

UC-NRLF




B 3 497 548



LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA





SIR GEORGE CALVERT, BARON OF BALTIMORE.



A Paper read before the Maryland Historical Society,


April 14th, 1884,

BY

LEWIS W. WILHELM, A. B.,

FELLOW IN HISTORY, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Baltimore, 1884.



SIR GEORGE CALVERT,

BARON OF BALTIMORE.

Fund-Publication, No. 20.

SIR GEORGE CALVERT.

BARON OF BALTIMORE.



A Paper read before the Maryland Historical Society

April 14th, 1884,

BY

LEWIS W. WILHELM, A. B.,

FELLOW IN HISTORY, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Baltimore, 1884

PEABODY PUBLICATION FUND.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION.

1884-5.

HENRY STOCKBRIDGE,
JOHN W. M. LEE,
BRADLEY T. JOHNSON.

PRINTED BY JOHN MURPHY & CO.
PRINTERS TO THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY,
BALTIMORE, 1884.

P R E F A C E .

The history of the Baltimore family is indissolubly linked with the history of the province of Maryland. The first Lord Baltimore, Sir George Calvert, though dying two months before the charter of Maryland had passed the great seal of England, and two years before the first settlers arrived in the colony, had laid the beginnings of the colony. To his son and successor, Cecilius Calvert, the privilege was granted of sending over the immigrants of 1634, and of completing the initial steps taken by his father, by which a new province was added to the British Empire in America. As lord proprietor of Maryland for almost a half century, he occupied an important part in moulding the constitutional, religious and economic history of the colony. The last baron of Baltimore died in 1771, only a few years before the inhabitants of his province declared themselves an independent commonwealth. The biography of each member of the family is sufficiently interesting in itself to claim the attention of the historian. From the accession of James I. to the reign of George III., the Calverts enjoyed a high political and social rank in England; but the most important member of the family was, beyond all doubt, its founder, George Calvert. The history of the first baron of Baltimore is peculiarly interesting from many points of view. As a leader of the Court party in the famous parliaments of the reign of James I., and as one of the king's principal ministers during the negotiations in the celebrated Spanish Match,

he occupies an important place in the parliamentary and constitutional history of England; as a member of the most important trading company of his day, whose fleets were circumnavigating the globe; as an executive officer in the administrative councils which controlled the destinies of the great Virginia companies, whose domain extended from Maine to Florida, and as an energetic colonizer of settlements in America, personally inspecting the lands patented by him, and for many months taking up his residence in the New World, Sir George Calvert's career must fill many pages in the history of the economic and institutional development of the people of the American colonies. The religious phase of his career is not devoid of interest; as a convert from the Church of England to the Church of Rome, when absorbed in the duties of privy counsellor and of minister of state, the story of his life is peculiarly instructive to the student of history seeking for the causes and development of the religious movement in England which led to the great Civil War, to the establishment of the English Commonwealth, and to the founding of the new England in America.


In the preparation of this biography a liberal use has been made of books and documents contained in the libraries of the Johns Hopkins University, the Peabody Institute, the Maryland Historical Society, and the Whittingham library. Though there exists in these libraries abundant material for the public life of Calvert, very few details are revealed concerning his private life, his ancestry, his boyhood, his domestic life, or of his residence in Ireland during the interval between his withdrawal from Court and his removal to America. A research into the annals of Yorkshire, England, and of Wexford and Longford counties, Ireland, would doubtless throw much additional light upon many

parts of his career. I have endeavored, in this monograph, to group together the details contained in the interesting biographies of Calvert written by Kennedy, Morris, and Neill, and to unify and to supplement the material so obtained by a study of the other works embraced in the bibliography contained in the appendix.

I am indebted to several of my fellow students, particularly Mr. Basil Sollers and Mr. Charles H. Shinn, for important suggestions in the arrangement of the material; I am also specially indebted to Dr. Wm. Hand Browne, Librarian of the University, for a review of the manuscript, and to the Hon. Henry Stockbridge, Vice-President of the Maryland Historical Society, for his loan of valuable documents and for his aid in correcting the proof-sheets.

L. W. W.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
May, 1884.



SIR GEORGE CALVERT, BARON OF BALTIMORE.

OF all the counties of England none has held and is now holding a larger interest in English history than Yorkshire. The successor of the old Kingdom of Deira, even under its present name, it stretched, in the times of the Domesday survey, from sea to sea; and when joined to its sister Kingdom of Bernicia, under the common name of Northumberland, it for many years remained "the first state of Britain, first in arms, first in arts." The richness of its soil, the wealth of its mines, the varied beauty of its valleys, dales, and terraced hillsides, and the accessibility of its inland country, pierced by its great rivers, have made the North of England the scene of battles fought for plunder, for religion, and for local supremacy; and in each of its winding valleys and along each of its broad roads have been heard the feet of men in martial array,

and the cries and groans of the vanquished. Here in Deira, in Yorkshire, had settled the Romans, the Danes, the English. Of all the cities north of the Alps, York, with but one exception became the only imperial city of the Roman Empire, the residence of its emperor; here the Danish Conqueror had planted his black standard and here had reigned the Danish Kings in the only thoroughly Danish England, Deira; it was the city of York, the Roman Eboracum, the English Eoforwic, that had been chosen by Bretwalda Eadwine as the royal city, holding sway over all England save Kent alone. Through Yorkshire had raved the fierce Norman Conqueror, swearing by an awful oath dire vengeance on the shire for its bold revolt and the murder of the Norman garrisons. The Conqueror commenced his savage work at York. The inhabitants met a cruel death; their towns were destroyed, their crops trampled down, and their implements of husbandry and their cattle consumed in raging fires; a hundred thousand souls perished of famine alone. Yorkshire was conquered and its political life was crushed, but its capital became a center of a vigorous spiritual life and a rival of the old see of Canterbury, and claimed the authority, if it could not grasp it, over all Britain from the Humber to the Hebrides Islands. For many centuries the seat

of English power remained in the south, but long before the times of James I., the old shire had re-asserted its former political and social place and has ever since continued to maintain its prominent position; the North of England, including Yorkshire and Lancashire holds now the first place both in politics and in local trade.

To Americans also, the most widely known of all the shires of England is Yorkshire; Kent and Cornwall recall the days of great religious and political struggles, whose histories have come down to us in beautiful legends, but the frequent repetition in colonial history of the names of York, New York, Yorktown, Yorkville, tell the story plainly that the great county from which these names are taken had a close hold upon the favor of the colonists. The popularity of the name is not a mere caprice; many names famous in American history are of Yorkshire lineage; the Winthrops, the Penns, the Washingtons, and the Calverts, names closely identified with the settlement and the development of the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland had their old English homes in Yorkshire; it was here the Puritans had gathered in great numbers before they sought an asylum in Holland. In this famous old shire, not far from the river Swale, is the little town of Kiplin, long unknown to fame and almost neglected by

the local annalists, but a place now famous in American history as the birth-place of George Calvert, the settler of Avalon and the founder of Maryland.

In one of those isolated spots in the valley of the Swale, within sight of the highway joining Durham and York, and about half-way between these cities, there yet may be seen ruins of the days of Roman supremacy in the dismembered castles and broken walls lying in and around the old town of Catterick. The annalist gravely remarks that *cataract* is derived from this old town, lying in the midst of rugged scenery. To the right of Catterick may be seen the well-known Hornby castle, the residence of the Duke of Leeds; to the left is an estate known as Kiplin Park, for many years the home of the Earls of Tyrconnel.

A day's walk from the old bridge that spans the Swale at this place will bring the pedestrian, travelling north-eastward, to the mouth of the Tees, along whose waters King Ida and his invading hosts had sailed their keels in the days of the English Conquest. A day's walk in a northern direction from Kiplin will bring the traveller to the border line between the counties of Durham and York; towards the west the eye rests upon the rolling meadows and pasture lands that mark the beginning of the hills that extend towards the famous Lake District of Cumberland and

Westmoreland, so graphically described by the poet Wordsworth.

In travelling eastward, the pedestrian can soon reach the heights of the lofty hills of Egton Moor, extending eastward until abruptly stopped by the blue waters of the German Ocean; from many points of the moor glimpses may be had of the famous town of Whitby; its venerable remains, clearly outlined by the blue background of the ocean, recalling the days of King Oswi, of Caedmon, and of Hilda, the English Deborah. A visit to this old town, so near his birth-place, may have reminded Calvert, particularly when his own religious faith began to waver, of the famous struggle that took place within the walls of the Abbey many centuries before his era. At Whitby had occurred the culmination, on English soil, of the strife of Ireland against Rome, of the followers of St. John against those of St. Peter, when King Oswi decided to forsake the Celtic church of Colman and to cling to the Roman church of Wilfrith and the Pope.

The village of Kiplin, where George Calvert was born, lies in the narrowest part of the valley joining Middle England to the North country. A local description of its situation a half century since has a quaint sound to American readers:—
 “Kiplin: a township in the parish of Catterick, union of North Allerton, wapentake of Gilling-East, North Riding of the county of York, 2½ miles

[E. S. E.] from Catterick, containing 114 inhabitants.”¹ Within sight of the village are the towns of Richmond, noted for its grand old castle; Ripon, with its celebrated Fountains Abbey, the most perfect monastery in all England, and its Grammar School founded by Queen Mary; North Allerton, the scene of the famous defeat of King David of Scotland at the battle of the Standard; and Thirsk, with its old church erected to St. Mary.

Though Kiplin was the birth-place of Calvert, it had not been the residence of his ancestry. We do not know how many centuries previous his forefathers had left the lowlands of Flanders to seek a new home in England, but during the long days of the reign of good Queen Bess, his parents Leonard Calvert and Alice Crossland had been living in the town of Danbywiske lying four or five miles east of Kiplin. Very little is known of this worthy couple, though it is generally stated that Leonard Calvert, was a grazier, that is the owner of large pasture lands, and occupied the social position of the modern English country squire. The story of their uneventful lives remains buried in the musty rolls of the parish church, upon the stones of neglected cemeteries, and in the annals of antiquarians and of local historians. Like so many of this world's heroes George Calvert was

¹ Lewis: Topographical Dictionary of England.

thrust into the arena of public life unheralded and almost unknown.

The exact date of his birth has not been determined; by some writers it has been placed in the year 1580, and this is probably the more correct date, though according to the conclusions of others, his birth took place in the year 1584, the same year in which occurred the discovery of Virginia by the vessels sent out by that famous old mariner, Sir Walter Raleigh. Almost nothing has been unearthed concerning the boyhood of Calvert, but it is probable that until his entering upon college life at Oxford, he resided with his parents in the North Riding. The natural scenery and the historic associations of the places immediately in his vicinity would give his young mind much food for inquiry and contemplation. In our imagination we can see him directing his steps towards the great Richmond castle, built in the days of the Conqueror, its lofty square tower standing like a huge sentinel on the eminence washed at its base by the Swale. His thoughtful mind was doubtless soon attracted to the many picturesque panoramas of nature opening up in all directions; mountains and valleys, wide open moors, and quiet river views being within easy range. Towards the north-east, about a score and a half miles distant lay Durham, a place well-known in the days of the Saxon Kings, and early consecrated by the

monks of Lindisfarne, who lovingly laid to rest within its walls the remains of their devoted St. Cuthbert. The town is famous in modern times as the site of the magnificent Durham Cathedral; founded in the reign of William the Red, it is a perfect specimen of Norman architecture and a fitting memorial of Norman strength and endurance; for centuries before the days of Calvert, thousands of pilgrims wended their way to this shrine of St. Cuthbert and the venerable Bede. Towards the south-east of Kiplin, about two score miles lies the old town of York, a place that witnessed the death of the Emperor Severus and of the father of Constantine the Great, and by some writers claimed as the birth-place of the first Christian Emperor; its Roman walls, Saxon Cathedral and Norman Castle suggestive of most important chapters in English history. It is not improbable that the famous Queen Mary's Grammar School at Ripon, founded by the predecessor of Queen Elizabeth, had trained the mind of the young Calvert for his future career at Oxford.

Whatever may have been his early associations, it is quite likely he felt the influence and imbibed the teachings of the great families living in his shire. Here were sown those seeds, well watered at the Oxford University, that in after life rendered him so prominent an advocate of the King's prerogative and of close alliance between England and

Spain. Here lived great families whose political and religious struggles have filled whole chapters in English history. Yorkshire was truly the *terra Mariæ* of England. As the seat of the Catholic revolts of 1569, when according to the Earl of Sussex, Elizabeth's general in the North, "there were not ten gentlemen in Yorkshire that did allow [approve of] her proceedings in the cause of religion," the region of the Swale was filled with devoted followers of Mary the Queen, and of Mary the Virgin.

Though the career of Calvert, until his entrance into Trinity College, Oxford, about 1593, had been quiet and uneventful, yet during these twelve or thirteen years the life of the English people had been marked by most important events. During this short period, in England, upon the Continent, and in the New World, and even upon the ocean lying between, there was constant activity and confusion; the ominous noises of armies in motion, the thunders of naval combats, the hoarse cries of oppressed peoples, and the acclamations of joy of religious enthusiasts, indicated the effervescent state of men's minds. Acts of great daring and bravery succeeded dark deeds of passion and violence, and both left an indelible mark upon the pages of history. While the air was filled with confused rumors of plots for the murder of Queen Elizabeth, the hand of an assassin had sud-

denly removed the noble Prince of Orange. While the shores of Virginia were being sounded and mapped by Raleigh and his successors, the Spanish coast was harried by Drake, and the great Armada was shattered in the English Channel and washed up on the English strand. Though but a boy, Calvert must have been a witness of the joyful pæans of the Puritans and the tears of sorrow of the Papists upon the execution of the beautiful, yet erring, Mary of Scotland. His youthful mind was not sufficiently matured to realize the vast wealth stored up in the writings of his contemporaries, of Marlowe and Spenser, of Shakspeare and Hooker, of Jonson and Bacon.

At the age of thirteen Calvert entered as a commoner the Trinity College, Oxford,¹ an institution founded and endowed by bishops of Durham. His college career is briefly told, for very few details are known; in addition to the Greek and Latin studies, he paid considerable attention to French, Italian and Spanish; it was his knowledge of these languages, probably, that enabled him in later life to retain the favor of King James. As he was a commoner in the College, paying all his own expenses and not upon the foundation, it is

¹“At Oxford, subscription to the thirty-nine articles had been required on matriculation since 1581; and dissenting students had thus been wholly excluded from that university. It was a school set apart for members of the church.” May; Constitutional History of England, III., 195.

very certain that his parents were possessed of some means, unless perhaps he was assisted by friends. After the usual course of three or four years he obtained the degree of B. A. on February 23, 1597, the same year in which appeared the "Essays" of Bacon, his future co-laborer. Calvert indicated his proficiency in the Latin tongue, and also the bent of his inclination, by the publication, at this time, of a poem dedicated to the memory of a statesman, whom he had early learned to admire.

The young graduate rounded off his collegiate instruction, and at the same time laid the foundations of his future political career, by visiting the continent in the same year he left his Alma Mater; the notion was still prevalent that the education of young men was not completed until they had visited the various courts of Europe, and had paid their respects to the reigning sovereigns. It is not improbable that he was one of the number of two hundred that composed the splendid retinue of Sir Robert Cecil in his embassy to the Court of France. Henry of Navarre, a Protestant, had been elevated to the throne of France by the assassination of the last of the line of Valois, Henry III., in 1589; Philip of Spain, in despair of injuring England in open warfare, after the wreck of the two great Armadas, had struggled hard to reach his great rival by laying claims to

the throne of France. To strengthen her own position by alliance with a strong neighbor, Elizabeth continued to send men and money to the King of France until the end of her reign. Sir Robert Cecil, who became in after years warmly attached to the interests of Calvert, was the leading spirit in the foreign policy of the Queen, and probably secured for the young politician an honorable place in the diplomatic corps. It is not known how long he remained abroad, though the embassy of Cecil returned in April, 1598; it is not improbable that Calvert returned with them, since we find him a few years afterwards busy at work at the English court.

In the year of the accession of James I. to the English throne, 1603, we notice Calvert busily employed in assisting Cecil, his patron, in the management of the manors and bailiwicks included in the jointure of Queen Anne of Denmark, the consort of James; and in the same year he was elected a member of the first Parliament of James, from the borough of Bossiney, a small fishing town in Cornwall; Hansard does not relate any instance of his taking part in the debates; his colleague was Sir Jeronimus Horsey.

It is not certainly known in what year he married Anne Mynne, daughter of George Mynne, Esq., of Hertingsfordsbury, Hertfordshire; probably the event took place in the year 1604 or 1605;

his oldest son Cecilius was born in 1606. The name given by Calvert to his first-born indicates the regard he had for his patron, who, on the death of Elizabeth had been continued by James as Secretary of State. The second son, Leonard, was named by Calvert after his father. Though almost no particulars are known of Anne Mynne, she seems to have been a devoted, amiable wife and a true lady; the encomiums passed upon her by her husband in answer to the queries of James at his appointment to the Secretaryship in 1619, the memorial tablet lauding her virtues, erected by Calvert, and his loving illusions to her in his letters to Wentworth long after her death, would all seem to indicate that in Anne Mynne the young politician had found a helpmeet and a companion.

The year 1605 marked an epoch in the career of Calvert; in this year he received the degree of M. A. from his Alma Mater, an event that greatly favored him in his ambitious projects. It would be an advantage to him to have the degree conferred at a time marked by some great event; it was probably for this reason that he waited until James visited the University in August, 1605. It was the first and only visit paid this seat of learning by the King, and great preparations had been made to give him a right royal reception. The progress of James and his retinue from Theobalds to the University had been the occasion of contin-

uous ovations and banquets, and when the royal party reached Oxford, August 27th, a great host of learned divines and jurists had gathered to receive them; many great nobles and the most prominent ministers and councillors had accompanied the King, and no expense was spared to provide a brilliant entertainment. The neighboring markets had been so depleted of provisions that for many days the prices of the perishable goods remained unusually high. The old town had been newly painted and cleaned, and the college buildings and grounds had been gaily festooned and brightly illuminated. When the royal party appeared upon the college grounds it was met by the University party, preceded by the Chancellor, carrying in his hand the white staff of office; the "bedells" attired in "fair gowns, velvet capps and chains of gold" accompanied the Chancellor, while behind him in long procession followed the doctors, graduates, fellows, scholars and probationers, all attired in their best gowns, hoods and caps.

During his sojourn at Oxford, the King was honored by innumerable orations, sermons, debates, and addresses in Latin and Greek. Banquets, processions and novel entertainments followed in rapid succession. The King did his part to enjoy the celebrations, though at times he would give way to a feeling of weariness, and during most laughable comedies he would be seen sleeping

soundly; but "of disputations he was never weary, and was so active in bearing his part and interposed so often, that he had not time or inclination to sleep;" he felt grateful to the Oxonians for their congratulatory epistle sent him at his accession, dedicated to the "*serenissimum Jacobum.*"

The degrees of M. A. were conferred in the presence of the King on the third day of his visit, August 30th. It was a proud day for Calvert when in the afternoon he received his degree, and was summoned to a seat in the Convocation among the great nobles and the venerable masters attired in their "black civill hoods" and in "black wide-sleeved gowns faced down to the foote with taffaty." The degree of M. A. was conferred upon forty-three candidates, including the Duke of Lennox; Henry Vere, Earl of Oxford; Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland; and many other lay and ecclesiastical lords. According to the annalist "there was great labor made that the Prince [Henry] might be admitted Master of Arts, but the King would not consent thereto." The last name in the long list of newly created masters was that of "George Calvert, Esq." It is worthy of note that this same day, Sir Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, the friend of Calvert, long since an M. A. of Cambridge, was admitted into the Oxford fraternity by receiving the honorary M. A. degree from this University.

After leaving Oxford, Calvert continued with his patron, and through the favorable notices of Cecil he was at once brought into favor with the King. A contemporary of his, writing a few months before the King's visit to Oxford, had said, "George Calvert hath good favor with his Lordship [Cecil] and is diligent enough." It was in the following year that James alluded to Calvert as "a good subject," and "a gentleman of good sufficiency."

Sir Robert Cecil, who had so early befriended the young politician, had held important official positions for many years. His father, Lord Burleigh, though "the youngest and boldest" of the Queen's advisers, was "the one minister in whom she really confided." Young Cecil had succeeded to the honors and the official standing of the elder, and attended the Queen to her last hour. The change of dynasty had even increased his power at Court. It was through his energy and diplomacy that the first of the Stuarts had secured the English throne without open opposition; it was he who furnished James with the ready money to enable him to make a creditable display in his progress to London; it was at Theobalds, the country seat of Cecil, that the King took up his residence. In securing the favor of such a powerful minister, Calvert had laid the foundation of all his future advancement. Long after the death of Cecil, the King remembered him with affection

and told Calvert that he was worthy to succeed him.

In a letter of March 10, 1611, Calvert wrote to Edmondess,¹ giving some account of the visit he paid Cecil on his return from abroad. The attachment of the Secretary for the young clerk is evident from one paragraph in the letter; it reads: "I presently went to the court and delivered my dispatch; I found my lord [Cecil] in a disposition calm and sweet, using me with that favorable respect wherewith he is pleased to grace those poor servants he makes account of."

II.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CALVERT'S PUBLIC LIFE.

Calvert was inducted into political life at a very early age; he was not over twenty-three years old, possibly not even of age, when we find him busily employed in clerical and ministerial work for the Prime Minister, Cecil, who, at the beginning of the reign of James, had been also appointed High Bailiff and Steward to Queen Anne. It was the duty of Cecil to manage the numerous lands and tenements embraced in the Queen's jointure and to appoint deputy bailiffs and stewards. As his higher official duties claimed his close attention,

¹ English Ambassador at the French Court.

it is probable that most of the work of preparing letters patent, hearing reports from the manor courts, etc., was entrusted to subordinates. Various entries in the English State Papers indicate that some of this business passed through Calvert's hands. An entry of the date of October, 1603, reads: "Ralph Ewens [Queen's Auditor] to Geo. Calvert. In making a particular of the bailiwick of Spalding; thinks the bailiff of Hampton-in-Arden a fit man for it. Sends particulars for Prince's Risborough bailiwick, the patent to be in Rich. Edward's name." Another entry of November 8, 1603, reads: "Geo. Wilson to Geo. Calvert, Account of fees of the stewardship of certain manors, co. Somerset in the Queen's jointure."

During the decade from the accession of James to the death of Cecil, 1612, Calvert's advancement was steady and certain, though not especially rapid; he was maintained in office by Cecil and through his influence he secured some honorable appointments from the King. He became the private Secretary to his patron probably in 1606. In a letter contained in Lodge: "Illustrations of British History," bearing date January 26, 1607, Calvert is alluded to as the Lord of Salisbury's Secretary.

It was in the summer of 1606, that Calvert received from King James the reversion of an important clerkship in Ireland and so became officially identified with the country from which

two decades later he received his title of "baron." Calvert was presented to Lord Lieutenant Chichester with the following letter: "The King to the Lord Deputy. Considering how necessary it is that persons well qualified and trained in public service should be chosen and called to employment in public offices, he earnestly recommends his good subject, George Calvert, as a gentlemen of good sufficiency, to whom, for the respects above said, to grant the office of clerk of the Crown and of assize and peace within the province of Connagh and the county of Clare, which office Sir Richard Cook now hath. Requires therefore and authorizes the Deputy to cause a grant of those offices to be made to the said George Calvert, by letters patent under the great seal of Ireland; to be held by him or by his sufficient deputy or deputies during his life." The "yearly fee" or salary attached to this office was but 26½ l. Irish, but the perquisites were doubtless not inconsiderable. Since the Conquest of Ireland in 1603, by Mountjoy, many Englishmen had sought fortunes in the green island and the expectations of a large number were realized; the late Lord Deputy was known to have accumulated an enormous fortune, and probably Calvert found opportunity to add to his store. He was evidently well pleased with his Irish ventures, for his desire in 1611 for a wider sphere of action was gratified in his appointment,

together with Clement Edmondes, to have charge of the musters of garrisons in Ireland; the nominal fee, however, was but 6½ s. per day. There is no evidence that his request in 1614 to be appointed Master of Rolls for Ireland was granted, though his appointment in 1613, on two very important commissions to visit Ireland indicate the King's approval and recognition of his intimate acquaintance with the politics and people of this oppressed country.

The "thorough and terrorizing" policy of Wentworth in Ireland had not yet been inaugurated, but in the same year in which Calvert had received his Irish clerkship, James had begun his new policy of Anglicising his Irish subjects, and made great efforts to bring the Irish people under the established religion and common law of England. The clan system was broken up and communal tenure of land was rendered illegal; the old Celtic laws and customs were fast swept aside; English colonization was encouraged, and in 1610 the plantation of Ulster was begun, and Derry was colonized by the London Company.

The mutterings of the native Irishry became too deep and threatening for James to fail to recognize, and to obtain definite information of grievances he appointed, soon after the plantation of Ulster, several commissions to visit the island, and to obtain from the natives and the settlers the burden of

their complaints. Calvert was appointed upon two of these important commissions. One, consisting of five commissioners, was instructed to examine into the abuses of the Irish parliament and the general abuses of administration; the other, consisting of four members, was appointed to hear the grievances of Catholics and other recusants. The smaller commission, consisting of Sir Humphrey Wynch, Sir Charles Cornwallis, Sir Roger Wilbraham, and George Calvert, arrived in Dublin, September 11, 1613, and after a patient hearing of a long list of complaints, they returned their report November 12, the same year. Many of the grievances were dismissed as too trivial to demand investigation, though others could not be passed by in silence. Many fraudulent methods of securing the control of elections were revealed, and the baleful interference of the clergy in the elections was particularly censured; the commission lament the prevalence and the pernicious influence of papistry. A paragraph of the report reads: "that there have been practices in divers places to hinder the election of protestants is very clear, and that the priests have been persuaders in these practices appears both by the confession of some persons whom they have examined and by other pregnant circumstances." From the tenor of the report it is evident that none of the commissioners, including Calvert, were well favored toward the claims of the

Catholics or of the other less influential recusants in Ireland.

The more important commission of five members, upon which Calvert was appointed, included Chichester, the Lord Deputy of Ireland; it was appointed August 27, 1613, and made its report in the middle of November. They received twenty distinct instructions or subjects of inquiry, and were instructed to interview the reverend fathers, the lords bishops, justices of assizes, sheriffs, *et al.* They were ordered to ascertain if writs of elections had been duly sent to all counties, cities, and ancient boroughs, and if sheriffs were engaged in illegal practices and extortions; also to find out if there existed any unlawful confederations to tamper with elections, and any intermeddling of Jesuits in elections, by using the terrors of excommunication to enforce contributions to an election-fund, or otherwise; also to ascertain if the laws for the advancement of true religion had been enforced. Finally they were instructed to make a thorough inspection into the progress of the new plantation of Wexford, the kinds of land tenure, the nativity and pursuits of the residents, the condition of the soil, the variety of crops, and to gather other information relating to the administration, religion, and economy of the island. The report submitted by the commission was very lengthy and replete with valuable and interesting

statistics. In many respects it is just the sort of document that a modern Irish commission appointed by a Liberal government might be expected to draft and return to the Home office. The pernicious influence of the Jesuits is particularly pointed out, plans for the redress of parliamentary administration are proposed, and the condition of the Wexford plantation is clearly analyzed. The severe condemnation of the practices of the Catholics would preclude the notion that any of the commission were inclined towards this faith. Three years after the appointment of these commissions, Calvert's name is still found in the English archives in connexion with the affairs of Ireland.

During all these years Calvert was still enjoying the favor and confidence of Cecil, and upon his death in 1612, he continued to enjoy the "princely approbation" of James. A letter of September 6, 1609, to Calvert, begs him to use his influence with the Lord Treasurer (Cecil) to secure a warrant to some money sought by the writer of the letter. The mission of Calvert to the French Court in 1610, the year of the accession of Louis XIII., upon the assassination of his father, Henry IV., was probably prompted by Cecil to secure friendly relations with the French King; he returned to England in the early part of March, 1611. That he had a most enjoyable time abroad is evident from the tone of his letters. It was only

with difficulty he declared, that he was able to withdraw his mind from the pleasant memories of the Faubourg of St. Germain.

Before the close of the year 1611, Calvert had secured the favorable notice of the King by coming to his aid when profoundly stirred by a religious dissension that had occurred on the continent, the great Armenian controversy in Germany provoked by Dr. Vorstius. Sir Thos. Windebank had said in reference to this event, that "this was the first occasion that ever gave me access to His Majesty." Calvert already had access to the royal favor, but it is probable his assistance to James in the religious strife greatly strengthened his relations with his Majesty. In 1598, Vorstius, a sturdy religious disputant, had been accused of Socinianism, but betaking himself to Heidelberg he cleared himself of the charges; he was, however, closely watched by the anti-socinians, who were greatly perturbed by his vigorous writings. His election, in 1610, to the chair of theology at Leyden, to succeed Arminius himself, was a signal for a general alarm among all the Calvinists, and letters strongly condemning the election were sent by them to the various home and foreign universities. James himself became much interested, and, after listening to the charges, and reading some of the writings of Vorstius, he pronounced them very heretical and ordered them to be gathered at the Universities

and publicly burned. His anger increasing as he continued to read the "blasphemous book" of the Leyden professor, he wrote to the Dutch government a letter of bitter denunciation, and "recommended Vorstius to be purified by being burned at the stake, and declared that unless he was expelled from Holland, he would inaugurate a general Protestant crusade against Vorstius for his Armenian heresies," and that, as defender of the faith, he would take means "to remand to hell such abominable doctrines." In this year, 1611, had appeared the translation of the Bible known as King James' version. The King's holy indignation was not appeased until he had written a tractate against the unfortunate professor, though it is probable that but a small part of the book was written by the irate yet easily wearied King. In his letter to Salisbury, January 15, 1612, Calvert said that he was "writing out the discourse which the King began concerning Vorstius," but it is difficult to decide whether his "writing out the discourse" meant transcription, translating, or actual composition. The King generally wrote in French, but this tractate appeared in English and Latin. It is probable that Calvert did actually compose parts of the book as outlined by the King.

Calvert's intimate knowledge of Latin and the modern languages rendered his services to the

King of peculiar value. At the same time that he was writing out the French discourse against Vortius, we find him employed in answering the voluminous Italian and Spanish correspondence of the King. By this means he was enabled to gain an insight into the politics of the continent that became of good service to him a decade later when, as Secretary, he was negotiating the Spanish Match.

The emoluments of the positions held by Calvert, and the fortune he had accumulated, enabled him to gratify a taste for speculative ventures by joining some of the more important trading companies at this time just coming into existence and patronized by all classes of citizens. Among the numerous grantees of the second Virginia Company, chartered in 1609, the name of Robert Cecil, Calvert's patron, heads the list; his name is followed lower down by that of George Calvert, Esq. It is not improbable that Calvert was a patentee of the first Virginia Company, chartered in 1606; and so late as the year 1620 his name is still found enrolled among the patentees of the Virginia Company. In the year 1609 he was admitted a member of the East India Company, and five years later, 1614, he added the sum of £600 to his stock in this company. It is interesting to note that in 1622 he was a member of the New England Company.

The year 1612 had opened very auspiciously both for Calvert and the King, for the latter was gaining a stronger hold upon popular affection by his active interest in the Vorstian controversy; both the English Government and the English Church were in strong sympathy with the Calvinists. It seemed for a moment as if the breach between James and his parliament, widened by the late angry dissolution of the latter, was being bridged over by the King's vigorous foreign policy, but the death of Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, in 1612, marred the plans of James and rudely disturbed the dreams of Calvert. The King was entirely at sea at the death of the wisest of his councillors, and instead of conciliating the people by selecting a suitable successor, he abandoned himself to the caprices of most extravagant and reckless upstarts. The death of his patron clouded the career of Calvert, but only for a moment. The very act that removed James farther and farther away from the confidence of the country party, the party of the liberals, drew Calvert more closely into the confidence of the King. In discarding the counsels of his great ministers, he was constrained to rely more implicitly upon the services of his confidential clerks. The overthrow of the Scotch page, Carr, only cleared the way for the advancement of the handsome and vicious Villiers, better known as the Duke of Buckingham. The close of the year

saw Calvert securely entrenched in the favor of the King; but there is no evidence that his position was secured by questionable means.

A letter of Calvert's, of the date of August 1, 1612, to Sir Thomas Edmondess, Ambassador at Paris, throws a broad ray of light into the recesses of the Court, now swayed by the all-powerful influence of Carr, Earl of Rochester. He writes: "You know the *Primum Mobile* of our Court, by whose motion all the other spheres must move, or else stand still; the bright sun of our firmament, at whose splendors or glooming all our marygolds of the Court open or shut. In his conjunction all the stars are prosperous, and in his opposition, malomious. There are, in higher spheres, as great as he, but none so glorious." Calvert felt instinctively the evils attending the Court swayed by the whims of an irresponsible favorite; he would have by far preferred to see the administration placed in the hands of a responsible ministry, but such a constitutional measure would have seemed revolutionary in his day; thrones and dominions must be overturned before such an event were possible. The glooming of the *Primum Mobile* did not dim the brightness of Calvert's star, for in the ensuing year, 1613, he was appointed by James one of the five clerks to the Privy Council, at a nominal salary of £50 annually, and in the same year he was sent on the above mentioned missions to Ireland.

Calvert was appointed clerk in ordinary, that is, in actual and stated attendance, not honorary, yet it is probable his services were claimed by the King more frequently than by the Council. Since the death of Cecil, the King had been acting, in his way, as his own prime minister, and was gradually withdrawing from the Council much of its powers. The attitude of the King is indicated by entries in the State Papers: "Numerous candidates for the Secretaryship, but the King says he is prettily skilled in the craft himself, and will execute it till he is weary;" another entry reads: "Neville has failed of the Secretaryship, because of the flocking of Parliament men to him. The King says he will not have a Secretary imposed on him by Parliament." Calvert's long tenure of the clerkship, for he only resigned in 1619 to accept the Secretaryship, is evidence that his services were valuable to the King; the tenure of all offices was very precarious under the arbitrary and fickle James. In March, 1614, it was widely rumored that Calvert would be sent as Ambassador to Venice, but he did not urge his claims. A contemporary writer said, Calvert is "not likely to affect such a journey, being reasonably well settled at home and having a wife and many children, which would be no easy carriage so far." He preferred the quieter and less expensive duties of clerk to the Council. That his services were appreciated we are constrained to

believe by the fact that in October, 1616, he and his co-laborer, Clement Edmondcs, received the liberal donation of a thousand pounds each, "to be paid out of the checks in Ireland." Clement Edmondcs had been the associate of Calvert in the administration of musters of garrisons in Ireland, and it is not improbable that a portion of the money was received for services rendered in this capacity; the nominal salary of the office was but 6½s. per diem.

This long period of quiet clerical and administrative work, for a foolhardy King, at an intensely corrupt court and surrounded by reckless upstart favorites was a critical time in the career of Calvert, yet it served as a good training school for the responsible duties soon to be thrust upon him. His patron, the Earl of Salisbury had served James faithfully for almost ten years and was so favored that he rose from one position of honor and trust to still higher ones, but no one could impeach Cecil at any time of want of honor or of principle, though his cold-hearted, selfish, suspicious disposition had alienated many of his friends and had lost him popular esteem. But to Calvert, the old minister had left a valuable legacy of political discipline and courtesy, of prudence, good management and thorough honesty, qualities eminently useful to a minister serving a master like King James.

At the period of Cecil's death, Calvert had probably ceased to be employed by him. His name does

not appear in the list of the late Secretary's clerks and private secretaries; yet Cecil had continued to remember him, for Calvert had been selected by him as one of the four executors of his will.

The year that witnessed the execution of the unfortunate Raleigh, 1617, was made memorable to Calvert by his elevation to the knighthood. He was still a clerk to the Privy Council, for he is so addressed subsequent to this event. Calvert was Knighted by the King on September 29, 1617. The royal family and a very full representation of the nobility had assembled at Hampton-Court to attend the marriage of Sir John Villiers, brother of Buckingham, to Lady Frances Coke, which occurred on September 27th. Two days later while the wedding festivities were at their height, James dubbed with the sword Albert Morton, Clement Edmondes and George Calvert, all clerks to the Council; the honor of the spurs was not, however, conferred on young Lake, also a clerk of the Council, a son of the Secretary Lake, whom Calvert succeeded in office.

In the interval between his knighthood and his appointment as Secretary, February, 1619, there is but one reference to Calvert in the English archives and this is entirely unintelligible. In a letter from Chamberlain to Carleton, ambassador at the French Court, bearing date August 20, 1618, the writer says: "Sir Geo. Calvert gone

to Court, his lady kept under guard." Unfortunately we are not permitted to lift the veil that clouds his domestic happiness and to ascertain the causes of his wife's imprisonment and his own hurried trip to London. His trip to the Court seems to have resulted satisfactorily, for no further mention of the event is made by the gossips of the day.

The most important step in the career of Calvert and in some respects a very unfortunate one, was his acceptance of the office of Secretary of State, tendered him by King James. The office was one of great honor, but also one of great responsibility. An old writer says: "The office of Principal Secretary of State is deemed of the highest trust and of great honour, and it is looked upon as of great consequence, both in the eyes of the sovereign and people." Queen Elizabeth had made use of but one Secretary; King James had followed this custom until the middle of his reign, when he appointed two principal secretaries of state, but their respective jurisdictions were not sharply outlined; it seems to have been usual for one to remain in or near London and the other to follow the King in his progress. Since the reign of Elizabeth the principal secretaries have been members of the Privy Council, previously their duty had been to prepare the business for the Council, in a room adjoining the Council Chamber,

but not to take part in the deliberations, unless specially summoned.

The course of events that led to Calvert's appointment to the Secretaryship is peculiar and interesting. A vacancy had occurred upon the dismissal of Sir Thomas Lake, February 13, 1619, on account of certain domestic difficulties which interfered with his official duties and greatly irritated the King. Secretary Lake had given much satisfaction to the Catholic element, his own private chaplain was a suspected priest. The Secretary's dismissal was probably due to religious complications, since the King viewed with much suspicion his Papal leanings. At the moment of Lake's dismissal James felt somewhat embittered towards his Catholic subjects and towards certain members of Lake's household who had gone over to the Roman Church. In a long and well delivered speech in the Star Chamber, a day or two after the dismissal of Secretary Lake, after bidding "all secretaries beware of trusting their wives with secrets of State," the King "compared Lake to Adam, Lady Lake to Eve and Lady Roos [their daughter] to the serpent." He gave orders to "the musters and the troops to be ready against the Papists, who grow bold in hope of the Match with Spain;" at the same time, "the King charged the Judges to beware of Papists, especially of women, who are

the nourishers of Papistry." A contemporary writer, in a letter, speaking of the dismissal of Lake, says: "the Papists were much dejected at his fall. The nuns of Louvaine are said to have prayed for his deliverance from his enemies. The King at this time was severe in his prejudice against Papists." The writer goes on to say that James, in his anger, even went so far as to say that Papists and disreputable women were *voies convertibles*, "which," the writer continues, "the Catholic ladies take very ill."

Though the King wavered from hour to hour in his political creed, yet at the time of Calvert's appointment as Secretary, he was bitter in his denunciation of Catholics, and very lukewarm in his proposals for an alliance with Spain.

At the time of his appointment Calvert was a member of the Established Church, and had not yet forgotten the policy of his old master, Cecil, which was a close alliance with Holland and France. He did not oppose the Spanish Match, but he was not one of its ardent supporters. Gradually, however, he became one of the leaders of the Spanish Party, and refused to desert the party even in the hour of defeat. He testified the sincerity of his political convictions in accepting the religious creed of the Spaniards, even though it obliged him to vacate his place in the ministry.

Streeter is not entirely correct in saying that in the year of his appointment Calvert was an advocate of close alliance with Spain. At a meeting of the Privy Council, held in the year 1619, some Bohemians present, in urging the claims of the Palatine, had narrated how they had inflicted the ancient and national penalty of *fenestration* upon their enemies. One of the Councillors whispered to another that it would give him pleasure to see some of the *Hispaniolized* members present treated to the same reward. Continues Streeter: "had the penalty been carried out in the English Council, as intimated, several among the members would have found it necessary to make their exit by another way than the door, and among them Sir George Calvert." It may be added that the punishment of fenestration consisted in throwing the offender out of the window.

To return to Calvert's appointment to the Secretaryship. He hesitated to accept the office, and was doubtless sincere in giving a reluctant consent. He had been in office long enough to gain some insight into the fickleness and selfishness of the King's disposition, and the constant dismissals from office revealed to him the sword suspended by a thread. In the five years preceding the degradation of Lord Bacon, 1621, there had been immured in the Tower "a lord chancellor, a lord treasurer, a lord chamberlain, a lord admiral, a

master of the horse, a secretary of state, a master of the wards, a lord chief justice, and an attorney general." The appointment came to Calvert when tenure of office seemed extremely precarious. He could not fail to see also the war clouds looming up towards the east, soon to deluge the continent with blood for three decades. Towards the west he saw the Irish sullen and threatening. The Spaniards and the French were guided in their state policies by the tact and wisdom of Count Gondomar and Cardinal Richelieu, keen, active, unscrupulous diplomats. In England, itself, there was no peace; the people were split up into great religious and political factions, struggling for the mastery.

Calvert was aware that he could not count upon the co-operation of Buckingham, who wished the office for Carleton, Ambassador to Holland. The Ambassador was much disappointed in failing to secure the Secretaryship and his disappointment reflects the chagrin of Buckingham. Offers were made to Calvert to secure his resignation. A few weeks after the appointment, a friend wrote Carleton that the newly appointed Secretary had been considering his proposals and would probably accept them, and turn the office over to him [Carleton], but his ambition was not satisfied until long after King James was dead, and not until Calvert had become a resident of America.

A letter of the time says, "Sir George Calvert sworn Secretary. Buckingham declares the choice

the King's own, and that he would not have a more eminent man, for fear of reflecting on Secretary Naunton." It is improbable since Buckingham's claims were passed by, that the King would attach much importance to the scruples of Naunton, who was subsequently disgraced and deprived of the functions of his office. Buckingham concealed his chagrin and went in person to inform Calvert of his appointment. He "disabled himself divers ways, but specially that he thought himself unworthy to sit in that place so lately possessed by his noble Lord and Master" [Cecil]. The King sent for him and expressed himself much pleased at his modest and unassuming manner; he asked him questions concerning Lady Calvert, and was assured by Calvert that she was a model woman and under no circumstances would she imitate the conduct of Lady Lake, whom James had compared to Eve. Camden's *Annals* speaks as follows of the appointment: "the King returns to Theobalds, when he had appointed in the place of Tho. Lake, Geo. Calvert, Secretary, who was Clerk of the Crown, whose prudence and fidelity in State matters, Robert Cecil, Secretary, was thoroughly acquainted with, and of whose assistance also the King made much use, yea, and he judged that he would be a great help to Robert Naunton, the other Secretary."

Calvert received the seals of office and was sworn in on February 16, 1619; as he was the King's

choice, he probably paid nothing for the office; it was rumored that he presented the favorite with a rich jewel, probably to secure his friendly co-operation, but Buckingham declined the gift. The Lord Treasurer, subsequently appointed, paid for his white staff no less than 20,000 pounds.

In his "Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage," Gardiner, the well-known historian, gives the following pen picture of Secretary Calvert: "his [Lake's] successor was Sir George Calvert, an industrious, modest man, who might be trusted, like Naunton, to do his work silently and well. In former times he had been a Secretary of Salisbury, but his opinions fitted him to be the channel of communications which could not safely be entrusted to one who looked with extreme favor upon the Continental Protestants; for though he was anything but a thorough-going partisan of the Spanish monarchy, yet he had no sympathy whatever with those who thought that a war with Spain was a thing to be desired for its own sake."

The new secretary proved himself such an efficient public servant, that within a year he was appointed to the responsible position of "Commissioner for the office of the Treasurer." He and his colleague, Sir Lionel Cranfield, [Lord Middlesex,] received their appointment January 11, 1620. The duties of the Commissioners were very responsible. The Lord High Treasurer took rank as the

third great officer of the crown. Since the death of Cecil the office had been put in commission, now held by Calvert and Cranfield.

The year 1620 was one long to be remembered by Calvert. It saw him carried by an ebb tide far out upon the sea of political preferment and elevated above many of his old associates, and he was little conscious that the ebb tide would ere long turn into the flood and beat him back upon the strand bruised and disheartened. Buckingham was now gracious to him, and the King continued to show to him favors. While Bacon, his former associate in office, was grovelling in the dust before Buckingham, begging him to protect him from the coming storm, Calvert, a confidential advisor, was following the royal household from palace to palace and sumptuously entertained at the banquets given at Whitehall. The Great Chancellor was deprived of the Great Seal of office, was imprisoned and sentenced to pay an enormous fine; while Calvert was beginning to reap a golden harvest. Yet he could but feel hearty sympathy for the fallen minister, even though his patron, Cecil, had been uncompromising in his opposition to him. There can be no doubt that, when Calvert, Bacon and Arch. Abbott were commissioned to hear appeals from and perform certain administrative duties for the inhabitants of Jersey and Guernsey, the brilliant attainments of the

Attorney General, Bacon, had won the admiration of the methodical, careful Council Clerk. In his letter of December 5, 1620, Wentworth while electioneering for Calvert informed him of the high regard in which Bacon, Lord Chancellor, had held him; but Bacon himself was soon obliged to secure the aid of his friends. The only memorial of Calvert in existence, his portrait, was discovered in the last century, at Gorhambury, (near St. Alban's), the residence of Lord Bacon.

James bestowed on Calvert in May, 1620, an annual pension of 1000*l.* paid out of the customs duties. His nominal salary as Secretary of State probably did not exceed 200*l.* In this year he also received an increased grant on silk, to continue for twenty-one years. A facetious writer of the times had said "those that are nearest the well-head know not with what bucket to draw for themselves or their friends;" Calvert used no bucket but his own, but it generally came to the surface well filled. He continued to receive his revenues on silk uninterruptedly, notwithstanding his checkered career. In August, 1624, he received a letter from Wentworth, congratulating him upon the receipt of his 150 bales of silk. It was worth at this time about thirty shillings per pound. An entry in the Calendars of March 2, 1631, reads: "Warrant to pay to George, Lord Baltimore, 2,000*£*, to be deducted out of the increase of subsidy on raw

silk imported." The latest entry in the Calendars, October 31, 1631, is interesting from the fact that it indicates that for some reason Calvert surrenders his irregular, but extremely lucrative grants on silk for an annual pension. It is not improbable that he made the surrender to Charles, who, since his last Parliament in 1628, was becoming more and more straightened for money, in order to secure a favorable answer to his petition for the grant of land in Virginia. The entry reads as follows: "Grant to George, Lord Baltimore, (in consideration of his surrender of letters patent formerly granted to him upon the increase of subsidy upon every great pound of raw long silk and raw Morea silk, *and of his good service*) of a pension of 1000l. per annum, payable out of the impositions of all sorts of wines imported into this Kingdom, for 21 years from the feast of the Annunciation [March 25] 1632, with a discharge of 2000l. unpressted to him upon the grant of the increase of subsidy upon raw silk above mentioned." In this year, 1620, Calvert made his purchase of Avalon; it is not probable that in the days of the impecunious Charles he received Maryland without paying an equivalent.

The year 1621 was the beginning of Calvert's busiest career. At the Council Board and in the House his voice and his pen were kept actively employed. In the one he advocated a stronger

alliance with Spain, and at the other he was kept at work negotiating treaties with the Dutch and others, while, at the same time, his own estates in Ireland and his settlements in Newfoundland demanded his personal oversight.

There is no doubt that he was now beginning to feel the influence of the clerical party that finally succeeded in drawing him over to their side. Gradually, perhaps imperceptibly, he was alienating himself from the policy of his late patron, Cecil, and from the religious faith of his fathers. In pursuing the task assigned him by his master, he was becoming politically a strong advocate of the Spanish Match, and personally of the Spanish religion. On the eve of the meeting of Parliament doubtless three courses of political activity suggested themselves to him, to take a neutral position on the Spanish Match, to cast his lot with the majority in Parliament and oppose the Match, or openly to favor the Match and earnestly work for its consummation. When the Parliament assembled in February (1621), Calvert was one of the few members who eulogized alliance with Spain. It was a surprising blunder for an astute statesman to put himself in antagonism to the great body of the English people, for he surely saw the signs of the times; but the choice once made was consistently followed and clung to until it brought him to the awkward

alternative, either to resign his office and retire to private life or to play the part of a political weathercock, renouncing his former policy and so continuing to bask in the royal favor. When the moment came he resigned his offices, bade adieu to the Court, and retired to private life.

His reasons for advocating the marriage of Prince Charles to the Spanish Infanta are not clearly understood. They were not based upon religious enthusiasm nor due to fear of losing his official position. As a political measure, it was probably dictated by the dread he had of the power of Spain and the respect he had for their immense wealth; in one sense it would be a good financial measure as it would fill the purse of the bankrupt King of England. Of the calumnies and innuendoes directed against Calvert none is less warranted than the statement that he had been bribed by Spanish gold. Count Gondomar, the representative of Spain at the English Court, is said to have been the agent who bought the influence and services of the Secretary. It is well for Rapin's reputation that he did not write such history. It is true a recent editor of Rapin's History gives it as a rumor that Calvert had been bribed by Gondomar, but Rapin is not responsible for the unwarranted annotations of his editors. Gondomar may have had much influence over Calvert, as he had over the minds of hundreds of

contemporary Englishmen, but it was not that kind of influence that is stimulated by the sight of money and jewels.

The year 1621 had been ushered in not by the peals of joyful bells but by the ominous thundering of cannon, the groans of the oppressed and the hoarse cries of political and religious partisans. The reports and rumors from the seat of war on the Continent united nearly all classes in England in a clamor for the King to unsheath his sword and bid defiance to Spain and the German Emperor. The entrance of Spanish troops into the Palatinate of his son-in-law, the fall of Prague in November, the precipitate flight of Frederick and his wife to England aroused even James to action. He at once summoned Parliament. The proclamation for the new Parliament was issued November 6th, 1620. The last Parliament held was the Addled Parliament of 1614. In his proclamation the King had admonished the electors "not to choose any noted for superstitious blindness one way, or of turbulent humours another," but "obedient children of mother-church." The county electors were warned to choose as Knights of the shire no "bankrupt or discontented persons, who could fish only in troubled waters." The admonition of the King was not heeded and many persons of "turbulent humours," unfortunately for his peace of mind,

were sent to the Parliament. In this excitable Parliament of 1621, Calvert had been elected to represent Yorkshire. His election was almost entirely due to the resistless energy, tact and wisdom of Wentworth. Innumerable letters, persistent button-holing, and the promise of a great Christmas dinner to his followers secured for Wentworth the majority of votes for himself and his colleague Calvert; but Sir John Savile, the leader of the opposition, had set a great task for Wentworth. The great shire of York had been traversed on all sides by mounted local politicians working in the interest of the rival candidates. Secretary Calvert had been absent so long from his native town that he had almost ceased to be regarded as a resident of the shire, and had little local popularity. Wentworth was entertaining an intense hatred for Savile and was determined to defeat his parliamentary aspirations. He had refused to hand over the office of *Custos Rotulorum* to Savile, even at Buckingham's request, and had determined to elect as colleague one who would be a thorn in the side of Buckingham and so vent his wrath upon Buckingham and his ally Savile. This object he secured in the election of Calvert. This election is of peculiar interest since it cemented the friendship between Calvert and Wentworth, and laid the beginnings of the latter's bitter animosity to Buckingham.

The House of Commons assembled February 5th, 1621, the "greatest concourse and throng of people being present," says an eye witness. The Country party had an overwhelming majority over the Court party and they made an effective application of their power. James did not forget this Parliament of 1621, and Calvert who stood up almost alone in his defense of the King's policy did not soon forget the hisses that often greeted his remarks. There were a number of grievances to be redressed by the Commons as the growth of monopolies and the dishonesty of certain great officials, but for a moment all else was forgotten as they thought of the King's passive foreign policy. On the very first day Calvert made a speech for a supply of the King's wants. It was listened to with a feeling of curiosity mingled with suspicion. He reminded the members this was the principal motive for summoning Parliament, and after a review of the King's foreign policy, he concluded his address as follows: "All Christendom is in confusion—Germany, Bohemia, the Low Countries, Sweden and Poland are agitated and distrustful—the Turk has mustered the largest army he has ever brought together since the time of Solyman, and, by the first of March, it will be ready for action. When so many swords are drawn, it would be dishonorable indeed, should the King of England allow his to remain

in its sheath. Grievances there are doubtless; many and justly complained of; there is no body without some sores; but these are secondary; the King has promised that he will give a gracious hearing on that score; and he that will not rely on that promise betrays the country which has trusted him. I move, therefore, for a committee on the Supply." He asked for a subsidy of 30,000 pounds. "*Bis dat, qui cito dat,*" had exclaimed James in his opening speech. "Supply and grievances should go hand in hand," declared Sir Edward Coke, the disgraced Chief-Justice, in reply to Calvert. The rhetoric of the Secretary was doubtless more effective than his logic was convincing. His arguments ran;—the King has been struggling to unsheath his sword, but the hilt is held down by royal debts, therefore let the Commons grant a subsidy and the royal sword will be brandished in the face of the enemy. In the caricatures of the day James was frequently represented as wearing a huge scabbard, empty; or else a scabbard containing a sword at which many were tugging, but none could withdraw. He was also represented with his pockets empty and hanging down, and his purse turned inside out. It is to be feared the caricatures had made a deeper impression than Calvert's speech. Calvert's forwardness was regarded as very untimely, before any other business had been considered, and much

indignation was expressed, but the speech was known to have been delivered at the King's command. As is well known both houses of Parliament, at present, indicate their independence by considering some bill of their own before considering the Crown's message. One writer does say that Calvert "was censured in the Commons for his forward speech about contribution," but the censure was not an official action. The noisy opposition that greeted his opening remarks had hushed before he had finished, and the members were silenced if not entirely convinced. The bill was appropriately referred and a supply granted. Gardiner says Calvert's "conciliatory temper would in happier times have gained him the respect of the House." At any rate his present success was certain and thoroughly appreciated by the anxious King. "With the prospect of a grant of money," continues Gardiner, "he was beyond measure delighted. He ordered one of the Privy Councillors to inform the Commons that their conduct had made a great impression upon him."

It seemed for a moment as if the bonds uniting the King and the Commons had been indissolubly strengthened by the tact and prudence of Calvert. The House had made the grant to the King as "a testimony of their devotion," but the devotion was soon turned to hatred and the bonds violently sundered. Occasional fitful outbursts of

passion preceded the great storm that hurled the great Lord Chancellor down into the dust and that almost shook the throne itself.

The Secretary at once secured the confidence of the House by his apparent hostility towards the papal adherents, but he soon afterwards drew upon himself a great storm of indignation by the favors he showed towards Spain, through its ambassadors. Hansard says that on February 14th, (1621) was voted by the Commons "a conference for putting the laws in execution against Jesuits, &c." A committee consisting of "Sir Edw. Coke accompanied with the lord Cavendish, sir Fulk Grevil chanc. of the excheq., the Treasurer of the Household, mr. sec. Calvert, and several others of that house, delivered the following message to the Lords:—That the Commons do pray a Conference, concerning joining in Petition by committees of both houses unto his maj. for the better execution of the laws against Jesuits, seminary Priests and Popish Recusants; and this by the Nether House, is desired to be with all convenient expedition." Calvert lost the respect of many members, and almost forfeited the confidence of the Commons, by his apparent favoritism towards the Spanish ambassador, Gondomar. According to Gardiner, English naval stores, and particularly ordnance, were at this time (1621) highly prized on the Continent by the belligerents in the pending

struggle (The 30-Years' War). The exportation of English ordnance was "strictly forbidden, and the prohibition was only occasionally suspended as a special favor to the representatives of foreign nations. When, therefore, it was known that leave had been given to Gondomar to send a hundred guns out of the kingdom, the Commons were roused to an indignant remonstrance against the impolicy of furnishing arms to the enemies of the German Protestants. They listened with sullen displeasure to Calvert's explanation. James himself was obliged to come to the support of his Secretary. The license he said had been granted two years before, and could not now be revoked." The King was gracious to Calvert, and in less than a fortnight after the opening of Parliament, he made him the recipient of the grant of land in Longford county (February 18th, 1621). He makes mention of his Secretary as "a person deserving of his royal bounty." But Calvert's enemies in the House were active and vindictive. Within a week after the assembling of the Commons, Sir John Savile, the defeated candidate, had stirred up a strong opposition to Calvert and Wentworth, his rivals. The legality of their election was questioned, and it was rumored an attempt would be made to unseat them, but no official action was taken.

During the last week in February, an interesting debate took place between Sir Edwin Sandys and

Sir George Calvert upon the oft-mooted and still fruitful theme, money. The depression of trade, the ruinous falls in the value of land, and the general distress and poverty, argued Sir Edwin, resulted from the scarcity of coin. "The fountain of money," he continued, "is Spain. We have heretofore had from that country, yearly, one hundred thousand pounds. . . . Now we get no money from that country because we take so much of her tobacco; whereas if we would take that article from places under the protection of the crown, money must flow in from Spain." He concluded by urging the entire prohibition of the importation of Spanish tobacco. Calvert was the last to speak upon the debate. He was now cultivating no tobacco at Avalon, and was not personally interested in the encouragement of tobacco raising in the colonies, but probably in his arguments he arose above personal considerations. He dwelt upon the political advantages of maintaining relations with Spain. He argued, "it would be impolitic to prohibit the importation of Spanish tobacco," since free trade had been guaranteed to the merchants of each country, by treaty. The English merchants were now driving a large trade with Spain, receiving in exchange for their merchandise much Spanish gold. But the arguments of Sandys prevailed, the House resolved "that the importation of tobacco out of Spain is one occasion

of the scarcity of money in this kingdom." The unwitting testimony of the House to the great financial resources of Spain led Secretary Calvert to be even more cautious in his dealings with this power.

The House soon began to make attempts to curtail the royal prerogative. In despair of changing the passive, halting, foreign policy of James, they turned fiercely upon the redress of domestic grievances. Their first onset was upon monopolies. The King resisted, but in vain. Finally "he yielded to the storm and abandoned monopolies." They next attacked the King's ministers and were again successful. In preferring charges against the Lord Chancellor, the illustrious Bacon, they made a sharp and telling thrust at the King, and made him tremble for fear and indignation. The articles of impeachment were sustained, and Lord Bacon, in his own opinion, "the justest Chancellor" since his father's time, was abandoned by Buckingham and turned over to the tender mercies of the Commons. Heavily fined, imprisoned, stripped of all his privileges as an English citizen, he was forced to cry out, "I beseech your lordships, be merciful unto a broken reed." Calvert had boldly supported the King's prerogative in the House, and now was an earnest advocate of alliance with Spain. Probably many would like to see him receive the fate of the Chancellor, whose place in

the House, as a medium of communication with the King, he must now occupy.

During intervals in the stormy proceedings some purely economic topics were discussed. After the debate on the prohibition of Spanish tobacco, the Free Fishery question was agitated. The Commons were again treading upon dangerous ground, for the King considered that he had the entire control of colonial jurisdiction, and the House had no right to intermeddle. On the Fishery question Calvert was again in the minority, the House endorsed the sentiments of Sandys, "that a free liberty should be allowed to all the King's subjects to fish" upon the Newfoundland coast, now in possession of the Plymouth Company. Calvert "doubted whether the fishermen were not the hinderers of the plantation. That they burn great store of woods and choke the havens. He never would strain the King's prerogative against the good of the Commonwealth. It was not fit to make any laws here for those countries, which were not as yet annexed to the crown." This debate took place on April 25th, 1621. Calvert had but recently made an extensive purchase of territory in Newfoundland, and was personally interested in the Fishery question; he also felt his colonial privileges would be safer in the keeping of the King than in the keeping of Parliament. His fears, however, were allayed, for the bill was killed;

either negatived by the Lords or vetoed by the King. Chalmers says, probably incorrectly, that "owing to the reasons suggested by the Secretary of State, [Calvert,] it did not become the law of the realm." In Calvert's Charter of Maryland, the right was reserved "to all the subjects of our kingdoms of England and Ireland," of "salting and drying fish on the shores of the same province, [Maryland], and, for that cause to cut down and take hedging-wood and twigs there growing, and to build huts and cabins, necessary in this behalf," provided no "notable damage or injury" was sustained by the Lord Proprietary or the inhabitants of the province.

An ominous foreboding prevailed in the House when they were informed, in February, 1622, by Secretary Calvert, that the King intended to prorogue Parliament in a few days. It looked for a moment as if the past stormy scenes would be repeated. The members were intensely indignant that time was not allowed them to act upon important bills pending, now in the hands of committees. They had given the King a large supply, and had not expected such an untimely adjournment. They feared to meet their constituency with empty hands, as one speaker graphically stated it. They had granted much and had received nothing. After the excitement was somewhat allayed, Calvert arose and expressed his great surprise at the

demeanor of the House. The King's prerogative to summons, prorogue and adjourn Parliament, he argued, had never before been questioned. Certain religious grievances did call for redress, but mere discussion would accomplish nothing. In conclusion he exclaimed, "this Parliament hath married the King and the people, by a right understanding of each other, and cursed be the man that seeks to put them asunder." A great cry of "Amen" broke forth from all parts of the House.

Calvert was elated when he saw with what intense enthusiasm the Parliament adjourned. One who was present says: "that the like has scarce ever been seen in Parliament." On Monday, June 4th, in the course of an animated address, Sir James Perrott moved for a solemn Declaration that unless the continental powers would conclude satisfactory treaties with England during the recess, the Commons upon re-assembling would support their King with their fortunes, their swords and their lives. "The proposition was received with the utmost enthusiasm; and with the lifting of hands, the waving of hats, and the shouts of the excited members, the Declaration was read and adopted." Sir Edward Coke then arose and with tears in his eyes recited the Collect for the King and the Royal family.

During the recess of Parliament James had time to consider the best methods of securing the

co-operation of the House to his long cherished scheme of wedding "Baby Charles" to the Infanta of Spain. The King doubtless had many conversations upon the subject with Gondomar and Calvert. One great obstacle in the way was the inflexible perverseness of the House. Almost to a man they detested and yet dreaded the power of Spain. When the House had again assembled Calvert met the members with an unflinching courage, worthy of a better cause, though his manner was conciliatory and his words temperate. The members gathered together in November in no pleasant mood. Their constituents had vented upon them their disappointment, and the imprisonment of certain of their number had stirred up their wrath. The King's policy towards the continental powers was at once introduced and hotly debated; and Calvert was again on his feet to defend his master. Philips, an eloquent, but impulsive debater, had just delivered a vehement speech against the King's foreign policy, and favored the withholding of supplies. He was followed in a similar strain by Sir Edward Giles. "Calvert saw that it was time to interfere. In a few weighty words he explained the policy of the Government." He fully recognized the fact that "the friendship among princes is as their strength and interest is. He would not have our King to trust to the King of Spain's affection. As for the delaying of a supply

any longer, if we do it, our supply will come too late! It is said our King's sword hath been too long sheathed; but they who shall speak to defer a supply seek to keep it longer in the scabbard." "If James," says Gardiner, "instead of loitering at Newmarket, had been there to confirm his Secretary's words, he would have carried everything before him." The same historian continues, "For a short time it seemed as if Calvert's words had not been without their effect. Of the three speakers who rose after him, not one recurred to Philips' proposals to withhold supplies. But the distrust was too deeply seated to be easily removed. . . . Amongst the few who listened with dissatisfaction to the introduction of this irritating topic was Sir Thomas Wentworth, Calvert's youthful colleague in the representation of Yorkshire. . . . He [Wentworth] proposed, with the evident intention of giving time to communicate with the King, that the debate should be adjourned for some days. It was not an unwise suggestion, and if it had come from one with whom the House could sympathize, it might perhaps have been adopted. As it was, its rejection was certain. The renewal of the discussion was fixed for the following morning," and Calvert was again extolling the wisdom of the extravagant King. "Put not your trust in princes," had sung the Jewish minstrel, and James's Secretary could re-echo the sentiment.

While the King was recklessly wasting his money on the races at Newmarket, Calvert was strenuously endeavoring to replenish his impoverished exchequer, and in warding off the blows levelled at the King by the irate Commons, he was laying up for himself wrath and bitter enmity. One stroke was not parried before another was given from another unexpected quarter.

During the recess of Parliament, Sir Edwin Sandys, one of its members, had been arrested for his alleged conspiracy with Southampton in negotiating with Frederick and Elizabeth to seat them again upon the throne of Bohemia; he was at once sent to the tower and imprisoned for a month. A commission consisting of the Duke of Lennox, Marquis of Buckingham, Earl of Arundel, Sir Lionel Cranfield and Secretary Calvert had been appointed by James to examine into the charges brought against Sandys and his fellow-prisoners. Towards the end of July the prisoners were released. The arbitrary exercise of the King's prerogative was warmly discussed in the fall session of Parliament, and severely denounced. After many speakers had expressed their indignation at the event, Calvert arose to defend the action of the King, by declaring that the arrest and imprisonment of Sandys had not been occasioned by anything said or done in Parliament. One member took occasion to say in reply, "the house

will scarce believe Mr. Secretary, but thinketh he equivocateth." Mr. Spencer replied to Calvert with a great deal of warmth, in conclusion he said: "The speech of that honourable person [Calvert] that spoke touching this matter, gave me no satisfaction. For he said, it was not for any thing done or spoken in the house. . . . I would gladly know whether we are not as free to speak in Westminster-hall, as here: and whether we are a parl. in the forenoon, and not in the afternoon. Then farewell privileges, and farewell England!" "Calvert's statement," says Gardiner, "though literally true, was received with general incredulity, and murmurs of dissatisfaction were heard on every side. It was only upon Calvert's agreeing that his words should be entered upon the clerk's books that calm was restored." The Commons were apparently convinced but not fully satisfied. They hastened two of their members down into Kent to obtain from Sandys his version of the proceedings. The King heard of their distrust and the very next day sent them a tart letter for their presumption in sending a committee to wait upon Sandys. He told them in plain language that they had no business "to talk or write sawcily" of matters not pertaining to them; he strictly charged them to refrain from debating upon the marriage of his son, and not "to use reproachful language against his dear brother of Spain." The fiery leaders seem to have been

absent, for the Commons immediately sent the King a letter humbly apologising for intermeddling in the *Arcana Imperii*.

Calvert was no longer the silent Secretary described by Gardiner. He had ceased doing his work quietly, but had continued to do it well. In the Council and in the House he was now a conspicuous personage. The entire year 1621, beginning with the assembling of Parliament in February had kept him very busy and in continual excitement. The irritability of the King in his illness and his extravagant behavior, the increasing demands of the Commons and the antagonism between the King and his subjects upon the foreign policy had called forth from the Secretary the continual exercise of courtesy and diplomacy. It was his constant aim to bridge over the gulf between the King and the Commons, and yet not to curtail the royal prerogative. After the disgrace of Bacon, a part of the Parliamentary duties of the Chancellor seemed to have devolved upon the Secretary. He served as a medium of communication between the Crown and the Commons, and was often instructed to deliver the King's addresses by "word of mouth," to the House. Letters from James to the Commons were directed either to the Speaker or to Secretary Calvert; and as a representative from Yorkshire, he was burdened by the demands of a large constituency, frequently

unfriendly to him ; and his cares were necessarily further increased by the exceeding difficulty of reconciling his duties as a representative with his duties as privy Councillor and Secretary. Had he been willing to imitate the procrastinating, shiftless methods of Buckingham, his task would have given him little uneasiness.

But in the midst of all his public and private affairs, the Secretary preserved a calm, unruffled, affable demeanor, the quiet dignity of self-conscious strength and integrity. A very interesting pen picture of Calvert as he appeared towards the close of the year 1621 has been preserved. The French Ambassador, Tilli ers, resident at the English Court, in a letter of November 25, 1621, made the following observations of what he saw at London : " the control of public affairs rested with the King, Buckingham and the Secretary of State " [Calvert]. After mentioning the King's apathy in public affairs, he continues, " the Marquis presumptuously meddles with all affairs, domestic and foreign, though he in fact knows nothing of either, . . . the third man, in whose hands the public affairs are ostensibly placed is Calvert, Secretary of State. He is an honorable, sensible, well-minded man, courteous towards strangers, full of respect towards ambassadors, zealously intent upon the welfare of England ; but by reason of all these good qualities, entirely without consid-

eration or influence." This account of Calvert is particularly attractive as it represents him during the most active part of his career. It is very probably reliable, because it comes from an ambassador and a Frenchman. As a Frenchman he must have known that Calvert was the leader of the Spanish party, and as an ambassador he must have been a careful if not a keen observer. This was the Calvert upon whom the king relied in his communications with the famous parliament of 1621.

Fortunately for the peace of mind of the Secretary, the session was rapidly drawing to its close; but it closed in a manner that fully harmonized with the entire proceedings. On the day appointed for the discussion of the question of privilege in the Committee of the Whole (December 17), Calvert arose and proceeded to read a letter just received from the King, directed to himself. The tenor of the letter and the manner of the speaker were so conciliatory that further action upon the question of the day was deferred till the following day. The Commons then at once drew up a "petition of thanks" to be sent his majesty by a select committee; but while the committee was on its way to Theobald's with their olive branch, the Commons were again aroused to action, and hastily drew up the famous "Protestation." James was indignant at the conduct of the members, and on the eve of the last day of December he entered

the council chamber, and summoning the Clerk of the House, ordered him to produce the Journal of the House, in which had been recorded the Protestation. The King was offended at the resolution because "it contained words which may be construed so as to invade most of the prerogatives of the Crown; therefore in full assembly of Council and in presence of the judges, his majesty erased it from the Journal book with his own hand, and ordered an act of Council to be entered thereof" [Cal. Eng. State Papers]. Calvert has been censured for coinciding with James in his quarrels with the Commons. Perhaps he did sympathize to some extent with the Commons, even if he did not approve of their methods; but at any rate, it was not difficult to persuade himself that the King was not altogether in the wrong. He did not follow the King blindly or from sordid motives. He recognized and accepted the issue. He had declared in the House that he would not press the King's prerogative beyond its just bounds, but he felt that it would be suicidal to James and a dangerous experiment to the country to admit all the extravagant claims and pretensions of the House. Grievances must be redressed, but not hurriedly; he recognized that there was a limit to the surrender of prerogative. Calvert would not willingly assist in turning over to Philips and Sandys the reins of government, and let the King

be driven from the throne. About a fortnight previous to the adoption of the "Protestation" by the House, James wrote Secretary Calvert a letter which assured him of the King's good intentions. The King says that "he is so loath to have the time of the Commons spent in discussing his letter, that he descends from his dignity to explain that his objections to their calling their privileges those of inheritance rather than toleration, arose merely from hatred of anti-monarchical words; never intends to infringe on any privilege which they enjoy either by justice, grace or long custom; but rather to maintain and increase them. Urges that they proceed at once to business and refrain from further wrangling about words." Calvert felt with James that the supremacy of Parliament meant the supremacy of the people, and the supremacy of the people meant the repetition of those scenes of peasant revolutions that had threatened the very existence of the governments on the Continent. Calvert recognized the extreme weakness of the King's reply to Parliament, though he was loath to admit it to the indignant members; Hallam says: "Calvert, the Secretary, and the other ministers admitted the King's expressions to be incapable of defense, and called them a slip of the pen at the close of a long answer." The Secretary, however, dreaded an open rupture between the King and the Commons, and gladly welcomed the close of the stormy session.

After the adjournment of the Parliament of 1621, Secretary Calvert turned his attention more intently upon the ministerial and diplomatic duties of his office, but his duties in the House had not prevented him from jealously guarding the interests of England abroad. A break with Holland seemed to be imminent from the difficulty of compromising the opposing claims of the Dutch and the English East India Companies. These two companies had many disputes about their conflicting claims to territory in the East, their mutual interference with each other's trade, and the seizure of each other's vessels and cargoes. So heated grew the disputes that both England and Holland found it expedient to appoint Commissioners and to have all differences adjusted by arbitration and treaty. Both Calvert and Carleton took an active part in the negotiations. On July 24, 1621, Calvert had written to Carleton, Ambassador at the Hague, in allusion to the Dutch Commissioners sent to the England, "if their bad usage and neglect is continued, it will shake the amity between the Crown and the Provinces [Holland], and they will be the first to repent of it. The persistency of the Dutch is illustrated by a letter which Calvert wrote to Carleton nine months afterwards: "We stick still here in our treaty with the States' Ambassadors, not having concluded any one article; the fault is theirs and not ours, who have

yielded more than was reason; finding them, nevertheless, hacking and taking all advantage upon the least difference." Calvert was anxious to conclude a treaty with the Dutch as favorable as possible to the English Company, for he would not only promote his own personal interests but he would also secure an advantage to the English people, for the East India Co. was an important factor in English commerce, and it brought a large revenue to the crown. A letter of the year 1622 affirms that "goods bought in India for 356,288l. have produced in England 1,914,600l." Calvert was acting not simply as a Privy Councillor, or a Treasury Commissioner, or Secretary, but he had been appointed by James on the special commission to confer with the Dutch. Upon the completion of the treaty in 1623, Calvert wrote to Carleton as follows :

"After some thirteen months' debate with the States' Ambassadors about our East Indian quarrels, we have at last made an end and parted good friends, though with much loss and disadvantage to the English Company, as is conceived. This day they take their leave of the King."

The Dutch had adduced abundant proof that the English had fired upon and burnt their ships and stolen their cargoes. They were determined not to leave England until their injuries had been redressed. They were much elated over their success-

ful diplomacy, though it is not improbable that Calvert yielded somewhat in order to secure their friendly co-operation in the mooted alliance of England with Spain. In his reply to Calvert's letter, Carleton writes: "the States' Ambassadors landed in the Maese on Monday last and have made so good a report of their business and of the King's gracious usage of them during the whole of their long stay in England, that they remain here much comforted and well assured that our Match with Spain will breed no divorce with this State, of which there hath been of late days no small jealousy." In the English archives the treaty is designated: "Reglement between the English and Dutch East India Company. In 8 articles corrected and with marginal notes by Sec. Calvert."

Scarcely a year had elapsed since the signing of the Dutch treaty, when a thrill of horror passed over all Europe at the reception of the news of the torturing and the massacre of the English residents in the East by Dutch traders. In an outburst of anger Carleton wrote to Calvert, August 11, 1624, that he "has his hands as full of as tough a piece of work as he ever had in his life about the bloody business of Amboyna, which we must not suffer to be washed away with words." The Amboyna Massacre was not washed away with words, the bloodstains were almost indelible; but fortunately for Calvert's peace of mind the settlement

of the knotty question was entrusted to other hands.

Certain minor affairs were also entrusted to the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Among other local duties, he was particularly interested in the administration of the islands of Guernsey and Jersey. At one time he submits a report upon "the castles, forts, ordnance and supplies" of the islands, at another time we find him in receipt of letters from dissatisfied residents urging him to exercise "the vigor of your authority, for crosses fail not, Satan being vexed that they try to abolish his reign." In the early part of the year 1622, a warm triangular fight was waging between the Bailiff of Jersey, the Dean and the Governor upon questions of jurisdiction and appointments to office. The Secretary was obliged to interfere to restore order.

The year 1622 was made memorable to Calvert by its vicissitudes of joy and sorrow, of worldly prosperity and of domestic unhappiness. In the midst of his pleasurable anticipations upon the Spanish Match, his spirits were cast into gloom by the sudden death of his amiable wife, on August 8, after an illness of but two days, at the age of 52 years, leaving behind her eleven young children. The oldest child, Cecilius, who became the heir of his father's fortune and title, was but sixteen years old; Leonard and George a decade after this time

emigrated to the colony of Maryland; of Francis and Henry very little is known; John, born on the eve of his mother's death, is said to have died in youth. Of the five daughters little is known, save their names; Anne, the eldest, married Mr. William Peasley, and Grace became the wife of Sir Robert Talbot of County Kildare, Ireland; Dorothy, Elizabeth and Helen completed the family. The death of his wife was a severe blow to Calvert. Long afterwards he makes mention of her in tender terms in his letters to Wentworth; he caused a tablet to be placed in the Hertingfordbury Church as a memorial of her virtues and as a token of his sorrow.

The proceedings of the New England Company of which he, in this year, had been appointed a Councillor, the reports from the Virginia Company, in which he was interested, and the correspondence of his colonists in Newfoundland, which in this year had been entirely granted to him, served to divert his attention from his domestic grief. The multitudinous duties of his office also pressed upon him. One month after the departure from England of Gondomar (March, 1622), the Secretary was named a special commissioner by the King to arrest and to punish Seminary priests and other recusant clergy remaining in the country contrary to the law. The results of the investigations are not known, but it is somewhat significant that he

should accept such a position so soon after the departure of the Spanish Ambassador, who was said by some to have converted Calvert to Catholicism.

Calvert reached the zenith of his political career during the year 1623. Its opening had been very auspicious. The sun rose bright and cheerful and predicted a long term of sunshine and a radiant noontide, but the bells that tolled the death of the year also tolled the death-knell of the political policy of the Secretary. The evil genius who had shadowed his pathway finally brought about his fall and his retirement into private life. Buckingham, it is true, had become to all appearance reconciled to Calvert, and probably had meditated him no personal injury, but it was the reckless conduct of the Duke in Spain that shattered the airy castle of the Secretary, and drove him to tender his resignation and to seek a new field of activity in America.

The Spain of Calvert's time was a grand Empire, extending over portions of both the Old and the New World. Generally regarded as the possessor of enormous wealth and of vast resources, she was a strong ally in peace and in war was dreaded as a dangerous enemy. Forgetting for the moment that a house or a country divided against itself cannot stand, and dazzled by the glare of Spanish extravagance, Calvert had hoped to extend the

sway of England and make her a strong power by effecting a permanent alliance between his own country and the strongest of continental nations. Perhaps in looking down the vista of centuries he saw the time when England's King would become the peer of the German Emperor and the House of Stuart would reign over millions of continental subjects and control the destinies of myriads in the New World. The protégé of Cecil had abandoned the foreign policy of his patron and had gradually become a leader of the Spanish party. To Secretary Calvert, therefore, was entrusted the delicate and dangerous business of negotiating, at home, the consummation of the Spanish Match.

The Secretary entered upon his work at the very beginning of the year. A letter of the date, February 27, 1623, written by the newly appointed Secretary, Conway, to the Lord President of the North, requests his lordship to inform the King from time to time of the proceedings of the Council "and to relieve therein Sec. Calvert, who has much foreign business now lying upon him." The foreign business engaging Calvert's attention may be presupposed from the contents of a long, interesting letter, of same date, written by Calvert to Carleton. In this letter, he writes: "On Monday, the 17th [February], the King went from Theobald's to Royston, and the Prince and Buck-

ingham to Newhall, pretending to join him at Newmarket, instead of which they posted from Newhall to Gravesend, thence in disguise to Dover, where being joined by Sir Fras. Cottington and Endymion Porter, sent on beforehand to provide shipping and to stop the ports, they sailed for France, en route for Spain. The rumor flew to Newmarket, where the Council knelt to implore the King to tell them if it was true. He said it was, the Prince passionately desiring thus to put an end to the business that so long distracted the King's affairs; but pomp and splendour being inconvenient, he had gone privately. His Majesty reminded them how he, his father, and his grandfather had gone to Scotland to fetch their wives. After long discourses, they persuaded him to send some person of distinction after the Prince, in case he was stayed in France, and Lord Carlisle was chosen and sent off at once. The Prince and Duke sailed on the 19th, at five A. M., were very sick at sea, landed at Boulogne at noon, reached Paris on the 21st and left on the 23d at four A. M."

This letter proves almost conclusively that besides the King, and the two Knights errant, the best informed person of the escapade was Secretary Calvert. The entire Council, save himself, had been kept in profound ignorance. It took the runaways four days to reach Paris from Dover, yet within the four days succeeding their departure from

Paris, Calvert was in receipt of detailed information concerning all their movements.

The flight of Prince Charles produced a feeling of profound consternation both in England and across the Channel. Dud. Carleton, writing to his uncle at the Hague, said, "not one of the Council, except Buckingham, knew of it beforehand and all profess great apprehension." The apprehensions of others do not seem to have been shared by Calvert. He appears to have been unconscious of or indifferent to the general sentiment of the English people. If unconscious of the intense hatred of Spain felt by the common people, then he must have totally misjudged the meaning of the tumults of the late Parliament; however, he bent every energy to cement friendly relations between the two powers by means of the marriage of the Prince and Infanta. The official correspondence of this period indicate Calvert's activity and influence. While Secretary Conway is busily engaged upon the Scotch affairs and other domestic matters, Secretary Calvert is made the vehicle of communication between the King, the Duke, and Bristol, Ambassador at Madrid. In a letter of April 1, 1623, Conway reproves Sir Richard Bingley for hesitating to comply with Calvert's instructions because they were not endorsed by the King. He directs Bingley "to hasten to Spain according to Calvert's directions, whether Lord Vaughan become

or not. Advises him to acknowledge his faults of ignorance against Secretary Calvert, or he must be made to answer for it." Frequent letters passed between the King, Buckingham, and Calvert, during the progress of the negotiations. The Duke addressed the King as "Dere Dad and Gossepe," and subscribed himself, "Your Maj. most humble slave and dog, Steenie." James in one of his letters writes: "The newis of youre gloriouse receiptain thaire makes me afrayed that ye will both miskenne your olde Dad hereafter." In a letter of April 3, 1623, to Buckingham, Calvert writes: "there is amongst all honest men an universal joy for the good news brought us by Mr. Grymes, and we have made the best expression of it we can for the present. I hope it shall every day increase, first for the general good, and next for the great part of honor your Lordship hath in it." In May, Calvert wrote to the Duke: "His Majesty commands me to write unto your lordship about the portion and to put you in mind of that, of which I doubt not, but you will be careful enough without it, that is, that there be no diminution or falling from the first offer of six hundred thousand pounds; for that his Majesty hath had some cause given him to conceive that they begin there to think upon a less sum."

While Bristol and Buckingham are planning, banqueting, and at times quarrelling at the Spanish

Court, the Secretary is busily occupied in London, furnishing entertainment to the Spanish Ambassadors and their retinue. As the rumors of the pending negotiations percolated down through the masses, their indignation vented itself in acts of violence that required all Calvert's tact to ward off from the Spaniards. James had directed Calvert, in March, to allow "no ruffling words to be used to the Ambassadors," but this injunction did not prevent the London canaille from hooting them and throwing small missiles at them as they passed along the streets. The turbulence of the English mob in 1623 may be partly understood by observations of Baron D'Haussez, in "Great Britain in 1633." This French minister affirmed that "the lower classes in England are distinguished by a grossness of manners which places them lower in the social scale than any other nation. They are at once ferocious and depraved; their instincts dispose them to a state of permanent aggression against the rest of society." But the expressions of popular discontent did not weigh heavily with the busy Secretary. At the royal banquets given in honor of the Spanish Ambassadors, he was one of the gayest spirits. He followed the progress of the royal party in the spring of 1623, and at the entertainments he was conspicuous for his joviality. Chamberlain writing in May says, "the King kept St. George's feast at Windsor. . . . Secretary

Calvert was very gay and gallant there, all in white, cap-a-pie, even to his white hat and white feather."

The Secretary's mind was at times illumined with pleasure in receiving from his former colleague bright sparkling letters redolent with the odors of the Yorkshire hills and meadows. Wentworth urges him to take time to pay him a visit at his country seat, where the pastimes consisted, as he invitingly describes it, "in looking upon a tulip, hearing a bird sing, a rivulet murmuring." The uncompromising, energetic Wentworth was singularly drawn toward the courteous, thoughtful Secretary, and the correspondence between the two "cousins," as they called one another, forms an interesting chapter in the career of each. Calvert would gladly have hastened to Yorkshire, but he was too pressed for time. He indicated his regard for his friend by recommending to the King the appointment of Wentworth as deputy lieutenant of Yorkshire; but the King was not prepared to grant this honor to such a radical member of the Country party, and courteously passed by the request. It was not many years before Wentworth apostatized, and became the Lord President of the North.

Calvert devoted the summer of 1623, almost completely to the Spanish affairs. While Bristol, at Madrid, was using every means to move the

Spaniards to come to some speedy definite action, Calvert was employed at home in corresponding with Rome, in drawing up the marriage treaty, and in making elaborate preparations for the reception of Charles and his Spanish bride. Secretary Conway, the co-laborer of Calvert, had become the travelling companion of James; he had secured the King's confidence, but he transacted the King's orders through his "more experienced colleague." Conway was a good type of the courtier of the reign of James. His character and attainments stand in direct contrast to those of Calvert. Gardiner says: "it was soon understood at Court that he [Conway] had in reality no opinions of his own. His thoughts as well as his words were at the bidding of the great favorite [Buckingham]. In an age when complimentary expressions, which in our time would justly be considered servile, were nothing more than the accustomed phrases of polite society, Conway's letters to Buckingham stood alone in the fulsome and cloying flattery with which they were imbued." Owing to the incapacity of Conway, it became Calvert's duty, says Gardiner, "to write dispatches, to confer with foreign ambassadors and to attend to the details of business."

Sunday, July 20, 1623, was a day long to be remembered by Calvert. Doubtless the memories of its stirring events served to brighten many dark

days in store for him. It was the occasion of the "Solemn and Royall Entertainment given unto the two Spanish Ambassadors at Whitehall." The most important part of the services, held in the Royal Chapel, was the reading of the proposed treaty with Spain, containing the Marriage Contract. Besides the King there were present the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor and Keeper, the Lord Treasurer, the Lord President of the North, the Lord Privy Seal, and a large number of Dukes, Earls, Marquises, bishops, and members of the lower orders of nobility and clergy. Spain was represented by the two Ambassadors, dressed in gorgeous attire, "accoutremented alike in murrey velvet clokes, cassoques, and hose, all layde thicke with silver lace, and doublets and lynnynges of their clokes clothe of silver, branched with murrey flowers." Their attendants were dressed in "riche habillements, made noe lesse somptious with jewells and chaynes of golde, richly sett with pretious stones." At the appointed hour, amid great silence, befitting the occasion marking an epoch in English history, the Marriage Contract was produced and "Secretary Calvert redd the Articles in Latyne, which were twenty-five or twenty-six in nombre, written in a skynne of parchement on both sides, about a quarter of a yarde deepe, haveing thereunto then affixed the great seale of England." The Articles, actually

numbering but twenty-three, were then subscribed and sworn to by King James, Archbishop Abbott, and the great officers of state. The concessions made to Spain and the Catholics, by the terms of the Marriage Contract, were particularly aggravating to the body of the English people. Their feelings were more keenly shocked when it became whispered abroad that the King had agreed to a secret treaty, peculiarly advantageous to the Spanish bride and her retinue. The afternoon and evening of the day were devoted to a banquet, never surpassed at the English Court in the splendor of its appointments. The walls of the banqueting-room were festooned with the gayest colors, and covered with the richest piece of tapestry in the Kingdom, representing the story of Abraham. The tables were "relucent with the most richest Crowne plate," requiring eight carts to transfer it from the Tower. Much of the plate was of pure gold; "many pieces being most richly sett and embossed with pretious stones of great price." One single piece was estimated to be worth not less than forty or fifty thousand pounds. To the Spaniards the whole affair may have been a great farce; but James and his Secretary were thoroughly in earnest. When the oath was taken by James, at the reading of the secret treaty, he exclaimed, "Now all the Devils in Hell cannot hinder it," but he had quite forgotten Buckingham.

The Marriage Contract had been duly read and signed, the factious nobility had been won over, the clergy were apparently reconciled, the Commons had been quieted by a summary adjournment, the Spanish Ambassadors had been flattered and feasted, and the powers across the Channel had been bribed or threatened into silence. Everything was now ready for the coming of the bridegroom. A large share of the work of making arrangements to fitly receive the future Queen of England was committed to Secretary Calvert. Early in August, Conway, who was with the King and had caught the enthusiasm of his Master, wrote to Calvert, "if there be trust on earth, the Prince and the Infanta will be moving hither by the 28th; her household is preparing, 'therefore the word is Joy in Jerusalem, and peace in Sion, and haste, haste away the ships.'" Before Calvert had opportunity to haste away the ships, he was the recipient of another mark of favor from James. On the 7th of August he had petitioned the King that he be appointed a member of the Council of York. On the 11th the reply came back, saying, "the King grants at once Sec. Calvert's request to be one of the Council of York." Calvert began his work of making final preparations with the greatest zeal. Numerous correspondence was entered into, bonfires ordered to be kindled, sumptuous banquets were prepared, ships for escort duty were refitted, and public entertainments provided for on a large scale.

While Calvert is busily engaged in preparing for the coming of the bridal couple from Spain, we will take a more searching view of the actions of the Secretary, and endeavor to fathom his motives and guiding principles. He has received a due measure of censure for the leading part he took in a political transaction so hostile to the national feeling, and he has met the hard fate of being severely ignored by English historians. Not only has he been accused of willingly opening wide the door whereby a great train of evils would be brought into England, but he has been charged with sacrificing the national welfare to secure his own selfish ends and to gratify the ambitious projects of his newly made religious confrères. Bishop Goodman wrote many years ago: "the third man who was thought to gain by the Spanish Match was Secretary Calvert; and as he was the only secretary employed in the Spanish Match, so undoubtedly he did what good offices he could therein for religion's sake, being infinitely addicted to the Roman Catholic faith, having been converted thereunto by Count Gondomar and Count Arundel, whose daughter Secretary Calvert's son had married." If Calvert's oldest son, Cecilius, did marry Lady Arundel at the time of the Spanish negotiations then some excellent authorities have made some amazing errors. According to Kennedy, Cecilius Calvert, in 1623, was but 17 years old, and

according to Neill, in "Terra Mariae," Anne Arundel, in this year, was but eight years old. Such youthful marriages are certainly not usual in England. Count Gondomar had left England and was in Spain fully a year before the reading of the Marriage Contract. If Secretary Calvert was at this time "infinitely addicted to the Roman Catholic faith," there is a considerable lack of sincerity in his subsequent letters, and his conversion does no honor to the Church. During the negotiations Calvert remained a Protestant, and only became a Catholic when the Spanish Match was entirely set aside; but his religious opinions, like those of many contemporary statesmen, were not particularly strong. It was only when his cherished projects had been scattered to the winds that his religious creed became crystallized and took a permanent form.

Calvert, and Lord Keeper Williams, were close allies in the Spanish negotiations, and held opinions in common. A letter of Williams, of September, 1622, to the Earl of Arran will indicate the views of one of the ministers of James, who clung to the Spanish Match to the very last. He writes: "as to the offence taken by many, both in England and Scotland, at the King's release of recusants, the common people are unable to penetrate the action of Kings. Is no favourer of Popery, but thinks this step proper, because his Majesty could not hope to mediate successfully for

distressed Protestants in France, Germany, &c., whilst he was vigorous with Papists in England. No toleration for the future is intended, and those freed are only released on recognizances, and will be remanded if they presume on their privilege. Favour to Papists implies no favour to Popery; the King has always, by example, writing and legislation, proved himself a true Protestant." At the time this was written, not one of the Privy Council, including Buckingham, was opposed to the Match. There is a strain of jubilancy in the letter written in January, 1623, by Calvert to Mr. George Gage, English Agent at Rome, but the last clause would indicate that he was more concerned in the success of the Match than he was in the amelioration of the Catholics. He says: "His Majesty and the Prince have signed all the Articles sent by the Earl of Bristol [from Madrid] and have written to the King of Spain engaging to observe *verbatim* the last article which promises full toleration of Roman Catholics. Mr. S. Digby has returned from Germany, and will be sent to-morrow to Spain. Sends a token to *Aristides* which he hopes he deserves. He will probably be found at Alexandria. *Aeneas* again recommends secrecy and that the letter shall not be delivered to Father Maestro, till there is certainty of success."

A letter written by Secretary Calvert to Conway, August 2, 1623, a little over a week after

the reading of the Marriage Treaty by him in the Royal Chapel, and on the eve of the expected arrival of the Infanta, does not portray him as an enthusiastic Catholic. Calvert writes: "there is a little dispute about the mode of the pardon to Catholics. It was devised to include release from all past fines, forfeitures, treasons, felonies, praemunire, &c., wherewith they were charged on ground of religion, and freedom from future molestation. The Ambassadors object to the pardon, as inviting the necessity of persons discovering themselves by applying for it, and as being expensive for the poor and request a Proclamation of Grace to Catholics instead." Calvert opposed the demands of the Ambassadors, but finally concludes, "were it not for the noise which a Proclamation would make, should advise it, as it would be only a suspension, and the fines could be reclaimed with arrears if councils changed."

There can be no doubt that Gondomar's diplomatic tact did prevail upon the Secretary, and that he made more concessions to the Catholics, in remembrance of his gracious demeanor, than he would have been willing to make to a less skillful diplomatist. Gondomar is described as "endowed with a clear understanding—a rich vein of festive humour—a talent of adroit flattery—and that apparent frankness of manner which serves as the best disguise for artifice;" like the Florentine Tito

Melema, the Spanish Ambassador's face "wore that bland liveliness" which marks the popular companion. In his dealings with the Marquis Inijosa, the colleague of Gondomar, Calvert was not so fortunate; the arbitrary Spaniard greatly exasperated the otherwise affable Secretary. In a letter to Conway, Secretary Calvert calls the Marquis Inijosa "twenty devils," for "suggesting fresh doubts about the principle business;" soon afterwards he writes, "the difficulties with the Marquis [Inijosa] are at last over. Hopes an end of these hourly vexations." Calvert could not fail to recognize that the Catholics of England were British subjects, and he was willing to make some concessions to relieve them of the penal enactments against them, but he took this course simply as a political measure. James, no doubt, had some cranky notions about statecraft, but in his leniency towards the Catholics he was not altogether in the wrong; in his letter to the Commons he had declared that he was "willing to take all due care of religion, but the means must be left to himself; will not kindle a war of religion through the world, and by hot persecutions of recusants provoke foreign Princes to persecution of Protestants." The King's conciliatory policy may not have been the proper thing at the time; possibly if he had been willing to lend assistance in the war on the continent, he might have no occasion to fear the armies

of Spain or of Germany nor the policy of their sovereigns, but it did not suit his plans to break with Spain, and Secretary Calvert, as an adviser, did not see his way clear to a solution of the difficulty save by strengthening the ties binding England to Spain. Whatever judgment may be passed upon the political wisdom of Calvert, he was sincere in advising the Spanish alliance, thinking it would secure the general good of the English people. It was not Spanish gold nor papal allegiance that dictated Calvert's policy; he was no trickster, no propagandist, no mere courtier; his political measures were well conceived and ably administered; their failure indicated his inability to cope against the current of a strong popular opinion, and he resigned his office.

While Calvert was actively engaged in constructing his "Chateaux d'Espagne," and confidently awaiting the arrival of Charles and his bride, a number of anti-Catholics were strenuously endeavoring to demolish his cherished plans; even his former co-laborer, Cranfield, now Lord Treasurer, devoted as he was to the Spanish party, could not restrain an occasional murmur of discontent; he had written to Conway that he was "sick at heart with the idea of these extraordinary charges, when the King is so ill able to meet his ordinary expenses. Cannot hold out unless some extraordinary supply be thought of, or some large

sums come in from Spain;" but as Bristol had written that the Spanish bride would bring as a dowry not less than £500,000, the Lord Treasurer remained fast in his allegiance to the Match. Calvert had had a warm supporter in the queen, and even after her death, her influence was felt, but nearly all the clergy and the great mass of the people utterly repudiated the Match, and denounced it bitterly, but their demonstrations were in vain. But what could not be accomplished by the people was effectually and completely done by one man, and that man was Buckingham. James had exclaimed concerning the match, "now all the devils in hell cannot hinder it," but his favorite courtier, by a bold stroke, stopped the negotiations in Spain, utterly demoralized Bristol, and returning suddenly to England he threw into hopeless confusion the well-conceived and almost successful plans of the Secretary.

The bridegroom had come, but at an hour and in a manner that Calvert had not anticipated; instead of returning as the dignified brother-in-law of the dreaded King of Spain, he came as he went, the truant Tom Smith, the gay knight-errant. Calvert immediately saw the difficulties of his position, though he did not despair; there was a strong probability that James, for once, would repudiate the conduct of the great favorite, but the dream was delusive. With all his boldness and reckless-

ness, Buckingham was far-sighted and cunning; he saw more deeply into the hearts of the English people than did Calvert, and he felt that he could so work upon James, through the Parliament, that the leaders of the Spanish party would be driven from the field. His wounded pride and his erratic temperament hurried him from Spain, in October; his self-interest and love of popularity led him, on his arrival, to immediately repudiate the Spanish alliance. The ringing of bells and the glow of innumerable bonfires, assured him of the joy of the Londoners that the Infanta was left behind; he well knew that King James was building great hopes upon the arrival of the Spanish galleons, laden with the dowry of his daughter-in-law, but he was fully prepared to prove the actual "penurie and prowde beggarie" of Spain.

The merry bells and the bright fires which welcomed Charles brought no joy to Calvert; in the one he heard the death-knell of his political services, and in the other he saw his cherished plans crumbling to ashes. His only hope was exceedingly forlorn, but he would at least make the attempt to rally the powerful leaders of the Spanish party, and, by their united effort, overcome the influence of the favorite and once again renew the negotiations with Spain.

Calvert's star had reached the zenith and was now slowly but surely setting; he could consist-

ently remain in office so long as the Prince remained unmarried, but negotiations for some other bride would only bring an end to his political career; he therefore was guided henceforth not only by a desire to serve his King, but by the additional motive of preserving his own influence in the Council and at Court. He felt conscious that Buckingham could not easily set aside the solemn treaty entered into by the King and his entire Council; he also knew that the fear of a war with Spain would keep the conservative members to their pledged word.

By promises of advancement and by threats of dismissal, Buckingham managed to gain the active coöperation of some of the Councillors and to weaken the strength of the opposition by winning over to a neutral position a number of others, and so leaving the supporters of the Spanish alliance in a minority. An entry in the English Calendars of January 31, 1624, reads: "the King is still in Newmarket, but the Prince has returned to town. The juncto for foreign affairs sit closely upon the Match. The Lord Keeper [Williams], Treasurer [Middlesex], Marshal [Arundel], Weston and Sec. Calvert are for it; Duke of Richmond, Hamilton, Lord Chamberlain Pembroke and Belfast, neuter; Buckingham, Carlisle and Conway, against it. The Prince seems very averse to it, both on grounds of state and religion, and this changed some of the

neuters; but the Lord Chamberlain said he saw not how the King or those who swore to the treaty could fall away, if the Spaniards perform their part. This was done from pique against Buckingham, whose entire engrossing of the Prince's favour, as well as the King's, causes some heart-burning in many who aim to take him down; so he keeps close to his Majesty and prevents all access to him." An entry by another writer of the same time, says: "the Juncto for foreign affairs sat hard all that week;" it corroborates the above entry in asserting that five councillors stood for the Match, three against it and four were indifferent.

In despair of forcing his policy upon James, Buckingham determined to lay the matter before Parliament and so secure his ends; the King fell into the trap of the wily courtier and summoned the Parliament of 1624, ostensibly to extricate his daughter, the Queen of Bohemia, from her deplorable plight, and to restore her and her husband to the Rhenish Palatinate. The adherents of the Spanish Match were totally opposed to the summoning of the Parliament, knowing that a war with Spain would be immediately resolved. Gardiner says, "of the nine who had originally voted against Buckingham, five, Calvert, Weston, Arundel, Williams and Middlesex, had already declared against the summoning of a Parliament, and were all for various reasons the advocates of peace."

The Secretary had forfeited his popularity in Yorkshire, and his old rival, Savile, was returned from this county; but he had raised up friends elsewhere. He was elected, together with Sir Isaac Wake, by the University of Oxford to be its representative in the newly-summoned Parliament. This old seat of learning was represented in Parliament for the first time in 1603, the year of the accession of James; it was devoted to the interests of the Court Party, and, in succeeding years, was a staunch supporter of the unfortunate Charles; it was very reassuring to Calvert to be elected its delegate to the national council. The Parliament of 1624 met on February 19; some of the old leaders were absent, but their loss was more than compensated by the younger, more vigorous leaders who succeeded them. It did not take a long time for the Secretary to see that Buckingham's influence in the Commons was almost as strong, on account of unity of ends in view, as it had been in the Council. Calvert felt that the country was gradually being drawn to an open rupture with Spain and to an abrupt ending of his scheme of foreign policy; he saw his influence was waning and he took a very secondary part in the proceedings; he had lost the gayety of the past year and was grave and silent; quite frequently he absented himself from Parliament on the plea of sickness. In April, the Subsidy Bill, which had

already provoked some warm discussions, was again introduced; the members, probably looking defiantly at the disconcerted Calvert, complained of the misuse of previous subsidies, and that the "subsidy bill came on winged feet and bills of grace on leaden ones;" there was a general outcry for a definite and final break with Spain, the members complaining that the declaration of the dissolution of the Spanish treaty "was only by word of mouth and should be made and inserted in the body of the bill." Calvert felt that he should express himself, and, according to an eye-witness, he rose and "after a grave preamble, arguing that the making or dissolving of foreign treaties belongs to the royal prerogative alone,—inconsistently proposed that the declaration should be at the beginning of the body of the bill."

When the subject of the Newfoundland fisheries was again introduced, the personal sympathies of Calvert were again enlisted and he felt constrained to reiterate his views as previously expressed in the Parliament of 1621; he argued that unlimited free fishing upon the shores and banks of the island would interfere with the prosperity of the plantations and tend to their destruction, and that the unrestrained license to all fishermen to cut down the timber near the settlements would seriously interfere with the planters; the speaker was aware of the truth of his arguments for he was in con-

stant receipt of letters from Avalon detailing the ravages of the piratical fishermen, but he was scarcely conscious that centuries after his times, the Newfoundland fisheries would lead to serious international complications. Notwithstanding all the force of his arguments the bill to allow free fishing, etc., was adopted.

Calvert was not only chagrined at the sudden turn of events in regard to the Spanish alliance, but he had occasion to fear the Commons' anger as well as that of Buckingham; but the personal attachment of the King doubtless saved him from summary disgrace. In a letter to Conway he says that he "is prevented by illness from attending regularly himself" at Parliament; but doubtless his illness was that of a mind troubled and in alarm. After the favorite had secured the friendly coöperation of the Commons by his adroit flattery and diplomatic subserviency, he laid his plans to crush the leaders of the Spanish party; Gardiner says that "Williams and Weston had convinced their patron that they would be ready to carry out his wishes," and they were spared. The former associate of Calvert in the Treasury Commission, Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex, received the full measure of Buckingham's spleen; he had done his best to prevent a rupture with Spain and continued to urge a peaceful policy; this was enough for Buckingham. He was impeached for corrupt prac-

tices, heavily fined and dismissed from office; Gardiner says that as Lord Treasurer, Middlesex "had done more than any other man to rescue the finances from disorder. He was a careful guardian of the public purse." The King feeling the pangs of an incurable sickness, looked upon the doings of the Prince and the Duke in utter helplessness, but he gave a word of prophetic warning when he impatiently told them, "you will live to have your belly full of impeachments."

Calvert's position had now become decidedly uncomfortable; his foreign policy had been rejected; Buckingham was seeking his disgrace, the Prince regarded him with cold indifference, and even James, though he threw around him his protection, had become somewhat suspicious; the the Parliament was ready at a moment's notice to cause him to follow the fallen treasurer, Middlesex. A letter of April 24, 1624, declares that "Sec. Calvert is on ill terms with the King and Prince, and is called to account; amongst other things for detaining letters to Carleton, a year ago, at the request of the French Ambassador;" a groundless charge, but the mere fact that his official acts were viewed suspiciously by his master indicated to Calvert that a storm was brewing. One little incident will illustrate Archbishop Abbot's remark about Calvert—"a course was taken to rid him of all employments and negotiations." The Secretary

held in his possession a copy of the letter sent to the Pope to secure his approbation of the Spanish Match; Buckingham wanted this letter so as to use it as a model for another letter to the Pope in reference to the French marriage; the favorite called on Calvert and after artfully securing the letter, assured him that his request to serve the King upon the French negotiations would undoubtedly be granted. "If this be a lie," wrote the Duke to the King, "as I am sure it is, then you may begin to think with a little more study I may cry quittance." In making false promises to Calvert, the favorite said it was necessary "to tie him to secrecy." The Secretary saw that his only hope of basking in the Royal favor was to desert the Spanish party at once and to throw the weight of his influence in favor of an alliance with France; a number of the advocates of the Spanish Match had already gone over to the other side and not a few were wavering, ready to desert their old party at an opportune moment; the King was gradually forgetting his enthusiastic admiration for Spain, of the previous year, and was drawn into the policy of his shrewd favorite. In a letter of June, 1624, Dud. Carleton wrote: "the French Match and treaty rapidly proceeding. The King is almost as much in love with France as he was with Spain and is merry and jocund." But the Secretary refused to bend his knee in submission to Bucking-

ham, even to please his master ; he scorned to play the part of the sycophant ; he held on to his office, but with much heaviness of heart ; the neglect he daily received grated harshly upon his proud spirit ; the duplicity of Charles and the Duke, and the childish fickleness of the King filled him with gloom and disgust ; refusing to desert his old principles, he had no alternative save dismissal or resignation ; to avoid the disgrace of the former he decided to surrender the seals of his office.

The first reference to Calvert's desire to resign is contained in a letter dated April 4, 1624, soon after the assembling of Parliament ; the extract reads : "Sec. Calvert is in ill health and talks of resigning the Secretaryship." Probably the Secretary was in ill health, but it was the illness that comes from mental unrest ; in his Declaration to the Commons of March 25, 1624, James affirmed his willingness to annul the treaty with Spain and to cease negotiations on the Match. As the Secretary's illness and his speedy desire to resign his office followed so soon after the King's declaration, it is not improbable that the two events were intimately connected. A letter of April 6, reads : "Sec. Calvert is willing to resign his place upon reasonable terms ;" a letter of May 3, is more definite ; it says, "Proceedings relative to the proposal that Carleton should purchase the office of Sec. Calvert, who wishes to retire on account of ill health, if he could do so

without losing reputation and could part with his office advantageously. He would let Carleton have it for 6,000 l., though when he was made Secretary, Lord Hollis offered 8,000 l. and Sir John Suckling 7,000 l. It is but three years' purchase, the place being worth 2,000 l. a year." Calvert's hopes began to revive when he saw that his immediate dismissal was not contemplated. When he recalled the unbounded influence of Buckingham and saw him coöperating with the Commons, his first impulse was to vacate his dangerous position and so avoid the fate of Middlesex. But the wrath of the favorite gradually melted away as he saw the quickening success of his French policy, and he felt that he could afford to deal less harshly with the self-willed, though courteous Secretary, particularly since James was still gracious to his old minister. A letter of June 1 reads: "Buckingham approves Sec. Calvert's proposals [to resign in favor of Carleton]. Advises him [Carleton] to come over to solicit it." Although it was whispered about at Court and was known to some of the Commons that Calvert was about to resign the Secretaryship, no one seems to have insinuated or even to have suspected that he had any leanings towards papacy. His willingness to resign was attributed to Buckingham's enmity and to the rout of the Spanish party. In a communication to the King, bearing date May 20, 1624, the Commons urge

him to take more aggressive measures against the popish recusants, the non-communicants and Catholic suspects. They give him a list of sixty names of suspected Catholics holding positions of official trust. Calvert's name is not included in the list, even though his partiality towards Catholic Spain had aroused much bitter animosity.

For some reason during the month of June, his hopes began to revive. He breathed more easily, thinking probably that Buckingham's hatred of Spain had spent itself. He watched very closely the outcome of the quarrel between the Duke and his avowed enemies. A letter of June 26, contains one item, as follows: "Secretary Calvert's proposal to resign is occasioned not by ill health, but by fear of being displaced; if the Earl of Bristol stands, he will not abandon office." The statement that his proposed resignation was not caused by ill health is true, but it is also true that at this time the health of the Secretary was shattered by nervous prostration and mental anxiety. Not long after this time he was in receipt of a letter from Strafford congratulating him upon his recovery from his late sickness. Calvert did wisely in watching what would be done with Digby, Earl of Bristol. As ambassador at the Court of Spain, this minister had worked zealously to consummate the marriage of Charles and the Infanta. He had quarrelled with Buckingham at Madrid, and, soon after the return

of the favorite, he was recalled home and his official course was declared to be unsatisfactory and a commission consisting of Calvert and Weston was appointed to consider his whole proceedings upon the Spanish Match and draw up a number of questions to be propounded to the Earl. The King, prompted by Buckingham, had appointed these ministers upon the investigating committee because "Calvert knows the whole of the Earl of Bristol's affairs and Weston is fit to direct the work." Weston, who had been one of the leaders of the Spanish party, had deserted his party and was in high favor with Buckingham. The Secretary was again in a dilemma. He could not refuse the appointment upon the commission without offending the King. He could not deal leniently with Bristol and hope to avoid the resentment of Buckingham, for the favorite was determined to humble the unflinching, courageous Ambassador; but to deal harshly with this sturdy advocate of the Spanish alliance would criminate himself. Unfortunately the report of the commission is not to be found, but whatever its contents, the fate of Bristol was sealed. He did not stand. He was dismissed from office and strictly commanded not to appear at Court.

The following extracts from contemporary letters will indicate the mental unrest of the Secretary, in fear of summary dismissal, unwilling to lose

reputation by resigning, and refusing to propitiate the favorite by repudiating his political principles and ministerial policy. Ambassador Carleton received a letter in August, 1624, stating, "Sec. Calvert droops and keeps out of way, and it is reported that the seals are taken from him." For several months Calvert kept out of the way, and nothing is heard of him until late in autumn. A letter of October 23, declares, "Sec. Calvert is resigning, and Coke, Master of Requests, related to Lord Brooke, is to succeed him." Another letter of November 23, states on good authority that "Calvert was reconciled to Buckingham, who had assured him that he should have the option of refusing any offer made for his place." Since there was no longer fear of dismissal, Calvert determined to hold on to his office a while longer, so as to dispose of it upon the most favorable terms. He intended immediately after leaving Court to hasten to Avalon and to carry with him as much available means as possible in order to promote the prosperity of the settlement. A letter of January 8, 1625, says: "Now those gain preferment whose parts agree best with the humour of the times. Sec. Calvert is dismissed, but not empty handed; and Sir John Coke who has lately married an alderman's widow, and therefore can give well, succeeds him." A letter of the ensuing week, January 16th, says with truth, "Sir Albert Morton is to

be Secretary in Calvert's place." Within a month Secretary Calvert did finally resign and surrender the seals of his office. In a letter dated February 12, 1625, we read: "Sir Albert Morton is at Newmarket, and is sworn in; Sec. Calvert giving him the seals for 6000*l.* and an Irish barony, either for himself, or any whom he likes to bestow it." Another letter of the same date from Thos. Locke to Ambassador Carleton supplements the above letter. It reads: "On the 9th [February] Sir Albert Morton had the seals delivered to him and was sworn Secretary. Sec. Calvert retains his place as Privy Councillor and is made Baron Baltimore in Ireland." It is not improbable that his resignation was hastened by his appointment on January 21, 1625 upon a commission to try recusants. In this appointment we may see the hand of Buckingham, who was anxious that the Secretaryship should be secured at once by one of his favorites, as the French business needed a strong, steady hand, such as Morton's, to guide it successfully. In his capacity as Secretary, Calvert was instructed, together with the other members of the commission, "to examine parties charged with errors in matters of faith, tending to schism against the established church, who refused to have their children baptized or allowed that ceremony to be performed by a Jesuit or popish priest or were guilty of any offense against the established

church." The instructions were aimed against Baptists, Catholics, and Puritans. In declining to serve upon this commission the Secretary could, with some appearance of truth, assure his old master, now on the verge of death, that the duties of the office were incompatible with his religious belief; and, with his royal approbation, he would retire into private life. As the latter part of James' life was rendered miserable by great suffering, it is probable he knew but little of the intrigues in the Privy Council. He remembered Calvert with affection and respected the change in his religious faith, and suffered him to resign with his approbation. Gardiner thus speaks of Calvert's resignation: "Calvert, who was secretly a convert to the church of Rome, and had long been anxious to escape from the entanglement of office, had laid his secretaryship at the Duke's feet, telling him plainly that he intended to live and die in the religion which he professed. Buckingham, who had spoken hard things of Calvert a few months before, was always inclined to deal gently with opposition of this submissive kind, and assured the Secretary that he would come to no harm by his avowal. He was therefore, allowed, according to the custom of the time, to bargain with his successor for 6000*l.* to be paid to him as the price of his withdrawal from office, and he was soon afterwards created Lord Baltimore in the Irish peer-

age.”¹ Calvert thus was enabled to leave the Secretaryship without losing reputation and also not empty handed. The purchase of the Irish peerage was afterwards confirmed by the King and letters patent made out conferring the honor upon him and his heirs.

During the session of 1624, the House of Commons had made some attempts to coerce the King to dismiss his Catholic ministers. A petition was sent to him from the members with the request “that all papists should be removed from London and the court.” The petition was, of course, passed by, for Buckingham’s own wife and mother belonged to the Catholic faith. Not long afterwards parliament presented the King with a list of popish lords and knights, employed in the civil service, intimating that their dismissal would be exceedingly grateful to the people. Under these circumstances, when the House was protesting against the public employment of Roman Catholics, Calvert’s public avowal to the King of his conversion to this faith, would deter the King from urging his continuance in office.

Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, who was secretly opposed to the Spanish Match, and yet

¹ Calvert’s peerage title is found spelt in many ways in colonial records and correspondence; the most common spellings were: Baltimore, Baltamore, Baltemore, Balthamore, Balthamor, Balthamoer, Balthasermoer, Balthemor, Baltimoor, Balthimor, Balthus Moor. See General Index to “Documents Relating to the Colonial History of New York.”

willingly put his signature to the Articles of Marriage and the Treaty with Spain, speaks of the resignation as follows: "Secretary Calvert hath never looked merrily since the Prince's coming out of Spain. It was thought that he was much interested in the Spanish affair. A course was taken to rid him of all employments and negotiations;" in this there is much truth, but he certainly spoke unadvisedly when he continued, "he apparently turned Papist, which he now professeth, this being the *third* time he hath been to blame that way." The Archbishop also asserted that the ex-secretary had bought a ship of 400 tons and was on the eve of visiting Newfoundland. Calvert did not visit the island until two and a half years after this time.

The *Sloane* Manuscripts contain the following passage among others in reference to Calvert: "In the yeare 1624 [1625 N. S.] he obtained a dismissal of the King from his employment of Secretary of State, though with some difficulty, his Majestie haveing a particulaire affection to him by reason of his great abilities and integrity. And though he had then declared himselfe a Roman Catholique, ordered him to be continued a Privie Councillor, and created him Lord Baltemore of Baltemore in Ireland."

James had been very prodigal of titles to the Irish peerage. When he ascended the throne in

1603, there were not over five or six Irish earls and not over twenty viscounts, and barons, but before the close of his reign the number had increased three-fold.¹

Calvert was the last, save one, raised to the Irish peerage during this period. His title of "Baron Baltimore, of Baltimore, co. Longford, Ireland," was received February 16, 1625, only a few weeks before the death of his old master, James I. It is stated in the Sloane MSS. that "King Charles desired his Lordship to be continued a Privy Councillor to him, resolving to dispense with his takeing the oath of supremacy, but at his request he gave him leave at length to retire from Court." Within a fortnight after his elevation to the peerage, Calvert left the scenes of his political triumphs and failures, and desiring to visit again friends and relatives in Yorkshire, went north in company with Sir Toby Matthew, an old school-mate. This friend of Calvert's is described by Surtey as the oldest son of Tobias Matthew, bishop of Durham, who died in 1628. The son had become a Jesuit during his father's lifetime. He was knighted by James for his zeal in the Spanish Match, being sent upon some important missions. He is described as a

¹The total number of peerages conferred by King James amounted to 226; of these 60 were Irish, divided as follows: 9 earls, 18 viscounts, 33 barons. Nichols: Progresses, etc., of King James (preface).

deep, intriguing politician and a secret agent in the service of Rome. According to the Aspinwall papers, it was Matthew who succeeded in converting Calvert to Roman Catholicism. In after years we find him in receipt of letters from friends in the newly planted colony of Maryland [*vide* Streeter papers]. It is not improbable that Calvert, now Lord Baltimore, left London so soon after his resignation of the Secretaryship in order to be present at the wedding festivities of his old friend and ally, Wentworth, who was married to his second wife, Lady Clare, on February 24, 1625. On the death of this noble woman, six years later, Calvert wrote Wentworth a long letter full of Christian sympathy and condolence.

It was rumored at the time of his resignation that Calvert was extremely anxious to visit his plantation at Avalon, but was stayed by King Charles, who probably felt that he could well employ the talents of his father's faithful minister in diplomatic services. He decided, however, to leave England temporarily and to repair to his estates in Ireland, which needed his personal care, and there were also political reasons. In view of the rumored early marriage of Charles to the French Princess, Calvert felt it would be inexpedient for him to remain at Court when he was universally known to be out of sympathy with the administration and as strongly in favor

of the Spanish alliance as ever before. He felt that his temporary absence was a political necessity and that his Sovereign would well appreciate his motives in retiring into private life. Had the ex-secretary's conduct in retiring from office and from the Court been followed by other great ministers, there might have been no Civil War in England. Whatever Calvert's personal virtues may have been, his political wisdom is commendable in laying down his office and retiring when he felt he no longer had the King's confidence, and saw his administrative policy rejected.

The personal regard of King Charles for his fallen minister continued undiminished. He respected his virtues if he could not endorse his administration. In a letter of May 29, 1625, to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, the King thus speaks of Calvert: "Right trusty and well-beloved cousin and counsellor, we greet you well: whereas our right trusty and well-beloved, the Lord Baltimore, hath acquainted us with his purpose to repair into that Kingdom [Ireland] to reside there for some time; being an eminent person and a nobleman of that Kingdom, we have thought good by these our gracious letters to recommend him to your special favor, requiring you not only to give him all lawful assistance and good expedition on such occasions as he shall have there, but also to respect him according to his quality and degree, and as

one who is parted from us with our princely approbation and in our good grace.”

It is not known where Calvert lived in Ireland nor what occupied his time during his residence there. He was granted certain lands in Longford county; but he purchased some lands in Wexford county. Whether he devoted his entire time to the care of his estates, or received an official appointment from the Lord Deputy of the island, it is now impossible to say. It is not improbable that he declined to accept a position in the administration of Ireland, but that he devoted himself entirely to the improvement of his landed property and to the directing of his settlements in the New World, though at the same time holding himself in readiness for any summons to England, both in order to reinstate himself at Court, and to testify his gratitude to the King for the favors he had received. The manor of Baltimore lay in Longford county, but Calvert had probably other estates in Ireland since he was a long time officially connected with this country, and at this time real property was selling there at a low figure. There is some reason for believing that, when sent a Commissioner to examine into the affairs of Wexford county in 1613, he made purchases of land there, for much of that region had been deserted. Brereton, in his book of Travels (1634), makes a statement as follows:

“We left Carnue about seven hour, and went thence into the county of Wexford to Claghman [Clohamon] my Lord of Baltamoare’s town, where he hath a brave house, but of no great strength, nor built castle-wise. . . . This town is seated upon the bank of the river Slane” [Slaney].

The grant of land in Longford county, Ireland, received by Calvert February 18, 1621, contained 2304 acres, comprising certain town and other lands. At the time the land was first received he obtained no special privileges nor manorial rights, but he held it subject to certain conditions or instructions. These instructions obligated the patentees “not to sell to Roman Catholics of any nation, and to require all settlers to take the oath of supremacy and be conformable in point of religion.” As Calvert was a professed Protestant and had signified his allegiance by taking, in common with other members of the Commons, the Lord’s Supper according to the prescribed method of the Established Church, the terms of the grant were not onerous. But as he had made an open profession of his conversion to Catholicism, when he resigned the Secretaryship, he could not legally hold his Irish estates as originally granted, and so, on February 12, 1625, immediately after his retirement from office, he surrendered the patent, and on March 11th ensuing he received back the patent with the religious clause struck out and other claims inserted

in keeping with his rank of baron. By the terms of the re-grant the lands rose to be held in free and common soccage by fealty only, for all rents due; the estates in the Barony of Longford were erected into the manor of Baltimore and those in the Barony of Rathlyxe into the manor of Ulford. In both manors he was allowed the privileges of courts, parks, free warrens, &c. It may be said in this connexion that the manor of Baltimore¹ in Longford county had nothing to do with the town of Baltimore on the southern coast of Ireland, in Cork county. The town of Baltimore and the vicinity had been in the possession of the Driscols from the days of Strongbow (1169), and at the time when Calvert received his estates in Ireland, the Driscols were called the sovereigns of Baltimore (town). It is not known why Calvert chose this name for his most important manor. The province of Maryland was granted to Baltimore in the same terms by which

¹The exact location of the Barony of Baltimore is unknown. The name is not found upon any recent map of Ireland, though it is not improbable that it can be found upon the finely executed maps of Ireland made by Sir William Petty, in 1654, and placed in the Birmingham tower. Of the 1430 maps made under the direction of Sir William, about 260 are baronial maps. An authority on the local topography of Longford county says, there is at present neither a barony nor a parish named Baltimore in Ireland. See *Liber Hiberniæ*, vol. 2, part VII, p. 335. Also *Baltimore Weekly Sun*, December 24, 1881, (containing an interesting letter from P. F. O'Carroll, Esq., of Dublin, to the Hon. William A. Stewart, of Baltimore, Md., on the site of the Barony of Baltimore.)

the manor of Baltimore was held, "in free and common soccage, by fealty only."

During the years of his seclusion in Ireland, Calvert heard much from the English Court to give him pain and cause him uneasiness. Great events followed in quick succession—the first Parliament of Charles, 1625, had been dissolved in anger; the armed fleet sent against Spain had ventured as far as Cadiz, but instead of storming the city and seizing the Spanish treasure ships, it had been defeated and "hurried home with tattered sails and starving crews;" Buckingham had hurried to Holland to raise up a great confederacy against Spain and was met on his return by the furious onsets, in Parliament, of Sir John Eliot, resulting in the impeachment of the great favorite by the Parliament of 1626. The Parliament was at once dissolved without having voted a shilling, and in his financial distress, the King summarily demanded a free gift and a forced loan. Charles had failed to keep his marriage treaty, and in his anger had driven from England the French attendants of his queen. Ill feeling was in consequence stirred up between France and England, resulting in 1627 in a declaration of war between the two powers. It was an extreme moment for England, and the reckless Buckingham. His intense hatred for Richelieu finally led him to

make overtures to Spain and to seek an alliance with that country against France. He looked around for some of the old leaders of the Spanish party—some had been so crushed that they could not be withdrawn from their retirement, but the favorite remembered one of the leaders of the opposition who had left England for a time accompanied by the royal grace and approbation, and despatches were immediately sent to Calvert summoning him to Court on important business. The ex-secretary's time had come. The wisdom of his foreign policy was at last acknowledged, and it was with a feeling of much gratification that he left his quiet home in Ireland and hastened to England, again to take part in the councils of the nation. He reached the English Court in March, 1627. Calvert was very graciously received by both the King and the Duke and was directed to hold himself in readiness to go on an embassy to Brussels to secure the coöperation of the Archduchess to a treaty between Spain and England. It was rumored his colleagues would be the Earl of Salisbury, Sir Richard Weston and Sir Humphrey May. Buckingham was at loss what was the best thing to do at the present, so "taking Baltimore with him, he went to Newmarket and invited all the Privy Councillors on the spot to discuss the matter in the King's presence;" but

while the English Council was engaged in discussion the Cardinal Richelieu had promptly negotiated an engagement "between France and Spain for common action against England." Calvert remained in England, at a place called Savage, until the last week of the month of May. He had tired of the Court life as directed by the rash and irresponsible favorite and longed to get away from the entanglements of State. After much entreaty, he finally received royal permission to visit the plantation at Avalon, "a place," he writes to Wentworth, "which I have had a long desire to visit and have now the opportunity and leave to do it."

III.

INTEREST IN TRADING COMPANIES, IN COLONIZATION. HIS DEATH.

Calvert's interest in companies organized for trade and in the planting of colonies had been awakened very early in his official career. It is not improbable that his attention had been drawn to the subject by the active part taken in trading companies by the Cecils, in whose employ he had passed many years of service. His interest in these companies was strengthened by the active part taken in such enterprises by all the prominent men of

the times. In the reigns of Elizabeth and James began that great exodus of adventurers and emigrants from all parts of Europe, towards all points of the compass, to seek fortunes and new homes in the new found lands daily discovered and explored. From the east and the west, from the north and the south, came stories, reports and rumors of countries peopled by strange tribes, living in luxuriant idleness upon the bountiful productions of nature, dwelling in abodes fitted up in barbaric splendor and worshipping in temples filled with thank-offerings of precious things. Then came confused but glowing accounts of waters swarming with myriads of fish, great and small, of immense forests of trees and shrubbery valuable for medicinal and domestic uses, of valleys filled with rare spices and fruits, of thickets roamed over by large and small animals most valuable for food and raiment, of mines and streams glittering with precious metals and bright gems. Corroborative evidence was found in the arrival of Spanish galleons from America, filled with gold and jewels; of Dutch vessels from the East burdened with aromatic plants and beautiful fabrics. The lethargy of past times in England was suddenly rolled away and all classes were roused to activity. The hope of gain and the desire for adventure quickly overcame the superstition and indifference of former days. Companies were organized for trade,

for privateering, and for stimulating emigration. Books were circulated, sermons preached, addresses delivered, lauding some particular phase of the new activity. Sailors and adventurers were hurrying away and emigrants were bidding daily farewells to the old island. The sea was scoured in all directions, merchantmen were plundered, naval duels were of frequent occurrence, piracy and privateering were winked at, the buccaneer and the freebooter plied their nefarious trade. The club rooms and coffee houses of England were daily engaged discussing the exploits of Hawkins, of Drake, Frobisher, Raleigh, John Smith. Though Da Gama had landed at Calicut in 1498, and in the same year Cabot had touched at Labrador, yet two generations were allowed to pass by before the English people had fully realized the importance of the great maritime discoveries. Not until the reign of Elizabeth did the English become the rivals and successors of the French and the Spaniards in the acquisition of territory across the great waters.¹ It was not until the end of her reign that the importance of the East as a centre of commer-

¹ Referring to the beginnings of James's reign (1605), Ploetz says: "In North America, a few scattered Spanish settlements in the south and one French colony in the north were the only representatives of European civilization. The next few years witnessed a mighty change. England, which for all her voyages had not a foot of land in America, entered on a course of settlement and conquest."—Ploetz: *Epitome of Universal History*, p. 291.

cial operations dawned upon the English merchants, and King James was seated upon the English throne before the English trading and colonizing companies were fairly under way. In the very flood tide of the new activity, Calvert, a young man ambitious for fame and wealth, had taken up his residence, as an officer of the government, in the great commercial city of London.

In the year 1600 was established the greatest of English commercial enterprises, the English East India Company. It began at once to send out vessels and adventurers to the Indies and China, to erect trading posts, and to bring back the new and valuable products of Asia. Other companies were rapidly organized to colonize the unoccupied territory of the New World, to bring back its productions, and to make deeper explorations into the great rivers and bays extending inland from the Atlantic seaboard. The hope had long been indulged that a Northwest passage would secure a short and safe route to the Indies, and attempts had been made to discover these hidden waters by scouring the inlets of the ocean lying on both sides of the great island of Newfoundland. It was predicted by enthusiastic sea captains that as soon as the Northwest passage was revealed, Newfoundland itself would become a great naval station in the route to India. Its advantageous commercial location together with the abundance of its fisheries,

had exaggerated the importance of the island, and many of England's shrewdest statesmen began to invest largely in Newfoundland trading companies. For many years it was the only territory in America whose possession had been contested by the great nations of Europe. The French adventurers had established fisheries there as early as the year 1506, but for an entire century, owing to the large number of claimants, it had remained a veritable no-man's land. The Spanish, Dutch, French and English were represented in its waters by squadrons of fishing vessels, but the ownership of its shores had shifted from season to season, the temporary authority being lodged in the strongest party.

At the time Calvert began his maritime ventures, the English claims upon Newfoundland, if not recognized, were not generally disputed. He could therefore prosecute his adventures there without undue fear of foreign interference. He received a grant of a portion of the island some time in the year 1620. Captain Whitbourne, writing in 1622, had said, Calvert "hath already most worthily sent thither in these last two years a great number, with all means for their livelihood, and they are building houses, clearing off land and making salt." The plantation had been purchased by him from Sir William Vaughan, a fellow student at Oxford. Although at this period engrossed

in duties at Court, Calvert found time to keep well informed of his economic investment in Newfoundland and to adopt the best means to guarantee the prosperity of the colony. According to Streeter, in May, 1622, John Hickson, an experienced salt-maker, was sent to the settlement by Calvert and also the Rev. Richard James, a clergyman of the Established Church.

Captain Wynne, the governor of the colony, sent numerous letters to Calvert, stating in detail the growth and needs of the colony; these letters enable us to see the place as Calvert saw it previous to his visit there in 1627. In a letter bearing the date July 28, 1622, Captain Wynne writes: "It may please your honour, that, as soone as I had delivered my last letters of the 5th of September, I immediately addressed myselfe onely to businesse." "Nothwithstanding our diligent labour and extraordinary pains-taking, it was All-hallowtide before our first range of buildings was fitted for an habitable being. After Christmas we employed our selves in the woods, especially in hard weather, whence wee got home as many board-stocks as afforded us two hundred boards and about two hundred timber trees besides. Wee got home as many trees as served to palisado into the Plantation about four acres of ground for the keeping off of both man and beast, with post and rail seven foot high, sharpened in the top, the trees being pitched

upright and fastened with spikes and nayles. Wee got also together as much firewood as will serve us yet these two moneths. Wee also fitted much garden ground for seed. I mean barley, oates, pease and beanes. For addition of building, wee have at this present a parlour of fourteen foot besides the chimney and twelve foot broad, of convenient height and a lodging chamber over it; to each a chimney of stone work, with stairs and a stair case; besides a tenement of two rooms, or a story and a half, which serves for a store house, till we are otherwise provided. The forge has been finished these five weeks, the salt-worke is now almost ready." Other letters followed giving fuller accounts of the settlement and describing in attractive terms the gardens, pasturage, the timber-land and the fisheries.¹ "The vines that came from Plymouth doe prosper very well;" he asserts "anything that grows in England will grow well here." The governor concludes one of his encouraging letters with a request for more able-bodied emigrants, those who are strong and healthy and can endure the climate and who will promote the prosperity of the settlement. He specially requests "six masons, four carpenters, two or three good quarrymen, a slater or two, a lime burner and lime, a

¹The first Act of the English Parliament relating to America regulated the fisheries of Newfoundland. (2 Edw. VI, Anno 1548.) Ploetz: Epitome of Univ. Hist., p. 288.

good quantity of laths, a couple of strong maids, that, besides other work, can brew and bake, also wheels, hemp and flax, and a sufficient number of West country labourers to fit the ground for the plough;" he wishes no more boys or girls sent over, since they cannot well endure the hard work; more ammunition is required, also some ordnance and a gunner to have charge of the gun in the fort overlooking the harbor.

At the time Calvert was receiving from his governor such favorable reports from his Newfoundland plantation, a thrill of horror and indignation passed through Europe upon the reception of the news detailing the bloody Indian massacres in Virginia. The year 1622 was long remembered by the settlers along the James, who escaped the Indian butcheries. Sir George may have well flattered himself upon his wisdom in selecting Ferryland, instead of Jamestown, as the scene of his economic enterprises, but he could not foresee that in less than a decade the plantation at Avalon, begun so auspiciously, would prove a miserable failure, while the undertaking in Virginia, though sown in blood and watered with tears, would continue to increase in prosperity until it had become the England of the New World.

In December, 1622, Calvert received a grant of the entire island of Newfoundland. The State

Paper entry reads simply, "grant to Sir George Calvert and his heirs of the whole country of Newfoundland." This large territory was held only a few months, for on March 30, 1623, a re-grant was made "with alteration and addition of some particular points, for better encouraging that plantation." He recognized that a large territory remote from the home country could not be well governed unless more power was entrusted to the governor, and acting upon the suggestion of Capt. Wynne, he applied for and obtained the Charter of Avalon, dated April, 1623. The Charter of Avalon has been described as "one of the earliest instruments prepared as the basis of social, civil and religious organization of English colonists on the North American Coast." It was received by Calvert just forty years after Sir Humphrey Gilbert had landed on the shores of Newfoundland with the charter he had received from Queen Elizabeth. Gilbert proclaimed his authority, published his charter, and demanded of each settler wood and water as a token of fealty and allegiance, but his authority was only administrative. It was revocable at the Queen's pleasure, but by the terms of the Charter of Avalon, Calvert received royal jurisdiction, enjoying many privileges belonging in England only to the royal prerogative. In his limited territory he was made as supreme in taxation, the making of laws, the

holding of courts, etc., as the Bishop of Durham, the Earl of Chester, or even as the King of England. Holding his domain by feudal tenure, by Knight's service, Calvert must recognize King James as his over-lord, his suzerain. After an analysis of previous charters and grants, Streeter comes to the following conclusion: "I find the patent of Avalon, to be, in the main, but a repetition of the provisions which had been previously made in the charters granted to Gilbert, Raleigh, Alexander and the several companies of adventurers for Newfoundland, Virginia and Plymouth, modified somewhat to conform to the position he assumed as absolute Lord and Proprietary."

It is not known whether the name of "Avalon" was first given to his province in Newfoundland by Calvert himself. In his letters from the island he usually dates them from "Ferryland." As soon as he had secured the Charter he took steps to make its attractiveness, as a colony adapted to emigrants, known in various parts of England. A request had been sent by the members of the Privy Council, including Calvert, to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York desiring them to use their influence in securing emigrants for the Newfoundland settlements, including Avalon. Their Graces willingly acceded to the request and gave a flattering endorsement to Captain Whitbourne's book on Newfoundland, in

which the worthy Captain, who had travelled in many seas, gives a very graphic account of the beauty, salubrity, fertility and general excellence of the great island. The book was circulated through England about the time Calvert had received the re-grant and charter. Much of the Captain's book can only be compared, in its lively description, to the circulars and pamphlets of modern land companies, but there was a basis for his account in the wealth of the Newfoundland fisheries. In March, 1621, a commission consisting of Calvert, the Earl of Arundel and the Duke of Lennox, had submitted a report on Newfoundland in which it was stated that at least 300 ships were annually employed in the Newfoundland trade, and that not less than 10,000 British seamen were employed. The customs on imported goods amounted to £10,000 annually.

In August, 1623, Calvert wrote to Secretary Conway a letter expressing his indebtedness to a certain Captain Nutt, for "protecting the infant plantation in Newfoundland." Calvert has been much censured by Paxton Hood in his *Life of Sir John Eliot* (?), and by others, for his zeal in procuring a pardon for Nutt, on the ground that he was a pirate and that he was unworthy of Calvert's friendly mediation; whatever may have been his past career Nutt had proven himself a good subject by his energy in protecting English vessels

in foreign waters and especially upon the Newfoundland banks, and Calvert was indebted to him both personally and as an administrative officer of the English government.

During the succeeding three or four years Calvert seems to have taken less interest in the affairs of Newfoundland. He was extremely anxious to visit his plantation, but was prevented by his home duties. For some years he had been a member of the New England Company, and under the new patent issued in 1622, he became one of its Councillors. This was a place of honor and of importance and secured for him a large range of vision over discoveries and settlements in the New World. In the list of the eighteen Councillors of the company were the names of Buckingham, Earl of Arundel, Earl of Carlisle, Marquis of Hamilton, Duke of Lennox, Earl of Salisbury and others well known in Court circles. In July, 1624, one month after the old Virginia charter had been declared invalid, he was appointed to the important position of one of the quorum of the provisional council in England, constituted to exercise temporary government in Virginia until a new charter should be granted the company. These positions as Councillor in the two important English companies gave him a direct share in the management of almost the entire English settlements in America. It is not

known how long he retained these positions though it is not improbable that his profession of the Catholic religion in 1625, caused him to retire from them when he resigned his secretaryship.

Calvert did not visit his plantation at Avalon until the year 1627. In a letter, dated May 21, after he had been recalled to England and had been awaiting his commission to go on the embassy to Brussels, he informs Wentworth that he had finally received the royal consent to cross the ocean, and that he would soon have the pleasure of carrying out his long deferred desire of visiting Newfoundland. He promises to remain but a few months and to return not later than Michaelmas (middle of October). It is in this letter that the ex-Secretary warns his old colleague of the danger of wilfully opposing the Court, advises him to be cautious as he had strong enemies at Court, and to secure himself from imprisonment and disgrace by paying the forced loan levied by Charles. Before many months the ambitious Wentworth had become as thorough in his allegiance to the King as he now was in opposition. Calvert set sail for Avalon, June 7, 1627, accompanied by members of his family and two seminary priests. In the same month and year, Buckingham, "with a stately fleet of a hundred sail," embarked from England to relieve the Protestants of Rochelle. The expeditions of the two

friends, whose lives had run in parallel lines for many years, were directed to opposite shores of the ocean, and in each case ended in miserable failure; but the failure of Buckingham, at the isle of Rhé, led to intense resentment in England and to his ignominious death by an assassin; the failure of Calvert, in Newfoundland, was but the preface to enduring success on the shores of the Chesapeake.

The little fleet of Calvert arrived at Ferryland, Newfoundland, in the last week of July, 1627. The party could have remained but two months in the island, for it had returned to England in November. The first voyage of Calvert to Avalon had been merely for the purpose of inspecting the plantation and not to select a permanent residence there. In his letter to Wentworth he implies that he was going to put things in order, to secure the enforcement of laws, to reduce the expenses, and in general to endeavor by his personal presence to so order the affairs of the community that his expenditures during the previous six or seven years would prove more remunerative. It was neither the voyage of a missionary nor of an exile. Calvert spent the winter and spring of 1627-8 in his home in England. It is not improbable that his anxiety for the temporal welfare of his colony added to the feverish state of society in England may have finally induced

him to fix his permanent abode in the New World. There were stirring political events in England at this period. The failure of the expedition to Rhé in November, 1627, and the assassination of Buckingham by Felton soon afterwards profoundly disturbed the political horizon. Eliot, the zealous leader of the people, was daily increasing the number of his excited followers, and Wentworth was strengthening himself to defend the King and his party; and on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, summoned to assemble in the early part of 1628, the air was filled with the party cries of political and religious enthusiasts. Even in the household of the King, the French and the English, the Catholics and the Protestants were wrangling upon questions of jurisdiction and precedence. Calvert was not old in years, but he was weakened by bodily infirmities and he felt a longing to pass the remainder of his days beyond the pale of the troubles looming up in England. His days of usefulness were over, and his country having repudiated his services, he concluded he might as well spend the few years remaining to him in Newfoundland as in Ireland or England.

In the spring of 1628, Calvert's fleet could be seen the second time ploughing the Atlantic, en route for Avalon. The severity of the climate and the ruggedness of the country could not deter him. He had been a visitor to Newfoundland,

the previous year, during its most inviting season, the summer and early autumn. The flowers bloomed rapidly and the cereals gave fair prospects of an abundant harvest, the berries and fruits of various kinds gave promise of a large ingathering; but he had not penetrated beyond the margin of the shore, into the interior of the island and witnessed its desolation. Had his eyes rested upon the great sand-heaps broken only by huge boulders and rocky deposits, the steep hills covered with a scant vegetation and stunted trees, the long, narrow, treeless valleys leading into broad, sandy plains, incapable of tillage, he would not have been so eager to settle his family and friends at Avalon. The vicissitudes of the climate and the variableness of the soil had deceived him as it had deceived others. He arrived in Newfoundland, in his second voyage, in the early part of the summer of 1628. He had brought with him about two score persons, so that the entire colony was increased to not less than one hundred souls.

Calvert's prospects during the first few weeks of his residence upon the island seemed reasonably fair. He had a well-built house to live in and the peace of the colony was almost as good as he could have desired, but he soon began to meet with troubles from enemies from without. The French cruisers and pirates began to attack his vessels and even dared to seize his stores upon the land,

but he soon put a check upon their pillaging and finally drove them from the coast. In fact, Calvert was more successful out in the open waters than he was upon the mainland. He came to "sett and to sow," but he found it necessary to clear the waters of hostile craft before he could find peace in his colony, and in his new rôle of sea captain he was successful even beyond his expectations, for not only did he scatter the pirates and privateers, but he recaptured from the French a score of English vessels with their crews, and also succeeded in capturing a number of French prizes. With the aid of the *Victory*, a London war-ship, he made war upon and captured six French fishing vessels lying in the harbor of Trespaxès. These vessels were moored to Ferryland and guarded by the guns of the fort and subsequently were divided "man for man and ton for ton," between Calvert and the owners of the *Victory*. Upon the arrival of the prizes in England, the commander of the *Victory* objected to the previous equal division of the spoils and proceeded to appropriate more than his allotted share. This unjust distribution was objected to by Calvert's agents and the case went from one tribunal to another and was finally brought before the Privy Council for their adjudication. Their decision is not recorded, but Calvert evidently did not reap the spoils of victory. He appears to have had no letters

of marque and his actions were doubtless not in strict accordance with maritime usage. One of the vessels, however, the *St. Claude*, was loaned him by the government and is quite frequently mentioned in Calvert's correspondence.

The peace of mind of Calvert was ere long disturbed by some religious troubles which seemed to have been stirred up by a certain Erasmus Stourton, a Puritan, who was afterwards banished the colony for his misdeeds and insubordination. Upon the arrival of Stourton at Plymouth, England, in October, 1628, he laid charges against Calvert of fomenting religious difficulties at the settlement by the favoritism shown to the Catholic residents. As Stourton was a Puritan minister, and as Calvert was far away, the impression gained ground that the Protestant residents were not fairly treated at Avalon; but in whatever way the story reached the ears of the King, he did not think it a matter of much importance, for the request of Calvert for the loan of the *St. Claude* was readily granted.

It is not probable that the residence of Calvert upon the inhospitable island, removed from all the social amenities to which he had been accustomed in England and which were not even inaccessible in Ireland, was very congenial to his refined and sensitive nature. It certainly was a strange freak for a man occupying his station in

life and possessing his delicate health to banish himself from the scenes of his early associations and to prefer the troubled life at Avalon to the comparatively secluded life at the manor of Baltimore, or even at Kiplin. It is a plausible theory that he was led to remain abroad in order to found a religious asylum, but this theory is not sustained by good evidence. It is not improbable that he was urged forward in his economic enterprises by the persuasions of his sons, particularly Cecilius, his heir, who was now an energetic, ambitious young man of twenty-two or three. Calvert took occasion to relieve the tedium of colonial life by writing letters to friends in England. One letter is particularly interesting, written on August 23, 1628, to Buckingham, thanking him for his services in securing him his possessions at Avalon, "a wild part of the world," and relating his naval exploits. In a vein of humor he recalls some of the pleasant reminiscences of his old master, King James. But Buckingham did not receive the letter of the distant writer. At the time when Calvert was writing the letter, the hand of Felton was raised to strike to the ground the great favorite. The news of the awful death of Buckingham must have been very depressing to Calvert in his isolation.

As the rigors of the cold weather commenced to be felt, Calvert began to lose heart and recognized

that it would not be practicable for him to further prosecute his undertaking in such a cold climate. Although suffering with bodily infirmities, he refused to desert the colonists in their extremity and decided to brave the perils of the winter, even at the risk of his own health and safety. The winter of 1628-9 nearly crushed his spirit, for then he felt for the first time the intense severity of a Newfoundland winter, which from all accounts seems to have been unusually severe. The intense coldness, added to the want of proper food and shelter, caused at least one-half of the one hundred colonists to be laid upon beds of sickness. Even his own house was turned into a hospital, and because of his own illness, he was unable to minister personally to the wants of others. Nine or ten succumbed to the weather and disease, and perished. Spring had not dawned before he had determined to leave the cold, cheerless land, and, as soon as practicable, to seek a home in some better country. In his letter to the King, August 19, 1629, he said he had met with difficulties "no longer to be resisted." Both the land and the sea, he stated, are frozen over the greatest part of the winter season, lasting from October to May; he is forced, therefore, "to shift to some warmer climate of the New World, where the winters are shorter and less rigorous," and to commit his affairs at the plantation "to fisher-

men that are able to encounter storms and hard weather." Though his "strength is much decayed," he is determined to "proceed in plantations," and he therefore renews his request for a grant of land in Virginia, "with such privileges as King James granted him in Newfoundland," that is, that his privileges be secured by a charter, such as that of Avalon. He had already received a promise from the King that "he might have any part of that country [Virginia] not already granted." Calvert probably did not wait to receive an answer to his letter, for he set sail from Avalon in the early part of September, accompanied by his family and attendants, amounting in all to about forty persons. Those colonists who did not remain upon the island, returned to England. Calvert's vessel sailed directly for Virginia arriving at the mouth of the James in the early part of October, 1629.

In the year 1637, Cecilius Calvert, in a petition to the King, to secure him his possessions at Avalon, thus epitomizes the economic undertaking at Avalon: "His father, Sir Geo. Calvert, late Lord Baltimore, having purchased a good part of Newfoundland, obtained a grant from King James, and sent over divers colonies of the King's subjects to plant; where he built houses, erected forts, and placed Governors as Capt. Winne, Capt. Mason and Sir Art. Aston. His father afterwards resided there with his family; employed

his ships against the French, who then infested the place, and chased them from the coast. Has disbursed more than 20,000*l.* but was compelled about 6 years past, through the severity of the weather, to remove, leaving a governor with the colony." In his memorial of 1660, Cecilius puts the sum expended upon Avalon equal to 30,000 *l.*

George Calvert was evidently well pleased with the bright prospect that met his eyes in Virginia, even on the verge of winter; the large bay to his right stretching northwards to an indefinite extent, the great roads at the mouth of the rivers upon whose unruffled surface entire fleets could quietly anchor and the encircling shores covered with primeval forests, and the glittering white beach fringing the waters on all sides, gave him enlarged ideas of the beauty of the New World. The hospitable reception tendered him and his own, decided him to cast anchor upon the James and remain here until his plans were perfected, and possibly make it his permanent residence. At the time of Calvert's landing in Virginia about three thousand settlers were located at James' City and upon the neighboring plantations. Food was plentiful, the soil was fertile. Well-kept orchards and fine pasture lands offered a great contrast to the environments of his late home at Avalon, and probably brought to his remembrance the well-kept farms and manors of Mid-

dlesex and Yorkshire. The community seemed to be orderly and well governed and ample protection was secured against the Indians, who had long since been repaid for their bloody deeds of 1622. The Virginians were doubtless well pleased to receive among them such a warm friend of King Charles, to whom the colonists were attached, and one whose wealth and social standing would greatly add to the dignity of the colony, but all hopes of his permanent residence among them were in vain, so long as Calvert remained a Catholic. The Virginians could have omitted to tender him the oaths required of all settlers, or Calvert might have taken the oaths in view of his ill-health and the large number of persons entrusted to his care, but the one action would have been as illegal as the other would have been dishonorable. The difficulty could only be bridged over by the King. In the middle of November, Calvert was tendered the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, since by this time he had probably decided to remain, for a while at least, a resident at the settlement. The oath of allegiance he could take without difficulty, but in taking the oath of supremacy he must deny the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, and this he was not prepared to do.

In the instructions to Governor Yeardley, of Virginia, in 1624, he was directed "to administer the

oath of allegiance and supremacy to all such as come there with intention to plant and reside; which if any shall refuse, he is to be returned or shipped from thence." These instructions had been renewed to his successors, and were felt to be incumbent upon Dr. John Potts, the acting Governor, in the absence of Governor Harvey. Calvert, wishing to become a settler, agreed to take a modified form of the oath of supremacy, but this the council could not accept without instructions from the King. Accordingly they at once despatched a letter to Charles. In this letter the council state that "about the beginning of October last, there arrived in this colony the Lord Baltimore from his plantation in Newfoundland, with an intention, as we are informed, rather to plant himself to the southward than to settle here; although, since he has seemed well affected to this place, and willing to make his residence therein with his whole family, we were readily inclined to render to his Lordship all those respects which were due to the honor of his person, which might testify well with how much gladness we desire to receive and entertain him, as being of that eminence and degree whose presence and affection might give great advancement to the plantation." The letter states that the oaths were tendered him, and continues: "his Lordship offered to take the oath, a copy of which is included;

but, in true discharge of the trust imposed on us by his Majesty, we could not imagine that so much latitude was left for us to decline from the prescribed form, so strictly exacted."

It is not definitely known how long Calvert remained in Virginia. He could not become a *bone fide* resident and a member of the community, until a favorable answer was sent in reply to the letter of the Virginia council; according to Streeter, he left Virginia at the beginning of winter, arriving in England about the middle of January, 1630. If, however, the rowdy Tindall, who was pilloried in March, for insulting Calvert, was punished immediately after his rude behavior, Calvert must have remained until the middle of the spring of 1630. During his temporary residence he had ample time to ascertain the value for colonization of the unoccupied lands lying both to the north and the south of the Virginia settlements; but, notwithstanding the fair prospects of the land lying on both sides of the Chesapeake, he was more favorably inclined towards the warm lowlands stretching southward from the James, and now known as the Southside of Virginia. Had his free choice met with no opposition, it is not improbable that George Calvert would have become the founder of the Carolinas.

After an eventful career in the New World, lasting many months, after being driven by

nature's laws from Avalon, and by man's laws from Jamestown, Calvert found himself once again in England, in the summer of 1630. Notwithstanding his bitter experiences in America, the infirm state of his health, the warm greetings of his old friends, including Strafford, and the solicitous consideration of King Charles, Calvert persisted in preparing once more to cross the ocean and to make for himself a home in the American wilderness. King Charles was at a loss to understand the actions of his father's old servant and plainly told him that, "men of his condition and breeding are fitter for other employments than the framing of new plantations," and advised him to remain in England where he would "enjoy such respect as his former services and later endeavors justly deserve."

Calvert was in a dilemma. He had left Virginia expecting soon to return, but he dare not return in opposition to the King's will, and could not without forfeiting his good favor. So sure was he of returning that he had left behind him Lady Baltimore (his second wife) and members of his family. He had remained with the Virginians long enough to experience their generous hospitality towards visitors, and he knew his family, in his absence, would receive every kind attention. Constrained to remain at home, he immediately wrote to Secretary Dorchester, "pro-

cure me a letter from my lords of the Councell to the Governor of Virginia in favour of my wife, now there, that he would afford her his best assistance upon her returne into England." In this letter he expressed his intention to remain in his native country the balance of his days. The *St. Claude*, the vessel loaned him by the government to bring over his family, made its way to America in safety, but on its return it was wrecked on the shores of England, and much valuable stuff was lost, though the passengers all escaped in safety.

Calvert took up his residence in London (his letters were dated from Lincoln's Inn Fields). He continued to enjoy the "princely approbation" of Charles and doubtless could have received some position of honor and emolument, since Spain and England were on friendly relations, but he found it impossible to forget the great tracts of unoccupied territory in America and urged his claims so well that he received from the King a large grant of land extending southward from the James as far as the River Chowan (Roanoke) and reaching from the Atlantic westwards to the mountains. This patent was signed in February, 1632. The grant of this territory was immediately opposed by members of the old Virginia Company, including Clayborne, who were influential at Court, and who had been

negotiating with Charles for a restitution of the Virginia grant, with the corporate and territorial rights formerly held by the Company. Calvert decided to return the grant of Carolana, rather than contest his rights with the strong Virginia party, and to accept in lieu the territory lying to the north of the James and south of the New England grants. He was successful in securing, without opposition from the Virginia Company, the grant of land now known as Maryland,¹ though it is not improbable that the new grant would have been stoutly contested by individuals, had they known of its progress through the Council, since many preferred to own allegiance to a corporation or to the King rather than to a subject.

During the two years he spent in England on his return and previous to his death, Calvert was engaged in other matters besides projecting colonies in the New World. He had not quite forgotten his old political instincts and closely watched the domestic and foreign policy of the government. By education and association an adherent of the Court party, he was a devoted admirer of the misguided Charles, even though he could not approve

¹ As the charter confirming the grant of Maryland did not pass the great seal of England until after the death of George Calvert, an analysis of its provisions, as the basis of the constitutional history of Maryland, belongs more appropriately to the biography of Cecilius, second Baron of Baltimore.

of all his doings. He felt impelled to enter the political arena once again, and though not caring and perhaps not able to sustain the burdens of office, he raised his voice once more in favor of his old foreign policy, by writing, in the spring of 1631, a tractate to King Charles, embracing his views upon the continental embroglio, now made even more interesting by the arrival in Germany of the famous Gustavus Adolphus (June, 1630). Calvert took as a basis for his arguments certain vigorous pamphlets that had caused a considerable flutter in political circles. These were "Tom Tell-Troth or a Free Discourse touching the Manners of the Times" (1622), "Lamentations of the Kirke" (1624), and "The Practice of Princes" (1630). All these tracts denounced in caustic terms the foreign policy of James and Charles, and as the first two had appeared when Calvert was holding the office of Secretary, it is not improbable that some of the paragraphs were levelled at him. He entitled his address to Charles, "The Answer to Tom Tell-Troth, the Practice of Princes and the Lamentations of the Kirke." The burden of the address is a closer alliance with Spain and a surrender of the King's position upon the claims of the Palatinate.

The contents of the tract may be estimated in part from the titles given the different chapters, viz.:

“1. Introductory.

“2. That Ferdinand was lawfully elected King of Bohemia.

“3. That the crown of Bohemia is not only elective.

“4. For the title of the Palgrave.

“5. Of the Proscription of the Palgrave.

“6. Of King James his not taking Armes to vindicate the honour of his Sonne proscribed.

“7. Reasons why the Court Palatine is not to be restored by Armes.”

The conclusion of the tract reads, “therefore this is my humble supplication and suite to your Majesty, that yourself would be pleased to peruse and ponder these few lines and to bee perswaded that nothing moveth me to this scribbling presumption, but my owne fidelity, and the love of some of your servants here that pray for your happinesse. Protesting and taking God to witness that I write by no instruction of forreigners, nor for no pension, nor obligation to any forreigne Prince whatsoever, but this *hanc animam concede mihi tunc cætera sunt.*”

The tract was intended for private circulation, and primarily for the edification of King Charles; it was not published until the year 1642, the year of the battle of Edgehill and the beginning of the Civil War in England. The pamphlet is particularly interesting for the views it contains upon

religious questions and the events of the great struggle on the continent, known in history as the Thirty-Years' War. The religious feeling and political sentiments of Calvert are well illustrated in its pages.

Within a year after his address to the King, and soon after he had surrendered his patent of Carolana, the spirit of the secretary and colonizer had passed away. As the earth was beginning to feel the genial warmth of the spring-tide sun, and the buds were bursting their shells, Calvert felt the coldness of death creeping over him and on Sunday, April 15, 1632, in the midst of his large family, he calmly passed away in death. He had felt his end approaching, for on the previous day, the 14th of April, he executed his will, bequeathing "all his estates in England, Ireland and elsewhere to his son Cecilius, whom he appointed his executor; at the same time desiring his noble and ancient friends, the Lord Viscount Wentworth, now Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and Lord Cottington, now Secretary of State, to be overseers, "whom he humbly requested to have a care of his poor family and to patronize and to love it" (Streeter). He left a small sum of money to be divided among his relatives at Kiplin.

Within a few months after Calvert had died, the great Gustavus Adolphus, the "Snow-King," perished on the field of Lützen, struggling, as an

intense Protestant against the machinations of that Spain that had so bewitched the mind of the first and greatest of the Baltimores.

Old St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street, London, in the chancel of which the remains of dead statesmen were interred, has long since perished by fire, nothing remains of Calvert, save a portrait discovered in the homestead of his friend and co-laborer, Lord Bacon;¹ not a bust, a monument, or a memorial tablet can be found on either side of the Atlantic to commemorate the virtues and wisdom of the founder of Maryland.

IV.

REVIEW OF HIS CAREER AND CHARACTER.

Some years ago, an ardent admirer of George Calvert, in an after-dinner speech, eulogizing his character, said that frequently the name of a patriot, like that of Calvert, though a long time "overclouded by calumny or darkened by neglect, blazes forth at once in the clear effulgence of true glory. It receives the homage of genius, and the gratitude of nations. It becomes the precept of

¹This portrait was painted by Mytens, court painter of James I. A very fine copy of the original, made by Vinter of London, was presented to the State of Maryland by the Hon. John W. Garrett. See *Balto. Sun*, Jan. 31 and Feb. 1, 1882.

age, and the example of youth;" but since the orator had remarked that "the minute facts and dates" of Baltimore's career were not very fresh in his memory, his fulsome praise is pardonable.

Calvert was neither a Loyola, a Newton, nor a Washington, yet his career is not devoid of interest and romance, and his life may be studied with profit. He did not possess the qualities that constitute a great man, yet his character stands unimpeached for the principles of moderation, prudence, energy and thorough honesty. Considering the suddenness of his political preferment, the obscurity of his birth, the utter corruption of his times, and the intensity of party feelings, it is remarkable that his course was so even and upright. Not a line can be found in any memoir, history, or state document that could be introduced as evidence against his integrity. The literature of the day, both of private and public sources, though abounding in flippant gossip and vindictive personalities, does not contain a word reflecting upon his political morality. Notwithstanding the almost unlimited influence of Buckingham, who, says Gardiner, "had spoken hard things of Calvert," he resolutely refused to sacrifice his principles of rectitude to propitiate the wrath of the favorite, and, though he knew Buckingham was striving to secure the secretaryship for a personal friend, he refused to make any advances to secure his coöperation

to maintain himself in office. In after years when Calvert had resigned his office and retired into private life, the impulsive favorite recognized his personal worth and became attached to his interests.

In the many parliaments in which he was a representative, Calvert was a conspicuous figure, both on account of his personal talents and his prominent place in the King's Council. As an orator, his talents were not of the first class. He was not eloquent, yet his manner of speaking, his tact and courtesy, were sufficiently impressive to quiet and frequently to convince the most pertinacious of the Puritan leaders. He had a most difficult side to espouse, the side of King James, yet he was frequently successful in obtaining a favorable recognition of the King's demands for subsidies, and an acquiescence in the King's foreign policy. It argues greatly to his credit as a skillful speaker that by his strong appeals he was enabled to silence such men as Coke, Selden, Pym and Philips; but as James became more arbitrary, and as Buckingham became more influential in Parliament, Calvert sought refuge in silence.

Calvert's position upon the Spanish Match did not add to his popularity, and has detracted much from his reputation; but throughout the entire negotiations he was guided by fixed principles and was ever consistent with himself. He did

not display a large amount of political foresight in planting himself in opposition to the *Vox Populi*, but he was no friend to popular government as then understood. Like many thoughtful men of his time he viewed with much distrust the rising power of the masses, and felt that it would be far preferable for the King to direct the people than the people to control the King. He knew the Spanish Match was not popular, but he did not think the will of the people was the best foundation for a government. Not only Germany and France, but England itself was filled with fanatical spirits, seeking what they might destroy, and in many places these fanatics had become rulers by popular acclamation. He himself could remember when the streets of London were profoundly disturbed by the excesses of enthusiasts, who, when brought to trial had boldly said, "they were above the magistrates," and had declared their purpose "to change the whole form of government." He thought the Commons were pressing towards the same goal, and felt it his duty to check the advance. Calvert was living in a period of constitutionalism, but he could not read the signs of the times. Had he possessed less integrity or less prudence he might have shared the fall of Bacon or the fate that befell his comrade Strafford. He did not err in wishing to have a strong central government, but he made a mistake in not recog-

nizing the just claims of the people. He was a strong Royalist, but he was actuated not by caprice or selfishness, but by a strong feeling of conservatism, strengthened by a long career at the Court. There were fields of legislation in which the Commons could take a prominent part, but in the general administration of government, the making of treaties and of foreign alliances, the King was entitled to exclusive authority and unquestionable obedience. He was fully persuaded an alliance with Spain would be of great advantage to England, it would not only connect her by a strong tie with the most powerful nation of the period, but it would give to England the enviable position of umpire in disputed points of international polity. The influence that Gondomar is said to have exercised over Calvert was political not personal. The Spanish Match did not at first offer to the Secretary any special hope of pecuniary reward or political preferment, though he clung to it finally so tenaciously in order to save his official reputation. He was not without precedents for his foreign policy and his efforts were seconded by some of the purest and wisest statesmen of the times. Gardiner's passing remark is sustained by the amplest evidence; he says: "I may take this opportunity of stating that it is quite a mistake to suppose that because Calvert afterwards became a Roman Catholic, he was ready to betray English

interests into the hands of the Spaniards." He was careful not only of the rights of the English people, as he regarded them, but also of the claims of those who looked to England for aid. Even when the news from Madrid was most favorable to the success of the Match and when an alliance with Spain seemed inevitable (1623), Calvert did not lose sight of the German subjects of Frederick, James's son-in-law. As soon as he heard that the Court of Spain was rejoicing over the selection, by the Diet, of Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, a rigid Catholic, to the Palatine electorate of Frederick, Calvert went immediately to the Spanish Ambassadors in London and complained of the indelicate action of the Spanish government in celebrating an event that deprived Frederick of his paternal principality. The Ambassadors made excuses and said the action of the Spanish Court was only a mere compliment. Calvert, however, was not satisfied; he intimated to the King that "the time was come for a more decided policy in Germany," and that it would be advisable to reconsider the policy adopted towards Frederick. Professor Diman, in his "Lectures on the Thirty-Years' War,"¹ admitted that the election of Frederick to the throne of Bohemia was not strictly legal. This was the view James had taken in his reply to the petition of the Commons, (December 11, 1621.)

¹ Delivered at Johns Hopkins University, in 1879.

and Calvert did not see any impropriety in England's joining in alliance with Spain because it refused to recognize the claims of the rash Prince Palatine to Bohemia, or because it was a Roman Catholic power. The story that Calvert was bribed by Spanish gold to intrigue in the interest of Spain is without shadow of foundation; the story is put in Rapin's History by his editor. Bishop Goodman, in his history of the Court of James the First, mentions the rumor that Middlesex, Bristol, and Calvert were interested in the success of the Spanish Match from pecuniary motives, but Goodman himself shows the utter falsity of the whole story (Vol. I., p. 377). In fact, in those days it was so usual for great offices of State to be prized for their money value, that it was difficult for the general body of the people to conceive of a statesman who could resist the temptation to sell his services to the highest bidder; but even under Buckingham's régime there were honest statesmen in the English ministry and among them was the Secretary of State.

Calvert's conversion to the Catholic religion was thorough and honest, though the change of belief had been gradual. At a crisis in his career he made an open profession of his adherence to papacy and accepted the consequences. Upon his appointment to the Secretaryship in 1619, he was regarded by all classes as a Protestant,

a member of the Church of England. If he was secretly a member of, or an adherent to, the Roman Church, he was guilty of deceit and hypocrisy entirely inconsistent with his whole career. He had his frailties, but hypocrisy was entirely foreign to his character. In a letter of March 11, 1611, to Sir Thomas Edwardes, English Ambassador at Paris, Calvert describes the reunion of the celebrated Theophilus Higgins to the Church of England, as "a famous conversion of a revolted minister of our Church," thus identifying himself with the English Church, in a private letter written to a confidential friend. In the reports of the Irish Commissions of 1613, the practices of Irish Catholics were severely criticized, and repressive measures were proposed to abolish their iniquitous proceedings; both of these reports were signed and endorsed by Calvert. At the time of his appointment to the Secretaryship, James was particularly embittered against Catholics. He had dismissed Calvert's predecessor, Lake, partly on religious grounds; and in thinking upon the duplicity of Lady Lake, he had applied most offensive epithets to the Catholic ladies of the Court, and he was much enraged at the report that the "nuns of Louvain" and other Catholics were praying for the deliverance of Secretary Lake from his enemies. Under these circumstances Calvert could not have hoped to

receive the Secretaryship if he had been a Roman Catholic. As a member of the Parliaments of 1621 and 1625, Calvert must have been regarded as a Protestant, for no professed Catholic could sit in the Commons at that period. It is true that within a few years after his appointment to the Secretaryship, Calvert is called by some members of Parliament, "the Popish Secretary," but this epithet was simply a party cry, fastened upon him as one of the foremost leaders of the Spanish party. He was probably charmed by, and irresistibly drawn towards the elegant and courteous Spaniard, Gondomar, but after this ambassador had permanently left England, Calvert was still serving on anti-Catholic commissions, and was one of the first of the Councillors to advise his Majesty to render more effectual assistance to the German Protestants.

He did not resign the Secretaryship because he was a Catholic, but because, as a minister, he had lost the confidence of the King by the tactics of Buckingham and by the failure of the Spanish Match. But before he did resign he had become a Catholic, and his conversion gave him an additional reason for resigning. He retired into private life, taking with him the best wishes of the King for his personal welfare. But the fallen minister did not become a religious propagandist or a patron of religious refugees. He found con-

solation in the teachings of the Church, but he did not seek to inculcate its doctrines on any beyond his own family. In the darkest hour of his career, when he landed in England after his disastrous failure at Avalon and his banishment from Virginia, and but a short time after the vessel bearing his wife had been wrecked and his personal wealth lost in the ocean, and at a time when the Puritans were growing in numbers and strength, Calvert wrote to his old friend Wentworth a letter breathing a spirit of generous benevolence. In his letter he says: "Thus your Lordship sees that we papists want not charity towards you protestants, whatsoever the less understanding part of the world think of us," (August 12, 1630). In August, 1624, when Calvert was feeling depressed by the ill success of his projects and by the burden and cares of his ministerial and Parliamentary duties, he had received a refreshing letter from Wentworth, concluding: "God bless you in all your ways, and that they may all terminate in your heart's desire." Many years afterwards, Wentworth's own rugged spirit was crushed by the death of his lovely wife. Calvert sympathized with his old colleague in his bereavement, and in the spirit of his contemporary, George Herbert, he wrote to Wentworth: "I beseech his Almighty Goodness to grant that your Lordship may, for his sake, bear this great cross with meekness and

patience, whose only Son, our dear Lord and Savior, bore a greater than you; and to consider that these humiliations, though they be very bitter, yet are they sovereign medicines, ministered unto us by our Heavenly Physician, to cure the sickness of our souls." This letter to Wentworth, written in October, 1631, breathes the spirit of a man who through tribulation had gained patience and experience, and through experience had obtained hope. "Wife, children, honor, wealth, friends," said the writer, all "pass away." In the bosom of the Catholic Church, Calvert had sought and found that peace that his soul longed for. To him the altar, chalice, candlestick, etc., described by Bishop Goodman, as kept in his best room, were but symbols to express his religious belief or to intensify his religious aspirations.

Calvert's special claims to recognition in America are based upon his interest in the American trading companies, and upon his personal endeavors to colonize the New World. Whatever diversity of opinions may exist regarding his last undertaking in America, there is no evidence that his first ventures were otherwise than entirely economic and speculative. He buys a large tract of territory in Newfoundland, sends over a number of men, mechanics, salt-makers, fishermen, etc., to erect a settlement, and is informed by his governor that it is impolitic to send over any

save those who will do hard work; no boys or girls are wanted, they are only an expense; the fishing community bids fair to secure remunerative returns to the undertaker. In the course of a few years the scope of operation widens, the governor recognizes the need of better laws and of more authority, he informs Calvert of his requirements and soon the royal charter (1623) is obtained, a rude form of government is instituted, commissioned officers are sent over with ample powers to enforce order and to administer justice; storehouses, granaries, dwellings, forts, are erected, forests are levelled and the grounds palisaded to secure the community from enemies without; immigration is encouraged, agriculture is carried on, a regular commerce is begun, and the fishing hamlet develops into an orderly, thriving English settlement, bearing a strong resemblance to some of the little seaports of Cornwall or Devonshire. Calvert finally is permitted by the King to visit his colony across the ocean, and on his return the idea becomes dominant in his mind that the settlement at Avalon might offer him and his large family a more comfortable home than either the valley of the Swale, the banks of the Slaney, or the plains of Longford County. He migrates with his family, prepares to make the New World his permanent home, makes appropriate laws and ordinances, secures better protection to life and

property, scatters the pirates in the neighboring waters, and looks forward to ending his days here in peace and plenty. But his well devised and well executed plans find an invincible enemy in the waves and the winds and the intense cold, and he seeks refuge in a warmer climate. He anchors in Virginia, near its capital, decides to make this place his home; declares to the Council his intention to abide in the country and to live under its laws and protection. But there is an obstacle in the way he had not foreseen. He forgot that other men were not so tolerant upon religious matters as himself, and is banished from the settlements by a religious law which many years before he had endorsed, if he did not actually formulate. He recognizes the legality of the position taken by the Council, returns to England either to press the King for a suspension of the objectionable oaths, or to urge his claims for a new grant of territory, and while in England he is informed by the King that his migratory disposition is distasteful to him, and is advised to remain in his native country and to take the rest to which his eminent services entitle him. To a staunch royalist as Calvert the will of the King is as obligatory as his command, and the famous voyager decides to pass the remainder of his days in England.

The actual designs of George Calvert in renewing his claims to a grant of land in the New

World after he is enjoined by his sovereign to desist from planting colonies cannot be exactly determined. His motives could have been best understood by analysing the direction taken by a settlement under his own management, but unfortunately, before an opportunity was given him to inaugurate his new movement he had passed away in death and his large grant of territory passed into the control of another, in truth, his son, but one who was educated in a school of religion and politics quite different from that of his father. It is not improbable that religion formed one element in his motives, but quite a secondary one, and it cannot be demonstrated that it was the guiding principle that led George Calvert to found the province of Maryland. Though he was a Catholic, he was none the less an Englishman, and as a broad-minded Englishman he could not found a settlement to benefit a single class or party. His example was a proof that even in an age swayed by strong passions, a Catholic could be as tolerant, as charitable as a Protestant. In the very year that a law was enacted in Massachusetts disfranchising the non-church members (1631), Calvert was drawing up his charter securing toleration and protection to all creeds and parties. But when Calvert was devising plans for the new colony, his co-religionists were not so persecuted as to be obliged to

leave their country. Queen Henrietta was herself a member of the papal church and she found ample opportunity to secure the redress of grievances. Charles, who recognized the Catholics as sturdy supporters of the King's prerogative, had warned the Commons "to leave priest and recusant to the discretion of the Crown," and while the Charter of Maryland was awaiting the King's signature, Bishop Laud was on the eve of receiving the Canterbury Archbishopric, and his division of religious parties was not Papist and Protestant, but "Orthodox" and "Puritan." But even granted that there was a strong persecution of Catholics at this period, and that many were fleeing in haste from England, this fact in itself would not be a proof that Calvert was preparing an asylum to receive them. It might be a strong motive to a pious son of the Church to found such a place of refuge, but it is not convincing evidence that he would do so. It is true, some Catholics and several priests did accompany the first pilgrims to Maryland, but it is not the less true that Calvert's settlement at Avalon was composed principally of Puritans, among them some Puritan ministers, and the one fact is as conclusive as the other; but it must also be remembered that the first emigrants to Maryland were sent over, not by Sir George, but by Cecilius Calvert, almost two years after the death of his honored father.

The history of Maryland as a commonwealth begins with the Charter, but as Calvert never saw the Charter in its completed form, it cannot be determined exactly what course of government he would have pursued. His motives in securing the grant were not entirely religious, not entirely pecuniary, probably a commingling of both; but interpreting his motives by his life, as seen in its various phases, we are led to the conclusion that, notwithstanding his virtues, his piety, his papal adherence, he sought the grant of Maryland more for an economic than for a religious object. It may be true that Cecilius Calvert, in his colonization plans, was actually "treading in the steps of his father," but the mere fact that the King so proclaimed it, does not make it historically true. It is not conclusive to trace in the plans of the son the motives of the father.

In the life of George Calvert we witness the career of a man raised suddenly from obscurity to a seat with princes; from a mere Council clerk to the chief counsellor of the King and the pilot at the helm of state. This sudden possession of power and exalted rank had whetted his ambition, had dazzled his imagination, and probably had unconsciously perverted his sound judgment, but his integrity remained unimpaired; his sense of justice, his principles of rectitude remained unaltered; his hands remained clean and his conscience re-

mained unscared, at a period in English history unexampled for its unbridled corruption and its refined immorality. Though he gambled with fortune, he did not become intoxicated with success, nor time-serving and servile when he lost. He staked his whole future preferment upon a single movement, and was defeated. The failure of the Spanish alliance terminated his career. In his bitter disappointment, surrounded by foes seeking his disgrace, and only retaining his place by the uncertain affection of an unsympathetic, extravagant King, he for awhile drifted hither and thither, until he became finally anchored in the spiritual haven, the Catholic Church.¹ But in his new sphere, he did not act like the pendulum, swinging from extreme to extreme, but remained moderate, courteous, charitable. He became no spiritual propagandist, but sought only to educate his children in that faith, which afforded him peace and contentment. He was anxious to be released from the entanglements of the Court, and sought a vent for his mental activity in making voyages of discovery and in planting colonies. As a pioneer in this employment he met with failures, but his failures became valuable lessons to his

¹There is no evidence that Calvert's conversion was due to any sinister motive. The Church of Rome offered him, in his distress of mind, a surer peace than the deeply stirred Church of England, or the aggressive fold of the Puritans.

immediate heir and to the generation that succeeded him. He died probably thinking his whole life was a long failure; but a grateful posterity has rescued his name from oblivion, and has placed his monument in the niche allowed to the immortals.

His motto, on his own coat-of-arms, well expresses the tenor of his life: "womanly words, manly deeds"—*fatti maschii, parole femine*. In all his correspondence there runs a broad vein of kindness, sympathy, energy and courage. Possessing a strong will and a sound judgment, he moved along quietly, doing his work thoroughly and conscientiously. His ambition was lofty, but it was legitimate; it did not carry him into intemperate zeal or into corrupt practices. Judging him from the brief notice he has received from English historians, he occupied, in their estimation, but an unimportant place in the history of his times; but in America he will be long remembered for the impetus he gave to discoveries, to trade, and to the planting of colonies, and in Maryland his name will be continually remembered in honor and devotion, not only as the founder of the State, but as the first one to introduce in the New World a palatinate form of government, and a palatinate so wisely planned as to secure to each individual the fullest toleration in religion and the greatest freedom in political and civil life; a palatinate so

constituted that the Catholic, the Protestant and the Quaker might each quietly enjoy his religion, and in the enjoyment of his religion be protected, tolerated; and, as an Englishman, be allowed civil, political, and social rights and privileges, without distinction of party, class, or creed. In his lofty ideal, the founder of Maryland contemplated neither a great empire swayed by one political ruler, nor a great hierarchy controlled by one spiritual head, but a state founded upon the principles of justice, equality and liberty, a state established and built upon the basis of civil and common law, but guided and controlled by those principles of ecclesiastical polity that would meet the universal acceptance of all its citizens.

APPENDIX.


AUTHORITIES CONSULTED

IN PREPARING THE BIOGRAPHY OF

SIR GEORGE CALVERT, BARON OF BALTIMORE.

- Anderson: History of Commerce. Vol. II.
Anderson: History of the Colonial Church. Vol. I.
Anspach: History of Newfoundland.
Aspinwall: Papers, etc.
Baltimore: Answer to Tom Tell-Troth, etc. (Manuscript copy).
Bancroft: History of the United States. Vol. I.
Bozman: History of Maryland. Vol. I.
Brown: Civil Liberty.
Burke: Vicissitudes of Families.
Burke: Peerage of England, etc.
Calendar of English State Papers (Domestic).
Calendar of English State Papers (Ireland).
Calendar of English State Papers (Colonial).
Calendar of English State Papers (West Indies).
Calendar of English State Papers (Carew).
Camden: Annals of King James I.
Chappell: Voyage to Newfoundland.
Clarendon: Calendar of State Papers. Vol. I.
Doyle: English Colonies in America.
Dunlop: Memoirs of Spain. Vol. I.
Foley: Records of the English Province, Society of Jesus. Vol. III.
Freeman: English Towns and Districts.
Fuller: Worthies of England.
Gardiner: The Puritan Revolution.

- Gardiner: England under Duke of Buckingham and Charles I.
 Gardiner: Prince Charles and the Spanish Match.
 Gardiner: History of England. Vol. II.
 Gardiner: Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty.
 Gladstone: Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion.
 Goodman: Court and Times of King James I. Vol. I.
 Green: History of the English People. Vol. III.
 Hallam: Constitutional History of England.
 Halliwell: Letters of the Kings of England. Vol. II.
 Hansard: Parliamentary History. Vol. I.
 Hazard: Historical Collections. Vol. I.
 Hennings: Statutes of Virginia. Vol. I., 123.
 Johnson: The Foundation of Maryland.
 Kennedy: Life and Character of Sir George Calvert.
 Lewis: Topographical Dictionary of England.
 Liber Hiberniæ. Vol. I. and II.
 Lingard: History of England. Vol. VII.
 Lodge: English Colonies in America.
 Lodge: Illustrations of British History.
 Macdiarmid: Lives of British Statesmen. Vol. III.
 Mayer: Calvert and Penn.
 Morris: The Lords Baltimore.
 Neill: Founders of Maryland.
 Neill: Terra Mariæ.
 Neill: English Colonization in America.
 New York Colonial Documents. Vol. III.
 Nichols: Progresses, etc., of King James I.
 Oldmixon: British Empire in America.
 Osborne: Parliamentary History. Vol. V., VI.
 Poore: Charters and Constitutions of the United States.
 Purchas: His Pilgrimes. Vol. IV.
 Rapin: History of England.
 Rushworth: Historical Collections. Vol. I., II.
 Scharf: History of Maryland. Vol. I.
 Sloane Manuscripts. (Copy at Md. Hist. Soc'y).
 Sparks: American Biography. Vol. IX.
 Strafford: Letters and Despatches. Vol. I.
 Streeter: The First Lord Baltimore. (Manuscript).
 Surtees: County Palatine of Durham. Vol. I.
 Verplanck: Discoveries and Addresses.
 Whitbourne: Westward Hoe! For Avalon. (Abridged reprint).
 Whitelock: Memorials of English Affairs. Vol. I.
 Wood: Athenæ Oxoniensis. Vol. II.





**RETURN
TO →**

CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
202 Main Library

LOAN PERIOD 1

2

3

HOME USE

4

5

6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.

Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

SEP 16 1991

7

AUG 16 1991

FORM NO. DD6

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

©s

LD 9-20m-4, '55 (B12058)

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C038142894

