

# MEMORIAL DISCOURSE

Trinity College Dublin

Trinity Monday 1902

Viscount Falkland

By Rev. W.R. Westropp Roberts, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College

*Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.*

*Philippians iv. 8*

Among the families whose members have, from time to time, become distinguished and illustrious in our annals few can make a higher boast than the house of Cary. In the last decade of the reign of Queen Elizabeth we find Sir Henry Cary, the representative of a knightly family long seated in Somerset and Dorsetshire, entering Exeter College, Oxford, where he became highly accomplished and acquired that love for literature and cultivation of manner which has been characteristic of so many of his race.

Before the close of the sixteenth century he succeeded his father, Sir Edward Cary, as Master of the Queen's jewels, and shortly afterwards he was united in marriage to Elizabeth, sole daughter and heir of Sir Lawrence Tanfield, Chief Baron of the Exchequer. Sir Henry was never in affluent circumstances, and it was necessary, if he were to maintain the position occupied by his ancestors, that he should ally himself to a lady of fortune and rank equal to his own. Elizabeth Tanfield possessed ample means, and was heir to Burford Priory and Great Tew, both charming seats not far from Oxford. Her wealth and rank were thus sufficient to secure her a brilliant marriage, while her mental qualities and attainments and the beauty of her character were such as to render few men worthy of her. Thoughtful beyond her years, she early exhibited a strong inclination for the study of languages, mastering French, Spanish, Italian, Latin, and Hebrew before her marriage at the age of fifteen years.

Not long before their union Sir Henry Cary, leaving his wife at her father's residence, served in the Low Countries, and was taken prisoner at the siege of Ostend. After his release, and on his return to England, he was introduced to Court, and was appointed to a position in the household of the king. In November, 1620, he was created in the Scottish peerage Viscount Falkland in the county of Fife.

About the year 1610 Lucius Cary, his eldest son, the subject of this discourse, was born, and was brought up at Great Tew, his grandfather's residence, while his parents resided chiefly at Court.

In 1622 Lord Falkland, mainly by the favour of Buckingham, was appointed to succeed Viscount Grandison as Lord Deputy of Ireland. He landed at Howth on Friday night, the 6<sup>th</sup> September, and on the following Sunday received the sword in Christ Church. Always in

want of money, at no time of his career was he free from pecuniary embarrassment. To enable him to enter upon the office of Lord Deputy he was obliged to induce his wife to mortgage her fortune, by which she so seriously offended her father, Chief Baron Tanfield, that he disinherited her and her husband, and settled the lands of Burford Priory and Great Tew, in Oxfordshire, on his grandson Lucius.

It was in these early years of his life that the character of Lucius Cary was formed and moulded, largely by the influence of his mother, a woman of singular piety and sweetness of disposition. For her the call of duty was imperative, and her life appears to have been a continuous sacrifice of self in her devotion to others. Her first care was her family and the instruction of her children in religion in letters; her second, at that time, the establishment of industrial schools in Dublin, in which instruction in the making broadcloth was afforded, and other trades taught. But her endeavours to promote the well-being of the people were unsuccessful. They were ready to take her money, but could not exchange the old life of indigent freedom for one of greater advantages, but imposing regular restraint.

Lucius Cary, who had accompanied his parents to Dublin, entered Trinity College shortly afterwards, being then about twelve years old. With such parents to direct his studies it is little wonder that the boy profited to the utmost by the instruction and education afforded him in the University. Lord Falkland desired that his son should occupy a plane near him whenever possible, so that Lucius enjoyed the society, and derived advantage from the conversation, of the many cultivated and learned men who assembled at his father's Court.

Something must now be said of the condition of Trinity College at the time of his undergraduate course.

William Temple, formerly of King's College, Cambridge, was our Provost when Lord Falkland was appointed Lord Deputy. We are indebted to Temple for many reforms. He divided the Fellows into seven Senior and nine Junior, four of whom were probationers, and he placed the Government of the College in the hands of the former. By his careful administration of the College revenues he was enabled to increase the number of Scholars from twenty-eight to seventy.\* It is to Temple also that we owe the arrangement of our College offices, which he modelled upon that of the Cambridge Colleges.

Then, as at present, students were divided into four classes. In the junior class Logic was studied, and students were required to bring to their lectures an analysis "*Inventionis et Elocutionis Rhetoricae*." In the second year the study of Logic was continued, and students were obliged to present each week an analysis "*Inventionis et Judicii*." In the third year students were taught Physiology, and in the fourth Psychology and Ethics. It was in his fourth year of study (1625) that Cary took his degree. †

\*In 1620 we find a statement by Temple that, of natives by birth, there were five Fellows and thirty-seven Scholars.

†The Commencements in these days were brilliant pageants, and were held with great solemnity, most probably in St. Patrick's Cathedral, as it is likely that the great Commencements, held in St. Patrick's Cathedral, August 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>, 1614, at which the Lord Lieutenant and Officers of State were present, and at which James Usher took his degree of D.D., served as a model for future occasions. Our students at that time regularly attended sermons in Christ Church Cathedral, where certain seats were assigned to them and to the Fellows. It may be interesting to note that in 1613 there were twenty native Irish out of sixty-five students supported by the College.

In the same year an incident occurred, which separated the son from his mother. Lady Falkland had long favoured Roman Catholic doctrine, but appears to have broken away openly from the Established Church in 1625. This led to a rupture between her and Lord Falkland, in consequence of which Lady Falkland left Ireland, and, after living for some time in retirement in Oxfordshire, she took up her residence in London, where she employed herself in soliciting suits for her husband and promoting his interest by every means in her power.

This year was thus a memorable one in the life of Lucius, for the difference of religious opinion, which then arose between his parents, made a lasting impression upon him, as we shall see later on. Next year, on the occasion of the king's coronation, we find the name of Lucius Cary among those who received knighthood from Lord Falkland.

At this time the young man was not only master of Latin, having read all the poets and the best authors, but understood and spoke French with the ease and fluency of one brought up in France.

Lord Falkland, when Lord Deputy, appears to have quarrelled with many of the members of the Privy Council and the Lords Justices, who gratified their spite by inducing the king to deprive Sir Lucius of a company his father had conferred upon him and give it to Sir Francis Willoughby. Lucius was naturally indignant at such treatment, and challenged Willoughby to "give him satisfaction with his sword." Sir Francis, who was in no way party to this act, denied having sought the command of the company, but Sir Lucius was not appeased by his reply, and expressed his determination to hold Willoughby responsible, either for his own act or for that of the king. The bold language made use of in this letter, and the expressed determination to meet Willoughby, appears to have reached the ears of the king, for Sir Lucius was committed to the Fleet by an order of the Privy Council on the 17<sup>th</sup> January, 1630, and was further threatened with the Star Chamber, but was liberated on the 27<sup>th</sup> by the intercession of Lord Falkland with his Majesty.

Shortly before this, Sir Lucius entered into possession of the estates of Burford and Great Tew, and he consequently found himself, at the age of nineteen years, possessed of two excellent and well-furnished houses and an income of some £2000 per annum.

Chivalrous and cultivated, Sir Lucius numbered many friends, the chief among whom was the amiable and scholarly Sir Henry Morison. The remarkable friendship which existed between Cary and Morison and the untimely death of the latter, formed the subject of a Pindaric Ode by Ben Jonson, who had some years before sung the praises of Lord Falkland. In the society of the Morisons he became acquainted with Letitia, the sister of Sir Henry, for whom he conceived an ardent passion, and to whom he was married in 1631. Letitia Morison's patrimony was small, but although the marriage united him to "a lady of most extraordinary wit and judgement, and of the most signal virtue and exemplary life that the age produced" – to quote the words of Lord Clarendon\* - it nevertheless was the cause of his father's deep displeasure, as it struck a death-blow at his scheme for repairing his broken fortune and fallen hopes by an advantageous alliance between his son and the daughter of the Lord Treasurer.

Sir Lucius, on learning his father's serious displeasure, implored his forgiveness, offering at

\*Clarendon's *Life*, p.21.

the same time to resign the whole of the Tanfield estates, and actually went so far as to have the deeds of the transfer prepared, declaring himself ready to execute them and to rely solely on his father's bounty. But Lord Falkland neither forgave the marriage nor accepted the generous offer of his son. Deeply pained at this treatment, and unwilling to remain in the neighbourhood of a father who would no longer receive him, Sir Lucius, accompanied by his wife, immediately left England for Holland, intending to obtain some military command; but, failing to do so, he returned home to England the following year and retired to Tew, thinking "that as he was not likely to improve himself in arms, he might advance in letter."\* So bent was he on this design that he resolved not to see "London which he loved above all places" † until he had perfected himself in Greek literature. The death of Lord Falkland in 1633 was the first interruption of his retirement.

Although the demise of his father brought Sir Lucius a peerage, it added nothing to his income; but, on the contrary, involved him in serious loss, as he was forced to sell one of his own estates to clear off a heavy mortgage with which his patrimony was burdened. Having visited London to arrange his affairs, Lord Falkland, as we must now call him, again retired to the country and resumed his studies. And now follow the halcyon days of Falkland's existence. His life at Great Tew was one of tranquillity and intellectual enjoyment, undisturbed by domestic or political anxiety.

Among the friends who frequently visited him, and who found at Tew a home and a refuge from the cares and troubles of life, we find Dr. Sheldon the future Primate, the learned Hammond, Morley the patron and friend of Isaac Walton, Chillingworth the controversialist, John Hales of Eton, the poets Waller and Cowley, Thomas Triplet, the wit of Christ Church, Dr. Eale, and lastly, but above all, Edward Hyde, the future Earl of Clarendon.

"When we went from Oxford to Great Tew," says Triplet,\*\* "as we found ourselves out of the University so we never thought ourselves absent from home." Bishop Earle has left it on record that he learnt more in conversation at Tew than at Oxford, while Clarendon tells us that Falkland's "whole conversation was one *convivium philosophicum*, or *convivium theologicum*, enlivened and refreshed by wit, good humour, and pleasantness of discourse." It was here that Chillingworth wrote his book against the Jesuit Nott, and in this society debated many of the controversial points embodied in that work.

Lord Falkland possessed a gentleness which spread its influence on those around him, and that well-bred politeness which springs from a delicate regard for the feelings of others. His great delight was to aid "worthy persons who needed assistance, as Ben Jonson and others," †† who could accept from him what it would have been impossible for them to take from other hands. By his kindness to those with whom he came in contact he won their affection, as he did their respect by the depth and variety of his attainments. Cheerful and animated, he delighted all by his conversation and wit, and yet we find it recorded that no profane or loose word ever passed his lips, or indeed – such was his influence – was ever uttered in his presence.

\*Clarendon's Life, p.21.

†Teale's *Lives of English Laymen*, p. 6

\*\*Teale, p. 9

†† *Lives from the Clarendon Gallery*, vol. I., p. II

Falkland was a man of deeply religious views, and his intimate friend Triplet tell us “his religion was the more eminent because the more early, at that age when young gallants think least of it.”\* Of his theological works there remain, “A discourse on Episcopacy,” “A discourse on the Infallibility of the Church of Rome,” and “A Reply to the Answer thereto,” “A Letter addressed to Mr. Walter Montague concerning his change of Religion,” and others of less importance. He was a decided member of the Church of England; but his toleration for the opinions of those who differed from him was not less remarkable than the knowledge upon which his own were based. His treatise against the Infallibility of the Church of Rome is a conspicuous monument to his learning and candour.

I have already mentioned that his mother became a member of the Church of Rome, and this induced Falkland to devote much of his time to controversial studies, and stimulated him to read the best of the Greek and Latin Fathers. He never declined an opportunity or occasion of conference with Roman Catholics, whether priests or laymen, and conducted himself with such civility in controversy that they retained some hope of this conversion, even when they had ceased to reason with him. As Triplet says of him, “He excelled his antagonist no less in civility than in reason, and thus showed that a gentlemen writ with a scholar’s pen.”\*\*

But the year 1639 brought to a close the pleasant life at Tew, and interrupted the delightful interchange of views of those who met there. In this year King Charles took the field in person against the Scotch, and Falkland, feeling that duty led him to take arms in his sovereign’s cause, expressed his desire of obtaining a command, and, though disappointed in this, he volunteered to serve under the Earl of Essex. The expedition to Scotland was fruitless and inglorious. The army was disbanded, the Scots burned their own version of the proposed treaty at the hands of the common hangman, and the king returned to London, his army disappointed, his nobility impoverished, and his reputation tarnished.

From this time we shall find Falkland a prominent figure in that wide arena in which passion, cupidity, political ambition, religious enthusiasm, and desire for equity and justice were the various incentives to the actions of those within it.

In the succeeding year Falkland was chosen Member of Parliament for Newport, in the Isle of Wight. The first occasion on which he addressed the House was when the Earl of Strafford was impeached of high treason. The unkindness, and even injustice, displayed by Strafford to Falkland’s father when Lord Deputy might have reasonably made him a somewhat partial critic of Strafford’s conduct; yet we find that he was the only Member of the House of Commons who, when the proposal was made to accuse Strafford of high treason, desired the House to consider “Whether it would not suit better with the gravity of their proceedings, first to digest many of those particulars which had been mentioned by a committee before they sent up to accuse him.”\*\*\* This suggestion was rejected by Pym, who feared that any delay might enable Strafford to use his influence with the king to dissolve Parliament, and so save himself from further proceedings.

We next find Falkland speaking at some length against the legality of ship-money, and on the opinion which had been pronounced by the judges on this subject. In this speech he draws

\*Dr. Triplet’s *Dedication*.

\*\**Lives from the Clarendon Gallery*, vol. I., p. 179

\*\*\* Clarendon’s *History of the Rebellion*, vol. I., p.243 (ed.1849)

attention to, and dwells upon, the crimes of the Lord Keeper Finch.

“Mr. Speaker,” said he, “there is one that I must not lose in the crowd, whom I doubt not but we shall find, when we examine the rest of them, with what hopes they have been tempted, by what fears they have been assailed, and by what and by whose importunity they have been pursued, before they consented to what they did, I doubt, I say, but we shall find him to have been a most admirable solicitor, but a most abominable judge; he it is who not only gave away with his breath what our ancestors had purchased for us by so large an expense of their time, their care, their treasure, and their blood; not only gave away, but strove to root up those liberties which they had cut down, and to make our grievances immortal, and our slavery irreparable, lest any part of our posterity might want occasion to curse him; he declared that power to be so inherent to the Crown as that it was not in the power even of Parliaments to divide them.”\*

This vigorous language, followed up by a resolution that a Secret Committee might draw up his and their charge, was productive of important results. Four resolutions were passed in the House, declaring that the “raising of ship-money,” the “extra judicial opinions of the judges,” “the ship-writs,” and the “judgement in Mr. Hampden’s case,” were all contrary to the laws of the realm and the rights of property. Shortly afterwards the thanks of the House of Commons were ordered to Mr. St. John and Mr. Whitelock, the Lord Falkland, and Mr. Hyde, for “the great services they have performed to the honour of this House and the good of the Commonwealth in their conduct of this business.”\*\*

The accusation of the Lord Keeper Finch was but the first step on the oath that was now pursued by the supporters of legal and constitutional rights, who were determined to resist the undue exercise of power in Church and State. Wren, the Bishop of Ely, was next impeached, and shortly afterwards Laud was voted by the House of Commons to be a traitor. The London petition, signed by 15,000 people, alleging their various grievances from the oppression of the bishops, and praying for the abolition of Episcopacy, was presented in December.

The discussion of the London and other petitions on the 8<sup>th</sup> February gave rise to a debate on episcopal government, in which Lord Falkland distinguished himself by a speech of singular clearness of statement and force of argument. He pointed out that the oppressions of the people, both in religion and liberty, were due in a large measure to the bishops and their adherents. “But, alas!” said he, “they, whose ancestors in the darkest times excommunicated the breakers of Magna Charta, did now, by themselves and their adherents, both write, preach, plot, and act against it, by encouraging Dr. Beale, by preferring Dr. Mainwaring, appearing forward for monopolies and ship-money, and, if any were slow and backward to comply, blasting both them and their preferment with the utmost expression of their hatred, the title of Puritan.”\*\*\*

We must remember that what Falkland had in his mind was an ideal system of Church government and ideal bishops, and he consequently found fault with all that fell short of these ideals. Still, with all his objections to the practices of the bishops, he was not in sympathy with those who were in favour of the abolition of episcopacy. “My opinion is,” and he, “that

\**Lives from the Clarendon Gallery*, vol. I., p. 41.

\*\**Lives from the Clarendon Gallery*, vol. I. p.43

\*\*\**Lives from the Clarendon Gallery*, vol. I. p.56

we should not root up this ancient tree, as dead as it appears, till we have tried whether by this or like topping of the branches the sap, which was unable to feed the whole, may not serve to make what is left both grow and flourish.” † Finally, a compromise was effective by Falkland, in which it was agreed that the London petition should be referred to a committee, but that the question of episcopacy should be reserved for the future consideration of the House.

It is necessary for us to trace briefly the course of events which followed this speech, in order to make clear the influence and position of Lord Falkland in the domain of politics.

In March, 1641, a Bill was drawn, which aimed at depriving the bishops of their legislative and judicial powers in the House of Peers, as prejudicial to the Commonwealth, but it is to be noted that episcopacy was not challenged in this measure. There is no doubt but that the Bill was received in the House with approbation by many who were neither of the same principles nor purposes, and who, after hearing the arguments in its favour, honestly believed that the passing of this Act was the only means of preserving the Church. Lord Falkland took that view, and it was in the debate arising out of this Bill that the first difference of opinion between Falkland and Hyde arose, and they found themselves on opposite sides.

The Bill passed the Commons in the month of May, and while it was still being debated in the Lords, another Bill was introduced by Sir Edward Dering into the House of Commons, “for the utter abolishing and taking away of all Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, Prebendaries, Chapters and Canons, and all other under officers.”\* This was the famous “Root and Branch Bill” which was opposed by Falkland, who compared it to a total massacre of men, women, and children, and thus again found himself on the same side as Edward Hyde.

The opponents of the Bill, however, felt but little zeal in their own cause. The debates were long and tedious, and the temptation to spend the June days in the tennis court proved too great for many of them, while dinner was an almost irresistible attraction, so that the House was all but emptied of the opponents of the Bill at that time, which drew from Falkland the remark, “that those who hated the bishops hated them worse than the devil, and that they who loved them so well as their dinner.” †† The opposition, however, which the Bill received in committee was sufficient to materially hamper its progress, and after the king’s departure for Scotland in August, it was dropped.

In October a Bill was again introduced into the House for depriving the bishops of their votes in Parliament and disabling all in Holy Orders from the exercise of all temporal jurisdiction and authority. The Bill was carried, but Falkland concurred with Hyde in opposing it. Hampden remarked upon this change of opinion, and Falkland replied, “that he had formerly been persuaded by that worthy gentleman to believe many things which he had since found to be untrue, and therefore he had changed his opinions in many particulars as well as to things as to persons.”\*\* In November the king returned from Scotland, and, conscious of the need of

† *Ibid* p. 62.

\**Parl. Hist.*, vol.II., p. 838.

††*Lives from the Clarendon Gallery*, vol. I., p.69.

\*\**Lives from the Clarendon Gallery*, vol. I, p.70

counsellors upon whom he could rely, made overtures to Lord Falkland and Sir John Culpepper to accept the vacant offices of Secretary of State and Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Falkland plainly saw the clouds of approaching storms gathering round the political horizon, and he hesitated to take office, but Hyde urged him to be a guide to the king in this time of peril, and to save the king from his own weakness and duplicity and the influence of the queen; and Falkland, feeling that acceptance was a duty, complied. Honesty, he said, obliged him to serve the king, but he foresaw his own ruin by doing it. Falkland and Culpepper were sworn in on January 1, 1641-2. Hyde, though declining office, was to assist the others in their councils.

Lord Falkland was a good linguist and was, in many ways, eminently fitted to perform the duties incidental to his office, but his actions were regulated by a moral standard so lofty as to place him at a disadvantage in his dealings with others. There were two things connected with his office which he never could bring himself to perform. Falkland would not employ a spy nor would he, under any circumstances, open a letter (even a suspicious one) addressed to another.

We can only indicate here in barest outline the principal events which followed in rapid succession the attempt of Charles, in January, 1642, to arrest the five members. The dismissal of the Earls of Essex and Holland by the king was a fatal error, as it resulted in Essex being appointed Lord General of the Parliamentary Forces in July, 1642. In August the king set up his standard at Nottingham, thus beginning the great Civil War. We pass over the Battle of Edgehill in October, the death of Hampden in January, 1643, and the siege of Gloucester by Prince Rupert.

Such glimpses as we can obtain of Lord Falkland's career, during this troubled time, serve to mark his fidelity to the cause he had espoused, and his devotion to his King.

London was now about to throw its sword into the scale. On August 22 Essex reviewed 8000 men on Hounslow Heath, who were ready to start on the perilous enterprise of the relief of Gloucester. The march of the Parliamentary army was a rough and fatiguing one for Londoners unused to war. But they were borne up by a spirit of religious enthusiasm which found expression in the words "The Lord that called us to do the work enabled us to undergo such hardships as He brought us to."\* There is no evidence of such a spirit in Charles's camp before Gloucester.

Many noble hearts had already wearied of the conditions under which they were fighting. Carnarvon had retreated from Dorsetshire; Chillingworth and Falkland (but too conscious of the king's weakness and duplicity) beguiled the weary nights by disputations in a smoky hut. The citizens of Gloucester were holding out bravely. On the morning, of the 5<sup>th</sup> of September their supply of ammunition was all but exhausted, and hope nearly gone, when they descried a commotion in the Royalist army. It was soon evident that Charles's force was in full retreat in the direction of Painswick. On the 7<sup>th</sup>, the day before Essex entered Gloucester, the king took up his position at Sudley Castle, to block the way by which Essex had arrived from London, and by which he might be expected to return. For some days the armies strove to out-manoeuvre each other.

\*See Gardiner's History of the Great Civil War, vol. I. p.240.

In order to follow clearly the movements of Essex and the king, let us take Newbury as a central point of reference, and endeavour to form a mental picture of the surrounding county. Due north lies Oxford, while nearly north-west, and almost in a right line, lie Aldburn and the towns of Swindon, Cricdale, Cirencester, and Gloucester, Painswick lying a little south of Gloucester. Through Hungerford and Newbury runs the river Kennet, flowing, in this part of its course, nearly due east. On September 15 Essex surprises two regiments of the king at Cirencester, and then hastens to gain the road running through Hungerford and Newbury to London. He has outwitted the king, for Cirencester lies nearer to Newbury than Painswick. And now nothing is left to Charles but to race for Newbury, and head his opponent before he reaches it and slips away to London.

Charles, therefore, marches with what speed he can for Newbury, while Rupert hurries on with his cavalry, and succeeds in driving back Essex on the 18<sup>th</sup> to Hungerford, after a sharp skirmish on Aldbourne Chase. On the 19<sup>th</sup> Charles sleeps at Newbury, the greater portion of his army lying in the fields on the south of the Kennet.

We must now note the features of the battle-field, which lay on the south of the river. A long ridge runs east and west, nearly parallel to the Kennet, and about two miles distant from it. Near Enborne, at the foot of this ridge, and between it and the river, Essex took up his position on the evening of the 19<sup>th</sup> September. On the southern slope the ground was open. The western end of the ridge was cut up by copses and deep lanes intersecting one another, while the greater part of the northern slope was covered with enclosures. The eastern end of the ridge opened out into spurs bending towards the river, some of which, it is important to remember, ran in the direction of the royalist army.

Essex knew the morning light would bring him no easy task. He was more or less hemmed in, he could not hope to gain the road running through Newbury, and he had no alternative but to make his way among the hedges and lanes, avoiding the open ground on the southern slope, till he reached the road which ran to London, not far from the eastern extremity of the ridge. Resolute and determined Essex quickly made up his mind, and again proved more than a match for Prince Rupert, for, while his main body struggled through the hedges and lanes, he dispatched a party to seize some high ground on one of the spurs which commanded the king's position in the valley.

Suddenly the royalists became aware that the hill above them, where they least expected an attack was crowded by the enemy's advancing force. Sir Nicholas Byron at once gave orders that his nephew, Sir John Byron, who commanded a troop of horse, and with whom was Lord Falkland, should immediately hurry up the hillside and retrieve the ground; while he himself followed with his brigade of infantry. For a long time the combat raged with varying success on either side, when ultimately the enemy took up a strong position behind a bank, or hedge, from which the royalists, now partly in the open, were exposed to their fire.

There appears to have been an opening, or gap, in this fence, and Sir John Byron decided that this should be enlarged at all costs, in order to admit his cavalry. Sir John's horse was shot in the throat, and while he called for another, Lord Falkland spurred his horse into and through the gap, and was immediately killed.

To appreciate fully the loss sustained by the nation, we must recall the services he rendered his king and country, and the influence produced by one whose moral standard was so lofty,

and whose sense of duty was so keen. From his earliest years he had cultivated and improved his talents, and from the time he entered upon a parliamentary career, these talents were employed to the utmost in the interests of the nation and the government of the country.

At a time when questions of Church government were closely mingled with political struggles, he brought the learning of a theologian and the faith of a Christian to meet the fanaticism with which the Church was so often assailed. During the Civil War Falkland's task was no easy one, as his mind was oppressed by conflicting obligations. To serve his sovereign was one thing, but to serve such a master as Charles quite another. Sick at heart, and weary of the prolonged struggle, he found in his military duties a solace and a relief; and, full of hope that a successful issue to the battle of Newbury might bring the war to a close, he threw himself into this combat with the greatest ardour, and fell, at the post of honour, in the discharge of his duty.

Thus Falkland died, soldier, poet, scholar; thus was terminated a life of singular purity, of almost childlike innocence.