

3 Sir Benjamin Rudyerd and England's 'wars of religion'*

David L. Smith

I

This essay examines the public career of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd (1572–1658), especially during the period 1640–5. After first considering Rudyerd's activities during the 1620s and 1630s by way of context, the essay will then focus on his career during the two years before the outbreak of the English Civil War, and the first three years or so of the war itself (after which he became less and less active in political affairs). In particular, the essay will explore the development of Rudyerd's political and religious ideas, and their impact on his actions. A reconstruction of how Rudyerd's position evolved in the years leading up to war and during the early part of the conflict allows us to assess the significance of ideology, especially religion, as against other motives, in shaping his moderate Parliamentary allegiance. The essay thus engages with John Morrill's work at two levels: first, by reconsidering the importance of religion in causing the Civil War and influencing the choice of sides; and, second, by offering a case study of the 'political psychology' of one prominent and well-documented, but hitherto little studied, individual. The essay will explore the intertwining of religious and political attitudes in this period. It will also grapple with the challenge of reconstructing the relationship between beliefs and actions, and hence of explaining the nature of political motivation. It thus offers a case study of moderate Parliamentary allegiance that can be situated within the wider context of some of the

* I first became interested in Sir Benjamin Rudyerd back in 1984–5, when I wrote a Cambridge B.A. dissertation on his career, supervised by John Morrill. It therefore seems appropriate for this volume, over a quarter of a century later, to revisit a subject that I first explored under John's expert guidance. An early version of this article was presented at the seminar on the religious history of Britain, 1500–1800, at the Institute of Historical Research in May 2007, and I am grateful for their helpful comments to all those who were present, especially Ken Fincham, Tom Freeman and Nicholas Tyacke. I also wish to thank Mike Braddick for his valuable advice on the first draft of this piece, and the History of Parliament Trust for permitting me to see prior to publication Simon Healy's article on Rudyerd's career up to 1629.

central concerns and approaches of 'revisionism' in general and of John Morrill's work in particular.

II

Rudyerd's parliamentary career began relatively late in his life; born in December 1572, he was aged nearly fifty when he first entered the Commons in 1621. He sat in every parliament from then until 1648, and he was one of the thirteen oldest members of the Commons by the time the Long Parliament assembled in November 1640.¹ Educated at Winchester College and St John's College, Oxford, he was later admitted to the Middle Temple in April 1590, and called to the Bar in October 1600. At an unknown date he married Mary Harrington, and in 1610 he obtained a licence to travel abroad for three years. After his return he was knighted, in March 1618, and the following month was appointed Surveyor of the Court of Wards for life. He held that lucrative office until the court's abolition in February 1646, whereupon the Long Parliament voted him £6,000 as compensation. In 1619 he was also granted an annuity of £200 that was apparently still being paid in the 1640s.² Rudyerd was noted for his eloquence, and Sir Edward Dering referred to him in the Long Parliament as 'that silver trumpeter'.³ Sir John Eliot was less impressed, and once wrote that Rudyerd 'did speak never but premeditated, which had more show of memory than affection and made his words less powerful than observed',⁴ but what Rudyerd's speeches may have lacked in spontaneity they made up for in rhetorical prowess and colour of language. His attitudes can be reconstructed principally from these parliamentary speeches, and his concerns ranged broadly across the public issues of the period, from foreign policy to the crown's finances and the future of the Church of England.

The key influence on Rudyerd's political career appears to have been his friendship with William Herbert, third earl of Pembroke, and with his younger brother Philip Herbert, earl of Montgomery and fourth earl of Pembroke. Rudyerd's connection with the Herberts apparently grew out of his early association with Robert Sidney, Lord L'Isle, whose elder

¹ Mary Frear Keeler, *The Long Parliament, 1640–1641: A Biographical Study of its Members*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 36 (Philadelphia, 1954), p. 19, table 4.

² For biographical accounts of Rudyerd see J. A. Manning, ed., *Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, Knt* (1841); C. H. Firth's life of Rudyerd in the old *DNB*; and my life of Rudyerd in the *ODNB*.

³ *The speeches of Sr. Edward Deering in the Commons House of Parliament* (1641), p. 4 (Wing, D 1116).

⁴ Maija Jansson and W. B. Bidwell, eds., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1625* (New Haven and London, 1987), p. 507.

son he tutored on a grand tour. The third earl of Pembroke, to whom Rudyerd owed his appointment as Surveyor of the Wards, was L'Isle's nephew. Rudyerd sometimes answered letters for both the third and the fourth earls of Pembroke, and he also acted as a surety for some of their legal transactions, such as indentures conveying land. Similarly, his return to Parliament for Portsmouth (1621, 1624, 1625), and then for the Wiltshire constituencies of Old Sarum (1626), Downton (1628–9) and Wilton (1640–8) was directly due to the earls of Pembroke, whose seat was at Wilton House. During this period the earls of Pembroke nominated both members for Wilton and at least one for each of the three other constituencies that Rudyerd represented.

Throughout his parliamentary career Rudyerd co-operated closely with his patrons. Conrad Russell described him as 'the chief House of Commons spokesman for Pembroke'.⁵ Both the third and fourth earls were strongly committed to godly Protestantism, an outlook with which Rudyerd appears to have been instinctively in sympathy. Vehemently anti-Catholic, Rudyerd, like the Herberts, advocated a pan-Protestant, pro-Dutch, anti-Spanish foreign policy, and was prepared to contemplate a French alliance if that helped to isolate Spain. Rudyerd's view of diplomacy was guided primarily by his horror that 'our religion [was] battered abroad and mouldered away at home'.⁶ More specifically, this outlook translated into a deep concern about scandalous livings as well as scandalous ministers, and a wish to alleviate the poverty of the Church.

This theme occurred repeatedly in Rudyerd's parliamentary speeches during the 1620s, and was clearly among his highest priorities for the reform of the Church. Thus, on 15 May 1621, in his maiden speech in the Commons, he advocated an oath to prevent patrons selling clerical livings: 'Here in this place have many good laws been made against papists; but the best that I know would be to employ the best ministers, for matter of belief is not to be compelled, but persuaded.'⁷ His concern with ecclesiastical matters was evident again on 25 June 1625, when he spoke against inserting a proviso into the petition on religion that aimed to allow silenced ministers to preach on agreed points of doctrine and discipline, on the grounds that 'moderate bishops would do it of themselves'.⁸ During the later 1620s he became ever more preoccupied with the problems of scandalous livings and the under-endowment of the Church of England. Thus, on 10 February 1626, he urged the

⁵ Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (Oxford, 1979), p. 13.

⁶ Wallace Notestein, F. H. Relf and H. Simpson, eds., *Commons Debates, 1621*, 7 vols. (New Haven, 1935), II, p. 445.

⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, p. 344. ⁸ *Proceedings in Parliament, 1625*, p. 248.

Commons 'to enlarge ministers' livings, and lamented the case of two Lancashire ministers whose livings yielded 'but £6 per annum', and who had been 'found to be unlicensed alehousekeepers'. There was, he complained, 'scarce such blindness or ignorance in Christendom as in some parts of this kingdom'.⁹ He called for a bill to improve the endowment of scandalous livings, and subsequently suggested that this be paired with another bill concerning scandalous ministers.¹⁰ A subcommittee was appointed to draw up such a bill, but it does not appear to have reported before the parliament was dissolved.¹¹

Two years later Rudyerd explored these problems much more fully in a major speech, probably delivered on 21 April 1628, and later published as a separate, entitled *Sir Beniamin Ruddierd's speech in behalfe of the Cleargy*.¹² He maintained that 'there were some places in England, which were scarce in Christendom, where God was little better known than amongst the Indians'. These places included 'the utmost skirts of the north, where the prayers of the common people are more like spells and charms than devotions', and Rudyerd detected 'the same blindness and ignorance . . . in divers parts of Wales'. He insisted that 'to plant good ministers in good livings was the strongest and surest means to establish true religion', and that 'it would prevail more against papistry than the making of new laws or executing of old'. He believed this was 'absolutely within our power'. Rudyerd was tough on scandalous ministers – 'there is no man shall be more forward to have them severely punished than I will be' – but also tough on the causes of scandalous ministers: 'let us provide them convenient livings, and then punish them, in God's name; but till then, scandalous livings cannot but have scandalous ministers'. The 'glorious and religious work of King James' offered an inspiring example: 'within the space of one year he caused to be planted churches through all Scotland, the Highlands, and the Borders, with £30 a year apiece, with a house and some glebe land belonging to them; which £30 a year, considering the cheapness of the country, and the modest fashion of ministers living there, is worth double as much as anywhere within an 100 miles of London'. He asserted that 'though Christianity and religion be established generally throughout this kingdom, yet until it be planted more particularly, I shall scarce think this a Christian commonwealth'.

⁹ Maija Jansson and W. B. Bidwell, eds., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1626*, 4 vols. (New Haven and London, 1991–6), II, pp. 12, 15, 17.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, II, p. 128; III, p. 101. ¹¹ *Ibid.*, II, pp. 26–9.

¹² For the problems of dating this speech, and a convincing case for regarding 21 April 1628 as the most probable date, see M. F. Keeler, M. J. Cole and W. B. Bidwell, eds., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1628*, 6 vols. (New Haven, 1977–83), III, p. 17n. *Sir Beniamin Ruddierd's speech in behalfe of the Cleargy* (London, 1628) is ESTC, S2865, 21435.7.

This matter would, Rudyerd declared, 'lie heavy upon Parliaments until it be effected', and he concluded, 'I will never give over soliciting this cause as long as Parliaments and I live together'. Rudyerd believed that until Parliament took radical steps, the Church's economic problems would remain unresolved. When, on 16 May 1628, the scandalous ministers bill received a third reading, he again urged that it might go 'hand in hand' with the scandalous livings bill, although the latter was never reported to the House.¹³

By the later 1620s, Rudyerd had another growing concern about the state of the Church of England, namely the increasing influence of Arminianism. His anxieties became evident in April 1626, when he informed Sir Francis Nethersole that Pembroke 'does not think fit his Majesty should stand neutral towards the Arminians lest he should give them too much countenance'.¹⁴ A few days later, he supported Pym's investigation of Richard Montagu and urged that the charges against him should be related to the Lords.¹⁵ In the 1628 Parliament, Rudyerd was named to the committees that drew up charges against two other divines, Roger Maynwaring and Richard Burgess.¹⁶ Parliamentary fears of creeping Arminianism came to a head in the 1629 session, and on 29 January Rudyerd made a remarkable speech in the committee of religion that offers an important insight into his conception of the Church of England and the dangers that it faced. According to Sir Edward Nicholas, Rudyerd argued that

His Majesty hath already publicly declared to keep the unity of love in the bond of peace; popery is ancient amongst us and in that we complain only of the want of execution of laws against recusants. Arminianism lately crept in and crept up into high places. Moves that we should consider of the articles of our faith long since agreed, 1552, and published again lately; the ancient catechism appointed and published in our book of common prayer, and to consider also of those also at Lambeth: from all which he would have us to take our proceedings, to express what those were, and to advance against all that shall vary from those, without disputing for or against particulars nor upstart opinions.¹⁷

By highlighting the 1552 Articles and the Lambeth Articles of 1595, Rudyerd was espousing a strongly Protestant – indeed, Calvinist – vision of the Church of England. Small wonder, then, that he was deeply opposed to any signs of growing Arminian influence, and about two weeks later, on 10 February, he urged the Commons to write to the

¹³ *Proceedings in Parliament, 1628*, III, pp. 431, 438, 440.

¹⁴ *Proceedings in Parliament, 1626*, IV, p. 309. ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, III, p. 101.

¹⁶ *Proceedings in Parliament, 1628*, IV, pp. 36, 60.

¹⁷ Wallace Notestein and F. H. Relf, eds., *Commons Debates for 1629* (Minneapolis, 1921), p. 116.

universities of Oxford and Cambridge requesting details of the 'public censures and recantations . . . made on such as have held tenets of Arminianism and popery'.¹⁸ The House duly resolved that the Speaker should do this.¹⁹

Rudyerd's religious outlook was consistent not only with Pembroke's, but also with that of other members of the Commons with whom he regularly collaborated politically, not least in seeking an overhaul of crown revenues, most notably Sir Nathaniel Rich, Sir Dudley Digges and John Pym. These members aimed both to enlarge the monarch's income and to safeguard the future of parliaments. Politically, Rudyerd was probably the least radical of them, and throughout the 1620s he mainly confined himself to advocating the grant of a generous number of subsidies. For example, on 26 November 1621 he moved that 'we would not suffer the instrument to be strained too high to the ruin but proceed to bounty speedily'.²⁰ Rudyerd consistently urged the Commons to back up its advice on foreign policy, and especially its calls for war, with generous grants of supply. Thus on 22 June 1625 he hoped that members would 'carry [them]selves in this first session' of Charles I's reign 'with sweetness, with duty, with confidence in and towards his Majesty', who had been 'bred in Parliaments'.²¹ Eight days later he reminded members that 'the King's domestical charges [were] exceeding great; for funeral, entertainment of ambassadors, and coronation. The charge of the navy like to be 3 hundred thousand pounds', and he wanted the House to 'give . . . in some proportion to this great charge'.²² In a similar vein, Rudyerd declared on 22 March 1628 that 'the way to show that we are the wise counsellors or that we should be so is . . . by giving a large and ample supply, proportionable to the greatness and importance of the work in hand, for counsel without money is but a speculation'.²³ He recognized that Parliament's 'power of the purse', if pushed too far, could force the king to resort to non-parliamentary means of raising money, and this fear lay behind his celebrated warning to the Commons, earlier in that same speech, that 'this is the crisis of Parliaments: we shall know by this if Parliaments live or die'.²⁴

Rudyerd's repeated calls for generous supply closely resembled Pembroke's own views, and their attitudes towards the duke of Buckingham were similarly aligned. Throughout, they remained at heart suspicious of the duke, but they were prepared to co-operate with him for tactical reasons, especially after 1623–4, when Buckingham became committed

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 57, 137. ¹⁹ *Cj*, I, pp. 928, 930. ²⁰ *Commons Debates, 1621*, II, p. 445.

²¹ *Proceedings in Parliament, 1625*, p. 219. ²² *Ibid.*, p. 274.

²³ *Proceedings in Parliament, 1628*, II, p. 59. ²⁴ *Ibid.*, II, p. 58.

to an anti-Spanish foreign policy. This reconciliation was, however, only skin-deep; it was a member of the Pembroke 'interest', Dr Turner, who launched the attack on Buckingham in the 1626 parliament, and Rudyerd was among the sixteen members of the Commons appointed to assist the managers of the duke's impeachment.²⁵ A further attempt at reconciliation, in the form of a marriage agreement concluded in early August 1626 between Buckingham's daughter and Pembroke's nephew, appears to have had some effect,²⁶ and probably explains why both Rudyerd and Pembroke took a moderate line in the debates over the Petition of Right in 1628, and in particular opposed naming the duke in the Petition.

Rudyerd indicated his view of the Petition on 28 April 1628, when he told the Commons that 'if justice and wisdom may be stretched to desolation, let us thereby learn that moderation is the virtue of virtues and wisdom of wisdoms. Let it be our masterpiece so to carry the business that we may keep parliaments on foot; for as long as they be frequent there will be no irregular power, which though it cannot broken at once, yet in short time it will be made and moldered away.' Rudyerd was pleased to see 'that old decrepit law Magna Carta, which has been so long kept and lain bedridden . . . walk abroad again with new vigour and lustre'. Equally, he insisted that 'the King is a good man who is greater than any king who is not so', and he reminded members that 'the King has intimated that he would have the abuses of power reformed: a happiness to us.'²⁷ Pembroke's stance in the Lords, while supportive of the Petition in principle, was likewise conciliatory. On 9 May, he reportedly 'occurs [*sic*] with the petition. Moved to sweeten the manner, not to lay down the particulars so at large . . . As many of the particulars to stand as may stand. None to be omitted, but such as will distaste the King.'²⁸ Rudyerd spoke in very similar terms on 11 June in the Commons: 'We have daily experience of his Majesty's grace. I desire that we be so provident that we gratify his Majesty with a good turn so as we may have the benefit. The work we are about must have a future operation if his Majesty consider how dangerous the counsel is that has been offered him. If we name the person we may give a distaste to his Majesty.' According to another version of this speech, Rudyerd warned that 'if we give the King distaste, our counsel will not go down with him'.²⁹ Rudyerd's attitude towards the Petition – and even his specific language about the need to avoid causing Charles I 'distaste' – was thus strikingly close to that of his patron.

²⁵ *Proceedings in Parliament, 1626*, II, pp. 261–2, 268–9; III, pp. 140, 147.

²⁶ Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (Harlow, 1981), p. 333.

²⁷ *Proceedings in Parliament, 1628*, III, pp. 128–9, 138. ²⁸ *Ibid.*, V, p. 401.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, IV, pp. 247, 260.

These political and religious associations remained very much in evidence during Charles's Personal Rule. The third earl of Pembroke died on 10 April 1630 and was succeeded by his younger brother Philip Herbert, earl of Montgomery. Rudyerd shared his new patron's interest in colonial enterprises, and on 4 December 1630 he became one of the original incorporators of the Providence Island Company. Here again we find him working regularly with Pym and Rich. Although this company was not the hotbed of Puritan opposition that has sometimes been claimed, many of its members shared Rudyerd's commitment to godly Protestantism.³⁰ One particular letter, written in 1633 on behalf of his brother to the governor of Providence Island, Philip Bell, is very useful in throwing further light on Rudyerd's religious attitudes. Rudyerd wrote,

[P]icking here a Verse, and there a Verse to be sung after the Sermon, wherein two Reverend Preachers were cited for Examples: this is a Course I never heard, or heard of, and I am sure that in London congregations it is not used, neither can it be conveniently performed, where the Clerk doth publicly direct what Psalm, or what part, or what parcel by itself, is to be sung; and although it be no ill nor unlawful thing, to sing the scattered collected pieces of a Psalm, yet certainly it is no discretion to be unnecessarily singular.³¹

This letter suggests that Rudyerd wanted a clear liturgical framework, and his defence of the established order of worship is consistent with his comments in January 1629 about the Book of Common Prayer.

Rudyerd's religious concerns again came to the fore when Parliament was recalled in 1640. In a major speech on 16 April,³² he reportedly lamented that 'in so long a vacation between Parliaments many disorders must needs grow in upon us as deviation in religion, violation of laws, invasion upon liberties'. He argued that 'the best religion makes the best subjects' and declared,

Let us set up more and better lights to lighten their darkness, burning, shining lights, not lukewarm glow-worm lights; that the people in all places of the kingdom may be diligently taught, carefully instructed, in soundness of doctrine by God's example in their pastors . . . The best way to suppress all other religion is to uphold our own to the height.

³⁰ See especially Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Providence Island, 1630–1641: The Other Puritan Colony* (Cambridge, 1993).

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

³² The fullest surviving accounts of this speech are found in Esther S. Cope, ed., *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640*, Camden Society, 4th series, 19 (1977), pp. 138–40, 248–51. The following quotations are taken from these texts unless otherwise stated. There is another, rather more abbreviated, version in Thomas Aston, *The Short Parliament (1640) Diary of Sir Thomas Aston*, ed. Judith D. Maltby, Camden Society, 4th series, 35 (1988), pp. 3–4.

This emphasis on improving the quality of the ministry was entirely consistent with Rudyerd's recorded words in the parliaments of the 1620s. His commitment to conciliation between crown and parliament, and to the granting of generous supply, remained equally striking. He reportedly warned the Commons that 'it is wisdom in us to preserve temper and moderation' lest 'we may turn the medicine into a worse disease and so undo all, even root out the race of parliaments for ever'. Parliament was 'the bed of reconciliation between a King and his people', and Rudyerd continued to regard the speedy and generous granting of supply as essential to achieving this: 'Before the ending of this Parliament, the untimely breaking whereof would be the breaking of us, I doubt not but His Majesty's revenues may be so settled, that he may live plentifully at home and abroad.' However, his warning to the Commons not to 'fall with too much vehemence on our own grievances, before we look on the king's occasions'³³ went largely unheeded, and Charles I, faced with a majority of members who refused to grant supply until their grievances were fully aired, dissolved the parliament after only three weeks.

III

When the Long Parliament met the following November, Rudyerd's rhetoric became rather more forceful, yet his two central concerns – religion and supply – remained the same. In a lengthy speech on 7 November 1640, he stressed the primacy of religious issues: 'let religion be our *primum quaerite*, for all things else are but *etcaeteras* to it'.³⁴ He bitterly denounced Laudian innovations and complained that they 'would evaporate and dispirit the power and vigour of religion, by drawing it out into some solemn, specious formalities – into obsolete, antiquate ceremonies, new furbished up.'³⁵ He felt that

they have so brought it to pass that under the name of Puritans, all our religion is branded . . . Whosoever squares his actions by any rule, either divine or human, he is a Puritan. Whoever would be governed by the King's laws, he is a Puritan. He that would not do whatsoever other men would have him do, he is a Puritan. Their great work, their masterpiece, now is, to make all those of the religion to be the suspected party of the kingdom.³⁶

Rudyerd lamented the 'disturbance [that] hath been brought upon the Church for vain, petty trifles. How the whole Church, the whole kingdom,

³³ Aston, *Diary*, p. 4.

³⁴ *Five Speeches in the High and Honourable Court of Parliament, by Sir Benjamin Rudyerd* (1641), p. 8 (Wing, R 2184).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9. ³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

hath been troubled where to place "a metaphor" – an altar. We have seen ministers, their wives, children, and families undone, against all law – against conscience – against all bowels of compassion – about not dancing upon Sundays . . . These inventions are but sieves made on purpose to winnow the best men, and that's the devil's occupation.³⁷ Rudyerd insisted that these religious issues should be the parliament's highest priority, and argued that

if we secure our religion, we shall cut off and defeat many plots that are now on foot by them and others. Believe it, our religion hath been for a long time, and still is, the great design upon this kingdom. It is a known and practised principle, that they who would introduce another principle into the Church must first trouble and disorder the government of the state, that so they may work their ends in a confusion which now lies at the door.³⁸

He was, he declared, 'zealous of a thorough reformation in a time that exacts, that extorts it'.³⁹

Equally, Rudyerd remained sympathetic to the crown's financial problems. In this same speech he went on to call for the removal of what he termed the 'subverting, destructive counsels', who rang 'a doleful, deadly knell over the whole kingdom', and who had 'not suffered his Majesty to appear unto his people in his own native goodness' and had 'eclipsed him by their own interposition'.⁴⁰ Once these counsels had been removed, he argued, the king would be able to shine 'in his own splendour',⁴¹ and Rudyerd hoped that the Houses would then grant generous supply. He continued to affirm the innate symbiosis between the monarch and his subjects: 'the King must always, according to his occasions, have use of his people's power, hearts, hands, purses. The people will always have need of the King's clemency, justice, protection; and this reciprocation is the strongest, the sweetest union.'⁴² He hoped that 'as we shall be free in our advices, so shall we be the more free of our purses, that his Majesty may experimentally find the real difference of better counsels'.⁴³ Here again, we can see a direct continuity with Rudyerd's earlier speeches during the 1620s in his promotion of good relations between crown and parliament, his attack on evil advisers, and his advocacy of a generous grant of supply.

Rudyerd returned to this last point on 23 December 1640, when he asserted that 'the principal part of this business is money; and now we are about it, I shall be glad we may give so much as will not only serve the turn for the present, but likewise to provide that it comes not quick upon

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 8–9. ³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 11. ³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 15–16. ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 12, 14.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14. ⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 14–15. ⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

us again.’ He declared that ‘this is the business of all the businesses of the House – of all the businesses of the kingdom; if we stand hacking for a little money we may very shortly lose all we have’. Convinced that ‘four subsidies will do the work, if they be given presently’, he urged members to ‘do this whilst we may’.⁴⁴ Rudyerd’s speech appears to have had the desired effect, for the Commons resolved to grant two further subsidies in addition to the two on which they had already agreed.⁴⁵

Rudyerd’s religious and financial concerns, and the close connection between them, were further illustrated in a speech that he made the following month, probably on 21 January 1641.⁴⁶ He regarded the Scottish commissioners’ demand for £514,000 as ‘a portentous apparition which shows itself in a very dry time, when the King’s revenue is totally exhausted, his debts excessively multiplied, the kingdom generally impoverished by grievous burdens and disordered courses’. He felt that it would lead to ‘the utter draining of the people, unless England be *puteus inexhaustus* [an inexhaustible well], as the Popes were wont to call it’. Nevertheless, he would ‘most willingly and heartily afford the Scots whatsoever is just, equitable, and honourable, even to a convenient, considerable, round sum of money towards their losses and expenses’. He regarded the Scots as ‘being truly touched with religion, according to their profession’, and hoped that such a settlement would ‘contract a closer, firmer union between the two nations than any mere human policy could ever have effected, with inestimable benefits to both in advancing the truths of religion; in exalting the greatness of the King; in securing the peace of his kingdoms against all malicious, envious, ambitious opposites to religion, to the King, [and] to his kingdoms’. Rudyerd’s sympathy for the Scots as a nation ‘truly touched with religion’ was thus consistent with his more general commitment to godly Protestantism.

That Rudyerd did not, however, want the Church of England to be reformed along Scottish lines became increasingly clear as Parliament found itself faced with demands for radical reform, such as the London ‘root and branch’ petition. When the Commons debated whether or not to commit this petition on 8 February 1641, Rudyerd argued that ‘it now behoves us to restrain the bishops to the duties of their functions, as they may never more hanker after heterogeneous, extravagant employments’, and he stressed the need ‘to regulate them according to the usage of ancient churches in the best times, that, by a well-tempered government,

⁴⁴ Manning, *Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd*, pp. 166–7. ⁴⁵ *CJ*, II, p. 57.

⁴⁶ Maija Jansson, ed., *Proceedings in the Opening Session of the Long Parliament*, 7 vols. (Rochester and Suffolk, 2000–7), II, pp. 239–40.

they may not have power hereafter to corrupt the Church, to undo the kingdom'.⁴⁷ He was not, however, in favour of the outright abolition of episcopacy, and declared that 'this superintendency of eminent men, bishops, over divers churches, is the most primitive, the most spreading, the most lasting government of the Church'. He warned the Commons, 'Whilst we are earnest to take away innovations, let us beware we bring not in the greatest innovation that ever was in England. I do very well know what very many do very fervently desire. But let us well bethink ourselves, whether a popular, democratical government of the Church (though fit for other places) will be either suitable or acceptable to a regal, monarchical government of the State.'⁴⁸ Rudyerd concluded by moving that

we may punish the present offenders, reduce and preserve the calling for better men hereafter. Let us remember, with fresh thankfulness to God, those glorious martyr-bishops, who were burnt for our religion in the times of popery, who by their learning, zeal, and constancy, upheld and conveyed it down to us. We have some good bishops still, who do preach every Lord's day, and are therefore worthy of double honour. They have suffered enough already in the disease; I shall be sorry we should make them suffer more in the remedy.⁴⁹

Rudyerd's godly Protestantism and hatred of Laudianism were typical of many who became Parliamentarians in the Civil Wars; where he was somewhat less usual was in his continuing attachment to the institution of episcopacy and his mistrust of 'root and branch' reform.

Rudyerd returned to these issues in a major speech on 11 June 1641, when the Commons debated at length a bill for the abolition of episcopacy. This speech contained perhaps the fullest and most eloquent statement of Rudyerd's view of the church and the nature of church government. He began by stating that 'one thing doth exceedingly trouble me, it turns me quite round, it makes my whole reason vertiginous, which is, that so many do believe, against the wisdom of all ages, that now there can be no reformation without destruction, as if every sick body must be presently knocked on the head as past hope of cure'.⁵⁰ Conrad Russell wrote perceptively that this statement revealed 'the frustration which increasingly afflicted those who had been happy with Archbishop Abbot'.⁵¹ This is a very telling point, because the debate over church government was rapidly moving into uncharted waters in which Rudyerd felt increasingly out of his depth. He was not, he affirmed, 'of their

⁴⁷ *Five Speeches*, p. 21. Cf. *Proceedings in the Opening Session of the Long Parliament*, II, p. 390.

⁴⁸ *Five Speeches*, p. 22. ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23. ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 24–5.

⁵¹ Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642* (Oxford, 1991), p. 345.

opinion who believe that there is an innate ill quality in episcopacy, like a specific property, which is a refuge, not a reason'. He hoped that 'there is no original sin in episcopacy, and though there were, yet may the calling be as well reformed as the person regenerated'.⁵² Rudyerd remained committed to episcopacy, albeit of a reduced kind: 'Let them be reduced according to the usage of ancient churches in the best times, so restrained that they may not be able hereafter to shame the calling.'⁵³ He warned that 'if we pull down bishoprics, and pull down cathedral churches, in a short time we must be forced to pull down colleges too'. This was, he felt, 'the next way to bring in barbarism, to make the clergy an unlearned, contemptible vocation, not to be desired but by the basest of the people; and then, where shall we find men able to convince an adversary?'⁵⁴ This brought Rudyerd back to his long-standing concern with the under-endowment of the clergy. 'It will', he declared, 'be a shameful reproach to so flourishing a kingdom as this, to have a poor, beggarly clergy. For my part, I think nothing too much, nothing too good for a good minister, a good clergyman . . . Burning and shining lights do well deserve to be set in good candlesticks.'⁵⁵ Rudyerd concluded by summing up his position thus: 'I am as much for reformation, for purging and maintaining religion, as any man whatsoever: but I profess, I am not for innovation, demolition, nor abolition.'⁵⁶

What is perhaps most interesting about this speech is that from late summer 1641 such an attachment to a moderate, primitive episcopacy inclined some members of the Long Parliament to rally to the king.⁵⁷ Yet Rudyerd remained at Westminster, and his deep commitment to godly Protestantism and 'reformation' probably contributed strongly to this decision. Conrad Russell included Rudyerd straightforwardly on his list of 'members of the Commons in favour of further reformation'.⁵⁸ Rudyerd broadly shared this religious outlook with his patron the fourth earl of Pembroke, and the close political alignment between them continued to be apparent throughout 1641–2. Pembroke became progressively more estranged from the court during summer 1641, and on 3 May he promised the crowds at Westminster that he would 'move his Majesty that justice might be executed' against Strafford 'according to their requests'.⁵⁹ Charles I never forgave Pembroke for these words to the crowd and dismissed him as Lord Chamberlain of the King's Household

⁵² *Five Speeches*, p. 25. ⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 25 [*recte* = p. 26]. ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 28–9.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 29. ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁵⁷ Cf. John Morrill, *Revolt in the Provinces* (Harlow, 1999), p. 70.

⁵⁸ Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990), p. 224.

⁵⁹ *A Perfect Journal of the Daily Proceedings and Transactions in that memorable Parliament, begun at Westminster, 3 November 1641* (1641), p. 90.

the following July.⁶⁰ During Strafford's trial, Rudyerd's main concern appears to have been that the Commons should act in close consultation with the Lords and follow the lead of the upper House as much as possible. Thus on 12 April 1641 he 'showed the great treason of the Earl of Strafford and yet said that one full third part of the evidence was not heard and that divers of the Lords who were present at the opening thereof were not satisfied that it was treason'.⁶¹ Rudyerd went on to decline 'the reading of the bill to that effect', and moved 'for a conference with the Lords'.⁶² Four days later Rudyerd warned the Commons, 'invert not the saying "slow to speak and swift to hear". Judges must first fully hear and then justly determine.'⁶³ In addition to his looking to the upper House for a political lead, these contributions to the debates over Strafford's fate also show a judiciousness that was highly characteristic of Rudyerd.

This quality was evident again the following November in the ambivalent view that Rudyerd took of the Grand Remonstrance. He accepted that it was 'requisite we should publish a declaration, because there are so many depravers of this Parliament',⁶⁴ such as 'papists, delinquents, and libertines [who] accuse us falsely'.⁶⁵ It was, he felt, important to make it clear that 'we have done great things in this Parliament. Things of the first magnitude.' These included 'something of religion', which he 'reckoned last because least done!'⁶⁶ Regarding the Grand Remonstrance, his vote went 'along in general with the narrative historical part of it; but for the prophetic part, to foresee the whole work of this Parliament to come, and to bind it up by anticipation and engagement of votes beforehand, for ought I know, Sir, we have no such custom'.⁶⁷ He could agree to 'the narrative part . . . , but not the prophetic part, lest we fail of our performance'.⁶⁸ He was thus 'for the narrative [but] against the prophetic part [because] to engage by way of anticipation this Parliament is new and wherein he cannot satisfy himself'.⁶⁹ Rudyerd was willing to endorse the Long Parliament's previous measures but not the

⁶⁰ TNA, SP 16/482/95 (Thomas Wiseman to Sir John Pennington, 29 July 1641).

⁶¹ *Proceedings in the Opening Session of the Long Parliament*, III, pp. 512–13.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 517.

⁶³ H. Verney, ed., *Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament . . . by Sir Ralph Verney*, Camden Society, 1st series, 31 (1845), p. 49.

⁶⁴ Manning, *Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd*, pp. 221–3.

⁶⁵ Verney, *Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament*, p. 122.

⁶⁶ Simonds D'Ewes, *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the First Recess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles from London*, ed. Willson H. Coates (New Haven, 1942), p. 184.

⁶⁷ Manning, *Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd*, pp. 221–3.

⁶⁸ Verney, *Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament*, p. 122.

⁶⁹ D'Ewes, *Journal*, p. 184.

demands for future reforms, and this important distinction may well have reflected a desire to avoid further inflaming relations between the king and Parliament. Certainly a wish to secure an accommodation between Charles and the Houses was entirely characteristic of Rudyerd, as was a feeling that religious reform had not yet been given as high a priority as it deserved. Both these attitudes continued to be evident in Rudyerd's speeches as England moved closer towards civil war.

The outbreak of rebellion in Ireland strengthened Rudyerd's instinctive anti-Catholicism, and when the Commons debated Irish affairs on 29 December 1641, he warned of 'the great danger this kingdom is in through the practices of priests and Jesuits, and all of the popish religion'. There were hazards, he argued, in 'not removing . . . those popish officers in this state that have places of great trust and strength committed to their fidelity', and he hoped 'that they may by degrees remove such dangerous officers, and place good Protestants in their room'. He also wished to see 'the bishops and such lords as favour[ed]' the retention of their votes in the upper House 'speedily brought to trial and by the sword of justice taken out of the way', so that they 'may be removed from the presence of his Majesty, by whom he is mis-counselled and his mind somewhat averted from complying so willingly with the Parliament as otherwise it is conceived he would be'. Rudyerd thought it 'of absolute necessity to remove such as are not inclined towards the Protestant religion', and he reminded the House of 'the treacherous stratagems that have been attempted against not only the persons of the princes of this kingdom that have been Protestants, by papists and the favourers of that part, but also against the whole state, to bring it to confusion and place themselves and their religion herein'.⁷⁰ In Rudyerd's mind, these defensive measures against Catholicism were closely associated with a continuing desire for further reform of the church, and on 26 March 1642 he moved 'to appoint a speedy day to consider of the matter of religion, to settle the distractions of the church for the present, and to provide for the future'.⁷¹

Following the king's withdrawal from London in January 1642, Rudyerd repeatedly tried to encourage reconciliation between Charles and Parliament. On 7 February he 'desired that we might move his Majesty to return and to give thanks'.⁷² Interestingly, when, on 10 June, Rudyerd advanced £100 for Parliament's military preparations, he did so 'freely without interest for defence of king, kingdom, and parliament

⁷⁰ *Sir Benjamin Rudyerd his Learned Speech in Parliament on Wednesday, being the twenty ninth day of December 1641* (1641), pp. 2–4 (Wing, R 2186).

⁷¹ Willson H. Coates, Anne Steele Young and Vernon F. Snow, eds., *The Private Journals of the Long Parliament*, 3 vols. (New Haven and London, 1982–92), II, p. 89.

⁷² *Private Journals of the Long Parliament*, I, p. 297.

conjunctively'.⁷³ Such a form of words seems consistent with someone who, like Pembroke, tried vigorously to promote an accommodation between the crown and the two Houses. On 9 July 1642, for example, they can be found presenting the same message; that morning, Pembroke made a speech 'laying open the means for that happy union',⁷⁴ while later that day Rudyerd begged the Houses 'to compose and settle these threatening ruining distractions' and 'make a fair way for the King's return hither'. He praised the reforms of 1640–1 as a 'dream of happiness' and cited in particular the abolition of High Commission, Star Chamber and forest fines, the provision for triennial parliaments, and the fact that 'the bishops' votes' had been 'taken away'. He urged Parliament not to 'contend for such a hazardous, unsafe security as may endanger the loss of what we have already' and, in a memorable phrase, warned that the Houses 'cannot make a mathematical security'. He concluded by stating that 'we are at the very brink of confusion and combustion', and that 'every man here is bound in conscience to employ his uttermost endeavours to prevent the effusion of blood'.⁷⁵ Similarly, two weeks later, on 23 July, when the Commons was considering how to react to Charles I's *Answer to the XIX Propositions*, Rudyerd moved that they should 'embrace an accommodation of peace'.⁷⁶

IV

Rudyerd's support for peace negotiations continued during the Civil War. For instance, on 17 February 1643, as the Commons debated Charles I's responses to the Oxford Propositions, Rudyerd warned the House that 'we have already tasted the bitter bloody fruits of war, [and] we are grown exceedingly behind-hand with our selves since we began it'. He implored members to consider

who shall be answerable for all the innocent blood which shall be spilt hereafter, if we do not endeavour a peace, by a speedy treaty? Certainly, God is as much to be trusted in a treaty as in a war: it is he that gives wisdom to treat as well as courage to fight, and success to both, as it pleases him. Blood is a crying sin, it pollutes a land: why should we defile this land any longer? . . . Let us stint blood as soon as we can. Let us agree with our adversaries in the way, by a present, short, wary treaty.⁷⁷

⁷³ *Ibid.*, III, p. 467.

⁷⁴ *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament, from 4 to 11 July 1642* (1642), p. 6.

⁷⁵ *A Worthy Speech spoken in the Honourable House of Commons, by Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, this present July, 1642* (1642), pp. 2–4 (Wing, R 2207).

⁷⁶ *Private Journals of the Long Parliament*, III, p. 120.

⁷⁷ *Sir Benjamin Rudyerd His Speech in the High Court of Parliament the 17 of February [1643], for a speedy Treaty of Peace with His Majestie* (1643), pp. 4–5 (Wing, R 2196).

Like other moderate Parliamentarians such as Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bulstrode Whitelocke and John Selden, Rudyerd advocated peace talks with the Royalists at every possible opportunity.

Rudyerd likewise remained strongly committed to godly reformation, and on 12 June 1643 he and Pembroke were among those who were appointed lay members of the Westminster Assembly.⁷⁸ Rudyerd does not appear to have spoken often in the Assembly and such contributions as he did make suggest that his ecclesiastical position was complex and difficult to categorize in simple terms as either Presbyterian or Independent. He seems to have been nervous about the activities of the more radical Independents and on 14 November 1643, when some members of the Assembly expressed concern about 'the Independents gathering churches in the city and elsewhere', he 'promised to present [the matter] to the Houses' of Parliament.⁷⁹ This would seem consistent with the reservations he had expressed in connection with Providence Island in 1633. Rudyerd's first priority appears to have been reformation within an orderly framework, and this may have made him suspicious of the assertions of *ius divinum* that Presbyterians and Independents alike asserted against those who favoured a more Erastian approach.

This concern came through in Rudyerd's speech in the Assembly on 30 April 1646, when a delegation from the Commons presented a series of nine queries to the Assembly on the subject of church government. Rudyerd asserted that

The matter you are now about, the *jus divinum*, is of a formidable and tremendous nature. It will be expected you should answer by clear, practical and express Scriptures, not by far-fetched arguments which are commonly told before you come to the matter . . . I have heard much spoken of the pattern in the mount so express . . . I could never find in the New Testament . . . The first rule is let all things be done decently and in order to edification. Decency and order are variable and therefore cannot be *iure divino*. Discipline is but the hedge.

Rudyerd continued by hoping that the Assembly would make its 'answer in plain terms'. He had

heard it often very well said, the present Assembly are pious and learned men, but a Parliament is to make laws for all sorts of men. It hath been often objected, this power is so strongly opposed bec[ause] it makes a strict discipline . . . I believe we have done nothing against the word of God, neither do all the churches agree throughout. The civil magistrate is a church officer in every Christian

⁷⁸ *AGO*, I, p. 181.

⁷⁹ Cambridge University Library, MS Dd.XIV.21 (Journal of John Lightfoot), fo. 36r.

commonwealth. In Scotland, nobility and gentry live commonly in the country and so the clergy are moderated as by a scattered Parliament.⁸⁰

These words seem to reflect sympathy with an Erastian approach to church government, and this possibility is reinforced by the fact that Pembroke, to whom Rudyerd continued to be close, apparently had leanings in the same direction. From 1643 Pembroke also served as a member of the Westminster Assembly and, as the 1640s progressed, his most consistent priority was an Erastian hostility to the more radical demands of both the high Presbyterians and the Independents. In early November 1644 he and the earl of Warwick went to the Westminster Assembly and 'chide[d] the Independents for retarding the work of reformation'.⁸¹ He supported Laud's attainder in January 1645, but in March 1646 he voted to reject the high Presbyterian petition submitted by the City of London. Interestingly, Pembroke, like Rudyerd, remained sympathetic to the preservation of episcopacy, and evidence of the earl's moderate episcopalianism may be found in his choice of the future bishop of Winchester, George Morley, as his domestic chaplain, as well as in the nature of his ecclesiastical patronage within the parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields, of which he was a resident.⁸²

The continuing friendship between Rudyerd and Pembroke was evident in other ways. Both were appointed commissioners for the plantations in the West Indies on 2 November 1643.⁸³ On 14 June 1645, in the Committee of Both Kingdoms, 'two letters were brought in by Sir Benjamin Rudyerd, one directed to himself and the other to the Earl of Pembroke'.⁸⁴ In his will, dated 1 May 1649, Pembroke stipulated that Rudyerd was to continue to occupy the premises in Kent that the earl had assigned to him by an indenture of 21 February 1639. At his death in January 1650, Pembroke owed Rudyerd a debt of £260, which was discharged shortly afterwards by the earl's executors.⁸⁵

During the second half of the 1640s Rudyerd became less and less active in political affairs. He made fewer speeches in the Commons and

⁸⁰ Chad B. Van Dixhoorn, 'Reforming the Reformation: theological debate at the Westminster Assembly, 1643–1652', Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2005, VII, p. 546.

⁸¹ Thomas Juxon, *The Journal of Thomas Juxon, 1644–1647*, ed. Keith Lindley and David Scott, Camden Society, 5th series, 13 (1999), p. 62. See also Van Dixhoorn, 'Reforming the Reformation', V, pp. 449–50.

⁸² For a fuller discussion see my life of Pembroke in the *ODNB*. ⁸³ *A&O*, I, pp. 331–3.

⁸⁴ TNA, SP 21/8 (Committee of Both Kingdoms, fair day book), pp. 335–6.

⁸⁵ Sheffield Archives, Elmthirst MS (Pye deposit), EM 1358/1, EM 1358/2, EM 1360; Hatfield House, Accounts, 168/2, pp. 22, 28.

was appointed less regularly to committees. Early in 1646 he adopted a characteristically judicious position on the fate of the Court of Wards, of which he had been Surveyor since April 1618. He urged that ‘if in any part of it there be any thing unfit, or exorbitant, it may be reduced and rectified by a better law; but if there be found corruption, extortion, or bribery in any of the officers, let them be prosecuted and punished to the utmost’. Rudyerd claimed that ‘I have always endeavoured to perform my best service to the King, yet my tenderness hath been to the subject, because we do meet with many estates sore bruised and broken with debts and children.’⁸⁶ As usual he struck a balance between the interests of the crown and those of the subject, and was an inveterate foe of corruption and injustice. When the Court of Wards was abolished, the Commons granted him a sum of £6,000, together with the continuation of his existing annuity of £200, in compensation for his office.⁸⁷ Rudyerd’s reduced activity during the later 1640s may partly have been a consequence of old age – he turned seventy-five in December 1647 – but it may also have owed something to growing disillusionment with the course of events and with the conduct of Parliament and the New Model Army. In his last recorded speech, on 5 August 1648, Rudyerd lamented that ‘we have sat thus long, and are come to a fine pass; for the whole kingdom is now become Parliament all over. The army hath taught us a good while what to do; the city, country, and reformadoes, teach us what we should do; and all is, because we ourselves know not what to do. Some men are so violent and strong in their own conceits that they think all others dishonest who are not of their opinion.’⁸⁸ These words reflected Rudyerd’s deep unhappiness at the turn that events had taken and his yearning for a settlement between crown and Parliament.

The following month, Pembroke was one of the Parliamentary commissioners appointed to negotiate with the king at Newport, while back in London, on 5 December, Rudyerd voted that the talks should continue. The next day, he was among those arrested, and briefly imprisoned, by Colonel Pride.⁸⁹ However, Rudyerd was released later the same day, and David Underdown has commented that ‘Rudyerd was too old and decrepit to be dangerous, and had powerful friends like his patron Pembroke.’⁹⁰ Immediately after his release Rudyerd, who was then just short of his seventy-sixth birthday, retired to his seat at West Woodhay in Berkshire. He lived out his remaining years there very quietly until his death on 31 May 1658, and he was buried in the chancel of the church at

⁸⁶ Manning, *Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd*, pp. 241–2. ⁸⁷ *CJ*, V, p. 46.

⁸⁸ Manning, *Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd*, p. 244.

⁸⁹ *Mercurius Elencticus*, no. 55 (5–12 December 1648), 527.

⁹⁰ David Underdown, *Pride’s Purge* (1971), pp. 147–8.

West Woodhay. Rudyerd's will, which he composed earlier that month, survives, but reveals little that was individual about Rudyerd's religious beliefs. The opening form of words reads,

I do freely bequeath my soul unto Almighty God my creator and to his beloved son my Saviour Jesus Christ, by and through whose only death and passion I do already trust to have remission of my sins and to enjoy everlasting life. My body I do commit to the earth from whence it came.⁹¹

It may be, however, that the absence of a dogmatic religious position in Rudyerd's will is in itself revealing of someone who apparently felt most at home within the broad church of Elizabeth and James. That church could accommodate Rudyerd's commitment to a well-endowed preaching ministry within an episcopalian framework that preserved order and decency while allowing freedom from antiquated formality.

A similar conclusion may perhaps be drawn from a hymn that Rudyerd composed in his later years:

O God! My God! What shall I give
To thee in thanks? I am and live
In thee; and thou dost safe preserve
My health, my fame, my goods, my rent:
Thou makest me eat, while others starve,
And sing, whilst others do lament.
Such unto me thy blessings are
As though I were thine only care.
But, Oh! My God, thou art more kind.
When I look inward on my mind,
Thou fill'st my heart with humble joy,
With patience meek, and fervent love
(Which doth all other loves destroy),
With faith which nothing can remove,
And hope assured of Heaven's bliss:
This is my state, my grace is this.⁹²

It is possible that the closing reference to 'hope assured of Heaven's bliss' would tend to place Rudyerd at the more clearly Calvinist end of the Jacobean spectrum, and this would be entirely consistent with the picture of him that emerges from his parliamentary speeches.

V

Rudyerd's religious and political views, as they evolved during the course of his life, thus provide a fascinating case study of how a strongly

⁹¹ TNA, PROB 11/284. ⁹² Manning, *Memoirs of Sir Benjamin Rudyerd*, pp. 255–6.

Protestant layman reacted to the changing circumstances of early and mid-seventeenth-century England. Having been happy with the church led by Archbishop Abbot, and having advocated improving reforms within this Jacobean framework, Rudyerd felt much less at ease in the more polarized atmosphere of Charles I and the Laudians. He felt equally unhappy with the more radical Parliamentary responses to Laudianism, and as both official policies and reactions to them moved further apart, Rudyerd, who disliked confrontations and always preferred persuasion to coercion, proved less able to cope and became a progressively more marginal figure. In that sense, he was, perhaps, a 'Jacobethan' whose long life meant that he saw events turn in directions that he regretted.

He believed in the English Reformation and praised the 'martyr-bishops' of the 1550s. He was deeply committed to further reformation of the church, and especially to improving the endowment of the clergy, but he did not want destruction or liberty to turn to licence. He sought orderly reformation, and believed that this could best be achieved by more generous funding of the Church of Elizabeth and James. Rudyerd abhorred the hijacking of that church by Laud and his allies; but he was equally suspicious of the more radical measures that Parliament adopted in response during the 1640s. He deprecated both the Laudians' actions and the Long Parliament's reactions. Instead, his heart really lay in the Church of Elizabeth and James, in which he had grown up and which he had sought to reform.

Politically, Rudyerd consistently sought harmony between crown and Parliament. He believed in the innate constitutional symbiosis of the two, and throughout his public career he strove to overcome differences between them. In practical terms this often led him to advocate reform of the royal finances accompanied by generous grants of supply as evidence of Parliament's trust in the monarch. The more that that trust became eroded, the more Rudyerd sought to restore it and to promote an accommodation between crown and Parliament. If his religious attitudes helped to make him a Parliamentarian, his political attitudes ensured that he always remained a moderate. This was a pattern that he shared with his patron, the earl of Pembroke, who appears to have been a further influence behind Rudyerd's Parliamentarian allegiance. Rudyerd's behaviour was thus the product of a complex blend of motives in which political, religious and personal considerations were fascinatingly intertwined.

These points bring us back, in conclusion, to the two problems with which this essay began, namely the role of religion as an influence on the choice of sides in the Civil War, and the nature of 'political psychology' in motivating behaviour. Like many of those who were committed to godly Protestantism and further reformation of the Church, Rudyerd

became a Parliamentarian. His allegiance was thus consistent with, and directly reflected, his religious attitudes. These were not, however, his only motive, for other aspects of his behaviour owed much to his political and constitutional beliefs. In particular, his long-standing desire to preserve harmony between crown and Parliament was crucial in ensuring that he remained a moderate and tried constantly to achieve an accommodation between Charles and the Houses in the years immediately before and during the Civil Wars. Furthermore, his characteristic religious and political beliefs placed him in close accord with his patron, Pembroke. This brings us to the second problem, for it shows that 'political psychology' often involved a complex blend of motives which merged to form an integrated whole within which they were distinguishable but not separable. Rudyerd's religious, political and personal motives were analytically distinct but they cannot be fully understood in isolation from each other. This in turn suggests the fundamental – and psychologically plausible – conclusion that an individual with several reasons for doing something is even more likely to do it than someone with only one reason. In a case like Rudyerd's, to assert the primacy of any one consideration would be to risk distorting the complexity of the multiple motives that guided his behaviour. He saw the world in terms of an integrated vision that unified both political and religious elements, and the integrated quality of his ideas comes through strongly in the accounts in his own words quoted throughout this essay.

Rudyerd's tragedy was to live in a period when the harmonies that he wished to preserve – between crown and Parliament, and between the established Church and Protestant reform – steadily became incompatible with each other, and in the end events forced him to make choices between them. His search for gradual, orderly religious reform, within a framework of political and constitutional harmony, took place against a background where opinion was becoming ever more polarized and the nation ever more deeply divided, and as a result his quest ultimately turned out to be in vain. He nevertheless pursued it with a singular eloquence and integrity that make it still worthwhile to reconstruct the sounds of the 'silver trumpet' of the early seventeenth-century House of Commons. In the voice of that trumpet, we can hear the authentic anguish of a prominent 'Jacobethan' who, in his advancing years, had to experience the trauma of England's 'wars of religion'.