

NS: 51. K5  
A838.1  
1749

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-001749

HISTORY OF THE  
ENGLISH REVOLUTION.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF

M. GUIZOT,

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE FACULTY OF LITERATURE AT PARIS,  
AND MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION IN FRANCE.

BY LOUISE H. R. COUTIER.

VOL. I.

2v.



OXFORD: D. A. TALBOYS,

AND 113, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

M DCCC XXXVIII.

V3:51. K5

A838.1

1749

## TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

---

It may be asked why, after the many works that have appeared in England on the subject of which these volumes treat, it has been thought necessary to translate the present work. For an answer the reader is referred to M. Guizot's preface, in which he gives his reasons for writing the book at all. There, after doing full justice to the merit of those authors who have enriched English literature with their views of this important period in the national life of their country, he shows that a complete history of the English revolution is still found wanting, and that the French revolution having placed the events of 1688 in a new light, the narrative of Hume and other historians are no longer sufficient to satisfy the present age.

In fact, though time, like an eternal night, may for ever spread the veil of obscurity over some events, it passes over others as a transitory shadow, from which arises the dawn of a new day. Thus time has proceeded, civilisation proceeded, and nations have grown rich by their experience; the sun of knowledge has risen, and vested the dim obscurity of distance in its true colours. Let us hope that we are about to enjoy the full meridian splendour of the light

that shines upon us, and cast away that philosophy which would represent man as toiling for ever to reach a certain height, from which, when attained, he can never move but to recede. What! in the life of a nation is there no great end held in view by Providence? or must we suppose that the necessities of life, its luxuries, its pleasures, are the only motors of that mighty mass of living creatures whose industry, commerce, arts, and genius are for ever active and in progress? Is there no deeper, no purer motive to their exertions than the food of the day, the gratification of the hour? For thousands there may not be; but, unconsciously, they are forwarding a nobler end. In seeking the amelioration of their own lot, the faculties of their minds are called into action, and these can be of no advantage to themselves till rendered useful to their fellow-creatures. Thus the civilisation of nations is constantly in progress. But is that progress, like the life of man, to be followed by decrepitude and death? it is an awful, chilling question; and who shall answer it? What say those ruins which are scattered over the surface of the globe? are they not the gray tombstones of mighty nations that have long passed away? Go into the vast unconscious desert; see Palmyra, the great, the beautiful, the fallen; ask where are the sons of genius who once walked among the gorgeous pile; alas! echo answers "where!" All this is true, but too true. All over the globe, in this island, are scattered memorials of an en-

lightened race, to whom conjecture alone has given a name; and these, I grant, appear to sanction the cheerless sentence of utter vanity which many sages in every century have pronounced against earthly things. But I must believe another creed than this; as I said before, Do not let us adopt a philosophy whose cold tenets would fain chill every warm and glowing energy of the human breast, make the noblest hopes appear but delusive visions, and divest the Great Author of all good himself of his own true attribute of Omnipotent Love! He stands not cold and immutable, viewing the anguish, the deep anxiety with which the good and great seek, in the fervency of their hearts, to ameliorate the state of human affairs, as the impassible rock views the idle chafing of the waves—this stern, cold mockery is not the character of Him who assists even manual labour with the dew and the sunbeam. It is not because great nations, whose wealth and power astonished the world, committed great faults and fell, that we are necessarily doomed to do the same; their fall is a warning to us against that pride and luxury by which they were hurried into the abyss, not an example of the natural consequence of time upon civilised communities. Take, however, what view we may of the question, we must all own that we are agents in the hands of an inscrutable Providence, with whose designs we cannot become acquainted, though continually and mysteriously engaged in

forwarding their development. On the ultimate ends of revolutions we can therefore form no conjectures; we all know from experience that all human institutions partake more or less of imperfection; that the least imperfect form of government under which we can live, cannot ensure that frail and delicate thing—human happiness, dependent as it is on that which no human power can control. Nevertheless, that the gradual progress of society from a state of barbarism to refinement, is carried on by a series of revolutions, is certain. The work neither begun nor ceased with the memorable epoch which these volumes pourtray, and this M. Guizot clearly demonstrates. In the history here given that gentleman does not relate events alone, but points out the motives by which the different parties were actuated, with all the acuteness of one who has studied the human heart and the spirit of revolutions with philosophy and truth. His History of the Revolution therefore appears to me to possess a peculiar interest; the actors live and move before the reader's eyes, and the whole scene reappears before him. The cause of liberty is advocated throughout, not with the blindness of passion, but with the steadfast dignity of earnest belief. The feelings and errors of all parties are appreciated with impartiality; in short, the work is one that must attract from all Englishmen the attention it so eminently deserves. I therefore trust, that in laying before the public the present translation,



TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE. ix

I am rendering a service to those who are not sufficiently versed in the French language to enjoy the original. French being, as it were, my native language, I hope I have in no instance mistaken the author's meaning; though, I fear, that as a foreigner, I may not always have expressed it so elegantly as I could wish. I have to regret that my distance from a public library has rendered it impossible for me, in many instances, to verify M. Guizot's references and give the very words of the author whom he quotes. I should certainly not have failed in this had the works been within my reach; as it is, I hope the reader will pardon a deficiency which I have supplied by the best means in my power—a strict fidelity to the author's text.

LOUISE H. R. COUTIER.

ENHAM, JANUARY, 1838.

## THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

---

I HAVE published the original memoirs of the English revolution; I now publish its History: Before the French revolution this was the greatest event that had happened in Europe.

I am not afraid that its importance will be forgotten; the French revolution, in surpassing, did not lessen its greatness; both are victories in the same war, and to the profit of the same cause; glory belongs to both, and instead of eclipsing they enhance each other's merits. My fear is rather that their true character should not be understood, and that the proper place which belongs to them in the history of the world, should not be assigned to them.

If we adopt an opinion now widely diffused, it would seem that the two revolutions are strange events emanating from principles and conceived in designs unheard of before, which have thrown society out of its ancient and natural course; that they were hurricanes, earthquakes, in short, that they belonged to those mysterious phenomena which men cannot explain, that burst suddenly from the will of Providence either to renovate or destroy. Friends and enemies, panegyrists, and detractors, all hold this same language. According

to some, these glorious events have for the first time brought truth, liberty, and justice to light; before they happened, all was absurdity, iniquity, and tyranny; by them the human race has been saved. According to others, these deplorable events have interrupted a long golden age of wisdom, virtue, and happiness; the perpetrators of them having proclaimed maxims, put forward pretensions, and committed crimes, till then without example or parallel. Nations, in a fit of insanity, forsook their accustomed road; an abyss suddenly gaped beneath their feet. Thus all parties, whether they bless, deplore, or condemn revolutions, agree in forgetting every thing else in their presence. By all they are entirely cut off from the past, and are themselves regarded as responsible for the destiny of the world. In short, they are either loaded with unmitigated anathema or with glory.

It is time to forsake these puerile and unfounded declamations.

Far from having interrupted the natural course of events in Europe, neither the English nor the French revolution either said, wished, or did anything that had not been said, wished, done, or attempted, hundreds of times before. They proclaimed the illegality of absolute power. Free concurrence with regard to laws and taxes, and the right to resist with arms and force, were among the constitutive principles of the feudal administration; and the church has often repeated these words of St. Isidorus, found in the canons of

the fourth council of Toledo : " He is king who rules his people with justice ; if he act otherwise he shall no longer be king." These canons attacked prerogative and laboured to introduce a greater degree of equality in social order. Every king in Europe has done the same ; and down to the present day, the progress of civil equality has been founded and measured by the progress of royalty. These canons required that public offices should be accessible to every individual, that merit alone should be the standard of their distribution, and that power should be conferred by election. This is the fundamental principle of the interior government of the church ; and the church has not only acted upon it, but loudly proclaimed its virtue. And whether we consider the general doctrines of the two revolutions, or the things to which they were applied—whether the government, the state, or the civil legislation are spoken of, property or persons, liberty or power—nothing will be found altogether peculiar to them, nothing but what may likewise be met with, or but what had at least its origin in what are called peaceable times.

This is not all. The principles, the designs, the efforts, which are exclusively attributed to the English and to the French revolutions, not only preceded them by several centuries, but are precisely those to which society in Europe owes all its progress. Was it by their disturbances, and their privileges, by the brutality of their strength, and by crushing men beneath their

yoke, that the feudal aristocracy took a part in the moral growth of nations? No; but the feudal aristocracy struggled against royal tyranny, exercised the right of resistance, and maintained the maxims of liberty. For what have nations blessed kings? for their pretensions to divine right and to absolute power? for their profusion, for the splendid pageantry of their courts? No; but for combating the feudal system and aristocratical privileges, for having introduced something like unity in legislation, and in the administration; in short, for having aided the progress of equality. Whence, again, do the clergy derive their power? how have they advanced the march of civilisation? Is it by separating themselves from the people, by opposing the growth of human reason, and sanctioning tyranny in the name of heaven? No; but the clergy have always gathered together in their churches, and under the law of God, the great and small, the poor and rich, the weak and the powerful of the earth; they have honoured and cultivated science, instituted schools, favoured the propagation of knowledge, and the development of mind. Look into the history of the conquerors of the world, examine the influence of the several classes that have decided its destiny, and wherever any good is perceptible, whenever the tardy gratitude of man testifies of some great service rendered to humanity, it will be found that a step was taken towards the same object, sought by the English

and the French revolutions, and one of the same principles they endeavoured to establish is invariably presented to the moral vision.

Let us not then any longer regard them as monstrous phenomena in the history of Europe; let us hear no more of their unprecedented pretensions, their infernal contrivances. They have advanced civilisation in the path it has pursued for the last fourteen centuries; they proclaimed the maxims and forwarded the works to which man has at all times been indebted for the development of his nature, and the amelioration of his condition; they have done that which has been by turns the glory and the merit of the aristocracy, the clergy, and of kings.

I do not think they will much longer be obstinately and sweepingly condemned because they are sullied with errors, misfortunes, and crimes. All this we must admit to the fullest extent to their adversaries; we should even surpass them in severity, and only examine their accusations to supply their omissions. But then, let me summon them in return to draw up a catalogue of the errors, crimes, and miseries of those times and those powers they defend; and I doubt whether they will dare to accept my challenge.

But it will be asked, By what then are the two revolutions distinguishable from any other epoch; and, if they did but continue the work of ages, how came they by their name, and how did they,

in fact, alter the features of the moral world? The answer is this:

Divers powers have successively prevailed in European society, and led by turns the march of civilisation. After the fall of the Roman empire and the invasion of the Barbarians, in the dissolution of all ties and the ruin of all powers, dominion everywhere belonged to bold and brutal force. The conquering aristocracy took possession of all things; persons and property, the country and the people. In vain did a few great men, Charlemagne in France, Alfred in England, attempt to submit this chaos to the unity of a monarchy. All union was impossible. The feudal hierarchy was the only form that society would accept. It invaded everything, the church as well as the state; bishops and abbots were barons, and the king was chief suzerain. How gross and wavering soever this organisation, yet Europe is indebted to it for its first step from barbarism. It was among the proprietors of fiefs, by their intercourse, their laws, their customs, their feelings, their ideas, that the civilisation of Europe began.

The barons heavily oppressed the people. The clergy alone endeavoured to reclaim a little reason, justice, and humanity in favour of all. Those who held no place in the feudal hierarchy, had no other asylum than the churches, nor any other protectors than the priests; though very insufficient, yet being the only one this pro-

tection was immense. Besides this, the priests alone offered food to the moral nature of man; to the cravings of thought, knowledge, hope, and belief; unconquerable cravings, that overcome every obstacle, and outlive all misfortune. The church soon acquired a prodigious power in every part of Europe. Kingly power in its infancy, lent it fresh power by borrowing its assistance. Thus the preponderance passed from the hands of the aristocratical conquerors to the clergy.

In alliance with the church, royalty soon took precedence of its rivals; but no sooner had the clergy given it their assistance than they wished to enslave it. In this new struggle, royalty sometimes called to its aid the barons, now become much less formidable, and more frequently the commons and the people, already strong enough to help, though not sufficiently so to demand a high reward for their services. By their aid royalty triumphed in its second struggle, became almost the ruling power, and was invested with the confidence of nations.

Such is the history of ancient Europe. The feudal aristocracy, the clergy, and royalty, by turns took possession of it, and successively presided over its progress and destiny. It was to their co-existence and to their struggles that Europe for a long time was indebted for all it acquired of liberty, prosperity, and knowledge; in short, for the development of its civilisation.

In England, in the seventeenth century, and



in France in the eighteenth, all struggle between these three powers had ceased. They lived together in sluggish peace ; it might even be said, that they had lost their historical character, and even the remembrance of those deeds that had, of old, formed their power and their fame. The aristocracy no longer protected public liberties, not even their own ; royalty no longer sought to abolish aristocratical privileges, but seemed, on the contrary, favourable to their possessors in return for their servility. The clergy, the spiritual power, stood in awe of the human understanding, and, not knowing how to guide it further, sought by threats to check its career. Still civilisation followed its course, and became daily more general and active. Forsaken by their ancient leaders, astonished at their apathy and disposition, seeing that less was done for them as their desires multiplied and their strength augmented, the people began to think that it behoved them to transact their own affairs ; and, assuming at once the various functions which all besides had forsaken, they claimed, of the crown, an extension of liberty, of the aristocracy, equality, and of the clergy, the rights of human intellect. Hence broke out revolutions.

These brought forth, for the benefit of this new power, what had already occurred several times in Europe ; they gave to society, leaders that would and could direct it in its progress. By this only claim had the aristocracy, the church, and the kingly power by turns been pos-

sessed of precedence. The people now took the same right, through the same means, and in the name of the same necessities.

Such is the real history, the predominant character of the English revolution as well as that of France. After they had been considered as absolutely alike, it was said that they had nothing but appearances in common. It was urged, that the first was political rather than social; the second sought to change at once both society and government; the one sought liberty, the other equality; one, rather religious than political, only substituted dogma for dogma, a church for a church; the other, more especially philosophical, claimed the full independence of reason. This ingenious comparison is not without truth, but nearly as superficial, as light, as the opinion it pretends to correct. While, through the exterior resemblance of the two revolutions, a great dissimilitude is perceptible, so, beneath their dissimilitude, a still more profound resemblance is hidden. It is true that the English revolution, from the same causes that brought it forth an age before ours, retains a deeper trace of the ancient social state. In England, free institutions, originating in barbarous times, had survived the despotism they could not prevent; the feudal aristocracy, or, at least, a portion of them, had united their cause to that of the people. Royalty, even in the days of its supremacy, had never been fully and peaceably absolute; the national church itself had begun the religious

reform, thus encouraging the daring inquiries of the mind. Everywhere, in the laws, the creed, and the habits of the people, revolution found its work half accomplished, and from that order of things which it sought to change, came at once assistance and obstacles, useful allies, and still powerful adversaries. And thus did it present a singular mixture of elements, to all appearance the most contrary. At once aristocratic and popular, religious and philosophical, appealing alternately to laws and theories; sometimes proclaiming a new yoke for conscience, and at others its entire liberty; sometimes narrowly confined within the limits of facts, at others soaring to the most daring attempts; placed, in short, between the ancient and the new state of things, rather as a bridge of connection than as an abyss of separation.

The most terrible union, on the contrary, reigned throughout the French revolution. The 'new spirit' alone prevailed; and 'the old system,' far from taking any part in the movement, only sought to defend itself against it; a defence that it could not maintain an instant, being as deficient in strength as it was in virtue. On the day of explosion one only fact remained true and powerful,—the general civilisation of the country. In this great but only result, old institutions, old manners, old creeds, the remembrances of the past, in short, the whole national life, was swallowed up. So many active and glorious ages had only produced France. Hence the immense

results of the revolution, and also the immensity of its errors : the revolution possessed absolute power.

Undoubtedly the difference between the two revolutions is great, and worthy to be noted. It strikes us particularly, when, undertaking to unravel, if I might so express it, the physiognomy and individual character that belong to each, they are considered in themselves as isolated events detached from general history. But let them take their places in the natural course of ages, and examine what they have done towards the development of European civilisation, the resemblance will reappear, and predominate over all apparent dissimilitude. Created by the same causes, the fall of the feudal aristocracy, the church, and kingly power, they both laboured to obtain the same result, the dominion of the public in public affairs. They struggled for liberty against absolute power, for equality against privilege, for progressive and general interests against stationary and individual interests. Their situations were different, their strength unequal. What one clearly conceived, the other had but faintly and imperfectly imagined ; in the career that one followed, the other soon became stationary ; on the same battle-field one found victory, the other defeat ; one sinned through its cynical principles, the other through its hypocrisy ; one was wiser, the other more powerful ; but their means of success alone differed ; their tendency as well as their origin was the same ;

their wishes, their efforts, their progress, were directed towards the same end; what one attempted or accomplished, the other attempted and accomplished also. Though guilty of religious persecution, the English revolution saw the banner of religious liberty unfolded in the ranks of her followers; notwithstanding its aristocratical alliances, it founded the power of the commons; more busied with political than civil order, it still claimed a more simple legislation, —parliamentary reform, and the abolition of birthright and entails; and though disappointed in its premature hopes, it caused English society to take a wide step from the monstrous inequality of the feudal system. In a word, the analogy of the two revolutions is such, that the first would never have been understood had not the second taken place.

In fact, in our days, the English revolution has changed in appearance. Hume<sup>a</sup> formed, by his History, the opinion of Europe; and, notwithstanding the name of Mirabeau<sup>b</sup>, Mrs. Macauley's declamations were not able to shake his authority. All at once, the minds of the people threw off their trammels. A number of works

<sup>a</sup> Hume published his first volume of the History of the Stuarts in 1754, and the second in 1756.

<sup>b</sup> Mrs. Macauley's work was to have been a 'History of England from the Accession of James the First to the Elevation of the House of Hanover,' but it reaches no further than the death of James the Second. This work was published in England from 1763 to 1783. Of the French translation, under the name of Mirabeau, only two volumes appeared, published in 1791.

attest that the revolution became again the object of lively sympathy, and that the narrative and opinions of Hume had ceased to satisfy the imagination and reason of the public. A great orator, Mr. Fox<sup>e</sup>, and many distinguished writers, Mr. Malcolm Laing<sup>d</sup>, Macdiarmid<sup>e</sup>, Brodie<sup>f</sup>, Lingard<sup>g</sup>, Godwin<sup>h</sup>, and others, hastened to gratify this newly-roused curiosity. This interest having originated in France, could scarcely fail to be felt there. 'L' Histoire de Cromwell,' by M. Villemain, 'L' Histoire de la Révolution de 1688,' by M. Mazure, evidently prove that in France also Hume was no longer sufficient; and I have been able, myself, to publish the voluminous Collection of the Memoirs of that epoch, without fatiguing the attention or exhausting the curiosity of readers<sup>i</sup>.

<sup>e</sup> History of the Two Last Kings of the House of Stuart, one vol. 4to. London, 1808. The French translation, published in Paris 1809, in two volumes, 8vo. is very incomplete.

<sup>d</sup> History of Scotland from the Union of the Crowns to the Union of the Kingdoms, 4 vols. 8vo. The first edition dates from 1800.

<sup>e</sup> Lives of British Statesmen, 2 vols. 8vo. second edition, London, 1820. The second volume contains the Lives of Strafford and Clarendon.

<sup>f</sup> History of the British Empire, from the Accession of Charles the First to the Restoration of Charles the Second, 4 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh, 1822.

<sup>g</sup> History of England; the 9th and 10th volumes, London, 1825, contain the reigns of James the First and of Charles the First.

<sup>h</sup> History of the Commonwealth of England; London, 1824; only the first volume has appeared. [It is now completed in 4 vols. 8vo.]

<sup>i</sup> This Collection, now completed, forms 25 vols. 8vo. Paris, Bechet, aîné.

It would little become me to enter here into a minute examination of these works; but I fearlessly assert that, without the French revolution, without the clear light it threw on the struggle of the Stuarts and the English people, they would not possess the new merits that distinguish them. I shall only advance as a proof, the difference that is to be remarked between those written in Great Britain and those produced in France. How great soever the patriotic interest awakened in English writers by the revolution of 1640, even when they enlist under the banners of one of the parties which it formed, historical criticism reigns throughout their works; they apply themselves in particular to the discovery of exact facts, by comparing and debating divers testimonies. What they relate, is to them an ancient history with which they are well acquainted, not a drama acted in their presence; a past age that they pride themselves on knowing well, but in which they *live* not. Mr. Brodie partakes of all the prejudices, suspicions, and passions of the bitterest puritans against Charles the First and the cavaliers, while he is blind to any faults or any errors in the puritans. One would think so much passion would produce an animated narrative; and that, at least, the party exciting so much sympathy in the mind of the writer, would be represented with warmth and truth. Such, however, is not the case. Notwithstanding the violence of his peculiar notions, Mr. Brodie studies but sees not, discusses but represents not;

he admires the popular party, but does not bring it before the reader's eye; and his work is a learned and useful dissertation, not a moral and animated history. Mr. Lingard partakes of none of the affections nor opinions of Mr. Brodie. He remains impartial between the king and the parliament, he pleads neither the cause of one nor the other, and seeks not to refute the errors of his predecessors; he even boasts of not having opened the work of Hume since he began his own; he says he wrote with the aid of original documents, with the times he wished to picture forth even before his eyes, and with the firm resolution of shunning all systematical views. Does animation arise from this impartiality? Not at all. Mr. Lingard's impartiality is but indifference; a Roman catholic priest himself, he cares little whether the protestants or the presbyterians triumphed; and indifference helped him no better than passion did Mr. Brodie to penetrate beyond the exterior, and, one might almost say, the material form of events; and, again, the principal merit of his work is, in having carefully examined facts, collected them with tolerable accuracy, and well disposed them. Mr. Malcolm Laing describes with more sagacity the political character of the revolution; he has very well shown, that, from the first, without exactly understanding its own aim, the revolution tried to put down prerogative and to place it in the hands of the commons, thus substituting parliamentary for royal government, and that its only basis was



this result. But the moral side of the epoch, the religious enthusiasm, the popular passions, party intrigues, personal contentions, in short, none of those scenes in which human nature shows itself freed from the restraint of laws and customs, are to be found in his book. It is the narrative of a clear-sighted judge, but of one who has only inspected written documents, and who neither calls before him the actors nor the witnesses of the scenes he relates. I might review all the works with which England has been recently enriched on this subject; they all present the same character—a new interest for this great crisis of national life, a more attentive study of the facts that relate to it, a keener feeling of its merits, a juster appreciation of its causes and consequences; still it is but meditation and science; the work of erudition or philosophy. I seek in vain for that natural sympathy in the writer for his subject that gives to history the light of life; and if either Hampden or Clarendon were to return to life, I scarcely can believe that they would recognise their own times.

I open 'l'Histoire de Cromwell,' by M. Villemain, and find myself in presence of another scene. It is not so complete, so learned, nor so exact as several of the works I have mentioned, but, throughout, there is a quick and keen comprehension of the opinions, passions, and vicissitudes of revolutions; of public dispositions and individual characters, of the unconquerable nature and the changing of parties. The historian's

mind knows how to understand all situations and ideas ; his imagination is moved by real and deep impressions ; his impartiality, perhaps rather too sceptical, is yet more animated than is frequently the passion itself of the advocates of one party ; and though the revolution appears in his book only confined in the too narrow frame of a biography, it is clearer and more animated than in any other work.

The reason of this is, that, without speaking of the advantages of talent, M. Villemain had the advantage of situation. He has looked at and judged of the English revolution from the midst of that of France ; he found in the men and the events beneath his own eyes, the key to understand those he had to paint ; he drew life from his own times and infused it into the times he wished to recall before his readers.

I refrain from carrying these reflections farther ; I have said so much only to point out how great is the analogy between the two epochs, and also to explain how a Frenchman might think that the history of the English revolution has not yet been written in a fully satisfactory manner, and that he may be allowed to attempt it. I have carefully studied nearly all the ancient and modern works that have been written on the subject ; I did not fear that this study would alter the sincerity of my own impressions or the independence of my judgment ; it seems to me that there is too much timidity in dreading so much that an auxiliary should become a master,

or too much pride in refusing so absolutely all help. Yet, if I do not deceive myself, it will easily be recognised, that original documents have more particularly been my guides. I have nothing to say of the 'Memoirs;' I sought in the 'Notices' that I affixed to them when they were published, to define their character and worth; and those to which I did not give a place in my 'Collection,' though I have made use of them in my 'History,' appeared to me of too little importance to be dwelt upon. As for the collections of official acts and documents, they are very numerous; and, though often explored, still abound in unknown treasures. I have looked into those of Rushworth, Thurlow, the journals of both houses, the 'Parliamentary History,' the ancient one as well as that of Mr. Cobbett, the 'Collection of State Trials,' and a great number of other works of the same kind, which it would be uninteresting to enumerate here. I also found, not only in the English, but in the French pamphlets of the time, some curious information; for the French public was more occupied than may be generally supposed by the English revolution; many pamphlets were published for and against it, and the Frondeurs took advantage more than once of its example against Mazarine and the court. I must also say, to do justice to a man and a work now too much neglected, that I have often consulted with profit the History of England, by Rapin Thoiras; and, notwithstanding the inferiority of the writer's talents, the English

revolution is perhaps better understood in it, and more completely displayed than in the works of most of his successors.

To conclude, let me be allowed to express here my gratitude to those persons who in France as well as England, have had the kindness to give my work an anticipated favour, and lent me the most valuable assistance. Amongst others, to whom I am indebted, I have to thank the kindness of Sir James Mackintosh, as inexhaustible as his mind and knowledge, for indications and advice that no one but himself could have given me ; and one of those, who, amongst us, are the best informed with the past and present state of England, M. Gallois, has bestowed upon me, with a benevolence that I have some right to consider as friendship, both the treasures of his library and his conversation.

PARIS, APRIL, 1826.

# CONTENTS

## OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

---

### BOOK THE FIRST.

1625—1629.

Accession of Charles the First to the throne, 1; state of England, 3; meeting of the first parliament, 17; spirit of liberty manifested therein, *ib.*; parliament dissolved, 21; first attempts at arbitrary government, *ib.*; their bad success, 22; second parliament, *ib.*; impeachment of the duke of Buckingham, 25; parliament dissolved, 28; bad administration of Buckingham, *ib.*; third parliament, 33; petition of rights, 40; prorogation of parliament, 46; murder of Buckingham, *ib.*; second session of parliament, 48; fresh causes of public discontent, *ib.*; the king's displeasure, 49; third dissolution of parliament, 51.

### BOOK THE SECOND.

1629—1640.

Intentions of the king and his council, 53; leading members of parliament prosecuted, 55; apparent apathy of the country, 56; struggle of the court and ministry, 57; the queen, *ib.*; Strafford, 59; Laud, 61; incoherence and discredit of government, 63; civil and religious tyranny, 66; its effects on the different classes of the nation, 68; trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, 99; Hampden, 103; insurrection in Scotland, 107; first war with the Scots, 112; peace

of Berwick, 120; short parliament in 1640, 128; second war with Scotland, 131; its bad success, 133; convocation of the long parliament, 137.

### BOOK THE THIRD.

1640—1642.

Opening of parliament, 138; its proceedings, 139; state of religious and political parties, 140; the king's concessions, 150; negotiations between the king and the leaders of parliament, 156; conspiracy in the army, 158; Strafford's trial and death, 160-175; the king's journey to Scotland, 180; insurrection in Ireland, 186; debate on the Remonstrance, 190; the king's return, 195; progress of the revolution, 196; riots, 202; affair of the five members, 209; the king leaves London, 221; the queen's departure for the continent, 231; affair of the militia, *ib.*; negotiations, 232; the king fixes his residence at York, 236; both parties prepare for war, *ib.*; an entrance into Hull is refused to the king, 244; vain attempts at conciliation, 253; formation of the two armies, 255-260.

### BOOK THE FOURTH.

1642—1643.

Breaking out of the civil war, 261; the king erects his standard at Nottingham, 263; battle of Edgehill, 268; alarms in London, 272; combat of Brentford, 274; attempts at negotiation, 278; character of the civil war, 280; the queen returns from the continent, 285; negotiations at Oxford, 290; suspicions entertained against the earl of Essex, 294; dissensions in the interior of parliament, 296; conspiracy of the royalists in the city, 302; death of Hampden, 306; the parliamentary army several times defeated, 309; energy of the parliament, 314; efforts of the partisans of peace in the

**CONTENTS.**

**xxxi**

house, 316 ; the king's project to march upon London, 324 ; the project defeated, 326 ; siege of Gloucester, *ib.* ; raised by Essex, 329 ; battle of Newbury, 331 ; death of lord Falkland, 332 ; alliance of parliament with the Scots, 334 ; triumphant return of Essex to London, 335.

**ELUCIDATIONS AND HISTORICAL  
DOCUMENTS.**

- I. The paper found in the hat of Felton, the murderer of the duke of Buckingham . . . . . 339
- II. Fines imposed for the profit of the crown from 1629 to 1640 . . . . . 340
- III. A list of the army raised by parliament in 1642 . 342