



Sacred Heart
UNIVERSITY

Sacred Heart University
DigitalCommons@SHU

School of Communication and Media Arts Faculty
Publications

School of Communication and Media Arts (SCMA)

11-1991

A Royalist Rewriting of George Herbert: 'His Majesties Complaint to his Subjects' (1647)

Sidney Gottlieb

Sacred Heart University, gottliebs@sacredheart.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/media_fac



Part of the [Literature in English, British Isles Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gottlieb, Sidney. "A Royalist Rewriting of George Herbert: 'His Majesties Complaint to his Subjects' (1647)." *Modern Philology* 89.2 (1991): 211-224.

This Peer-Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Communication and Media Arts (SCMA) at DigitalCommons@SHU. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Communication and Media Arts Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@SHU. For more information, please contact ferribyp@sacredheart.edu.

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A Royalist Rewriting of George Herbert: *His Majesties Complaint to his Subjects* (1647)

SIDNEY GOTTLIEB

Sacred Heart University

Robert H. Ray's detailed *Herbert Allusion Book* confirms F. E. Hutchinson's claim of "abundant evidence of *The Temple* being read throughout the seventeenth century by men of widely different churchmanship and political attachments."¹ Nevertheless, as Ray points out in a later essay interpreting some of his findings, a large proportion of allusions to Herbert—as many as 70 percent in the texts he cataloged—come from writers who can be safely identified as "loyal Anglicans and Royalists."² While this estimate should not lead anyone to minimize Herbert's influence on political and religious radicals and nonconformists, it can spur us to examine in greater detail the uses made of Herbert in mid- and late century Royalist panegyrics and apologetics. An anonymous poem not noted by Ray, *His Majesties Complaint to his Subjects. Occasioned by his late sufferings, and A not right understanding between him and his Parliament* (1647), provides an excellent opportunity to study how Herbert's verse

I am grateful for support from the Huntington Library, where I began work on this essay during a Short Term Fellowship, and the Folger Library, where I finished writing it during a Folger Institute seminar directed by Esther S. Cope, focusing on, among other topics, representations of Charles I. I have benefited greatly from encouragement from Robert H. Ray and Helen Wilcox, as well as the example of their extensive work on allusions to George Herbert.

1. *The Works of George Herbert*, ed. F. E. Hutchinson (Oxford, 1941; corrected reprint, Oxford, 1945), p. xliii. All references to Herbert's poems are to this edition. Robert H. Ray, *The Herbert Allusion Book: Allusions to George Herbert in the Seventeenth Century*, Texts and Studies, 1986, *Studies in Philology*, vol. 83, no. 4 (1986).

2. Robert H. Ray, "Herbert's Seventeenth-Century Reputation: A Summary and New Considerations," *George Herbert Journal* 9, no. 2 (1986): 1–15. King Charles himself evidently admired Herbert's poems. Thomas Herbert notes that Charles "read often in . . . Herbert's divine Poems," and Anthony à Wood records that "while he was a prisoner of Carisbroke castle" Charles "delighted to read in . . . G. Herbert's *Divine Poems*." Both Thomas Herbert and Wood list other works Charles liked (see Ray, *The Herbert Allusion Book*, pp. 128, 141).

could be manipulated to create sympathy for King Charles during one of his many periods of crisis.

Samuel Gardiner quotes four stanzas from *His Majesties Complaint* and briefly describes it as “a parody of George Herbert’s *Sacrifice*” insofar as it “audaciously compared the sufferings of Charles with the sufferings of Jesus,” but he does not discuss its extensive allusions to Herbert as well as to contemporary events.³ The poem is worth reprinting in its entirety, but before I do so it will be helpful to sketch its historical context and clarify some of its topical references.

The title page reads “Printed in the Yeare, | 1647,” and Thomason’s addition of a date, June 25, helps to pinpoint the circumstances of the poem’s appearance. After the Royalist forces were defeated in the first phase of the Civil War, Charles took refuge with his Scots allies. On January 30, 1647, however, he was turned over to parliamentary commissioners and lodged in Holmby (or Holdenby) House in Northamptonshire, where he was charged not to communicate with anyone without his custodians’ knowledge. This restriction did not keep him from comfortably biding his time and plotting secretly to exploit the growing rift between Presbyterian and Independent factions in Parliament and the army.

At the beginning of June, Charles was suddenly taken from Holmby by troops led by Cornet George Joyce, acting under orders from Cromwell, who had good reason to believe that such action was necessary to keep Charles from making himself a party to English and Scottish Presbyterian initiatives aimed at renewing hostilities. Charles mildly protested his unceremonious transfer but willingly suffered removal to Newmarket, where he was able to capitalize on an outpouring of sympathy, communicate with his allies, and watch his enemies bicker among themselves. All things considered, Charles was evidently right where he wanted to be, and he declined Fairfax’s offer to return him to Holmby.⁴

His Majesties Complaint focuses directly on Charles’s captivity and briefly describes indignities he suffered, in particular at Holmby (lines 57–64), and in general from what he imagined as his ungrateful and thoughtlessly cruel subjects. But the poem also runs allusively through a list of political grievances: triennial Parliaments, instituted in 1641, restricting the king’s “right” to summon and dismiss Parliament as he sees fit (line 30); the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643, which con-

3. Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War, 1642–1649*, 3 vols. (London, 1891), 3:135. Lois Potter also mentions the *Complaint* briefly in *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 174.

4. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, 3:105. For a full description see Gardiner, “The Abduction of the King,” *ibid.*, 3:67–94.

tracted a military and religious alliance between England and Scotland on terms amenable to the prevailing Presbyterian majority in Parliament (lines 49–56 and appended note in the text); the *Directory for Public Worship*, a substitution for the *Book of Common Prayer* prepared by the Westminster Assembly of Divines and approved by Parliament on January 4, 1645 (line 66); the General Synod called for in the Grand Remonstrance of 1642, designed to “suppress innovations, and take away the monuments of idolatry” (line 73);⁵ and *The Declaration of the Army* (line 77) promulgated June 15, 1647, just after the king’s move from Holmby, a remarkable document that, in Gardiner’s words, stated “for the first time the modern political doctrine that the people themselves are the source of power.”⁶ Other political allusions are more difficult to identify specifically: the “evill counsell” mentioned in line 43 may echo the widespread claim that parliamentary opposition was aimed at the king’s advisors rather than the king himself, but even this elliptical reference may evoke the convictions and executions of Strafford and Laud; and the “Ordinance” in line 50 could refer to the Militia Ordinance of 1642, which helped establish the right of Parliament to act on certain crucial matters without (and even against) the king, or to any one of the various ordinances for indemnity granting parliamentary soldiers back-pay and other rights that were discussed and passed in 1647 over the opposition of Royalists.⁷

The nontopical references and images which constitute the most dramatic and effective parts of the *Complaint*, together with the stanzaic form and refrain pattern, are drawn largely from Herbert’s “The Sacrifice” (hereafter cited as “S”). The opening, however, clearly echoes the exuberant lines that begin Herbert’s “The Thanksgiving,” the poem immediately following “The Sacrifice” in Herbert’s *The Temple*: “Oh King of grief! (a title strange, yet true, / To thee of all kings onely due)” (lines 1–2). These lines from “The Thanksgiving” also recall one of the later stanzas from “The Sacrifice,” where Christ notes ironically that “A king my title is, prefix on high; / Yet by my subjects am condemn’d to die” (“S,” lines 233–34). From this point on, the *Complaint* repeatedly appropriates details from “The Sacrifice” to identify Charles’s position with Christ’s. While the parting of the garments (line 11) and the attack with clubs and staves (line 13) are embellishments of

5. Samuel R. Gardiner, *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution, 1603–1660* (New York, 1893), p. 131.

6. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, 3:117.

7. On the Militia Ordinance, see Richard Tuck, “‘The Ancient Law of Freedom’: John Selden and the Civil War,” in *Reactions to the Civil War, 1642–1649*, ed. John Morrill (New York, 1982), pp. 148–56; on ordinances of 1647, see Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, 3:32, 65, 76, 97.

biblical incidents, the immediate source is Herbert's "They part my garments" ("S," line 241) and "With clubs and staves they seek me, as a thief" ("S," line 37). The picture of the attackers running to court—"Alas! What haste you made to be undone: / Although but Glow-wormes, you'd out-shine the Sun" (lines 14–15)—is a contemptuous diminution that goes beyond Herbert's own image of disparagement in this same vein: "How with their lanterns do they seek the sunne!" ("S," line 35). (Note also here and throughout that Herbert's third-person references to those who insult Christ are replaced by direct address—"you"—in the *Complaint*, a point that I will return to later.)

The borrowings from "The Sacrifice" are almost always slightly modified. Lines 17–19 follow "S," lines 85–87, closely but without identifying the malicious accusers as "Jews." Similarly, lines 21–23 follow "S," lines 81–83, but substitute "High Counsell" for "Herod" sitting in judgment. The *Complaint* is made to focus specifically on what, in Royalist eyes, are current abuses by Parliament and its supporters, so some scriptural references give way to contemporary allusions. But the pattern of the substitution does not preclude the author from intensifying Herbert's expression of contempt for a foolish people who "doth now me brave, / Had to this day been an Egyptian slave" ("S," lines 9–10) into an open accusation: the modern populace "Are become worse then an Egyptian slave; / Using that power against us which we gave" (lines 26–27).

The dramatization of the people's folly is similar in the two poems. The cowardly "fear" that "puts a barre / Betwixt my friends and me" in "The Sacrifice" (lines 49–50) is expanded in the *Complaint* to an indictment of Parliament for using "Plots, feares and jealousies" to "blind the vulgar" (lines 33–34); Herbert had also referred to the people as "blinde" to Christ ("S," line 2). But the ironic description of the misguided and ungrateful mob that attacks Christ is much more extensive in "The Sacrifice" (see esp. "S," lines 95–148, 185–88) than in comparable portions of the *Complaint*, where a brief and highly tendentious summary of recent parliamentary actions and ordinances substitutes for Herbert's dramatization of the Passion. And the author of the *Complaint* has to make a key adjustment in adapting Herbert's conventional gospel source. For obvious reasons the accusation that "The Princes of my people make a head / Against their Maker: they do wish me dead" ("S," lines 5–6) undergoes a recasting: "Arme, arme ye people: quickly make a head / Against the King, for we may wish him dead / Whose evill counsell hath him thus mislead" (lines 41–43).

The *Complaint* again echoes "The Thanksgiving" at line 57. Herbert's hypothetical "Shall I be scourged, flouted, boxed, sold?" (line 7) turns into a passionate declaration that may accurately reflect Charles's feel-

ings after the Scots gave him up to imprisonment by the army in Holdenby and then Parliament instructed the army to relocate him: "I have been truckt for, bought and sold, yet I / Am King (though prisoner) pray tell me why / I am removed now from Holdenby?" (lines 57–59). This passage also draws from lines 233–35 of "The Sacrifice," which focus on the irony of a captive king's mistreatment and then mention his impending execution, a topic raised in the next stanza of the *Complaint*, lines 61–63. Herbert's "They strike my head" ("S," line 170) might seem too ominous to adapt, but perhaps Charles's bravado and impolitic jauntiness underlie the *Complaint*'s transformation of this detail into a prophetic glance at the possibility that Parliament might eventually "seek to make me shorter by the head" (line 63).

As the *Complaint* progresses, there are fewer direct allusions to Herbert. The image of the king weeping in lines 81–83 may recall Christ weeping over the state of his people in "The Sacrifice," lines 149–50, but the image is in any case conventional. The chased bird of line 89 is a commonplace of Cavalier poetry but may owe something to one of the most stunning lines in "The Sacrifice," "But who does hawk at eagles with a dove?" ("S," line 91; also see the continuing dove image in "S," lines 94–95). Finally, the *Complaint* briefly mentions the unavailing "reproaches" (line 102) leveled at the king. For Herbert, as Rosemond Tuve points out, the traditional "Reproches" ("S," line 219) or *Impropria* of Good Friday figure centrally in "The Sacrifice." The poem includes some of the specific insults of the people in italicized phrases ("S," lines 142, 173, 221), but for the most part catalogs Christ's ironic commentary in a way that Tuve finds comparable with the well-known medieval lyrics on the Complaints of Christ to His People.⁸

It is tempting to think that the author of the *Complaint* responded to some of Herbert's stylistic nuances. For example, the sudden shift to the first-person singular "my" in line 55 resembles the strategic switch from first to third person in lines 129–31 of "The Sacrifice," often read as a linguistic sign of extreme stress in the poem. But since the *Complaint* is not particularly subtle or skillfully written overall, it is probably safer to reserve judgment on this shift to the first person as a carefully planned artistic or rhetorical move. Some broad stylistic similarities remain. Most obviously, for the duration of twenty-seven stanzas the *Complaint* basically adopts the triple-rhyme and repeated refrain pattern of Herbert's stanzas in "The Sacrifice." Yet even here there are significant differences. Herbert's refrain is a rhetorical question—"Was ever grief like mine?"—changed only twice at climactic moments to the statement

8. Rosemond Tuve, *A Reading of George Herbert* (Chicago, 1952), p. 24. All of pt. 1, pp. 19–99, is relevant to this point.

"Never was grief like mine" ("S," lines 216, 252), while the *Complaint* makes use of seven slightly different refrains—for example, lines 4, 8, 12, 36, 40, 48, and 68. The *Complaint* also undergoes a comprehensive alteration in verse form. The last stanza before the *Lamentations of the Church*, the separately titled second part of the poem, is written as a quatrain with two couplets and no refrain. This stanza serves as a transition to the *Lamentations*, also written in quatrains, and perhaps links the voice of the complaining king with the voice of lamenting church, an identification common in Royalist works and encouraged by Charles himself.⁹

Other differences between the *Complaint* and "The Sacrifice" prove more critical in measuring the poetic and rhetorical effects of these poems. The repeated use of first-person pronouns makes "The Sacrifice" in some respects a strikingly personal poem, but this effect is diminished by the *Complaint's* substitution of the royal "we" for the less majestic "I." Perhaps the refrain "Never was grief like Ours" gains political resonance by indicating that the king and people share their suffering, but it voids the touching intimacy of Christ's "Was ever grief like mine?" in Herbert's poem. Similarly, by exchanging the somewhat distancing third-person references to the people ("they" and "their") in "The Sacrifice" for a substantially more direct form of address ("you" and "your"), the *Complaint* tends to sound strident and accusatory rather than poised. There are other important tonal differences: "The Sacrifice" contains a few glances at Christ's impatience with mistreatment at the hands of an ungrateful people whom he might easily overwhelm ("S," lines 151, 155), but the Royalist poem is alternately a plea for sympathy and an emphatic call for divine vengeance. In June of 1647, although he was in captivity, all was not yet lost for Charles, and he and his allies no doubt still believed that a portrayal of an unjustly afflicted king cursing his enemies and asking for help to "destroy them quite" (line 108) could mobilize not only sympathy but also practical support. Indeed, as Lois Potter notes, "several royalist uprisings did break out in the spring of 1648."¹⁰

Herbert's devotional and reconciliatory objectives are thus modified by the author of the *Complaint* to serve a strategy of political maneuvering that was highly characteristic of this era. M. L. Donnelly observes: "As Charles's fortunes suffered eclipse in the revolution, the dominant iconography associated with his person shifted from the classical,

9. I owe this point to Janel Mueller. The twelve stanzas of the *Lamentations* bear little relation to Herbert, so my comments on the *Complaint* focus on the first twenty-seven stanzas of the poem.

10. Potter, p. 175.

mythical, and heroic, or these mixed with religious allusions, to the biblical, presenting him as prophet, saint, martyr, and sacrificial victim."¹¹ Charles had long been prepared for these latter roles, by himself and others—most notably his father, a frequent proponent of divine right monarchy in his writings. James's *A Meditation Vpon the 27, 28, 29 verses of the XXVII chapter of St. Matthew* (1620) was dedicated to Charles and offered as instruction in the art of being a king. As the subtitle indicates, James considers the ways in which the mistreatment of Christ just before the crucifixion is "A paterne for a King's inauguration." He warns Charles to expect many difficulties as king and suggests that the inevitable cares and indignities confirm his legitimacy in his office. Just as the mocking treatment of Christ can be read for its deeper significance as an unintended image of his tormentors' true obedience, so too the crown of thorns Charles will wear is "a bodily external acknowledgement" of his "true title."¹² With or without his father's advice in mind, Charles accepted this identification with Christ and Christ-like suffering. Potter cites a letter written as early as December 1642 to the Duke of Hamilton: "I will either be a glorious king or a patient martyr."¹³ Many of Charles's subjects were disposed to accept a blend of royal and religious iconography, and in an age attuned to signs it was particularly convenient that Charles's name could be turned into an anagram of Christ: CHAROLVS STUARTVS = CHRISTVS SALVATOR.¹⁴

To modern readers, *His Majesties Complaint to his Subjects* may appear to commit a gross impropriety—if not blasphemy, as Gardiner thought—in placing Charles in the role of Christ, but the identification is nevertheless part of a well-established tradition, authorized by Charles himself and by the ideology of the king's divine right. Again according to Gardiner, this identification "struck the keynote of thousands of subsequent inflammatory appeals to the popular temper."¹⁵ While it is beyond my scope and capacities to undertake a survey of these thousands of subsequent appeals, I want to comment on two interesting examples—the first, minor, the other, much more significant. "Majesty in

11. M. L. Donnelly, "Caroline Royalist Panegyric and the Disintegration of a Symbolic Mode," in *The Muses Common-Weale: Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia, Mo., 1988), p. 169.

12. King James, *A Meditation Vpon the 27, 28, 29 verses of the XXVII chapter of St. Matthew*, 1620, STC 14382, p. 89. I am grateful to Nancy Klein Maguire for steering me toward this work, as well as toward "Majesty in Misery," which I discuss below. For an extensive survey of Royalist works picturing Charles as a martyr, see her "The Theatrical Mask/Masque of Politics: The Case of Charles I," *Journal of British Studies* 28 (January 1989): 1–22.

13. Potter (n. 3 above), p. 173.

14. *Ibid.*, pp. 50–51.

15. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War* (n. 3 above), 3:135.

Misery," purportedly written by "his Majesty in his Captivity" at Carisbrooke, is strikingly similar in certain respects to the *Complaint* and "The Sacrifice."¹⁶ Like these two poems, it takes the form of rhymed iambic pentameter triplets, but it lacks a refrain; and although the speaker addresses rather than identifies himself with Christ, his situation is implicitly likened to Christ's in suffering countless indignities and responding with irony and patience. The king of "Majesty in Misery" faces and resists several of Satan's temptations of Christ: the offer of great power if he will only worship an illegitimate authority—"They promise to erect my royal stem, / To make me great, t' advance my diadem, / If I will first fall down, and worship them!" (lines 52–54)—and the challenge "to make bread of stones" (line 57). "Majesty in Misery" may contain specific allusions to "The Sacrifice": for example, "those that owe my bounty for their bread" (line 15) recalls Herbert's "they do wish me dead, / Who cannot wish, except I give them bread" ("S," lines 6–7); and "To make religion / Herod and Pontius Pilate are agreed" (lines 35–36) may echo "They bind, and lead me unto Herod: he / Sends me to Pilate. This makes them agree" ("S," lines 73–74). But whether or not "Majesty in Misery" is specifically indebted to either "The Sacrifice" or the *Complaint*, its particular use of Christ's suffering as an interpretive framework for recent political events links it clearly with the strategy of the *Complaint*.

Far more interesting and important is the way in which the *Complaint* stands as a kind of miniature *Eikon Basilike*, helping pave the way for the enormously popular later work. *Eikon Basilike* was, of course, written for distribution at or after the death of the king in January 1649, at a point when little would be gained and much might be lost by calling for vengeance, divine or human. Hence, unlike the *Complaint*, *Eikon Basilike* pointedly avoids anger and threats—with a few exceptions like the general warning that "'Tis more than an even lay that they may one day see themselves punished by that way they offended" and the barely restrained glee at the fate of the Hothams, whose indecisive support of the king led to their execution ordered by Parliament, interpreted as "a notable stroke and prediction of divine vengeance."¹⁷ But we should recall that, despite the publication of *Eikon Basilike* early in 1649, the material from which it was primarily assembled probably dates back as early as 1642, when Charles began writing a defense of his actions—a project that he perhaps resumed again during and just after his stay at Holmby and then turned over to John Gauden, the ultimate executor and "author" of the work as published.¹⁸

16. This poem is reprinted in Margaret Barnard Pickel, *Charles I as Patron of Poetry and Drama* (London, 1936), pp. 178–81.

17. *Eikon Basilike*, ed. Philip A. Knachel (Ithaca, N.Y., 1966), pp. 18, 33–38.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. xxx–xxxii.

It should be no surprise, then, to find many similarities between *Eikon Basilike* and the *Complaint*, which both date from and reflect on the key events of this particular time. The two works provide a chronicle of events as they take up in turn triennial Parliaments, the departure of the queen and her children, the raising of an army against the king, the Solemn League and Covenant, the *Directory*, the king's captivity at Holmby, and so on, and frame their Royalist apologies within the format of a historical narrative. Some of the themes mentioned only briefly in the poem are elaborated in greater detail in the longer prose treatise: for example, the elliptical statement, "Our *Conscience* must be subject unto you" (line 10), foreshadows *Eikon Basilike's* repeated protest that Charles's conscience, along with his reason, was his guiding light amid constant assaults by his unworthy subjects.¹⁹ But perhaps most significant is the way both texts play on the identification of Charles with Christ. The *Complaint*, written when the king's predicament was serious but not hopeless, attempts to galvanize support by figuring Charles as a Christ-like "King of griefe," and the allusions to Herbert underlying this strategy are witty as well as moving and rhetorically effective. *Eikon Basilike*, however, despite its transparent political motivation, is less a complaint than a pathetic lament, characterized not by energetic irony but by a dutiful and monotonously repeated taking up of a crown of thorns.

His Majesties Complaint, then, reprinted here, is a noteworthy document for several reasons, not only because it exemplifies the political uses to which a religious poet can be adapted but also because it offers useful insight into the construction of the image of Charles as "royal martyr," an extraordinary blend of humility and audacity.²⁰

His Majesties Complaint to his Subjects

Are wee your King? A King of griefe 'tis true,
 A Title strange, yet all wee have from you:
 Our other honours you usurp as due.
 Never was King so griev'd.

19. Among many examples: "I know no resolutions more worthy a Christian king than to prefer his conscience before his kingdoms" (ibid., p. 28). Throughout *Eikonoklastes*, Milton rightly satirizes the emphasis on Charles's reason and conscience found in *Eikon Basilike*.

20. I reprint *His Majesties Complaint* from a microfilm copy of the Thomason Tracts, E. 393 (38) [Wing H2078]. A few misprints are silently corrected. For ease of reference I have inserted line numbering, but not for the *Lamentations of the Church*, which I do not cite specifically in my commentary. It is unclear whether *Lamentations* is to be treated as a separate poem or as the second part of a two-part poem.

- Our Scepter's broke, our Lawes lie troden downe, 5
 The Revenues belonging to our Crowne
 Are all but purchasers of your renowne.
 Never was griefe like Ours.
- Our Wif's debar'd us, Our deare Children too,
 Our *Conscience* must be subject unto *you*: 10
 Why don't you vote to *part our garments too?*
 Was ever griefe, &c.
- With Clubs and Staves you to our Court did rune
 Alas! What haste you made to be undone:
 Although but Glow-wormes, you'd out-shine the Sun. 15
 Never was griefe, &c.
- Must you accuse us with despitefulnesse,
 Vying your malice with Our gentilenesse,
 Pick Quarrells with your only happinesse?
 Never was griefe, &c. 20
- You in High Counsell sit, Whilst wee by-stand,
 Voting us with a censorious hand:
 Wee must obey, that should all you command.
 Was ever griefe, &c.
- Yet you your selves, that now at us doe brave, 25
 Are become worse then an Egyptian slave;
 Using that power against us which we gave
 Was ever griefe, &c.
- You cannot thinke we had an ill intent
 In granting a Trienniall Parliament, 30
 Though you by it usurpe ou[r] government.
 Never was griefe, &c.
- Plots, feares and jealousies indeed you had
 To blind the vulgar, and to make them sad,
 A thiefe at his owne shadow may run mad. 35
 Was ever case like mine.
- When he has mist his aime in doing ill,
 And so despairing to effect his will
 For feare or shame himselfe himselfe may kill.
 Never was griefe like mine. 40

Arme, arme ye people: quickly make a head
 Against the King, for we may wish him dead
 Whose evill counsell hath him thus mislead.
 Was ever grieve, &c.

Thus by your witchcraft, rebellion 45
 You charm'd our subjects, gull'd the whole Nation,
 Blessed effects of such a Reformation.
 Never was King so, &c.

Your holy League with th'Scots must next advance
 Your treachery: Then mount your Ordinance, 50
 'Tis but the breach of your Allegiance.
 Never was grieve, &c.

Your Nationall* Covenant must next agree
 Between your deare brethren the Scots and yee,
 To rob my subjects of their liberty. 55
 Never was grieve, &c.

** You sweare in your Vow and Covenant in the presence of Almighty God the searcher of all hearts, that you doe in your conscience beleave that the Forces raised by the two Houses of Parliament, are raised and continue for their just defence, and for the defence of the true Protestant Religion, and Lawes and liberties of the Subject (what Religion or Lawes you meane, we cannot tell, neither you your selves as wee believe.) You having abolished the Protestant Religion, trodden downe the Lawes, and trampled on the liberties of the Subject, quite contrary to your former Oaths. Therefore whosoever have taken this Oath with you, are bound to oppose both Lords or Commons, or whosoever else shall endeavour the destruction of the Protestant Religion, and Lawes and liberties of the Subject, or must bee guilty (as must be justly feared too many of you are) of that abhorred sin of perjury.*

I have been truckt for, bought and sold, yet I
 Am King (though prisoner) pray tell me why
 I am removed now from Holdenby?
 Never was grieve, &c. 60

To Newmarket now I am by your Army led,
 They'l sell me better then your brethren did,
 Else seek to make me shorter by the head.
 Never was grieve, &c.

Religion, our life, our Crowne, our glory, 65
 By you exchanged for a Directory,
 Never was read the like in any story.
 Nor grieve like ours.

- You have abandoned both Law and liberty,
 And studied to root out Monarchie
 To create an arbitrary Tyranny. 70
 Never was griefe, &c.
- Your cholérique Synod stood you in great stead
 To make you new Commandements and Creed,
 They'l make you a new God too, if you have need. 75
 Never was griefe, &c.
- Both God and King, both Church and Nation,
 Are all comprised in your Declaration,
 You sure are both Saviour and salvation. 80
 Never was griefe, &c.
- With watry Rivelets both mine eyes oreflow
 To thinke my people should be ruined so
 By them that did pretend their weale, not woe.
 Never was griefe, &c.
- For my wrong'd Kingdomes sake: my very griefe 85
 Doth breake my heart, untill I finde reliefe,
 Ile sue to heav'n, Mercy from God my chiefe.
 Never was griefe, &c.
- Causelesse they like a bird have chased me,
 Behold, O Lord, looke downe from heaven and see, 90
 Thou that hearest prisoners prayers, heare me.
 Never was griefe, &c.
- They have rebelled, and falne away from thee,
 O pardon them, even for thy clemencie,
 Looke downe from heaven and our afflictions see. 95
 Never was griefe, &c.
- Compassion as thy mercy is infinite,
 Else we had been ere this consumed quite,
 But we thee pray, that thou our cause wilt right.
 Never was griefe, &c. 100
- Thou know'st my wrongs, their vengeance they have wrought,
 Their reproaches thou hast heard, and what they thought,
 And now hast all their counsells brought to nought.
 Never was griefe like, &c.

I was their song whether they rise or sit,
Give them reward Lord; for their working fit,
Sorrow of heart, thy curse; and with thy might
Follow, and from under heaven destroy them quite.

105

Lamentations of the Church.

The precious sons of Sion which should be
Valued at purest gold, how doe wee see
Low rated now, as earthen pitchers stand,
Which are the work of a poore potters hand?

The stones which were of the Sanctuary
Scattered in corners of each street doe lye;
A fire is kindled in Sion, which hath power
To eat, and her foundations to devoure.

They which before were delicately fed,
Now in the streets forlorne have perished,
And they which ever were in scarlet cloth'd
Sit and imbrace the dunghill which they loath'd.

Remember Lord, what is fallen on us,
See and marke how we are reproached thus;
For unto strangers our possession
Is turn'd, our houses unto aliens gone.

Waters which are our owne, we drinke and pay,
And upon our owne wood a price they lay,
They are but servants which doe rule us thus,
Yet from their hands none will deliver us.

The anointed Lord, breath of our nostrills, he
Of whom we said, under his shadow we
Shall with more ease under the heathen dwell
Into the pit which these men digged fell.

How is the Crowne fallen from our head, and wo
Be unto us, because we have sinned so;
For this our hearts doe languish, and for this
Over our eyes a cloudy dimnesse is.

Because Mount Sion desolate doth lye,
And foxes there doe go at liberty;
But thou, O Lord, art ever, and thy throne
From generation to generation.

Why shouldst thou forget us eternally?
 Or lead us thus long in this misery?
 Restore us Lord to thee, that so we may
 Returne, and as of old, renew our day.

Because I am in straits, Jehovah see
 My heart oreturn'd, my bowells muddy be
 Because I have rebell'd so much, as fast
 The sword without, as death within doth waste.

Of all that heare my mone, none comfort me,
 My foes have heard my griefe, and glad they be,
 That thou hast done it; but thy promis'd day
 Will come, when, as I suffer, so shall they.

The Close.

Let all their wickednesse appeare to thee
 Doe unto them, as thou hast done to me,
 For all my sins: The sighs which I have had
 Are very many, and my heart is sad.

FINIS.

Copyright of Modern Philology is the property of University of Chicago Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.