

The Examination of John Perkins, of Sleighkogh, in the County of Cavan.

Ex. 36. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That they said that the king was dead, and that the young king went to masse; and they were the queen's souldiers, and we were traytors. And the said words were affirmed by Cormack mac Cloney, parish-priest of Killan.

JOHN J. P. PERKINS
his mark.

Deposed before us, 8th Jan. 1641.
ROGER PUTTOCK, JOHN STERNE.

The Examination of Tho. Middlebrook, of Leagne Caffry, in the County of Fermanagh, Yeoman.

Ex. 37. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That on the 26th day of October last, he heard Cabell Boy mac Dermot say, that within one fortnight they should have a new king of Ireland crowned one of the ô Neals, or words to that effect; which words were spoken by the said Cabell, in the presence of Alice Tibs, this deponents sister, and Avis Braishaw, wife of John Braishaw. And further, that he both heard that the rebels had murdered about threescore English protestants (that lived in good manner within the said parish.) And further saith, that there cannot be so few as one hundred English protestants (that lived in good manner within the said parish) perished and dead since the said rebels did banish and drive them from their habitations.

THO. I. MIDDLEBROOK
his mark.

Deposed before us, Jan. 4. 1641.
ROGER PUTTOCK, HENRY BRERETON.

The Examination of Alice Tibs, of Ringvilly, in the County of Fermanagh, Widow.

Ex. 38. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That she heard Cabell Boy mac Dermot, of Killrout, in the county aforesaid, yeoman, say, That Dublin castle was taken, and that they could afford the English two or three barrells of powder; and that the Irish within one fortnight would have a new king, or words to that effect; which words he spake in the hearing of this deponent, Avis Braishaw, wife to John Braishaw, and Thomas Middlebrook, the five-and-twentieth day of October. And did after hear another Irishman (whose name she knoweth not) say, That it was pity that any of the English or their breed should be suffered to live, for fear they should grow strong again; or words to that effect.

ALICE UV. TIBS
her mark.

This deposed before us, Jan. 4, 1641.
ROGER PUTTOCK, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of Avis Braishaw, late of Agheruskie Moore, in the County of Fermanagh.

Ex. 39. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That she heard Cabell Boy mac Dermott, of Kilrout, in the county aforesaid, say, That Dublin castle was taken,

and that they could afford the English three or four barrels of powder, and that the Irish would have a new king within a fortnight after; which words, or to that effect, he spake in the hearing of this deponent, Tho. Middlebrook, and Alice Tibs, the 25th day of October last.

This deposed before us, Jan. 4, 1641.
ROGER PUTTOCK, HEN. BRERETON.

AVIS UU BRAISHAW
her mark.

The Examination of Rich. Knowles of Newtown, alias Castle-cool, in the County of Fermanagh, Yeoman.

Ex. 40. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That there is one hundred of the said parishioners (that lived in good rank and fashion) since they were driven out of their habitations and banished by the said rebellious Irish (being all English protestants) perished and dead. And this deponent is the rather confident that there is one hundred or more dead, by reason they dayly die in such abundance, this deponent well knowing the said parishioners, being his neighbours; and this deponent, being a butcher by trade, had some dealing with the most of them.

Deposed this 10th of Jan. 1641.
JOHN WATSON, WILLIAM ALDRICH.

RICH. R. KNOWLS
his mark.

The Examination of Robert Barton, of Newtowne, alias Castle-cool, in the County of Fermanagh, Blacksmith.

Ex. 41. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That some Irish rebels neer unto Virginia, in the way towards Rells, did strip this deponent, and said, That they had a new king, and commission from him for what they did. And further deposeth, That he heard that Captain Rory, or some other of his company, had murdered of the said parishioners to the number of fourty or thereabouts.

Deposed before us, Jan. 5, 1641.
HEN. BRERETON, WILLIAM HITCHCOCK.

The Examination of Hugh Culme, of Leitrim, in the County of Monaghan, Gentleman.

Ex. 42. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That he was told that one Art mac Machown, who lived in the parish of Tehollan, said that they which spoke English should pay 10s. to the king; the party to whom he spoke it desired to know what king desired it? his answer was, what other king but the Earl of Tyrone.

And this deponent heard one Thomas mac Aleare's wife, of the same county and parish, say, that Captain Bryan mac Mahon, of Tehollan, said he would hang any that would speak English. And heard the priest Mac Clerey, of Tehollan, say, that all the English in Monaghan must be hanged; I asked him why? he said, meat was scarce, and they would not be at the charge to keep us.

And heard more by very honest men, that Mr Cottingham, minister of Monaghan, being in a dungeon bolted, desired for God's sake to get a little straw to lye upon, being put to such extremitie.

And that Mr Richard Blaney, justice of peace, in the county of Monaghan, was hanged in this manner.

Art Roe mac Bryan Sanaght, of Haslough, in the county of Monaghan, marshall to the rebels, came to Mr Blaney to the dungeon, and desired him to come out to speak with him; when he came out to him, he led him to my Lord Blaney's orchard in Monaghan, and said to him, do you remember how you hanged my brother, and made me flye my country for three yeers; but I will hang you before you go, but if you will, you shall have a priest; he said no, but he desired to have Master Cottingham, the minister of Monaghan, but they would not, but hanged him there, and flung him in a ditch, and he was two dayes unburied.

And this deponent heard that there was one Luke Ward, a Scotchman, which had indicted a man the quarter sessions before this rising, the same man came to him where he was in the gaol, and carried him to an alehouse, and made him drunk, and when he had done, carried him into the backside and hanged him; after he was cut down, they flung him into a river, and I could never hear that he was buried.

HUGH CULME.

Deposed before us, Jan. 25, 1641.

HEN. JONES, HEN. BRERETON.

I heard Master Mountgomery, minister, and Master Hollis, with severall other men of good worth, report, that the Sunday before this rising of the rebels, that there was seen a sword hanging in the ayre with the point downwards, the half seeming to be red, and the point turned round.

HUGH CULME.

The Examination of Mistresse Martha Culme, of Leitrim, in the County of Monaghan.

Ex. 43. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That she being by the rebels forced from her dwelling, and robbed of all her goods, she was enforced to shift from place to place for safe-guard of her life; particularly at William Boy Flemings house, in the parish of Tehollan, in the county of Monaghan, where she did hear the said Flemming, in detestation of the cruelty of the rebels, to relate, that while Sir Phelomy ô Neal did lye with his forces before the Ogher, in the county of Tyrone, the Irish women would follow after the Irish rebel souldiers, and put them forward in cruelty, with these and such words: Spare neither man, woman, nor childe, God so pittie your souls, as you pity them, intending those words to cruelty.

This examine further saith, that in the said Flemings house, one Art mac Patrick mac Toole Boy mac Mahon, of the barony of Balline Cargy, in the said parish, speaking to this examine in Irish, she desired he would deliver himself in English, for she understood not Irish; he answered in English, that such as spake English should forfeit ten shillings to the king; what king, saith this examine, have we, that will not allow the speaking of English? what king, saith he, but the Earl of Tyrone; she asked where the earl was; he answered in the north, where he was landed with 40000 Spaniards, whereof 10000 were then with Sir Phelim ô Neal.


MARTHA CULME.

Deposed before us, Feb. 14, 1641.

HEN. JONES, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of Elizabeth Gough, late of Ballanenagh, in the County of Cavan, Spinster.

Ex. 44. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That the Irish purposed to have a king of their own in Ireland, and that Phelomy ó Neal should be he.

ELIZABETH  GOUGH,
her mark.

Deposed before us, Feb. 8, 1641.

HENRY JONES, HENRY STERNE.

The Examination of Anne Gill, of Newtown, in the County of Fermanagh, Widow.

Ex. 45. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That when Rory Magwire had taken the church at Newtown aforesaid, he the said Rory (in the presence and hearing of this deponent, and a great many of his neighbours, the kings majesties loving subjects) gave forth that it was to no purpose for them to fly to Dublin for succour, for Dublin was taken by the Lord Magwire, who was to be king of Ireland.

ANNE L GILL,
her mark.


Jur. 29, Jan. 1641.

JOHN STERNE, WILLIAM ALDRICH.

The Examination of Elizabeth Vause, late of Creigs Toune Loughfield, in the County of Leitrim, Widdow.

Ex. 46. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That when this deponent asked why the rebels so robbed them, they asked again, who sent you over, and being answered, that God and the king did it, they the said rebels said, let your king fetch you out again.

And saith further, that the said rebels burned divers houses and two children, and one old man in them, and that very many protestants that fled for safety and succour to the castle of Sir James Craige, Knight, being near them, were there famished, starved, and dyed for want of means.


ELIZ.  VAUSE,
her mark.

Jur. 9, die Feb. 1641.

JOHN STERNE, WILLIAM HITCHCOCK.

The Examination of Nicholas Michael, of Farnan, in the County of Cavan.

Ex. 47. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That the parties that robbed this deponent, said they have an Irish king amongst them, and they regarded not king Charles the king of England.

NICH.  MICHAELS,
mark.

Deposed before us, Jan. 15, 1641.

WILLIAM HITCHCOCK, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of Andrew Foster, of Mocredin, alias Caryetsfort, in the County of Wickloe, Gentleman.

Ex. 48. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That the rebels said that they would within a week burn Dublin, and that neither king nor queen should govern Ireland any longer, for they would govern it themselves.

ANDREW FOSTER.

Jur. 17, Febr. 1641.

WILLIAM ALDRICH, JOHN STERNE.

The Examination of Richard Witton, of Kilnane, in the County of Wickloe, Miller.

Ex. 49. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That Luke Burne, gentleman, of Kilnane, said he would have their religion flourish, no thanks to king or subject.

RICH. WITTON.

Deposed this 11. of Jan. 1641.

WILL. ALDRICH, WILL. HIRCHCOCK.

The Examination of Edward Taylor, late of Saint Margarets, alias Ravan, in the County of Wexford, Clerk.

Ex. 50. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That one Piers Synnot, of Ballyvodegg, in the said county, and his sonne David, and other their complices, before this rebellion burst out, did disposses this deponent of his goods and church livings, into which he was long since invested by his majesties presentation, for which abuse this deponent impleaded some of them in this last parliament at Dublin; and a little before the beginning of the said rebellion, he shewed the said David an order from the said parliament for this deponents quiet enjoying his said church livings and restitution of the profits thereof, by them wrongfully detained, to which the said David Synnet answered, that he cared not for that, and that it was no parliament, but meet him at Dublin in Michaelmas term next, and question him if he durst, for then they would have a parliament of their own, in which parliament, he said, the deponent durst not complain, or words to that effect.

EDWARD TAYLOR.

Jur. 23, Feb. 1641. coram nobis.

JOHN STERNE, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of Nathaniel Higginson, of the Castle of Knockballymore, in the County of Fermanagh, Gentleman.

Ex. 51. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That the rebels then said, that they had a commission or broad seal from the king for what they did, and that when they, the said rebels, had vanquished ower-runne this kingdom, they would go over into England, where they would have the assistance of Spain and France for over-running the same.

NATH. HIGGINSON.

Jur. 7, Jan. 1641. coram.

ROGER PUTTOCK, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of Anne Marshall, of Castle-Waterhouse, in the County of Fermanagh, Widdow.

Ex. 52. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That some of the rebels most cruelly murdered William Marshall, husband unto this deponent, giving him sixe several mortall wounds, then said, that the Scots were at that time sent to leave never a drop of English blood in England, and that the Irish now had authority and command from the king to leave never a drop of English blood in Ireland.

And further deposeth, that the common speech of the said rebels was, that they were the queens souldiers.

ANNE MARSHALL.

Deposed before us, 3 Jan. 1641.

ROGER PUTTOCK, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of Jathniell Mawe, of Ferringrin, in the County of Fermanagh, Gentleman.

Ex. 53. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That he heard some of the rebellious Irish company say, that there should not be one Englishman, woman, or childe, left within this kingdom, and that they had the kings broad-seal for what they did.

JATHNIELL MAWE.

Deposed before us, Jan. 3, 1641.

HEN. JONES, WILLIAM ALDRICH.

The Examination of Richard Cleybrook, of Ballyellis, in the County of Wexford, Farmer.

Ex. 54. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That he heard Luke Toole say, that he intended soon after to march to Killeothery and take it, and afterwards to come to Dublin and take the castle there, and that he would not leave an Englishman or English-woman in the kingdom, but they all should be banished, and that he would not leave an English beast alive, or any of the breed of them.

He saith also, that he heard the said Luke Toole say, that he would have his own religion settled in this kingdom, and that he would pull the Lord Parsons hat from his head.

RICHARD *u* CLEYBROOK,
his mark.

Coram me.

JA. WARE.

The Examination of Margaret Farmeny and Margaret Leadley, Widdows, both of Acrashaniey, in the Parish of Clowish, and County of Fermanagh.

Ex. 55. These examines, duely sworne *inter alia*, depose, That on the 23d day of October last, the rebels in that county, to the number of an hundred, or thereabouts, robbed the deponents of their goods and chattells, and bound their hands behind them, urging them confesse money. And that the said rebels bound one of the deponents husbands, and led and dragged him up and down in a rope, and cut his throat in her

sight with a skean, having first knocked him down and stript him. And at the same time murdered 14 persons more, all English protestants; the said rebels then allcading, that they had the kings broad seal to strip and starve all the English, and that they were his souldiers. And as the deponents fled for succour towards Dublin, they were stripped on the way by the Irish seven times in one day, and left stark naked, being aged women of 75 yeers old; and the rebels that saw the deponents naked, bid them go and look for their God, and let him give them clothes.

Jur. 3. Jan. 1641.

JOHN STERNE, WILL. HITCHCOCK.

The Examination of Henry Fisher, of Powerscourt, in the County of Wicklow.

Ex. 56. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth, *inter alia*, That Luke Toole, chief of the rebels in those parts, said, That there was landed at Wexford nineteen thousand of the Spanish enemy: whereupon, they leaped and danced for joy.

And this examine further deposeth, That Bryan Lynch, of Powerscourt, revolted and fell from the protestant religion to masse; and the said Linch, with severall other rebels, entered the parish church of Powerscourt, called Staggonnell, and burnt up pues, pulpits, chests, and bibles, belonging to the said church, with extreme violence and triumph, and expression of hatred to religion; and this convert, Linch, strongly laboured to have this deponent hanged.

HEN. FISHER.

Jur. Jan. 25, 1641.

JOHN STERNE, WILL. HITCHCOCK.

The Examination of Adam Glover, of Slonasy, in the County of Cavan.

Ex. 57. This examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That this deponent and his company that were robbed, observed, that 30 persons, or thereabouts, were then most barbarously murdered and slain outright, and about a hundred and fifty more persons cruelly wounded, so that traces of blood issuing from their wounds lay upon the highway for 12 miles together, and many very young children were left and perished by the way, to the number of sixty, or thereabouts, because the cruell pursuit of the rebels was such, that their parents and friends could not carry them further. And further saith, that some of the rebels vowed, that, if any digged graves, wherein to bury the dead children, they should be buried therein themselves; so the poor people left the most of them unburied, exposed to ravenous beasts and fowl; and some few their parents carried a great way to bury them, after they were dead; and some were hid in bushes, that the rebels should not find them. And this deponent further saith, that he saw upon the highway a woman left by the rebels, stripped to her smock, set upon by three women and some children, being Irish, who miserably rent and tore the said poor English woman, and stripped her of her smock, in a bitter frost and snow, so that she fell in labour in their hands and presence, and both she and her childe miserably died there.

And this examine further deposeth, That James o Rely, of or neer to the parish of Ballybeys, yeoman, and Hugh Brady, of or neer the parish of Urnagh, and divers others of the rebels, did then often take into their hands the protestant bibles, and wetting them in the dirty water, did five or six several times dash the same on the face of this deponent and other protestants, saying, Come, I know you love a good lesson,

here is a most excellent one for you; and come to-morrow, and you shall have as good a sermon as this; and used other scornfull and disgracefull words unto them.

And further saith, That one Owen Brady, of the parish of Armagh, gent. being one of the principal guard to Philip mac Hugh mac Shane ô Rely, did take divers protestants (as they went by their court of guard to the church) by the hair of the head, and in other cruell manner, and, dragging them into the church, there stripped, robbed, whipped, and most cruelly used them, saying, If you come to-morrow, you shall hear the like sermon, or to that effect, with other scornfull and opprobrious words.

The mark of ADAM GLOVER.

Deposed before us, Jan. 4, 1641.

HEN. JONES, RANDALL ADAMS.

The Examination of Elizabeth Tayler, Wife of John Tayler, of the Newtowne, alias Castlecool, in the parish of Drumuly, and Half-barony of the Coole and County of Fermanagh, Weaver.

Ex. 58. This deponent, being duly sworn, deposeth, That (*inter alia*) she and her said husband, with the rest of her neighbours, fled for the more safety of their lives into the church of the Newtown, being a fair church, new built by the inhabitants of that parish, and there remained, untill the Monday following, being the 25th of October last, when, about ten of the clock in the forenoon, Captain Rory mac Quire, brother to the Lord Magwire, where they so were, came, accompanied with a great multitude of Irish, to the number of one thousand persons, and upwards; which they not being able to resist, upon his faithfull promises that they should quietly enjoy their town, and receive no harm, they let him and his company into the said church, whereinto he had no sooner entred, but, in contempt of God and his sacred word, he went up into the pulpit, and took down the English Bible that was there, and rent and tore the same in pieces, and he and his company trampled the same under their feet, and then perfidiously fell upon the English, and rifled and stript them naked, and turned them out of the town, and fired and burnt the same down.

ELIZ. TAYLOR, & her mark.

Deposed before us, Jan. 8, 1641.

HEN. JONES, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of Edward Slack, of Gurteen, in the County of Fermanagh, Clerk.

Ex. 59. The examine, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That, on the 24th of October last, the rebels in the county of Fermanagh aforesaid, took his Bible, opened it, and laying the open side of it in a puddle of water, leapt and trampled upon it, saying, A plague on't, this Bible hath bred all the quarrel; and they hoped that, within three weeks, all the Bibles in Ireland should be used as that was, or worse; and that none should be left in the kingdom; and also, that the said rebels burnt this deponent's house, and after, some other rebels cut and wounded him twice in the head.

EDW. SLACK.

Deposed before us, 4 Jan. 1641.

HEN. JONES, WILL. ALDRICH.

The Examination of Edward Dean, late of Oghram, in the County of Wicklow, Tanner.

Ex. 60. This examinee, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That the Irish rebels made proclamation, That all English men and women, that did not depart the country within twenty-four hours, should be hanged, drawn, and quartered, and that the Irish houses that kept any of the English children should be burned.

And further saith, That the said rebels burned two protestant Bibles, and then said that it was hell-fire that burnt.

EDW. DEAN.

Jur. 7 Jan. 1641, coram nobis.

ROGER PUTTOCK, JOHN WATSON.

The Examination of Katherine Bellew, alias Bedlew, late of Blittock, in the County of Monaghan, Widdow.

Ex. 61. This deponent being duly sworn (*inter alia*), deposeth, That one Mistresse Elcock, who, being in child-bed, was, nevertheless, carried away to prison, together with the Lady Blaney and her seven children.

The τ mark of the said KATHERINE.

Jurat. 5 Febr. 1641, coram nobis.

WILL. ALDRICH, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of John Wisdome, of Ardmagh, Parish Clerk of the Cathedrall there.

Ex. 62. This examinee, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That at Loughgall, in the county of Ardmagh, the English being promised a safe conduct by the rebels, from garrison to garrison, till they came to the next haven, and there to take shipping for their own country, by the way some of them were murdered, viz. Master William Fullarton, parson of Loughgall, and two or three others, as the deponent heard, the rest which they found at Loughgall, and about the country there, to the number of eightscore persons, which they drowned at Port-a-down bridge, as the deponent is informed by one William Pitchfork, that was present at their suffering, but escaped himself, being begged by an Irish rebel to be his servant; and, about the same time, they fired many in one house near Ardmagh.

And this deponent further saith, That Master Roger Holland related to him that he was told by one John Babe, an owner of a boat in Carlingford, that Mistris Holland was hanged at Carlingford, and delivered of a child while hanging.

And further, this examinee saith, That he was credibly informed by Master Franklin, of Dublin, who came part of the way towards Dublin in the deponent's company, That, at the Newry, a man was carried out, and so wounded, that he was laid for dead, but, after recovering, he was again set upon and murdered; and his wife also having her belly ript up, and two children fell out.

And the examinee further saith, That at the Corr, in the county of Armagh, there

were drowned at once one hundred and twenty persons, men, women, and children, which the deponent heard from master Holland aforesaid.

JOHN WISDOME.

Jur. 8 Feb. 1641, coram nobis,
ROGER PUTTOCK, HEN. JONES.

The Examination of Philip Taylor, late of Port-a-down, in the County of Armagh, Husbandman.

Ex. 63. This examinee, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That, about the 24th of October, he was taken prisoner at Port-a-down aforesaid, by Tool mac Cann, now of Port-a-down, gentleman, a notorious rebel, and a commander of a great number of rebels, together with those rebels, his soldiers, to the number of a hundred persons, or thereabouts; at which time the rebels first took the castle and victualled it, then they assaulted and pillaged the town, and burnt all the houses on the further side of the water; and then the said rebels drowned a great number of English protestants, of men, women, and children, in this deponent's sight, some with their hands tyed on their backs.

And this deponent further saith, That the number of them that were drowned then amounted to an hundred ninety and six persons, as this deponent hath been credibly informed; and the same rebels then also threatened to shoot to death one Master Tiffin, a zealous protestant minister there, and discharged a peece a him accordingly, but, as it pleased God, they mist him, and at length he escaped from them.

And the deponent further saith, That the said rebels kept this deponent in prison at Port-a-down aforesaid, for the space of seven weeks, and set a horse lock upon his leg; but at length he got a passe from the said Tool mac Cann, and so got away from them: but whilst he staid there, many poor protestants were by the rebels murdered in severall places about Loughgall. And they also that time stript off the cloaths of one Master Jones, a minister at Segoe, neer Port-a-down aforesaid, who afterwards escaped from them to the town of Lisnegarvey.

And the deponent further saith, That he hath credibly heard, that one Master Fullarton, a minister, and another in his company, were also murdered by the rebels, before the drowning of the protestants aforesaid; and that the rebels aforesaid killed a dyer's wife, of Rossetrever, at Newry, and ript up her belly, she being with child of two children, and threw her and the children into a ditch, and this deponent drove a sow away that was eating one of the children.

Sig. PHILIP TAYLOR.

Jur. 8 Febr. 1641.

WILLIAM ALDRICH, JOHN WATSON.

The Examination of John Mandefield, late of Miltown, in the County of Dublin, Barber-Chirurgeon.

Ex. 64. The deponent, being duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That some of the rebels in that county did strike his wife, and stab her with a skean in the breast, when she had a young childe sucking on her, which wound this deponent, being a chirurgeon, with much difficulty healed.

JOHN MANDEFIELD.

Jur. 3 Feb. 1641, coram nobis.
HEN. JONES, WILL. HITCHCOCK

The Examination of Margaret Stoaks, the Wife of Hugh Stoaks, late of Clonkelly, in the County of Fermanagh.

Ex. 65. The said deponent, being duly sworn, *inter alia*, deposeth, That whilst she was in the said county, she heard credibly among the Irish, and observed by their discourses one with another, that the castle of Lissegoal, neer Eniskillin, (which belonged to the Lord Hastings, and wherein one Master Segrave dwelt,) was burned by the rebels, with all the English and Scots that were therein, which were very many; and that almost all the English and Scots that dwelt in Magberboy were likewise killed and robbed by the rebels; and that there was a woman, who, when the said castle was a fire, let down through a window her young childe, whom she gave suck unto, and after leapt out of the window herself, which the rebels observing, presently killed the said woman, and the next morning, finding the young childe alive, sucking the dead mother's breast, they cruelly murdered the childe.

This deponent further saith, That as she was coming on the way to Dublin, at Ballybayes, she heard for certain, that handicraftsmen and tradesmen, and others of the English that were remaining at Belturbart, were killed and murdered by the rebels about the last of January last past, and the rebels hanged the men and drowned the women and children.

The deponent further saith, That when the rebels, or any of them, had killed any Englishman in the country, many others of them would come one after another, and every of them would in most cruell manner, stab, wound, and cut him, and almost mangle him; and to shew their further malice, would not suffer nor permit any to bury them, but would have them to lye naked for the dogs, beasts, and fowles of the aire to devoure them.

The deponent further saith, When they had so killed the English, they would reckon up and accompt the number of them, and in rejoycing and boasting manner would often say, that they had made the divell beholding to them in sending so many souls to him to hell.

The deponent likewise saith, *inter alia*, That as she was coming towards Dublin about Dunshaglin, the rebels that were in garrison there said unto her, that if they thought she and her children had but one drop of English blood in them, they would kill both her and her children.

MARGARET STOAKS.

Jurat. coram.

GERRARDO LOUTHER.

The Examination of Mary Woods, late of the Town and County of Killare, Widdow.

Ex. This examinee, being duly sworn and examined, *inter alia*, saith, That since the beginning of this present rebellion, she hath been stripped and robbed of her goods by the rebels in those parts, since which time the bodies of severall deceased protestants, buried in the church there, were taken up and thrown away into filthy places, exposed to be devoured of dogs, and other beasts, which was done partly by the commandment or direction of James Dempsey, a priest, Peter Sarsfield, Thomas Fitz Gerald, James Flatisbury, and John Leighe, Esquires, and others whom she knoweth not.

And further saith, That the said rebels and others about that town, did of late first strip her husband of cloaths, and after stabbed him, and after that shot him, and last

of all most barbarously buried him alive, where he remained with earth upon him above an hour before the breath went from him.

Sig : præ : ANNE WOODS.

Jur. 23d Feb. 1641. Coram nobis.

JOHN WATSON, JOHN STERNE.

The Examination of Thomas Huetsen, of the Town and County of Kildare.

Ex. 67. This deponent, being duly sworn and examined, deposeth, That (*inter alia*) about a moneth or three weeks since, one John Courtis, of Kildare aforesaid, weaver, and Martin Courtis his sonne, Walter White of the same, labourer, Bonaventure Berry, of the same town, the reputed son of Will. Berry, of the same town, a popish priest, and Tho. Berry, of Kildare aforesaid, neer kinsman to the said priest, and divers other rebels of the Irish, did in the cathedral church of Kildare aforesaid, dig the graves of Dominick Huetsen, this deponent's brother, who had been buried about 20 months before, and Christian Huetsen, the deponent's grandmother, who had bin buried about a week before, and took their corps out of the same graves and church, and laid them both in a hole which they digged up for that purpose, withjn a garden, out of the walls of the church yard, which was done by the command or procurement of Rosse mac Geoghegan, titular bishop of Kildare, James Dempsie, the popish vicar generall there, the foresaid William Berry, priest, Dominick Dempsie, guardian to the fryars there, James Flanagan, a fryar, Bryan ô Gormooley, a fryar, and other fryars whose names he now remembreth not.

And the deponent also saith, That the said Berry, the priest, brought this deponent before the said titular bishop, and informed him, that the deponent was looking at the church window when the corps of his said brother and grandmother were taking up, and that he there writ down the names of those parties that so took them up, and so desired to know what must be done with this deponent, who answered, That if he found that report to be true, or that this deponent should do any thing against their catholick cause, he would imprison and hang him.

And this deponent further saith, That the parties above named, with divers others of the town of Kildare, said, that they could not sanctifie nor hallow the said church of Kildare, untill the heretickes bones were removed out of it.

THOMAS HUETSON.

Jur. 15th Feb. 1641.

ROGER PUTTOCK, WILLIAM ALDRICH.

The Examination of Rebecca Collis, late of the Town and County of Kildare.

Ex. 69. This deponent, being duly sworn and examined, deposeth, That since the beginning of this rebellion, she and her husband have been robbed and despoiled of their goods by the rebels in those parts. And further saith, That about Christmas last, the titular bishop of Kildare, the guardian, and other priests and fryars there, did take away the chapter-chest belonging to the cathedrall church of Kildare, and did cause the same to be carryed to the house of Peter Sarsfeild, of Tully, Esquire; and shortly after a consultation had amongst the said Peter Sarsfeild, James Flatisbury, Thomas Fitz-Gerald, John Leigh, Esquires, James Dempsie, vicar generall to the said titular bishop, by whose directions or command the dead bodies of divers deceased

protestants were digged out of the church of Kildare, and cast into a filthy ditch, to be devoured by beasts and dogs.

REBECCA COLLIS.

Jur. 23d Feb. 1641. *coram nobis.*

JOHN STERNE, WILLIAM ALDRICH.

The Examination of Margaret Parkin, of Newtowne, in the County of Fermanagh, Widdow.

Ex. 69. This deponent, being duly sworn and examined, deposeth *inter alia*, That, by the information of divers credible persons, she understood that the rebels boyled a young childe to death in a great kete in the church at Newtown aforesaid.

MARGARET PARKIN.

Jur. 19th Jan. 1641.

ROGER PUTTOCK, WILLIAM ALDRICH.

The Examination of Elizabeth Bairsec, of Newtown, in the County of Fermanagh.

Ex. 70. The deponent, being duly sworn (*inter alia*,) deposeth, That she was credibly informed by a great number of people of Newtown aforesaid, that about the 23d of October last, or since, the rebels did boyl a childe of one John Strettons, about 12 years old, to death.

ELIZABETH BAIRSEE.

Jur. 19th Jan. 1641.

ROGER PUTTOCK, JOHN STERNE.

The Examination of Henry Boyne, late of Mullaghtean, in the County of Tyrone, Clerke.

Ex. 71. This deponent being duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, and further saith, That as he was come to his own house, he found there an Irish woman that was come (out of good will) from Donaghmore, about sixe miles distant from his said house, to tell the deponents wife, that it were best for the deponent to be gone, least he might be killed, for (as the said woman related) the rebels there had cut off one Master Madders head, a minister, and that their chief malice was against church-men.

HENRY BOYNE.

Jur. 16th Feb. 1641.

ROGER PUTTOCK, JOHN STERNE.

The Examination of Elizabeth Trafford, late Wife of Thomas Trafford, late Vicar of Ballincormock, in the County of Longford, Clerke.

Ex. 72. This deponent being duly sworn, deposeth (*inter alia*,) That since the beginning of this rebellion, the rebels in those parts robbed and stript her and her said husband of all their goods and cloaths; and then one of the rebels, called John Raynolds, stabbed her husband with a sword, whereof he lay languishing three houres, and then the rebels stabbed him into the throat, and wounded him in the head, so that he dyed, and then turned her and her poor children naked away, exposed to

hunger and cold. And at the same time, the said rebels, or some of them, stabbed and killed one Francis Marshall, merchant, Matthew Baker, vintner, John Smith, Thomas Allen, John a butcher, and another who was a sadler, another that was a millner, and by report divers others.

And further deposeth, That the rebels said, that it was the king's pleasure that all the English should be banished, and loose their goods, because the queen's priest was hanged before her face.

ELIZ. TRAFFORD.

Jur. 8th Jan. 1641. Coram.

HENRY JONES, JOHN WATSON.

The Examination of Margery Sharp, late Wife to John Sharp, of Kells, in the County and Diocese of Meath, Minister of God's Word.

Ex. 73. This deponent, being duly sworn and examined, deposeth *inter alia*, That her said husband was by the rebels in those parts wounded, that he was deprived of his life; but in such a blessed manner that God gave him strength to pray unto him, and to expresse himself, and being ready to die, another company of Irish rebels came and wilfully murthered him in the same place where they found him, being coming towards Dublin to seek for refuge; and after breath was departed from him, this deponent sought to have him buryed in Christian buryall, which the portreiffe or suffraigne of the Navan would not admit, but sent to cause the grave to be made in the same place where he was murthered. And further saith, that before her said husband was murthered, he carryed away, for fear of the rebels, a good number of his best divinity books, and divers bonds, specialties, and writings. And she further saith, that the souldiers, under the command of the rebel Capt. ò Rely, meeting with him, stripped him of all his cloathes, and inforced him, being naked, to trample and tread upon his said books and papers in the water to spoil them, and then the said rebels threw them away, and tossed many of them in the winde.

Sign. præd. MARGERY.

Jur. 29th Jan. 1641.

JOHN STERNE, WILLIAM HITCHCOCK.

The Examination of Reynold Griffith, late of Tandergee, in the County of Armagh.

Ex. 74. This deponent, being duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, and further saith, That neer the Newry severall rebells took from this deponent's wife, a childe of hers of 14 years of age, and drowned it in a bog or pit, and held it down before her face with a sword whilst the said childe was a drowning.

REYNOLD GRIFFITH and ELIZ. his Wife.

Jur. Jan. 6, 1641.

JOHN STERNE, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of Charles Campbell, late of Shamulloghe, in the Parish of Clonnisse, in the County of Monaghan, Gentleman.

Ex. 75. This deponent, being duly sworn and examined, deposeth *inter alia*, That the said deponent likewise, whilst he was amongst the rebells, observed these severall passages ensuing, *viz.* First, the burning of the castle of Lisgowle, in the county of

Fermanagh, containing the number of seven score persons, men, women, and children, whereof none escaped death, except one man who was taken prisoner; which cruelty severall of the mac Mahons and mac Guires did confesse to this deponent; one Cassedy, a frier, being the chief instrument thereof. Another priest also, one Philip mac Enany, told this deponent, that it was no sinne to kill all the protestants, for that they were all damned already. And the said deponent was an ocular witsesse of the hanging and killing of thirty persons in one day, at Clonnisce, by Patrick oge mac Rosse mac Guire, Rory mac Mahon, Patrick mac Aperson ô Connelly, and severall others, the said deponent being likewise upon the ladder with a wyth about his neck, ready to be cast off, but delivered by the intercession of the said Rory mac Mahon and his wife. Afterwards this deponent, with Robert Aldrich and Matthew Brown, being then prisoners with the said deponent, were sent unto the siege of Drogheda by captain Rory mac Mahon his wife, conducted by an hundred rebels, or thereabouts, where they remained for the space of three weeks, untill this deponent's escape. In which time aforesaid, one Eyer mac Mahon, brother to captain Redmond mac Mahon, told this deponent, that there was not a Roman catholique in Ireland that could dispend ten pounds per an. but was accessory to the rebellious plot. This deponent likewise heard severall of the mac Mahons affirm, that the Earl of Antrim was also guilty of the said plot: and this deponent was credibly informed, that with Sir Phelim ô Neal were conversant the Lord of Gurmanston, the Lord Nettervyle, the Lord Lowth, with many other the chief gentry of the pale; and did see the Lord of Dunsany frequent the said rebels company, and that the counties of Meath and Lowth did furnish the rebels there with all sorts of victualls and such necessities.

CH. CAMPBELL.

Jur. 2. Martii, 1641.

JOHN STERNE, WILLIAM HITCHCOCK.

The Examination of Alexander Creighton, late of Glasloghe, in the County of Monaghan, Gent.

Ex. 76. This deponent, being duly sworn and examined (*inter alia*) deposeth, and further saith, That when he, this deponent, was so robbed by the rebels, they imprisoned him and his brother-in-law, Andrew Lesk, Alexander Bailie, James Anderson, John Mewhead his son, Alexander Ballengall, and his son William, and kept them there in Glaslogh castle for 14 dayes, or thereabouts, in great misery, neither suffering their wives or friends to come and bring them relief. From thence the rebels sent them to the gaole of Monaghan for 14 dayes more, where they were in no lesser misery than before; from thence they were sent back to Glaslogh aforesaid, and there Art mac Bryan ô Samogh mac Maghan did gather all the whole British prisoners, aswel those aforesaid, as others, to the number of twenty-two, or thereabouts, and sent them to Corbridge; but in there going, another company, by the direction of the said Art mac Bryan, way-layd them, and slew sixteen of them, and the next morning murdered forty-six more English at Corbridge aforesaid; where this deponent escaping with his life, was admitted to go to Sir Phelim ô Neal, who gave him a protection for himself, his wife, and childe. And then this deponent heard the said Sir Phelim say, that he would make no man account for what he did, and that he had his majesties commission for what he did under the great seal of England; and being asked who did put Master Richard Blany, senescall to the Lord Blany, and one of the knights of the shire, to death, because it was reported that one Art mac Bryan ô Samagh mac Maghan put him to death, he answered, Let not that gentleman be blamed, for my hand signed the warrant for his hanging, for the prosecuting of my cousen ô Rely. And further saith, that there

were killed by the name or sept of the δ Hughes, twelve families of men, women, and children of English and Scottish protestants; and that Edmond Boy δ Hugh, foster-brother to the said Sir Phelim δ Neal, did at Kinard, at the entry of the said Sir Phelim's gate, shoot to death with a brace of bullets, behind his back, the Lord Cawlfeld; and that night after killed seven families of English men, women, and children that lived on the land of the said Sir Phelim. And, as this deponent hath heard, there were above twenty families slain betwixt Kinnard and Armagh by the rebels. And after the repulse given at Lisnegarvy, Shane oge mac Canna, and a company of rebels under his command, marched thorow all the barony of Trough, in the county of Monaghan, and murdered a great number of British protestants; amongst others, Ensign Peirce, gentleman, Ambrose Blany, gentleman, William Challengwood, gentleman, and William his sonne, David Draynan, gentleman, Andrew Carr, weaver, John Lasley, labourer, and his wife.

And this deponent heard it credibly reported amongst the rebels at Glaslogh aforesaid, that Hugh mack δ Degan mac Guire, a priest, had done a most meritorious act in the parish of Glanally and county of Fermanagh, in drawing betwixt 40 and 50 of the English and Scottish there to reconciliation with the church of Rome, and after giving them the sacrament, demanded of them whether Christs body was really in the sacrament or no, and they said, yea. And that he demanded of them further, whether they held the pope to be supreme head of the church, they likewise answered he was. And that thereupon he presently told them they were in a good faith, and for fear they should fall from it and turn hereticks, he and the rest that were with him, cut all their throats.

And this deponent further saith, that the wife of master Luke Ward told him, that the rebels had forced her husband to be drunk in drinking of his part of 3s. in drink, and that they, when he was so drunk, hanged him, and she shewed this deponent the place where he was executed.

• And saith also, that the rebels pulled up and took away the seats in the church of Monaghan up to the quire, and carried them to the gaol, and made fires with them for the friers, and that the rebels did, at Glaslogh aforesaid, burn two or three bibles or service books, and heard them say, they would never lay down arms till their church were put into its due place, and that all the plantation lands were given to the right owners; and that if they had once gotten the city of Dublin taken, they would hold it no rebellion to follow the kings sword, in doing any act they pleased; and this deponent heard Brian δ Hugh, priest to the said Phelim δ Neal, say, that they had fifteen hundred thousand of the Irish blood to maintain their wars begun; and the said Alexander further deposeth, that about the beginning of Feb. last, one Ensign William Pew, of Glaslogh, in the county of Monaghan, being stripped, robbed, and expelled by the rebels, was seven times in one day taken up and hanged on a tree, and taken down again for dead every time by Patrick Duff, mac Hugh, mac Rosse, a captain of the rebels near Monaghan; which cruelty was practised by the instigation of Patrick Mother mac Wade, who had informed that the said William Pew had monies, the confession and knowledge whereof was intended to be extracted by the foresaid hard usage.

ALEXANDER CREICHTON.

Jur. primo Martii, 1641.

JOHN STERNE, WILLIAM HITCHCOCK.

The Examination of Roger Holland, of Glaslogh, in the County of Monaghan.

Ex. 77. The examinee, duly sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That during his imprisonment he was credibly informed, that there were 38 persons, men, women, and children

drown'd, being thrown over into the river of Corr Bridge, in the county of Armagh; and also saith, that Sir Phelim ô Neal, under pretence of sending a convoy with many of the English of Logh gall, and thereabouts, the said convoy did drown at the bridge of Pontie Down, 68 persons, as he is credibly informed; and likewise, that he did see 14 or 15 kill'd by the Irish as he passed in the country.

And further saith, That friar Malone, when this examine arrived at Skerries, that his company shot one shot at the vessel, and that the said company asked whether we had a passe or not, which we told them we had; whereupon they replied, that if we had not we should all suffer; but so soon as we shewed them our passe, they made much of us, and told us that we should take no hurt; which they performed the next day, being Christmas-day.

The said friar took a boat to go to the boat, to see whether there were a leak in our vessell or not, and searching for the leak, he found some bibles and other prayer-books, which said books he cast into the fire, and wished that he had all the bibles in Christendom, and he would serve them all so; and demanding of him what was the reason he answered, that it was fitting for every man to have the bible by rote, and not to misinstruct them which should have it by rote; and the said Roger sitting by him alone, demanded of him, what might be the reason of their going out in such manner, as in killing and robbing the English, and perswading him to make peace; he replied, unlesse all men that had estates lost, by the kings giving them unto great men, that were little worth in former times, unlesse they had their estates given under the kings broad-seal, that they would never yield; and withall, if they had not the Duke of York for their govenour and ruler in this kingdom, and to be a papist, they would never yield as aforesaid. And further said, that they would have the whole kingdom to themselves, and that they have been about this plot this seventeen yeers past, but never had so fit an opportunity as now they had.

And the said Roger saith further, that, being in company with Colonell Pluncket, at Newry and Carlingford, the said colonell told the said Roger and many others, that this said plot was for these seventeen yeers past in plotting, and that the said fryar Malone and himself, and one of the Lord of Trimbortons sonnes, which is a fryer, with many others of the nobility of the pale, and in the north, knew it of long time, but that others of the nobles knew not of it, but of late; but as for the rest they have known of it the space and yeers aforesaid; and that they said they would have their religion or not any, or else that they would loose both their lives and estates, for in strength they were able enough, for he said all the Irish would not fail, but stick close to them, for they fought for God and their country, for certain they knew that their cause was just, and that God would not see them suffer, and that they were sure of Dublin, for there was not any thing done, but that they had such friends that they heard out of Dublin every day; and as for Sir Phelim ô Neil, he made no accompt, as he said, of all Ireland to be his own, and others, for that was their intents.

And further saith, that at Carlingford, when the aforesaid Roger was there three or four days, Sir Con Magenis sent his warrant to send away all such prisoners as came from Newry over to Green-castle; which warrant was directed to one Jo. Babe, provost-marshall, directed by Sir Con Magenis; which provost-marshall, according to his direction, sent them away; which prisoners were sent for the releasing of some prisoners that were taken at Down-Patrick: but no sooner came the foresaid prisoners unto Green-castle, but they were all cut off; and the next day following, the said Sir Con Magenis sent a convoy with all such prisoners as were there left; and what became of them this examine cannot tell.

And further saith, that an owner of a boat in Carlingford told him, that one Mrs

Holland was hang'd; and as she was hanging, was deliver'd of two children; and further cannot say.

ROGER HOLLAND.

Jurat. this 4th of March, 1641.

WILLIAM ALDRICH, HEN. BRERETON.

The Examination of George Cottingham, Parson of Monaghan.

Ex. 78. This examine, duely sworn, deposeth *inter alia*, That about the 30th day of October, this examine, with most of the English, was cast into the dungeon, which was a place of that noysomenesse, by reason of great heaps of mens excrements, that had been there a long time, that they were almost stifled. The dungeon was so little and the people so many (being some fourty eight persons,) that they were fain to lie one upon another; so that the examine, after he had been some seventeen dayes, sometimes in the dungeon, sometimes in the gaol, got such a loosenesse, with cold and hard lodging, that he was not able to go, but as he was carried betwixt men. During their continuance in this miserable restraint, no meat was allowed the prisoners by the rebels, neither would they scarce suffer either their wives or friends to see or speak with them; but oftentimes, both in the night and day, severall of the rebels came to the prisoners with swords and skeans drawn, with pistols cocked, to the great terrour of the prisoners: and some came often and searched them; and if they found any silver, either more or lesse, they took it from them, and stripped them of their cloaths, in the very dungeon, and left many almost naked, with few or no rags to cover them: And when these prisoners were set at liberty, soon after many were murthered with skeans, some drowned, and some hang'd. Master Richard Blaney, who was prisoner in another place, being bolted with irons, was taken forth suddenly and hang'd, and cast into a kind of boggie place, without buriall, stark naked. The same day, one Master Luke Ward was taken and hang'd in the same town of Monaghan, in the beginning of the night, and was never told he should die; but being taken by one Patrick oge ô Connelley, was brought into a house in town, and there Patrick gave him worth 12d. or more of drink, as though no hurt were intended, presently went to the back-side, and called out the said Luke Ward, and, with others of his company, laid hold on him, and hang'd him, and after threw him into a little river, where he lay naked and unburied. The next morning, many of those that were let out of prison, being almost starved and famished, were murthered with skeans, and others drowned. Master Oliver Peirce, ensigne to the Lord Blaney, murthered with swords and skeans, Master John Francis, Edward Lewis, Richard Bollard, and William Jones, murthered with skeans and swords, and many others pursued, who escaped that night. Thomas West was never heard of since. A poor Englishman, unknown, came stragling to the town, having escaped from some other place, was hang'd.

Some of those that were imprisoned were sent out of the towne of Monaghan to Glaslough, where they had lived formerly, and there they, with others, to the number of fourty, were cast into a river at the edge of the county, men, women, and children. In the mean time, so many escaped were in great misery and fears, dayly hearing that not an English man, woman, or childe, should be left alive; that there was the like stirre in England and Scotland; and that never a protestant must be suffered to live in any of the three kingdoms; and that the seas were full of Spanish and French shipping; and that all the Irish in other parts were coming homewards to help to subdue the English in Ireland, and then they were to be in England before May, for the same purpose; and the like to be done in Scotland also. It was usually reported that none must bear rule in Ireland but only the natives; and that all the lands which were en-

joyed by any of the British must forthwith be taken from them; which was accordingly done in all parts hereabouts.

It was frequently noysed and reported that the king's majesty was dead, or not to be had; and that there was a crown consecrated for some other that should deserve it best; and when, afterwards, it was reported his majesty was in England, it was said Sir Phelim ô Neal was made generall by his majesties appointment; and that there were others that had command by the same appointment.

We dayly heard of most cruell murders of prisoners on all sides of us, besides what we saw committed in our own town. In some places neer were hanged sometimes 17, sometimes 22, at a time, as at Clownish and Carrick mac Rosse. And, within seven miles, were murthered some 25 men, women, and children, in the night; and every hour we expected the like usage, being often threatned that not any English should be left in Ireland. Convoys were sent with many, pretending to bring prisoners safe to such places as they were desired to go, and were most pitifully murthered and drowned by the way, by such as convoyed them. Others were turned out without any convoy, and so murthered.

About six weeks since, I, my wife, and four small children, with some other English, were turned out of the town of Monaghan, about three of the clock in the afternoon, the drum beating, and Art Roe mac St Patrick mac Art Moyl, who is chief governour there, went before, and declared that we must be gone forthwith, and not suffered to return, on pain of death; when we were assured, that, not past a quarter of a mile before us, there were men, with swords and with skeans, lying in wait to murther and strip us, of which we were fully assured; but it pleased God we escaped that time, by means of one Bryan mac Hugh mac Rosse mac Mahon: About a week after we had leave to come as far as within a mile of Drogheda, called Bewley; neer unto which place are encamped many rebels, which came from towards Monaghan and other places of the north; at which place Sir Phelim ô Neal was, where might be perceived, by the speeches of the rebels, that they were very confident to take Drogheda and Dublin; but, during this examinate remaining there, were driven off the walls, which they assayed to assault with scaling ladders, on Sunday last was a sennight, in the morning before day; and many (praised be God) run from the walls, and left some of their muskets and pikes behinde them, as they related amongst themselves. From thence this examine was sent into Drogheda, and a prisoner released thence for him, and from thence is gotten to Dublin by sea, with his wife and four small children, neer famished and starved, being left quite destitute of all relief for the present.

GEORGE COTTINGHAM.

Jurat. Martij 4, 1641.

HEN. JONES, WILL. ALDRICH.

And whereas the sufferings of the loyall subjects of this kingdom of Ireland do consist as in the cruelties exercised on the persons, so in the spoiling and robbing them of their estates, fortunes, and livelyhoods, whereof the said severall commissioners do authorize and require a strict inquiry to be made. And whereas, in the foregoing Remonstrance, depredation of the goods of the subjects is one part of the charge laid to these rebels, and humbly offered by the remonstrants to be considered of by the honourable House of Commons in England.

They the said remonstrants and humble petitioners, for the fortifying of that their allegation, do here withall present the generall summes of such counties, as have answered to that particular, from the 30 of December last past, untill the 8 day of March,

1641; the whole amounting unto above six hundred thirty five thousand three hundred seventy five pounds, four shillings and ninepence; the persons thereunto appearing being in all hitherto examined but six hundred and thirty seven: whereas this, by the following considerations, may be readily conceived hardly to be the five hundredth part of the full losses of the whole kingdom.

I.

For first, Out of the whole province of Munster, containing these following large and rich counties, viz. Tipperary, Limerick, Cork, Kerry, and Clare, no one hath yet appeared.

II.

Out of the whole province of Connaught, containing these counties, Roscommon, Mayo, Galway, Sligoe, and Leitrim, there have only eleven out of Leitrim given in their losses, being 1352*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.*

III.

Out of the province of Ulster, these alone have appeared themselves, viz.

		<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Out of	Lowth, 6 examinares	4332	01	04
	Cavan, 113 examinares	47418	07	00
	Fermanagh, 94 examinares	26947	10	08
	Armagh, 8 examinares	3802	12	08
	Tyron, 2 examinares	1667	00	00
	London-Derry, 1 examine	1911	00	00
	Monaghan, 31 examinares	36181	00	08
	Their losses			

None appearing out of the counties of Down, Antrim, or Donegall.

IV.

Fourthly, For the province of Leinster, the number of the examinares is as followeth:

		<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
In the	County of Dublin, 72 examin.	120032	15	03
	County of Kildare, 57 exam.	98967	17	04
	County of Wicklow, 65 exam.	132457	14	02
	County of Wexford, 38 exam.	62519	12	04
	County of Catherlagh, 16 ex.	10270	01	08
	County of Kilkenny, 5 exam.	8312	00	00
	County of Meath, 46 examin.	33678	14	03
	County of Westmeath, 7 ex.	3512	12	00
	Kings County, 9 examinares	11525	04	08
	Queens County, 14 examinares	18884	15	09
	County of Longford, 28 exam.	16440	10	08
	Their losses			

V.

Fifthly, Of those counties that have come in, one being considered with another, not the five hundredth part hath appeared, there being of them,

1. Many imprisoned or besieged by the rebels.
2. Many gone into England before the beginning of this commotion and since.
3. Multitudes murdered, and none hitherto appearing for them.
4. Many thousands, by reason of the danger of the wayes, not daring to appear.

5. Many being sick and weak, by reason of their sufferings, so not able to appear.
6. Many there are who (in time) purpose to give in the particulars of their losses, but for the present forbear, being in many respects not prepared for the doing thereof.
7. Lastly, of such as have given in their particulars, few can depose to the full of their losses, wanting the help of their papers torn from them, or of their agents, who could inform them of their estates, they being remote in the country, and there imprisoned or besieged, or, by reason of the danger of the wayes, not daring to adventure from such places of safety as they have betaken themselves unto, if perhaps they have not altogether perished by the hands of the enemy.

The same consideration may also induce any to beleieve, that of the other particulars in the said Remonstrance, either for words blasphemous against God, impious against religion, or traitorous towards his sacred majesty; or for actions, wicked, cruell, or barbarous; or for discovery of the minds and intents of these conspirators and their adherents, the least part hath been set forth in the said Remonstrance, and examinations thereunto annexed; and yet that alone is sufficient, and more than enough, to set forth the miserable condition of the poor distressed church and miserable wasted kingdom of Ireland.

Of all which, we, the commissioners aforesaid, do herein give up a true report, attested under our respective hands, this seventh of March, 1641.

HEN. JONES,
ROGER PUTTOCK,
JOHN WATSON,
JOHN STERNE,
WILLIAM ALDRICH,
RANDALL ADAMS,
WILLIAM HITCHCOCK,
HEN. BRERETON.

Murder Will Out; or, The King's Letter, justifying the Marquess of Antrim, and declaring, That what he did in the Irish Rebellion was by Direction from his Royal Father and Mother, and for the Service of the Crown.

Be astonished, O ye Heavens, at this, and be ye horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the Lord.
Jer. ii. 12.

For there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, nor any thing hid, which shall not be known, or come abroad. Mat. x. 26.

The following tract is said to have been written by the celebrated Col. Ludlow, one of the judges of Charles I. Its object is to throw upon Charles I. the guilt of the Irish rebellion, because his son, Charles II., pardoned the Marquis of Antrim, who had been an actor in it. The fullest

state of the charge against Charles is to be met with in Cook's Case, containing what would have been pleaded against him at his trial. "But I know the ingenious reader desires to hear something concerning Ireland, where there were no less than 152000 men, women, and children, most barbarously and satanically murdered, in the first four months of the rebellion, as appeared by substantial proofs, at the King's Bench, at the trial of Magwire. If the king had a hand, or but a little finger, in that massacre, every man will say, Let him die the death. But how shall we be assured of that? How can we know the tree better than by its fruits? For my own particular, I have spent many serious thoughts about it, and I desire, in doubtful cases, to give charity the upper hand; but I cannot, in my conscience, acquit him of it. Many strong presumptions, and several oaths of honest men that have seen the king's commission, cannot but amount to a clear proof. If I meet a man running down stairs with a bloody sword in his hand, and find a man stabbed in his chamber, though I did not see this man run into the body by that which I met, yet, if I were of the jury, I durst not but find him guilty of the murder: and I cannot but admire that any man should deny that for him which he never durst deny for himself. How often was that monstrous rebellion laid in his dish; and yet he durst never absolutely deny it! Never was bear so unwillingly brought to the stake as he was to declare against the rebels; and, when he did once call them rebels, he would suffer but 40 copies to be printed, and those to be sent to them sealed; and he hath since above forty times called them his subjects, and his good subjects, and sent to Ormond to give special thanks to some of (his) these rebels, as Muskerry and Plunkett (which, I am confident, by what I see of his height of spirit and undaunted resolution at his trial, and since acting the last part answerable to the former part of his life, he would rather have lost his life than to have sent thanks to two such incarnate devils, if he had not been as guilty as themselves.) Questionless, if the king had not been guilty of that blood, he would have made a thousand declarations against those blood-hounds and hell-hounds, that are not to be named but with fire and brimstone, and have sent to all princes in the world for assistance against such accursed devils in the shape of men. But he durst not offend those fiends and firebrands; for if he had, I verily believe they would soon have produced his commission, under his hand and seal of Scotland, at Edinburgh, 1641; a copy whereof is in the parliament's hands, attested by oath, dispersed by copies in Ireland, which caused the general rebellion."—*King Charles's Case, by John Cook, apud Ludlow's Memoirs, Edin. 1751-8. III. 350.*

Ireland, Aug. 22, 1663.

Ever honoured Sir,

LAST Thursday we came to tryal with my Lord Marquess of Antrim, but, according to my fears (which you always surmised to be in vain,) he was, by the king's extraordinary and peremptory letter of favour, restored to his estate, as an innocent papist. We proved eight qualifications in the act of settlement against him, the least of which made him incapable of being restored as innocent. We proved,

1. That he was to have a hand in surprising the castle of Dublin, in the year 1641.
2. That he was of the rebels party before the 15th of September, 1643, which we made appear by his hourly and frequent intercourse with Renny O Moore and many others, being himself the most notorious of the said rebels.
3. That he entered into the Roman-Catholick confederacy before the peace in 1643.
4. That he constantly adhered to the nuntio's party, in opposition to his majesties authority.
5. That he sate from time to time in the supream council of Kilkenny.
6. That he signed that execrable oath of association.
7. That he was commissioned, and acted as lieutenant general, from the said assembly at Kilkenny.
8. That he declared, by several letters of his own penning, himself in conjunction

with Owen Ro Oneale, and a constant opposer to the several peaces made by the lord lieutenant with the Irish.

We were seven hours by the clock in proving our evidence against him, but at last, the king's letter being opened and read in court, Rainsford, one of the commissioners said to us, That the king's letter on its behalf was evidence without exception, and thereupon declared him to be an innocent papist.

This cause, sir, hath (though many reflections have passed upon the commissioners before) more startled the judgments of all men, than all the tryals since the beginning of their sitting; and it is very strange and wonderful to all of the long robe, that the king should give such a letter, having divested himself of that authority, and reposed the trust in the commissioners for that purpose; and likewise it is admired, that the commissioners having taken solemn oaths to execute nothing but according to and in pursuance of the act of settlement, should, barely upon his majesties letter, declare the marquess innocent.

To be short; there never was so great a rebel that had so much favour from so good a king: And it is very evident to me, though young, and scarce yet brought upon the stage, that the consequence of these things will be very bad; and if God of his extraordinary mercy do not prevent it, war, and, if possible, greater judgments cannot be far from us; where vice is patroniz'd, and Antrim, a rebel upon record, and so lately and clearly proved one, should have no other colour for his actions but the kings own letter, which takes all imputations from Antrim, and lays them totally upon his own father.

Sir, I shall by the next, if possible, send you over one of our briefs against my lord, by some friend. It's too large for a packet, it being no less in bulk than a Book of Martyrs. I have no more at present, but refer you to the kings letter, hereto annexed.

CHARLES R.

Right trusty and well-beloved cousins and counsellors, &c. We greet you well. How far we have been from interposing on the behalf of any of our Irish subjects, who, by their miscarriages in the late rebellion in that kingdom of Ireland, had made themselves unworthy of our grace and protection, is notorious to all men; and we were so jealous in that particular, that shortly after our return into this our kingdom, when the Marquess of Antrim came hither to present his duty to us, upon the information we received from those persons who then attended us, by a deputation from our kingdom of Ireland, or from those who at that time owned our authority there, that the Marquess of Antrim had so misbehaved himself towards us, and our late royal father of blessed memory, that he was in no degree worthy of the least countenance from us, and that they had manifest and unquestionable evidence of such his guilt: Whereupon we refused to admit the said marquess so much as into our presence, but, on the contrary, committed him prisoner to our tower of London; where, after he had continued several months under a strict restraint, upon the continued information of the said persons, we sent him into Ireland, without interposing in the least on his behalf, but left him to undergo such a tryal and punishment as by the justice of that our kingdom should be found due to his crime, expecting still that some heinous matter would be objected and proved against him, to make him incapable, and to deprive him of that favour and protection from us, which we knew his former actions and services had merited. After many months attendance there, and (we presume) after such examinations as were requisite, he was at last dismissed without any censure, and without any transmission of charge against him to us, and with a licence to transport himself into this kingdom; we concluded that it was then time to give him some instance of our favour, and to remember the many services he had done, and the sufferings he had undergone, for his affections and fidelity to our royal father and our

self, and that it was time to redeem him from those calamities, which yet doe lie as heavy upon him since as before our happy return: And thereupon we recommend him to you our lieutenant, that you should move our council there, for preparing a bill to be transmitted to us, for the re-investing him the said marquess into the possession of his estate in that our kingdom, as had been done in some other cases. To which letter you our said lieutenant returned us answer, that you had informed our council of that our letter, and that you were, upon consideration thereof, unanimously of opinion that such a bill ought not to be transmitted unto us, the reason whereof would forthwith be presented to us from our council. After which time we received the inclosed petition from the said marquess, which we referred to the considerations and examinations of the lords of our privy council, whose names are mentioned in that our reference which is annexed to the said petition, who thereupon met together, and after having heard the Marquess of Antrim, did not think fit to make any report to us, till they might see and understand the reasons which induced you not to transmit the bill we had proposed, which letter was not then come to our hands; after which time we have received your letter of the 18th of March, together with severall petitions which had been presented to you, as well from the old souldiers and adventurers, as from the Lady Marchioness of Antrim, all which we likewise transmitted to the lords referees. Upon a second petition presented to us by the Lord Marquess, which is here likewise enclosed, commanding our said referees to take the same into their serious consideration, and to hear what the petitioner had to offer in his own vindication, and to report the whole matter to us, which, upon a third petition, herein likewise enclosed, we required them to expedite with what speed they could. By which deliberate proceedings of ours, you cannot but observe that no importunity, how just soever, could prevail with us to bring our self to a judgment in this affair, without very ample information. Our said referees, after severall meetings, and perusal of what hath been offered to them by the said marquess, have reported unto us,

That they have seen several letters, all of them the hand writing of our royal father, to the said marquess, and several instructions concerning his treating and joining with the Irish, in order to the king's service, by reducing to their obedience, and by drawing some forces from them for the service of Scotland. That, besides the letters and orders under his majesties hand, they have received sufficient evidence and testimony of several private messages and directions, sent from our royal father and from our royal mother, with the privy and with the directions of the king our father, by which they are persuaded, that whatever intelligence, correspondence, or actings, the said marquess had with the confederate Irish catholicks, was directed or allowed by the said letters, instructions, and directions; and that it manifestly appears to them, that the king our father was well pleased with what the marquess did, after he had done it, and approved the same.

This being the true state of the marquess his case, and there being nothing proved upon the first information against him, nor any thing contained against him in your letter of March 18, but that you were informed, he had put in his claim before the commissioners appointed for executing the act of settlement; and that if his innocency be such as is alledged, there is no need of transmitting such a bill to us as is desired; and that if he be *nocent*, it consists not with the duty which you owe to us, to transmit such a bill, as if it should pass into a law, must needs draw a great prejudice upon so many adventurers and souldiers, which are, as is alledged, to be therein concerned. We have considered of the petition of the adventurers and souldiers, which was transmitted to us by you, the equity of which consists in nothing, but that they have been peaceably in possession for the space of seven or eight years, of those lands which were formerly

the estate of the Marquess of Antrim and others, who were all engaged in the late Irish rebellion; and that they shall suffer very much and be ruined, if those lands should be taken from them. And we have likewise considered another petition from several citizens of London, near sixty in number, directed to our self, wherein they desire, that the Marquess his estate may be made liable to the payment of his just debts, that so they may not be ruined in the favour of the present possessors, who (they say) are but a few citizens and souldiers, who have disbursed very small sums thereon. Upon the whole matter, no man can think we are less engaged by our declaration, and by the act of settlement, to protect those who are innocent, and who have faithfully endeavoured to serve the crown, how unfortunate soever, than to expose to justice those who have been really and maliciously guilty. And therefore we cannot in justice, but, upon the petition of the Marquess of Antrim, and after the serious and strict inquisition into his actions, declare unto you, that we do find him innocent from any malice or rebellious purpose against the crown; and that what he did by way of correspondence or compliance with the Irish rebels, was in order to the service of our royal father, and warranted by his instructions, and the trust reposed in him, and that the benefit thereof accrued to the service of the crown, and not to the particular advantage and benefit of the Marquess. And as we cannot in justice deny him this testimony, so we require you to transmit our letter to our commissioners, that they may know our judgements in this case of the Lord of Antrims, and proceed accordingly. And so we bid you heartily farewell. Given at our court at White-Hall, July 10, in the 15th year of our reign, 1683.

To our right trusty and right entirely well-beloved Cousin and Counsellor, James Duke of Ormond, our Lieutenant General and General Governour of our Kingdom of Ireland, and to the Lords of our Council of that our Kingdom.

By his majesties command,

HENRY BENNET.

Entred at the Signet-office,
July 13, 1663.

A true and full Relation of the Horrible and Hellish Plot of the Jesuites, Popish Priests, and other Papists in Ireland, for the Massacring of the two Chiefe Justices, and all the Privie Councill and Protestants in that Kingdome, as it was related by my Lord Keeper in the House of Commons, November the First, 1641.

This is a brief account of the communication made by the Earl of Leicester to the house of commons, respecting the first discovery of the Irish rebellion, 1st November, 1641. The full detail is given in Rushworth's Collections, part III. p. 398, *et sequent.* The names in the following tract are very incorrect.

THE lord keeper declared unto the house of commons, that the lord deputy of Ireland had received a letter from the two lord chief justices and privie councill in Ireland, of

the discovery of an horrible plot by the jesuites, popish priests, and other papists in the kingdome of Ireland, for the murthering of the two chiefe justices and all the privie counsell and protestants of Ireland, as also to seaze on all the kings forts, castles, and magasens whatsoever; and moreover, that they would murther all persons that should oppose them in any of their intentions and desires, which were these:

1. First, to have their crowne not to bee dependant upon England, nor to be a conquered nation.
2. Secondly, to have their Irish laws established, and such as should bee made hereafter.
3. Thirdly, to have free liberty of the exercise of their religion.

The Earle of Leicester declared the same also, adding that hee had the originall of a proclamation which was made there, and had caused the same to be coppied out. The letter beares date the twenty third of October, 1641, declaring that Hugh Ocorett¹ went to Dublin unto the lodging of Hugh Maymubawne² his very good friend, and he and his friend going to the lodging of the Lord Marques,³ understood great store of noblemen and strangers had beene there, but they were all gone abroad, and they could not finde them; wherefore they returned backe againe to his friends lodging, where his friend revealed unto him the whole plot; but swore unto him he should not stirre till it was put into execution, and therefore his friend commanded his servants to look narrowly to him: but after a while he fained some excuse of necessity for his going downe, which his friend gave way too, but sent his servants with him; when he was come downe, the servants not being so carefull to watch him as they might have beene, he leaped over a wall in the yard and made an escape, and went to Sir John Burlacy, and discovered to him the whole plot, which was this:

That at nine of the clocke the next morning, the Irish rebels (amongst whom the Lord Marques was one of the chieftest) intended at one hower and moment of time, to massacre and murder all the English and protestants in the kingdome of Ireland, likewise to murder the two lord chiefe justices and all the privy counsell at Dublin, and at the same time, to seaze upon all the kings castles, forts, and magazens throughout the whole kingdom of Ireland, as also the castle of Dublin, and that if they should finde any of the citie that would not submit to them, then they would shoote downe from the castle, the tops of the chimneys to affright them, and if that did not prevaile, they would then batter downe their houses about their eares. Hereupon the lord chiefe justice and the rest of the privy counsell of Ireland sat all night in consultation, and tooke the best course they could imagine of for the safe-guard and security of themselves, together with the castle and city of Dublin. The next morning they apprehended great store of these traytors and rebels, together with the Lord Marquise, who was gone from his lodging before day, and hid in a cockloft, and at his lodging they found great store of chaines, hammers, and hatchets without halves. The same day they had notice of severall places and forts seased upon in Conno and Monno and other places, together with severall villages plundered by the rebels; but they wrote word that they did not beleieve that distemper was so generall as was reported to be, and then they made no question but they should with care and paines bring all to a good issue; to that end they had sent for five hundred of the horse to come and guard them at Dublin, and had likewise raised five hundred English for the sucuring of themselves and the city, and that out of those five hundred they had chosen an hundred to be put into the castle under the command of Sir Francis Welloughby, who they hoped would give a good accompt to his majesty

¹ O Conally.

² Col. Hugh Oge Mac Mahon.

³ Lord Mac Guire. There seems some reason to suspect that the blunder is here intentional, and that the word Marquis is put instead of Mac Guire, to lead the readers to infer that the person here meant was the Marquis of Antrim, afterwards pardoned by Charles II. See the preceding and subsequent tracts.

of the place fees two monthes; and in the meane time, for feare least there should be some further and worser plots then they know of, they did desire that the parliament in England would send them downe their lord lieftenant with men, money, and ammunition. They further gave us to understand, that they had taken order for their army of old souldiers, to bee in a readines, and to march in opposition to any of the rebels that should draw to a head.

A Vindication of the Royal Martyr King Charles I. from the Irish Massacre in the Year 1641, cast upon him in the Life of Richard Baxter, wrote by himself; and since in the Abridgment by E. Calamy. Being a Case of present Concern, in a Letter to a Member of the House of Commons. The Second Edition, 1704.

The passage, which called forth the resentment of the vehement loyalist who wrote the following tract, occurs in the life of the celebrated Richard Baxter, the Coryphæus of the Calvinist divines during the civil wars. "I had forgotten one passage in the former war of great remark, which put me into amazement: The Duke of Ormond and counsell had the cause of the Marquess of Antrim before them, who had been one of the Irish rebels in the beginning of that war, when in the horrid massacre two hundred thousand protestants were murdered. His estate being sequestred, he sought his restitution of it when king Charles II. was restored. Ormond and the council judged against him as one of the rebels: He brought his cause over to the king, and affirmed that what he did was by his father's consent and authority. The king referred it to some very worthy members of his privy council to examine what he had to shew: upon examination they reported that they found that he had the king's consent or letter of instructions for what he did, which amazed many: Hereupon his majesty Charles II. wrote to the Duke of Ormond and council to restore his estate, because it appeared to those appointed to examine it, that what he did was by his father's order or consent. Upon this the parliaments old adherents grew more confident than ever of the righteousness of their wars; and the very destroyers of the king (whom the first parliamentarians called rebels) did presume also to justify *their* cause, and said that the law of nature did warrant them.

"But it stopt not here: For the Lord Mazarine and others of Ireland did so far prosecute the cause, as that the Marquess of Antrim was forced to produce in the parliament of England, in the house of commons, a letter of the king's (Cha. I.) by which he gave him orders for his taking up arms: which being read in the house, did put them into a silence. But yet so egregious was their loyalty and veneration to majesty, that it put them not at all one step out of the way which they had gone in. But the people without doors did talke strangely: Some said, Did you not perswade us that the king was against the Irish rebellion? And that the rebels belied him when they said that they had his warrant or commission? Do we not now see with what mind he would have gone himself with an army into Ireland to fight against them? A great deal more not here to be mentioned was vended seditiously among the people, the sum of which was intimated in a pamphlet which was printed, called 'Murder Will Out;' in which they printed the king's letter and animadversions on it. Some, that were still loyal to the king, did wish that the king that now is had rather declared that his father did only give the Marquess of Antrim commission to raise an army as to have helped him against the Scots, and that his turning against the English protestants in Ireland, and the murdering of so many hundred thousands there, was against his will; but *quod scriptum erat, scriptum erat*. And though the old parliamentarians expounded the actions and declarations both of the then king and parliament by the commentary of this letter, yet so did not the loyal royalists; or at least thought it no reason to make any change in their judgments, or stop in their proceedings against the English presbyterians and other non-conformable protestants."—*Reliquia Baxteriana*, Lond. 1696, fol. part III. p. 83.

Sir,

Among the many lewd and poisonous pamphlets of late spread abroad to debauch the nation, there is one more particularly deserves your animadversion, and of your honourable house; at this time especially, when your yearly celebration of the memory of the royal martyr King Charles I. is near at hand.

To confront you in which, there is publish'd this same year, 1702, An Abridgment of Mr Baxter's History of his Life and Times, by Edmund Calamy, with the printer's and no less than three booksellers names affix'd to it; wherein that blessed martyr is represented as the most unnatural and bloody monster, and most harden'd hypocrite, that ever the earth bore.

For all he must be, and worse, if we could find names for it, if he was the author of, and gave commissions for the barbarous massacre of the protestants in Ireland, an. 1641, and yet shou'd stand it out and deny it, not only in his publick declarations to the world, but in his soliloquies betwixt God and his own conscience, in his *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, and even to his last breath.

Yet all this is charg'd upon him, first by Richard Baxter, that arch-rebel, who had himself borne arms against him: And now by this Calamy, in his Abridgment of Baxter's Life, ch. 4, p. 44, where blasphemously he charges the discovery of this upon Providence! For, speaking of those who thought this an horribly unjust and scandalous aspersion upon his majesty, he adds, but, as Providence ordered it, a certain memorable particularity help'd to set this matter in a true light. Then he goes on to tell what this particularity was, for which I refer you to the place, being loth to transcribe it here; but it ends and is summ'd up all in this, That the Marquess of Antrim was forced to produce in the house of commons a letter of King Charles I., by which he gave him order for the taking up arms. And for this we have nothing but Baxter's word—no journal of the house of commons, or any other authority whatsoever. And had it not been in so publick a manner expos'd, sure some other besides Baxter would have taken notice of it. Something of it would have been inserted in the journals of that house, if not the letter itself.

But suppose all this was granted, what wou'd it amount to? We must see the date of this letter, what time it was when the king gave orders to my Lord of Antrim to take up arms, and to what end it was, whether to massacre the protestants, or to assist his majesty against his bloody rebels then in arms against him in England and Scotland. We know this Marquess sent forces to the glorious Montross in Scotland, where they did eminent service in reducing the unnatural rebels there. And we doubt not but he had the king's order for it. And moreover, after the cessation made by the Duke of Ormond with the Irish, many of them returned to their duty, and fought under the said Duke, his majesty's lord lieutenant there, against the rebels. And why might not my Lord of Antrim have a commission as well as others? So that, till we see the date of these pretended orders to the Marquess of Antrim, and the contents of them, no judgment can be made. They must be sent before the massacre of 1641, to answer to the diabolical malice of these tongues set in fire of hell: Therefore let them produce their evidence.

Will it not become the justice of your house to require it? To vindicate not only the memory of him whom you celebrate as a martyr, but the honour of a former house of commons of England, who are brought in here as witnesses to so horrid a scandal thrown upon the best of kings, and grandfather to her majesty, who is reproached in him, who is her greatest glory, and of the nation; but the eternal infamy and mill-stone of that hypocritical and bloody faction, and will one day sink them, who, after having so many years abused the unparalleled goodness and condescensions of so pious and meek a king towards such incorrigible rebels, (which was his greatest fault) at last, not content to murder him, sat formally in judgment upon him by their own authority, that

they might murder the laws with him, and all that reverence which the whole world has ever paid to crowned heads or established constitutions, by such an example of a mock-court of justice as never before was seen since the earth was made! And which exceeds all this, they still glory in it, repeat it every year in their calves-head-feasts, where they sacrifice to the legion that possesses them. And not satisfied with the royal blood they have drunk, still thirst for more; in order to which, and to justify what they have done, they are never weary in raking into the ashes of this martyr for our church and our laws; they curse his memory, and blacken it with all the lies and malice of hell can invent; of which this is the greatest, to fasten the horrid massacre in Ireland upon him, against whom it was chiefly designed, and who of all mankind was most concerned for it, and was hindered from preventing or revenging it by those who accuse him for it; and seized the money and magazines he had provided for that expedition, and made use of them to carry on their own rebellion against him in England. And then their bell-weathers first invent, and then belch out their cursed lies among the people.

This particular, as to the Irish massacre, was first broached by that black saint Baxter, in his life, published since the revolution, (a proper time!) and prosecuted by Roger Cook, Oats, and the whole, &c. of the faction; but is since more impudently revived in this reign by Calamy; because that Life of Baxter, wrote by himself, (whereby his sins are kept in remembrance) has been answered; and as to this point particularly of laying the massacre in Ireland upon the king, and as to this story of the Marquess of Antrim by the Rev. Mr Long of Exeter, in his Review of Mr Baxter's Life, printed anno 1697.* To which no answer has been given by the faction, for they cannot yet repeat the same slanders over again, as this Calamy now five years after, without taking the least notice that they have been all disproved already; for it is one maxim of these saints to lie still on,—no matter for being disproved! Some will believe them,—leave those that will not; and repeat it again in the next company. Print it over and over; it will come into more hands than the defences! Their authority is sufficient with their own party, and their grave impudence with others, who cannot think mankind capable of so much devil!

Mr Long has vouched letters wrote by the king himselfe, and others by his order, to the then lords justices of Ireland, sometime before that inhumane massacre there, giving them notice of several informations he had received of some evil designs of the Irish soon to be perpetrated, and therefore commands them to be watchful over them; and brings the testimony of the Lord Primate Usher, undeniably attested for this. And though the dissenters shew greater regard to this most learned bishop than to any other of ours, yet cannot this stop their foul mouths; they answer it not, but, as I said, lye still on.

Mr Long next shews, that the rebels in Ireland did counterfeit commissions from the king, but that the forgery was found out, and that they confessed it at their deaths, as Sir Phelim O Neal, who had his life promised him at the gallows, if he would but say that he had such a commission from the king; of which I know some witness still living, and of unquestionable credit. And therefore he argues most rationally, that if they had a real commission from the king, what need had they to counterfeit such an one; and why would they not save their lives and estates by own-

* The work here mentioned is thus characterised by Baxter in his Life:—"Mr Hinckley grew more moderate, and wrote me a reconciling letter; but Long of Exeter (if fame misreport not the anonymous author) wrote so fierce a book to prove me, out of mine own writings, to be one of the worst men living on earth, full of falshoods, and old retracted lines, and half sentences, that I never saw any like it; and being overwhelmed with work, and weakness, and pains, and having least zeal to defend a person so bad as I know myself to be, I yet never answered him, it being none of the matter in controversie, whether I be good or bad, God be merciful to me a sinner."—*Reliquie Baxteriana*, III. 188.

ing of it, when tempted by those who strove to blacken the king all that they could, to justify themselves.

He tells, p. 205, That the Marquess of Antrim was not named in the histories of those times either as commander, counsellor, or confederate, till the cessation was treated of, July 19, 1643; and gives his authority. If so, he could not be concerned in the massacre of 1641, at least, not so as to be taken notice of; but so great and powerful a man as he was in that kingdom could not have been forgotten, where men of much less name were remembered as actors in that bloody tragedy. The chief of whom, the Lord Muskerry, the Lord Macguire, and Sir Phelim O Neal, did testify at their deaths, that they had no commission from the king, nor knew of any to countenance their insurrection. So that, if the Marquess of Antrim had any, he kept it to himself, and very private; for there was not a word of it till after the king was murdered.

There is not any mention made of his majesty's having the least hand in that massacre in the horrid indictment exhibited against him at his tryal. If those bloodhounds could have found the smallest semblance to have charged him with this, it would have been more to their cursed purpose than all they raked together to lay upon him. But they have since exceeded themselves in wickedness, being given up to a reprobate sense! Such hardened villains never before bore the name of Christians!

Sir, you must excuse me; I follow Dr Tillotson's advice, who truly says, in his Sermons of Education, that to reprove some sort of sins mildly is to encourage them; and that the censure ought to bear proportion to the crime. This is, as near as I can remember, his words, the book not being now with me; but I am sure I mistake not his meaning. However, it is a great truth, and a man may spare his indignation in some cases faultily. He that is not moved at the treatment these men have given to that blessed king, (and still continue to do) to this church and nation, these sixty years past, can have no natural affection, nor would have any concern, if he saw his country sink, and all the churches in the world in a flame! And such an one is not fit to live upon the face of the earth. He is no citizen of the world who has no regard to its welfare; and he can be no Christian who lays not to heart the breaches of Zion.

If these sinners shewed any signs of remorse, or repentance, reason were that we should beare with them, and though their sins be as scarlet, and not so much as named among the heathen, yet charity would plead for their forgiveness.

But when they still persist, and repeat their wickedness, and stand it out against all conviction, then the apostle directs, that such evil beasts, who are always lyars, should be rebuked sharpley. There is no other way to reclaim them, or save others from their infection.

Calamy begins his preface with the ill treatment that Mr Baxter's Narrative of his Life has met with, yet answers not a word to Mr Long's review of it, particularly as to this diabolical calumny cast upon the king in relation to the massacre in Ireland. No; but lye still on! He repeats it again, that it might not dye at this time, especially when the faction begin to be upon their mettle, and may have use for their old artillery again.

Therefore, sir, look to it in justice to the memory of the martyr, for the safety and honour of the queen, for the preservation of the peace of the nation, and for the vindication of the house of commons hereby aspersed, to have such a letter from that king laid before them as gave orders for the massacre in Ireland, and that they took no notice of it, though they were put to silence by it, as Baxter says, (in his Life, par. 3. p. 83., quoted in the Review, p. 192, 193,) and lays it upon what he calls their egregious loyalty, that they would, notwithstanding, support the monarchy in his

son K. Char. II. (as they who now re-publish the same mean it as egregiously to the rest of his posterity, for the reason is the same.) But hark to Baxter! which (letter of K. Char. I. says he) being read in the house (of commons of England) put them into a silence; but yet so egregious was their loyalty and veneration of majesty, that it put them not at all one step out of the way which they had gone in. But the people without doors talked strangely; some said, did you not persuade us that the king was against the Irish rebellion, and that the rebels belied him when they said they had his warrant or commission? Do we not now see with what mind he would have gone himself into Ireland to fight against them? Whereupon the parliament's old adherents grew more confident than ever of the righteousness of their wars; and the very destroyers of the king, whom the first parliamentarians called rebels, did presume also to justify their cause, and said, that the law of nature did warrant them.

Here is a vindication (in the third person) not only of the rebellion of this faction in 1641, but of the murder of the king in 1648. [From which some of the first saints of the presbyterians, (after they were outwitted, and wormed out by their younger brethren the independants) did endeavour, in spite, to free themselves, because not done by themselves.] And all upon account of this letter of King Charles I. to my Lord of Antrim. Therefore, sir, I hope it will appear incumbent upon your honourable house to examine into this material point, before the nation be too far infected, and more be found to feast at the Calves-head-clubbs, on the 30th of January, than to fast with you. It would set your teeth on edge to hear how this story of the Marquess of Antrim, since this last reviving of it, is carried about the party, and lapped like sweet-milk! And many who have not enquired into it know not what to say to it, and are deluded by it. I assure you it does great mischief, and tends to alienate the affections of the people from her present majesty, the whole race of that royal martyr, and monarchy in general; which are the uses the faction do make of it.

Now, sir, paper-defences come but to a few hands, and are well considered by fewer. Besides that this industrious party do print upon a publicke stocke, and have methods of dispersing their books which others have not; for, besides what they can allow to give away, and are directed to whom, they leave books at private houses, with sufficient time to peruse them, and then to return either the book or the money.

Therefore I know no way to stop the spreading of this most malicious and false story, but your honourable house taking it into consideration, and examining the bottom of it; then let the faction produce their evidence before you, and let the nation have their decision from thence.

Baxter quotes no other authority for it than a false and malicious pamphlet, called *Murder will Out*, supposed to be writ by Ludlow, one of the regicides, who not only sat in that execrable high court of justice, but was one of those who actually signed the sentence against the king for the cutting off of his head; the same who was (whileom) sent for over hither to be made a major-general, but that age of reviling and trampling upon martyrs for church or laws is over, blessed be God. When Dr Oats could be admitted to present volumes of his Billingsgate, in the Calves-head cant, against him, whom he stiled of notorious memory, (like Baxter's egregious loyalty) and was graciously received with, I thank you, good doctor! by some body that loved none of the martyr's family but one who did not deserve it.

Now, sir, since the whole of this story must centre in Baxter's authority, I desire to be heard a few words as to his credit, for I am of council for the defendant, the poore martyred king.

First, Baxter is no equal witness, he pleads for himself. He was an active rebel against this good king during that whole rebellion; and even after he was so bar-

barously murder'd, this same Baxter did canonize those as saints who brought him to the block.

This he did, in his *Saints Everlasting Rest*, in the edition of it printed *anno* 1649, page 83, and in the edition, 1652, part I. page 101, where, describing the joys of heaven, from the blessed company that is there, he says, "I think, Christians, this will be a more honourable assembly than ever you here beheld, and a more happy society than you were ever of before. Surely Brook, and Pim, and Hamden, and White, &c. are now members of a more knowing, unerring, well-ordered, right-aiming, self-denying, unanimous, honourable, triumphant senate, than this from whence they are taken is, or ever parliament will be. It is better to be a door-keeper to that assembly, whether Twiss, &c. are translated, than to have continued here the moderator of this. That is the true *parliamentum beatum*, the blessed parliament, and that is the only church that cannot err." And, page 82 of the first edition, and page 99 of the other, he names a number of other names, among the rest, Bradshaw.

Here some of the very regicides are named, as Col. White, who was one of the high court of justice, and sat upon the king, with an, &c. for all the rest of them. And Bradshaw, the president of the court, if they will not say that it was some other Bradshaw he meant, because he is set there among scholars, though some no more than himself.

But the whole rump of a parliament (having by force secluded the only true members of the house of commons, and turned out the whole house of lords, to whom, by a voluntary oath of their own making, they had sworn to render them secure, and then murder'd their king) are all together here sainted, and made a type of heaven, whose constitution they suppose, or the likeliest thing to it in this world, to be a parliament without a king, or an assembly of short-gray-cloak-lay-elders, all in parity, without any head or bishop over them.

This is their heaven!

The kingdom of heaven they leave to the cavaliers. But they have chosen a heaven in a parliamentary way! That's better for them. It suits better with their complexion. What should they do with a place full of kings and priests, as heaven is described in the Revelations? Why they would be all kings and bishops themselves! That is all they strove for upon earth, and would do the same in heaven, if they have not changed their principles; for there they will be higher than even there, or else it will go hard, and they are for no superior, except the Holy One! which is just the same good old cause that Lucifer fought in heaven. He would have none of God's deputies or viceregents over him, though it were the Son of God himself.

But Baxter, in his scheme, did not consider that there is an hierarchy in heaven, of superior and inferior orders, degrees and dignities, even as here; and we must be subject there, as well as here, to those whom God has set over us.

And who are not good subjects here will not be admitted there. St Jude says that the angels who kept not (or were not content with) their first estate (or principality, as our margin reads it,) but aspir'd to an higher order, were thrown out of heaven, whither no more rebels have any entrance. And they who cannot be content with the station God has plac'd them in here, but usurp upon their superiours, as Korah and his Levites against Aaron, and Dathan and Abiram, with their company, against Moses, they descend to a place of disorder and confusion, such as they would bring upon the earth.

Heaven is no such independent place as Mr Baxter has fancied, made up all of single persons, without any government among them, or any superior but God. His

* In this charge great injustice is done to Mr Baxter. He joined, indeed, with the parliament at the beginning of the civil war, but, like most of the presbyterian party, heartily disapproved of the king's death.

principles of rebellion upon earth have corrupted his very notions of heaven; where they submit to those set over them, as the ordinance of God. They submit freely: therefore they are free subjects. The devils rebel for their freedom: therefore they are slaves.

And God has given upon earth the resemblance of his government in heaven, in a subordination of several offices under the king as supreme.

And they who are rebels here against this institution of God, would be so there too, if they cou'd; and therefore they come not thither.

They will find no precedent there for Baxter's *parliamentum beatum*, his blessed parliament of 1648, without their king. Unless it be what Milton has left them upon record, in his *Paradise Lost*, where Lucifer called a convention, and was himself their speaker.

But, to leave these fooleries, I think such a man as Baxter is not to be admitted as a competent witness in the case of a martyr, whose murderers he has sainted (which is more consenting to it than keeping the raiment of those that slew him.) No, nor Ludlow, who had embued his own hands in the royal blood; so that they could not do justice to him, without condemning of themselves, and had the strongest temptation to lying, which is, to justify themselves.

2. For secondly, This Baxter was a notorious liar in other cases, even in this same religious life of his; as page 119, of the third part, where he says "Many French ministers, sentenced to death and banishment, came hither for refuge, and the churchmen relieve not, because they are not for English diocesans and conformity." Mr Long has taken him to task for this, in his *Review*, page 211, &c. where he shews, 1st. how very liberal and compassionate the bishops and clergy were to them; and, 2dly, that they did conform, received episcopal ordination, and many of them were prefer'd to good livings, and even dignities in the church, of which he names several, and the places where they were beneficed. But we need not single witnesses for this; the whole nation knows it. It is as notorious as Baxter's shameless impudence in asserting the contrary. You will find several other such like instances in the *Review*, to which, for brevity, I refer you.

Now is his single testimony, and that but from hear-say, to be taken of a matter of fact out of memory, and in a cause wherein he and his saints were so nearly concerned, who had the brass to lye so egregiously in the face of the whole nation, in the instance above nam'd, and at the time when the matter of fact was fresh, and before every bodies eyes! but it was for the good old cause, which sanctifies every thing!

3. This brings me to my last topick I shall use upon this head (because I would not detain you,) which is, that lying is a fourth property of these Baxterian saints, inseparable from their essence. The history of this would fill volumes. It is the first milk that they suck. It was this which gave birth to their blessed league and covenant, nourish'd and fatned it up—to the gallows.

Insomuch, that whatever story they tell (and they have abundance! especially pretty little private ones,) which concerns their cause, either of saintship to their own armigers, or to blacken a king, a bishop, a clergyman, or any who are well affected to them; and where they produce not (for they never spare for vouching) some other testimony than their own, you may conclude that it is an errant lye and slander; especially when you see a secret joy and satisfaction arise in the telling of it, which they can hardly conceal; for slander is their honey, they must lick their lips.

Therefore, were there nothing to confront this story of Baxter's, no proofs against it, no circumstances to make us doubt of it, but only his telling of it, and to see how sweetly it is echo'd and repeated by the party, it is sufficient to make any man that knows them believe that there is not one word of truth in it. He that has accustomed

himself to lying is justly to be suspected, even when he tells a truth; and truth suffers by coming from such mouths.

Now, sir, I will sum up my evidence, when I have desired one thing more, which is, That the royal martyr himself may be heard in his own defence, not as to this particularity (as Calamy calls it) of his letter to my Lord of Antrim, for that was not then invented; it was never heard of in all his life; for then it could have easily been dis-proved; but as to that imputation, which, in the generall, had been laid upon his majesty, of his having countenanced or abbetted that bloody rebellion and massacre in Ireland. Upon which he bestows the twelfth chapter of his in-comparable and unimitable book of *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*.

But, before I go on with that, let me observe with what malice and industry the faction, of late years especially, (when they had not only liberty but encouragement,) have bent their whole force, and wrote severall treatises, to rob the martyr of the glory, and save themselves from the shame and conviction that is contained in that book; and that by such honest and sincere artifices, as they have used in this, of charging the rebellion and massacre in Ireland upon the king. This from an invisible letter to my Lord of Antrim; that from an un-attested, suppos'd memorandum of my Lord Anglesey's, found or wrote after his death, in a vacant page of one of these printed books. Which is fully answered in a vindication of King Charles the martyr, proving that his majesty was the author of *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, against a Memorandum said to be written by the Earl of Anglesey, and against the Exceptions of Dr Walker, and others. Printed *anno* 1697.

There it is likewise shewed and undeniably proved, at the close of the second edition, that Milton and Bradshaw did foist in among the devotions in *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, a prayer, taken out of Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia. And then Milton, in his scurrilous answer to the king's book, plays the buffoon upon his sacred majesty for borrowing a prayer out of a romance; and Henry Hills, who was printer to Oliver, has heard Bradshaw and Milton laughing at the jest of their inserting this prayer, and then exposing the king for it; which in the said Vindication is fully attested; insomuch, that the hissing of this seed of the serpent is at present stopp'd, and the king is suffered to enjoy his own book.

But, perhaps, five years hence we may have the same clamour renewed again, without taking any notice of this Vindication, as Calamy has revived that of Baxter in the other case.

Having thus far cleared this book to be the king's own words, let us now hear what he himself says concerning the rebellion and massacre in Ireland. And when you have read over his xiith. chapter upon this subject (if you can with dry eyes) then judge whether he or Baxter is to be believ'd! He says, "That sea of blood which hath there been cruelly and barbarously shed, is enough to drown any man in eternal both infamy and misery, whom God shall find the malicious author or instigator of its effusion.———There was nothing could be more abhorred to me, being so full of sin against God, disloyalty to myself, and destructive to my subjects." And he prays to God, "O rescue and assist those poor protestants in Ireland, whom thou hast hitherto preserved.———And deal with me, not according to man's unjust reproaches, but according to the innocency of my hands in thy sight. If I have desir'd or delighted in the woeful day of my kingdoms calamities, if I have not earnestly studied, and faithfully endcavour'd the preventing and composing of these bloody distractions, then let thy hand be against me and my father's house. O Lord, thou seest I have enemies enough of men; as I need not, so I should not dare thus to imprecate thy curse upon me and mine, if my conscience did not witness my integrity, which thou, O Lord, knowest right well."

Now consider how tender his conscience was, by the deep remorse he express'd in his second chap. upon the Earl of Strafford's death. Tho' he passed that bill with the consent of parliament, and approbation of the generality of the nation, indeed was press'd to it wholly by their clamours and importunity. The history tells that he intended to have done publick penance for it; but his troubles came on so fast, as not to afford him a fitting opportunity. But he did it upon the scaffold, where he publickly and solemnly did confess it; and owned the unjust sentence against himself to be a just punishment from God, for that unjust sentence which he had suffered to pass upon another. Can any man then believe, that he could have call'd for those dreadful imprecations upon himself and family, as to the case of Ireland, and stood out in it even to his death, if he had been, in any wise, accessory to it? He knew not, when he wrote these meditations, that mortal eye should ever see them. They were the pouring out of his soul, betwixt God and him alone, when he was in prison, and none suffered to come near him, but whom his bloody butcherers pleas'd; so that he had no temptation to act such monstrous hypocrisy with God, if he had been otherwise capable of it, which I dare say no man upon the earth does believe, and the very sons and masters of lyes dare not alledge, and have therefore endeavour'd, first to discredit (as Milton by the prayer out of the Arcadia,) and since more impudently (grown older in mischief) to overthrow the authority of the whole book, in both of which wicked attempts they being detected, and the genuineness of the book fully vindicated, does, I think, put a full end to all this calumny as to Ireland, particularly as to that white-bear of the letter to my Lord of Antrim.

But this book of Calamy's does not only do mischief at home, but goes abroad wherever there are phanaticks; and our martyr will appear a monster to other countries, unless vindicated by some publick authority of which the world may take notice; considering that the reproach is so fresh, just now done, and made as publick as the interest of the whole faction can make it, and that in the reign of his grand-child, who it may be thought, and they will give it out hereafter, was willing to let it pass. Why may not this be thought, when in that pretended memorandum of the Earl of Anglesey's, they have presumed to bring in both his sons, K. Charles and K. James, as witnesses against their father?

If an action of *scandalum magnatum* may be brought in behalf of a private peer, even after his death, to vindicate his memory, and the honour of his family: Here are three kings vilely aspers'd after their deaths; what proportionable satisfaction ought to be made to them, the wisdom of your house best knows, and can give it; at least, I hope, that less than this cannot be done, to express their displeasure against this scandal (lest their silence may hereafter be constru'd as their approbation;) and to put such a stop to it as that it proceed no farther.

Sir, I wish your house may have the honour of punishing and suppressing the insolence of this faction (which has reign'd long enough) and you to make the motion, That the mouths of those who speak lyes, may be stopp'd. Jan. 10. 1702.

The anniversary of Arch-Bishop Laud's martyrdom, by the same hands.

Postscript.

This passage I have insisted upon in Calamy's Abridgement of Baxter's Life, is not the only one of this nature that is there. No, it is a virulent invective quite through against the church and the crown. The examining of all which would be a work by itself.

And it is to be presumed, that the noble lord, whose name is disgrac'd by the dedication of this libel to him, knows nothing of it, and that when he does, he will do himself justice.

The Irish Massacre set in a clear Light. Wherein Mr Baxter's Account of it in the History of his own Life, and the Abridgement thereof by Dr Calamy, are fully consider'd. Together with two Letters from Mr Chaundler, (the Dissenting Teacher of Bath, reviving the aforesaid Account) to the Reverend Mr Thomas Carte at Bath, with his two Replies to Mr Chaundler.

The Rev. Mr Thomas Carte, a laborious and indefatigable historian, was born in 1686, and settled as reader at the Abbey Church in Bath after 1707. In this cure he preached a sermon on the 30th of January, vindicating the memory of Charles I. from any share in the Irish rebellion, which involved him in the following controversy with Henry Chandler, a dissenting minister of worth and abilities, but more famous as the father of the celebrated Samuel Chandler, than for his own literary productions. The tract exhibits much of the violent party spirit, which distinguished Carte's works, but something also of his minute labour. The reader, who shall consider the controversy, may be perhaps disposed to halve the dispute between the combatants, and allow Charles to have been innocent of the design of the Irish massacre; although, while he felt himself overpowered by the parliament in England, he seems to have employed both Antrim and Glamorgan in endeavouring to bring over to his succour the forces of the rebellious catholics.

I CANNOT allow myself to publish these letters to the world, without giving some account of writing them, which was this:—Preaching on last January 30, in the Abbey church of this place, I gave in my sermon a detail of the methods and practices, whereby the rebels of 1641 carried on their designs, and effected the ruin of the church and monarchy of England. 'Tis scarce possible for an honest man to think of those times, and of the measures then taken, without horror, and very difficult to speak of them with tenderness; but the part that I chose was merely to represent them: They carried indeed their own, and that a very heavy censure with them, and are so flagrantly impious, that nothing can, at least nothing need be added to set forth their wickedness, or raise in good men an abhorrence of them.

But what in such has this effect, raises a different kind of resentment in others: They that entertain the principles of the rebels of those days, and would be glad to see the same steps pursued, the same practices repeated, rage at a representation that makes them odious, and may thereby prevent their success. The preacher that exposes these practises, not the person who committed them, is the object of these mens indignation, and whilst some pitying expressions are offered up to their memory, some alleviated circumstances urged to lessen the horror of their crimes and greatness of their guilt, he is sure to feel the effects of their passions, and weight of their censure for setting in a just light, actions, which, execrable as they are, were yet acted many years ago: Tho' he does this on a day set apart by authority to implore God's pardon

for those very actions, and to deprecate his judgments, which still lie heavy upon this nation on account thereof; and though these very persons thus displeased with the remembrance of the hypocrisy, treachery, rebellion, and other impieties of a faction, and one set of men dissenting from our church, who once triumphed in the actual ruin of it, and still threaten it with their attempts, can dwell for ever on all the shocking or unjustifiable practises of another body of men, enemies indeed to our church, but so disproportioned in number, and of principles so contrary to the spirit and genius of this nation, and whose very name is so odious to the generality of even the common sort of people, who have a sense of nothing else, that a reasonable man can hardly apprehend any real danger from them.

But men's actions and censures are not always very consistent, and 'tis no unusual thing for them to condemn in others that which they allow in themselves, and to exclaim against that method which disserves their cause, which they applaud when it promotes it. And if I have met with any reproaches, or raised any resentments by a just representation of the crimes and calamities of forty one, it has been from none but such persons as these, whose indignation will make none uneasy, and it has only served to convince me more clearly of the reasonableness and usefulness of such a representation, which cannot surely by any loyal or good man be thought improper, whilst there are such numbers who espouse the same principles with the rebels of those days, and who, as they justify their actions, may without breach of charity be supposed ready to re-act them.

But it is paying too much regard to this objection to take notice of it, for general charges seldom need an answer, and deserve only to be slighted. And yet nothing more particular has been objected against that discourse, no misrepresentation has been charged on it, as to any one fact asserted in it, unless as to that which Mr Chaundler, the dissenting teacher in this place, was offended at, and challenged me to prove, which, as it gave occasion for, makes also the subject of the following letters.

It cannot therefore be improper to lay before the world that passage which he accepted against, in the words wherein I preach'd it; of which take this account.

After shewing the reasonableness of the religious observance of the day from several topicks, as particularly, from its being a proper means to obtain God's pardon for the horrid murder committed on it, the fatal effects of which, and calamities naturally flowing from it, this nation has long groaned under, and yet cannot see an end of; from the encouragement which the seditious doctrines that supported the great rebellion have met with of late years, from the profanation of the day by a crew of wretches at their Calves-head-feasts, from the little or no alteration in the principles and conduct of the sects and parties, the great actors in the rapines and crimes of those rebellious times, that has appeared since, where they have the power of acting, from the barbarous treatment of the episcopal clergy in a sister nation since the revolution, a thing too little known and considered in this, and from the dissenters looking on the solemn league and covenant, that grand instrument of the rebellion as still obligatory on the nation. I after this observed, how carefully they are taught to abhor the memory of the royal martyr, as Mr Wesley, who was bred up amongst them, tells us in his account of the manner of education in the dissenting academies, and laid it down for a rule, that their actions are the truest test of their sentiments in this point, and the surest way we can take to form a judgment of them: and then immediately follow these words, &c.

And do not these (their actions) shew, that they hate the memory of King Charles to the utmost degree, and that they rejoyce in their ancestors treatment of him, and transcribe their copy as far as they can? Those, we know, not satisfy'd with spoyling the royal martyr of his kingdom and life, endeavoured to stab his honour, which was

dearer to him than both. Among other slanders which their malice threw upon him and his memory, this was one, that he had an hand in, and gave orders for the bloody massacre and rebellion in Ireland in 1641.

The malice and falshood of this charge have been sufficiently proved, and 'tis well known and attested, that when Sir Phelim O Neal, head of that rebellion, was taken, they endeavoured to perswade him to accuse the king, and at his tryal, nay, at his execution too, they offered him his life, his estate, and other advantages, would he but charge the king with it. This was a crime so horrid, that tho' themselves were villains enough to engage in it, yet Sir Phelim would not, but died, declaring the king's innocency. And yet this cursed, as well as false and malicious calumny, their sons have revived again within these eight years in the Abridgement of Baxter's Life, published by Calamy.

I insisted likewise, by way of proof of this their hatred of King Charles's memory, on the malicious, tho' impotent endeavours, used to make the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, that book of his, which contains the true picture of his soul, and this so exceeding lovely and beautiful an one, that it must charm all that have any taste of virtue and goodness, be suspected as spurious; and on the late republishing of all the lies and slanders that had been raised of him, and spreading them throughout the nation in Ludlow's Memoirs; and whether Mr Chaundler has by his conduct contributed any thing to the clearing of them from such an hatred of King Charles's memory, let the world judge.

What I am further to say, with regard to this passage is, that as it is the only one, the truth of which has been called in question, and which Mr Chaundler has chose for the subject of his attack, so I have quoted it fairly to a syllable as I preach'd it.

I must confess I did not imagine a clergyman of the church of England, preaching on such a day, setting forth the horror of those crimes, which occasioned the observance of it, and vindicating one of the best but most abused monarchs that ever lived, should be called to an account by a dissenting teacher for what he said from the pulpit in the execution of his office, in so just, at least so charitable, a cause, and in answering the ends for which the supreme authority of the nation enjoyned the observance of the day; such a conduct as this seeming to be no very suitable return for that toleration which our laws have graciously indulg'd the dissenters, was what indeed I did not expect; much less could I expect an attack on a point of so odious a nature, as the loading King Charles's memory with so black a crime, as being concern'd in the Irish massacre; and the world perhaps will be surprized to find any so malignant now as to suspect it possible for him to be guilty of so detestable an action, from which he has been so clearly vindicated, and which never had any the least proof to support it.

That a calumny of so gross a size should be charg'd upon King Charles, and a particular disproof of it required, one of his race sitting upon the throne, in a place of as publick a resort as any in this kingdom; a calumny which the rebels of 41 could never fix or prove upon him, tho' they used all arts to do it, tho' people were put to the rack to oblige them to accuse him as ' privy to and concern'd in the Irish rebellion, as was the case of Sir John Read; and tho' at the time of its first being charg'd upon him, it was undeniably refuted by Mr Howel and others: None of the Irish rebels that fell into the hands of the parliament offering to accuse him of it; and the Lord Macguire, than whom none was deeper engaged in the rebellion, or knew more of the persons concern'd, and of the measures to be taken in it, he, (as the king says in his declaration in answer to the parliament's resolution of no farther addresses, fol. 289,) tho' thus equally privy to all transactions, denyed to the last, that the rebels had any commission from the king, with more sense of conscience than they who examined him

* Lord Castlehaven's Memoirs, p. 39.

expected; tho' he was so far from giving them any commission, that he had no foreknowledge of their design, as, (says Mr Howel in his *Glance on the Isle of Wight*, p. 381,) besides a world of convincing circumstances, which may clear him in this particular; appears from the confession of the same Lord Macguire before his execution on Feb. 20, 1644, who upon the ladder, and another upon the scaffold, when they were ready to breath their last, and to appear before the tribunal of Heaven, did absolutely acquit the king in this point; and this spontaneously of their own accord, being unsought unto, but only out of a love to truth and discharge of a good conscience; nay, so far was he from having any intimation of the insurrection in Ireland, that, as Mr Howel attests,¹ the Spanish ambassador here and his confessor, a very reverend Irishman, told him the king knew no more of it than the great mogul did; and so confident was Mr Howel² of his innocence in this respect, that he dared to pawn his soul on the truth of it. That such a calumny as this, so clearly refuted on its first appearance in the world, should now be published afresh, and a particular disproof of it required at this distance of time, when the revivers of the charge might hope that all evidence to confront it was wanting, is indeed surprizing, but it is withal very unfair treatment of that excellent prince on whom the charge is laid, and is such a method of arguing against fact, that if it be allowed, there is no point in history so well attested but it may be disputed. And yet such a disproof is what Mr Chaundler has thought fit to insist on and demand from me as necessary for the clearing of the king. The words of his first letter are,

For Mr Carte.

Bath, Feb. 2, 1713-14.

SIR,

Whereas I am inform'd by some that heard you last Saturday, that you should say, that the charging King Charles I. with being accessary to the Irish massacre, was a thing that had been sufficiently disproved; I take the liberty to desire you would be pleased to let me know in what author I may find that, for I protest I should be heartily glad to find it. In justice to the memory of the royal martyr, in justice to your self and charity to me, you stand bound to do so much for one that from his heart abhors the doctrines of king-killing and country-enslaving, and is, Sir,

Your humble servant,

HEN. CHAUNDLER.

I received it at 4 in the afternoon on Tuesday, Feb. 2d, and read the contents not without wonder, that whilst the Roman Catholicks, who seem to have the strongest temptations in point of interest, and for the credit of their religion, to charge the king with giving them a commission, do (as Lord Castlehaven, Procurator Walsh, F. D'Orleans, and other of their writers) notwithstanding this, clear him of it, and ingenuously own the insurrection to be a rebellion, which it could not have been, had they the king's commission to warrant them. Whilst truth forces this confession from them, any who call themselves protestants, and pretend to a greater purity and more religion than others who are called by that general name, should allow themselves in a practise which those abhor, should dare to repeat the horrid slander on the king and demand a particular disproof of it.

One might at least expect that this should be done with modesty, or with the appearance of it, and that, whilst the action it self might raise a clamour and (what is more) deserve it, yet there might be something in the manner, in the circumstances of

¹ Italian Perspective, p. 289.

² Land of Ireland, p. 217.

the action to recommend it, and procure it a fairer reception in the world. But it is the fate of error to be confident, and a bad cause seldom suffers for want of zeal, a thing very necessary to support it, where truth and justice are absent. Such was the case and conduct of Mr Chaundler. Not satisfied with writing to me a letter he fancied I could not answer, he spread it about with an industry that prudence would not have suffered him to use, had it not been sure of victory; nor charity have allowed him in, whatever his persuasions were, without much better evidence for them than he has yet produced in the dispute. He shew'd it to an alderman of this city, who spake of it publickly at a place where the members of the corporation met at dinner, on Thursday, Feb. 4th. He sent copies of it to shops to be given away gratis, that the king's reproach and the credit his performance was to gain himself, might be spread the wider, and made as publicke as possible. Three of them were the same day, at Mr Harford's shop in the church yard, put into the hands of a person who, after evening service, assured me of this particular fact, and, in general, of the multitude of copies dispersed abroad.

Such confidence and zeal in so bad a cause did not more surprize than seem to upbraid me for the want thereof in a good one, and obliged me, without the least delay, to finish my first letter to Mr Chaundler, which I had begun the day before, and sent to him that evening, and is as follows:

For Mr Chaundler.

Bath, Feb. 3, 1713-14.

SIR,

Yesterday I received from you a letter, wherein you tell me that you are inform'd by some who heard me last Saturday, that I should say that the charging King Charles I. with being accessory to the Irish massacre, was a thing that had been sufficiently disproved.

You have not in this point been misinformed: I did say, that the malice as well as falshood of that charge have been sufficiently proved, and I had reason for saying so; reason indeed so clear, that I thought none could have been really ignorant, either of that blessed prince's innocence, or of the evidences whereby it is proved.

But since it seems you are, and therefore require me to tell you in what author you may find it, I do now, in answer to your demand, and to give you the satisfaction you want in this matter, refer you to Dr Nalson's Collections (a book to be met with at Mr Hammond's) vol. 2, pag. 528, 529, 530; where you may, in the deposition of Dr Ker, Dean of Ardagh, see Sir Phelim O Neal clearing the king from this unjust calumny, and declaring that he could not in conscience charge the king with it, tho' he had been frequently solicited thereto by fair promises and great rewards while he was in prison. You may see Sir Phelim every day of his tryal asserting the king's innocence, rejecting the judges offers of restoring him to his estate and liberty, in case that he could bring proof that he had any commission from the king for the levying of war, and proving, in the most satisfactory manner, that the commission, which he had formerly pretended to have received from him, was drawn by his (Sir Phelim's) own orders, and the broad seal fixed to it was taken from a patent of the Lord Caulfield's, found in the castle of Charlemount; which Mr Harrison (the man who took the seal from the patent and fixed it to the commission) likewise attests. You may see offers of mercy made to Sir Phelim at his execution, upon the barbarous condition of falsly accusing King Charles in that point; and may likewise see him under all the terrors of death, and the strongest temptations man could lie under, bravely attesting that prince's innocence, and sealing the truth of his testimony with his blood.

Read the whole, and then consider whether your demand is not effectually answered, and whether any thing can more clearly disprove that (as far as I have heard) only pretence of the charge against the king, or shew at once more evidently the consummate

wickedness of that party, which accused him of so horrid a crime, and their inability to make good their charge.

Both these are still farther cleared by what Sir Roger Manley says in his *History of the Rebellions of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, printed at London, 1691; where, after giving an account of king Charles's causing the Marquess of Ormond to deliver Dublin, then (A. D. 1646,) besieged by the Irish army by land, and block'd up by the parliament ships on the sea side, into the hands of the parliamentary rebels rather than the Irish; and after briefly reciting Sir Phelim O'neale's attestation of that king's innocence, he expresses himself in these words, p. 92: "Nor was it only with him (Sir Phelim) but with several other prisoners, that they most impiously endeavoured by promises of life, liberty, and estate, and no less abominable artifices, to sooth them to confessions that might entitle the king to that nefarious rebellion."

Can the most prejudiced person read this without being convinced, as well of that good prince's perfect innocence, as of the exquisite malice of his enemies.

You needed not then to have press'd me in so solemn a manner, to produce my vouchers for what I had said, or have challenged me to do it, as I was bound by the very strict obligations of justice to the royal martyr and myself, as well as of charity to you. I should have gratified you in your desire on less inducements, and given you that proof which probably you did not expect, and which I hope may be to your conviction; and tho' you have hitherto laboured under a so very rare and almost singular misfortune, as not to have met with any author that has cleared the king from being accessary to the Irish massacre, (tho' there is scarce an historian that writes of those times but clears him,) and have never found that it has been sufficiently disproved; yet that now you will own the falsehood of the charge, or let me know what you will be pleased to allow as a sufficient disproof of it.

I have shewn you where it is (as any rational unprejudiced person must think) sufficiently disproved; tho' I might with better reason have demanded of you, where it was ever proved. This should have been done before a vindication could be necessary, and it was reasonable to expect it; since matters of fact, as they are too stubborn to allow of tedious cavils, are withal plain enough to admit of an easy proof. And yet what proof can be brought for the charge? None that deserves the name, or would be allowed the authority of a testimony in the most trifling instance; and therefore certainly ought not to be allowed in the case before us, against a person in the highest station, and for a charge of the blackest nature, in proportion whereto the proof ought to be the clearer.

Lord Clarendon (*History of the Rebellion*, vol. 1, book 4, p. 238,) says, it is a calumny without the least shadow or colour of truth. And when we consider its inconsistency with the general character of that blessed prince, and more particularly with that extraordinary tenderness and compassion of nature, which was remarkable in him, and which (says Lord Clarendon's *History*, vol. 3, book 11, p. 197.) restrained him from ever doing an hard hearted thing; with his sentiments in point of religion and zeal, for the constitution of the church of England, for which he died a martyr; with the whole conduct and in a manner every action of his life; with his most solemn professions and appeals to God, who knew his heart; (see his *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, c. 12.) nay, and with his very interests too; for he never recovered the disadvantages which the very charging of this calumny brought upon him; and that it had for its support the weakest foundation imaginable, the pretence only of rebels, who would be glad at any rate to make the best of their cause, and might get a broad seal in a way easy to be accounted for, and which every charitable man's thoughts would soon suggest to him: Can we think that any man, who was very willing to believe it true, could easily receive a charge of such a nature, or demand a particular disproof of what was never proved, and is so improbable in every respect?

Tho', therefore, such a disproof be not in itself necessary, I have, nevertheless, in compliance with your desire, and in obedience to those obligations you tell me I lie under to do so much for you, laid it before you.

And now let me add, that the same considerations of justice and charity require you now to use your endeavours to vindicate the royal martyr from this calumny. You cannot but know how it has been revived within these few years; and with how degenerate and base a spirit, with how bitter a rancour, a rancour reaching even beyond the grave, which puts a period to common hatreds, some have trampled on the ashes of that blessed prince, and the calumny, probably, has found belief with many.

And since it is the duty of every one (as he has ability and opportunity) to do right to the injured, I hope it will be your business to undeceive all that you know labour under so unjust and uncharitable a mistake. Such a measure of justice may surely be expected from one who professes to abhor from his heart the doctrine of king-killing. I would fain persuade myself that in this you know your own heart, a thing which, as it is deceitful above all things, often deceives a man's self; and that you would not take up arms and fight in the field against your prince, and use your sword to slay him there whom you would not murder solemnly and deliberately out of it; and that by the doctrines of country-enslaving, you do not design, in the use of that term, to throw a reflection on any doctrine of Christianity, or to represent the duties of passive obedience and non-resistance (duties which primitive Christianity practised under the greatest trials, and which the church of England has gloried in) in an odious as well as false light: For, if you do, be assured that your pretences to abhor from your heart the doctrine of king-killing are vain, whilst you only boggle at a particular manner of doing the act; and you would do well to consider whether a duty which is enjoined by the laws of the land can enjoin this character of country-enslaving, and what he deserves that gives it.

I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

THO. CARTE.

To what I say of Sir Phelim O'neal in this letter, I can't think it necessary to add any thing, unless it be one remark out of an account of his trial, which I have now before me, and have often heard from a very worthy clergyman, who was born in Ireland before the time of the trial, and whose uncle, from whom he had the relation, was present at it in the chancery court of Dublin, where the high court of justice sate, the commissioners whereof were directed by a committee, that sate in an adjoining room, call'd the chancery chamber, what questions they should propose to O'neal, a communication being kept up by means of a messenger who went constantly between them, and represented to the committee all proceedings in the court, and brought instructions to the commissioners on every occasion, speaking to them through a square hole in the wall; and the remark is this, That Sir Phelim seems to appear in the court with a remorse for the sins of his life and the blood he had shed in the rebellion, and with an unfeigned desire of washing away the guilt of his former crimes by a sincere repentance of them. And therefore, when the commissioners, whose barbarous endeavours to extort from him an accusation of the king, during the course of his trial, which was drawn out to the length of several days, that he might be work'd upon in that time, he had resisted with a constancy that could hardly be expected in his circumstances, owning that he had shew'd a commission, but it was of his own drawing, he having been bred in the inns of court in England, and the broad seal fixed to it as above related. When they pressed him to plead this commission as given him by the king, he answered, That he would not increase his crimes by accusing an innocent man who was dead, herein shewing a remorse that justly upbraids the impenitence of

those fanatic regicides who suffered here in England, and such a regard to truth and justice, and concern for the honour of an injured prince, that we have reason to wish a sort of protestants among us would imitate.

On Feb. 5th, in the morning, I received from Mr Chaundler the following letter:

For Mr Thomas Carte.

Bath, Feb. 4, 1713-14.

Sir,

YOURS I just now received. I thank you for the favour of a reply to mine of the 2d instant. You may assure your self, if it had contributed in the least to my satisfaction, I should not have dissembled it; but it does not touch upon the matter that occasioned my giving you the trouble of my first writing to you, which was your reflecting upon Mr Baxter and Dr Calamy his abridger, with respect unto the business of the Marquess of Antrim; a story printed in Mr Baxter's Life near eighteen years ago, and which, if it has been proved to be false, I protest I have been so unhappy as not to have met with that proof, which proof (if such there be) I declare in the presence of God I will heartily thank you for directing me to; and this, whatever you think, I think a sufficient reply to yours.

I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

HEN. CHAUNDLER.

He calls this a reply to my letter, tho' it takes not the least notice of any one thing said in it, and refers me to a story which I never heard, and which, being founded on the conduct of a private man, might, at the distance of 70 years from the time of his actings, be hard to be confuted; or, if it was to be set in a true light, yet the doing this would require more time than I had to spare, and greater pains than my constitution was able to bear.

On these accounts, many who have the justest regard to the royal martyr's honour, thought it not proper for me to engage further in the dispute, or, at least, that it was not necessary to clear a story whose falsehood might sufficiently appear to all unprejudiced persons, by its attacking a character so well establish'd as his. But, being entered upon the controversy, and challenged, in particular, to clear this story, being made sensible of the prejudices whereby many were drawn aside to believe the horrid charge against him, their confidence in the truth of this story, the only pretence left to uphold the charge, and the triumphs that would ensue a neglect of refuting it, and being likewise verily persuaded that every member of that church for whose cause he died a martyr, owes more to the memory, the remains of King Charles, than a bare hazard of his health, I resolved, notwithstanding the precariousness of that and the business of the place, to set about refuting it; and, after reading over all the histories, pamphlets, and accounts that I could procure, relating to the Irish rebellion, and the conduct of persons during the continuance of it, I drew up the following letter at those hours which I could borrow from the night; and, as it has been thought to contain a clear vindication of King Charles from the aspersions thrown upon him in the story which gave occasion to it, I now publish it to the world without any alteration.

For Mr Chaundler.

Bath, Feb. 19, 1713-14.

SIR,

I received yours on the 4th instant, in which you tell me that my letter of the 3d has not contributed in the least to your satisfaction, so that (it should seem) the black charge against King Charles I. of his being accessory to the Irish massacre, is still in possession of you, and is not, in your opinion, sufficiently disproved. It would have been some satisfaction to me had you told me what you will be pleased to allow as a sufficient disproof of it, and what will give you any degree of satisfaction in this point. But, instead of doing this, as I pressed you to do, you, without taking any notice of what I urged, think it a sufficient justification of that very hard opinion you have entertained of King Charles, to refer me to (what you call) the business of the Marquess of Antrim. This you do without telling me that you'll be satisfied if I clear that matter, so that I am still at a loss to know what farther kind of disproof you expect, or when your scruples will end.

However, to remove (if possible) your prejudices, and to lay before you those evidences and reasons which every rational and impartial man must allow to be sufficient for conviction, I shall add some considerations to what I urged in my former, and then answer that story which you lay so much stress upon in your last.

I have already represented unto you that the charge has never been proved, that it is wanting both in external and intrinsick evidence, that it is inconsistent with the king's character and conduct on many accounts, and that the rebels pretences to a commission from him have been in the most unexceptionable manner refuted by Sir Phelim Oneal. Let me now, to make those appear in a juster as well as clearer light, desire you to consider whether Fleetwood, Ludlow, and the rest of that factious crew, who had a share in the government of Ireland at the time of Sir Phelim's tryal (Feb. 1652,) would ever have taken so base and execrable a method to stain the king's honour, and fasten that horrid charge upon him, had they had any real grounds for it, and whether their acting thus, and their disappointment in the impious attempt, must not be looked upon by all sober and good men as an irrefragable proof of the king's innocency, which, notwithstanding all the arts and endeavours, the promises and threats, the severities and rewards, the bribes and temptations, which the power and wealth of the nation could enable them to use, with the persons they solicited to accuse him, could stand the test of them all, and bear up with so glorious a success against the utmost efforts and assaults, that the most powerful wickedness, malice, and cunning could make against it. Had the king been indeed guilty, less industry, honester methods, fewer temptations, weaker inducements, would have proved his guilt; whereas nothing but the purest innocence and best establish'd truth could stand firm in such tryals as this, and against all attempts that such enemies could make. It was the force of this truth which extorted not only from Sir Phelim in particular, but from the rebels in general, from the commanders as well as fryars, a confession that they had no commission at all from the king, but (as Dr. Robert Maxwell, afterwards Bishop of Kilmore, deposed upon oath, Aug. 22, 1642,) that they thought it lawful to pretend what they could in advancement of their cause, and that in all wars, rumours and lies served many times to as good purpose as arms, and that they would not disclaim any advantage.

It could be nothing else but the force of truth that extorted this confession from rebels, who (as appears from the testimonies of Dr Maxwell, and another gentleman who was prisoner amongst them, both examined upon oath)³ were desirous to raise up against

² Borlace, p. 302. 304.
and council to King Charles, dated March 26, 1642.

³ Borlace Appendix, p. 126.

³ See letter from the lords justices

the king as many enemies, and throw on him all the odium that they could; and who hated him to such a degree, that some of them, and they of note among them have said, that 'if they had his majesty in their power, they would flea him alive: Others, that they would give a great sum of money to have his head, that however they would have the kingdom and their will of him; that they would have an Irish king, and regarded not King Charles, the King of England; that they had a new king, and had commission from him for what they did; and that they would not be contented with the conquest of Ireland alone, but would drive King Charles with his whole posterity out of England,² so that he and his posterity should be afterwards *profugio in terra aliena in æternum*, wanderers in a foreign land for ever,—a work which they, thro' impotence, left to that factious race (whose inconsistent malice would pretend that the king should give this commission to those who hated him thus outrageously, the better thereby to enable them to execute their designs against himself, and to deprive him of his kingdom and life) by a more successful rebellion to prosecute, and in too great a measure accomplish.

To mention a publick act of the whole body of rebels, which evidently shews their want of any commission or countenance from his majesty. The³ preamble of their remonstrance delivered (by the Lord Viscount Gormanston, Sir Lucas Dillon, and Sir Robert Talbot, to the king's commissioners, who were authorised to hear their proposals,) at Trim, in the county of Meath, March 17, 1642, quotes those words of his majesty out of his commission to hear what they had to say, in⁴ which he expresses his utter detestation of that odious rebellion, which the recusants of Ireland had without ground or colour raised against him, his crown and dignity,—words not spoke in a corner, but under the great seal of England, and even in that commission which those false accusers were to see and hear read, words that stung them to the heart, which the king would not have used, had he not been perfectly innocent, nor they have born, had they been less guilty, and which sufficiently provoked them to plead that authority which they had so falsely pretended, had they had the least shadow for so black a calumny, and yet they quote them, without pretending in the least to the king's approbation of their rebellion, and with an acknowledgment of his real abhorrence thereof, which abhorrence therefore they use their utmost endeavours to remove.

These things, one would think, might be sufficient to prove the king's innocency, and to shew the falshood of all pretences to a commission from him: But this will farther appear, if we consider that the granting a commission or authority in the case before us to any person whatsoever, is contrary,

1. To the publick⁵ and authentick acts of the king himself and lords justices, to the proclamations of October 30, of Jan. 1, and Feb. 8, 1641; acts of such a nature as to vacate, or at least to render useless all commissions inconsistent with them, and granted in a clandestine way, if any could be so uncharitable as to suppose that the king would grant any for the crimes of rapine, murder, and rebellion, or so senseless as to imagine that he would grant it for no end, or for one that it could serve but a day, or (strictly speaking) but a week.

2. To the king's surprize at the breaking out of this rebellion, express'd in his letter to the⁶ Marquess of Ormand, wrote from Edenburgh, October 31, 1641, and to his care in improving every hint and intelligence he received of ill and seditious designs, for preventing them, see his letter wrote by his order to the justices of Ireland, March 16, 1640.

² R. Cox, Append. 4. p. 6, 7, &c. 528. Sir R. Cox, Append. 5. p. 15. 34, 65, 30. Append. 3, p. 21, 6, p. 27. p. 168.

³ Rushworth, Abridged, vol. 4, p. 190.

⁴ Earl of Orrery's answer to W. p. 29.

⁵ Sir R. Cox, Append. 49. Rushworth Abridgment, vol. 3,

⁶ Nalson, vol. 2, p.

⁷ Borlace, p. 53,

3. To his professions of having had since the beginning of that monstrous rebellion no greater sorrow than for the bleeding condition of the kingdom of Ireland, and of his being grieved from the very soul at the calamities of his good subjects there.

4. To his repeated solemn appeals to God, and calling him to witness for the truth and sincerity of his professions.

5. To his whole conduct and actions, to his zealous endeavours and use of all means in his power, that timely relief might be sent over to the succour of the distress'd protestants; to his leaving the management of the war there to the parliament, and parting with his prerogative, already sufficiently pared, that if possible to move them by such a sacrifice, it might be carried on the better; to his consenting to all propositions (how disadvantageous soever to himself) that were offered to him for that purpose; to his sending over immediately, on the first news of the insurrection of the rebels, 1500 men to oppose them, and sending afterwards arms and ammunition in such proportion and quantities, and at such times as he could very ill spare them; to his inflexible resolution (even after the fatal battle of Naseby) when his affairs seem'd desperate, that if the condition of them were still more desperate, he would never redeem them by any concessions to the Irish rebels that must wound his honour and conscience, and that, let his circumstances be what they would,* he would run any extremity, rather than do the least act that might hazard the religion of the church of England, in which, and for which he was resolved to live and dye; and to his orders sent from time to time to the Marquess of Ormond, in regard to which, that marquess expresses himself (in his answer to the address of thanks from the two houses of parliament in Ireland, for the preservation of themselves and the rest of the protestant party there, thro' his care and providence, March 17, 1646-7) so fully as to prevent all cavils that may be raised on account of any particulars thereof, and gives so remarkable an attestation of the justice, goodness, and piety of them, that I shall here set down his words, which are these, *viz.* And now, my lords and gentlemen, since this perhaps may be the last time that I shall have the honour to speak to you from this place, and since that, next to the words of a dying man, those of one ready to banish himself from his country, for the good of it, challenge credit, give me leave, before God and you, here to protest, that in all the time I had the honour to serve the king my master, I never received any command from him, but such as spoke him a wise pious protestant prince, zealous of the religion he professeth, the welfare of his subjects, and industrious to promote and settle peace and tranquillity in all his kingdoms, and I shall beseech you to look no otherwise upon me than upon a ready instrument set on work by the king's wisdom and good for your preservation.

To not only what he did, but what he would farther have done; to his unfeigned offers of venturing in his own person all the dangers of war, of hazarding his very life for the defence of his protestant subjects in Ireland, and for the chastisement of those perfidious and barbarous rebels (as he stiles them) and of pawning or even selling his own parks, lands, and houses for this service.

To not only his constant expressions of abhorrence of that rebellion, but also to his denying all knowledge of it, with the strongest asseverations and declarations of his detestation of it to such a degree, as to vow that, if his own son had a hand in it, he would cut off his head.

To this consideration likewise, which alone (says Sir R. Cox) must convince all mankind of the king's innocence in this affair, and that is, that an Irish rebellion was the most unlucky and fatal thing that could happen to his majesty at that juncture; it broke

* Sir Robert Cox, part 2, chap. 1, p. 152.

all his measures, and was so evidently against his interest, that no body could suspect him to contrive it, that does not at the same time think he was mad.

You need but look into the king's first and other messages to the parliament about the affairs of Ireland, particularly that of April 8, 1642. His answer to a petition presented to him at York, April 8, 1642, by the Earl of Stamford and others in the name of both houses; his answer to the petition of the protestant committee for Ireland, December 1, 1642, and into ^a Sir Robert Cox's Apparatus to the 2d part of his *Hibernia Anglicana*, to see every particular of these evidently proved to you.

And yet these are such contradictions as I hope there are very few of so keen and unreasonable a malice towards King Charles as to swallow them for the gratifying it; and if consider'd as they ought, together with the universal confession of the rebels, in not only single persons, but in a body, that they had no commission from him, and with the other points I have insisted on, must be look'd upon by all impartial and good men as a sufficient disproof of the charge against that prince, as such a vindication of his innocence that nothing but the directest testimony should make him ever suspected, as a defence of him too strong to be beat down by such weak attacks as are made against it in the story of the Marquess of Antrim, which I am now to consider, and which you tell me was the occasion of your writing to me your first letter.

Had you told me this before, it might have been answered in my former, but I cannot divine, and that letter has not a word of the story; a story which (as far as I can remember) I never heard of before. It is indeed printed in Mr Baxter's Life, but that is a book that I never saw till last week. It was not touched upon in my sermon on January 30, wherein I only insisted on Sir Phelim Oneal's clearing the king at his trial and execution, the truth of which I therefore thought you questioned in your first letter.

And as for Dr Calamy's Abridgment of Mr Baxter's Life, that is a book I never read, nor indeed did ever meet with except once, betwixt 2 or 3 years ago, at the house of a worthy friend with whom I had then some discourse about the revival, which some people have of late years made, (with what design they know, and honest men fear) of all the calumnies that have been ever thrown upon the royal family; and therefore, I only just mentioned it, as a book in which this very calumny has been revived.

Though therefore I am under no particular obligations to refute your story, yet since some people have their reason and faith under so absolute a command, and in so entire a subjection to their own inclinations and passions, or the interests of their cause or party, as to reject even the clearest evidences, if they have but some piece of secret history, and undated, unattested, studiously-concealed memorandum, or an uncertain story to oppose to them; and with all the confidence to call things of this nature a sufficient reply to those evidences; I shall therefore at large consider this story you refer me to, as related by Mr Baxter, and after him by Dr Calamy, and shew how little it can serve your purpose.

Mr Baxter (in his Life, part 3, p. 173, p. 83,) tells us that the Marquess of Antrim was one of the Irish rebels in the beginning of that war, (and that at the time) when in the horrid massacre 200000 protestants were murder'd. His estate being sequestred, he sought his restitution of it when King Charles the II^d. was restored. The Duke of Ormond and the council judg'd against him as one of the rebels. He brought his cause over to the king, and affirmed that what he did was by his father's consent and authority. The king referred it to some very worthy members of his privy-council to examine what he had to shew: Upon examination they reported that they found that he had the king's consent or letter of instruction for what he did. Hereupon King Charles the II^d. wrote to the Duke of Ormond and council to restore his estate, because it appeared to those appointed to examine it, that what he did was by his father's order or consent.

^a Sir Robert Cox, Hist. Ireland, Appar. 10, part 2.

This account of the story we have there; and in it we must distinguish betwixt Mr Baxter's assertions and the words of what he calls the king's letter to the Duke of Ormond. The letter says, That what the Marquess of Antrim did (by way of correspondence, compliance, &c., as I shall quote presently,) was by the king's orders, and it says no more than this: That the Marquess of Antrim was one of the rebels in the beginning of the war, when 200000 protestants were murder'd, is purely Mr Baxter's own affirmation, without any the least ground from the letter, or any just foundation in history, to support it.

The letter tells us not the time of the marquess's correspondence and actings. It fixes no date for the king's instructions. It gives no hint to guess at these but from the end and design of them, which (it says) was the king's service, by reducing the Irish to their obedience, and by drawing some forces from them for the service of Scotland. And this seems to determine the time of both to the year 1643; whereas the beginning of the war was 1641.

But had we not this reason from the letter it self to fix the date of these so late, yet a man of a charitable temper, of a Christian spirit, would have judg'd in the most favourable manner, and not have fixed the date or time thereof sooner than he had clear evidence for so doing.

But Mr Baxter's turn would not be served by so just as well as candid a way of dealing. He is resolved, at any rate, to make the marquess one of the first that engaged in that rebellion which begun with the massacre, and to interpret what is said of the king's instructions to him, so as to entitle King Charles to both.

Is this the practice of a good man? or is it any part of that piety and integrity which Dr Calamy tells us were so conspicuous in Mr Baxter?

But if the letter does not justify Mr Baxter, what does history? what account does that give of the Marquess of Antrim's conduct? This I am now to shew you.

But first, before I give you the detail of this, it may not be amiss to observe, as a good presumption in favour of the marquess, that the Court of Claims in Ireland, after the Restoration, on hearing his cause, adjudg'd him innocent; and Sir Winston Churchill, one of the commissioners of it, does, in his *Divi Britannici*, p. 347, clear the king from giving any orders for, or being any ways concerned in that rebellion. And yet he could not but know what the Marquess of Antrim's actings and what the king's instructions were: For as the marquess's actions were represented, so the king's letter likewise was laid before them.

It looks well, likewise, in the marquess's behalf, that he is not mentioned in any of the lists or accounts that we have of the rebels, nor in the account that we have of those who first appeared in the province of Ulster (in which province the county of Antrim lies) for the execution of the conspiracy (see Nalson's Collections, vol. II. p. 632,) nor in the list of the principal rebels, found among the papers, in the clerk of the commons house of parliaments office (*ib.* p. 888;) nor in the account we have of them in Dowdall's deposition (Borlace's History, p. 39;) nor in the proclamation against the rebels, published by the lords justices and council, Feb. 8, 1641, where those then in rebellion are particularly named (Borlace's History, p. 65, and appendix, from p. 27 to p. 35.) And to be named in no catalogue of them is surely a good sign of his innocence, and that he had no hand in the rebellion.

And how little he was concerned either in that, or in the massacre, may appear from Dr Maxwell's depositions before quoted, in reading which you may see some of the rebels (who were desirous, at any rate, to have him amongst them for a credit and support to their cause,) complaining of his (the marquess's) not taking up arms. You may see others exclaiming against him, so long as the March following, at the end of the year 1641, for that their cause suffered by his non-concurrence. You may see him condemning the bloodshed and robbery which they had been guilty of, and which had

even then spoiled their business, and would be their ruin. You may see others so imbibited against him, as to be for detaining him prisoner, and crying out against the letting him go, after he had been taken by them. Nay, you may see them carrying their resentment so far against him, as to say he deserved to lose his head, for saying (as he went through Armagh, at the latter end of April, or beginning of May, 1642) that he saw nothing among them (the rebels) but desolation and execrable cruelty, for which God's wrath and the king's just revenge hung over their heads, and would speedily overtake them. What then did the marquess act in that rebellion, which the rebels exclaimed against him for not joining in? What hand could the marquess have in that massacre which he so abhor'd, and was so free in expressing his abhorrence of? Or with what face, on what pretence, can the king be charged with being accessory to it, through a commission given to the Marquess of Antrim, when that very marquess declares that his majesty would speedily revenge it, and his justice would fall on the heads of those that were guilty of it?

Nor are the other accounts that we have of the marquess in history inconsistent with these. For when the Irish, after they had, in March, 1641, routed Archibald Steward, animated with the success, invested Colerain, we find him using all the good offices which either his rank and condition, consanguinity or religion, could enable him to use with success, to engage them to raise the siege, and not only doing so, but also sending provisions and other relief into the town. And when the protestant army, on or about April the 4th, 1642, came near Kilcullen, the Marquess of Antrim, with the Duchess of Buckingham, his lady, and the Earl of Castlehaven, came in a coach to visit the Marquess of Ormond, and were kindly received by him, and the whole army passing by, saluted them.

This is a passage seemingly of so small a moment, that it would seem strange to have it expressly recorded in history, did not Sir Robert Cox (*Hibernia Anglicana*, part II. chap. i. p. 105, and in his *Apparatus*) tell us his design in mentioning it, viz. To shew the reader that the Earl of Castlehaven was not under any necessity of joining in the Irish rebellion, but might have lived quietly at home, if he had pleased. Does not this give us reason to conclude that the latter was the marquess's practice? For, would not he that so carefully marks the defection of Castlehaven, have observed the same of Antrim, had he ever joined the rebels afterwards, as it is certain he had not done before?

His sentiments in the beginning of May, with regard to the conduct of the rebels, I have already shewn; and in June, 1642, he delivered his strong castle of Dunluce into the hands of Monroe, general of the Scotch forces, who, confining his person, he broke loose from his restraint, and fled, not to the Irish rebels, but (say the parliament in their declaration of July the 25th, 1643) into the northern parts of England; and the queen having landed at Burlington, in February, 1642, and come from thence to York, he waited on her majesty there.

About this time, in the beginning of the year 1643, the army in Ireland, under the Duke of Ormond, being reduced to unspeakable extremities of want of all things necessary to the support of their persons, or maintenance of the war, and no visible means of preserving the remnant of the king's good subjects in that kingdom from utter destruction, a cessation of arms with the Irish rebels became absolutely necessary, as you may see expressly asserted in the lords justices letter to the king about the state of Ireland, May 11, 1643, and in Lord Clarendon's History, vol. II. book vii. from p. 319 to p. 337, and in the opinion of all the members of the council of Ireland, given under their hands the day that the cessation was concluded.

This being the condition of affairs in that kingdom, the king, by his letter of April the 23d, 1643, impowers the Duke of Ormond to treat with the rebels, and agree on a

cessation with them, giving further instructions likewise about it, in his letter of May the 3d.

To promote this work of the cessation, the Marquess of Antrim is sent into Ireland by the queen from York, with letters and instructions for this purpose. And his pass to go to Dublin and other parts of the kingdom is signed by the Earl of Newcastle, May the 4th, 1643, which pass, with the letters aforesaid, were found in the marquess's pocket, when he was taken by Monroe (as the parliament say in the declaration aforementioned,) in the county of Down, or as Monroe's letter from Carrickfergus (in the castle whereof the marquess was kept prisoner,) dated May 23, 1643, tells us more particularly, in a bark coming from the Isle of Man, which bark he had the good fortune to hawl, as he lay before the castle of Newcastle.

And that this was the marquess's design, and the purpose of those instructions which he had from the queen (the parliament tells us) appears not only from the confession of the marquess himself, but from that likewise of his servant, Master Stewart (who was taken with him) when they were both under examination before General Monroe and the council of war, June 12, 1643.

Some time after this he got his liberty, and coming into England, settled at Oxford. The cessation was perfected and signed September the 15th, 1643; and at the latter end of this year, the Marquess of Montross coming to Oxford, and engaging to raise such a party in Scotland for the king, as should oblige the Scotch army to return out of England, if he had but some troops to begin with, and to serve for a protection to the royalists that should join him. The Marquess of Antrim is sent to Ireland with Daniel Oneal (a wise and faithful servant of the king's, and a protestant,) with instructions to draw a body of men out of that kingdom, to serve as a foundation for Montross's raising forces in Scotland. This body was to be sent in April, 1644; but (as, in the execution of designs, unforeseen difficulties often arise to retard it) did not land in the Highlands of Scotland till about the end of July following. These forces were in number about 1500 (say Clarendon and other historians,) and were commanded by Alexander mac Donnel, brother to the marquess, and behaved themselves with the utmost bravery in all the daring actions and amazing victories that Montross won against the rebels in that kingdom.

Whitlock (in his *Memoirs*, p. 93,) says these forces were 2500, and makes the marquess to be with them in person (p. 99;) and all along, wherever he mentions the marquess, he still supposes him to be in Scotland (see p. 225. 231, 232,) even till the end of the year 1646. But this account of his seems not to be exact, since those who have given us the most distinct relations of Montross's actions in Scotland take not the least notice of the Marquess of Antrim's being there. And yet all the historians that we have to give us an account of the affairs of Ireland are as entirely silent as to his being in that kingdom; nor have we any mention of him, till after the conclusion of the peace, March the 28th, 1646; and therefore it would be very hard treatment to charge him with any act of rebellion in that time, since there is not the least ground for it, nor indeed can be, when we consider that the cessation lasted all this while, and was continued from time to time, from September 15, 1643, till it ended in that peace which was concluded on March the 28th, and finally perfected July the 30th, 1646.

And now (as Sir Robert Cox in his *Apparatus* observes) affairs took a new turn; and what passes after this concerns not the argument, and there is no pretence of the marquess's acting by any orders from the king.

However, to lay before you what history records of him, I find him sent into France by the general assembly of Kilkenny, to the queen and prince, in January, 1647, to desire a lord lieutenant might be sent over to them. They that went with the marquess proposed and obtained of the queen that the Duke of Ormond might be the man sent over, tho' in this point the marquess dissented from and opposed them, there having been long an open and declared hatred between him and the duke.

The marquess returns from France in September, and on the 29th of the same month, 1648, the Duke of Ormond lands at Cork, and in November goes to Kilkenny to treat with the supreme council about a peace, which is concluded and signed January 17, 1648: the nuncio declares against it, but is forced to fly the kingdom, February 23d. However, Owen O'neal and the Marquess of Antrim adhere to him, and stand it out against the peace, which was concluded but 13 days before King Charles was murder'd in England, whose orders therefore surely cannot be pretended for this great conduct of the marquess.

His whole conduct from this time is justly blameable, but it is as clear that it cannot be imputed to King Charles, and that it was impossible for that prince to give his consent and instructions for it. For whether his picque against the Duke of Ormond, or a desire to save his estate by compliance with the regicides, and meriting their favour, who had then all the power of England in their hands, and would soon, in all human appearance, reduce Ireland; whether either of these were the motives of his actions, 'tis certain he not only stood out against the peace with Owen O'neal (who was at last by Daniel O'neal's interest and negociation brought over to join the Duke of Ormond, October 2, 1649,) but by means of his priest Kelly, carry'd on an intrigue with Cromwell from the time of his landing, which was August 15, 1649, and from the time of the taking of Ross, which was in the beginning of October, the correspondence became the more intimate and effectual, so that, as Sir Robert Cox (*Hibernia Anglicana*, part 2. chap 2. p. 55,) says, on May the 9th, 1650, his officious desires to serve that party prevailed with him to importune a conference with Commissary General Reynolds and the Bishop of Clogher, and afterwards with that bishop and Colonel Owen. In which, tho' the design was to asperse the memory of King Charles the 1st, and to justify and encourage his enemies; and so Ireton understood it, as is manifest from the favour and kindness he thereupon shewed to that lord, yet when discoursing about a commission being granted by the late king to the Irish, for their rising and acting as they had done in Ireland, on October 23, 1641, and after; the Marquess of Antrim said that he knew nothing of any such commission.

Not long after this conference, Antrim had a pass for going into England, and an order from Ireton to go among his tenants, and levy what money he could for his journey. By virtue whereof he raised 1000*l.* and came to Chester, December 3, 1650, carrying with him likewise a letter from Ireton to the council of state, importing that he the Marquess of Antrim had done the parliament army singular service since the first day they came before Ross, and so recommended him to their favour to compound for his estate (for which he had nine months time given him,) for two of which he was to be protected from all suits, and the rather, for that it did not appear that he had an hand in the beginning of the rebellion.

Having thus traced the conduct of the Marquess of Antrim thro' the whole course of those rebellious times, it will help us to explain the severall particulars contained in that letter which Mr Baxter makes the great ground of the charge against King Charles the 1st, and which he says King Charles the 2d. wrote to the Duke of Ormond and council.

This letter was wrote by King Charles the 2d's order, July the 10th, is signed Henry Bennet, and passed the signet office July 13, 1663, and is to be found at length in Ludlow's Memoirs, vol 3. from p. 353 to p. 357.

In it we may observe King Charles the 2d's averseness to interpose in behalf of any, that by their miscarriages in the late rebellion in Ireland had made themselves unworthy of his grace and protection; an averseness that was notorious unto all men, and particularly shewn in the case of the Marquess of Antrim. We may observe his jealousy in this point so great, as only on a general information of the misbehaviour of

the marquess towards himself and his father of blessed memory, (the proof of which was deferr'd) to deny him admission into his presence, and to imprison him in the Tower of London, to continue him there under a strict restraint for several months, -to send him afterwards to Ireland without interposing the least in his behalf, and to leave him there to undergo such a trial and punishment as should by the justice of the kingdom be found due to his crime.

We may likewise, (whilst the king was expecting that, pursuant to the information he had received, some heinous matter would be objected and proved against him,) see the marquess, after many months attendance there, and, 'tis to be presumed, after such examinations as were requisite, dismiss'd without any censure, without any transmission of charge against him, and with a licence to transport himself into England. These are all good signs of the marquess's innocence, and make for him.

Nor does what follows in the letter give any just grounds for Mr Baxter's uncharitable inferences from it. It takes notice of the marquess's meriting by his former actions the favour and protection of the king, and of the many services he had done, and the sufferings he had undergone for his affection and fidelity to the king's royal father and himself; which services were (as appears from history, from the very letter before us, and from the act which restored the marquess to his estate) his reducing the Irish to obedience, drawing forces from them to send to Montross in Scotland, and not only assisting King Charles the II^d. with arms and ammunition whilst he was in the west, but also furnishing him with ships to make his escape into foreign parts, when his armies were defeated in the west.

In a sense of these services, the king recommended to the lord lieutenant to move the council of Ireland for preparing a bill to be transmitted over, for the re-investing the marquess into the possession of his estate in that kingdom.

The lord lieutenant and council indeed (as appears from the letter) were of opinion that such a bill ought not to be transmitted. The reasons of which opinion they give in their letter of March 18, which they sent over to the king, with a petition from the old soldiers and adventurers.

The equity of the petition consisted only in this, that they had been peaceably possessed of the Marquess of Antrim's estate for 7 or 8 years, were very desirous to keep it longer, and should suffer if it was taken from them. And the reasons of the council were only, that they were informed, that he (the marquess) had put in his claim before the commissioners appointed for executing the Act of Settlement, and that if he was by them adjudged innocent, there was no need of the bill, but if nocent, it was not consistent with their duty to transmit such a bill, as, if pass'd into a law, would be a prejudice to so many soldiers and adventurers.

These reasons (you see) charge nothing against the marquess, and the council only desire, that his cause may be determined by the commissioners for executing the act of settlement.

The king however causes all the letters and petitions sent to him to be examined by several lords of the privy council, who, after a full hearing of what could be alledged on both sides, make this report, that they have seen several letters, all of the handwriting of King Charles the 1st to the said marquess, and several instructions concerning his treating and joining with the Irish in order to the king's service, by reducing them to their obedience, and by drawing forces from them for the service of Scotland. That (besides the letters and orders under his majesty's hand) they have received sufficient evidence and testimony of several private messages and directions sent from King Charles the 1st and from his queen, with the privy and direction of the king her husband, by which they are perswaded, that whatever intelligence, correspondence, or actings the said marquess had with the confederate Irish catholicks, was directed or allowed by the said letters, instructions, and directions, and that it manifestly appears

to them, that King Charles the 1st was well pleased with what the marquess did, after he had done it and approved the same.

This is the passage of the letter and the report of the members of the council which Mr Baxter founds his charge against King Charles the 1st upon, and with regard to which report the king declares at the end of the letter, that he cannot but in justice, and after a strict disquisition into the actions of the marquess, declare that he finds him innocent from any malice or rebellious purpose against the crown; and that what he did by way of correspondence or compliance with the Irish rebels was in order to the service of his royal father, and warranted by his instructions and the trust reposed in him; and that the benefit thereof accrewed to the service of the crown, and not to the particular benefit and advantage of the marquess. And the whole plainly relates to the correspondence and actings which the marquess had with the rebels, in order to get forces for Montross's assistance, or to make a peace, or at least a cessation, with them, which was then absolutely necessary for the preservation of the king's army in Ireland, and the security of his good subjects there, as I have observed before, and may be seen likewise in the king's motives to a cessation, published October 19, 1643.

And the letter so expressly tells us this to be the end of all the king's instructions and the marquess's correspondence, that Mr Baxter, did he not read this letter with the blindest prejudice, or were he not resolved to prevent its true meaning, must see it.

But so fair, so just a construction would not serve his purpose. No body could blame the king for making a cessation so necessary for him in the circumstances his affairs were then in; or for endeavouring to rid his hands of one enemy in Ireland, so that he might draw his forces thence to assist him against other more powerful and dangerous, and not less implacable enemies in England, (as he did, see Borlace History p. 139,) and to procure others to be sent to Scotland.

And if he gave any body orders or instructions for treating with them for this end, every one must see that this could be no more called giving a commission to the Irish rebels than his empowering others to treat with the English rebels at Uxbridge could be called a giving them a commission to fight against him, or an authorising their rebellion. Nor could the marquess in justice be stiled a rebel for treating and corresponding with the Irish in order to a peace, any more than those whom the king empowered in England for the like purpose were: And therefore Mr Baxter, to blacken the king, and render him as odious as possible, makes the marquess to be concerned in the beginning of the rebellion at the time of the massacre, and insinuates, that the king's instructions related to his actings then, contrary to the words and sense of the letter, contrary also to the accounts which the histories of those times give us of the marquess's conduct, which (as I have traced it) appears to be such as shews, that the instructions from the queen (mentioned in the letter of July 10, 1663) were given to the marquess at the beginning of the year 1643, as those from the king were at the end of the same year.

And that these were those very instructions, and no other, appears undeniably (to the full satisfaction of all that reverence the royal martyr's memory, and the confusion of those who impiously load it with such heavy calumnies) from King Charles II'd's own words, deliver'd on this very subject of the letter, in the most authentick manner, in an act of parliament (anno 17 and 18 Car. 2.) in the 2d about the Irish forfeited estates, and which, I think, is the same with that called the Act of Explanation, passed Dec. 15, 1665, in which he declares, that the testimony of the Marquess of Antrim's innocence, which he had given in that letter of July 16, 1663, and which, at the end of that letter, the Duke of Ormond and council are required to transmit to the commissioners for executing the act of settlement, for them to regulate their proceedings by, was only to declare, that the Marquess of Antrim was employed in Ireland to pro-

cure what forces he could from thence, to be transported into Scotland for his late majesty's service under the late Marquess of Montross, to the end, that the conversation of the said Marquess of Antrim in the rebels quarters, which was necessary for that service, might not, according to the letter of the former act, render him criminal. These are the words of that act of parliament, and is it possible for any thing more clearly to shew what the kings instructions, and what the Marquess of Antrim's correspondence and actings, pursuant thereto, were? Do they not appear to be perfectly innocent? And what then has Mr Baxter to answer for representing them otherwise?

I shall only observe one thing farther, (*viz.*) that by the first act of settlement, those that join'd with the nuncio, and opposed the peace of 1646, or that of 1648, forfeited their estates. And as the Marquess, by his conduct in that point (which I have represented before) had, according to the letter of that act, forfeited his, the council of Ireland (who on all occasions seem to favour the cause of the adventurers) in their letter of July 31, 1663, desirous to keep the marquess from his estate, and having nothing else to charge him with, insist on that clause in the act, and the marquess's conduct in that particular, and represent to the king, that if the marquess was restored to his estate, and adjudged innocent, it would infringe the act of the settlement, which was the very foundation of the kingdom's peace and quiet. The king, therefore, sensible of the inconveniencies of breaking through that act, and of a precedent of that kind in the court of claims (that court having adjudged the marquess innocent, though condemn'd by the letter of the act) thought fit by the act of explanation to provide for the security of the adventurers in general, and as the marquess's particular case was entitled to his compassion and favour, to provide likewise for his relief, by repealing at once the judgment of the Court of Claims in his favour, and restoring him to his estate by that act.

And as for that other story in Mr Baxter about the Lord Mazarine's and others prosecuting the cause so far, as that the Marquess of Antrim was forced to produce in the parliament of England, in the house of commons, a letter of King Charles I, by which he gave him order for his taking up arms; if this letter of the king's was one of those produced before the lord referees of the council, it has been already considered and cleared, and as it relates only to the marquess's drawing forces out of Ireland for the service of Scotland, the king can be no more blameable for giving the Marquess of Antrim such order, than for giving one to the Marquess of Montross for the like purpose and for the same service; but then this does not serve the purpose of those who quote this letter, and does not in the least support the charge they lay against the king.

And yet, if it is pretended that it is none of those which were laid before the lords of the council, it will be hard to account how the marquess came not to produce it before them for his fuller vindication: A man, all whose fortune depends on his being able to clear or justify his conduct, is very rarely shy of producing what is necessary for that end; and this and other circumstances about the letter give us just grounds to suspect the story, and (till we see better reason to credit it) to look upon it as one of those lies which that faction (whose rebellion subverted our constitution, and to whose malice the king himself fell a sacrifice) have never scrupled to raise and to assert with confidence whenever they thereby could serve the interests of their cause,—a cause indeed that needed them, and could not be supported otherwise.

That the Lord Mazarine should petition against the marquess is no wonder; he had part of his estate, and was desirous to keep it; and though he and Sir John Clotworthy (whose daughter and heiress he had married) had been engaged with the faction in those times, and he then actually enjoyed the plunder of one of the king's palaces, yet, considering the usual modesty of the party, which was so egregious as hardly ever to suffer them to beg pardon of the king for their rebellion, or shew a sense of shame for what they had acted against him, we have no reason to be surprized at that lord's

petitioning that he might be allowed to retain what of the Marquess of Antrim's estate he was possessed of.

But that he should petition the parliament of England, and bring the cause before the house of commons here, is a point that may well be question'd. I cannot find it in any account but what Mr Baxter refers us to; so that (for ought appears) it stands upon the single authority of the writer of the pamphlet, called *Murder will Out*, an authority too wretched and inconsiderable to give weight and credit to the veriest trifle in this dispute.

The act of explanation, which restored the marquess to his estate, and which passed Dec. 15, 1665, mentions a solemn hearing before his majesty at the council board in England, and upon a petition exhibited by several adventurers and soldiers (of which in all probability the Lord Mazarine was one) against the marquess, and the judgment and decree of the Court of Claims in his favour, but gives not the least hint of any petition presented in the parliament of England, which surely it would have done, had any been then presented, and it would be too late to present any afterwards, when the king had by act of parliament restored the marquess to his estate, and thereby put an end to all disputes about it.

And indeed the council was the proper court for the petitioners to apply to, whereas the English parliament meddled not in the settlement of Ireland; yet the story makes them apply to a court before whom the cognizance of their cause did not properly lie, and says, that their petition was presented, but without telling us when. 'Tis dangerous to fix a time for some facts, it might discover their falshood, and therefore it is waved in this case; and those who are willing to believe the charge against King Charles are left to imagine this petition, presented some time or other, they know not when, to be a matter of fact, without any just proof or credible testimonial of it.

And as to the letter said to be produced on occasion of this petition, we are told that the original of it was once (as Dr Calamy was informed) in the Paper Office, but now it is we know not where. The time of its being wrote we are not made acquainted with, and must be therefore at a loss about the date of it, as well as about that part of the marquess's conduct, which he produced it to justify. This looks very suspicious indeed; but what more directly proves the falshood of the letter, or the representation made of it, is, that it is quoted for justifying a man for doing what he never did, (as you see by the marquess's conduct before related,) and for giving the marquess a commission to take up arms in the Irish rebellion, which the marquess himself knew nothing of, and which he was so far from pretending to or counterfeiting, that (when he was most desirous to curry favour with the English rebels, at whose mercy he lay, and to whom he could not possibly recommend himself more than by accusing the king in this point) he utterly disavows all knowledge of any commission whatever given to the Irish for taking arms; as he does expressly in his conference before quoted, which he confirmed the truth of and attested under his hand, August 22, 1650.

And is not this a fine story to ground one of the blackest charges in nature against King Charles upon! A story that is attended with such suspicions and inconsistencies, and is palmed upon us without a witness to attest it, (for an unknown one is none at all,) and stands only on the no credit of the uncertain author of a scandalous pamphlet,* who might (for ought Dr Calamy knows) be the author also of the letter he makes the Marquess of Antrim to produce, and be guilty of an horrid imposition on the world, by representing it otherwise, and putting it to a different purpose than it really served to, and who was certainly of a party of men of the same principles with those who loaded King Charles, when alive, with so many and horrid lyes, and who would not, therefore, much scruple aspersing his memory when dead, if the doing so would advance the in-

* Abridgment of Baxter's Life, p. 44.

terest of their cause: a cause which they promoted by the most abominable forgeries that ever men were guilty of, and by the very common but villainous practice of counterfeiting authors, forging papers, letters, and petitions, and then imposing them upon the world for genuine, of which practice of theirs you may see several instances in Mr Wagstaff's excellent vindication of King Charles the martyr's title to the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλέως*, printed 1711, from p. 116 to p. 132, and p. 12, 13, and in the Earl of Clarendon's History.

And now, sir, to consider briefly Mr Baxter's conduct and manner of expressing his sentiments in the case before us, we may observe with what a sneer he mentions (what he calls) the egregious loyalty and veneration of his majesty in the house of commons, which was such, that the letter produced before them put them not at all one step out of the way which they had gone in.

It seems it did not alter their sentiments of the king; they still thought (because they knew) him to be innocent of this charge; for whatever Mr Baxter may think of the sense and conduct of the royalists in this point, their judgment and testimony are not to be laughed at, but will with unprejudiced men have their weight, and be allowed as no inconsiderable vindication of him.

For who could know the king's innocence and guilt so well as they? They were the men that were about him constantly; they knew his councils, his secrets, his actings, and proceedings; they were privy to all his affairs, were consulted in all the measures that he took, were necessary to the carrying on of any of his designs, and best knew the real sense of his heart; and if they who are best able to judge of and had the greatest opportunities of knowing his mind and actions; if they cleared the king from this charge, is it for those who had no such opportunities, no such means of knowing them, to dare to accuse him of it?

And as for those without doors, we know that there is nothing so absurd, so unreasonable and malicious, but some of them will say it; and we know as well a writer's meaning that quotes their seditious speeches; they are a very convenient sort of creatures for an author's purpose; for when he has a mind to say things he dare not own, 'tis but putting it into their mouths, and he gratifies his malice without the hazard of his credit, whilst he would be thought to relate other people's sentiments and not his own; but the artifice is grown stale and common, every one sees through it, and who-soever the words are, we know whose sense they speak.

Now what these are brought in for, is to insinuate, that the king was not against the Irish rebellion: But how can this be imagined? Was not that rebellion the ruin of his affairs? Was it not inconsistent with every part of his character? Did he not on all occasions, and with the most pathetic and vehement expressions declare, and in all his conduct shew, his abhorrence of it? And can any honest or good man suspect him of insincerity? No, men generally judge of others by themselves, and it is not so very strange, that a race of men all whose professions, whose most solemn appeals to God for the sincerity of their promises to make him a glorious king, were false and hypocritical, or those who inherit their principles are engaged in the same cause, and tread in the same steps, should suspect his to be so likewise; but that they should do this without evidence to support their suspicions, in opposition to his nearest interests, against the whole tenour of his actions and all the reason of things; this must raise, if not the wonder, at least the indignation of every fair and impartial person.

With what pretence to reason can Mr Baxter make any to suggest, that the rebels did not belie the king, when they said that they had his warrant or commission? Were not all the interest of the Irish and all the malice and power of the English rebels too weak to shew that any commission was given them? Did not Sir Phelim Oneal, the head of that rebellion, under the greatest tryals, and with his dying words, clear him from this charge? Did not the rebels in general own that their pretence to it was a lie?

Did they not in a body wave all pretensions to a commission, and acknowledge the king's abhorrence of their rebellion? Does not the Marquess of Antrim also expressly clear him, and declare, that he knew not of any commission ever given to the Irish? Was ever innocence better proved? Can any thing be added to set it in a better light, or to expose more shamefully the malice of those who revive the calumny?

Nor is the next insinuation less malicious and unjust, (viz.) as if the king with a treacherous mind had offered to go himself with an army into Ireland to fight against them.

His virtues, and particularly his integrity, were too bright and manifest to all the world, to be tarnished with the base suspicions of his enemies. Treachery never made any part of his character, never appeared in any one action of his, but was notoriously the main ingredient in the composition of his enemies, and was used by them in the whole course of their conduct, so that for them to accuse him of treachery was the highest impudence, as their accusation was the basest slander.

And as for those wishes which Mr Baxter puts upon those that were still loyal to the king, viz. that King Charles II. had rather declared (viz. in the letter of July the 10th) that his father did only give the Marquess of Antrim commission to raise an army, as to have helped him against the Scots. What need of this wish, when King Charles II. has plainly done it, as I have shewn in the examination of that letter? Or of the other wish, that his (the marquess's) turning against the English protestants in Ireland, and the murdering so many hundred thousands, had been declared to have been against his (King Charles's) will? And what need likewise of that solemn addition, containing in it a vile insinuation and charge, which we have in these words: *But quod scriptum erat, scriptum erat.*

For a man to charge the Marquess of Antrim with being concerned in the beginning of the rebellion, and with having an hand in the murder of so many hundred thousand protestants, and this without a single fact in history to support the charge against the confessions and exclamations of the rebels, against the express testimony of Ireton in his behalf, is certainly a wickedness of a very heinous nature.

To do this, and to wrest the words of a letter, in order to stain the honour of one of the best princes that ever filled a throne, and to impute an impiety of such a nature to a prince of admirable virtues, a prince who had been dead many years, who, as he had led a life full of sorrows and embittered with the heaviest calamities, died also in such circumstances as must move the compassion of all that have any humanity in them; and might (one would think) melt the heart even of his most cruel enemies, he being murdered before his own palace, in all the pomp of a triumph, by the most barbarous rebels under the sun, and to treat him in this manner, to pursue him even beyond death, and not let his ashes to rest in peace, but to call him from the grave, to arraign him afresh, and murder him in his memory, has in it all the circumstances of baseness.

To do this, and to lay upon him a charge in its nature inhumane, in its circumstances incredible, without all intrinsick or outward evidence, inconsistent with the king's character, contrary to his publick acts, to his constant professions, to his repeated and vehement declarations of abhorrence, his solemn appeals to God, his whole conduct and actions, his offers, his religion, and his very interest, against the testimony of all that were about his person, and of all the historians who have wrote of those times, of friends and enemies, of rebels as well as subjects, *i. e.* against all the evidence that the nature of the thing will admit of, and in spite of ten thousand absurdities and contradictions, is a practice so full of horror, an iniquity of such a size, as I want words to express its just demerit. And yet this is what Mr Baxter has done, with what conscience let all indifferent people judge, with what end is plain

from his own words, after his false accusation of the Marquess of Antrim, and vile perverting of King Charles II'd. words and meaning in his letter. Upon this (says Mr Baxter) the parliament's old adherents grew more confident than ever (they were always confident, and among these Mr Baxter, but now more than ever) of the righteousness of their wars, and the very destroyers of the king, whom the first parliamentarians called rebels, did presume also to justify their cause, and said that the law of nature did warrant them.

Here we see the end of horrid slander on the king, and the use to be made of it, (viz.) to lessen the horror of his martyrdom, to shew the righteousness of the most unnatural and inexcusable rebellion that was ever raised, and to justify even the cause of the regicides.

Such causes indeed are not to be carried on but by such vile methods, by a succession of such calumnies as have been thrown on the blessed martyr; but to join in these methods, and to propagate these calumnies, whatever policy there be in it, has certainly in it abundance of impiety.

But as bad as it is, it is one degree less execrable than the calling upon Providence to justify it, and to father the horribly unjust and scandalous aspersion thrown on the king. And yet Dr Calamy (in his *Abridgment of Mr Baxter's Life*, p. 43, edit. 1713;) imputes the discovery of it to Providence, and says, that as Providence has ordered it, a certain memorable particularity (viz.) the story of the Marquess of Antrim, (which I have refuted) helped to set this matter in a just light, *i. e.* (as he thinks) to shew that King Charles was guilty of the charge. The falshood of this I have shewn already, and shall only observe farther, that to make Providence order the publishing of a story, whose weight is owing only to downright falshoods, or unfair representations of the sense of words, for so base an end, is treading in the steps of the rebels of 1648. The regicides of those days, we know, called upon God to warrant the murdering of their king in his person, as Dr Calamy does for the murdering of him in his memory.

This is a point in which Dr Calamy cannot call upon Mr Baxter to patronize him in, as he does for quoting the story of the Marquess of Antrim from him; but is there not the same reason and conscience to keep a man from spreading as from raising a lye? Is it not a very poor excuse for the injury done to the royal martyr's honour, by publishing a notorious calumny of him, for a man to say he transcribes it from another, and therefore is not to answer for it? Dr Calamy should know better what a man owes to truth and justice, and that he who spreads a lye does by that act adopt it for his own, becomes a party to it, and makes it his own act and deed, and must answer for his publishing as well as the author for his inventing it.

And as for your own conduct in this dispute; that a man at this time should dare to load the memory of the royal martyr with so horrid a slander; that this should be done by you, who have generally passed for a fairer and more moderate man than most of your sect, is what I am sorry, as others are surprised to find, and may teach us how to judge of others of the same party of men, who have more warmth in their nature and less caution in their conduct. That you should do this in the publick manner that you did, should spread your first letter with so much diligence, so much ostentation, as to place it in the shops of this town to be distributed about (of which I was assured by a person to whom three copies of it were actually offered on Feb. 4, in the afternoon, before I had sent or indeed finished my first letter to you, and which made me hasten the sending that letter) does not look as if you desired private information; but as you had made your challenge publick, so you expect a publick dispute. That you should (after I had laid before you the reasons and testimonies of King Charles's innocence, contained in my letter of Feb. 3, and represented the defective-

ness of the charge against him in point of proof, and the necessity of its being proved before it could be needful to clear him) still persist in your demand of having it more particularly disproved, send me yours of Feb. 4, and with a surprising modesty tell me, you think it a sufficient reply to what I urged in mine for the king's vindication, is, what will make me have a modest opinion indeed of the effect, which the proofs that I have now brought of the king's innocence may have on you towards your conviction.

I have, however, answered your challenge, and cleared the business of the Marquess of Antrim; I have (what has been always thought too unreasonable to be demanded) even proved a negative, and shewn that he was not concerned (as Mr Baxter charges him) in the beginning of the rebellion or massacre, and that there is not the least ground for the false and malicious interpretation made of King Charles the II^d. 's sense in the letter of July 10, 1663. I have therefore given you the satisfaction you desired, and all the evidence that can be expected about a matter of fact; and may therefore justly be allowed now to require you to make an acknowledgement of the royal martyr's innocence as publick as your charge against him was. This is the only satisfaction that you can make for the injury you have done his memory, and justice exacts it as far at your hands; and if you decline doing it, it will give the world no advantageous opinion either of your charity in advancing so abominable a charge against King Charles, or of your honesty in not retracting it.

I shall take notice but of one thing more, and that is, the insults and triumphs of many on the delay of this answer. Well-wishers to a cause, be it ever so bad an one, can hardly conceal their transports at every imaginary advantage that they gain; and what little ground there was for their triumphs and confidences you may by this time be sensible of; and it can hardly be needful for me to assure you, that this delay was occasioned, not so much by the difficulty of clearing the point, which is the chief subject of this, as by the vast hurry of the business (of which they could not be ignorant) incumbent on me in this place, which has been so great, that from the receipt of yours till the date above, when I begun this letter, I had not had one hour any day to myself, and which has caused me so many avocations since, so that I have been obliged to defer sending to you till this day, February 27.

I am, Sir,

Your humble servant,

THOMAS CARTE.

Mr Baxter and Dr Calamy, to support their charge against King Charles, depend chiefly (as appears from their words quoted in this letter) on two wretched authorities indeed. The one is a letter said to be produced in the house of commons in England by the Marquess of Antrim; the other is the pamphlet called *Murder will Out*; concerning which I am to observe, that I have searched for both, with all the diligence I could use, but without success; this is what I might well expect with regard to the former, since Dr Calamy expresses himself about it in such a manner,* that it looks as if he was conscious that there was no such letter in being.

And with regard to the letter, I only get this account, which is given by Mr Long, in his *Review of Mr Baxter's Life*, p. 207, that it is a scandalous libel, written by one of the regicides, and (as he thinks) by Ludlow, and published after the revolution, when that infamous wretch dared to return into England, in hopes of the protection of the government, when in his, and other pamphlets that were published about the same

* Abridgement of Baxter's Life, p. 44. Edit. 1713.

time, all the lies and calumnies that had been ever raised of the royal family were revived; and what regard such an authority deserves let any judge.

How far it is from deserving any in the present dispute, I have shewn already, in the letter I sent to Mr Chaundler, on February 27, from whom I have ever since waited for an answer, but that perhaps is what I have no reason to expect. I might, however, at least hope for his thanks for giving him that proof of the king's innocence which he had not seen, and called upon me to direct him to; this being what himself has offered and bid me to expect. And whoever considers his seeming regard to the doing the royal martyr justice, his protestation that he should be heartily glad to find the calumny disproved, his giving me assurance that he would not dissemble any satisfaction that is given him, his solemn declaration, in the presence of God, that he would heartily thank me for directing him to a refutation of this story, will think that these were encouragements enough to hope for thus much from him. For can it be imagined that such protestations, such solemn appeals to God, should mean nothing, and be attended with no effect. We know indeed what end they served, and what their meaning was in 1648; but sure those times are not returned, surely men will not now dare to deal freely with God and his providence, or make their appeals to him with that hypocrisy which was practised then. One would in charity hope that their assurances might be somewhat more to be depended on, and their declarations in the presence of God made with more sincerity of heart. But at present, in the case before us, we can only hope this. 'Tis performance must give us assurance of it, and the longer that it is delayed the weaker our hopes must be. For as Mr Chaundler cannot but know that justice to the martyr's memory, (an obligation which with a needless care he has put me in mind of,) requires him to publish his satisfaction in the proofs of his innocence that have been laid before him; so his desires likewise (if they are hearty, as he pretends they be) of seeing the impious calumny disproved, will not suffer him to delay this a moment, will not let him dissemble his satisfaction longer.

As for his promise of thanks to myself, that, as far as is in my power, I willingly release him, only desiring that satisfaction may be made for the injury done to King Charles's memory, as the most pleasing return that can be made to me. His obligations to this are too plain to be denied, and (may I hope! they) are too strong to be got over, and since I need not with Mr Chaundler more a knowledge than he has of his duty how to act in this case, let me at least with him have an heart to perform it.

To provide however against a neglect, and to supply what has been hitherto wanting on his part, I have taken this method to vindicate the king's honour and refute the charge against him,—a method which seems the more necessary, because this story of the Marquess of Antrim is referred to as an established truth, as an authentick piece of history, in p. 7, of a late pamphlet, entituled, 'A Letter from a Gentleman at Dunkirk to a Nobleman in London,' who, from what is said, p. 21, appears to be a bishop.

I have but one thing more to add, which is, that I hope, if the reader meets with any uncorrectness of expression in my two letters, the haste and circumstances in which I wrote them may be allowed as an excuse for it. But as for the main of the argument, I desire no favour, for if I had not thought it clear, should not have troubled the world with it; and I cannot think this nation yet so generally poisoned with ill principles, or to have so little sense of gratitude to King Charles, or regard for his memory, as not to receive favourably a vindication of him, or to make it needful to use any other apology for publishing it.

Bath, May 12, 1714.

Postscript.

Since it grates hard on human nature (such is the corruption of it) to recant any error, and scarce any thing is a greater tryal of a man's humility and regard to truth and justice, to dispose Mr Chaundler the more readily to a publick vindication of King Charles from the charge against him, and to an ingenuous acknowledgment of his error, and of the falshood of his prejudices in that point, let me recommend to him the example of some of his own brethren, not only that of Mr Henderson, whose recantation and repentance are already publick enough, and whose memory is valued nothing more than for this part of his conduct, but that likewise of Mr Vines, a very celebrated man among the presbyterians in the time of the rebellion, of whose sentiments of King Charles, after the treaty at Uxbridge, take this account as it was given about the year 1675, by Mr Nathaniel Gilbert of Coventry, in an information subscribed by his own hand, the original whereof is in the custody of my father, now living in Leicester, and minister of the church of St Martin's there, to whose grandmother the said Mr Nathaniel Gilbert was half-brother there, and what I here publish is taken from an attested copy of it, now lying before me.

When Mr Vines returned from the treaty at Uxbridge, Mr Walden being at London with Mr Nathaniel Gilbert, news was brought to them that Mr Vines was returned, whereupon they both went to Mr Vines, who, after usual ceremonies between friends, said, with great affection, Brother Walden, how hath this nation been fooled! We have been told that our king was a child and a fool; but, if I understand any thing by my converse with him, which I have had with great liberty, he is as much of a Christian prince as ever I read or heard of since our Saviour's time; he also said he is a very precious prince, and is able of himself to argue with the ablest divines we have.

Item, That he gave such undeniable reasons for episcopacy, &c. that the world could not answer them, that he had convinced him that it was agreeable to the primitive times.

As for his (meaning the king's) clergy, there is no fence against their flails; they are a great deal too hard for us.

That this, and much more to the same purpose, was affirmed by M. Vines to Mr Walden, is attested by Nathaniel Gilbert.

Among the other things affirmed by Mr Vines, my father well remembers Mr Gilbert told him this expression of his in relation to the king, viz. "That among all the kings of Israel and Judah there was none like him."

INDEX.

A

B

ADAMSON, Archbishop of St Andrews, libel on him, 415.
 Adderton Moor, Fairfax defeated there, 382.
 Allibond, John, account of him, 503. *Rustica Academia Oxoniensis, nuper Reformata Descriptio*, *ibid.* The same in English, by Edward Ward, 506
 Alured, Colonel, takes Lord Goring prisoner, 381
 Amsterdam, Socinian books burnt there, 17. Rope dancers prohibited, *ib.*
 Antrim, Marquis of, accused of participating in the Irish rebellion, 618. The king's letter to him justifying the rebellion, 625. His trial, 630. Assists the Marquis of Montrose, 631, 643. Account of the restitution of his estate, 650. Endeavours to pacify the rebels, 652. Account of his proceedings, 652, 653. Imprisoned and escapes, 652. Again taken prisoner, 653. Sent over to the queen and prince, in France, *ib.* Comes over to England, 654. General vindication of his conduct, 660
 Armagh, cathedral of, defaced by the rebels, 585
 Arundel, Thomas, Earl of, Lilly's account of him, 466
 Ashley, Sir Jacob, wounded before Gloucester, 322. Wastes Gloucestershire, 363, 364
Assembly Man, by Sir J. Birkenhead, 487
 Atkinson, Captain, slain at Wetherby, 377
 Augsburg, Confession of, quoted, 58
 Axtell, Colonel, cries out for justice against the king at the trial, 206

VOL. V.

Backhouse, Captain, feigns a treaty with the enemy to give up Gloucester, 338. Mortally wounded, 370
 Baillie, General, his behaviour at Marston Moor, 282. At the siege of Newcastle, 287
 Baillie, Rev. Mr, his account of the negociations of the Scotch commissioners at London, 88
 Ball, William, *The Power of Kings discussed, in answer to Judge Jenkins*, 132
 Ballantine, Lieutenant-colonel, mortally wounded at York, 281
 Banbury, skirmish there, 352
 Bastwicke, John, M. D. *Litany of*, 403. Account of him, *ib.* His speech at the pillory, 414
 Baxter, Richard, accuses Charles I. of having caused the Irish rebellion, 630. His encomiums on the regicides, 635. Carte's answer to Baxter, 639
 Beachly, fortified by the royalists, 356, 359
 Bedford, Earl of, Lord Burleigh's instructions to him respecting Berwick, 554.
 Belgia, Confession of, quoted, 58
 Bellasis, Colonel, governor of York, 388.
 Berkenhead, Sir John, reasons for his being the author of the Reply to Cook's Case of King Charles, 237. *The Assembly Man*, 487. Account of him, *ib.*
 Berkeley castle summoned in vain by Massie, 355
 Berwick, Lord Burleigh's instructions respecting, 554
 Beverstone castle attacked by Massey in vain, 332. Surrendered to him, 348.
 Birmingham, houses burnt there, 34

- Blaney, Richard, a justice of peace, hanged by the Irish rebels, 606, 621
- Blaxton, Sir William, wounded, 358
- Bohemia, Confession of, quoted, 57
- Bowdon-hill, battle of, 280
- Bradford, action of, 376. Taken by the Earl of Newcastle, 383
- Bradshaw, Lord President of the high court for trial of the king, 195. Speech before the sentence, 209
- Brentford fight, 265
- Brett, Sir Jerome, summons Gloucester, 312
- Brightman, Dr, prophesies the downfall of prelacy, 463
- Bristol surrenders to the royalists, 319
- British Lightning, or Tumults in England, &c.* from the Dutch, 3
- Buckleugh, Lord, a snake said to have been found in his heart, 565
- Buckingham, Duke of, view of his behaviour at the Isle of Rhee, by Colonel Fleetwood, 398. Accused of poisoning James I. and the Marquis of Hamilton, 437, 442
- Buckingham, second Duke of, epitaph on Lord Fairfax, 397
- Burleigh, William Cecil, Lord, instructions respecting Berwick, 554
- Burrows, Sir J., killed on the Isle of Rhee, 400
- Burton pilloried and banished, 408. His behaviour at the pillory, 426
- Butler, Sir F., account of what passed in the commons house when he and Judge Jenkins were voted guilty of treason, 128.
- Butler, Samuel, *King Charles's Case truly stated, in answer to Cooke*, ascribed to him, 237. His character of King Charles, 246. *Proposal for the farming of Liberty of Conscience*, 494
- Byron, Lord, besieges Nantwich, 387
- C
- Calamy, E., accuses Charles I. of the Irish massacre, 630, 633, 638. Answered by Carte, 639
- Calendar, Earl of, commander of a Scottish army, 283. Takes Stockton and Hartlepool, 284. Crosses the Tyne, *ib.*
- Cambridge, petition of the university of, to parliament, 503
- Capel, Lord, taken by Fairfax at Colchester, 395
- Carew, Sir Matthew, flies from Tewksbury, 315
- Cary, Mrs, sees apparitions of Charles I., 469
- Carte, Thomas, *The Irish Massacre set in a clear Light*, 639
- Catholics, treaty of Ormond with them, 542, 545. Their further demands, 547. Their meeting in Westmeath, 589. Resolutions passed there, *ib.*
- Chaloner, T., speech respecting the disposal of the king's person alluded to, 82
- Chancery, account of the origin of the court of equity in, 64
- Chandos, Lord, his horse join the Irish forces, 333. He is surprised, 334
- Charles I. writes a letter to the pope, 36. Howell's account of the intended Spanish match, and of his negotiations with the pope, 54, 55. Negotiations respecting him between the Scotch and English commissioners, 69. Manner of his coming to the Scotch army, 81. Account of his intended escape from Carisbrook castle, 152. Tract concerning that transaction, *ib.* His fortitude and patience in confinement, 164. *Proclamation for Trial of the King*, 191. Observations on the trial and execution, 191. *Narrative of the Trial*, 195. Continued, 203, 205. His behaviour on entering the court and during the trial, 195, 198. Charge against him, with Lilburne's notes, 196. Disclaims the authority of the court, 198. His character, 201. Speech before his condemnation, 207, 208. Report that he proffered to resign the crown to his son, 208. His sentence, 210. His execution, 211. His reasons against the pretended high court of justice, 212. *King Charles's Case, or an Appeal to all rational Men concerning his Trial*, by Cooke, 214. Answer to this, ascribed to Butler, 237. Accused of having caused his father to be poisoned, 219, of having caused the Irish rebellion, 229, 573; and of having betrayed Rochelle, 229, 231. Letters to the citizens of that town, 232. *Narration of the Title, Government, and Cause of the Death of King Charles*, 248. Alexander Henderson's character of him, 251. Another by Mr Vines, 252. *The Dissenting Ministers' Vindication of themselves from the Murder of King Charles I.*, 258. *Iter Carolinum, or Account of the necessitated Marches, Retreats, and Sufferings, of Charles I.*, 262. List of those who condemned him, 275. *Relation of some Passages when he was in Spain*, 461. *Murder will Out, or the King's Letter justifying the Marquis of Antrim*, by Colonel Ludlow, a tract accusing the king of having caused the rebellion in Ireland, 624. *Vindication of Charles I. from the Irish Massacre*, 630. *The Irish Massacre set in a clear Light*, by Carte, 639
- Charles, Prince of Wales, declaration concerning the illegal proceedings of the commons of England, 252. Letter to the king, 253. Let-

ter to the Marquis of Antrim justifying his rebellion, 625
 Charrington down, battle of, 340
 Chaundler, Mr, Letters to Mr Carte, accusing Charles I. of the Irish massacre, 642, 648, 646. Carte's answers, 642, 643, 647
 Chesne, de, King Charles's letter to the pope, printed in a book of his, 36
 Cirencester garrisoned, 307. The king's forces come before the town, and retire again, 308. The town stormed, 309; retaken by the parliamentary forces, 328.
 Cockatrices, supposed origin of them, 566
 Coford, skirmish there, 312
 Coke, Roger, observation on the execution of the king, 192
 Cole, Captain, defeats the rebels at Sligo, 549, 551
 Colchester taken by Fairfax, 395. Proceedings against the puritans there, 418
 Colerain besieged by the rebels, 652
 Colthorpe, Sir Henry, liberties and usages of the city of London, 520
 Commons, house of, see Parliament
 Con, Seigneur, negotiates with Laud, 468
 Congrave, Lieutenant-colonel, killed at Westbury, 345
 Confessions of different churches quoted to shew the divine right of kings, 57
 Cooke, John, answers the advertisement for the new election of burgesses, 62. *King Charles's Case, or an Appeal to all rational Men concerning his Trial*, 214. Quotation from it, 625
 Cooke, Sir Robert, governor of Tewksbury, 316
 Corbet, John, history of the siege of Gloucester, 296
 Cowley, Abraham, *The Puritan and Papist*, a satire, 480
 Crawford, Earl of, distinguishes himself at Marston Moor, 288
 Crawford, Colonel, repulsed before York, 388
 Crispe, Captain, makes a successful sally from Gloucester, 323
 Cromwell, Oliver, recommends the murder of the king, 161. The independents claim the honour of the battle of Marston Moor for him, 281; where he commands the left wing of the horse, 289. Overturned in Hyde-park, 469

D

Digby, Lord, treaty with Captain Backhouse for the surrender of Gloucester, 338
Dissenting Ministers' Vindication of themselves from the Murder of King Charles, 258
Divine Right and Irresistibility of Kings evidenced, 56

Doucet, a soldier, assists the king in his intended escape from Carisbrook castle, 163. His information against Rolfe, 163

E

Earthquake, supposed effects of one in 1640, 5
 Edgehill, battle of, 32, 305
 Eglington, Earl of, his behaviour on Marston Moor, 282
 Eglisbam, Dr George, pamphlet accusing the Duke of Buckingham of having poisoned King James I. and the Marquis of Hamilton, 437
England's Petition to their King, 33. *England's Tears for the present Wars*, by T. Howell, 37.
 Judge Jenkins's tract on the laws of the land, 98.
 Essex, Earl of, retakes Worcester, 305; besieges Reading, 316; appears before Gloucester, 327; Fairfax's opinion of him, 391.
 Essex, Colonel Thomas, enters Gloucester, 306
 Evesham besieged by Massey, 371; stormed, 372

F

Fairfax, Sir Thomas, marches towards the Scotch, 70, 84. His fear of being poisoned, 164. The presbyterians claim the honour of the victory of Marston Moor for him, 281. Made governor of York, 283. Memorials of himself, 374. His character by Lord Orford, *ib.* His sentiments of the king's murder, 375. Joins Monk at the Restoration, 376. Wounded, 384. Joins Cromwell, 386. His exploits at Marston Moor, 389. Wounded at Helmsley, 390. Reasons for his fighting for the parliament, 390. Difficulties of his army, 392. Waits on the king near Cambridge, 394. His behaviour during the execution of the king, 395. Executes Sir George Lisle and Sir Charles Lucas, 396. His epitaph by the Duke of Buckingham, 397. Believes in astrology, 461
 — Lady, interrupts the trial of the king, 206. Taken prisoner by the royalists, 384. Released, 385.
 — Brian, publishes Fairfax's Memoirs, 376
 — Charles, mortally wounded at Marston Moor, 390
 Farrer, Dr, proposes that the king and parliament should decide their differences by lot, 211
 Fettiplace, Colonel, governor of Cirencester, 307

Fiennes, Colonel, defeated by Prince Rupert, 304
 Fleetwood, Colonel, *View of the Behaviour of the Duke of Buckingham at the Isle of Rhee*, 398.
 Fletcher defeated in Westmorland by the Scots, 280
 Follot, Captain, defeats the Irish at Lowthers-town, 551
 Fox, Right Hon. C. J. Remarks on his observations on the execution of the king, 192
 France, absolute power of the king of, 50

G

Game at Scotch and English, Unhappy, 68; written by an independent, 74
 Gifford, Major-general, blamed by Fairfax for disaffection, 382
 Glenham, Sir Thomas, attacks Fairfax at Wetherby, 377
 Gloucester, *History of the Siege of*, 296. Reasons for the king's attacking it, 296. Sentiments of the inhabitants, 302. The king's army comes before the town, 320. Answer to the summons of the king, 321. Discontent of the garrison, 334
 Goring, Lord, repulses Fairfax, 380. Taken prisoner, 381. Raises an army in Kent, 393
 Gray, Major, killed by Major Hammond, 353
 Gregory XV., Pope, his negotiations with Charles I., 54.

H

Hacker, Colonel, commands the guard at the King's trial, 195
 Hamilton, James Marquis of, Buckingham charged with having poisoned him, 437. Account of him, 440.
 Hamilton, Duke of, marches with an army into England, 393
 Hammond, Colonel, prevents the king's escape from Carisbrook Castle, 153. Account of him, 156. Accused of having intended the king's death, 161. Kills Major Gray, 353
 Haslerig, Sir Arthur, commands the first body of cavalry in the parliament's service, 316
 Hayden, Sir W., drowned at the isle of Rhee, 399
 Helvetian confession quoted, 57
 Henderson, Rev. Alex., his opinion of the king's piety, 164. Account of him, 250. *Declaration upon his death bed*, *ib.* Declared a forgery by the General Assembly, *ib.* Alluded to, 664
 Henderson, Lieut. Col., killed at Newcastle, 289
 Henderson, Sir John, attacks the rear of Fairfax, 386

Henrietta Maria, Queen, goes to the Hague with the prince, 30
 Herbert, — conversation with the king previous to the execution, 211
 Herbert, Lord, rises for the king in Wales, 306
 Hereford, differences between the King's governor and the country people, 367, 368
 Herne, Colonel, slain, 382
 High Constable and High Steward of England, observations on those offices, 509
 Highnam, taken, 313
 Holland, corruptions in the government there, 23, 24. Treaties with the parliament, 31
 Honorius, Phil., his observations on the English laws, 65
 Hopton, Sir Ralph, defeated at Charrington Down, 340
 Hopton, parliamentary Colonel, taken prisoner, 366
 Horncastle fight, 386
 Hotham, Captain, charges the cavaliers at Sherburne, 379. Treats with the Earl of Newcastle, 379
 Howard, Colonel Henry, taken in Malmesbury, 348
 Howell, James, *England's Tears for the present Wars*, 37. Account of his imprisonment, *ib.* 53. Letter to the King, 37. *The pre-eminence and Pedigree of Parliament*, 47. Denies that Charles I. caused the Irish massacre, 641, 642
 Hudson, Dr Michael, his account of King Charles's coming to the Scots army, 81

J

James I., his instructions to Drs Mawe and Wren on his Son's going to Spain, 54. Exalts the court of chancery, 64. Buckingham charged with having poisoned him, 437, 442
 Jenkins, David, Judge, account of him, 92. *Plea to the Earl of Manchester and the Speaker*, 92. *Argument concerning a gentleman condemned for the late rising in Canterbury*, 94. *Remonstrance to the Lords and Commons*, 95. *Lex Terra, or the Laws of the Land*, with the original dedication, 98. Refutation of some of Prynne's tenets, 110. His *Cordial for the People of London*, in answer to H. P., 115. *Discourse on the Inconveniences of a long-continued Parliament*, 123. *Account of what passed in the Commons House when he and Sir Francis Butler were voted guilty of Treason*, 128. His answer to Lenthall the speaker, 129. Liberated at the Restoration, 132. William Ball's answer to him, 132
 Jerusalem, story of Ananias foretelling the destruction of, 467
 Impropropriations purchased at Goldsmith's Hall, compounding with Delinquents, 140

Inchiquin, Lord, commands an Irish regiment before Gloucester, 335

Independents Loyalty, or the Plot to murder his Majesty discovered, 152

Jones, Dr Henry, *Remonstrance of some Passages concerning Ireland*, 573. His deposition, 587

Ireland, atrocities committed by the rebels, 5, 28, 31, 579, 589. Pamphlets relating to the rebellion, 542, 572, 624, 628, 630, 639. *Irish Cabinet, or his Majesty's secret Papers for establishing the Papal Clergy*, 542. *Remonstrances of some remarkable Passages concerning the Church and Kingdom of Ireland*, 573. Commissions for trying the rebels, 581, 582. *True and full Relation of the hellish Plot of the Papists in Ireland*, 628. *Murder will Out, or the King's Letter justifying the Marquis of Antrim*, 624. *Vindication of Charles I. from the Irish Massacre*, 630. *The Irish Massacre set in a clear Light*, 639

Juxon, Bishop, his conversations with the king at his execution, 211

K

Kent, rising of the cavaliers there, 94

Kyrle, Colonel, surprised by Massey, 357

L

Latham, the siege raised by Prince Rupert, 388

Laud, Archbishop, preaches against the Jesuites, 10, 11. His alterations in the Scottish liturgy, 13. Vindicated from the charge of having advised the omission of a sentence in the coronation oath, 216. Bastwicke's libel on him and the other bishops, 403

Lawley, Sir Richard, slain, 312

Lawyers, their unpopularity among the republicans, 62

Ledbury, stormed by Colonel Massie, 345

Leeds, stormed by Fairfax, 378

Leg, Col. William, sent to treat with Col. Massey respecting the surrender of Gloucester, 320, 321

Legge, Col. Robert, governor of Evesham, taken prisoner, 372

Leicester, earldom of, 510, *et seq.*

—— Earl of, delivers an account of the Irish rebellion to parliament, 629

Lenthall, W., speaker of the Commons, speech against Judge Jenkins and Sir F. Butler, 128

Lesley, David, real commander of the Scots army, 279. Leads them at Marston Moor, 283

Lesley, Lord, delivers up his sword to the king at Newark, 78. State of his army, 86. Commands the Scots army only nominally, 279

Lewis, XIV., declaration against the rebellious party in England, 257

Lidney, skirmish there, 365. The house burnt, 371

Lilburne, Col., account of him, 196. His notes on the charge against the king, 196

Lisle, Sir George, taken prisoner by Fairfax at Colchester, and executed, 395

Lissegoal Castle, burnt by the Irish rebels, 614, 617

Lister, Captain, slain at Tadcaster, 378

Lithgow, William, account of the siege of New-castle, 279

London, the citizens rise against the Parliament, 170. *Liberties, Usages, and Customs of the City*, 520

Long, Mr, answers Baxter respecting the king's causing the Irish massacre, 632

Loudon, Earl of, his speech on the covenant, 82, 83

Lowther's Town, the Irish defeated there, 550

Lucas, Sir Charles, taken by Fairfax at Colchester, and executed, 395

Ludlow, Col., his account of Colonel Pride's purging the House of Commons, 183. His inconsistency, 184. *Murder will Out, or the King's Letter justifying the Marquis of Antrim*, 624, written by Ludlow, 634, 662

Lumsdale, Col., his behaviour at Marston Moor, 283

M

Macdonnel, Alexander, joins Montrose with the Irish forces, 653

Macguire, Lord, his share in the Irish rebellion, 589, 597, 629. Denies that the king had caused the massacre, 641, 642

Malignants, Howell's observations on the term, 52

Malmesbury, stormed by Massey, 348

Malon, John, chaplain to the Irish Catholic army, 583

Manchester, Earl of, defeats the royalists at Horn castle, 386

Manley, *Iter Carolinum, or Relation of the Marches, Retreats, and Sufferings of Charles I.* 263

—— Sir Roger, denies that Charles I. had caused the Irish rebellion, 644

Marston Moor, battle of, Lithgow's account, 281. Fairfax's, 389

Martin, Henry, speech against Judge Jenkins, 129

Massey, Col. Edward, governor of Gloucester, account of him, 297. Appointed governor, 317. Refuses to treat with the king, 320.

Removed from the government, 373, 374

Maurice, Prince, takes Tewksbury, 315. Forces Sir W. Waller to retreat, 316
 Maxwell, Dr, Bishop of Kilmore, asserts the innocence of Charles I. with respect to the Irish massacre, 647, 651
 May, Dr E., *Account of a Serpent found in the Heart of John Pennant*, 558
 Mazarin, Cardinal, his intentions towards England, 257
 ——— Lord, petitions against the Marquis of Antrim being restored, 657
 Meldrum, Sir John, storms Selby, 388
Mercurius Britannicus, Tragi-comœdia, 444
 Micklethwait, Captain, slain at Marston Moor, 389
 Mildmay, Sir H., his speech respecting one Hall recommending the murder of the king, 162
 Milton, John, answers King Charles, 637
 Min, Nicholas, Colonel, commands an Irish brigade before Gloucester, 340. Wastes the country, 352. Slain, 354
 Mompesson, Sir Giles, condemned by the Commons, 118
 Monmouth, taken by Sir W. Waller, 314. By Massey, 358. Retaken by the loyalists, 362
 Monro, General, imprisons the Marquis of Antrim, 631
 Montreuil, the French agent, negotiations with the Scotch concerning the king, 78, 80, 81, 86
 Montrose, Marquis, assisted by the Marquis of Antrim, 631
 Morgan, Colonel, repulses the royalists, 387
 Morley, Sir John, his defence of Newcastle, 280, 287. Answer to the summons, 288
 Morton, Sir William, surrenders Sudley, 350
 Musgrave, ———, defeated in Westmoreland, 280
 Muskerry, Lord, treaty with the Earl of Glamorgan respecting the Catholics, 542, 545

N

Nantwich, the siege raised by Fairfax, 387
 Naseby, Battle of, 271
 Newberry, Battle of, 328
 Newcastle, taken by the Scots, 22. Lithgow's account of the siege, 279. Situation of the town, 285. Taken, 290
 Newcastle, Earl of, his regiment cut to pieces on Marston Moor, 282. Takes Bradford, 383. Besieges Hull, 385, 386. Forced to retire to York, 387, 388. Goes beyond sea, 390
 Newnham, taken by Massey, 346
 Norton, Lieut. Col., kills Captain Atkinson at Wetherby, 377
 Norwich, Wren, Bishop of, anecdote of him, 432. Accused of popery, 463

Nottingham, meeting of the soldiers there to sign a petition to Parliament, 392
 Nurse, Luke, appointed governor of Gloucester, 374

O

Odington, skirmish there, 318
 Ogleshorpe, Captain, taken prisoner, 347
 O'Neal, Owen Mac Arte, defeated at Lowther's Town, 550
 O'Neal, Sir Phelomy Roe, calls himself the King's General in Ireland, 586, 618. Denies the king's causing the Irish rebellion at the gallows, 632, 641, 643. Account of his trial, 645
 Orme, W., of Longdon, his fine increased for furnishing the garrison of Lichfield with provisions, 148
 Ormond, James, Marquis of, treaty with the Irish Catholics, 542, 545. Concludes a peace with them, 654
 Osborne, endeavours to effect the king's escape from Carisbrooke Castle, 153, 156. Escapes, and prosecutes Rolph for intending to murder the king, 153, 156. Letters to Lord Wharton, 154, and to the Earl of Manchester, 155. Account of him, 156. Accused by Lord Wharton, 158. Defence of him, 159, 160
 Overbury, Sir Thomas, poisoned, 464
 Oxford, poem on the purging of the university, 503, 506

P

P. H. answers Jenkins's *Lex Terræ*, 115
Parliament, the Pre-eminence and Pedigree of, by James Howell, 47. *Advertisement for the Election of Burgesses*, 62. Judge Jenkins's observations on the illegality of its proceedings, 106. His discourse on the inconveniences of a long-continued parliament, 123. Triennial act passed, 124. Col. Pride's purge of the House of Commons, 167, 183. Their declaration for annulling the votes passed during the continuance of the force upon them, 167. Ordinance for this purpose, 173
Parliament of Ladies, 472
 Pembroke, Philip Earl of, the butt of the royalists, 488
 Pennant, John, a snake found in his heart, 558
 Persons whose names are to be presented to the king to die with mercy, 90
 Peters, Hugh, recommends the execution of the king, 161. The blasphemy of his sermons, 233. Supposed to manage the breaking of the king's staff at his trial, 470. Sir John Berkenhead's account of him, 493

Pie-poudres, account of the term, 64
 Plunket, Colonel, one of the principal Irish rebels, 620
 Pointz, Colonel, hems in the Scotch army in Yorkshire, 89
 Pride, Colonel, purges the House of Commons, 167, 394. Account of that transaction, 183
Proposals for regulating the Law, 534
 Protestants of Ireland, petition to the House of Commons, 575. Amount of their losses, 623
 Prynne, W., attacks Howell, 47. Some of his tenets refuted by Judge Jenkins, 110. *Brief Memento to the unparliamentary Junto, on their Intentions of deposing and executing the King*, 174. Account of Prynne, 174. His *Letter to the General demanding whose and what kind of Prisoner he is*, 183. His *Charge against the King*, 186. Not his own work, but collected from his former writings, 187. His behaviour at the pillory, 427
 Pudsey, Serjeant Major, brings the answer of the city of Gloucester to the king's summons, 321. Makes a successful sally from Gloucester, 323
 Puritans, satires on them, 479
 Pym, John, his arguments respecting king and people, 93. His argument against the Earl of Strafford, 96

R

Read, Sir John, put to the rack to induce him to confess that Charles I. caused the Irish massacre, 641
 Reading, besieged by Essex, 316. Taken, 317
 Rhee, Isle of, Fleetwood's account of the Duke of Buckingham's behaviour there, 398
 Relien, Cardinal of, *Synopsis of his Life*, 538. Account of his tragedy of *Europa Triumphata*, 540
 Riddell, Sir Thomas, surrenders Tinemouth, 294
 Robberies committed in Ireland, 597
 Rochelle, the king accused of having betrayed the town, 229, 231
 Rolph, a captain, endeavours to murder the king, 153, 156. Account of him, 155. Committed to custody, 157
 Roundheads' Resolution, a satirical pamphlet, 500
 Roundway Down, battle of, 318
 Rupert, Prince, overthrown at Marston Moor, 281, 389. Defeats Colonel Fiennes, 305. Takes Cirencester, 309. Summons Gloucester, 311. Prevents the London forces for some time from succouring Gloucester, 327. Wastes Herefordshire, 369. Forces Massey to retreat, 370. Oaths imposed by him upon the country, *ib.*

S

Saint-John, his argument concerning the bill of Attainder of the Earl of Strafford, 96.
 Saint-Pauls, subscriptions exacted for repairing the cathedral of, 436
 Sakers, account of those pieces of ordnance, 317.
 Salisbury, Robert, Earl of, state and dignity of a secretary of state's office, 552.
 Saxony, confession of, quoted, 58.
 Say, Lord, appointed lord-lieutenant of Gloucestershire, 302.
 Scot, Major, treasonable speeches against the king, 160.
 Scotch and English, a game, described, 68
 Scotland, bishops introduced there, 20. The covenant subscribed, 21. The king accused of not keeping his treaty with the Scots, 22. The confession quoted respecting the divine right of kings, 59. Demands of the commissioners respecting the king, with the answers of the parliament, 69. State of their army in Yorkshire, 86, 87. The parliament's declaration against their proceedings, 170.
 Scudamore, Lord, taken prisoner, 317
 Seacroft-more, Fairfax defeated there, 30
 Secretary of state, dignity of that office by Robert, Earl of Salisbury, 552.
 Selby, skirmish in the town, 384, stormed by Fairfax, 388.
 Selden, visits the puritan assembly, 488
 Seneschalsey, *Observations on the Office*, 509, 514
 Sharpe, a protestant minister, murdered in Ireland, 599.
 Sherburne, skirmish there, 379
 Short, Richard, antagonist of Bastwick, 428
 Shrewsbury, taken, 367
 Skippon, Gen., moves that Osborne's information respecting the intended murder of the king be withdrawn, 162
 Sligo, fight of, 548.
 Spain, the catholics expect an army from thence, 575, 585, 586.
Spring-garden, Passages of the Ladies assemble in Parliament there, 472
 Staile, account of the word, 282
 Stamford, Earl of, enters Gloucester, 326
 States-General, letters to the parliament to desist from executing King Charles, 254
 Stephens, Col. Henry, raises a regiment in Gloucester, 318
 Steward, Archibald, routed by the Irish rebels, 650
 Stewards of the queen's and king's household, 218

Stockton, taken by the Scots, 284
 Strafford, Earl of, beheaded, 26
 Sudley castle taken by Sir William Waller, 350.

T

Tadcaster, stormed by the royalists, who are forced to retire, 378
 Temple, Sir Purbeck, evidence against Colonel Astel at his trial, 206
 Tewksbury, attacked by Massey, 349. He is driven out of the town, *ib.* Abandoned by the royalists, *ib.*
 Tinemouth capitulates to the Scots, 280, 294
 Toole, Luke, chief of the rebels in the county of Wicklow, 610, 613. Drowns about a hundred persons, 613
 Tracy, Sir Humphrey, taken prisoner, 353
 Tuam, Archbishop, killed at Sligo, 542, 549
 Tyrone, Earl of, the Irish are said to intend to make him king, 606

U & V

Vavasour, Sir William, commands the South Wales forces before Gloucester, 322. Sent to Worcester, 329. Takes Tewksbury, 330. Retires to Hereford, 331. Annoys the garrison of Gloucester, 335. Deceived by a pretended treaty to give up Gloucester, 340. Skirmish with the garrison, 339.
 Veale, Colonel, governour of Berkley castle, 335.
 Vines, a presbyterian minister, his character of King Charles, 252. Alluded to, 664.

W

Worcester stormed by Fairfax, 381.

Waldgrave, Lady, Bastwick's dedication of his *Litany* to her, 408.
 Waller, Sir William, marches towards Gloucester, 312. Takes Monmouth, 314. Retreats before Prince Maurice, 316. Defeat at Roundway Down, 318. Defeats Sir Ralph Hopton, 340. Pursues the king to the north, 351.
 Ward, Edward, translation of *Rustica Academia Oxoniensis Reformatæ Descriptio*, 506.
 Warton, John, a puritan, persecuted, 433.
 Warwick, Sir P., his account of the execution of the king, 211.
 Wetherby, skirmish in the town, 377.
 Wharton, Lord, *The Independent's Loyalty, with an Answer to Lord's Wharton's Evasions*, 152. His character, 156. His vindication answered, 157. Accuses Osborne, 158. Accused of having intended the murder of the king, 161.
 Wilmot, Lord, defeats Sir W. Waller at Roundway Down, 318.
 Winsby fight, 386
 Winter, Lieut. Col., slain, 312.
 Winter, Sir John, governor of Newnham, 331. Takes Westbury and Huntley, 336. Defeated by Massey, 360, 366. Relinquishes Lidney, 371.
 Withers, George, account of his *Vox pacifica*, 62.
 Wood, Anthony, fined for a libel on Lord Clarendon, 92.
 Worcester taken by the king's forces, 305. Essex enters the town, 305. Summoned by Massey, 371.
 Worcester, Marquis of, his Welsh forces defeated, 312.
 Wykes, Aquila, Bastwick's letters to him, 421, *et seq.*

Y

York besieged, 281. Surrendered, 283.

END OF VOLUME FIFTH.

