchman, who became bishop of London in 1663, was a son-in-law of Bishop Townson of Salisbury. Richard Montagu, who was bishop of Chichester from 1628 until 1641, was the son of the vicar of Dorney in Buckinghamshire and Edward Rainbowe, who became bishop of Carlisle in 1664, was the son of the vicar of Blyton in Lindsey. Archbishop Accepted Frewen was a son of the rector of Northiam in Sussex. It will be noted that these examples are mostly taken from the promotions of the Restoration period.

of those who had worked their way without assistance, among whom William Laud may be included.¹

For the rest the Abbots, Juxons, and Cosins came from the privileged wealthy burgess circle. They and the juniors of their own background were lit companions for John Hutchinson, when he came to Peterhouse as a fellow commoner. The links between the families of some of these prelates and the company of Merchant Taylors² might be examined. A respect for authority, a realism where money was concerned, and a driving energy, rather rare in the circle of the court, tended to mark the churchmen who had sprung from the new rich civic group.³

This was an interesting and in some ways improbable association between the episcopate and the city; it certainly was not likely to endure.

In John Ferrar's life of his brother Nicholas there is a passage relating to their father which throws light on the way of life which could nourish the early Caroline churchmanship. It

¹ Statements as to humble parentage were at that time in the nature of accusations. Richard Gorbet bishop of Oxford and Norwich from 1628 until 1635 is described as the son of Vincent Gorbet, a gardener or nurseryman of Ewell in Surrey. There is no reason to suppose that this did not imply a background of substantial prosperity. He entered Westminster School as a scholar. Archbishop Laud was the tenth child of a clothier at Reading and his family does not seem to have been in a position to assist him. Archbishop Harsnett of York, who died in 1631, belonged to the same stratum as the son of a baker in Colchester. The predominance of the urban background was very marked. John Prideaux, who became bishop of Worcester in 1641, was sent to Exeter College from his Devonshire village at the expense of a patroness, Lady Fowel. Joseph Hall, bishop of Exeter from 1627 until 1641, was the son of John Hall, who was deputy for the third earl of Huntingdon at Ashby-de-la-Zouch. Archbishop Gilbert Sheldon, who was promoted to Canterbury in 1663, was described as descended from a decayed stock of minor gentry, his father acting as 'a menial servant' to Gilbert seventh earl of Shrewsbury. *Athenae Oxonienses*, iv. 854.

² William Juxon was at Merchant Taylors' School and his grandfather John Juxon was closely connected with the Merchant Taylors' Company. Bishop Matthew Wren was the son of Francis Wren mercer in London, and his brother Christopher, afterwards rector of East Knoyle, was at Merchant Taylors' School from 1601 until 1609. In the previous generation John Buckeridge, who was bishop of Rochester and Ely from 1611 until 1631, was at Merchant Taylors' School, his family having connexions with the Company. These families were all centred on London. Barnaby Potter, bishop of Carlisle from 1629 until 1642, was the son of a mercer at Kendal.

³ There were associations with the Skinners' Company. Bishop Henchman was the son of Thomas Henchman, skinner, of London. Archbishop Frewen's brother, Stephen Frewen, was master of the Skinners' Company. John Cosin, master of Peterhouse 1635-44 and bishop of Durham 1660-72, belonged to a rich mercantile family based upon Norwich.

should be noted that Mr. Ferrar was deputy treasurer of the Virginia Company in which the archbishop of Canterbury's brother Sir Maurice Abbot, a pioneer in such investments, had a strong interest.¹

'And of this worthy, Old Mr. Ferrar N. F.'s father', so runs this account,² 'know further, that he was a gentleman by birth, of the family of the Ferrers of Yorkshire, a merchant of good reputation in the city, and as they terme it, an alderman's fellow or companion; a merchant adventurer, trading to the East & West Indies, Spayne, Flanders, Germany &c: who kept (as they terme it) a good free table & constantly wanted (entertained?) not only company of his owne ranke, but often had men of eminency to dine with him, yea Lords, Knights, Ladyes &c: & Sir John Hawkins, Sir Francis Drake, Sir Walter Raleigh all gallant seamen, with whome he was an adventurer, evermore affecting the planting of the Christian Religion in the New World, & advancing trade & commerce for a common good, as well as his owne lawfull trading.'

Here was a sober inter-dependence of wealthy commerce and churchmanship, conservative, God-fearing, far removed from fashion, and insular in temper.³ The merchant and the churchman were both bound to their own considerable places; above them stood the king.

Still this burghess-ecclesiastical equation must not be pressed. The influence of the universities began in boyhood and lay upon each grave young candidate. A type of bishop began to emerge who appreciated learning but was not himself a scholar. A skill in academic business would attract the favourable notice of those who had the management of all preferment. Such was the atmosphere in the time of Laud's predominance. The system

¹ The influence of Sir Maurice Abbot and Sir Edwin Sandys, who was himself the son of an archbishop of York, seems in part responsible for the fact that among the adventurers to Virginia we find the names of the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of London, Bath and Wells, and Worcester. The lists also include Rawlie and William Crashaw, the latter apparently the poet's father, Jcffery Duppa, and Thomas Juxon. The last-named was a relative of Archbishop Juxon; the pedigree of Bishop Brian Duppa remains obscure. *Records of the Virginia Company of London*, iii. 58-66 and 80-90.

² A life of Nicholas Ferrar by John Ferrar printed in *The Ferrar Papers*, cd. B. Blackstone, p. 67.

³ Archbishop Sandys of York who became bishop of London in 1570 was closely associated with the Elizabethan mercantile group in the city. His son Edwin entered Merchant Taylors' School at the time that Lancelot Andrewcs was leaving. In the latter period Francis White, who was bishop of Ely from 1631 until 1638, was a protège of John Ferrar, *ibid.*, p. 82.

of protection and dependence was well established and we can trace the filiation of the pupils and the proteges of Lancelot Andrewes.¹ The headship of certain colleges seems to have led on naturally to the episcopate,² and it was in the community of high tables that there was moulded that especial type of the Caroline prelacy which filled the Anglican bishoprics and deaneries between the promotion of William Laud to Canterbury and the deprivation of Archbishop Sancroft. In a later chapter the Laudian and Puritan influence in the social structure will be considered. Here it is mainly a question of stating the method of class-formation and indicating certain of the ways in which the bureaucratic setting of the Hanoverian governmental world was even now becoming visible. With the ecclesiastical framework of the universities so strongly marked, it was inevitable that the clerical private tutor should begin to play his part. The figure of the young clergyman who attaches himself to the service of the university³ appears about this time.

¹ Bishop Duppa, for example, was a favourite pupil of Lancelot Andrewes when the latter was dean of Westminster.

² Archbishops Laud and Juxon and Bishop Buckridge were presidents of St. John's College, Oxford; Archbishop Abbot and Bishop Bancroft were masters of University College; Bishop Abbot was master of Balliol; Bishop Wright warden of Wadham; Bishop Prideaux rector of Exeter; and Archbishop Frewen president of Magdalen. Archbishop Sheldon was warden of All Souls and Bishop Potter provost of Queen's. The deanery of Christ Church was held by Bishops King, Corbet, Duppa, and Morley. At Cambridge Bishop Feme was master of Trinity; Archbishop Harsnett and Bishop Laney were masters of Pembroke Hall; Bishops Wren and Cosin were masters of Peterhouse; Bishop Cary master of Christ's; Bishops Overall and Brownrig masters of St. Catharine's Hall; Bishop Gunning was master successively of Clare and St. John's; Bishop Montague was master of Sidney Sussex; Bishop Rainbowe master of Magdalene; Bishop Sterne master of Jesus College.

³ This is borne out in the early history of Dr. Isaac Barrow, later master of Trinity and first Lucasian professor of mathematics at Cambridge. 'Dr. Isaac Barrow was the son of Mr. Thomas Barrow (a citizen of London of good reputation yet living...).... He was born in London, Oct. 1630. His mother was Anne daughter of William Buggin of North Cray in Kent, Esq. His first schooling was at the Charterhouse for two or three years. . . . For his book he minded it not, and his father had little hope of his success in the profession of a scholar to which he had designed him.... Removing thence to Felsted in Essex, he quickly made so great a progress in learning and all things praiseworthy, that his master appointed him a little tutor to the Lord Viscount Fairfax of Emely in Ireland. While he stayed here he was admitted in Peterhouse, his uncle the Bishop's college; when he removed to (and was fit for) the university of Cambridge, Feb. 1645. He was planted in Trinity College.' *The Works of Isaac Barrow, D.D.*, ed. Dr. Tiltson (1683), pp. a-3. Dr. Barrow's uncle was Isaac Barrow the elder, bishop of Sodor and Man in 1663 and later of St. Asaph. The father, Thomas Barrow, was linen-

Side by side with this character is the tutor who takes charge of a special aspect of his pupil's study;¹ the classical and mathematical tutor are here differentiated. Again, there is the clergyman who is made responsible for a young lord on his travels.² Very soon the bear-leader shades off into the secretary, now first maintained by private individuals, the ornate successor of the old factotum.

Meanwhile the foreign clement, which had been present in educational circles throughout the Tudor period, was still in evidence, and tutors of continental origin offered a brisk competition to the less experienced English clergy when travel was in prospect. They appealed especially to the lords of near-Calvinist sympathies. They called to their service energy, persistence, solidarity, and strong Protestant principles. Thus a French tutor was maintained in the Chaworth family.³ An

draper to Charles I. The peer seems to have been William third Viscount Fairfax who was considerably his tutor's senior. Isaac Barrow passed through all these educational experiences before reaching his sixteenth year.

¹ The practice of having a tutor in addition to a schoolmaster is seen in the arrangements for the education of John Wilmot second earl of Rochester. He was born at Ditchley on 1 April 1647 and educated at Burford Grammar School under John Martin while at the same time he was taught at home by his tutor the Rev. Francis Giffard, chaplain to the countess. He entered Wadham College as a nobleman on 18 January 1660 at the age of twelve. (If. introduction to the *Collected Works of John Wilmot Earl of Rochester*, ed. John Hayward, pp. xix-xx.

² Cf. an account of the foreign journeys made by James fourth duke of Lennox when he was seventeen. On 29 September 1629 a licence was made out to the duke of Lennox permitting him to travel for three years and to take with him Dr. Topham, dean of Lincoln, and John St. Alitian with eight other servants. They were allowed £200 in money. Reports were sent to Lord Dorchester, secretary of state, by the duke's tutor Edward Dacres. In September 1630 it is explained that the duke had been at Aubigny for the summer and was fixed in Paris for the winter. He paid fifty crowns a month for his house, had bought a coach and four horses, and maintained ten servants 'whereof five are gentlemen'. Such expenditure could not be defrayed at £2,000 a year. Dacres asked for an additional £500 per annum. On 22 November Dacres wrote that the duke was willing to stay at Paris 'till he has attained to some perfection in his exercises'. In the spring he proposed to make the *'leur tie France* and at the end of summer to go on to Italy. On 12 August 1631 Dacres wrote to Lord Dorchester from Saumur. They had come to this town to pass the dog days and were on the point of leaving intending to follow his lordship's direction and winter in Spain. An undated letter apparently belonging to 1631 and addressed by the duchess of Lennox to Lord Dorchester includes bills of exchange received from her son. She asked his opinion as to whether she should accept them or not, *State Papers, Darn., Charles I.*, clxxiii. 56, clxxv. 83 and 88, cxviii. 29, and ccv. 69. Compare also the letters addressed to the first earl of Carlisle from Italy in 1629 by James Viscount Doncaster and the latter's tutor James Traill, *ibid.*, cxv. 18 and cxvii. 9 and 74.

³ Gilbert Chaworth, son and heir of Sir George, later Lord Chaworth of

interesting recommendation written by Sir Henry Wotton and relating to another Huguenot tutor survives among the Lismore Papers; it was addressed to the earl of Cork and resulted in an engagement to take Lord Kinalmeaky and Roger Boyle on a foreign tour.¹ Throughout the period foreigners continued to settle in England and pressed in upon the universities.² Still in the professional world foreigners, apart from those in the service of the court, had little place. They came as individuals and were lost in the stream of their English competitors. In the years before the revocation of the edict of Nantes they tended increasingly to pass unnoticed, while the professions which depend on patronage³ would open up gradually. A

Wiverton, Notts. Born in London. Educated for three years under Mr. Prudentius du Boys, a Frenchman. Admitted to Gonville and Caius College as a fellow commoner on 20 November 1622 aged fifteen (admissions register, Venn, op. cit. i. 260). The younger brother John later second Viscount Chaworth also entered the same college. His education is described: 'At Perse School, Cambridge, under Mr. Lovering, three years, age 17. Admitted pensioner to the Bachelors' table March 12, 1626-7', *ibid.*, p. 280. This seems to be an instance in which a boy boarded at what was normally a day school. There appears to have been no clear distinction in this matter.

¹ Sir Henry Wotton's letter was dated from London 24 November 1635. 'He [Monsieur Marcombes] is by birth French, native in the Province of Auvergne, bred seven years in Geneva, very sound in religion, and well conversant with religious men; furnished with good literature and languages, especially with Italian, which he spaketh as promptly as his own, and will be a good guide for your sons in that delicate piece of the world. He seemeth in himself neither of a lumpish nor of a light composition, but of a well fixed mean. He hath given good proof, both in his discretion and fidelity, in my Lord of Middlesex his house, and is well reported... Lastly I believe my Lord of Dungarvan [Lord Cork's eldest son] will afford him his good word, or his good opinion with your Lordship.' *Lismore Papers*, second series, iii. 220-1.

² Cf. a letter from Wolfgang Meyer to the earl of Carlisle dated from Basel 1 October 1629. The writer expresses his thanks to Lord Carlisle for having given his son an allowance of £16 per annum and for having provided him with new clothes, a gown and bed, and other things necessary for an undergraduate. He thanks his patron for having given his son a letter to the late master of Trinity College, Cambridge, which had procured him admission to the bachelors' table; he had been allotted a tutor and a proper sleeping-chamber. He now asks for a further recommendation to the new master, Dr. Brooke, so that in due time his son might be elected to a fellowship, *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cl. 8.

³ A letter dated at Christ Church on 12 April 1631 and written by the dean, Dr. Bryan Duppa, to Lord Dorchester, secretary of state, shows that the eighteenth-century attitude to the privileges of undergraduate peers goes far back. The dean reported that he had entered the name of Lord Bayning (Dorchester's step-son) as a commoner at the canon's table 'where his diet will be very good, though not altogether in that height it was lately grown to, three or four dishes being now the ordinary' stint'. His tutor would be Chaworth, younger brother of the Viscount of that name. Nothing was now needed but a lodging for Lord Bayning and this

regular tutorial secretarial group was now in process of formation. This question of the secretarial element in the professional class needs to be considered with some care.

In the political firmament the principal figures had an area of responsibilities that made the use of intermediaries essential. The retainers of gentle birth were fast going out of fashion since the disintegration of Essex House; in their place had come the middleman. Here there was present in germ that type of political private secretary which would reach its maturity under the old system when Edmund Burke came to serve the marquis of Rockingham in that capacity. The whole character of secretarial work began to take on an intimate familiar aspect which seems to have been lacking in the sixteenth century. In a general way it appears accurate to state that in the entourage of Lord Burghley and the first earl of Salisbury and at Leicester House and Essex House the wives of the great leaders hardly counted. Under the queen's rule there were reasons which might be held to emphasize this tendency. At the same time the tie which bound the Welsh and marcher squires to the fortunes of the Devereux turned upon a sense of obligation towards and claim upon the earls of Essex; it was a relation in which no feminine influence would enter. On the other hand there was of course a tradition, affected perhaps by Castiglione's // *Cortegiano*, in which women played a definite intellectual-social role as they had done in Sir Thomas More's household.

In the seventeenth century a political significance was becoming attached to a unit which had the character of the hearth rather than that of a dynasty. Thus the Pctworth and Penshurst family group was composed of sisters and brothers, husbands and wives. Here the women had a taste for and an activity in politics on those terms which the France of the *grand siècle* would come to admit. In consequence of this situation a new type of secretary was brought into being. This can be best explained by a brief study of the countess of Northumberland's gentleman of confidence.

There is a good deal of information available relating to

Lord Dorchester might obtain by speaking to the bishop of Peterborough [Dr. William Piers] then in London who intended to live in Peterborough. Ibid, clxxxviii. 49.

George Garrard. He had been a fellow of Merton¹ and had settled in London in 1613;² he appears as possessed of many accomplishments, busied in the selling of land³ and the renting of houses,⁴ a commentator on public affairs,⁵ a valuer and purveyor of news, useful and pliable. He was in particular at the service of ladies of quality.⁶ Emerging as a familiar dependant of Cottington, he had passed thence to the Petworth circle. Throughout his career there was present a search for a settled income; one letter to Wentworth should be set out because it is typical. Garrard is explaining⁷ his objective:

'It is for a grant from the King of the mastership of Sutton's Hospital [the Charterhouse] when it falls. Sir Robert Dallington [the master] is full of years, so weak and feeble. . . . The commodity of the place, good lodgings, a collegiate diet, and £100 a year stipend. And he must be an unmarried man. . . . I have been long

¹ Letter to Viscount Wentworth dated 9 January 1634: 'Sir Edmund Powell, a pretty senseless Master of the Requests. I may be bold with him, my Lord, he was one of the fill-pots in Merton College when I was Fellow there', *Letters and Dispatches of Thomas Earl of Strafford*, ed. William Knowler, i. 176.

² Letter to the same dated 6 December 1633: 'As soon as I began to settle in London, which constantly I have done almost twenty years about Allhallentide', *ibid.*, p. 165. There is also Garrard's comment made on 14 April 1635, 'London is the place I love best to live in', *ibid.*, p. 412.

³ Letter to the same dated 24 July 1637: 'My Lord of Antrim, now with you in Ireland, hath bought the Lord Zouch's great house [Bramshill] near Hartlow, and four hundred pounds a year about it, for which he pays fourteen thousand pounds, an excellent bargain, for the house was worth the money', *ibid.* ii. 86.

⁴ Letter to the same dated 27 February 1634 relating to Lord Cottington's search for accommodation in London. 'I have gotten for him that part of Salisbury House where my Lord Newport lived', *ibid.* i. 207. And again, 'My Lady Carlile... lives (at Mr. Thomas Cary's) house in the Strand, for the taking of physic and recovery of her health, which house her Lord hath taken at £150 a year rent ever since Mr. Carey was designed Ambassador for Venice', *ibid.*, p. 177.

⁵ Letter to the same dated 20 June 1634: 'I am, God willing, the rest of this summer to be at Hatfield and Petworth. . . . Now Wallenstein is dead, the King of Hungary is the man; his and Bavier's forces are joined together and they are made rich by the Duke of Friedland's monies, which they seized on after his slaughter', *ibid.*, pp. 265, 266.

⁶ Letter to Viscount Conway dated from Spain 6 October 1640: 'As soon as the dog days began I left London and retired to Hatfield where the Countess of Devonshire and her mother often talked of you', *State Papers, Dom.*, *Charles I*, cccclxix.45. The links between these various patronesses should be set out. William second earl of Salisbury and his wife, Lady Catherine Howard, had among other daughters Elizabeth, wife of William third earl of Devonshire, and Anne, wife of Algernon tenth earl of Northumberland, whose sisters were married to the earls of Carlisle and Leicester respectively.

⁷ Letter to Viscount Wentworth dated 13 January 1635, *Letters and Dispatches*, i. 361.

known to his Grace [of Canterbury]; the first year King James came to the Crown he was proctor and regent master, having spent twelve years Fellow of Merton College. . . . Perhaps my Lord's Grace loving the Church . . . will bestow it . . . upon a divine. That strictness at Eaton College hath been long dispensed with. I am now fifty-five years old . . . have only one boy.'

For three years Garrard struggled and, finally, in the spring of 1638 obtained the place after he had taken deacon's orders as a qualification.¹ Through his phrases we can perceive that quest for security at a time before the sinecure system was in working order. When the secretaries were numerous enough, provision would be made for those who served the oligarchy.

In this connexion it is interesting to consider the effect of the king's defeat and the years of the lord protector's rule upon the development of a professional class. The subject still requires examination, but it appears probable that this change was hastened by the failure of certain forms of patronage, which were bound up with Royalism. The old-established groups, the lawyers and the doctors, became increasingly the arbiters of their own income; for the more dependent sections these lean years proved the need for that system of sinecure and graded payment that marked the method by which the eighteenth-century governing-world rewarded the new class of trained middleman.

¹ Garrard also considered the Hospital of St. Catherine by the Tower, but this was in two reversions, 'one to Sir Robert Aiton, the Queen's Secretary, the second to Wat Montague', *ibid.* In a letter to Lord Conway dated 18 September 1635, Petworth, 11 at night, Garrard wrote: '13 stone and 6 lb. I weigh. 'This next Sunday.. . the learned Bishop here makes me a deacon; then I hope I shall be fitted to succeed Sir Robert Dallington whensoever it happens.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, ccxviii. 10. On 20 March 1638 there is a letter sent to Lord Wentworth: 'Sir Robert Dallington hath been dead these three weeks and your most humble servant is elected newly into his place' as Master of the Charterhouse. *Utters and Dispatches*, ii. 152.

VI

THE LAUDIAN AND PURITAN INFLUENCE

It is evident that neither a parallel nor a direct antithesis can be established between the Laudian and Puritan impact on the social structure. More accurately a distinction may be drawn between the Puritan and Anglican approaches, although it must be added that the body of Puritan opinion did not conceive itself as separated from the wide franchise of the Church of England. Before examining the matter in detail, it may be said that the Puritans were international in outlook, ahistorical and contemporary. On these three points the Anglican attitude, although less clearly formulated, appears plainly divergent. It was the essence of the Anglican position to be immersed in tradition; a tradition which was national in its emphasis and always patient of an evangelical interpretation. Thus Anglican concepts crystallized around the idea of order manifested in a worshipping community. The Puritans laid stress on preaching and on savoury discourse.

The term Laudian seems really only applicable to a subdivision of those attached to the Anglican school. The Laudian point of view appears principally concerned to conserve or where necessary to restore order in worship. Its external manifestations can be described as an attempt to express a certain tradition in terms of restrained Anglican ornament. At the same time this approach was not without its own class emphasis. The notion of careful liturgical practice, envisaged in the first place in the setting of cathedral or collegiate worship, had an appeal limited to those groups who were within range of such experience. On the other hand the strong intellectual foundation which the men of Laudian views shared tended to separate them from the mass of Englishmen.

The withdrawn, almost coterie, quality of the Laudian support, as opposed to the high public position of its few protagonists, stood in contrast with the widespread popular appeal of those who gave themselves to Puritan enthusiasm. There was an immediacy and a clarity in the Puritan vision which

recalled that of the Anabaptists¹ at Miinster. The Harlot on her Seven Hills came to them with a sharpness of conviction. 'The oppressed saints and honest people' of those times knew the whole truth. To them Spain was the enemy and persecutor of all true professors. Insular and single-minded, the merits of the Calvinists came home to them, 'the sunny reflection of all the neighbouring churches'.

To such men the Laudian position was alike suspect and incomprehensible. As a consequence the presence of Laudian practices never failed to arouse opposition. Among the cathedral clergy the introduction of liturgical customs of a high church character seems normally to have been followed by sharp controversy.² The universities throughout retained their colleges of

¹ It is curious that the particular charge of being Anabaptists was brought by the Puritans against the Laudians who were called as a term of abuse Arminians. 'And though, since the death of James Arminius, a fleshly divine of Leyden in Holland, these heretical Anabaptists have called themselves by a new invented and false name of Arminians, yet are their wicked and scandalous lives, their cursed and graceless doctrines, no less to be abhorred, than when they owned their first, their ancient, and still true name of Anabaptists. And certainly if it were possible, they yet deserve a worse appellation, having broached many wicked tenets and practised the idolatrous adoration of the Altar, of the elements of the Sacrament, and other creature objects.' *Autobiography of Sir Simonds IYewei*, ed. J. O. Halliwell, ii. 65.

² Cf. the controversy at Durham in 1628-9 when John Cosin was treasurer and Richard Hunt dean. The following passages in the articles exhibited by Peter Smart, a prebendary of Durham, will serve to indicate the temper of the disputants. 'But you, Dr. Lindsell, craftily lurking in corners, made bolts for your friend Cosin and others to shoot: and you are thought to sitt at the steme of popish Arminianisme in England . . . And again, you, John Cosin, speaking of a learned reverent bishopp of Durhame deceased . . . scurrilously termed him "a buckram bishopp" because he appointed poore parishe-churches, being not able to procure more costly furniture, to have the Communion Table covcr'd with buckram, or some such decent stuff', *Cosin Correspondence*, Surtees Society, i. 102 and 164.

These injunctions, it is explained, were laid by 'your elder brother and a senior residentiary Peter Smart seeing . . . and perceiving the simple people inveigled and begiled, by your popish baits and allurements of glorious pictures, and Babalonish vesturs, and excessive number of wax candles burning at one tyme, and especially the horrible profanation of both the sacraments with all manner of musick, both instrumental!, and vocall, so iowde that the Ministers could not be heard, what they said, as if *Bacchanalia*, the feasts of Bacchus, or the Aegiptian Isis, or the Phrygian Cybele, *cum multiforis libiis, et crepitantibus sittris*; with fluits, and bag-pipes; with tymbrells and tabcrs; and not the Death and Passion of our Saviour Christ were celebrated.

'Nay the Sacrament itself is turned wel neeie into a thecatricall stage play . . . And this kind of administration of the Holy Communion, with so many pictures, and so strange gestures and excessive musick, at the same time, is not used in any cathedrall church of England, nor in Durham, till you John Cosin became

strong Puritan preferences: it was in an arena of the smallest scale, at Little Gidding or at Peterhouse Chapel, that changes could be made without resulting in the rise of faction.

In this last instance there seems to have been general support among the fellows of the college for the action taken. It was outside the academic circle that the storm broke. 'In Peterhouse Chapel' wrote Prynne in *Canterburys Doom*,¹ 'there was a glorious new Altar set up to which the Masters, Fellows and Scholars bowed and were enjoined to bow by Dr. Cosens the Master, who set it up: there were Basons, Candlesticks, Tapers standing on it, and a great Crucifix hanging over it. . . . In St. John's and Peterhouse Chapels there were pictures of the Holy Ghost in form of a Dove.' It is interesting to note the effect produced on John Hutchinson.

'He kept not company', we are told in the *Memoirs*² in regard to his years as a fellow commoner at Peterhouse, 'with any of the vain young persons, but with the graver men, and those by whose conversation he might gain improvement. He was constant at their chapel, where he began to take notice of their stretching superstition to idolatry; and was courted much into a more solemn practice of it than he could admit, though yet he considered not the emptiness and carnality, to say no more, of that public service which was then in use.'

It is indicated that opinion at the high tables ran against him. 'His tutor'³ and the masters that governed the college while he was there, were of Arminian principles, and that college was noted above all for popish superstitious practices; yet through the grace of God, notwithstanding the mutual kindness the whole household had for him, and he for them, he came away, after five years' study there, untainted with those principles or practices'.

praebendary of the same, that is within this three years.' *Ibid.*, pp. 165-7. After inveighing against the introduction of a cope of crimson satin powdered over with stones and David with Goliath's head worked on the hood and the placing of eighteen cherubim with faces as white as snow on the pillars of the high altar Smart concludes with this attack: 'And because you (John Cosin, Treasurer, and Richard Hunt, Deane) thought in your religious wisdoms, that it were not befitting the image of poore Christ, above the Bishop's throne, should be all of shyning gold and scarlett, as gay as the 50 glorious angells, by the counsaile of the foresayd popish paynter, you thought good to honour him with a golden beard, and a new blew capp, like a potlidd, covering his head with rayes like the sunn beames.' *Ibid.*, p. 169.

¹ *Canterbury's Doom*, pp. 73-4.

² *Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson*, by Lucy Hutchinson, i. 77. * *Ibid.*, p. 78.

This is a rare example of the absence of direct opposition between the factions.¹ It suggests an important question in this controversy, the area of appeal of the rival standpoints. The Puritans will be considered later, for their support came from several diverse quarters; it was shot with the patriotic motive, marked by an absolute assurance and fortified by moral indignation. A hatred of iniquity and of her instruments burned in the oppressed saints. As a consequence a Puritan energy could with difficulty co-exist with an appreciation of art; similarly it tended to exclude all those who felt attracted by the concept of sophistication. The Laudian approach was designated 'popish' as a simple term of opprobrium, but it would be more just to state that it presupposed an awareness of contemporary continental values. In consequence its appeal was restricted to that circle which for reasons of scholarship or fashion felt some element of aesthetic kinship with what Garrard termed 'beyond the seas'. In the sense that both the art-forms and the hieratic thought of France and the Spanish Netherlands were impregnated by the Baroque spirit of the Counter-Reformation, it can be said that the Laudian school came within the orbit of the latter movement. Still it was principally the secular implications of the movement so loosely called the Counter-Reformation that can be traced in the Anglican setting. An account given by George Garrard of the visit of the king and queen to Oxford in August 1636 will indicate the use that was made of continental ornament in a re-establishment of Anglican collegiate church order.

'The churches or chappels of all the colledgcs', he wrote² in a letter to Lord Conway dated from Hatfield House, 'are much

¹ In Colonel Hutchinson's case it was his wife who had the definitely Calvinist affiliations. In the *Memoirs* she speaks of the upbringing of her mother, Lady Apsley. 'My uncle's wife (Lady St. John) ... persuaded her to remove herself from her sister's envy, by going along with her to the Isle of Jermy where her father was governor; which she did, and there went into the town, and hoarded in a French minister's house, to learn the language, that minister having been, by the persecution in France, driven to seek his shelter there. Contracting a dear friendship with this holy man and his wife, she was instructed in their Geneva discipline, which she liked so much better than our more superstitious service.' *Ibid.*, p. 11. Cf. Clarendon's reference to Lady Fairfax. 'She was of a very noble extraction, one of the daughters and heirs of Horace Lord Vere of Tilbury; who, having been bred in Holland, had not that reverence for the Church of England, as she ought to have had'. *History of the Rebellion*, vi. 2 §4.

² Letter preserved among State Papers, Domestic and primed in *Oxoniewia*, 1936.

beautified, extraordinary cost bestowed on them; most of them newe glazed, richer glasse for figures and painting I have not seen, which they had most from beiond the Seas; excellently paved theyre quires with black and whyte stone; where the East end admitts not glasse, excellent pictures, large and greate church worke of the best hands they cold gett from the other side, of the birth, Passion, Resurrection & Ascension of our Blessed Saviour. All theyre Communion Tables (are) fayrely covered with rich carpetts, hung some of them with specyall good hangings. I am sure Merton CoUedge is soe, and rayld about with costly rayles.'

Here we note again the quality of miniature; this decoration seems to be the work of a few men in the small colleges.

The same spirit is found reflected in another academic pre-occupation of the clerical high tables, the college library. Here, too, there was an openness to continental influence and a sense of the still unshattered republic of learning. An examination of the Perne Library at Peterhouse will provide material for some interesting conclusions under this head. This library was in the first place formed from a bequest by Andrew Perne, who held the mastership from 1554 until his death in 1589. Dr. Perne, who had been vice-chancellor of the university during the reigns of Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth, had initiated a tolerant admissions policy and this custom had been maintained. Undergraduates of strongly opposed views lived amicably¹ within the college. A similar absence of prejudice was

¹ Cf. *Peterhouse Admission Book*, ed. T. A. Walker (1912) and *Peterhouse Biographies and Register*, ed. T. A. Walker (1927-30). Henry Walpole the Jesuit and John Penry had both been undergraduates during Perne's mastership. Sir Thomas North the translator of Plutarch's *Lives* was at Peterhouse a generation earlier. The Admissions Register indicates a wide variety of undergraduate types. In 1616 Ralph Knevctt the author of *fflioda and Iris*, a pastoral (1630) and *Funeral Elegies* (1637) was admitted and in 1617 Christopher Cartwright, a friend of Richard Baxter and described by him as 'a very learned, peaceable and godly man'. In the same year William Hodson, the author of *Divine Cosmographie* (1640), joined the college and in 1618 Brian Walton, afterwards bishop of Chester, and Henry fourth Lord Delawarr. In 1619 James Margetson, later archbishop of Armagh, came up, and in the same year John Ashburnham, who was in college from July 1619 until December 1619 and seems almost certainly to be identical with John Ashburnham of Ashburnham, groom of the bedchamber to Charles I. In 1620 Luke Skippon, afterwards bursar and a brother to Major-General Philip Skippon, came up with John North who went to New England in 1625. William Brewster who sailed in the *Mayflower* was at Peterhouse. In 1622 Sir Philip Musgrave of Edcnhall joined the college and in 1623 Andrew Perne, the fourth or fifth of that name at Peterhouse. Isaac Barrow and John Bargrave, both subsequently fellows, came up in 1629 and in 1630. Joseph Beaumont who married the

shown in the formation of the library. The volumes which were presented by Dr. Perne are clearly marked as are other later gifts such as those made in 1635 ^{bY Mrs} - Gulston.¹ A remarkable feature of the library is the number of books printed beyond the seas.² A careful study of seventeenth-century cathedral and chapter libraries would be rewarding. step-daughter of Bishop Matthew Wren, master of the house from 1625 until 1634, was himself master of Peterhouse 1663-1699. Beaumont was one of the first two chapel clerks of the new chapel. In 1631 John Hutchinson became a fellow-commoner.

During the mastership of Dr. Cosin, Richard Crashaw was elected to a fellowship. He had taken his degree from Pembroke in 1634 and transferred to Peterhouse the next year. As an indication of the link with Little Gidding, Ferrar Collet was admitted on 16 March 1636 *sub titulo Dmi. Crashaw*, George Calveley, admitted in 1631, is described under the heading of *postea Domini Crashaw*. The note against Samuel Booth under 1 March 1636 runs *admissus est sizator sub Domino Crashaw*. A Catholic link appears with the admission of John Lord Relays of Worlabey on 25 March 1638 'annos natus scptemdecim admissus est pensionarius ad primam mensam scholarium sub tutela Mgri Beaumont'.

¹ The works presented by Mrs. Gulston belonged to her husband Theodore Gulston, M.D., founder of the Gulstonian lecture. They include Felice Accoromboni's *Annotations in Aristotelem* printed in Rome in 1615, Commentaries on the *De Arte Rhetorica* by Antonio Maioragio printed at Venice in 1591, two volumes of a commentary on the *Summa* by the Augustinian Joannes Puteanus printed at Toulouse in 1627, ^{anc}^ the commentary on the *Summa Theologica* by Philippe Gamaches in the Paris edition of 1634. The first edition of this last work was published in 1627 and the copy at Peterhouse must have reached England in the year of issue. This is evidence of a close contact. Older books presented by Mrs. Gulston included three volumes of the commentary on Kzckiel published by John Baptist Villalpandus, S.J., between 1598 and 1604, volumes of Peter Victorius's commentaries on Aristotle in the Florentine editions of 1560 and 1579, Francesco Robortello's commentary on the *Politic** in the Florentine edition of 1548, and Simon Simoni's commentary printed at Geneva in 1566. It is worth noting that with the exception of this last work all these books were written by Catholic authors.

² Another series of books formed part of a gift presented to the Perne Library by Dr. Thomas Raymcent on the resignation of his fellowship in 1625. Dr. Rayment, who had held the chair of sacred theology, died as archdeacon of St. Albans in 1631. His interests appear principally in exegesis. His gift included the commentary on the Pentateuch by Cornelius a Lapide in the Antwerp edition of 1616, as well as the same author's commentaries on the four major prophets, on Jeremias and Baruch and on the epistles of St. Paul. This last volume was printed at Antwerp in 1621 and the two former at Paris in 1622. It is clear that they were purchased when they were issued by Dr. Raymcent for his own use. Dr. Kayment also presented to the library a commentary on the *Sentences* and on the *Summa Theologica* published by Estius at Douai in 1615-16.

Pupils sometimes gave books. Thus an edition of the *Opera Omnia* of William of Auvergne printed at Venice in 1591 is inscribed 'ex dono clarissimi juvenis Thomas Appeton hujus collegii quondam alumni'. The donor was a Royalist squire whose name is found together with that of Sir Philip Musgrave among the supporters of the chapel fund. The Rev. Richard Drake, a Fellow of Pembroke, gave a copy of Banes's commentary on the *Secunda Secundae*.

It may be said that the collections of this time tend to bear the mark of a period before iconoclasm. In particular the commentaries on Aristotle acted as bridges; they were as acceptable in the universities that had received the Reformation as in those that had not swerved from their attachment to the Roman pontiff. There were divergences of emphasis and in certain Oxford colleges, for instance, the proportion of foreign books of Protestant provenance seems to have been greater than at Peterhouse. In all cases there was agreement that books in general should circulate.

In this connexion the Crosfield diary throws light on an approach which, while devoid of theological implications, only remained possible in a world in which the Puritans were not victorious. In 1633 Gerard Langbaine was elected to a fellowship at Queen's College, Oxford, and in December of that year the Rev. Thomas Crosfield, a fellow of the same college, made a note of 'some bookes I see in Mr. Langbaine's chamber'.¹ It seems clear from the context that the volumes were not on loan from the college library.

They included works in French as well as Le Mason's translation of the *Decameron*. It is not surprising to find the *CEuvres de Rabelais* and Commynes's *Memoirs*. One or two items are unusual.² Finally three titles have a legal bearing, Cuneus *De Republica Hebraeorum*, Schickard's *Jus Regium Hebraeorum*, and Sir Thomas Ridley's *View of the Civil Lawes*. A small point is worth making. Although the date of the edition of these works is not given, they were none of them new books; Schickard's volume published in 1625 ^{was} the ^{most} recent.

Langbaine was a clergyman of twenty-four and the tastes of the future provost of Queen's had not yet clarified. The small mixed bag here indicated has an interest as part of the cultural background of a young man who would always be a Royalist; the Commynes, the *Decameron*, the *Rabelais*. Here was an

¹ *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield*, ed. Frederick S. Boas (1935), p. 68.

² Among the fourteen titles in this short list there appear a French translation of Diego de Stella's Spanish devotional treatise and a book in defence of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew entitled *Lo Stratagemma di Carlo ix contro gli ugonotti rebelli descritto per Camilla Capilupi*. These were perhaps acquired as curiosities. One book has the insufficient title '*II. The Councill of Trent'. There were two other volumes in Italian: the letters of Pietro Bembo and Giovanni Botero's world history. Other titles include 'Florios Italian Dictionary, Cotgrave French, Xenophon Greek', *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield*, p. 68.

element that was at once humane, traditional, and bawdy. There were always present in the rich loam of English life those coarse cheerful satisfactions which precisians would abhor.

About them lay the secular-religious appurtenances of monarchy as these had been understood for the last century at Lutheran courts. Crosfield has a note¹ in his description of the king's visit to Oxford in 1636. * August 30. The following day being Tuesday his maiesties entertainment was thus ordered. *Hora #.*^a A sermon by Proctour browne at Christ Church: his text Luke 19.38. Blessed be the King y^t cometh in y^e name of y^e Lord peace in heaven and glory. The Kings power proved against y^e Anabaptist, puritane and papists. A hearty vote to God his benedictus upon him.'

A light is thrown on the Anglican approach by a series of statements which perhaps form the kernel of Archbishop Laud's defence. They were all composed in the Tower of London during that winter of 1641 which saw the breakdown of the king's experiment. Their manner is hardly of less importance than their substance and each sentence is imprinted with that nervous strong vitality which marked the old primate when brought to bay.

'For', wrote² the archbishop in an answer to Lord Saye and Sele dated 3 December 1641, 'of all simulations or dissimulations, that is the basest, when a man, for poor, temporary, fading ends, shall shift his religion or his judgment concerning it, with the time if not with the tide, as if at all times he had somewhat to seek before he would express: whereas it is most true which St. Hilary speaks in matter of religion, *Non opus est intervallo aliquo inter cor et os*: "There's no need of a distance between the heart and the mouth; as if a man were to bethink himself of some faithless ambiguity, before he would speak that which belonged to the profession of his faith".'

The spirit of a national ecclesiastical tradition was strong upon him. 'Certainly', he wrote,³ 'my comprehensions are not so narrow as theirs (the Sectaries) whose largest cannot, or will not, look upon one entire national Church; nay, a parochial is too big for them, and a conventicle big enough.' Such an outlook was in Laud's case profoundly insular and impregnated

¹ Ibid., p. 91.

^a Archbishop Laud's *Works*, vi. I. 84.

^j Ibid., p. 88.

with that patriotism which underlay his theocratic-regalian schemes.

'My Lord [Saye], it seems', Laud is found saying,¹ 'knows not how far I will extend the word "sectary". Truly, no further than the Church of Christ extended it, ever since sects and schisms broke in upon it, to help despoil it of peace and unity.' Then suddenly we come upon a violent fierce defence of that quality of mercy which characterized the thought of the Anglican inheritance.

'In the eighth place,² almost all of them [the Brownists] say that God from all eternity reprobates by far the greater part of mankind to eternal fire, without any eye at all to their sin. Which opinion my very soul abominates. For it makes God, the God of all mercies, to be the most fierce and unreasonable tyrant in the world. For the question is not here, what God may do by an absolute act of power, would He so use it upon the creature which he made of nothing; but what He hath done, and what stands with His wisdom, justice and goodness to do.'

These quotations may end upon a swift strained note. 'And my Lord',³ wrote the archbishop, 'is extremely mistaken, to say that "I brought both into those distractions, danger and dishonour, with which they are now encompassed." For 'tis not I that have troubled this Israel of God.' Here surely is the voice of a Christian administrator. It cannot be held that a class distinction lay between the Anglican adherents and the wealthy grouping which favoured the Puritan approach. On the other hand it is possible to detect a contrast in administrative experience. Thus those who -were themselves employed in the ecclesiastical administration tended to support the Anglican position, which under its general aspect was congenial to the body of the country gentry in so far as the latter grouping remained socially conservative. A more adventurous and financially aggressive element among the gentry, allied to the merchant stratum, leaned either to a Puritan trend within the Church of England or to that Presbyterian approach which would lead men outside the frontiers of episcopacy. Nevertheless the position at the opening of the Caroline period would foreshadow the situation of the early nineteenth century when every gentleman, the Catholic squire alone excepted, was by

¹ Archbishop Laud's *Works*, vi. I. 86. * Ibid., p. 133. * Ibid., p. 92.

definition a member of the Church of England. By that date the Hanoverian high churchmen had long come to terms with the dominant Latitudinarian prelacy. As a consequence the amalgam was perfected through which a parson-squire relationship was accepted in that still agricultural English world.

In the reign of Charles I the explicit Anglican tradition found its strength among those who valued Church order. In a cultural sense the Anglican mood was attuned to the Tridentine West in its seventeenth-century expression; politically it was always insular. A calm distaste spread out towards Rome and Geneva. By contrast the Puritan approach was buoyant and inexperienced, almost raw. It is not easy to exaggerate the intemperate bitterness that Dr. Laud roused in them,¹ and yet they had such hope about New England² or the Continent.³

Meanwhile there were many links that bound the families of the Puritan gentry to those of their own economic grouping who had a sympathetic outlook on the Anglican establishment. Separated almost as much from the Presbyterian lords and Puritan squires as from the protagonists of church order, there moved the craftsmen and their inferiors in unorganized labour who made up the mass of 'oppressed saints'.

In this connexion it may be suggested that Latitudinarianism in its earlier English form placed no less stress on church order than did the Laudian protagonists. The episcopate was as integral a part of the Latitudinarian as of the Laudian framework;

¹ Cf. for the almost pathological effect produced by the primate on his enemies, the following passage from the *Autobiography of Sir Simonds D'Ewet*, ii. 100-1. 'A heavy loss also had our English Church by the decease of Dr. George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury. Dr. William Laud, Bishop of London, a little, low, red faced man, of mean parentage, succeeded him. His own speech made in the Star Chamber, June 4th 1637, at the censure of some godly men, being since printed, shows sufficiently his allowance and practice of the adoring or bowing to and towards the altar with other tenets, which made me even tremble when I read it.'

² 'But this I am confident, they [the men bound for New England] do most of them, in the main, aim sincerely at God's glory, and to reduce the public service of God to that power and purity which it enjoyed in the primitive times. Vices and sins are so severely punished amongst them, and the godly so countenanced and advanced, as in that respect it seems to be a true type of heaven itself.' *Ibid.*, p. 116.

³ 'The sole honour and glory of this victory', wrote Sir Simonds D'Kwes of the battle of Breitenfeld, 'next under God, to whom the religious King of Sweden gave the only glory, redounded to the Swedes and Scots, and other nations in the Evangelical army.' *Ibid.*, p. 59.

it was in the new humanitarian emphasis that divergence lay, a divergence of mental habit reaching from the same postulates to contrasting conclusions.

Thus William Chillingworth, the child of an Oxford brewer, was Laud's godson. He came with Hales, Sheldon, and Hammond into that company at Great Tew where Falkland's *Convivium Philosophicum* lay at the centre of explicit intellectual Anglicanism. There is now a new approach, a mildness foreshadowing the future. With a manner, that had its own Salesian quality,¹ Chillingworth would introduce those generous concepts which would commend the Latitudinarian standpoint to those eighteenth- and nineteenth-century generations which had discarded the earlier assurance. 'Suppose', we read² in Chillingworth's third sermon, 'our garments should be presented to God with the same question that Jacob's sons sent their brother Joseph's. "Is this thy son's coat?" Would they not rather be taken for the skins of savage beasts, so unlike are they to that garment of Humility and Patience, which our Saviour wore, and which he bequeathed us in his Legacy?' This quietness is very far from the embattled enmities of Laudian bishop or free minister; rather it is that note, at once evangelical and humane,³ which would outlast the Stuart controversies.

In the struggle that was about to open, Chillingworth, like Falkland, would be found supporting Charles I.⁴ In religion,

¹ Chillingworth's style reflects that commerce with the Continent which characterized his generation. Thus there are sentences which recall *The Introduction to the Devout Life* which he may have read in the translation by Miles Carr during his stay at Douai. 'These heat-drops,' wrote Chillingworth in his first sermon before the king, 'this Morning Dew of Sorrow, though it presently vanish, and they return to their sin again upon the next temptation. . . .' (p. 9.)

* Chillingworth *Works*, ed. 10, 1742, p. 38.

³ Cf. a quotation from the fourth sermon. 'After all this, it is no great thing, if the Lord should require our whole selves, souls and bodies, for a whole burnt-offering, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; if he should require from us our whole substance, whole rivers of oil, and all the cattle feeding on a thousand hills.' *Ibid.*, p. 49. '*Hoc Ithacus velit et magnae mercentur Atridae*' he wrote in the seventh sermon—'They will never be unfurnished of matter to write books to the world's end, if this shall be the method of stating controversies. Oh! what an impregnable cause should we have against the church of Rome, if we ourselves did not help to weaken and betray it.' And again in the same sermon, 'For I desire to have no adversaries in my preaching, but only the devil and sin.' *Ibid.*, p. 83.

⁴ Neither man survived the opening stages of the war. Lord Falkland was killed on 20 September 1643 at the battle of Newbury at the age of thirty-three. William Chillingworth died in January 1644 at the age of forty-one.

as in politics, there were those upon the Royalist¹ side who in matters of doctrine were ancestors of the Whigs.

There were also those whose Puritan convictions never carried them outside the Episcopalian ranks. Such men had usually inherited an extreme Elizabethan Protestant approach while accepting the church establishment prescribed by the queen and her successors. The standpoint was most commonly found among men who were elderly during the Caroline decade. An example may be seen in the life of William Bedell during his tenure of the rectory of Horningshatch in Suffolk between 1616 and 1627 which has been the object of a minute study and well reflects this cast of thought.² It may be said that this outlook went invariably with an uncompromising horror of Rome³ and a tendency to blame the poor for their

¹ The sixth sermon perhaps contains one of the most explicit statements of Chillingworth's Royalism. He is addressing the king. 'It may be', we read, 'God has suffered the antient, superstitious histrionick adorning of his temples to be converted into the late slovenly prophane (commonly called worshipping in spirit, but intended to be worship without cost) that you may find a happy occasion to restore those sacred places, dedicated to His honour, to that majesty and reverence, as may become houses wherein God delights that His name should dwell.' *Ibid.*, p. 77.

² Dr. Bedell was born in 1571, became bishop of Kilmore in 1629, and died in 1642. He was at school close to his home 'at a market town called Braintry' before entering Emmanuel College. He came of East Anglican stock established in a Protestant tradition. 'His father and grandfather were; both noted in their time for love to true Religion. The bishop's father married a helper or yoke-fellow meet for him, Elizabeth Elliston. These two lived together to a great age in Black Notley [in Essex], much esteemed and beloved.' *A True Relation of the Life and Death of the Right Reverend Father in God William Bedell, Ijord Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland*, Tanner MS. xxxvii. 147, Bodleian Library ed. Thomas Wharton Jones, Camden Society, 1872, pp. 1-2.

³ Dr. Bedell had been chaplain to Sir Henry Wotton in Venice and a quotation will serve to indicate his attitude towards the church of Rome. 'It happened', so runs a passage relating to Dr. Bedell's stay in Venice, 'to be in a time of very weighty transactions between the then Pope, Paulus V and that State; which was a singular opportunity for him to be thoroughly acquainted with the mysteries of Papal iniquity: for by occasion of the controversy just closed, between the Pope and the State of Venice, many corruptions and much of the Pope's nakedness became more publick than might well suit the credit of the common cause of Popery.* *Ibid.*, p. 8. At the same time Catholics often held that the spectacle of Catholicism on the Continent would persuade their fellow countrymen to that religion. The Anglican writer Sir John Reresby makes the following comment in regard to the standpoint of his Catholic grandmother Lady Reresby. 'At my going to travel I she recommended to me the Roman religion, desiring me to consider it well, for that ther [on the Continent] I should see it in its splendor, whereas it was under a cloud in England.' Reresby family history quoted by Professor Andrew Browning in his introduction to the *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby*, p. xxxviii.

own misfortunes. The standard of living was frugal and ineradicably *bourgeois*, the level of education rather high and linked up with the universities. Men of this stamp were often bred in the 'Ture House of Emmanuel'; from Cambridge they went out to the livings in the eastern counties.

Mr. Bedell is described in his first rectory with his wife and their seven children; Mrs. Bedell's five children by an earlier marriage also lived with them.

'And now⁵, relates the biographer, 'we are to conceive Mr. Bedell settled at Horningsheath. His manner was to rise very early (commonly at 4 in winter and summer) and so to retire presently to his study; where he would be so fix'd till prayer time, that if any thing did happen to call him down, he would be even angry with the messenger (wife, child or servant) of any such occasion of interruption. For prayer he observ's three seasons, morning, noon, and evening, never tedious or prolix: At noon, his manner was to read and expound some chapter of the Bible before prayer. His expositions were methodical, concise and substantial.'

There was nothing Lutheran in this conception; it derives very clearly from Geneva.

'When his friends came to visit him', the account of Bishop Bedell continues,¹ 'his entertainment was friendly, neat, and bountiful; but his grave deportment and savory discourse surmounted all, being of such influence, that it gave a law to the company and held them (as it were) under a kind of discipline; which that he might somewhat relax and yet not warp from his own principles, he would retire from them to his study, with some grave item.'

From these sentences it may be gathered that the family at Horningsheath was ruled in accordance with these methods which the Calvinist divines had always taught.²

¹ *Life of Bishop Bedell*, pp. 16-17.

² *Ibid.*, p. 19. 'One principal point more is yet behind and that is his [Dr. Bedell's] manner of governing his family upon the Lord's day. Being risen himself (most commonly the first in the house), he presently retir'd to his study... His company being assembled together he would come down among them, but as at all times, so more especially then, with his countenance compos'd to all possible gravity, piety and solemnity; indeed, the presence of that day, and his deportment together, wrought no small effect both upon children and servants, as to preparation for the service of God, and so truly was he God's Vice-gerent in his family.'

'In the passage from his house to the church, which was not very far, strict notice was taken of the gestures and behaviour of his children, either by himself or to be sure by his consort, an helper to him to the height of these best things. But especially their words were observed. And of such failings as were committed this

It has been held that these God-fearing households¹ were a conscious protest against the indifference of the court circle. May they not also have been a protest against the indifference of the poor?

A significant element in the picture here presented is Dr. Bedell's attitude towards the indigent and undeserving. The actual line of action would of course vary with the temperament of each clergyman; still a class consciousness was now manifest which would bind together the Anglican clergy for three hundred years.

'There is yet further to be noted', the biographer continues,² 'in his domestical course of conversation, his behaviour to the beggars, bedlams and travellers that use to come to men's doors. These he would not fail to examine, mixing both wholesome instructions and severe reproofs. Nor rested he there, but if they had any passes to travel by, he would be sure to scan them thoroughly, and finding them false or counterfeit, his way was to send for the Constable.'

These sentences indicate a middle-class psychology. An official nexus bound together the ministers of all the jarring stand-points. The great mass of the people were far away. At the same time in contrast to this Puritanism of the parsonage there was a popular Puritanism, sustained and angry. It is vital to an understanding of this period to inquire how far this apocalyptic religion seeped through the ranks of the craftsmen down into the alleys of the crowded city and into the wide unorganized groupings dependent on the novel casual labour.

godly couple were diligent observers and severe correctors.' Ibid., pp. 19-20. It is worth examining this passage as a study in a careful Sabbatarianism.

^x An account of Mrs. Bedell suggests the character of the bishop's helpmate. 'Mr. Bedell entered into the holy estate of matrimony with a very pious, grave and every-way-accomplish'd gentlewoman, Mrs. Leah Maw, widow, daughter of John Bowles Esq. of Ersham in Norfolk, and late wife to Robert Maw Esq., Recorder of the town of St. Edmund's-Bury. There were diverse things on either side that might seem to dissuade from the match. . . . But these weightier considerations (as his piety and ability for heavenly knowledge, as also his conscientious integrity, and again her no-less eminent endowments of nature, education, and grace, for a woman) moved them to consent together in holy wedlock.' Ibid., p. 16.

² Ibid., p. 19.

VII

THE MIDDLE CLASS AND CASUAL LABOUR

THERE are two types of material which assist us to form a judgement as to the extent to which Puritanism in its apocalyptic mood had come to penetrate the world of the craftsmen and the under-privileged urban classes. The records of the court of High Commission possess an unparalleled value and there are also certain literary sources that have merit. An illuminating passage is to found in *Reliquiae Baxterianae*. It deals with the religious situation at Dudley in 1638.

'In this town of Dudley',¹ wrote Richard Baxter, 'I lived in much comfort, amongst a poor tractable people, lately famous for drunkenness, but commonly more ready to hear God's Word with submission and reformation than most places where I have come: so that . . . the church was usually as much crowded within, and at the windows, as ever I saw any London congregation: (partly through the great willingness of the people, and partly by the exceeding populousness of the country, where the woods and commons are planted with nailers, scithe-smiths, and other iron-labourers like a continual village).'

The situation here described would perhaps link up with country Puritanism and with that religious background from which George Fox and John Bunyan sprang. There is little evidence that such preaching affected the men in irregular or casual employment in London.

In the capital it is not easy to find evidence for the existence of a response to apocalyptic enthusiasm in the milieu below that of apprenticeship.² On the other hand a certain levelling in social relationship was present³ among the Puritans, at least

¹ *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, p. 14.

² Cf. Richard Baxter's experience. 'While I was in London I fell into acquaintance with a sober, godly, understanding apprentice of Mr. Philemon Stevens the bookseller', *ibid.*, p. 11.

³ This tendency is apparent in Baxter's approach. His own milieu is neatly described. 'Above a year after the death of my mother, my father married a woman of great sincerity in the Fear of God, Mary the daughter of Sir Tho. Hunkes: whose holiness, mortification, contempt of the world and fervent prayer have been so exemplary.' *Ibid.*, p. 12. At the same time he developed an intimacy both with Mr. Stevens's apprentice and also with certain 'very godly Noncon-

in theory, if not in practice. At the same time it is difficult to decide how far the binding power of Puritanism extended. Even in the case of men holding the same principles the factor of economic inequality inevitably gave rise to patronage. Still, a link existed between squires like Colonel Hutchinson and such craftsmen as had become 'pure worshippers of God'. The nexus is perhaps best expressed by the idea that this grouping of artisans and craftsmen, the travelling masons and the weavers and the smiths of different kinds, looked to the influential Puritans as their ultimate protectors. As they came before the court of High Commission there always remained the hope that the Lord would use his instruments to put a term to their peril.

This point of view is indicated in a series of examinations taken at Dover in July 1639^{anc*} collated before that court in the following November.¹ John Trendall of Battle Bridge, St. Olave's, London, a freemason about fifty years of age, was brought before the mayor and jurats of Dover charged with holding conventicles in and about that town and taking upon himself to expound the Scriptures to both men and women. The details given serve to throw light upon a segment of society. Trendall stated that he had come to Dover about 11 November in the previous year, being hired to work in Archcliffe Bulwark near the town. His family consisted of his wife Ann, and his two children, Sarah aged eight and John aged five. He had living with him Humphrey Watts, a youth of eighteen, described as his servant but perhaps more accurately his assistant. Trendall admitted that he had not attended divine service or sermons at either of the churches in the town because his conscience would not 'serve him to yield to the worship under

formists in Shrewsbury, and the adjoining parts, whose fervent prayers and savoury conference and holy lives did profit me much*. A spirit of religious warmth drew him towards them. 'And when I understood that they were people persecuted by the Bishops, I found much prejudice arise in my heart against those that persecuted them, and thought those that silenced and troubled such *men* could not be the genuine followers of the Lord of Love.' Ibid., p. 13. A parallel line of thought is reflected in Mrs. Hutchinson's comment on those whom she termed State Protestants. 'The former sort of these in zeal to reduce the whole land from their idolatrous practices, procured laws and invented oaths to suppress popery, which they little thought, but we now sadly find, are the bitterest engines to batter down the pure worshippers of God.' Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

¹ These examinations were taken on 27 July 1639 and collated in London on 9 November 1639, *State Papers, Dom.*, Charles I, cccxxxii. 27, i, ii, and iii.

the Bishop's power there used⁹. He witnessed this statement, signing with his mark.

A deposition followed made by Joan wife of William Tiddeyman. She declared that she had known Trendall for three months and that he had instructed several persons on a Sunday in her house. John Haselwood the younger, of Dover, shoemaker, confessed that he was at Tiddeyman's house about Sunday month or three weeks and had heard Trendall expound a text from the Scriptures. He admitted that he had been absent from church the last two Sundays, on one of which he was walking and sitting under the Castle Hill and on the other in his house. This deposition was followed by that of another shoemaker, Edward Godwin, who admitted that he had gone about eight or nine o'clock in the morning on a Sunday to William Tiddeyman's house in Dover, Tiddeyman being then at sea,¹ and had stayed there until about eleven o'clock or noon to hear what reasons John Trendall could give as to why it was not lawful to hear our ministers preach in our churches. This cautious statement was confirmed by William Tatnell of Dover, shipwright, who affirmed that Trendall took his text from Isaiah li. 7. Further statements showed that Thomas King of Allhallows, London Wall, freemason, Anne wife of John Broom, Susan Lee widow, Elizabeth wife of John Hogben, and Joan wife of Nicholas Crux, all of Dover, were present at Tiddeyman's house on this occasion.

Various features in the picture here presented have an especial interest. The self-confidence is as marked as the unabashed determination. In part, this may be attributed to the witnesses' knowledge that the mayor and jurats who examined them shared the detestation of Popery, which was common to all the men of strict opinions. There was also, possibly, a sense of strong protection in the background. These men had a reliance, at once hearty and courageous, on the conception of the Cause of Protestants.

¹ Cf. for a rather similar case also connected with seafaring men, the examination of Edward Hurst of Cambridge, tailor. It is stated that he had come to London on the Thursday previous and had lodged at the *Bull* in Bishopsgate Street. He had gone to a house in Rotherhithe and found twenty or thirty persons, men and women, all strangers to him and they did all pray together. 'Constables of Rotherhithe found divers gathered together in a house where one Hayward dwells, he being at sea, and his wife with her friends in the country.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cccriv. T18 and 118. i.

Nevertheless, it is hard to disentangle the religious from the patriotic motive; it is clearly needless to attribute biblical fervour to all those who were ready to denounce popish iniquity. In this connexion it is worth noting that by the reign of Charles I the custom of possessing some religious or controversial works was established among the literate classes. Thus from the Eaton-Wellingham correspondence we find that a copy of Dr. Hall's *Contemplations* had been sent out in 1636 to Prestwick Eaton at Bilbao.¹ This is the more interesting, since it is the solitary reference to religion in a long series of letters whose value lies in the light that is thrown upon the way of life in what may be termed the central core of the middle class in commercial London.

The correspondence in question reflects the changing round of a young English factor during eleven years spent in Spain, first at San Sebastian and later at Bilbao. Eaton seems to have been sent out by his sister's husband George Wellingham, who carried on business at the sign of the 'Golden Anchor' in St. Swithun's Lane. He appears to have acted as a representative of various London trading houses; only his side of the correspondence has been preserved. Commercial transactions are only mentioned incidentally and the letters are chiefly valuable as providing a view of current tastes and an appreciation of certain elements in a standard of living. The isolation and the insularity are very marked:² San Sebastian was hardly reached

¹ In thanking his cousin for this gift, Eaton remarked that it was dangerous to keep the bishop of Exeter's works in Spanish territory. He also refers to a copy of Dr. Hall's *Contemplations* bound together. It seems probable that this refers to the *Occasional Meditations* and the *Old Religion*. The full title of the latter work will explain its unpopularity with the Spanish authorities. *The Old Religion A Treatise Wherein is laid down the true State of the Difference betwixt the Reformed and Roman Churchy and the Blame of this Schism is cast upon the True Authors, Serving for the Vindication of our Innocence, for the settling of Wavering Minds, for a preservative against Popish Insinuations*, letter from Prestwick Eaton to George Wellingham, dated at San Sebastian 12 December 1636, *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, ccccxvii. 3. A passage from Dr. Hall's tract *The Honour of the Married Clergy*, printed in 1620, will give the nature of his approach. 'It is only the Church of Rome, the great and imperious mistress of the world, that imposes the yoke of this vow upon her vassals. Imposes it, but *ad libitum*; so as her great paramour, in whose vast bosom that whole Church lies, may dispense with it as he lists.'

² Thus Eaton asked his brother-in-law to send him a couple of pounds of good tobacco packed in glasses. He ordered some Bristol hangings and asked him to send out a small barrel of oatmeal 'for here they know not what it meaneth'. He sent a case of bottles home to be replenished with the best liquor. At different

by English travellers. Eaton had little contact with the Spaniards¹ and appears never to have learned their language. He seems equally devoid of interest in English politics.² In these letters, written between 1631 and 1642,³ there is no reference to the developing political situation in England.

There is also discernible in these wholly unselfconscious letters that taste for brave display, for rapiers and scarlet waistcoats,⁴ which linked the Elizabethan and Restoration worlds. This of itself would prove a solvent of the Puritan spirit which could not coexist with an addiction to the playhouse and the masque.⁵ There was an attitude to elaborate living which bound together in a fashion all those who derived a profit from its continuance.

times he ordered two bulldogs and a spaniel, recommending that they should be procured at the Bear Garden. He asked for two globes in frames as decoration for his rooms, and sealing-wax was sent to him from London with his barrels of ink. *State Papers, Dom., Charles I., clxxxxviii-cxxxxiii, passim.*

¹ After staying for nearly three years at San Sebastian, Eaton ordered from London some silk lace and carnation silk stockings, presents for the mayor of the province and his wife, probably given to strengthen a business connexion.

² His correspondence contains no reference to any Englishman of influence. One note dates from the period of his residence at Bilbao. It was reported from the English embassy at Madrid that Prctswick Eaton 'gives conveyance to my Lord Ambassador's letters'. *Ibid, cccccxiii. 105.*

³ Eaton's first letter was written in the Downs on board the *Nathaniel* bound for Spanish ports in January 1631. His last letter was sent to George VVellingham from Bilbao in the autumn of 1642.

⁴ Details of goods ordered from England during 1636-7 will indicate Eaton's taste and standard of living. Articles ordered on 12 December 1636 included a dozen kegs of sturgeon for Lent and thirty-eight yards of mingled colour mohair. On 10 February 1637 Eaton sent for a scarlet waistcoat, four dozen white gloves with white tops, and a Turkey camlet or silk mohair gown laced and with silk and silver buttons and loops. On 22 December 1637 he asked his sister to keep for him certain objects sent by Robert Sergeant. These included a silver basin and ewer, a rich salt-cellar, a case of pictures, and a trunk of books. No details are given of the books in question. Eaton inquired after the damask bed that he had sent to be dyed. *Ibid, cccccxviii. 3, cccclvi. 75, and cccccxiii. 74.*

⁵ The reaction against the Puritan endeavour was also implicit in the ordinary life of the younger members both of the commercial and the professional middle class. Cf. an entry under October 1636 in the diary of John Greene, son of John Greene of Bois Hall near Navestock in Essex and lately a fellow commoner at St. John's College, Cambridge. 'The 28 of this month, being my birthday, Douse, Preston, Tindall, Black well, Petters and I supt at Banke House at the Greene dragon in Cheapside. . . . On Saturday Smith came to towne and in commons only. On Saturday Tindall admitted in the dancing schoole, and Smith paid quarteridge and began to learne. On Monday also I had my new neat leather-bootes and galossoos.. . . On the 31, being All Saints Eve, wee had fire in the hall [of Lincoln's Inn], noe gameing, no revells. We had musicke and mirth and solace and the measures. It was fasting night.' *Diary of John Greene, ed. E. M. Symonds and printed in E.H.R. (1928), xliii. 389.*

In any consideration of the social structure in Caroline England the position of those who ministered to the rich must be examined. The number of men in such employment had been steadily increasing with the constant extension of the wealthy class that they served, and there is here a sharp distinction between London and the country. It is not unreasonable to postulate an element of sophistication among the running footmen and the link boys who had been brought up in the 'great wen' of London. A sharpness and a disillusion already separated those who lived in the great capital from their fellow servants on the country manors and from those who waited on the burgess households in Bristol or Norwich.

This dependent London stratum cannot yet be studied in its entirety. Much data is still lacking, and there has been little correlation; we await a detailed examination of fees and customary gifts. At the moment the life of those dependent on the wealthy circle can only be glimpsed in stewards' account sheets. Certain preliminary notions can be established.

In the first place the demand for such service had been increasing at an apparently even rate and without set-back. No war had checked the development, rather of luxury services than of luxury trades, which the spendthrift Jacobean reign had fostered. Studied under this aspect, the period of Puritan domination would give a shock to the social development of the London scene such as no other political upheaval was to administer. Again, an interesting and as yet unexplored facet of this subject is concerned with the part played in such labour by the born Londoner. This in turn was proportionately increasing. With the breakdown of Leicester House and Essex House, the practice of bringing a mass of serving men to London would seem to have come to an end. Thus the depositions relating to the Essex Rising mention the Welsh speech of the grooms and attendants, who had come up with the carl from his Welsh properties or had been recruited by Sir Gelli Meyrick. With the opening of the seventeenth century it is clear that stewards of rich men visiting London were accustomed to engage temporary staff on their arrival. At the same time there were a number of purposes in connexion with which the practice of hiring men was on the increase. To give an example, the private barges with their rowers in the lord's livery belonged

to the Elizabethan period and were now passing out of fashion. In the early years of the reign of James I, Lord William Howard staying at Arundel House on a visit to London would hire from the general body of watermen.¹

In contrast to such an organized corporation² with its recognized charges,³ there stood the mass of casual labour, men pressing round the doors of the new town houses and waiting to take goods to the carriers or to run with messages. No service that a man of fashion might require would come amiss to them. While considering this matter, it is perhaps simplest to begin with the gifts and offerings handed out by a rich man's steward, bearing in mind that it is always difficult and often impossible to determine whether the recipient had any regular means of livelihood apart from the gaining of such casual sums.

In examining this particular subject attention may be called to the very detailed expense sheets⁴ compiled for the second Viscount Conway. A list of sums includes 2J. given to 'one of the guard that lighted my Lord' to his lodgings in St. Martin's Lane and two items of 6d. each paid to Phelim an Irish footman 'his running money to Nonsuch and Petworth'. The rate for this kind of service clearly varied. 2s. was given to 'the footman at Lord Carlisle's, his running money to Hampton Court and back again'. The same sum was given to Mr.

¹ The following details indicate the expenditure incurred. A pair of oars bringing Lord William from the Temple Stairs to the Old Swan or from Arundel House to the Old Swan cost xijd and this was likewise the cost of a pair of oars from Arundel House to Westminster. The charge for two pairs of oars from Arundel House to Westminster was xvijjd., 7"fo *Household Books of the Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle*, ed. Rev. George Ornsby, Surtees Society, pp. 262-3, 333.

² For a reference to one of the numerous salaried posts connected with the river, cf. the petition of John Leake to the privy council. Here it is stated that in 1635 a yeoman of the waterside's place for life under the lord mayor fetched £33. 13J. 4^h. *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cccx. 66.

³ It seems that the charges for boat hire were definitely standardized. In 1635 John Greene, then keeping terms at Lincoln's Inn, noted in his journal: 'Bote-hire (to Greenwich) cost 8/- forward and backward', *Diary* printed in *E.H.R.* xliii. 388.

⁴ In addition to the examples cited, the expense sheets contain certain items of interest. 'Given in earnest for my Lord's lodging in St. Martin's Lane £1, To the gardiner at Hampton Court 2/-.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, eclxxxv. 19. The expenditure on hackney coaches will afford a comparison with that on boat hire. 'To a hackney coachman that carried my Lord and my Lord of Northumberland to Westminster 3/-.' For the hire of two hackney coaches for two days 13/-.' These figures can be set beside those of an expense sheet made out by Edward Burgh, servant to Lord Conway, on 11 February 1637. 'For the hire of a hackney coach two days 16/-.' *Ibid.*, eclxxxv. 19 and cccxvi. 105.

Selden's boy and 55. was paid to 'a man bringing a present of Venice glasses'. Sixpence was given to a porter who brought books from Duck Lane. From another series of accounts¹ it is seen that Lord Huntingdon's steward escorting his master from London into Leicestershire gave 2s. to 'a guide that came to Glen to shew the coach the best way'.

The sums expended when going to the play are not usually set out in such detail,² but they deal with a very similar type of service. It is instructive to compare this expenditure with the amounts given in charity³ at this time. It may be observed that apart from moneys given in church collections,⁴ which were already associated with a scale dependent on the use of reserved sittings, there are hardly any references among documents of this character to payments made in connexion with religious observance.⁵ Payments to tradesmen will be dealt with

¹ Marked on a bill dated 3 January 1639 and giving expenses at Market Harborough. *Cal. Hastings AfSS.*, ii. 389.

² Cf. among Lord Conway's expenses for the period 7 July 1634-19 March 1635, 'My Lord had of me in silver at Jcronymo's 10/- . For my Lord's going to the play at Blackfriars 2/- . For my Lord going in to the play G'. For going in to two plays at the Cockpit 4/- . ' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I.*, eclxxxv. 19. It would appear from the character of the entries that these figures refer to sums given to attendants.

³ Cf. gifts in charity and casual expenditure recorded in the Vestry Minutes and Churchwardens' Accounts of Eltham, Kent. '1629, May 13. Gcvcn to a poore man that had his tongue cut out by the Turckes 1/6. For ringing the eight of clock bell from Mich, to Christmas 6/8. 1623, Sept. 4. Paid for killing a badger 1/- . Sept. 28. Paid for a poore minister 6/- . ' Accounts printed in Has ted's *History of Kent*, part 1, The Hundred of Black heath, ed. H. H. Drake, p. 206. Lord Conway's expenditure on charity worked out as follows. On the journey from Dublin to London his servants gave 'to the waits at Dublin 2/6; to the fiddlers at Bath 5/-; at Reading to the poor that had their houses burned 2/-'. On Lord Huntingdon's journey into Leicestershire these sums were disbursed. 'At Barnet, given to an old woman 6^d. At the *Red Lion*, Dunstable, given to the poor 1/6. At St. Albans, given to the prisoners 6^s. At the *Cock* at Stony Stratford, given to the poor 12^d. ' There are three further items of interest. At the unnamed inn at Market Harborough and at the *George* at Loughlxirough a poor-box was kept at the inn and in each case *as. 6d.* was given. At Loughborough we also find this entry. 'Given to the poor's box in the church 5/- . ' *Cal. Hastings AfSS.*, ii. 387-9. The accounts of Robert Read, secretary to Sir Francis Windebank, include this entry under 3 January 1639, 'to the poor boys at Christmas 1/- . ' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I.*, cccix. 29.

⁴ In Mr. Burgess's account of Lord Conway's expenditure there occurs this entry. 'Your lordship had of me to give at church 2/- . ' *Ibid.*, eclxxxv. 19.

⁵ A solitary entry in the household accounts of Lord Hastings, later sixth earl of Huntingdon, for the period between 15 May 1640 and 27 March 1643, refers to this aspect. 'June 1641, One Ball's Cathismes for the boy in the kitchen.' There was always an evangelical strain in the Hastings family and this reference to a catechism foreshadows that practice that evangelical masters and mistresses

THE MIDDLE CLASS AND CASUAL LABOUR

separately and later; this said, we can consider the position of established domestic servants.

In the first place a distinction must be drawn between the confidential or upper servants and the coachmen, footmen, and grooms. It is worth noting that in the fashionable London circle even those in the latter category were in receipt of handsome gifts from their masters' friends.¹ Certain details of the careers of these lower servants can be discovered so long as they remained in the service of a single master, but our control of the sources is not sufficiently extensive to enable us to follow them from one master to another. It is naturally difficult to trace the normal sequence of employment; this is occasionally possible when a man of good character has placed himself within reach of the law.² The range of upper servants inevitably yields more substantial results.

The domestic hierarchy would seem to have culminated in the house steward, who belonged in general to the same class as the small tradesman.³ Unlike the land steward, he lacked the opportunity of rising into the professional class.⁴ His duties

would develop of making their servants sufficiently literate to enable them to read the Bible.

¹ Cf. from Lord Conway's expense sheets, 'To Sir Kenelm Digby's coachman 10/-. To my Lord Goring's footman that brought books 5/-. To my Lord of Arundel's harbinger and cook £2.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cclxxv. 19.

² For instance, some impression can be gained of characteristic movements and periods of service from the examination of recusants. On 8 December 1638 William Cope, aged about 35 years, was examined before Thomas Day, mayor of Dover, and others. He stated that he was born at Garstang, co. Lancaster, and was brought up in the parish school until 15 or 16 years of age. Until he was about 24 he followed husbandry, after which he served Mr. Clayton of Preston, co. Lancaster, and Mr. Matthews of Woodford, Dorset, with whom about April or May last he went to Flanders and returned in June following. Now being about to go to Ypres in Flanders on his master's business, he attempted to pass as a Walloon because, being a Roman Catholic, he was unwilling to have the oath of allegiance administered to him, *ibid*, ccciv.

³ Sometimes these confidential servants were remembered in the wills of their masters. Thus the will of Richard first earl of Cork, dated 4 November 1642, contains the following provision. 'And I do desire my son Robert that in regard of the fidelity and trust I have found in the said William Chettle (who waited on me in my chamber and carried my purse for above 26 years) that he will entertain him in his service in the same place and condition', printed *Life of the Earl of Cork* by D. Townshend, p. 501.

⁴ This position is somewhat confused by the existence of a relatively new group of men in quasi-secretarial employments whose status can seldom be determined unless there is a considerable sequence of papers available for examination.

included the keeping of his master's purse¹ and the making of purchases.² The very considerable gifts made in certain houses by their habitués were probably expended in gaining the interest of confidential servants of this character.³ In the great houses in the country, life tended to be ordered along the lines traced out by London fashion,⁴ but even in the squires' families

¹ Two entries in Lord Conway's expense sheets bear on this point. Mr. Burgess notes 'My Lord had of me in three pences 3/-', while Mr. Burgh records 'My Lord had of me at Newmarket £15.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles* eclxxxv. 19 and ccclxvi. 105.

² A note of purchases made on Lord Conway's behalf throws a light on the standard of living. Tor a gold hatband 11/6. For a string for my Lord's hat 2^d. For a comb for my master 1/2. For a cane 8/-. For a gold sword £1:10. For a pair of gloves in Duck Lane 1/2. For a pair of spurs for my Lord 3/-. For two sweet lemons at the Old Exchange 1/-. For a Monmouth cap for my Lord 11/-. For a Spanish leather cap for my Lord 1/3. For a pair of "gessen gloves" 4/6. For six pairs of Cordovan gloves at 3/- a pair, 18/-. For a pistol 15/-. Paid for my Lord's down bolster £2:12.' *Ibid.* crlxxxv. 19. This may be compared with a note of Endymion Porter's expenses between August and November 1637 which indicates the responsibilities of his cash-keeper. 'Paid for bringing a present of Venice glasses 5/-, mending my master's scarlet coat at Oatlands 1/--. Paid my master at the Bowling Green £5:3; paid Walter Berckhamer, the groom, for so much he lent my master at the Bowling Green 5/6, for one lb. of bees-wax to wax my master's boots 1/6; lent Francisco, the Italian mountebank, by my master's orders to repay at pleasure £, paid Thomas Lyle for a book of the antiquities of England 4/-.' *Ibid.* ccclxxvii. 168. Against this may be placed the note dated 3 January 1639 of the account rendered by Robert Read of sums disbursed on behalf of his master Sir Francis Windcbanck between 1 May 1638 and the following January. In this case Mr. Read was secretary to Sir Francis. 'Mr. Bellamy for two picture frames £1:15; the porter, for whipping the footman 5/-; the smith that made a treble key for Greenwich 10/-; Joan, the rook maid, when my lady Windebank was abroad 20/-; the footman, for drinking money 2/f>; two maps £1:17, for rolling them 4/-; Lord Ncwburgh's man that brought trees 5/-; the man that brought sweet waters 10/-.* *Ibid.* cccix. 29. The references to expenditure on women's clothes are few. A bill was sent to Sir Francis Windcbanck for 'a pair of French shoes, laced with green silk lace, for Mrs. Ann Windebank 8/-', and among Endymion Porter's papers is a milliner's bill dated 24 March 1638 detailing goods to the value of £22. 12*. 1 *id.* supplied to Mrs. Olivia Porter; these included suits of ashy colour and Isabella colour, *ibid.* cexxi. 66 and ccclxxvi. 46.

³ Thus in Lord Conway's expense sheets there occurs the very large item 'given in my Lord of Carlisle's house £6.' *Ibid.* eclxxxv. 19.

⁴ Cf. the regulation drawn up for the government of the earl of Cork's family at Stalbridge, a mansion in Somerset purchased in 1637 for £5,000 from the widowed countess of Castlehaven. It is stated that 'all the women servants under the degree of chambermaids be certainly known by their names to the steward, and not altered or changed upon every occasion without the consent of the steward'. The younger servants were formally apprenticed. A poor ragged boy named John Wilmot was indentured for nine years to learn to become a cook, and a garden boy was indentured for five years, receiving £3 wages and a suit of clothes. The footmen received livery as well as wages, and the household musicians were dressed in scarlet, British Museum Add. MSS. 19852, f. 23.

THE MIDDLE GLASS AND CASUAL LABOUR

a man of confidence was often found established. In such a household he would sometimes double the role of the house and the land steward, while the fact of his employment would tend to indicate a fairly close connexion with the capital.¹ It follows that data relating to this type of confidential employee is confined to the muniments of families resident in the south of England. The career of Richard Harvey, the steward to Sir William Calley of Burderop in Wiltshire, appears to have a certain typical quality. His employer was a relative of Sir Edward Nicholas and he himself came of a Somersetshire stock connected in some ill-defined way with one of Lord Pembroke's properties at Langford; his brother Roger Harvey was a weaver at Taunton.² Both men appear to have inclined to the strict opinions.³ During 1637 Harvey seems to have left Sir William Calley's service for that of Endymion Porter, although he continued to make purchases for his former employers.⁴ The con-

¹ By contrast the Naworth Castle Accounts suggest a way of life which was completely self-contained. This is well brought out in respect to the charities. 'To widow Hetherton for finding honey vi^d. To two boyes for getting yvie for the deer iv^d. To Mr. Lowden's man bringing saxifrage vi^d. To Jo. Lambert bringing cherries xii^d. To three musicians at the gate xii^d.' With these sums may be compared the payment of is. to Mr. Pryce 'for drawing a pedigree' and the gift of 5J. to * W. Bowman's son for finding an earthen pot', this last a proof of Lord William Howard's antiquarian enthusiasm. *Naworth Castle, Household Accounts*, pp. 88-9.

² There are other ways of placing Richard Harvey. He received a begging letter from his cousin Jasper Sprak, who had settled at Lyme Regis with his seven children. There were contacts at another social level and with the recusant world. Thus Hercules Stourton, a cadet of the old Catholic family of that name, approached the steward in regard to a loan alleged to have been made to his uncle, Jerome Harvey. With a more intimate touch Mrs. Joan Crowne living in Tugfall's alley near the *Scotch Arms* in Westminster asked her friend Harvey for 55. to redeem her trunk. *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, ccccxviii. 112 and cccxciii. 10.

³ Roger Harvey followed the opinions of 'our minister, Mr. Godwin*. In a letter dated 17 August 1639 and addressed to his brother Richard he had explained, 'I can hardly read the small Geneva character, wherefore I request you to send me down Josephus, and I will pay the charge.' Two letters describe Roger Harvey's position. The course of his life is described as being 'from my bed to my lombs [looms] and from my lombs weary to my bed again'. This was written in the summer of 1637, but by March 1639 his situation had changed for the worse. He mentions that of the six looms which he operated, he now retains only two. *Ibid*, ccccxvii. 70, ccccxviii. 12, cclxiii. 15, and ccccxiv. 127.

⁴ In this case there is a curious contrast between the fashionable and the practical. Thus during 1638-9 Sir William Calley ordered cod-piece points of musk-coloured silk, Jordan almonds, a black tiffany hood, and linen boot-hose. He also sent for certain quantities of holland, some of it for handkerchiefs, six good table knives without a case, and a tierce of the best claret. Lady Calley

trast between Harvey's own Puritan background and that of the court grouping, which he served, is rather striking. It would be interesting to know whether this juxtaposition was common.¹

Having given some consideration to private service,² the

asked Harvey to buy her in London 'as much of the very best and richest black flowered satin, of the best worck, yet fit for an ancient woman, as will make a straight-bodied gown'. Harvey was to go to the dressmaker Mr. Davison, who would make it up. William Calley wrote on 8 December 1638, 'I entreat you to add twelve pairs of the best cards to be sent down with my father's Christmas provision.' He also ordered a black satin gown and a white satin waistcoat for his wife and a pair of gold-colour stockings for himself. He asked Harvey to sell a gelding for him at any price over £20 subsequently reducing his reserve to £16.

At the same time Harvey developed intellectual and aesthetic interests which commended him to his second patron. On 26 January 1639 Sir William Clalley asked for a book concerning the Scottish differences argued between six divines of the university of Aberdeen and three Scottish Puritan ministers and for my Lord of Canterbury's book 'when it comes forth'. Going through his library he wrote from Burdcorp to Harvey in these terms: 'I never had the book of orrurrents of '633, wherein the taking of Regensburgh by Duke Bernard is related, and if there be any occurrents of the present year in Low Dutch that might be gotten by Mr. Foreman's means, I wish I had it, though it should cost me dear.' This may have been the road which led Harvey on to more elaborate dealings. When he left Sir William's employment, he was established in an office in Mr. Kndyrnion Porter's lodging beside Durham House in the Strand. Sums were now deposited for Harvey with Mr. Weaskate, a scrivener working at the 'Naked Boy' in Fetter Lane. Finally, there is a letter from Lionel Wake junior, then apparently in Madrid, enclosing a power of attorney and instructing I larvcy to pay the bearer £700 for Sir Peter Paul Rubens, *ibid*, cclxxiv. 18, reexc. 124 and 136, crcxrii. 9 and 15, 16, cccc. 62, ccciv. 43 and 44, ccccx. 46, and ccccxvii. 108.

¹ An instance in which a chaplain of Puritan tendencies was established in a household originally close to the court world is provided in the case of Philip earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, a magnate on whom all these Wiltshire and east Somerset stocks were in a measure dependent. The Rev. John Shaw, who wrote his autobiographical fragment when vicar of Rotherham, was born in 1605 and was according to his own account converted about 1624 by a sermon preached by Mr. Weld. He describes how when a pensioner at Christ's College 'I was much taken notice of in the colledge and much opposed for a Puritan*. He was later chaplain at Wilton and his general outlook is plain from the account that he gives of his marriage. 'I was by Mr. Cudworth, at Trinity church in Micklelegate, in York, December 13, 1632, marryd to a most pious, religious wife, a sweet and suitable yoakc fellow, Mrs. Dorothy Hcathcote, of Cut-thorpc Hall, in the afore-said parish of Brampton (whose holy life and happy death I have in some measure discovered in a booke called "Mrs. Shaw's Tombstone" etc.).' *The Life of Master John Shaw*, printed by the Surtees Society (1877), pp. 125-6.

² Additional servants were sometimes hired by the day either from inns or from some general pool. In the household accounts of Alice countess of Derby kept between 15 May 1634 and 23 April 1635 during her residence at Harfield in Middlesex there occurs this entry: '30 Oct. To Barnes, a cook for helping when my lord Bridgwater was here 13/4.' Two other entries bear upon this point. 'To the fellow in the kitchen for making mustard by my Lady's command 2/6. To Barnes and Collynes two cooks, for helping at my lord privy seal's being here 30/-.'

position of inn servants may be mentioned. Their status can be held roughly to correspond to that of the lower servants of a private establishment. It would seem that those working in hostleries close to London, and frequented by the rich, benefited at a fairly regular rate¹ from the passage of each patron; the character of the eighteenth century was taking shape. In this connexion it would be interesting to examine carriers' rates and charges. Certain details of the actual inn accommodation can be gained from the Victuallers' Book² in the University Registry at Cambridge and from similar sources.

For various reasons the material available for the study of the social structure of Cambridge³ is relatively abundant. As

¹ On the earl of Huntingdon's journey home from London the following sums were disbursed between 31 December 1638 and 5 January 1639. 'At Barnet, to the chamberlains 1/- and to the cook 6^d; at St. Albans to the chamberlains 2/- and to the cook 2/-; at Little Brickhill, to the chamberlains 1/-, at the *Cock* at Stony Stratford, to the chamberlains 2/6, to the maids 1/-, to the cook 1/-; at the *Red Lion* at Dunstable, to the chamberlains 2/6 and to the cook 1/-; at the *Cock* at Kingsthorpe, given in the house 3/-; at Market Harborough to the chamberlains 2/6 and to the cook 1/6, to the man that brought wine 1/-; at the *George* at Loughborough, to the chamberlains and cook 5/-.' *Cat. Hastings MSS.*, ii. 388-9. In the details of Lord Conway's expenses in London gifts to servants in the eating-houses of the capital are not enumerated separately. They are presumably included in the following totals, 'for my Lord's supper at the *Bear* 13/-, for my Lord's supper at Jeronymo's 11/6, for my Lord's dinner at the *Bear* 13/-. My Lord's dinner at the *Bear* £3:9.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, cclxxxv. 19. One entry is a little difficult to place, 'the cook, bill for toad stools 5/-'. It does not appear to have been Lord Conway's practice to stay in inns. Details survive of his journey with twelve servants from Lisneygarvey to London by way of Dublin, South Wales, Bath, Reading, and London. 'My Lord Deputy's trumpeters' receive 10J. and the large sum of £1 is given to 'My Lord of Worcester's groom that guided my Lord'. This would seem to indicate that he received considerable hospitality in Lord Worcester's own houses and from that peer's friends. The final note on this list reads 'to my Lord Goring's man that took a lodging (in London) for my Lord 5/-.' *Ibid.*

² The following details from the vice-chancellor's licences appear typical: '31 July 1628. License that the house lately rebuildid in Chesterton by Henry Mann, which was heretofore the house of Richard Covington, and known by the sign of the *Dog and Bear*, should be an inn by the sign of the *Crown* it having seven or eight rooms fit and convenient to lodge and entertain guests, and stable room for twenty horses at the least. 19 Oct. 1630. License that the house called the *Blue Anchor* near the Butchers' Shambles on the Market Hill, where Christopher Adams dwelt, should be an inn, the same having stable room and bedding to entertain twenty horses and passengers and strangers at the least.' Licenses from Victuallers Book in University Registry. Cf. *Annals of Cambridge*, by Charles Henry Cooper, iii. 238.

³ The will of Dr. John Gostlin, master of Gonville and Cains College from 1619 until 1626, affords evidence of a mingling of academic and commercial interests. Dr. Gostlin had practised medicine at Exeter and sat as M.P. for Barnstaple in the

a minor point it is possible to obtain details of the extent to which a tradesman, who passed all his life in this town, could gather in property. It must, however, be admitted that the interest aroused by Hobson the carrier¹ was quite exceptional. Again, the newsletters dealing with the plague at Cambridge in 1630 provide a description of the life of the urban lower middle class² and of the labourers, who lived with them, to

years before his election to the mastership. In his will dated 25 January 1619 he enumerates his properties: 'My house in Norwich in St. Edward's parish. Item, the lease for three lives of my house at Exeter.' Besides these houses, and likewise excluding from the valuation his furniture, books, plate, and apparel, he found his assets to stand 'by the casting upp per accompt in summa £1557:7:2'. There was a sum of £475 in ready money. Dr. Gosilin bequeathed the 'Rose and Crown' inn at Cambridge to Gonville and Caius College and the 'Bull' inn to Catharine Hall. The Mermaid House, Norwich and other property went to his nephew John Gostlin, Venn, op. cit. iii. 80, 82.

¹ Thomas Hobson was born at Buntingford in Hertfordshire about 1544, his father another Thomas Hobson settling in Cambridge in 1561. The elder Hobson was a carrier and at his death in 1558 treasurer of the Cambridge corporation. His son inherited his business and in 1582 purchased a barn and yard in Little St. Mary's, later buying the 'Bull' in Bishopsgate Street, London. In 1629 he became possessed of the manor of Aylward and the site of Anglesey Priory. Corporation Common Day Book and Cooper, op. cit. iii. 236.

² The following details given in the Rev. Joseph Mead's newsletters are most illuminating. 'We have had', wrote Mr. Mead from Christ's College on 17 April 1630 in a record of the development of the plague at Cambridge, 'some seven died; the first, the last week (suspected, but not searched), a boy. On Tuesday a man, one Homes, dwelling in the midst between the two former houses (first affected). All three stand together at Magdalen College End. It began at the farther house, Forster's, a shoemaker, supposed by lodging a soldier, who had a sore upon him. The other two houses, the one is a smith, the hithermost, and the middlemost Homes', a tap-house; all [stand] beyond the bridge. But the worst news of all told me this morning by one of the searchers is, that this last night died a child of Pembroke Hall baker's, next the *Cardinal's Cap*, with all the signs of the plague, both spots and swelling, which discovers the town to be in very great danger. For there died some fortnight since one Disher, a bookbinder, suddenly, and another [one] or two, one being a soldier, whom this Disher, keeping an alehouse, lodged, and was comrade to the soldier that was supposed to have infected the shoemaker's house at St. Giles'. Nothing would be confessed till now this happened upon this child, whose mother is that Disher's wife's sister, and was with her both at and since the death of her husband. We hear that the plague, by some relation to these houses, is broken out at Histon and Gurton. Besides, it is begun in Northampton and other places. God have mercy upon us and deliver us.'

On 24 April Mead wrote again. 'As for the present the infection is not yet come near our end of the town, but remains still beyond the bridge and in Trumpington Street, of which, since my last, have died five. On Wednesday morning died one in a house called the Holt, behind Peter House, who dwelt till a week before at the Castle End; and, as it seems, fearing himself, removed thither without either consent or knowledge of the parish. On Thursday morning, at four o'clock died a boy of one Myton's, dwelling behind the Castle Hill. He is a tiler, and belonged to St. John's

which it is hard to find a parallel. The value of this particular account lies in the topographical detail and in the picture that is drawn of the small tradesmen and their lodgers. No financial information is given, but the diagram of a neighbourhood has seldom been set out more clearly. The double occupations are interesting; thus Mr. Disher was both the keeper of an alehouse and a bookbinder. The impression conveyed is that of the essential mobility of labour. The soldier, with whom the plague was held to have originated, appears as a Yorkshireman living in the family of this Cambridge alehouse-keeper. There is an atmosphere of independence, that self-assurance which is evidenced in Puritan depositions: the class from which the Trendalls and the Dishers came would make their contribution to Cromwell's Ironsides. In these letters, as in the examinations before the court of High Commission, the ties of relationship are shown as close. The intimate contact between town and country stands out clearly. On the other hand, in contrast to the depositions, the Mead letters lack exactness since they merely record rumours of the daily events in Cambridge. Thus Disher is described once as a bookbinder and once as a bookseller, but the former trade seems in the context the more convincing.¹

The place of the bookseller in the social economy is indeterminate, but some notes will indicate the position held among the general and luxury trades of London. Vintners' accounts should also provide valuable material² for study, but in the

College. He knew not how the infection should come at him, unless, as he said, by a dog his son played with, which came from one of the infected houses.' Having mentioned that a child living close to the 'Mitre' had received the disease from his relatives the Dishers, Mr. Mead proceeded to discuss the origin of the plague. 'He [Disher] was by trade a bookseller, but kept an alehouse, and by that occasion, about the beginning of the last month, lodged a soldier, one Thornewton, a Yorkshireman, who died in his house the next day. One Watson and his wife, of the Spittle House End, stript him and wound him; and a tailor there, one Pue, bought his clothes; all three of them dying suddenly within four or five days after, which occasioned some muttering and suspicion then, but the circumstances being not known, and the plague at London not spoken of, it vanished and was forgotten.' Letters from the Rev. Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville dated 17 April and 24 April 1630 printed in *Court and Times of Charles J*, ed. Williams, ii. 72-5.

¹ These were, however, not inconsistent. Cf. an entry in the household accounts of the dowager countess of Derby, '15 January 1635. To the bookbinder for books and papers for my lord [Chandos] 33/- per bill.'

² To give a typical small account, 'the countess of Huntingdon's vintner's bill for 7-23 June 1645 paid at the *Queen's Head* tavern in St. Martin's Lane' amounted

matter of the purchase of books the buyer tends to enter into greater detail than is the case with other wares. The range of prices paid is very marked,¹ while the constant practice of purchasing books abroad is characteristic of the period.² This can be seen in relation to the Perne Library purchases. The new approach went with a tendency to planned

to 10/3 and included small quantities of canary, sack, claret, and white wine, and some beer. *Cal. Hastings MSS.*, i. 392-3. Lord Huntingdon's accounts for 30 November 1629-23 April 1630 include an item in connexion with his visit to Sir Charles Blunt at Mapledurham, 'Paid at the Bear at Reading when my lord was there, for wine and beer 5/-'. *Ibid.*, p. 374. Among Lord Conway's accounts there appears an item, Tor wine, beer and sugar for Sir Tobie Mathew 1/-'. *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, eclxxxv. 19. These figures can be studied in the light of a proclamation issued on 16 January 1639 *^{or} fixing the price of several kinds of wine then in use. 'For one year next following Canary wines and "Allegants" in gross at 19/ the pipe, Muscadels in gross at 19/ the butt, Sacks and "Mallagoes" at 17/ the butt, the best Gascoigne and French wines at 19/ the tun, and the Rochelle wines and other small and thin wines at 16/ the tun in gross,' *ibid.*, ccccx. 57. The term Gascoigne was soon superseded by claret; Alicante and Malaga had been particularly favoured in the early years of James I.

¹ Cf. bill of a bookseller in account with Lord Hastings: '1 Peacham's new booke (*The Compleat Gentleman*) 8^d. 1 Shakespeares workes in folio, £1:2:0. Delivered to my Lord, Oct. 24, 1638.' *Cal. Hastings MSS.*, i. 390. The following details appear among Lord Conway's expenses between 7 July 1634 ^{anc*} 9 March 1635: 'For books in Westminster Hall 1/6; for three books in Paul's churchyard 1/8; Paid to the French bookbinder 10/-; for three books at the Temple 1/3; for books in Fleet Street 2/-; Paid to the bookbinder with the withered hand £2:11:0.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, eclxxxv. 19.

* Cf. letter from Antonio Tracy to Lord Conway dated from Florence 18 May 1633. He had sent him a chest of books containing as many as he could get at present. The chest had been dispatched by sea from Leghorn to London; the total cost was fourscore crowns. In this chest he had sent the *Life of the Grand Duke Cosimo* for Mr. Philip Mainwaring, *ibid.*, cexxxix. 3. On 6 January 1637 Sir Kenelm Digby, then in Paris, wrote to Lord Conway recommending to his knowledge Monsieur Cottard, whose brother was the chief bookseller in Paris for curious books and had correspondents in Italy, Germany, Spain, and in fact everywhere. On 21 January Sir Kenelm wrote again. He had been promised *La Conquete du sang real* for Lord Conway, and also the legend of Sir Tristram. He could procure for him a curious *Amadis* in twelve volumes. He concluded by asking his friend to let him know what he wanted and in what binding, *ibid.*, ccclxlii. 28 and ccclxiv. 58. On 20 January 1639 Lord Digby wrote to Lord Conway from Sherborne, 'I send you here a catalogue of such Spanish books as are thought the best by one well versed in the several authors of that language. Many of them I think to be pamphlets, but you may range among them your volumes of "balletts".' On 21 March 1639 John Lanyon wrote to Lord Conway from Brussels, 'In ten days I shall receive from the mart at Frankfort a printed catalogue of all books printed this year ... in all parts of the world, which I will send you. I have diligently enquired for a Naples courser. I have heard of a rare book lately printed in France named *Les Plans et profits de toutes les principales villes et lieux considerables de France* par le Sieur Tassin 2 vols., and I hope to procure it here very shortly.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, ccccx. 55 and ccccxv. 2.

arrangement¹ which hardly seems to have existed in Elizabethan libraries. Certain London booksellers appear to have specialized in the foreign trade,² and it would be of interest to discover the effect of the Civil wars upon their business. Among the tradesmen with whom Lord Conway dealt was Philemon Stevens,³ whose 'godly understanding apprentice' had been Richard Baxter's friend.

With the increase of private libraries⁴ there went a new carefulness in regard to interior decoration which had little in common with the Elizabethan idea of splendour.⁵ The note of

¹ Letter from William Chambers to Lord Conway dated at Lisneygarvey 14 March 1636. The writer explained that he was placing his lordship's books in their several faculties alphabetically because Lord Conway was bringing his catalogue to that method when the writer came from England. *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, ccxvi. 18. Details are given of the way in which Lord Conway moved his books from place to place. On 14 July 1634 he sent a note of instructions to William Weld 'To take care of the white Irish greyhound. To bring up the new written Polybius if it be reviewed and corrected.' On 2 July of the same year Lord Conway wrote to Foulke Reed to come up and bring with him the books of 'chymistry' sent by the Lord Primate, Cartwright on the Proverbs, and the second part of Guicciardini, *ibid*, eclxxi. 79 and eclxxii. 52.

² Cf. bill dated 4 March 1636 for Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish books sold to Viscount Conway and Killultagh; the total amounted to £16. 2s. *lod*. The bill is endorsed 'Books at the Latin warehouse', *ibid*, ccxv. 47. This expenditure may be compared with the sums paid for purchases in the Temple and in Paul's Churchyard as also with the very modest figures given in Lord William Howard's Naworth Castle accounts.

³ On 2 April 1640 Lord Conway paid a bill amounting to £10. 2s. for books supplied by Mr. Stevens the bookseller since 25 August 1639, *ibid*, cccl. 20.

⁴ As an indication of the development of private libraries among the country gentry the library of Sir Roger Bradshaigh of Haigh in Lancashire was valued at £40 at his death on 31 March 1684, *Cketham Miscellanies*, viii. 55. The external characteristics of a gentleman's library in the eighteenth century are foreshadowed in a note made by Evelyn in 1644. The duke of Orleans's library is described as 'well furnished with excellent bookes, all bound in maroquin and gilded, the valans of the shelves being of green velvet fringed with gold'. *Diary of John Evelyn*, i. 92.

⁵ The former practice by which galleries were furnished with a sufficient number of pictures of emperors or heroes without regard to artistic merit was still established in the great houses of the older fashion. The Wardour Castle inventories supply an instance of this practice in a private house, while Sir William Brereton made the following note on the bishop of Durham's palace, Bishop Auckland, during a visit in 1635: 'Here are three dineingc roomes: a faire matted gallerye: wherein there was placed on both sides these pictures: Jo. Huss, Hierom of Prague, Luther, Zuinglius, Cranmer, Latimer, Whittakers, Wickliffe, Calvin, Beza, Perkins, Bullinger, Jewell, Fagius, Bradford, Zanchius, Bucer, etc. and none but of this straine.' *Journal of Sir William Brereton*, Surtees Society, p. 10. Details are given in regard to the pictures in the possession of the company of Barber Surgeons:

privacy and the free rein given to individual taste¹ are alike discernible, whether manifested in the patronage given to miniaturists or in attention paid to the placing of the Vandyck portrait. These points are, however, only touched on here in so far as they tend to indicate the metropolitan character of each luxury trade. Such trades had always had their foreign practitioners and the returns relating to aliens make it possible to form some estimate of the significance of this element² in the population of London. At the same time it is difficult to determine how much English labour was absorbed into alien-

'1 August 1634. I*¹⁵ ordered that the 41 philosophers pictures shalbe rbeautified and repaired by Mr. Grecnebury at the cost of the house soe it excccdc not li.' Records printed in *The Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* by Sidney You.ig, p. 5^o9-

¹ The Conway Letters give an indication of one man's taste. On 3 November 1630 Lord Conway wrote to William Weld, whom he had just taken into his service, saying that he wished that he could find a good design for an iron work. On 31 October 1635 he wrote to George. Rawdon, his agent at Lisneygarvey, to say that he had taken two chambers in the Spring Gardens. He instructed him to bring over hangings for two rooms and the writer's great brass lamp, *Stale Papers, Dom.y Charles I*, clxxxv. 14 and ccc. 66.

² Information on this point is fairly extensive. In October 1635 a certificate was made out detailing all strangers—born, who dwell, lodge, or exercise any manual trade in Westminster. The number of persons listed worked out at 279. These included certain well-known names. 'Marquis Surdia, a French gentleman, a lodger, and six servants, all French. Grcgoria Pansana (Panzani), an Italian, and two servants, lodgers: Lewis Marshall, a Frenchman, a periwig maker, his wife and sister, lodgers. John Baptiste Ferine, her Majesty's perfumer, a Dutchman, a householder.' With the exception of Ferine, who lived in St. Clement Danes, the persons named resided in the parish of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, *ibid*, ccc. 75. On 25 December of the same year a letter from the lord mayor to the privy council detailed 2,547 strangers dwelling in the city of Ix>ndon. The information is more complete than in the earlier list and notices of three prominent foreign residents have an especial interest. 'In the precinct of Blackfriars: Sir Anthony Vandyke 2 years, six servants. In St. Bartholomew the Great: Hubert le Sueur, by profession a sculptor, born in Paris; he hath dwelt here five years and hath three children, English-born, four men servants, one an Englishman and three Frenchmen born in Paris. In St. Gabriel Fenchurch: Mr. Philip Burlamachi, merchant, naturalized by Act of Parliament. He was born in Sedan in France and has been in England this thirty years and more. He hath certain rooms in Mr. Gerald's house in Fenchurch Street for his necessary occasions of writing there some two or three days in the week, but his dwelling house with his wife and family is at Putney.' *Ibid*, cccv. 11. Two extracts from the court minutes of the company of Barber-Surgeons deal with Italians in London whose qualification to practice was denied. '7 December 1613. This daie John Antonio an Italian being an impostor practicing in surgery is forbidden by this court to deal any more in surgery. 7 December 1624. This daie John Baptist Succa a mountibanke and an Italian-born had order to forbear his practise here in London.' Printed in Young, *op. cit.*, pp. 331 and 332.

controlled trades. In the wider field it may be said that a political nexus bound the dependent groups together, or, to state the position more accurately, the workers in the luxury trades, the servant population whether in regular or casual employment, the watermen,¹ hackney coachmen, and sedan chairmen² were all in varying degrees affected by the presence of the king in London. Over against them stood that great section of the working population which, while it depended on the presence of capitalists, was wholly unaffected by the individual rich man or by the court.

In examining the way of life of those who served the industries of the constantly growing capital, it is perhaps simplest to concentrate on those employed in the coal-carrying trade. Besides, there was an element of novelty in this employment since the work of coal-heavers in the port of London was only organized during the seventeenth century. This was in part the result of the adaptation of the long-familiar Thames lighter to the handling of sea-coal, a development necessitated by the increase in draught of the sea-going hoys, which were now of such burthen that they could no longer anchor up the river beyond Tower Wharf.³ The situation was governed by the

¹ The situation as between the watermen and hackney coachmen is set out in a petition of the watermen of the Thames to the privy council dated 8 June 1634. It is arranged under four heads. In the first place it is contended that hackney coaches are so many in number that they pester the streets and make leather exceedingly dear; moreover, they carry every common person to the great prejudice of the petitioners. In the second place they play in term time at the Temple gate, and carry sometimes three men for 1*d.* each, or four men for *is.* to Westminster or back again. This practice 'undoes the company of Watermen*. In consequence in order to diminish the number of watermen, and also to replenish the Thames with knowing seamen, the petitioners recommend that every ship that goes out of London should take one waterman for every 100 tons burthen. Finally they entreat that the carriage of passengers' betwixt London and Gravesend and vice versa may be reserved to watermen alone. Hoys and other vessels many times in the night slip away with many passengers into foreign parts, where youth of both sexes are seduced, and transformed into priests, monks, friars, and nuns, *State Papers, Dom., Charles I.*, cclxix. 52.

² In 1634 Sir Sanders Duncombe was granted a monopoly of Sedan chairs for fourteen years. It is generally recognized that the establishment of places of amusement on the Surrey side of the river was regarded favourably by the city government on account of its Puritan character and by the watermen since this benefited their material interests.

³ The situation was complicated by the fact that until 1616 access to Tower Wharf was difficult because the lieutenant of the Tower forbade the passage of heavy coal cars through the bulwark of the Tower of London.

great increase of the coal imports amounting in a poor year to nearly 150,000 tons brought ashore at the port of London.¹ The men unloading colliers worked in gangs of sixteen paid by piece-work, the gangs earning between one and three shillings per London chaldron. The coal traders, who hired the lighters, bargained in the booths of the Exchange at Billingsgate with the shipmasters from the coal hoys. Under these circumstances the traders were compelled to hire such 'poor labourers'² as they could get to unlade the ships'. The vagrancy laws hung over these unorganized workers, 'persons³ of the meanest sort, of little worth, no settled habitation'.

By comparison the position of the coal carmen was relatively satisfactory. As a result of a decision of the court of Aldermen the power to grant licences to drive carts from the wharves to the new coal yards was vested in the Woodmongers Company, each carman paying a fine on taking out his licence and thereafter a fixed annual sum, which was not intended to exceed 1*js. qd.* During this period the use of Tyneside sea-coal came to replace coal or charcoal⁴ in the private fire-place; it was already the only fuel for industrial and commercial purposes.

A tract written a few years later gives a clear view of the part of the middle class in these transactions. As opposed to the chandler, who retailed coal by the sack, the woodmonger, with his coal yard and his yardman and night-watchman, never

¹ After giving the figure of the coal imports at London from Xmas 1637 until Xmas 1638 as 142,579 tons Professor John U. Nef gives it as his opinion that such imports in the thirties amounted in a normal year to nearly 250,000 tons, *The Rise of the British Coal Industry*, i. 21 and note 3. These Newcastle colliers bringing sea-coal from the Tyneside and Weardale pits were manned by a crew of ten and had a cargo-carrying space of between 200 and 300 tons. They would come into the Thames in fleets through the spring and summer averaging annually between five and nine round trips before they were laid up for the winter.

² Dale, *Fellowship of Woodmongers*, p. 136.

³ Alchin MSS., vol. 31, quoted by Nef, op. cit. i. 431. Two factors affected this poor and seasonal employment. During the six years of war between 1625 and 1631 the East Coast trade was harried by Dunkirk privateers, while after the incorporation of the society of Coal Merchants in 1638 instructions were issued that ships working in co-operation with that society should anchor above Barking Shelf, some six miles down the river, and there await arrangements for unloading.

⁴ In 1621 sea-coal from the north of England only figures occasionally in the earl of Middlesex's kitchen ledger, Sackville MSS. quoted by Nef, op. cit. i. 198, n. 6. In 1637 the earl of Rutland's steward laid in thirty tons of sea-coal as against six tons of Scottish coal for his master's London house, *Cat. Rutland MSS.*, i. 499-500.

dealt in smaller quantities than a chaldron¹ and catered for the established dyers and brewers and for the prosperous private citizens. In *The Two Grand Ingrossers of Coles* the way of life of a section of the townspeople is illumined in the snatches of conversation.

'Of all sly and subtle Cormorants in this nation',² writes the author of this dialogue between a woodmonger and a chandler, 'there are not any that do outstrip these two craftsmen. Thus to make his poor neighbours hurry to him for tiny sacks of coal the chandler sees to it that it is reported either that the fleet of colliers has been shipwrecked or that Dutch Pickeroons lie in wait off Sunderland or that the seamen were pressed into the navy or that the brewers, dyers, cooks, smiths, founders, and glasshousemen have taken the supply.' Naturally the methods of the woodmongers were more elaborate. An exchange is recorded between the agents of the latter and such rich men's stewards as appear to forestall a winter shortage.³ The woodmongers and the chandlers with their traditional reputation, the coal-heavers leaning on their shovels in Roomland and waiting for an engagement, and the heavy wooden coal-cars making their way along the narrow streets together build up a picture which has some of the familiar lineaments of Hogarth's London.

For the rest there were certain tendencies that would come to characterize the capital in the Hanoverian period which were already present. The development of the great properties such as the Bloomsbury estate of the Russells or the manor of Ebury belonged to a later generation, but already certain landlords were gathering to themselves large and sometimes disconnected areas of building land. Thus in Lord Wentworth's

¹ Eight Newcastle chaldrons were the equivalent of twenty-one tons.

² *The Two Grand Ingrossers of Coles*, 1653, pp. 11-12. As the date of publication indicates, the examples are cited from the period of the first Dutch war.

³ *'Either our wives or yardmen', so runs the woodmonger's piece, 'shall salute them with a kind of heavy countenance. "Indeed, Sir", the wife will say, "I am sorry to tell you wee are very loath to sell any as yet, for our stores arc almost spent and the warres continue." * The steward then pleads for 'thirty or forty chaldrons at any price and offers bribes. "Truly", replies die wife, "heare hath been my lord such a ones steward, and such and such brewer, and I heard them talke of a hundred or two hundred chaldron a piece, and whether my husband hath promised them or not I know not, but I'll do what I can with my husband to furnish my good lord/" Ibid., p. 12.

marriage settlement executed in 1638 many of the relatively new streets find a mention. In the pages of this document portions of east and north-east London can be seen almost in process of assembly.¹ The lists of persons compounding for buildings erected in London contrary to the proclamations² give an indication of the way in which the different areas of the capital were being developed. Petitions arising out of the incidence of ship-money³ reveal the presence of the non-resident landlord owning certain blocks of small houses in poor streets.

The immense discrepancy between the population of London and that of the other considerable towns in England places a constant emphasis on the capital. At the same time an ease of intercourse already existed between the members of the established middle-class resident in London and those living in such towns as York, Norwich, and Bristol. The cathedral cities were gradually manifesting their specialized character both in an ecclesiastical and a civic sense. As far as the middle classes were concerned, the provincial centres would in a measure reflect the life of London. The skilled artisans would move from place to place as their trade required within the framework of urban life. There was little divorce between town and country save, perhaps, in the case of London. There the great new population was a separating factor in the expanding capital.

¹ In the draft of the settlement on the proposed marriage of Thomas Lord Wentworth, son and heir of Thomas earl of Cleveland, with the sole daughter and heiress of Sir John Lambe the earl offered to bring into settlement the following properties in the neighbourhood of London: the lordship of Hackney and also lands in Shoreditch, Holywell Street, Whitechapel, Stratford-le-Bow, Poplar, North Street, Lime Street, Ratcliff, Brook Street, Mile End, Bethnal Green, Old Ford, Kingsland, Newington Street *alias* Hackney Street, Clapton, Church Street, Well Street, Humberton (Homerton), Grove Street, and Mare Street. *State Papers, Dom., Charles I., cccviii. 61.*

² Cf. as a typical example a list of persons compounding for the erection of such buildings: Sir John Cotton for four houses in Drury Lane, William Ryplingham for a new building in the 'Angel' inn in Islington, Henry Milton for nine houses enlarged by Limehouse, Harry Stevenson for six houses by the Ducking Pond, Ratcliff. *Ibid.*, p. 65.

³ A petition sent by the inhabitants of Saffron Hill and Field Lane in the parish of St. Andrew's, Holborn, and dated 10 April 1637 states that these **places are in** the possession of four non-resident landlords, the principal being William Hancock, vintner in Fleet Street, who has £236 per annum. The **inhabitants are poor people** assessed at £16 for ship-money and unable to pay **taxation**. *Ibid.*, ccclii. 54.

CONCLUSION

TAKING the raising of the king's standard at Nottingham in August 1642 as a final date, we can attempt to assess the contribution of the early Caroline period to the development of the English social structure. The date chosen is important not only as indicating the emergence of the real, although not technical, sovereignty of Parliament, but still more because it marks the withdrawal of the king from London. No king would again enter London as a sovereign until Charles II returned there in 1660.

This is significant because the life of the literate circles in the capital was profoundly affected by the influence of the court. Men of education who held to principles of the stricter sort were influenced by repulsion. On the other hand the existence of a standard of royal behaviour led to many imitations. Thus there was a clear reflection of the Caroline mood in the world of letters. It seems accurate to state that the influence in question depended on a court conceived of as immutable; it could, however, be metamorphosed into an approach to the court militant and the court triumphant. Such an influence lingered among the supporters of the king who gathered round the court at Oxford.

Thus some poets, and perhaps most markedly in their different fashions Sidney Godolphin and William Habington, had a strong Royalist emphasis; others were courtiers who depended on their court's immutability. The characteristic figures in this latter group, Sir John Suckling and Thomas Carew, did not outlive the king's withdrawal. In any event the Caroline mood could not survive the break-up of the court at Oxford; it vanished on that morning in May 1646 when, after the defeat at Naseby, Charles I rode over Magdalen Bridge to give himself up to his enemies.

A consideration of the approach which characterized men of letters dependent on the court may assist in determining the nature of the influence that emanated from King Charles and the royal entourage. Thus Suckling and Carew were in the strict sense courtiers. Carew, the elder of the two, had been sewer in ordinary to the king and appears to have died in 1639;

his poems were printed posthumously in the following year. Sir John Suckling was in all respects a more considerable figure, a man of distinction,¹ something of a politician,² a great gambler.³ He died at thirty-three in the year that the royal standard was raised at Nottingham. Suckling's poems have all the marks of a court culture; the privacy; the segregated air. They are stamped with the character of a coterie society; the wit turns upon the private jest or the secret meaning.

Some titles will bear out this last contention. 'To his Lord Lepington⁴ upon his translation of Malvezzi's Romulus and Tarquin. To my friend Will Davcnant upon his poem of Madagascar. Upon my Lady Carlisle's walking in Hampton Court garden.' This was a world which the outbreak of the Civil war was bound to shatter. There is evident throughout Suckling's work a deep attachment to the life of London⁵ as the court interpreted it. One contemporary put the matter mildly: 'some thought he had a little too much of the French air'.⁶ There was, too, a lightness of touch and a gaiety which are partly English in inspiration and for the rest derive from France of the days before the Hotel de Rambouillet. Some verses may be quoted as characteristic of two aspects of his

¹ Sir John Suckling was the son of Sir John Suckling, comptroller of the king's household, and nephew to Lord Treasurer Middlesex. He was born in 1609, educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and Gray's Inn, and knighted on coming of age.

² He was a dependent of the marquess of Hamilton and a follower of Sir Henry Vane the elder. He was opposed to 'those that are of Sir Thomas Roc's cabinet'; cf. letter from Sir John Suckling to Sir Henry Vane dated from Whitehall 2 May 1632, *State Papers, Dom.*, Charles I, cexvi. 6.

³ On 18 September 1635 George Garrard had written to Lord Conway from Petworth, 'I heard my Lord Dunluce lost at the Wells at Tunbridge almost £2,000 at ninepins, most of it to Sir John Sutlin' (Suckling). *Ibid.*, ccxviii. 10. In a letter sent by Garrard to Lord Wentworth on 10 November 1634 there occurs this comment, 'Sir John Sutling, a young man, famous for nothing before but that he was a great gamester'. *Letters and Dispatches of Thomas Karl of Strafford*, ed. William Knowler, p. 336.

⁴ These are printed in Sir John Suckling's *Works*. Other titles of this character include 'To my Lady E. C. at her going out of England', 'Mr. Davcnant's Barbary pigeons (and he now employs them all, he says himself, for the Queen's use)', 'Lady Kent's well-being'. *Ibid.*, p. 64, ed. Thompson.

⁵ 'Now all this discourse of dying, Madam, is but to let you know how dangerous a thing it is to be long from London, especially in a place which is concluded out of the world.' *Letters to divers Eminent Personages*, *ibid.*, p. 302. 'These things now we that live in London cannot help, and they are as great news to men that sit in boxes at Black-Friars, as the affairs of love to flannel-weavers.' *Ibid.*, p. 314.

⁶ Quoted in preface, *ibid.*, p. v.

manner. The title of the first piece is stamped by Suckling's hall-mark. 'Upon Sir John Laurence's bringing Water over the Hills to my Lord Middlesex house at Witten.'

And is the Water come? Sure't cannot be,
It runs too much against Philosophy;
For heavy bodies to the Centre bend,
Light Bodies only naturally ascend.

The second verse is from his familiar 'Song'.¹

The waving Sea can with each Flood
Bath some high promont that has stood
Far from the Main up in the River:
Oh think not then, but Love can do
As much, for that's an Ocean too,
Which flows not every Day, but ever.

By contrast Carew lacked Suckling's particular and modern lightness. Thus his work never lost the Jacobean flavour which he had acquired in youth;² there was something old-fashioned and conventional in his phrasing and a certain solemnity in his court manner.³ Carew had a feeling for the masque and when *Coelum Britannicum* was performed in the Banqueting House at Whitehall on Shrove Tuesday, 1633, his name was joined with that of Inigo Jones as the 'inventor'. The masque, however, considered both in detail and as a form of entertainment belongs more properly to the previous age: the rotund phrases

¹ *Collected Works*, p. 68.

* Thomas Carew, son of Sir Matthew Carew, was born about 1595 and educated at Merton College, Oxford, and the Middle Temple. He had been secretary to Sir Dudley Carleton at Venice in 1613-15.

³ This is evidenced in those of Carew's verses which are addressed to members of the court circle. 'To the King at his entrance into Saxham by Master Io. Crofts. Three Epitaphs on the Lady Mary Villiers. Epitaph on the Lady Mary Wentworth daughter of Thomas Earl of Cleveland. Obsequies to the Lady Anne Hay. To the Countess of Anglesey upon the immoderately-by-her-lamented death of her husband. An elegy upon the death of Dr. Donne. To my worthy friend M. D'Avenant upon his excellent play, the Just Italian. An hymeneal song on the nuptials of the Lady Anne Wentworth and the Lord Lovelace.' A characteristic expression occurs in the poem to Lady Anglesey, 'The froward Juno's or chaste Cinthia's love'. *Poems*, p. 90, ed. Hazlitt. Special ties linked this poet with the Wentworth family, and for the rest Carew traversed in a different spirit some of the ground which Suckling covered. One of his poems is entitled 'To the new year, for the Countess of Carlisle*.

might have been coined two generations earlier.¹ It seems that it was chiefly as an opportunity for spectacle that the queen and the court would still enjoy it.²

On the other hand there was by this time discernible that note of rather strained simplicity which would foreshadow the eighteenth century.³ This is reflected not only in the work of Habington, who was connected with the court as Lord Powis's son-in-law, but also in that of other writers from the circle of the country gentry. In this connexion an interesting light is thrown on contemporary cultural expression among the Catholic members of this milieu by the commonplace book

¹ The stage directions for *Coelum BriUmicum* possess a special interest. 'The curtaine was watchet, and a pale yellow in paines, which flying up on the sudden, discovered the scene, representing old arches, old palaces, decayed walls, parts of temples, theaters, basilicas and thermes, with confused heaps of broken columns, bases, coronices, and statues, lying as under ground, and altogether resembling the mines of some great citie of the ancient Romans, or civilized Brittaines. This strange prospect detayu'd the eyes of the spectators sometime, when, to a loud musick Mercury descends; on the upper part of his chariot stands a cocke, in action of crowing; his habit was a coat of flame colour girt to him, and a white mantle trimm'd with gold and silver; upon his head a wreath.' Two further scenes may be described. 'Atlas and the spheare vanisheth, and a new scaene appeares of mountaines, whose eminent height exceeds the clouds, which pass beneath them: the lower parts were wild and woody. Out of this place comes forth a more grave antimasque of Picts, the naturall inhabitants of this isle, ancient Scots and Irish: these dance a Perica, or a martiall dance.' The next instructions have a touch that is more in keeping with Renaissance feeling. 'The masquers dance their main dance; which done, the scaene again is varied into a new and pleasant prospect, cleane differing from all the other: the nearest part shewing a delicious garden, with severall walkes and parterres set round with low trees, and on the side against these walkes, were fountains and grots, and in the furthest part a palace, from whence went high walkes upon arches, and above them open terraces planted with cypress trees, and all this together was composed of such ornaments as might expresse a princely villa.' Pp. 198-9, 224, 229.

² Thus it might be held that the specifically seventeenth-century interest in masques was concentrated on the element of elaborate mechanical contrivance. Professor Allardyce Nicoll in *Stuart Masques and the Renaissance Stage* stresses this aspect. 'My endeavour . . . is to examine the work of Inigo Jones and his fellow "architects" in the light of contemporary Italian theatre practice for the purpose of determining—so far as such a determination is possible—the precise methods employed in the production of these royal entertainments.' *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³ This is notably the case in the work of Katherine Philips who was born about 1603. The manner varies from the formality of 'To the honoured Lady E. C to the careful simplicity of 'To my Lucasia, in defence of declared friendship*. Certain of the poems are of considerably later date, but 'Lucasia, Rosania and Orinda parting at a Fountain*. 'To my Lady Elizabeth Boyle singing "Now Affairs"' and 'Upon the gravings of her name upon a tree in Barn Elm Walkes' all seem to link Queen Henrietta's court with a foretaste of the Georgians. Cf. *Minor Caroline Poets*, ed. G. Saintsbury, pp. 543-6, 554, 567, 579, and 583.

of Mrs. Constantia Fowler, which is now in the Huntington Library.¹ The poems copied into this volume are in the main religious and by various authors, while among them are to be found some contributions from a Catholic family grouping centred upon St. Thomas's Priory and Tixall.²

This commonplace book provides an instance of the circulation of poems in manuscript; some verses by Robert Herrick, which were not published until 1648, are copied there. Herrick's own contact with the court was negligible and in any case now that his style had matured it was a question rather of the influence that he would exert rather than that to which he might be subjected. At the same time his position had points of resemblance to that of a younger poet John Cleveland, whose work is instinct with the Caroline mood. Both men belonged by birth to a grouping which had no hereditary ties to link them with the world of privilege. They were both bound up with a clerical circle which was far removed from influential patrons.³ Herrick accepted the living of Dean Prior in 1629; Cleveland, a son of the vicar of Hinckley in Leicestershire, became a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. The effect of this remoteness from the centre of power is seen in the poems of both men. Cleveland's work in particular is almost entirely devoid of reference either to public figures or to those who

¹ Huntington Library MS. 904.

² St. Thomas's Priory and Tixall are both in Staffordshire, and some of the verse has been printed by Arthur Clifford in the collection known as *Tixall Poetry*. Among the identified contributors are Henry Thimelby and his wife Gertrude Aston, Sir William Pearsall or Peshall, and Katharine Thimelby who married Herbert Aston of Tixall. Katharine Thimelby was born in 1614 and Miss Constantia Fowler was married in 1629. John Austin (born 1613) was tutor to the Fowlers at St. Thomas's Priory. The heading 'Verses presented with a beautiful picture to Celestina' occurs on folio 6. It is suggested that some of the names adopted in the grouping were suggested by *Celestina, The Tragick-comedy of Calisteo and Malibea*, the translation by James Mabbe from the Spanish of Fernando de Rojas being issued in 1631. The late Mr. Bernard Newdigate advanced the view that the poems 'On Castaraes sitting on primrose bankes' and 'Upon Castara's and her sister going afoote in the snowe' may have been addressed to Habington's 'Castara' Lucy Herbert. The 'Celia' of this grouping has been identified as Gertrude Aston (cf. *Tixall Poetry*, pp. 214-15), and it was suggested by Mr. Newdigate that 'Seraphina' is perhaps Katharine Thimelby.

³ Robert Herrick was born in 1591 and was familiar with all those who frequented the Jonsonian circle. Apart from such contacts the only name that one finds associated with his from the world of aristocratic patrons is that of Mildmay second earl of Westmorland. John Cleveland was born in 1613 and gained his fellowship in 1634.

moved in the royal circle. At the same time his 'Mark Antony' is perhaps the perfect expression of the standpoint and approach which the queen and her friends sought to achieve.

On this literary side the emphasis falls naturally upon the queen and her circle rather than upon the reserved and grave king. It was in other spheres¹ that the impact of his personality was felt, in all that concerned the Church, in architecture, and in statuary. Again, King Charles left his own peculiar imprint on the world of politics. From another angle it would seem that Hubert le Sueur's work suggests the king's idea of rather staid magnificence; in the creation of the vogue that came to Vandyck's portraiture² both sovereigns shared.

¹ The king's own taste seems to have played its part in the formation of the royal gallery at Windsor, and he had that general interest in pictures which had characterized his friend the duke of Buckingham. In 1626 the duke had purchased through Michel le Blond a collection of pictures owned by Rubens and then at Antwerp. Among this collection were included, according to the attributions, thirteen pictures by Veronese, seventeen by Tintoretto, three each by Leonardo da Vinci and Raphael, and thirteen by Rubens. These last included the picture of the queen regent of France sitting under a canopy, the picture of the duchess of Brabant with her lover, and a piece of gods and goddesses of the woods. Other objects purchased by the duke are found described as follows, 'a model of the Sabine which is in the great palace at Florence, Cain and Abel in marble by John of Bologna, now in York House garden, a Venus and a Cupid in ivory, St. Peter in chains, in alabaster, the 3 graces in ivory, and twelve boxes of agates and other precious stones, chased in gold and all antiques'. These are detailed in the catalogue of the duke of Buckingham's collection printed by Brian Fairfax in 1758; cf. *Papers relating to Rubens*, ed. W. N. Sainsbury, pp. 65-6 and 68.

These details have some bearing on King Charles's taste and can be compared with indications from a different quarter. The correspondence between the earl of Arundel and the court was distant, but there was a certain parallel between the royal collection and Lord Arundel's. Two letters in the duke of Norfolk's archives bear on this point. One paper is headed 'extract from a letter written in answer to mine near Dantzic, the 3 of May 1631. Item, there is a book in folio . . . bound and edged with silver, the pictures in it arc from the first folio unto the 38th folio. All sortes of Birds, and afterwards there are divers skillfull pictures. From the 46th folio to the 53rd folio there are seven planets made by the pennic. From the 54th folio to the 69th folio there are all sortes of fishes, and there follow other kindes of skillfull things.' Arundel Castle MSS., Letter no. 297. The other paper dated 9 Nov. 1632 is written by William Lisle, then at Cambridge. 'Since I saw your honour [Lord Arundel] last, I met with another book worthy to be layd by the former; this being as rare a monument of the French Church and language, as that other was of the English, *Psalterium interlineato antiquo Normanico*; of equal 1 antiquity and fair-written with a great pen or pencil 1, upon a thick parchment.' Ibid., Letter no. 306.

² A note on some of Vandyck's paintings dealing with English subjects will give an indication of the sphere in which his work was valued. In 1632 and 1634 he painted double portraits of the king and queen. In 1635 and the succeeding years he painted nineteen portraits of the king, and between 1633 and 1639 a series of

The king had come early to his preferences and his fixed beliefs. He had imbibed from youth those doctrines as to the extent and preservation of his Regality, which had given to King James I self-conscious pleasure. His royal duty was as manifest to the sovereign as was the impiety of those who in later life would attempt to curtail what God had given. In his eyes the enemies of the Church of England were never free from the shadow of the guilt of sacrilege. Again, the nexus between the king and the Established Church gained an additional strength since it arose from the essentially English character of shared responsibilities. Yet this bore heavily upon a sovereign who would have been ridden by scruple had he possessed imagination.

It was for these reasons that the legend of the royal martyr, when it shaped, was in essence both cold and tragic. His subjects found a difficulty in fathoming the workings of a mind which was at once so secret and so conscientious. Charles I was always conscious that he was separated from other men by his reception of the oil of consecration. His actions were henceforth measured by a single standard. They were judged in the light of his responsibilities as a crowned and an anointed king.

It seems probable that it was this element in his character which led King Charles to accept all men into his service. He was not so much disillusioned as unexpectant, and other things disturbed him besides a lack of loyalty. It seems a consequence

portraits of the queen. Vandyck did not paint in England after 1640; he died in 1641.

Portraits of English sitters dating from Vandyck's early life include those of Sir Robert Shirley (1623) and Anna Wake (1628), both painted abroad. There are few English subjects from this period, and it seems very doubtful whether the portrait painted in 1627 and now in the Royal Gallery at The Hague in fact represents a member of the Sheffield family. During his years in England Vandyck painted no less than seven portraits of the earl of Arundel, five of the countess of Sunderland, four of the countess of Carlisle, and four of Endymion Porter. Among ministers the earl of Strafford was painted six times and Lord Treasurer Portland four times. There are three portraits each of Mrs. Olivia Porter and of Margaret Lady Cary and a whole series relating to the connected families of Cary, Wharton, Goodwin, and Wenman. There are six portraits of the duke of Lennox and four of his duchess. Most of the intimates of the court were painted; there are four portraits of Sir Kenelm Digby. Vandyck painted Sir John Suckling, Thomas Carew, and Inigo Jones. The well-known picture of Lord John and Lord Bernard Stuart, together with that of the Ladies Savage and the portraits of the royal, Arundel, and Bolingbroke children, seems to have initiated a fashion for family groups. Cf. *Works by Vandyck*, by Sir Lionel Cust.

of this approach that in his later years King Charles would not admit that men by supporting him had gained a claim to be rewarded. As a corollary his mind stretched out to consider untiringly those with whom his own followers were contesting. He could not have shared the outlook which marked the Hanoverians; he could have led no party of King's Friends.

Such a line of action must have been at variance with the Stuart sovereign's religious approach to kingship. The opening words of a sermon preached by Dr. Laud in the royal presence bear on this point. 'For though there be many "pillars"',¹ declared the bishop of Bath and Wells at the opening of the king's first parliament, 'yet there is but *units rex*, one King, one great and centre pillar; and all the rest in a kingdom do but "bear up" under and about him.' A strengthening virtue was imparted by such deep, cool expositions. They were received by a nature that was at once both tempered and obdurate.

This quality in the king affected his subjects in different fashions and in very varying degrees. Thus the clergy of the Established Church were fortified in their teaching as to the king's position by the knowledge of their sovereign's attachment to that *pietas anglicana* which is associated with the name of Lancelot Andrcwcs. Many among them shared King Charles's feeling that the outlook of George Herbert represented a norm of Anglican devotion.² A line of descent is clearly

¹ Sermon for King Charles's first parliament, Laud's *Works*, i. 104. This may be compared with another sermon preached on the king's inauguration. 'And indeed moral justice alone cannot possibly be enough for a Christian King. Religious and pious "justice" must come in too. He must take care for the souls, as well as for the bodies and goods, of his people.' *Ibid.*, p. 205.

² George Herbert died on 1 March 1633. *The Temple* was printed at Cambridge in the same year. The first edition of Herbert's translation of Valdesso's *Considerations* was printed at Oxford in 1638; a preface to this work was dated from Bemerton on 29 September 1632. The following passages from *A Priest to the Temple* throw light on the king's religious approach. The first occurs in chapter IV, The Parson's accessory knowledge. 'The country parson hath read the schoolmen, and the later writers, or a good proportion of all, out of all which he hath compiled a book, and body of Divinity, which is the storehouse of his sermons and which he preacheth all his life.' Herbert, *Works*, ed. Hutchinson, p. 229. The second sentence is found in chapter X, The Parson in his house. 'His children he first makes Christians, and then Commonwealths-men; the one he owes to his heavenly Country, the other to his earthly, having no title to either, except he do good to both.' *Ibid.*, p. 239.

Some sentences from Chillingworth's second sermon seem also to reflect the Anglican approach. 'Now, how well does this express the Nature of Charity? For, what else is Love but a sweet breathing of the Holy Spirit upon our Passions,

traced between Herbert's life at Bemerton and the work that Nicholas Ferrar would develop at Little Gidding. Further, it seems accurate to state that among the clergy the number of the adherents of these views was steadily increasing. It was, in fact, a mark of the brief period that under the safeguard of the royal authority the attitude of a segment of the clergy and laity would veer from a strictly Protestant upbringing towards a traditional and sacramental standpoint. Both Nicholas Ferrar and Richard Crashaw would be found among those who trod this path.¹ In the same way the changes in the chapels of certain colleges² in the universities went forward sanctioned by the king's approval.

On those, however, who were closest to the king the strain of his remote temperament would fall most heavily. There is here no opportunity to study in detail the relations between King Charles and his ministers in the years that followed the duke of Buckingham's assassination. Still it can be stated with confidence that, except for the conventional friendship with Archbishop Laud, they were marked by an indifference which chilled into frigidity.

It was a consequence of this situation that the attachment to the king was seldom personal but flowed from doctrine. The moulding forces binding men to King Charles may be described as the old monarchic sentiment, which in a conflict

whereby the Holy Ghost does, as it did in the beginning of Genesis, *incubare aquis*, move by a cherishing, quieting virtue upon the sea of our Passions.' *Works*, ed. I o, p. 21.

¹ Nicholas Ferrar the elder, when deputy treasurer of the Virginia Company, had been preoccupied with the development of a college at Henrico, where Indian children were to be instructed in 'the true knowledge of God and understanding of righteousness'. Richard Crashaw was the son of the Rev. William Crashaw, B.D., who died in 1626 after completing a translation of St. Augustine's *City of God*. Mr. Crashaw had preached at the Temple in 1609 before Lord Delawarr's departure for Jamestown and he had certain links with the Virginia Company. He was the author of a controversial work entitled *Loyola's Disloyalty*. In his will he states, 'And I believe that I am bound to separate myself from that synagogue of Rome if I will be saved.'

² Notes have survived of a visitation of certain Cambridge chapels; the paper is headed 23 September 1636 and appears to have been drawn up by Dr. Cosins. Here is indicated that situation which the king wished to eradicate. 'Bennett College: The Chappell never yet consecrate. Table stands below as it did [as at Trinity, Emmanuel, Sidney, Catharine]. Sing long psalms of their own appointing, behave with little reverence. Christ's College: Their service reformed of late. Of their organ nothing left but broken case. Scholars lodge out in the Brazen George.' For a study of this subject cf. F. J. Varley, *Cambridge during the Civil War*.

would lead a great mass of the gentry to support their sovereign, and the new regalian outlook upon which the earl of Strafford had built up a framework for authority.¹ Under one aspect the key to Strafford's effect on the royal fortunes may be held to reside in the personal relation between the minister and his king.² It was only with reluctance that the soldierly mind of

¹ Two speeches delivered in 1628, after Lord Wentworth had accepted the lord presidency of the council of the North, indicate his outlook in the years before he became riled by the king's insufficiency. 'Princes,' he exclaimed on the first occasion, 'are to be indulgent, nursing fathers to their people; their modest liberties, their sober rights ought to be precious in their eyes, the branches of their government be for shadow, for habitation, the comfort of life, repose, safe and still under the protection of their sceptres. Subjects on the other side, ought with solicitous eyes of jealousy to watch over the prerogatives of the Crown; the authority of a king is the keystone which closeth up the arch of order and government, which contains each part in due relation to the whole and which once shaken, infirmed all the &ame falls together into a confused heap of foundation and battlement, of strength and beauty.' The second passage dates from his inauguration as lord president. 'May the tent of this Court be enlarged, the curtains drawn out, the stakes strengthened, yet no further than shall be for a covering to the common tranquillity and shelter to the poor and innocent from the proud and insolent.' The two speeches were first printed in Browning's *Prose Life of Strafford* Appendix I I, pp. 291-6, and reprinted in Lady Burghclere's *Biography*, i. 115, 117.

² It is doubtful whether King Charles ever liked his powerful servant, for a didactic coldness is apparent even in their earlier correspondence. Viscount Wentworth became lord deputy of Ireland in 1633 and in the following year asked for an earldom as a mark of the royal confidence. The phrasing of the king's refusal is characteristic. 'And as for the matter I desire you not to think that I am displeased with the asking, though for the present I grant it not. For I acknowledge that noble minds are always accompanied with lawful ambitions.' Two years later Wentworth was refused again. 'And believe it,' wrote King Charles on this occasion, 'the marks of my Favours that stop malicious Tongues are neither Places nor titles/ *Letters and Dispatches of the Earl of Strafford*, ed. W. Knowler, i. 332, and ii. 32. On his side Wentworth was by this time discouraged. 'I will serve His Majesty', he wrote to his intimate friend Archbishop Laud, 'with the same diligence, labour and faith as formerly; yet to confess a plain truth to your grace, with whom I neither must nor can ever dissemble, with less cheerfulness in myself hereafter.' In time the friendship between the primate and the lord deputy became a relationship from which their master was excluded. 'Your Lordship may assure yourself, wrote the primate on 10 September 1638, 'I shall not show anything in your letters to His Majesty, but that which I think shall turn to your advantage.' Another letter written a little earlier gives a measure of both these statesmen's approach to their sovereign. 'This done,' explained the archbishop to the lord deputy on 14 May 1638, 'I shall not need to answer the next passage of your philosophy; but that he that serves shall see how to steer himself, whatever the governor do, or omit, that is over him, and make his best use of that, which is oftentimes worse done. But for your close, I agree wholly with you, that a Prince puts a great prejudice upon his own affairs, if he continue a servant longer in any great employment, than he will give him trust and power to execute it.' Laud's *Works*, vi. 536 and 524.

Thomas Wentworth could be brought to work on that intractable material which the personality of his master presented to him. There was soon evident, and manifested in Lord Wentworth's correspondence, a sense of frustration deepening into a sharp dislike for his sovereign. A lack of definition was always apparent in King Charles's planning and in his policies.

At the same time in the ranks of those who hoped for preferment or for state employment the name of the duke of Buckingham was remembered. It was always felt that the king might take to himself another favourite. There is a sense in which King Charles's character does not seem to have been clearly understood except by the few who penetrated to his intimacy¹ and by the circle of the queen's dependents. It is in fact clear that after Buckingham's death the king's affection concentrated on his wife, and as the years passed he became uxorious.² The closeness of this marital relation³ does not

¹ It is worth considering Bishop Burnet's portrait of James first duke of Hamilton composed in 1673 at the request of the duke's daughter. King Charles had a deep affection for Hamilton, a feeling which the queen did not share. The duke's outlook on religious and national questions may have accounted for the queen's attitude. 'His Religion was Protestant and Reformed: and he was a Zealous enemy to Popery, so he was no less earnest for a good Correspondence among all the Reformed Churches in particular betwixt the Lutherans and Calvinists. He was the great patron of all Scotchmen in the Court.' Other aspects of his character, and perhaps above all an underlying melancholy, are likely to have gained for him the staid king's sympathy. His married life had not been happy. 'After the years of consummating the intended marriage [with Lady Mary Feilding] were come, he [the duke] was forced to it, not without great aversion.' The impression left is of a dim, ill-fated, and untrusted man. 'And indeed he [the duke of Hamilton] was so far from flattering himself with the hopes of great success in any of his undertakings, that he rather apprehended himself under some inauspicious Star, that crossed all his attempts, which made him in his latter years long for some secret Retirement out of the noise of business.' *The Memoires of the Lives and Actions of James and William Dukes of Hamilton and Castleherald &c*, pp. 406, 409, 412.

² The preoccupation of the king and queen with one another is manifest from the years following Buckingham's death after the first difficult period of their married life. A series of letters from Lord Goring, the queen's master of the horse, addressed to Sir John Coke and now in the possession of the marquess of Lothian at Melbourne Hall, throw light upon the private idiom. 'Yesterday', Goring wrote from Greenwich on 3 June 1633 during the king's absence in Scotland, 'I presumed to give you thanks for the infinite honour you have done me in giving me the opportunity to make so many inestimable presents to the Queen my mistress from His most excellent Majesty, my most gracious blessed Master, whereof we had no small need considering how disconsolate she hath been.' *Cal. Coke MSS.* ii. 16—17. In the political field the queen's influence was not strongly felt in the quiet years. In any case it inevitably strengthened after the elimination of Laud and Strafford.

³ Just as an intense relation with his wife and children came to mitigate King

appear to be noted in the body of surviving correspondence which the archives of the great families yield to us. The rich lords planned, caballed, and improvised against an event which did not happen, the emergence of a second favourite.

It is remarkable how deep rooted was the prejudice in favour of approaching the king by channels, a legacy from the practice of the previous reign. Men, even of high rank, would use the ministers, Portland, Laud, and sometimes Cottington, in trying to obtain the sovereign's ear. Similarly, attention was paid to gaining the suffrages of those who were seen as likely to be favourites, Lord Wentworth,¹ later earl of Strafford, and the marquess of Hamilton.² It is, perhaps, a mark of the

Charles's sense of loneliness so also he was responsive to the ties of blood. This was shown in his care for his nephews Prince Rupert and Prince Maurice and for his cousins James duke of Lennox and the other members of the Stuart d'Aubigne' family. The king was least at ease with violent personalities. Lennox and his brothers Lord John and Lord Bernard Stuart are presented as both delicate and courageous. Only the strong-tempered Rupert felt the lash of his royal uncle's cold severity.

¹ Cf. letter from the countess of Carlisle to her sister the countess of Leicester dated 19 December 1639. 'I am glad that you wish a Friendship betwixt 85 [Lord Leicester] and 93 [Lord Strafford] for I am confident it will be an essay Workc.' *Sydney Memorials*[^] ed. Arthur Collins, p. 026. On 9 January 1640 the earl of Northumberland wrote to his brother-in-law the earl of Leicester in regard to the vacancy in the secretaryship of state. 'In sounding 115 [Lord Strafford] as you directed, I find him right sett towards no [Lord Leicester] | else he deccaves me; he sayeth that he much doubts you getting to be 566 [Secretary], but in that, or any thing else that shall happen, he will do all he can for no [Lord Leicester J.' *Ibid.*, p. 629. These extracts from correspondence preserved among the Penshurst MSS. mark the completion of an approach to Strafford through his *Et>ma*, Lady Carlisle, that had been maturing for about three years. The beginning of this manoeuvre can be traced in a letter written by Lady Leicester to her husband on 10 January 1637. 'I fear that 154 [Lady Carlisle], who has more power with him, [Lord Wentworth] than any creature, will do nothing for our good.' *Ibid.*, p. 456. It is a little singular that Lord Leicester, who was at the time ambassador extraordinary in Paris, should have felt it necessary to use an intermediary at all.

² A letter from the earl of Northumberland to the earl of Leicester dated 31 December 1640 contains this phrase, '106 [Hamilton] having at this Tyme the sole Power with 102 [the King]'. *Ibid.*, p. 666. An earlier exchange between the same correspondents dated from London 22 July 1640 bears on this subject. 'The straight Freindship that was betwixt 112 [Archbishop] and 115 [Strafford] is shaken, and the greate confidence is now between 119 [Cottington] and 115 [Strafford]. 106 [Hamilton] seems to keepe an Interest in them all; but he deccaves the Worlde, if he hath Kindness to them or any Body else.* *Ibid.*, p. 657. Two comments made by Bishop Burnet in regard to the character of the duke of Hamilton are apposite. He 'was an example of temperance. Temperance was particularly recommended to him by his Majesty when he went to Germany'. 'His Accomplishments were great, though cultivated only by his own **thoughts for**

outlook of certain peers, who would in time be parliamentarians, that their personal approach to the king was unacceptable. A search for intermediaries characterized the last secure years of King Charles's reign.

Again Laud may be considered as a fixed quantity, his ministerial responsibility, to use a term that may seem anachronistic, his relationship with the king, his lines of policy, all these were known. It was Wentworth, away in Ireland as lord deputy, whose aims and purposes were unpredictable.¹ A study of the Penshurst manuscripts leaves the impression that even before the conflict it was difficult for men to gauge their sovereign's views.² Thus Lord Leicester did not know the influence that kept him out of place.³ Already in the years before the war there was a barrier between the king and his great subjects; a latent anti-clericalism singled out Laud as the enemy.⁴

he was no great scholar, neither was he bred abroad.' Burnet, *Memoirs*, pp. 412, 409.

¹ A letter from Lady Carlisle to her sister Lady Leicester is interesting as giving a view of possible combinations. '82 [Northumberland] is better with 93 [Strafford] than he has been; those two lords have made a littell expostulation; and 82 [Northumberland] is now call'd to all the greatest secrets of 65 [the King] which are now only in the trust of 80 [the Archbishop] and 82 [Northumberland], 93 [Strafford], 98 [Hamilton], 92 [Conway] will be Generall of the Hors and Counsellor, which is absolutely 93 [Strafford's] Act. 93 does absolutely governe 80 [the Archbishop] and sartanly maye perswade him to any Tiling.' *Sydney Memorials*, 2, p. 626.

² Thus on 21 November 1639 the earl of Northumberland wrote to the earl of Leicester from London, 'I was much surprised to understand how peremptorily 136 [the King] refused 103 [the Queen] to make 137 [Leicester] 566 [Secretary].' *Ibid.*, p. 618. It is curious that Northumberland should ever have imagined that the queen might intervene on his brother-in-law's behalf. In the Petworth circle there was both a distance from and a lack of respect for the person of the sovereign. In a letter exchanged between the same correspondents and dated 24 October 1639 this phrase occurs, 'Yet I know him [121: Windebank] to be so meane and fearfull, that he will not move any Thing that shall be distastefull to 136 [the King]'. *Ibid.*, p. 615.

³ The king's evasive answer made to Lord Northumberland when he inquired the reason for the failure of his brother-in-law's candidature marks the uneasy character of the relationship between the great peers and their sovereign. 'He [the King],' wrote Northumberland on 10 December 1640, 'answered that no [Leicester] was to greate for that Place, and that he intended not to have any of that Qualitie [as Secretary].' *Ibid.*, p. 664.

⁴ This is manifested very clearly in the correspondence dealing with Lord Leicester's political ambitions. The religious preferences of this peer are set out in a letter written from Paris to Secretary Coke and dated 10 April 1637. 'This is a *sepmaine des Tenebres* and may be taken for earnest of the whole year's blindness, and is not only observed as a mystic all ceremonie of the Church of Rome, but, I thinke, as a congruity to the perplexed and intricate proceedings of this State.'

The Fronde-like quality of the first phase of the struggle seems emphasized by the relation to the court of such rich peers as the masters of Petworth and Penshurst.¹ The earl

Ibid., p. 484. A support for an aggressive Protestant policy on the Continent was held to have been the cause of the archbishop's enmity. 'To think well of 542 [the Reformed Religion]', wrote Northumberland to his brother-in-law from London on 12 December 1639, 'is cause enough to make 112 [the Archbishop] their enemy; and though he cannot for shame auow it in publike, yet in private he will do 137 [Leicester] all the Mischeife he can.' Ibid., p. 623. Another expression of the same writer's conviction as to the primate's enmity to Leicester is found in a letter dated 21 November, while a sound reason for this opposition is explained in another paper in the same sequence written on 9 January 1640. 'He [Strafford] tells me that 112 [the Archbishop's] exception to 137 [Leicester] is for not using 118 [Scudamore] well.' Ibid., pp. 618 and 629. Lord Scudamore, an intimate friend of the archbishop's, was ambassador in ordinary at Paris during the period of Lord Leicester's residence as ambassador extraordinary. A final note throws an interesting light on the whole obscure scene. On 16 January 1640 Northumberland wrote in the following terms. 'If 112 [the Archbishop] had heretofore been as well inclined to assist 110 [Leicester], as now I hear he is, the Businesse had long since been out of all Danger.' Ibid., p. 631. There seems, in fact, little reason to suppose that the archbishop relented of his opposition. It is unlikely that Strafford had any political good will towards Northumberland or Leicester. The only tie that bound him to that grouping was his friendship for the countess of Carlisle. It is doubtful how far the families at Petworth and Penshurst had an appreciation of the springs of action which moved either the king or Laud and Strafford.

¹ In considering the position taken up by these groupings several points would seem worth noting. The alliance of Northumberland with his brother-in-law was only perfected late in this portion of the reign. As late as 10 November 1636 Lady Leicester wrote from Penshurst to her husband then in Paris. 'Neither have I perceived any inclination in him [Northumberland] to draw me from the solitariness I suffer in this place; for though I expressed a willingness to go to him, were I accomodated for a journey, yet have I received no manner of invitation, which I take a little unkindly.' At the same time there was at that date a double relationship with Lord Deputy Wentworth. On the one hand there was a plan for Leicester to supersede Wentworth in Ireland, while at the same time an effort at friendship was maintained. A letter from Lady Leicester to her husband dated 28 December 1636 bears on this second point. 'I have made curious inquisitions and cannot hear that anything hath been said to your prejudice, but what proceeded from the old Secretary. If the great man [Wentworth] be less kind to you than formerly, assuredly it is because you have maintained so great an intelligence with Holland, which now is not to be diminished.' These letters, noted among the Sydney Papers, are printed in full by C. M. Ady in *Saccharissa*, pp. 42, 50, 52.

In addition to maintaining contact with the queen's circle through Lord Holland, Lady Leicester kept in touch both with converts to Rome and with crypto-Catholics. Thus after Walter Montague's conversion she is found writing on 20 April 1637 to her husband from Leicester House. 'Watt has sup'd twice hear within this week, and speaks of you with much csteemation. It is not good losing the Offices which he maie do, and thearfor I prairie continue a Sivilitie to him.' *Sydney Memorials*, pp. 489-90. As late as 18 September 1639 Lady Leicester wrote in the following terms to Sir Francis Windebank, a crypto-Catholic. Though

of Northumberland was lord high admiral and the earl of Leicester was ambassador extraordinary in Paris. They resembled the chief *Frondeurs* in that they were linked to the crown by a formal relationship¹ which did not suffice to preclude acts of rebellion.

As the reign moved towards that summoning of the Short Parliament, which was the prelude to the outbreak of the conflict, the contrast sharpened between those few who foresaw the storm and the unheeding multitude. The applications for preferment went forward and the court revolved in its accustomed orbit. Sir John North detailed the country houses which the king would visit.² The royal ministers, however,

I am unknown to you, yet I profess to be your friend and servant.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I, ccccxviii*. 105.

These two last passages read strangely in view of the family's strong Protestant record. A comment on the religious side of life at Penshurst is, perhaps, in place here. Dr. Henry Hammond, after receiving his education at Eton and Magdalen, had been presented to the living of Penshurst in 1633, aged twenty-eight. 'He well knew', we are told, 'how much the application at the Table infore'd the doctrines of the Pulpit, how far upon these motives our Saviour thought fit to cat with Publicans and sinners, and how effectual the Loaves were to the procuring of Disciples.' Hammond's attitude to the Church of Rome is indicated in advice given to those who might be driven by the evil character of the times to a foreign country, 'where they should see a glittering Religion, recommended by prosperity and outward pomp, as also the insinuations of artifice and falsehood, and bold obtruding dictates; methods never wanting to the Factors for the Roman Cause'. *Life of Dr. Henry Hammond*, by Dr. John Fell, dean of Christ Church and lord bishop of Oxford, pp. 6 and 13.

¹ In the notes to his edition of the duchess of Newcastle's life of her husband, Sir Charles Firth throws light on the persistent applications made by persons of the highest rank desirous of posts about the members of the royal family. Thus Lord Newcastle approached Lord Deputy Wentworth as early as 5 August 1633 with a view to obtaining the governorship of the young prince of Wales. He suggested that use might be made of the good offices either of Lady Carlisle or of her husband. A letter on this subject written by Newcastle to his first wife and dated 15 April 1636 survives among the Welbeck MSS. and is printed in the 13th Report, appendix, part I I. 'My Lord Danby certainly did put very far for governor to the prince, but is gone to his government at Guernsey, and they say is denied. My lord of Leicester has also tried for it, but they say he is to go ambassador into France. Lord Goring also plies it for the same place, but they say he will not get it.' The offer to Newcastle finally came from Windebank on 19 March 1637.

² The following passage occurs among the transcripts of the North Papers in the Bodleian Library made by Professor R. Weiss. It is found in a letter from Sir John North dated 24 May 1638. 'The King and Queene go on Monday to stay at Greenwich to the 16th of July, on which day the King begins his wonted Progres northwards by Huntingdon, to Apthorp, Grimsthorpe Bever, Tutbury, Rufford and so by Woodstock homeward. The Queene intends to passe this time at Otelands, where it is said the Duchess of Chevreuse will likewise be. . . . The

knew the dangers that beset them. 'This it is',¹ wrote the archbishop to the lord deputy, 'when men think nothing is their advantage, but to run from government. As for your being left alone in the envious and thorny part of the work, that's no news, at least to me, who am forced to the like here, scarce a man appearing when the way is rough indeed.' Dating from the autumn of 1639, there is a letter to the primate from the lord deputy. 'Thus come I by buffets on all sides; to say Truth I know not whither to turn from them, everywhere I feel them about my ears. The unquietness is more than the paynes or danger, bearing it out thus naked, single against all weathers.' It was not in the king's nature to enter fully into his servants' peril.

This last factor was not without its influence on the slow foundering of such political stability as characterized the first Caroline period. For in the king's eyes his authority did not diminish and his assailed position was never irremediable. Thus the months when the court was at Oxford reflect in an exaggerated fashion² the life that the king and queen had lived so long.

Certain elements vanished quickly and in particular that court Catholicism, feminine in every emphasis,³ that the queen Duchesse of Chevreuse being at Windsor had a great honour done her there.' North MSS. C. 4.

¹ Letter dated 14 May 1638, Laud's *Works*, vol. vi, pt. II, p. 523.

² One jingle dating from the period of the court at Oxford gives a foretaste of the Restoration spirit. Aubrey has this entry. 'William lord viscount Brouncker of Lions in Ireland... His mother was an extraordinary great gamester, and played all, gold play; she kept the box herself. Mr. Arundell (brother of the lord Wardour) made a song in characters of the nobility.

"Here's a health to my lady Brouncker
and the best card in her hand,
And a health to my lord her husband,
with ne're a foot of land." '

Brief Lives, ed. Andrew Clark, i. 128-9.

³ Letters from George Con, the papal agent, to Cardinal Francesco Barberini will serve to indicate how little the English temperament was understood. 'Lord Strafford', he wrote on 11 August 1637, 'was a Catholic and met death like an angel.' There follows an account of the clandestine marriage of Lord Arundel's younger son with Strafford's sister. 'I have already settled with the Countess that they shall be married by a priest without the knowledge of the Earl.' British Museum Add. MSS. 15390, f. 378b and f. 410. *Yet it [Popery]', wrote George Garrard on 10 May 1638, 'much increaseth about London, and these pompous shows of the Sepulchre contribute much to it for they grow common. They are set up in the Queen's chapel, in the Ambassador's house, in Con's lodgings (in Long Acre), York House and in my lord of Worcester's house.' *Letters and Dispatches of Thomas Earl of Strafford*, ed. W. Knowler, ii. 165.

had fostered. The fashionable conversions, which had exacerbated an element of public opinion,¹ now ceased completely. With these changes there also came about a lessening of the French influence in its cultural aspect.² It would be of interest

¹ Some of Garrard's comments on this point are worth recording since his personal reaction was perhaps typical of the London upper class and its dependents. 1 March 1635. 'One Mr. Stafford, who buried but two months since his wife, married in the Queen's Chapel at Somerset House to the Lady Dorothy Shirley sister to my Lord of Essex. 28 April 1637. Wat Montague is come again into England . . . and is a great companion of Signior Con's. Another of my familiar acquaintance is gone over to that Popish religion. Sir Robert Howard. Monday in Easter Week, my Lord Andover was married by a Popish priest to Mrs Doll Savage eldest daughter to the Lord Savage, lately dead, against consent of parents on both sides.' 10 May 1638. 'My Lady Maltravers is declared a Papist.' *Letters and Dispatches of Thomas Earl of Strafford*, i. 373, and ii. 73 and 165. It is in accordance with the trouble that he took in such matters that Garrard should have produced the most accurate account of Lady Newport's change of faith. 9 November 1637. My Lady Newport 'went one evening, as she came from a play in Drury-Lane, to Somerset-House, where one of the Capuchins reconciled her to the Popish Church. The truth is, neither Wat Montague, nor Toby Mathew had any hand in this particular: my Lady Duchess of Buckingham, her sister Porter, and Seignior Con, have been chief agents in her conversion.' *Ibid.* ii. 128. A less accurate version of this same affair is given in a letter written by Sir John North and dated 25 August 1637. North MSS. C. 4, Bodleian Library.

It is not surprising that the approach to the king should have been singularly ill chosen. 'Does His Holiness love the King?', wrote Cardinal Barberini to Con's predecessor Panzani on 10 December 1635. 'Love him! Yes, he loves him with a personal affection, equal to that he bears his nephew.' *Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani*, ed. Joseph Berington, p. 202.

² The presence of Frenchmen among recusant schoolmasters has a certain interest. An example occurs in the acts of the court of High Commission registered on 18 June 1635. 'It appeared that William Hill being a popish recusant had taken upon himself to educate at Farcham young children as a schoolmaster, presuming to teach them without any lawful licence, and that upon search made above twenty children, many of them gentlemen's sons, were discovered in his house kept secretly and never permitted to come to church. He had also entertained the two Frenchmen (Nicholas Bailott and Amith Herbyn), being popish recusants, one under pretence of instructing the children in the French language, and the other pretending that he came hither to learn English or to trade in merchandise.' *State Papers, Dom., Charles I*, 1635, cclxi. fol. 245b. This foreign element can be fitted into the more accustomed picture of religious divergences as revealed by the visitation made on behalf of the archbishop of Canterbury by Sir Nathaniel Brent in the same year. Three entries appear typical.

'*Stratford-upon-Avon*. I suspended Mr. Wilson, minister of the place, for grossly particularizing in his sermons, for suffering his poultry to roost and his hogs to lodge in the chancel, for walking in the church to con his sermons in time of divine service etc.' In the same survey it is noted that in Warwick there are two ministers: Mr. Hall, who is conformable, Mr. Roe, an Emmanuel College man, who is much suspected.

'*Winchester*. Junii, 19, 20, 22 et 23. In these parts popery doth increase more than puritanism, and many children are christened by popish priests. One

to consider what foreign craftsmen still found employment under the Commonwealth.

Nevertheless, outside the world of the court, and beyond that circle in which reflections of court life were apparent, it does not appear that the outbreak of the Civil wars brought very great changes.¹ One immediate consequence was an increase in insularity, since foreign travel and continental contacts in general tended to cease.² Very little effect was produced on the pattern of life within England.³ Commercial enterprise and

Polwhele, dwelling in Winchester, is a dangerous papist. He teacheth music, and his son, of the age of 17 or 18 years, teacheth grammar in his father's house and many who come to school there are infected by them. Likewise one Agnes Francis in St. Michael's parish in Winchester, is a dangerous schoolmistress in that kind.

Guildford, Julij 7. 'There is much faction in these parts. One Prior, a shoemaker in Guildford, is much suspected to be a conventicler.' Ibid. cxciii, 128, pref. xl. 1.

¹ Throughout the whole period between the outbreak of the Civil war and the restoration of the monarchy there was the same care taken to preserve historical documents of political interest. This was, perhaps, in part due to the respect in which the Elizabethan policies continued to be held. Thus the Carew MSS. collected by George first earl of Totnes and bequeathed by his will proved on 29 May 1629 to Sir Thomas Stafford, who was apparently his natural son, were retrieved under the Commonwealth. A letter from Arthur Trevor dated 14 June 1655 and addressed to Secretary Thurlow explains the circumstances. 'The Earle of Totnes his books are now come, after the death of Sir Thomas Stafford, into the hands of Cornelius Bee at the King's Armer in Duck-Lane, and amongst them forty or fifty volumes of the transactions of Ireland in the whole settlement thereof after the rebellion in the queen's tyme . . . I find they are originally collected by the earle when he was deputy by the name of Sir George Carew, and only fit for a publique hand.' Note by the provost of Eton in *E.H.R.* (1927), xlii, 203-4.

² Certain items in the will of Sir Henry Wotton, who died in 1639, are indicative of the close of a century of regulated foreign contact. Both Land and Juxon were, of course, remembered. 'To my Lord's Grace of Canterbury now being, I leave my picture of Divine Love. To the Lord Bishop of London . . . I leave a picture of Heraclitus bewailing and Democritus laughing at the world. To Dr. Bargrave, Dean of Canterbury, I leave all my Italian books not disposed in this will. My viol de Gamba which hath been twice in Italy.' He also left a great loadstone, a piece of amber of both kinds naturally united, and a piece of crystal sexangular. The will is printed in full in Logan Pearsall Smith's *Life of Sir Henry Wotton*, i, 215-16.

³ It is probable that few considerable country houses were actually built during the years of conflict, but the improvement and ornamentation of property was continual. In 1639 and the succeeding years Lord Cork made alterations at Stalbridge in Dorset. Hyde, a freemason of Shaftesbury, was ordered to put up chimney-pieces 'of Marnell quarry stone, with figures answerable to or better than those already in the Earl's bedchamber'. The avenue called William Sydenham's walk was lengthened and planted with young elms. The terrace before the hall door was closed with a stone balustrade 'cramped with iron and the balustrade set so close that a dog could not creep through'. The entrance way was to be paved with freestone after the fashion of Lord Bristol's courtyard at Sherborne Castle. The garden was set with Harvey apples and Bon Chretien and Bergamot pears and with arbutus or cane apples from the County Kerry.

such industrialism as then existed were hardly affected by the military-political struggle. The social pattern that was in process of crystallizing was only superficially altered.¹ Among the various categories in the national life the academic world of the universities, which were so closely bound to the Church of England, naturally suffered the most severe change.² Even this can be exaggerated, and it came slowly.

Certain factors can be seen as invariable throughout the conflict and during its aftermath. Thus among the governing classes opposition to Catholicism remained a constant.³ For

¹ On 10 June 1646 an inventory was taken of the goods belonging to Milton's father-in-law Mr. Richard Powell of Forest Hill, Oxford. The details indicate the unchanging world of the solid middle class. 'In ye Greatc Parlour, one drawing table, one new tapestry carpett, one little drawing table, one carpett with greene silke fringe, one great Arras worke chayre, two wainscott chaircs, six greene cushions with silke fringe, one paire of brasse andirons, eleven pictures in frames, three greene window curtaines, two old greene car pet is. In ye Little Parlour, one overall table, one carpett of strip'd stuffo, fourteen leather chayres, six greene cushions. In ye study, one bedsted with greene curtain and vallans laced, one olde horseman's Coate with silver buttons.' There are two references to books in this inventory. 'In ye little chamber over ye Pantry, one Bible. In Mrs. Powell's lodging, one greatc Bible with <lasps.' MS. at Magdalen College in the possession of Mr. Bruce Macfarlane.

² Still there was very little change in the approach to learning among the knowledge-seeking minority in the middle class. Thomas Hobbes was born in 1588. 'At four yeares old he went to schoole in Westport churchc, till eight. Afterwards he went to schoole to Malmesbury, to Mr. Robert Latimer, a young man of about nineteen or twenty, newly come from the University, who kept a private school in Westport. At fourteen yeares of age he went awaye a good schoole-scholar to Magdalen Hall, in Oxford.' Aubrey's *Brief Lives* ed. Andrew Clark, i. 328.

Jeremy Taylor was born in 1613. He entered Gonville and Caius College as a sizar at the age of thirteen. His father Nathaniel Taylor, barber, claimed that his son was 'Reasonably learned' and that he had himself 'solely grounded his children in grammar and the mathematics'. Jones of Homra MS. quoted in Reginald Heber's *Life of Jeremy Taylor* i. v, 1822. Isaac Barrow was born in 1630. 'His first schooling was at the Charter-House for two or three yeares. For his look he minded it not and his father [Mr. Thomas Barrow] had little hope of success in the profession of a scholar, to which he had designed him. Removing thence to Felsted in Essex, he quickly made so great a progress in learning, and all things praise-worthy, that his master appointed him a little tutor to the Lord Viscount Fairfax of Emly in Ireland. While he stay'd here he was admitted in Peter-Hous; but when he removed to (and was tit for) the University of Cambridge, Feb. 1645, he was planted in Trinity College.' Life prefixed to *Works of Isaac Barrow, D.D., late Master of Trinity College, Cambridge*, by Abraham Hill, fols. aⁱ to a².

³ A letter written from Pembridge by Robert Breton and addressed to Colonel Edward Harley is characteristic. It is dated 1 April 1660, and the persons referred to are those gentlemen of Herefordshire who were opposed to Harley's return to Parliament. 'Popery is both the ultimate end of their giddy proceeding, and the primary engine that sets all their wheels agoing.' *Cal. Portland MSS.* iii. 220.

some years literary presentation was hardly modified; the work of Sir Thomas Browne may be instanced¹ as an example of a style that was in no way affected by the changing scene. One element vanished after 1646. The consciously contemporary, modern, sophisticated, and light-minded court, which had been gathered round the king and queen,² disappeared for ever. The effect of heavy sequestrations belonged to the next decade. For the rest the position of the farmers¹ and agricultural labourers and that of the town proletariat⁴ remained unaltered. Throughout the period of the wars it was doubtful if traffic was impeded.⁵ The limits and the privileges of the stronger social classes were carefully safeguarded.

The process of the gradual constitution of bureaucracy went forward with an even momentum through the calm years of

¹ Sir Thomas Browne wrote *Religio Medici* at Shipden Hall in 1635 and settled at Norwich in 1637. *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* appeared in 1646 and *Urn Burial* in 1658. The earliest letter in the collected edition is addressed to Sir Kenelm Digby and dated 3 March 1643. *The Works of Sir Thonuu Browne* ed. Geoffrey Keynes, vi. 271.

² It is noteworthy that when in England Vandyck confined his portraits to the court circle. There is no alderman and hardly any country gentlemen among his sitters. Sir Francis Crane appears to be the solitary example of a wealthy capitalist without landed connexions. In Henrietta Maria with her fragile distinction Vandyck seems to have created an ideal type. It is possible that his Prince Rupert also represents an ideal type within a closed society.

* *The History of the township of Arkholme*, by (loloncl VV. H. Chippindall, published by the Chctham Society, vol. xc, Miscellaneous V, contains a most careful analysis of the changes in certain north Lancashire yeoman stocks. Thus to take the area examined the Storrs of Storrs Hall are found referred to in later deeds as *gentleinen\ but their names do not appear iti the heralds' visitations, nor did they bear any coat of arms. As eaily as \ir>\ the Rev. William Storr, M.A., of Christ's College, Cambridge, held the living of Hauxwell. A minute study of the wills and other documents relating to the families of Beak bane of Cunnrcrthwaite, Orcen of Bainsbeck, Hatty of Docker Park, and Barker of Broomfield does not suggest any alteration of status in these farming stocks through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

⁴ The general development of the coal-mining industry round Wigan during this period can be followed in Haigh Colliery Orders 1635-90, earl of Crawford's MSS., and in 'Mining in Winstanley', by Mrs. Bankes, *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarians Society*, vol. liv, 31-64.

⁵ As far as traffic is concerned it may be noted that the *Bell* inn at Stilton, a village on the Great North Road six miles from Peterborough, was built in 1642 probably on a half-H-shaped plan with a central carriageway in the middle of the front block. For the state of industrial townships at this period cf. *The Survey of the manor of Rochdale*, Chctham Society, vol. 71, ed. Henry Fishwick. This gives a remarkable account of the number and placing of the houses in Rochdale in 1621* and details the coal-pits, corn-mills, and fulling-mills. Three inns arc mentioned in the High Street, the *Bell* (also called the *Bull*), *Eagle*, and *WhiteHarte*. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-9.

the reign of Charles I and was not checked in the decades that followed. The classes seeking education, and the quality of opportunity that such training gave, were alike affected by this quiet bureaucratic development. The emergence of a professional class and the particular status that that class acquired were factors immediately associated with the slow growth of a civil service. By the mid-seventeenth century the equation that linked the higher grades among the civil servants with those who practised medicine and law was already discernible. On the other hand the unique prestige resulting from the actual ownership of landed property was accepted as an axiom. While the bureaucracy was thus strengthening, the actual change of composition in the merchant class seems less remarkable. But the civil service, in the sense of a corps of practical administrators, and the great legal corporation were revealed as the lions beneath the throne of any future oligarchy. By comparison with such stable factors the nexus between the wealthy merchant class and the higher ranks of the Anglican clergy was a relatively transient phenomenon. Already the bureaucracy was manifesting that capacity to survive through political changes which is the mark of an upper-middle class entity freed from military considerations and not dominated by the sovereign's court. Regarded under these aspects, the early Caroline period would be seen to merge into the military government of the Commonwealth; each was a milestone on the road towards the oligarchic victory.

INDEX

- Abbot, George, Archbishop of Canterbury, 72 n. 2.
 — Sir Maurice, 71.
 Aiton, Sir Robert, 35 n. 1.
 Anabaptists, 79.
 Andrewes, Lancelot, Bishop of Winchester, 72, 121.
 Anglicanism, 78, 85, 86-8.
 Aristotle, commentaries on, 84.
 Arminians, 79 n. 1.
 Arundel, 14th earl of, 5, 37, 119 nn. 1 and 2.
 — House, 98.
 Arundell, Sir Matthew, 22 n. 4.
 Ashburnham, John, 82 n. 1.
 Ashton (of Forfar), Viscount, 39 n. 2.
 Assheton, Nicholas, 47.
 — Richard, 47.
 Aston, Gertrude, 118 n. 2.
 — John, 48.
 Autobiographical writing, characteristics, 20.

 Baker, Sir John, 53 n. 1.
 Bancroft, John, Bishop of Oxford, 72 n. 2.
 Bargrave, John, 82 n. 1.
 Baronets* estates, 53 n. 1.
 Barrow, Dr. Isaac, 72 n. 3, 82 ll. 1.
 Baxter, Richard, 82 n. 1, 92, 108.
 Beaumont (of Swords), Viscount, 39 n. 2.
 — Joseph, 82 n. 1.
 Bedell, William, Bishop of Kilmore,

 Bedford Accounts, the, 8.
 Belasy (of Worlaby), Lord John, 82 n. 1.
 Bemerton, 122.
 Benlowes, Edward, 117 n. 3.
 Berkeleys, the, 40-1.
 Bernini, G. L., 5.
 Billingsgate, i n.
 Book catalogues, 23.
 Booksellers, 106-8.
 Booth, Samuel, 82 n. 1.
 Boyle, Robert, 59, 65 n. 3, 74.
 Bradshaigh, Sir Robert, 108 n. 4.
 Bramston, Sir John, 66 n. 2.
 Breton, Robert, 132 n. 3.
 Brewster, William, 82 n. 1.
 Bridgeman, Sir Orlando, 22 n. 2.
 Bristol, 46, 97, 113.
 Browne, Sir Thomas, 133.
 Browning, Prof. Andrew, 14 n. 1, 89 n. 3.

 Buckenham. Dr. Henry, 62.
 — Dr. John, 61 n. 2.
 — Dr. Thomas, 61 n. 2.
 Buckridge, John, Bishop of Rochester and Ely, 70 n. 2, 72 n. 2.
 Buckingham, 1st duke of (George Villiers), 16 n. 2, 23, 27, 29, 37 n. 4, 119 ll. 1, 124-5.
 Bunyan, John, 92.
 Bureaucracy, growth of, 1, 3, 4, 72, 133-4; distinguishing marks, 3-4.
 Burgess groups, and the professions, 69-71.
 Burghley, Lord (William Cecil), 75.
 Burke, Edmund, 75.
 Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, 124 n. 1, 125 n. 2.
 Bury St. Edmunds, 6r.
 Butts, Sir William, 61.
 Byron, Sir John, 67.

 Caius, Dr. John, 61.
 — College, Cambridge, *see* Gonville and Cains College.
 Cally, Sir William, 102.
 Calvelcy, George, 82 ll. 1.
 Calvinism, 34, 79, 90.
 Cambridge, 27, 90; social structure, 104-6.
 Capital, fluidity of, 8-9.
 Capitalism, 25.
 Carew, Thomas, 114, 116-17, 119 n. 2.
 Carleton, Sir Dudley, 14, 15, 66 n. 1, 116 n. 2.
 Carlisle, 1st earl of, 30 n. 2, 31, 74 n. 2.
 — Lucy, Countess of, 30 n. 2, 33, 119 ll. 2, 125 n. 1, 126 n. 1.
 Cartwright, Christopher, 82 n. 1.
 Gary, Bishop, 72 n. 2.
 Castiglione, Conte B., 75.
 Catholicism, at Court, 129; governing classes' opposition, 132.
 Catholics, secret schools of, 54 n. 1; among gentry, 117-18.
 Cavendish, Sir William, 8.
 Chaitor, Thomas, 22 n. 5.
 Chamberlain, John, 14.
 Chambers, William, 108 n. 1.
 Chandlers, m-12.
 Charity, moneys for, 99.
 Charles I, King, 27, 28, 34, 35; his foreign policy, 29-30; his character and influence, 119-25, 129; and Henrietta Maria, 124-5.
 Chaworth family, the, 73, 74 n. 3.

- Chesterfield, 4th earl of, 8.
 Chillingworth, William, 88, 89 n. 1, 121 n. 2.
 Christ's College, Cambridge, 15.
 Church of England, the, 87; and Calvinists, 34; clergy, 56; burgess stocks in episcopate, 69-71; Puritan trend in, 86; Charles 1 and, 120-2.
 Church order, 86, 87.
 Civic life, in county towns, 48, 49.
 Civil service, 56, 134.
 — war, the, 28; immediate consequences, 129-33.
 Clare, 1st earl of (John Holies), 37 n. 5, 40 n. 1.
 Clarendon, 1st earl of, *see* Hyde.
 Clergy, 56, 59, 61; composition of, 69-72.
 Cleveland, John, 118.
 Coal trade, 110-11, 133 n. 4.
 Coke, George, Bishop of Bristol, 69 n. 2.
 — Sir John, 15, 16, 69 n. 1.
 Con, George, 129 n. 3.
Confessio Augustona, 34.
 Conway, 2nd Viscount, 16, 25, 98, 99 nn. 2, 3, and 4, 101 nn. 1, 2, and 3, 104 n. 1, 106 n. 2, 107 n. 2, 108, 109 n. 1.
 Conway, Thomas, 65 n. 1.
 Cooke, Edmund, 63 n. 2.
 Cope, William (of Garstang), 100 n. 2.
 Corbet, Richard, Bishop of Oxford and Norwich, 70 n. 1, 72 n. 2.
 Cork, 1st earl of, 16, 74, 100 n. 3, 101 n. 4.
 Correr, Anzolo, 30.
 Correspondence, as material, n; reasons for preservation in Stuart period, 11, 12; Elizabethan, n-12; character of Stuart, 12-13; official, 15-16; commercial, 17-18; domestic, 19; common characteristics of, 19.
 Cosin, John, Bishop of Durham, 70 n. 3, 79 n. 2.
 Cottington, Lord Francis, 31, 33, 44 n. 2, 76, 125.
 Counter-reformation, the, 81.
 Country Party, the, 13.
 County officials, administrative fulcrum, 3.
 Court, the, privacy of, 35-6; role in foreign policy, 35-6; composition, 36-7; influence of, 114, 115; relations of Penshurst and Petworth to, 127-8; at Oxford, 129; French influences, 129; effects of civil war on, 129-30; 133-
 Courtenay, Sir William, 53 n. 1.
 Craftsmen, Puritanism of, 92-5.
 Cranfield, Lionel (Earl of Middlesex), 8, 18, 24, 46, 47.
 Crashaw, Richard, 27 n. 1, 82 n. 1, 122.
 — William, 71 n. 1.
 Crew, Thomas, 24 n. 2.
 Croft, Herbert, Bishop of Hereford, 69 n. 2.
 Cromwell, Thomas, 4, 5, 8.
 Crosfield, Rev. Thomas, 23, 84, 85.
 Cruso, John, 63 n. 4.
 Dacres, Edward, 37 n. 2, 73 n. 2.
 Delawarr, Lord, 82 n. 1, 122 n. 1.
 Devereux, Robert, *see* Essex.
 Devonshire, 3rd earl of, 76 n. 6.
 — 7th duke of, 16 n. g.
 Diaries, 20.
 Digby, Sir Kenelm, 119 n. 2.
 Diggers, 28.
 Doctors, *see* Medical profession.
 Dorset, 4th earl of, 17, 35 n. 1.
 Dover, 93.
 Drake, Rev. Richard, 83 n. 2.
 Driver, Joseph, 64 n. 4.
 Ducarel, Rev. Andrew Coote, 57 n. 1.
 Dudley, 92.
 Dunbar, Viscount, 39 n. 2.
 Duncombe, Sir Sanders, no n. 2.
 Duppa, Brian, Bishop of Winchester, 71 n. 1, 72 n. 1, 74 n. 3.
 Eaton, Prestwick, 18, 95-6.
 Education, 64-7.
 Elison, Theophilus, 63 n. 3.
 Elizabeth, Electress Palatine, Queen of Bohemia, 32, 34.
 Ellis, William, 65 n. 1.
 Envoys, and the Court, 36; capitals where maintained, 36 n. 2.
 Essex, 2nd earl of, 2-3, 5.
 — 3rd earl of, 38.
 — House, 75.
 — Rising (1601), 2, 97.
 Estate agents, 56.
 Estrades, Comte, G. L. d\ 32 n. 1.
 Eton College, 44, 65-6, 67.
 Evelyn, John, 20, 54, 55.
 Expense sheets, 25.
 Eyre, Adam, 20.
 Fairfax, Lady, 81 n. 1.
 — (of Emley), Viscount, 39 n. 2.
 Falkland, 2nd Viscount, 9, 88 and n. 4.
 Fanshawe, Lady, 66 n. 3.
 Farnaby, Thomas, 66-7.
 Feilding, Basil, 33.
 Feme, Henry, Bishop of Chester, 69 n. 2, 72 n. 2.
 Ferrar, John, 70, 71 n. 3.
 — Nicholas, 70-1, 122.
 Feudal concepts, survival of, 2-3.
 — families, breakdown of fortunes in Stuart period, 8.

- Financiers, amateur, 6; professional, 8.
 Finch, Sir John, 35 n. 1.
 Fitling, Rev. Edward, 64 n. 4, 65 n. 2.
 Foreign policy, insular character, 29-31; Henrietta Maria's influence, 31-2; 'French' views, 32-3; role of Court in, 35-6.
 Foreigners, in England, 73-4.
 Fowler, Mrs. Constantia, 118.
 Fox, George, 92.
 France, 28, 29, 81.
 Frederick V, Elector of the Palatinate, 29, 32, 34-
 'French' policy, 30, 31, 32-3.
 Frewen, Accepted, Archbishop of York, 69 n. 3, 70 n. 3, 72 n. 2.
 Fronde, wars of the, 28.
 Fryars, Dr., 60.
 Fudd, Nan, 21 n. 1.

 Gamage, Barbara, 11.
 Garrard, George, 9, 76-7, 81, 115 n. 3, 130 n. 1.
 Gawdy, Philip, 13 n. 4.
 Gentry, the, private correspondence of, 12, 13-14; greater, 39-40, 40-1; distinctions in, 41-2, 51-2; smaller, 41, 43-5; and London merchants, 45-7, 48; and county town citizens, 48-50; education of, 52-4; professional classes' dependence on, 56; and Anglicanism, 86-7; and Puritanism, 86, 87.
 Gerbier, Sir Balthasar, 61.
 Glisson, Francis, 61.
 Goddard, William, 61 n. 1.
 Godolphin, Sidney, 114.
 Goldsmiths Rents school, 66.
 Gondomar, Count, 30.
 Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65.
 Goring, George (earl of Norwich), 35 n. 2, 36, 53 n. 1, 124 n. 2.
 Gostling, Dr. John, 104 n. 3.
 Gray, Sir Arthur, 22 n. 5.
 Great Maydekin manor, 12.
 — Tew, 9, 88.
 Greene, John, 20 n. 2, 96 n. 5, 98 n. 3.
 Guilford, 1st Baron (Francis North), 50 n. 1, 51 n. 1.
 Gulston, Mrs., 83.
 Gunning, Peter, Bishop of Ely, 72 n. 2.
 Gussoni, Vincenzo, 29.
 Gustavus II, 'Adolphus', King of Sweden, 32, 34.

 Habington, William, 114, 117.
 Hackney coachmen, no.
 Hales, John, 88.
 Hall, Joseph, Bishop of Exeter, 70 n. 1.

 Hamilton, 1st duke of, 37, 124 n. 1, 125 and n. 2.
 Hammond, Henry, 88, 127 n. 1.
 Hampden, John, 44 n. 1.
 Hapsburgs, the, 32.
 Harley, Lady Brilliana, 14 and n. 2.
 Harsnett, Samuel, Archbishop of York, 70 n. 1, 72 n. 2.
 Harvey, Richard, 19, 102, 103.
 — Roger, 19, 102.
 — William, 59, 61.
 Hastings, Lord, *see* Huntingdon.
 Hatton, Sir Thomas, 35 n. 1.
 Henchman, Humphrey, Bishop of London, 69 n. 3, 70 n. 3.
 Henrietta Maria, Queen, 31-2, 33, 35, 119, 124, 129.
 Herbert, George, 14, 121-2.
 Herrick, Robert, 7, 27 n. 2, 118.
 High Commission, Court of, 92, 93.
 Hobbs, Thomas, 132 II. 2.
 Hobson, Thomas, 105.
 Hodson, William, 82 n. 1.
 Holbein, Hans, 41.
 Holland, Henry, 1st earl of, 35 n. 1, 36, 127 n. 1.
 Holies, Gervase, 37 n. 5, 40 n. 1, 45 n. 1, 67.
 Horningshatch rectory, 89.
 House property, investments in, 46.
 Howard (of Effingham), Lord, 25 n. r, 47 II. 1.
 — Thomas, 14th earl of Arundel, *see* Arundel.
 — Lord William, 98.
 Huguenots, the, 29.
 Hunt, Richard, Dean of Durham, 79 n. 2.
 Huntingdon, 5th earl of, 39 n. 1.
 — 6th earl of (Lord Hastings), 99 n. 5, 104 n. 1, 106 n. 2, 107 n. 1.
 Hurst, Edward (of Cambridge), 94 n. 1.
 Hutchinson, John, 67, 70, 80, 81 n. r, 93.
 — Lucy, 67, 68, 71 n. I, 92 n. 3.
 — Sir Thomas, 67.
 Hutton, Matthew, Archbishop of York, 57. 58"-9-
 — Sir Timothy, 57 n. 2; his sons, 57 n. 2, 58-9.
 Hyde, Edward (1st earl of Clarendon), 44 n. 1.
 — Sir Laurence, 42.

 Ingram, Sir Arthur, 24.
 Inns, leases of, 46; servants in, 104.
 Inventories, 21-2, 23.
 Investment, fluidity in, 6.
 Ipswich, 62.
 Irish peerages, 39 and n. 2.
 Ironsides, the, 28, 106.

- Jegon, Dr. John, 12 n. 2.
 Johnson, Samuel, 7.
 Jones, Inigo, 116, 119 n. 2.
 Journals, 20, 24.
 Juxon, William, Bishop of London, 33,
 70 n. 2, 72 n. 2, 131 n. 2.
- Kenilworth Castle, 21, 22 n. 2.
 Kinalmeaky, Lord, 74.
 King, Henry, Bishop of Chichester,
 69 n. 3, 72 n. 2.
 King's College, Cambridge, 44.
 Knaresborough, 51.
 Knevett, Ralph, 82 n. 1.
- Labourers, 105; casual, 98-9.
 Land, capitalist class move towards,
 9-io.
 Landlords, in London, 112-13.
 Laney, Benjamin, Bishop of Ely, 72 11.2.
 Langbaine, Gerard, 23 11. 1, 84.
 Latitudinarianism, 87-8.
 Laud, William, Archbishop of Canter-
 bury, 28 n. 2, 31, 33, 34, 70, 71, 72,
 85-6, 87, 121, 122, 125, 126, 129,
 131 n. 2.
 Laudianism, Ch. VI *passim*.
 Lawyers, 56, 77, 134.
 Leicester, earl of (Robert Dudley), 21.
 1st earl of (Robert Sidney), 11,
 41 n. 1.
 - 2nd earl of (Robert Sidney), 17, 33,
 40, 126, 127 n. 1, 128.
 House, 21, 75.
 — Lady, 127 n. 1.
 Leighton Kcclrsia, 14.
 Lennox and Richmond, 4th duke of,
 37. 53 n. 1, 73 n. 2, 119 n. 2.
 Le Surr, Hubert, 24, 119.
 Letter books, 14.
 Levellers, 28.
 Libraries, 82-4, 108.
 Limbert, Stephen, 63.
 Lincoln, 68.
 Lisle, Viscountess, 12.
 Little Gidding, 80, 82 n. 1, 122.
 Littleton, Sir Thomas, 53 n. 1.
 London, 47, 113; the gentry and, 45-7,
 48, 52; working class in, 92, 98,
 110-11; middle class in, 95; servants
 in, 97, too-1, 104, in; booksellers,
 106-8; trades in, 109-12; landlords,
 112-13.
 Louis XIII, King of France, 28, 29, 32.
 Lucy, William, Bishop of St. David's,
 62 n. 2.
 Ludkin, Christopher, 62.
 Lutheranism, 34.
- Manners, Roger, 12 n. 2.
- Madrid, Treaty of, 29.
 Margetson, John, Archbishop of
 Armagh, 82 n. 1.
 Marlborough, 1st earl of, 53 n. 1.
 Masques, 116-17.
 Mathew, Tobias, Archbishop of York,
 48 n. 1.
 — Sir Tobie, 31.
 Matriculation, age of, 44 n. 1.
 Maurice, Prince, 124 n. 3.
 Mayerne, Sir Theodore, 60-1.
 Mead, Rev. Joseph, 14, 15, 105 n. 2.
 Medical profession, 56, 59-62, 69, 77,
 134.
 Medieval nexus, discernible at end of
 sixteenth century, 2-3.
 Memoranda, general, 23-5.
 Merchants, 86, 134.
 Merchant Taylors' Company, 70.
 — - School, 64, 70 n. 2.
 Meyer, Wolfgang, 74 n. 2.
 Meyrick, Sir Gelli, 2, 97.
 Middle classes, in London, 95-6; inter-
 course between towns, 113.
 Middlesex, 1st earl of, *see* Cranfield.
 Milott, Robert, 22 n. 5.
 Molyneux (of Maryborough), Viscount.
 39 n. 2.
 Monck, George, 69.
 Monopolies, launched by early Stuarts, G.
 Montagu, James, Bishop of Winchester,
 69 n. 2, 72 n. 2.
 — Richard, Bishop of Chichester, 69 n. 3.
 Moody, Sir Henry, 53 n. 1.
 Mordaunt, Charles, 65 n. 2.
 — Sir Robert, 65.
 Morley, George, Bishop of Worcester,
 69 n. 2, 72 n. 2.
 Morton, Sir Albertus, 15 n. 3, 66 n. 1.
 Murray, William, 35 n. 1.
 Musgrave, Sir Philip, 82 n. 1, 83 n. 2.
- Naseby, battle of, 114.
 Naworth Castle, 23, 102 n. 1.
 Neve, Robert Ic, 64 n. 2.
 Newcastle, marquesses of, 51.
 Newcastle-on-Tyne, 49-50.
 New College, Oxford, 44.
 New model army, 28.
 Newsletters, 14-15, 34, 105.
 Nicholas, Sir Edward, 13 and n. 3,
 41-2, 43, 53, 102.
 — John, 41-3.
 — Rev. Matthew, 43.
 — Sir William, 47 n. 3.
 Nicholson, Otho, 23 n. i.
 North, Francis, *see* Guilford.
 — Sir John, 15 n. 2, 128.
 — Roger, 50, 51 n. 1.
 — Sir Thomas, 82 n. 1.

- Northern Rising, isg6, 2.
 Northumberland, 9th earl of, 2.
 — 10th earl of, 33, 76 n. 6, 125 n. 1,
 126 n. 2, 127 n. 1, 128.
 — gentry in, 49.
 Norwich, 46, 61, 62, 63, 97, 113.
 — earl of, *see* Goring.
- Oakes, James, 64 n. 1.
 Oglander, Sir John, 45.
 Ogle (of Gatherlough), Viscount, 53
 n. 1.
 Oligarchic polity, growth of, 1, 7, 8,
 50-1, 57, 134; Whig oligarchy, 3;
see also Bureaucracy.
 Overall, John, Bishop of Norwich, 72
 11. 2.
 Oxford, 27, 84; Court at, 114, 129.
 Oxinden, Katherine, 46 n. 1.
 — Richard, 45 n. 4.
- Painting, portrait, 23-4; by Vandyck,
- Palatinate, the, 29-30, 34.
 Patron-client relationship, 4-6, 7.
 Peacham, Henry, 53.
 Peers, and the Court, 37 8; country
 peers, 39; Irish, 39; Scottish, 39;
 wealth of, 53.
 Pembroke, 4th earl of, 44 n. 1, 103 11. 1.
 Pcnshurst family, 75, 127.
 Place, 23.
 Perne, Andrew, 82-3.
 — Library, 23, 82, 83 n. 2, 107.
 Perse School, 64.
 Peterhouse, 70, 80, 82 n. 1, 8.j.
 Petre, Sir William, 8.
 Pettit, Valentine, 45 11. 4.
 Petworth group, 38, 75, 76, 127.
 Porter, Endymion, 6, 25, 36 11. 3,
 101 n. 2, 102, 119 n. 2.
 Portland, 1st earl of (Richard Weston),
 31, 33, 44 n. 2, 119 n. 2, 125
 Portman, Sir William, 53 n. 1.
 Pory, John, 14.
 Potter, Barnaby, Bishop of Carlisle,
 70 n. 2, 72 n. 2.
 Preferment, requests for, 124, 128 11. 1.
 Presbyterianism, 86.
 Prideaux, John, Bishop of Worcester,
 70 n. 1, 72 n. 2.
 Professional class, 43, 134; emergence
 of, Gh. V.
 Prynne, William, 80.
 Puckering, Sir Thomas, 14.
 Puritanism, 10, 30, 78, 79-80, 81, 86,
 89-9» 92-5.
- Rainbowe, Edward, Bishop of Carlisle,
 69 n. 3, 72 n. 2.
- Rant, Dr. William, senior, 61; his sons,
 62 and n. 1.
 Rayment, Thomas, 83 n. 2.
 Reformation, the, 2.
 Reresby, Sir John. 14 n. 1, 67 n. 1,
 89 n. 3.
 Reversions, purchase of, 6, 7, 42.
 Richelieu, Cardinal, 28, 32.
 Rivers, Dowager Countess, 22.
 Rochester, 2nd earl of, 73 n. 1.
 Roe, Sir Thomas. 28 11. 2, 32 n. 2, 33,
 34 n. 1.
 Rowse, A. L., 12 n. 3.
 Rubens, P. P.. 119 11. 1.
 Rupert, Prince, 124 n. 3.
- St. Paul's School, 6j.
 St. Thomas's Priory, Stall's., 118.
 Salisbury, 1st earl of, 16, 75.
 — 2nd earl of, 16 and n. 2, 76 n. 6.
 Salvetti, Amerigo, 29 11. 1.
 Sanicroft, William, Archbishop of
 Canterbury, 72.
 Sandys, Kdwin, Archbishop of York,
 71 11. 3.
 — Sir Kdwin, 71 11. 1, 7b n. 3.
 Savage, Viscount, 35 11. 1.
 Savile, Sir Henry, 66 11. 1.
 Scarborough, Sir Charles, 64 11. 3.
 Scottish peerage, 39 n. 2.
 Secretaries, 56, 57, 73, 75 6.
 Scnhouse, Kichaid, Bishop of Carlisle.
 69 n. 2.
 Servants, 96, 97 8, 100 4.
 Scvnoaks, 66.
 Shafto, Arthur, 22 11. 3.
 — John, 22 n. 5.
 Shaw, Rev. John, 103 n. 1.
 Sheldon, Gilbert, Archbishop of Canter-
 bury, 70 n. 1, 72 11. 2, 88.
 Sheppard, Luce, 21 11. 1.
 — Richard, 18.
 Sherborne, Sir Kichaid, 47.
 Ship-money, 113.
 Shippon, Luke, 82 11. 1.
 Shirley, Sir Robert, 119 n. 2.
 Short Parliament, the, 128.
 Shuttleworths (of Smiths), the, 20 n. 3.
 Sidney, Lady Dorothy (Saccharissa),
 40 11. 2.
 — Sir Philip, 5.
 Sinécures, growth of, 6, 7, 77.
 Skinners' Company, the, 70 n. 3.
 Slingsby, Sir Henry, 51-2, 60.
 Smart, Peter, 79 n. 2.
 Smith, Dr. Edmund, 64 n. 3.
 — Logan Pearsall, 35 n. 3.
 Smyth, John, of Nibley, 40-1.
 Soham, Tony, 64.
 Somerset, earl of (Robert Carr), 13.

- Spain, 31, 33, 79.
 'Spanish' party, 30-1.
 Squirearchy, conception of, 39. *See also* Gentry.
 Stafford, Sir Thomas, 131 n. 1.
 Sterne, Bishop, 72 n. 2.
 Stevens, Philemon, 108.
 Stewards, 21 and n. 1, 100-2.
 Stonham, Rev. Matthew, 62, 63-4.
 Storr, Rev. William, 133 n. 3.
 Stourton, Hercules, 102 n. 2.
 Strafford, earl of (Thomas Wentworth), 9, 16-17, 27, 28, 31, 113 n. 1, 118 n. 2, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127 n. 1, 128 n. 1, 129 n. 3.
 Stuteville, Sir Martin, 14.
 Suckling, Sir John, 114, 115-16, 118 n. 2.
 Suffolk, 1st earl of, 16 n. 2.
 Susa, Treaty of, 29.
 Swayne, Richard, 41 n. 3.
 Symonds, E. M., 20 n. 2.
- Tawney, R. H., 25 n. 1.
 Taylor, Jeremy, 132 n. 2.
 Teaching, 62-4, 69.
 Temple Newsam, 24.
 Thanet, earl of, 53 n. 1.
 Timperley, Nicholas, 46.
 Tixall, Staffs., 118.
 Totnes, 1st earl of, 131 n. 1.
 Tower wharf, no.
 Tradesmen, 105, 106, m-12.
 Traffic, during the Civil War, 133 and n. 5.
 Trelawney, Sir John, 53 n. 1.
 Trendall, John, 93-4.
 Tresham, Sir Thomas, 12.
 Tutors, 56, 57, 65-6, 72-4.
- Universities, 57; entrance to, 64-5; headship of colleges, 72.
- Vandyck, Sir Anthony, 119 and n. 2, 133 n. 2.
- Vane, Sir Henry (the elder), 15 n. 3, 31, 115 n. 2.
 — (the younger), 44 n. 1.
 Vaux, Anne, 54 n. 1.
 Villiers, George, *see* Buckingham.
 Virginia Company, 71.
- Wake, Anna, 119 n. 2.
 Wales, 2, 3.
 Waller, Edmund, 40.
 Walpole, Sir Robert, 6.
 Walsingham, Sir Francis, 4.
 Walton, Brian, Bishop of Chester, 82, n. 1.
 Walworth, Nathan, 19.
 Warwick, 2nd earl of, 38.
 Watermen, no.
 Wellingham, George, 18, 95.
 Wentworth, Thomas, *see* Strafford.
 Westmoreland, 6th earl of, 53 n. x.
 Weston, Sir Jerome, 44 n. 2.
 White, Francis, 71 n. 3.
 Wight, Isle of, 48 n. 4.
 Wills, 22-3.
 Winchester, 44.
 Windebank, Sir Francis, 15 n. 3, 33, 101 n. 2.
 Winterbourne, 42.
 Women, social role, 75.
 Wood, Anthony a, 66.
 Woodcock, Peter, 44.
 Woodmongers, iix-12.
 Worcester House, 21.
 — Marquesses of, 51.
 Working class, in London, no-ii.
 Wotton, Sir Henry, 35 n. 3, 36 n. 1, 37 n. 4, 41, 66, 74, 131 n. 2.
 Wren, Christopher, 70 n. 2.
 — Matthew, Bishop of Ely, 70 n. 2, 72 n. 2.
 Wright, Bishop, 72 n. 2.
 Wynne, Sir Richard, 35 n. 1.
- York, 46, 48, 113.

