Introduction

Among the Clarendon papers held by the Bodleian Library at Oxford and also in the Portland Manuscripts at Welbeck Abbey appear copies of a long and detailed letter of advice written to Charles II on the eve of the Restoration. Until the twentieth century the "Advice" was attributed to Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and Lord Chancellor during the early years of Charles's reign.[1] In 1903, however, Arthur Strong found that the handwriting of the Welbeck copy was identical to other documents written by William Cavendish, Earl of Newcastle.[2] Other evidence corroborates the essential correctness of Strong's claim.[3] The letter was apparently written by Newcastle in late 1658 or early 1659 and presented to Charles during the spring of 1659.[4]

Those few modern historians who cite the letter have minimized its significance as a historical document. David Ogg, among others, dismissed the political importance of Newcastle's advice. "It is at least certain," wrote Ogg, "that the counsels of the dissertation had no influence on royal policy; for its

---

[1] Falconer Madon attributed the fair copy held by the Bodleian to Clarendon. Madon, ed., *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. . .*, 3 (Oxford, 1895): 567.

[2] Arthur Strong, ed., *A Catalogue of Letters and Other Historical Documents Exhibited in the Library at Welbeck* (London, 1903). Strong observed that three other items near the letter in the collection, one signed by Newcastle, are written in the same hand. Those include, according to Strong, "notes in the handwriting of the (first) Duke of Newcastle for the book on Horsemanship which he published in London, in 1667" (Strong, p. 53); "A Note for Andrewe Clayton about my Building att Welbeck" (pp. 56-57) that was signed "W. Newcastle;" and a "Book containing songs and sketches of plays in the handwriting of the D. of Newcastle" (p. 57).

[3] Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, in her *Life of the Thrice Noble, High and Puissant Prince, William Cavendish, Duke, Marquess, and Earl of Newcastle* (London, 1667), mentioned that her husband, "when he was in banishment, presumed out of his duty and love to his gracious master, our new sovereign king, Charles the second, to write and send him a little book, or rather a letter, wherein he delivered his opinion concerning the government of his dominions, whensover God should be pleased to restore him to his throne."

[4] William Newcastle, Antwerp, to Secretary Nicholas, 18 April 1659, in C.H. Firth, ed., *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle* by Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle (London, 1886), 207. Madon, *Summary Catalogue (p. 54, n. 1)* mistakenly believed that the letter was written in 1660 or 1661. The fair copy of the letter itself clearly states that it was written and presented to Charles before his Restoration in 1660. Margaret Newcastle's *Life* (see n. 2) also noted that the letter was written during her husband's "banishment." Newcastle's letter to Secretary Nicholas in 1659 solicited presentation of a long letter, probably the one in question, to the king.

extreme length precludes the hope that Charles ever read it."[5] Arthur Strong also argued that the advice did not have "any effect upon the policy of Charles II."[6] Most historians of the Restoration, however, have simply ignored the letter. No copy of it has appeared in print since Strong's 1903 publication of the Welbeck copy.[7] No edition of the fair copy held by the Bodleian Library has ever before been published.

In reality, the direct political impact of the document can be neither proved nor disproved. There exists no evidence that Charles either read or did not read the letter. Only Secretary Nicholas's assurance to Newcastle that the "Advice" was presented to the king survives. What can be established, however, is that claims that Charles "did not take" Newcastle's advice are misleading. In large measure, many actions in which Charles engaged on his own initiative and that clearly represented his personal preferences were remarkably similar to Newcastle's vision of wise government.

Newcastle's letter represents also a political and philosophic view of the world not uncommon or unimportant in Restoration England. At a time when virtually everyone felt insecure, there were many men who noted similarities to a Hobbesian type state of nature and who longed for return to the England of Queen Elizabeth. Although times had changed dramatically and the recrudescence of Cavalier spirit never restored the halcyon days of the Elizabethans, some men lived who still remembered nostalgically the years of the Virgin Queen. Both Hobbes and Newcastle traced the troubles of their times to fanaticism and decried how "the Bible in English under every weaver's and chambermaid's arm hath done us much hurt."[8] Both longed for the comparative tranquility of the past.

This, then, is the significance of Newcastle's advice. The letter depicts a resurgent attachment to tradition that pervaded the thoughts of most members of the Restoration Parliament, of elder Cavaliers like Newcastle and Clarendon, the aging political philospher Thomas Hobbes, the king himself,

---

[5] David Ogg, *England in the Reign of Charles II*, 1. (Oxford, 1924); 147.

[6] Strong, *Catalogue*, VII. A.C.A. Brett also mentioned the letter in *Charles II and His Court* (London, 1910), 154-156.

[7] Brief excerpts from the letter were published in Joan Thirsk, *The Restoration* (London, 1976), 3-4, 32, 115, 170, and 184.

[8] Draft of Newcastle's Advice," Strong, ed., *Catalogue*, 188. "Fair Copy," Bodleian Library Ref., Clarendon MS. 109.

and many who looked to the past for values and the security that politics lacked under the later Stuarts. One might reasonably argue that these men were largely out of step with their times, that the future belonged not to Hobbes and the Cavaliers, but to Harrington, Locke, and the Whigs. To dismiss them so lightly, however, ignores the very real impact of their policies and the fact that they represented a significant body of actors and thinkers within Restoration society. By understanding how Newcastle came to think and write in largely Hobbesian terms; why he would presume to foist such views on the king; and why Charles, if not demonstrably receptive to the advice of this particular document, clearly shared the world views of both Newcastle and Hobbes, we come to know better the context of political action in Restoration England and the patterns of thought that shaped domestic and international affairs.

* * * *

Newcastle offered his "Advice" as one with "no oratory in it, or anything stolen out of books for I seldom read anything, but these discourses are out of my long experience to present your majesty with truths that great monarchs seldom hear."[9] He divided the letter into fifteen separate categories ranging from suggestions about the militia, the Church, and the law; to ceremony and order, "Your Majesty's Devertisements," the governing of Scotland and Ireland, and the conduct of foreign wars.[10] The length and detail of the letter preclude the possibility for summary here of the entire document.[11] I do wish to offer a brief account of the advice, however, as an introduction to the document itself and as a basis for establishing clearly the Hobbesian nature of the letter. Also of interest

[9] Ibid., "Fair Copy," 1. Not printed in Strong, ed., *Catalogue*.

[10] These categories included, in order of presentation, "For the Militia," "For the Church," "For the Law," "For the Sivell Law," "For Trade," "For the Country," "For Ceremony and Order," "Errors of State and their Remedies," "Of the Court Tables," "For Your Majesty's Devertisements," "For Country Recreations," "For the Government of Scotland," "For the Government of Ireland," "For Government in General," "For Foreign States," and "For France and Spain."

[11] The letter is sixty pages long in Strong, ed., *Catalogue* and eighty-eight pages in the fair copy.

are those portions of the letter that parallel actions taken by the first Restoration Parliament and by Charles on his own initiative and that reflect the king's personal preferences. Both the Hobbes connection and the actions of Charles will be discussed in greater detail elsewhere in this introduction.

Of primary concern to the monarch who wishes to rule England, according to Newcastle, must be control of the militia and of London. "Without an army in your own hands," he wrote, "you are but king on the courtesy of others. . . .Control London, master that city and you master the whole kingdom."[12] In order to subdue London, the king should grant the city a new charter that leaves all but military affairs in its hands. Charles should carefully attend to the politics of London, but "never violate any of their privileges for trade and they will remain loyal."[13] In the countryside, the king should keep the "traynde bands" (militia) active to subdue local insurrections and have only one lord lieutenant in each county, and the counties would remain calm and never again become ridden with faction. Close attention should be paid to the choosing of judges, sheriffs, and justices of the peace, but "the main business is a troup of horse in every county. . .to be paid from your own hand" for power remains the source of all authority. Not even the nobility are a "threat to the king as long as he keeps the force in his own hands."[14]

The successful ruler must also exert personal control over the Church. "Monarchy is the government in chief of the whole body politic," he wrote, "in all its parts and capacities by one person only. So that if either the whole body politic be under any pretence governed in chief by more than one generally it is no monarchy." If both the civil and ecclesiastical states "be not governed in chief by one and the same person, they cannot be said to be parts of the same monarchy." The king must "take control of the established church and remain on guard against Pope and Presbyterianism."[15] The former social positions of the bishops should be secured, lecturers strictly outlawed, and none but orthodox clergy and pupils permitted into the universities. There were already too many

[12] Strong, ed., *Catalogue*, p. 176.
[13] Ibid., 177.
[14] Ibid., 211.
[15] Ibid., 182.

scholars in the universities anyway. "Each university should have one half the number [of students and] they would be better fed and taught."[16]

Sermons throughout England should be tightly controlled, and here the Russian example was instructive.

> The emperor of Russia finding the people apt to commotions being stirred up by the pulpits, made a law that none should preach any sermons but what was delivered by the bishops to the ministers and printed and brought a great quiet and settlement to his kingdom only by this means.[17]

There should also be strict control of the printed word, "no disputation but in schools, nor no books of controversy writ but in Latin or else people get overheated with passion."[18] Newsletters circulating in manuscript, which had done great harm to the prestige of the government and Charles I, should also be ruthlessly suppressed. Economic exactions that annoyed the public and benefited only the clergy should, however, be relaxed. Ecclesiastical courts should be gentle to the laity and not excommunicate for every 'tithe sheafe' or be litigeous for that will never gain the people."[19] This last advice reflects the anti-clerical views of the Hobbesian circle.

Lawyers should also be curbed. Before the Reformation the Church had "swelled up so as to all but consume the kingdom." But after the Reformation, the law and lawyers had taken its place and the legal profession "grew to be so numerous and so vast a body as it swelled to be too big for the kingdom, and hath been no small means to foment and continue the Rebellion." Newcastle saw no real way to diminish lawyers' influence since they "have taken so deep root," but hoped that control of printing and drastic reduction of the numbers of students in universities and Inns of Court would help. "If you cut off much reading and writing, there must be fewer lawyers and clerks."[20] Even though great benefits would accrue to Charles by bringing the Church and the law under his personal control, Newcastle reemphasized his fundamen-

[16] Ibid., 188.
[17] Ibid., 187.
[18] Ibid., 189.
[19] Ibid., 190.
[20] Ibid., 192.

tal contention that nothing will nor can "confirm your majesty in a settled throne without your power, which is arms."[21]

In the matter of trade the Earl observed that "it is the merchant only who brings honey to the hive." If the king kept the merchants wealthy, controlled the Thames and London, made sure that exports exceeded imports, and never debased the coinage "trade and traffic [would] fill the kingdom with money."[22]

The "Advice" also enumerated major errors of the previous two reigns. The suggestion here again was that Elizabeth's reign represented a golden age of princely government. The greatest error of the Stuarts, according to Newcastle, was that

> they ever rewarded their enemies and neglected their friends . . . .[and they allowed their] subjects to dispute the king's perogative in Westminster Hall and in parliament to let everybody see what the king may do and what he may not do. Nothing makes a king cheaper or pulls him down more than this for it is an old maxim the king can do no wrong and it is most true for he is above the law and so are all governments.[23]

Appropriate regal behavior in these areas required a tighter control over the Privy Council among other remedies. The king must make sure that he had the best intelligence network in the kingdom. "He that has most and best intelligence must be wisest." "Do not hesitate to use money to buy intelligence . . . .Intelligence is the life of the state. . .and therefore nothing should be spared for intelligence."[24] Finally, and redundantly, the "Advice" argued that a king who "cannot punish and reward in just time cannot govern."[25]

In Newcastle's categorization of Stuart errors, Elizabeth's reign always provided the example for rectification. The queen did not call parliaments too often nor keep them very long in session. She was sparing in her creation of peers and never sold titles to the highest bidders. She neither permitted subjects to dispute her prerogative nor took advice from too large a group of counselors. Finally, and here Newcastle most longingly recalled the Elizabethan years, each class knew its

[21] Ibid., 201.
[22] Ibid., 203.
[23] Ibid., 217-218.
[24] Ibid., 220.
[25] Ibid., 221.

place during the queen's rule. Helpful in this regard would be a close attention to the maintenance of ceremony and order. "What is a king," Newcastle asked rhetorically,

> more than a subject but for ceremony and order [?] When that fails him he is ruined. . . .When you appear to show yourself gloriously to your people like a God, for the holy writ says we have called you Gods,—And when the people see you thus they will [get] down [on] their knees which is worship and pray for you with trembling fear and love as they did to Queen Elizabeth whose government is the best precedent for England's government absolutely, only these horrid times must make some little addition to set things straight and so to keep them.[26]

All of the passages summarized above have essential correspondences in either or both of Hobbes's treatises *Leviathan* and *Behemoth*. (Since *Behemoth* was not published until 1679, only *Leviathan* remains of concern here.) One is easily tempted, therefore, to assert a direct link between the two men. C.H. Firth, for one, did just that when he observed that "in his reflections on the past and his recommendations as to the future Newcastle echoes the views of Hobbes."[27] The ideas expressed in Newcastle's "Advice" circulated widely, however, among Englishmen during the mid-seventeenth century. Some of the notions expressed in the letter were, in certain respects, just as compatible with those of Gerrard Winstanley, an exponent of the radical left wing of Puritanism. Newcastle and Winstanley shared, for example, a passionate mistrust of learning derived solely from books. Talking and writing books, argued Winstanley, is "all nothing and must die; for action is the life of all, and if thou dost not act, thou dost nothing."[28] Similarly, if less passionately, Newcastle boasted in the preface to his "Advice" that he "seldom read anything" and elsewhere wrote that a future king should rather "study things than words, matter than language. . .for too much contemplation spoils action, and virtue consists in that."[29] Hobbes, too, is said to have bragged that he had read few works by other men.[30]

---

[26] Ibid., 210.
[27] Firth, ed., *Life of William Cavendish*, xxii.
[28] Quoted by Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (London, 1972), 386.
[29] Henry Ellis, *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, first ser., 3 (London, 1825): 288.
[30] John Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, edited by A. Clark, 1 (Oxford, 1898): 349.

Most of Newcastle's advice lacks, however, the universality implied by such observations. The heart of his philosophy stands opposed to all theories, Winstanley's included, that emphasized the reason and equality of men above the ruthless competitiveness of human nature and the necessity for established hierarchy to maintain order. Both Hobbes and Newcastle emphasized that the basis of regal authority was power, that the important consideration was not who the sovereign was but whether or not he could maintain order among his subjects and retain his throne.

Hobbes argued as strongly as Newcastle that the ruler of a nation must control the militia.

> For the power by which the people are to be defended consists in their armies, and the strength of an army is the union of their strength under one command, which command the sovereign instituted therefore has; because the command of the *militia*, without other institution, makes him that has it sovereign. And therefore whosoever is made general of an army, he that has the sovereign power is always generalissimo.[31]

The philosopher also emphasized his belief that a large city like London, unrestrained, could wreak havoc on the authority of a sovereign. "Another infirmity of a commonwealth," Hobbes wrote in *Leviathan*,

> is the immoderate greatness of a town, when it is able to furnish out of its own circuit the number and expense of a great army; as also the great number of corporations, which are as it were many lesser commonwealths in the bowels of a greater, like worms in the entrails of a natural man.[32]

As the sovereign must control the militia and town corporations, so also, according to Hobbes as well as Newcastle, must he assert his authority over the sermons, political disputations, and publications of his realm. "It is annexed to the sovereignty," said Hobbes,

> to be judge of what opinions and doctrines are averse and what conducing to peace, and consequently on what occasions, how far, and what men are to be trusted withal in speaking to mul-

---

[31] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (London, 1651), Part II, chap. 18. C.B. Macpherson, ed., (New York, 1968), 235.

[32] Ibid., Part II, ch. 29, 374-375.

> titudes of people, and who shall examine the doctrines of all books before they be published. For the actions of men proceed from their opinions, and in the well-governing of opinions consists the well-governing of men's actions, in order to their peace and concord.[33]

Elsewhere in Hobbes's writing there exists a direct analogue to Newcastle's warning against subjects openly debating the prerogative of the king. Hobbes wrote to Lord Scudamore that "the reason I came away [from England in 1640] was that I saw words that tended to advance the prerogative of kings began to be examined in Parlement."[34]

Hobbes advocated specific laws governing the accoutrements of hierarchy lest the order that ceremony promotes become undercut by inter-class competition.

> Considering what value men are naturally apt to set upon themselves, what respect they look for from others, and how little they value other men, from whence continually arise among them emulation, quarrels, factions, and at last war, to the destroying of one another and diminution of their strength against a common enemy—it is necessary that there be laws of honor and a public rate of worth of such men as have deserved or are able to deserve well of the commonwealth, and that there be force in the hands of some or other to put those laws in execution.[35]

Newcastle offered Charles the same advice in the section of his letter entitled "Ceremony and Order." The king ought "to speak to your Heralds," according to the earl,

> to set down the ceremony and order for all degrees of your nobility. . .and to have it printed. . .to keep what is only right and due for their places and dignities—as one thing none under the degree of a Baroness can have carpets by her bed and she but one or two at the most [because] now every turkey merchant's wife [has] all her floors [covered] with carpets."[36]

Finally, among many other possible examples of intellectual consanguinity between the two men, Hobbes prefigured the

---

[33] Ibid., Part II, ch. 18, 233. See also Part II, ch. 29, 375.

[34] Thomas Hobbes, Paris, to Lord Scudamore, 12 April 1641. Perez Zagorin, "Thomas Hobbes's Departure from England in 1640: An Unpublished Letter," *The Historical Journal* 21 (March 1978): 160.

[35] Ibid., Part II, ch. 18, 235-236.

[36] Newcastle, "Advice," 211.

economic advice that Newcastle offered his sovereign. On the subject of monopolies, Hobbes wrote, "to grant a company of merchants to be a corporation or body politic is to grant them a double monopoly. . . .Of this double monopoly one part is disadvantageous to the people at home, the other to foreigners."[37] Newcastle likewise warned the king that

> monopolies is [sic] a most horrible thing both to your majesty having but a small sum God knows and here one particular man ingrosses all the trade of that commodity to himself or his own use not suffering any man to trade except he will compound with him and at his own rates and by that means many a tradesman breaks and is undone both [sic] he, his wife, and his children as they did in the monopoly of soap and many others.[38]

One must require, however, more than comparison of parallel texts and mere assertion to establish the connection between Newcastle and Hobbes. Quentin Skinner has rightly observed that Hobbes's philosophy "fitted with a well-marked and by no means particularly sophisticated historical tradition."[39] It would be wrong to assume that his political views were isolated and original theories in his time. There was nothing original about Hobbes's most characteristic political ideas. His only real claims to originality were the reasons he gave for holding his beliefs. Hobbes became the center of philosphical and ideological debate in his lifetime, not because he was the single, unique advocate of a particular point of view. Contemporary opponents attacked Hobbes because his was seen as the ablest and most influential presentation of beliefs that were rapidly gaining adherents and hence ideological importance. Hobbes's *Leviathan* was said to have "corrupted half the gentry of the Nation."[40]

Sir Robert Filmer, among others, shared Hobbes's and Newcastle's penchant for order and their distrust of the multitude. "Many an ignorant subject," wrote Filmer during

---

[37] Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Part II, ch. 22, p. 282.

[38] Newcastle, "Advice," 206.

[39] Quentin Skinner, "History and Ideology in the English Revolution," *The Historical Journal* 8 (1965): 156, 164-165 and passim. See also his "Conquest and Contest: Thomas Hobbes and the Engagement Controversy," in G.E. Aylmer, ed., *The Interregnum: The Quest for Settlement, 1646-1660* (London, 1972), 97-98; and "The Ideological Context of Hobbes's Political Thought," *The Historical Journal* 9 (1966): 295.

[40] Anthony & Wood, "Thomas Hobbes," *Athenae Oxoniensis*, 2 (London, 1691-1692): 278-483. Quoted by Skinner, "Ideological Context," 295.

the 1640s, "hath been fooled into this faith that a man may become a martyr for his country by being a traitor to his prince."[41] Filmer believed that

> there is nothing more uncertain than the People; their opinions are as variable and sudden as tempests; there is neither truth nor judgment in them; they are not led by wisdom to judge of anything, but by violence and rashness; nor put they any difference between things true and false. After the manner of Cattel, they follow the Herd that goes before.[42]

Clearly, then, we need better evidence to establish that Newcastle's advice was uniquely Hobbesian in its content. One might have just as likely found many of the same concepts in the writings of Anthony Ascham, Robert Brady, John Hall, Sir Henry Spelman, or a host of other theorists. One remains especially hard-pressed to establish such links because Newcastle was apparently sincere in his assertion that he read practically nothing during his entire life. His wife lent support to Newcastle's claim in her *Life of the. . .Earl of Newcastle.*

> To school-learning he never showed a great inclination," she wrote, "for though he was sent to the University, and was a student of St. John's College in Cambridge, and had his tutor to instruct him; yet they could not persuade him to read or study much, he taking more delight in sports, then [sic] in learning.[43]

The handwriting, grammar, atrocious spelling, and syntax of the "Advice" all lend credence to the notion that Newcastle, although logical and intelligent, was not a particularly well-educated man. But several sources help to establish beyond doubt the personal Hobbes-Newcastle connection and even a tenuous link between Newcastle and *Leviathan.*

The earliest published letter from Hobbes to Newcastle bears the date 1634. The letter implies Newcastle's patronage of Hobbes well before that time. In January Hobbes wrote to Newcastle that because of inactivity at Court, he would now have "more time for the businesse I have so long owed to your Lordship, whose continual favors make me ashamed of my

---

[41] Sir Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha or the Natural Power of Kings,* edited by Peter Laslett (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949), 55. *Patriarcha* was apparently written in 1642 but not published until 1680.

[42] Ibid., 89-90. Filmer borrows here, of course, the language of the classical writers Thucydides, Xenophon, Livy, Tacitus, Cicero, and Sallust.

[43] Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, *Life,* 141.

dull proceedinge, savinge that into the number of those favors I put your Lordships patience and forbearance of me."[44]

Most of the correspondence between Hobbes and Newcastle among the Portland Manuscripts bears on the Earl's financial support of the philosopher. Typical of these is Hobbes's letter of August 1635.

> I have received your lordship's guift, proportioned to your own goodness, not to my service. If the world saw my little desert, so plainly as they see your great rewards, they might think me a mountebancke and that all that I do or would do, were in the hope of what I receive. I hope your lordship does not think so. At least let me tell your Lordship once for all, that though I honour you as my Lord, yet my love to you is. . .bred out of private talk, without respect to your purse.[45]

Hobbes also indicated his intention to reside at the Welbeck home of the Earl.[46] Hobbes's letters suggest that he had received an invitation from Newcastle to reside permanently at Welbeck Castle.

The next certain meeting between the two men occurred during the years 1646 to 1648 when Gassendi, Descartes, Newcastle, Hobbes, and the poet Edmund Waller gathered on numerous occasions at the earl's table in Paris. John Aubrey wrote in his *Brief Lives* that "I have heard Mr. Edmund Waller say that the Lord Marquisse of Newcastle was a great patron to Dr. Gassendi, and M. Descartes, as well as Mr. Hobbes, and that he hath dined with them all three at the Marquiss's Table in Paris."[47] Margaret Cavendish, in her *Life* of Newcastle, also mentioned that during his Civil War Parisian exile the earl and "some of his friends, among whom was also that learned

---

[44] Thomas Hobbes, London, to the Earl of Newcastle at Welbeck, January 26, 1633[-4]. Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, Preserved at Welbeck Abbey*, 2, 13th report (London, 1893): 124.

[45] Thomas Hobbes, Paris, to the Earl of Newcastle, 25 August 1635. *Manuscripts . . .Preserved at Welbeck*, p. 125. See also Hobbes to Newcastle, 13-23 June 1636 (128); 29 July-8 August 1636 (128-129); 16 October 1636 (129-130); 26 October 1636 (130); 25 December 1636 (130).

[46] Hobbes to Newcastle, 16 October 1636; 26 October 1636; and 25 December 1636. C.H. Firth believed it "doubtful whether the long visit ever took place." Plague, Newcastle's move to London, and the Civil War probably served as impediments to the event, according to Firth, *Life of. . .William Cavendish*, xvi.

[47] John Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, 1, A. Clark, ed., (Oxford, 1898), 349.

Philosopher Hobbes" often discoursed on questions of a scientific and philosophical nature.[48]

In fact, Margaret Cavendish claimed, on at least two occasions her husband corrected erroneous notions of Hobbes, who used Newcastle's ideas in *Leviathan*. One of these concerned witchcraft.

> They [Hobbes, Newcastle, and perhaps others] falling into a discourse concerning witches, Mr. Hobbes said, that though he could not rationally believe there were witches, yet he could not be fully satisfied to believe that there were none, by reason they would themselves confess it, if strictly examined. To which my Lord answered, that though for his part he cared not whether there were witches or no; yet his opinion was that the confession of witches and their suffering for it proceeded from an erroneous belief, viz. that they made a contract with the devil to serve him for such rewards as were in his power to give them and that it was their religion to worship and adore him.[49]

In fact, there does appear in *Leviathan* a passage that accords in substance with the ideas Margaret Cavendish attributed to her husband. "As for Witches," Hobbes wrote, "I think not that their witchcraft is any real power; but yet that they are justly punished, for the false belief they have, that they can do such mischief, joined with their purpose to do it if they can."[50] Whether Hobbes came by this and other ideas in the fashion recollected by Newcastle and told to his wife remains, however, purely a matter of conjecture. Sir Leslie Stephen, in his biography of Hobbes, chose to believe that "perhaps the lady claimed a little too much for her husband."[51] It is not difficult to imagine, though, Hobbes airing ideas before his friends while he was working on *Leviathan* and reshaping thoughts in the light of conversations. The ideas for which Newcastle apparently claimed credit were not of such intellectual stature as to preclude his conception of them. Neither of the ideas mentioned by Newcastle's wife contributed substantially to the central arguments of *Leviathan*. In any event, the important point stands that Hobbes and Newcastle did over a period of

---

[48] Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, *Life*, 143.
[49] Ibid., 144.
[50] Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Part I, ch. 2, 92.
[51] Sir Leslie Stephen, *Hobbes* (London, 1928), 36.

years regularly discuss questions of political and moral philosophy during the time that Hobbes was considering the *Leviathan*. We can probably safely assume that Newcastle learned more from Hobbes than vice versa.

The need remains to establish Newcastle's connection with Charles II; the nature of their relationship that would lead Newcastle to presume to offer, with some hope of influence, such a lengthy and detailed piece of advice. Also, in the absence of conclusive evidence that Charles ever read the letter, we would want to know how it happened that Charles and Newcastle shared such a temperament that the king would often act, when he did act at all, in a manner so closely akin to the earl's advice. How was it, we might ask, that the king and the earl came to think so much alike? Also, in the light of the above discussion of the personal and intellectual relationship between Hobbes and Newcastle, how did Charles come to share a largely Hobbesian view of the political universe?

William Cavendish was created Earl of Newcastle in 1628 after he entertained Charles I at Welbeck

> in such a wonderful manner, and in such an excess of feasting, as had scarce ever before been known in England; and would have been thought very prodigious if the same noble person had not within a year afterwards made the king and queen a more stupendous entertainment, which no man ever after in those days imitated.[52]

Such lavishness and the resulting debt (about £20,000) were at least partly aimed at securing an important Court office.[53] In a letter to Strafford of 5 August 1633 Newcastle wrote that "I have hurt my estate with the hope of it. If I obtained what I desire, it would be a more painful life, and since I am plunged in debt, it would help very well to undo me."[54]

A letter from Newcastle to his wife dated 8 April 1636 reveals that the specific office he pursued then was the governorship of the Prince of Wales. "They say absolutely another shall be for the Prince and that the king wondered at the report and said he knew no such thing and told the Queen so;

---

[52] Edward Hyde, Earle of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, W. Dunn Macray, ed., 1 (Oxford, 1888): 167.

[53] E. Mackenzie, *A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Town and County of Newcastle Upon Tyne. . .*(Newcastle, 1827), 46.

[54] *Strafford Correspondence*, 1: 101. Quoted in *Dictionary of National Biography*.

but I must tell you I think most of these are lies, and nobody knows except the King."[55] Another letter told just how stiff the competition became. Newcastle thought that Danby, Leicester, Goring, and the Scots were all serious contenders.[56] Nonetheless, in 1638 Newcastle was appointed the first governor of the eight-year-old prince and made a member of the Privy Council.

Few could have been surprised at the appointment. Newcastle was, according to Clarendon,

> a very fine gentleman, active and full of courage, and most accomplished in those qualities of horsemanship, dancing, and fencing, which accompany a good breeding; in which his delight was. Besides that, he was amorous in poetry and music, to which he indulged the greatest part of his time; and nothing could have tempted him out of those paths of pleasure which he enjoyed in a full and ample fortune, but honour, and ambition to serve the king.[57]

The ultimate significance of Newcastle's appointment was that so many of his personal qualities, beliefs, and interests came to be shared by Charles II.

Newcastle established from the first the habit of writing letters of instruction and guidance to the young prince. As we have seen, the practice continued well into Charles's adult years. One of the early letters bears striking parallels to his "Advice" to the king. Newcastle's "Letter of Instructions to Prince Charles for His Studies, Conduct, and Behavior," written some time after 1638, exhibited in philosophy and attention to detail the same sort of guidance offered in the latter discourse.

Newcastle warned the prince that "whensoever you are too studious, your contemplation will spoil your government, for you cannot be a good contemplative man and a good commonwealth's man; therefore take heed of too much book." The newly appointed governor also instructed Charles to "beware of too much devotion for a king, for one may be a good man but a bad king; and how many will history represent to you that in seeming to gain the kingdom of heaven, have lost

---

[55] Earle of Newcastle, London, to the Countess of Newcastle, 8 April 1636, in *Manuscripts. . .at Welbeck Abbey*, 2: p. 127.

[56] Newcastle to Countess of Newcastle, 15 April 1636, 1: 127.

[57] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, 8, ch. 83: 381.

their own?"[58] But from what he already knew of the prince, Newcastle believed that Charles seemed already to display a suitable indifference towards books and religion.

What worried the governor most was the formation of good manners by Charles. "The things that I have discoursed to you most," he wrote, "is to be courteous and civil to everybody . . .and, believe it, the putting off of your hat and making a leg pleases more than reward or preservation, so much doth it take all kind of people."[59] A final example exhibits specific concerns expressed in Newcastle's "Advice" to King Charles and passages from Hobbes's *Leviathan* cited above.

> To lose your dignity and set by your state, I do not advise you to do that, but the contrary: for what preserves you kings more than ceremony [?] The cloth of estates, the distance people are with you, great officers, heralds, drums, trumpeters, rich coaches, rich furniture for horses, guards, martialls men making room, disorders to be labored by their staff of office, and cry "now the king comes;". . .even the wisest though he knew it and not accustomed to it, shall shake of his wisdom and shake for fear of it, for this is the mask cast before us, and maskers the Common Wealth. Besides, authority doth what it list. . .you cannot put upon you too much king.[60]

Newcastle resigned his office in 1641 among the tensions surrounding the imminent civil war. Clarendon thought the hostility of Essex and Holland drove the earl to retirement,[61] although perhaps the discovery of Newcastle's complicity in the first army plot was a more provocative cause.[62] He maintained a lively correspondence with Charles during the Civil War years, however, and the prince continued to follow closely the advice and example of his former mentor. Indeed, beginning in 1650, Newcastle served a major role on the Privy Council of the government in exile.

It was during Newcastle's Parisian exile (1645-1648) that he brought Hobbes and Charles together. The earl, still an unofficial supervisor of the prince's education, secured Hobbes's

---

[58] The Earl of Newcastle to the Prince of Wales, [n.d.], Royal Letters in the Harleian Mss. 6988, att. 68. Printed in Henry Ellis, *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, first ser., 3 (London, 1825): 288.

[59] Ibid., 289.

[60] Ibid., 290.

[61] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, 4: 293.

[62] *Dictionary of National Biography*, cf. "Cavendish, William, Duke of Newcastle."

appointment as a tutor for Charles. It is, however, impossible to know whether Hobbes burdened the prince with much political philosophy at this time.

The prince may have been too young to absorb much philosophy but he could have acquired his appreciation for mathematics and science from Hobbes during their two years together. Charles maintained his interest in the practical application of scientific study and, in fact, may have died as the result of his own experiments with mercury. As king, he granted the Royal Society its charter of incorporation, gave its name, and granted it use of the building and extensive grounds of Chelsea College. Charles also had a hand in the founding of the Mathematical School at Christ's Hospital in 1673 and the building of the Royal Observatory at Greenwich in 1675, both aimed, in the king's mind, at the improvement of navigation. Sorbiere, a Frenchman traveling in England during 1663, expressed astonishment at the scientific knowledge of Charles and the support he gave to scientific enquiry.[63] After perhaps kindling the prince's interests in mathematics and science, Hobbes fell victim to a bout of royal displeasure. Hobbes and the king reconciled their differences, however, and Charles granted and even intermittently paid a pension to the philosopher.

Clearly the impact of Newcastle on the development of Charles's character and personality was much greater than the direct personal influence of Hobbes. In his personality as well as his actions, Charles bore the mark of Newcastle's training. Numerous incidents might be cited as evidence of the shared character traits of the two men. Newcastle's attitude toward his generalship during the Civil War illustrates the point well.

Before he left to join the exiles on the continent, Newcastle raised and commanded an army of about eight thousand men in behalf of Charles I. Of significance here is Newcastle's character in the face of military troubles, a character strikingly similar to that of the later King Charles II. According to Clarendon, Newcastle

> liked the pomp and absolute authority of a general well, and preserved the dignity of it to the full; and for the discharge of the outward state and circumstances of it, in acts of courtesy,

[63] Mons. [Samuel de] Sorbiere, *A Voyage to England* (London, 1709), 32-33.

> affability, bounty, and generosity, he abounded; which in the infancy of a war became him, and made him for some time very acceptable to men of all conditions. But the substantial part, and fatigue of a general, he did not in any degree understand,. . .nor could submit to, but referred all matters of that nature to the discretion of his lieutenant general. . . .In all actions of the field he was still present and never absent in any battle. . . .[but] such articles of action were no sooner over than he retired to his delightful company, music, or his softer pleasures, to all of which he was so indulgent, and to his ease, that he would not be interrupted upon what occasion soever.[64]

After Prince Rupert's signal defeat at Marston Moor on 1 July 1644, even though he had taken no command in the battle, Newcastle announced his retirement and intention to leave England the next day. Clarendon believed that it was simply because Newcastle "was so utterly tired with a condition and employment so contrary to his humour, nature, and education," that he resigned so precipitously. Clarendon was more surprised that he had "sustained the vexation and fatigue so long, than that he broke from it with so little circumspection."[65]

Charles exhibited a strikingly similar paradox of character as a man of action and a lover of ease. It was noted with astonishment by contemporaries that Charles labored like a navvy, toting buckets of water during the great fire of London. On the other hand Charles's dallying while the Dutch fleet sailed up the Thames disgusted contemporaries. "The night the Dutch burned our ships," Pepys heard that, "the King did sup with my Lady Castlemayne, at the Duchess of Monmouth's, and they were all mad in hunting a poor moth."[66]

Newcastle's injunctions to the prince against becoming too bookish or fervent in his religion apparently rooted in fertile soil. No one, in his lifetime or since, has accused Charles of having a scholarly nature. Halifax observed that

> his wit was not acquired by reading; that which he had above his natural stock by nature, was from company, in which he was very capable to observe. He could not so properly be said to have

[64] Clarendon, *Rebellion*, 8, ch. 86; 382-383.
[65] Ibid., ch. 80, 380-381.
[66] Samuel Pepys, *Diary*, 21 June 1667.

> a wit very much raised, as a plain, gaining, well-bred, recommending kind of wit.[67]

Whether attending the theater, participating in the unending series of Court entertainments, hunting, riding in the races at Newmarket, or conducting Cabinet meetings in his mistress's bedchamber, Charles seemed ever the protegé of Newcastle, never a son of the obnoxiously pious Charles I. Just as Charles's religious indifference contrasted with his father's piety, so too did his womanizing contrast with Charles I's devotion to his queen.

The only tacit criticism the Duchess of Newcastle made of her husband concerned his reputation as "a great lover and admirer of the female sex; which whether it be so great a crime as to condemn him for it I'll leave to the judgment of young gallants and beautiful ladies."[68] Charles notoriously shared the earl's addiction to the company and favors of numerous women. Charles cultivated his social graces, as his governor had encouraged, and never made bitter personal enemies. Most people genuinely liked Charles, although many thought him lazy and too neglectful of public business in the pursuit of personal pleasures. Clarendon, who condemned Newcastle for these same faults as a general, spent much energy scolding the rakish young king whose government he ran.

Evidence that Charles often borrowed books and carried a large trunk filled with them during his travels establishes only the possibility that he read Newcastle's 1659 letter of advice. The closeness of their relationship and the nature of surviving correspondence between them lends credence to such speculation. Charles did read other long letters written by Newcastle, such as the "Letter of Instructions" mentioned earlier. Charles's fondness and respect for his former governor continued unabated into his kingship. Charles's personal instruction by Hobbes suggests a possible knowledge or at least receptivity to the philosopher's ideas. Evidence that Charles shared many social and intellectual traits with Newcastle shows most convincingly, though, the king's pattern of receptivity to

---

[67] Sir George Savile, Marquis of Halifax, *A Character of King Charles II*, in H.C. Foxcroft, ed., *The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, Bart., First Marquis of Halifax*, 2 (London, 1898); 353.

[68] Margaret Newcastle, *Life*, 149-150.

the earl's advice, the continued closeness of their relationship on the eve of Restoration, and the reason why Charles as king acted in specific compliance with the nobleman's suggestions.

The often close correspondence between Newcastle's advice and Charles's actions as king, adds an extra dimension of significance to the document. Also of importance here are the legislative actions of the first Restoration Parliament during 1661 and 1662. Parliament's attitudes toward correcting the ills of government as illustrated by their actions proved essentially the same as Newcastle's prescriptions in several areas. Not only does the letter illustrate the recrudescence of Cavalier conservatism in Restoration England, but it displays, in the actions of Charles and the Parliament, the active social and political decisions such thought could and did provoke.

With the Militia Acts of 1661 and 1662 and the Act to Preserve the Person of the King (1661) Parliament disavowed any claim to constitutional supremacy. In "An Act for ordering the Forces in the Several Counties of this Kingdom" (1662), Parliament acknowledged that

> the sole and supreme Power, Government, Command and Disposition of the Militia, and of all forces by Sea and Land, and of all Forts and Places of Strength is, and by the laws of England ever was, the undoubted right of his majesty, and his Royal predescessors, Kings and Queens of England.

It further accepted that in the city of London, "these trained bands may again be put to [use] for the safety of his Majesty's person, and for suppressing or preventing of insurrections."[69]

Charles and his ministers were not remiss in this regard, recognizing the fundamental importance of establishing control over the city of London in particular and the military arsenals of the kingdom. The king maintained, just as Newcastle and Hobbes advised, a close and ever vigilant supervision over the London lieutenancy and militia, always careful that they remained in loyal and efficient hands.[70] Also, the Corporation Act (1661) affirmed the king's intention to control the towns and rid them of the "many evil spirits [that] are still working."[71]

---

[69] *The Statutes at Large*, 3 (London, 1770): 219.
[70] J.R. Jones, *Country and Court* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), 54.
[71] *Statutes at Large*, 3: 213-215.

Charles set out in 1660, as Newcastle advised, to consolidate his position as ruler of England. He moved rapidly to dispose of the large Cromwellian army that remained intact. The army, of course, posed one of the potentially most severe threats to Charles's rule. Parliament's generous general pardon excepting under thirty persons was actively supported by Charles and Clarendon. Such merciful conduct enabled the Crown to disband the army quickly without a serious threat to peace. A small rising in 1661 provided the necessary excuse to retain a much smaller force under the monarch's personal control, also just as Newcastle had called for. Former royalists commanded the militia and received appointments as justices of the peace. Charles and Clarendon elevated the bishops and orthodox clergy to positions of influence in society. They set out with the support of Parliament to secure the total re-establishment of the doctrine and government of the Church of England under its bishops. Only minimal concessions were made to Presbyterians and the sects. The Act of Uniformity (1662) harkened back, just as Newcastle did, to the idyllic reign of Queen Elizabeth, when "there was one uniform order of common service and prayer, and of the administration of sacraments, Rites and ceremonies in the Church of England agreeable to the Word of God, and Usage of the Primitive Church."[72]

To these examples of executive actions and legislative acts of the early years of Charles's reign might be added others illustrative of the shared attitudes of Newcastle with Charles, Clarendon, and Parliament. The two universities were purged and kept under strict control as advised by Newcastle. The earl must have applauded the precipitous fall in numbers of students and the waning of intellectual life in England since he felt there were twice as many students in the universities as warranted and too much attention to books in the nation at large. The Licensing Act (1662) and the Act Against Tumultuous Petitioning (1661) were also in line with Newcastle's strictures against free speech and uncontrolled presses. Another act of 1661 lent strength to the hierarchical structure of society by restoring bishops to the House of Lords and removing the clergy's disqualification from holding lay offices.

[72] Ibid., 3: 224-230.

These political actions of 1660-1662 display the receptivity of the first Restoration Parliament to royalist attitudes espoused by Newcastle but effected largely on the initiative of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and Lord Chancellor from 1660 to 1667. In this they constitute important evidence of the significance of the "Advice" as an expression of the thoughts and rationale that underlay the important political initiatives and widely shared attitudes of the early years of the Restoration. To isolate Charles's attitudes toward government, though, we must look to the later years of his reign. It was especially during the last five years of his life that Charles threw off the shackles of ministerial rule and asserted his own prerogatives as king.

By 1681 the Exclusion question had brought the king and Parliament to loggerheads. It was an event closest in parallel to the confrontation between his father and Parliament during 1640-1641. Charles took his political enemies by surprise, however, and appeared before both houses in full ceremonial regalia. Shaftsbury had no time to organize and *this* king had his Life-Guards and control of the London militia.

Charles was highly displeased at the failure of a London jury to convict the Whig leader on charges of high treason. He therefore remodeled his judicial bench in 1683 to make sure it would never again oppose his will. With the judges behind him, Charles next tackled the municipal corporations, the Whig strongholds, to ensure that the next Parliament would not be filled with his enemies. Many boroughs surrendered their charters rather than risk *Quo Warranto* investigations. Even London sacrificed its charter. A judicial order demanded "that the francise and liberty of London be taken into the King's hands." Charles magnanimously restored all its rights to his capital city on the sole condition that no elected official would in the future take office without his express consent. Charles imposed the same conditions on hundreds of other boroughs that gave him control of the political machinery that elected a majority of the representatives to the House of Commons. In this way Charles solved a constitutional problem that had plagued him since 1660. Indeed, one historian has appropriately termed the closing years of Charles's reign the "Indian summer" of the Stuarts.[73]

[73] This account relies heavily upon Roger Lockyer, *Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1471-1714* (London, 1964), 352-354.

In his relations with Parliament, London, municipal corporations throughout England, the lord lieutenancies and militias, the universities, and even the bishops of the Church of England, Charles acted as Newcastle advised. In 1679 the king remodeled his Privy Council along the lines recommended in the "Advice," dissolving the large and unwieldy body and substituting a new type of Council. It was much smaller and included men of varied opinions, even independent and opposition politicians. Charles followed the methods of Elizabeth very successfully among his advisers during the last years. Newcastle would have approved of the way he played on personal rivalries, listening first to one, then another, and always remaining free to pursue his own desires.

It is generally agreed that Charles lived his last years in peace because, as Hobbes and Newcastle predicted, once he silenced his enemies and controlled the military potential of the nation all remained calm. Censorship or fear stifled his opponents after the alleged Rye House Plot. Doctrines of passive obedience to a divinely ordained sovereign echoed from the pulpits unopposed.

It is not my intention in this essay to defend Charles's acts as ultimately just or wise, or even successful, for the history of England. I have hoped only to illustrate the possible origins of values Charles took to his kingship and the widespread acceptance of Newcastle's values among Restoration Englishmen. In this regard I have sought also to establish the significance of Newcastle's long letter to the king. If Charles "neither trusted nor forgave his enemies," as Halifax believed, and seldom forgot personal, if not public service, it was in large measure the result of instructions on conduct instilled in the King from the time he was eight years old and expressed most comprehensively in the 1659 "Advice."[74]

Modern historians have lamented the absence of documents revealing the thoughts of Charles II. Compared to his father and his brother, we know so little about what he believed. Perhaps, in any event, we are safest in judging a man of such duplicity only by his actions. But we do know that a passion for the status quo infected the ruling elites of Restoration England. It was this same passion that filled the pages of Newcastle's letter. Charles, at least, forgot few of the earl's precepts and shared the Cavalier's veneration of the Elizabethan past.

[74] Foxcroft, ed., Halifax's "Character of King Charles," 360.

In Newcastle's letter we have the closest surviving statement to a monarchist plan of action on the eve of Restoration.

Newcastle retired from active political life in 1660. The letter was his last political act. He devoted himself to writing plays and poems, encouraging horse racing, and writing his second book on the training of horses. Perhaps the Earl had depicted in his advice a society that became no more than a memory by 1660, but, as David Ogg observed, "in England survivals are long-lived, the sentiment for the past is deeply rooted, and an age is to be judged not alone by the wisdom of the statesman or the originality of the pioneer, but by the less articulate conservatism of the 'ordinary' man."[75]

In the articulate conservatism of the Earl of Newcastle's letter we also see germs of the Tory Party rooted in the old law, religious truth, and political power. Newcastle, in his life and in his "Advice" did not exactly epitomize the strengths of the convervative cause. Neither, of course, did Charles II embody the virtues of Tory conservatism. Both too greatly loved their ease; the former was no general, the latter a poor model for a king. It is Clarendon who rightly deserves renown as his party's single most significant actor among the Cavaliers. Newcastle's letter does, however, personify as no other surviving document the philosophical instincts that underlay the actions of England's ruling conservatives after the Restoration. Newcastle, in his advice, shared with Clarendon a longing to restore England "to its old good manners, its old good humour, and its old good nature."[76]

[75] Ogg, *England in the Reign of Charles II*, 1: 147.

[76] Clarendon to Parliament, 1660. Quoted by Keith Feiling, *A History of the Tory Party, 1640-1714* (London, 1924), 69.