

EVELYN AND COLONEL HERBERT MORLEY IN 1659 AND 1660

BY E. S. DE BEER

COLONEL HERBERT MORLEY of Glynde was one of the most prominent Sussex men in the time of the Civil War. Born in 1616, he was elected a member of parliament for Lewes in the Long Parliament; he proved a firm and energetic supporter of the parliamentary cause, rendering valuable services at first locally in Sussex and afterwards in the government of the country; returning to private life and local administration on the expulsion of the Long Parliament in 1653.¹ It is, however, not so much for his achievements that he is remembered as for the part which he was expected to play in an abortive intrigue. Among his schoolfellows (presumably at the Free School at Southover, which had been founded by a lady named Agnes Morley) had been John Evelyn, the diarist, who was about four and a half years younger than himself. In spite of the divergence of their views the two men had kept up some sort of acquaintanceship. In 1652 Evelyn decided to settle permanently in England and applied to Morley, who was at the time a member of the Council of State, for a pass for his wife and for her goods; this Morley 'courteously granted', and rendered Evelyn 'many other kindnesses, that was a great matter in those days'; they included a letter of recommendation to the magistrates and searchers at Rye, where Mrs. Evelyn was to land.² In 1655 Evelyn sold to Morley the manor of Preston Bekhelwyn.³ Towards the end of 1659 it appeared to Evelyn that Morley could bring about the restoration of the monarchy; while this was sufficient to engage Evelyn to try to persuade Morley to attempt it, he was aware that the latter, if

¹ These facts are taken from the article on Morley in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

² Evelyn, *Diary*, 30 May, 3 June 1652.

³ *Ibid.*, 29 May 1655.

successful, would make his own fortune. There was a certain amount of risk for both men, but this did not deter Evelyn from approaching Morley.

The account given by Evelyn in the *Diary* of his negotiations with Morley at this time is obviously inaccurate. Fortunately a fuller account, compiled by Sir Thomas Clarges, is available in Edward Phillips's additions to Sir Richard Baker's *Chronicle*, as printed in the edition of 1665.¹ There is also available Evelyn's draft or copy of his letter to Morley of 12 January 1660; this is printed, together with Clarges's account and notes by Evelyn on it and on the letter, in some editions of the *Diary*.

Morley had sat for Sussex in Richard Cromwell's parliament, and on the restoration of the Long Parliament on 7 May 1659 again took his seat in it. He was a member of the Council of State elected on 14 May; on 9 July he was made colonel of a foot regiment; and he was one of the seven commissioners appointed on 12 October for the government of the Army in England and Scotland.² On 12 October he and Colonel Moss with their regiments and some other troops were ordered to guard the parliament; when Lambert came to Westminster on the following day to prevent the further sitting of the parliament Morley and Moss were unable to resist him; the result was the second Exclusion of the Long Parliament.³ At the same time the Council of State and the commission for the government of the Army lost their power. Morley and eight other officers

¹ pp. 736-8; the account is altered in later editions; references to Baker in this article are to this edition, except when otherwise indicated. The account reached Phillips too late to be inserted in its proper place (it should come on p. 719, immediately before the last paragraph). In his next edition (1670) Phillips, probably at Evelyn's desire, gave a shorter account of the negotiation (see Evelyn's note, printed with the extract from Phillips in various editions of the *Diary*); he divided it into two parts, which are inserted in their proper places (pp. 683-4, 698-9), adding a new circumstance in the second part. Bray found at Wotton a draft of his account sent by Clarges to Evelyn. For Clarges and Phillips see the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

² *Commons' Journals*, vii. 654, 708, 731, 796.

³ *Weekly Intelligencer*, 11-18 Oct., pp. 189-[91]; see also E. Ludlow, *Memoirs*, ed. Firth, 1894, ii. 137-40. Evelyn's cousin, Major Arthur Evelyn, was in command of some of the troops guarding the parliament and was one of the signatories of *The humble representation* (see below).

published a protest, *The humble representation of some officers of the Army, to the Right Honourable Lieutenant General Fleetwood*; it is dated 1 November.¹ It concludes with the suggestion that the Army should permit the parliament to reassemble, so that it 'may take some effectuall course, for as comprehensive an election of a succeeding Parliament, as the safety of the Cause will bear'.

At about the time when Morley was composing this protest Evelyn first approached him. A justification of the exclusion of the parliament had been published on or about 24 October as *The Army's plea for their present practice*;² Evelyn wrote and published an answer to it, *An apology for the royal party: written in a letter to a person of the late Council of State*; this was in circulation by 4 November.³ An internal allusion⁴ shows that it was intended especially for Morley; Evelyn, who had perhaps already been in communication with him, gave him a copy of it. According to Phillips, Morley was convinced by it and asked Evelyn to intercede with the king on behalf of himself, his brother-in-law John Fagg (of Wiston), and some other relations of his. A message was sent to the king by Colonel Tuke, who met the king at Pontoise; the king promised to pardon Morley and his associates if they had not been concerned in the trial of Charles I.⁵

There is nothing to show that Morley was trying to do more than secure himself in the event of a restoration of the monarchy; on the other hand, he may have come to the conclusion that there could be no stable government without the restoration of the monarchy. But while the negotiation was proceeding the attitude

¹ George Thomason, the collector of the 'Thomason tracts', adds a date, 3 Nov. Birch printed the pamphlet, from a MS. copy, in J. Thurloe, *State Papers, 1742*, VII. 771-4. Morley is attacked in a reply, *The Lord General Fleetwood's answer, &c.*, 8 Nov.

² The date is given by Thomason; the French ambassador, Bordeaux, refers to the pamphlet in his letter of the same date (24 Oct./3 Nov.) to Mazarin: F. P. G. Guizot, *Hist. du protectorat de Richard Cromwell*, 1856, II. 275.

³ Thomason's date; Evelyn gives 7 Nov.: *Diary*.

⁴ 'I . . . knew your education': p. 1.

⁵ Baker, p. 736. Charles was at Pontoise on the night of 7/17 Dec.: *Calendar of Clarendon State Papers*, IV, 1932, p. 474.

adopted by General Monck, the commander-in-chief in Scotland, changed the prospects of the Long Parliament. On 12 November he wrote from Edinburgh to the Mayor and Common Council of London, saying that he would endeavour to re-establish the parliament; this letter was delivered in London on 17 or 18 November.¹ On 19 November Thomas Scott, the regicide, Sir Arthur Hesilrige, Morley, and Colonel Valentine Walton, with five other members of the late Council of State, wrote a reply to Monck, expressing their approval of his attitude and promising to support him so far as they could.² In accordance with this promise Hesilrige, Morley, and Walton went to Portsmouth, where they arrived on 3 December; they won over the governor, Colonel Nathaniel Whetham;³ Fagg was sent into Sussex to raise forces. Fagg was soon taken and was brought back to London on 11 December;⁴ but Portsmouth was too strong to be attacked. Evelyn had received a reply from the king which he now endeavoured to communicate to Morley; it was, however, evident that the Army must yield and Morley appears to have taken no immediate notice of the message. The Long Parliament reassembled on 26 December; Morley returned from Portsmouth on the evening of 28 December⁵ and on the following day he and Fagg received the thanks of the house.⁶

On 2 January 1660 a new Council of State was established; all members of it were required to take an oath abjuring the house of Stuart and promising fidelity to the commonwealth. Morley and Fagg, who had both been elected members of the Council, refused, with some others of the elected members, to take the oath, and as a result did not become members of the Council.⁷ Morley thus began publicly to diverge from Hesilrige and the extreme republicans; this, however, did not prevent his

¹ Baker, p. 731.

² *Ibid.*, p. 732.

³ *A letter from Sir Arthur Haselrigge in Portsmouth*, 1659. Their correspondence with Fleetwood is printed as *The true copys of several letters from Portsmouth, directed by Col. Sir Arthur Haslerig, &c.*, 1659.

⁴ *Publick Intelligencer*, 5-12 Dec., pp. [939-40].

⁵ *Parliamentary Intelligencer*, 26 Dec.-2 Jan., p. 13.

⁶ *Commons' Journals*, VII. 799.

⁷ Baker, pp. 739-40.

appointment by parliament on 7 January as Lieutenant of the Tower;¹ at about the same time Fagg was engaged in raising a regiment of foot.² Evelyn now again tried to enlist Morley's support; failing to obtain a satisfactory interview with him he wrote to him on 12 January, urging him to make some movement on behalf of the king; his language is extremely vague.³ He obtained an interview on 22 January;⁴ Morley temporized, probably because he was determined to follow Monck, whatever the latter's course might be; he is said at this time to have been engaged with him and Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper; it was noticeable that he and Cooper were now attacking Hesilrige in parliament.⁵ In any case, he was not strong enough to act independently, even if he had wished to do so. Another attempt to win him for the king was being made at this time by Sir Trevor Williams.⁶

On 28 January Monck, who was now at St. Albans, wrote to parliament to arrange for the disposition of the forces in London. To make room for his own troops, all the troops in London, with the exception of Morley's and Fagg's regiments, were to be moved elsewhere.⁷ Monck arrived in London on 3 February. On the evening of 10 February he decided to write his letter to

¹ *Commons' Journals*, vii. 805. He was given his commission on 11 January: *ibid.*, p. 807.

² No commission is traceable; the regiment, which was raised about Portsmouth, was stationed in London towards the end of January: Baker, p. 740. I have not succeeded in finding any notice to show that Fagg was ever governor of Portsmouth; he had just been brought to London at the time when Evelyn describes him as governor: see *Diary*, 12 Dec. 1659, where he is incorrectly called 'Fay'.

³ *Diary and Corr.*, ed. Bohn, 1859, i. 426-8; also printed in other editions of the *Diary*; Phillips gives a summary. Evelyn's note on this letter, printed with it, was written after 29 May 1660 and probably some years later; and is unreliable.

The entries in Evelyn's *Diary* for 10 and 12 Dec. are perhaps to be explained as entries for 10 and 12 Jan. that have been misplaced; the existing entry for 12 Jan. being an attempt to rectify the account. The text of the *Diary* shows signs of revision and contains a number of similar problems.

⁴ *Diary*; Evelyn's note to his letter of 12 Jan.

⁵ Baker, ed. 1670, p. 699; *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 650 (16 Jan.). Cooper claims to have assured Hesilrige, Morley, and Walton, that Whetham would deliver Portsmouth to them: autobiographical fragment in W. D. Christie, *Life of Shaftesbury*, 1871, i. 196.

⁶ *Clarendon State Papers*, iii. 655 (20 Jan.); see also *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers*, iv. 536.

⁷ Baker, pp. 741-2.

parliament urging it to issue writs for the elections for a new parliament and to fix a day for its dissolution; one of the contributory factors which determined Monk to write the letter was Morley's promising him control of the Tower and the support of his and Fagg's regiments; Morley told him that they 'all were resolved to agree with him in any matters that should be for the publike Peace and Settlement'.¹ His attitude seems to have been generally recognized; this is made clear in Ludlow's account of his appointment on 11 February as one of the five commissioners for the government of the Army;² when, some time in March or April, Ludlow projected a plot to seize the Tower, he was assured, he writes, of the support of Morley's regiment, but apparently did not expect support from Morley himself.³

The readmission of the excluded members of parliament on 21 February was followed by the appointment of a new Council of State, of which Morley was elected a member (23 February);⁴ at the same time the appointment of Monk as commander-in-chief on 25 February deprived him of his commissionership for the government of the Army. He appears to have retained his position as Lieutenant of the Tower until the king's return.⁵ He was returned as member for Rye in the Convention Parliament.⁶

Shortly after the publication of the Declaration of Breda (1 May) Morley and Fagg were negotiating for their pardons; their agent was a royalist, Sir Allan Broderick; this application, if Evelyn is to be believed, was unsuccessful; the pardon, he says, was obtained

¹ J. Gumble, *Life of General Monk*, 1671, p. 243; John Price, *Mystery . . . of His Majesty's Happy Restoration*, 1680, p. 102.

² *Memoirs*, ed. Firth, II, 223.

³ Ludlow reckoned on the support of three of the 'Generals that had been appointed by the Parliament', meaning presumably the five commissioners appointed on 11 Feb. The three would be Hesilrige, Walton, and Alured; the other two were Monk and Morley: *Memoirs*, II, 242.

⁴ *Commons' Journals*, VII, 849.

⁵ After Lambert's escape on 11 April there were rumours of his removal: *Calendar of Clarendon State Papers*, IV, 653, 656. Lambert's party is said to have won over Morley's and Fagg's regiments: *Clarendon State Papers*, III, 706-7 (24 March).

⁶ *A perfect list*, &c. (Thomason tracts in British Museum, E. 765/9). Fagg was returned for Steyning.

only at a later date through the influence of Lord Mordaunt and at the cost of £1,000 to Morley.¹ It is certain that Morley was granted a pardon in July; Fagg obtained one in the same month.² Morley had been superseded as Lieutenant of the Tower in June³ and in August was deprived of the command of his regiments;⁴ on the other hand he and Fagg were among the commissioners for the monthly assessments established by the act of parliament of 29 August;⁵ and on 11 December Fagg was made a baronet. Morley had apparently returned easily and rapidly to his natural place in the normal political life of the country.

Evelyn, when describing Morley's efforts to obtain a pardon, accuses him of pusillanimity in not attempting what Monck had achieved. The accusation appears to be unfair. Morley possessed neither the armed force nor the prestige of Monck; he was not strong enough to oppose or to dictate to the parliament. A declaration in favour of the restoration of the monarchy in January or February 1660 would have been premature; Monck, moving step by step, provided public opinion with time and opportunity to develop and to become conscious of its strength; all that lay in Morley's power would have been to start a new royalist rising, perhaps one ultimately successful, but only at the cost of immediate bloodshed and permanent discontent, and involving Morley in a breach of trust towards the parliament. In subordinating himself to Monck, Morley appears to have adopted a course at once the wisest in his private interest and the most beneficial to the public welfare.

¹ *Clarendon State Papers*, III. 740, 749; *Diary*, 24 May 1660. Broderick and Mordaunt appear to have been unfriendly.

² P.R.O., Signet Office Docquets (Ind. 6182), vol. 13. The day dates are not given.

³ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1660-1, p. 76.

⁴ *Mercurius publicus*, 16-23 Aug. 1660, p. 546. His successor was Henry Mordaunt, Earl of Peterborough.

⁵ 12 Car. II, c. 9 (*Statutes of the Realm*, v. 221); *Lords' Journals*, XI. 147.