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CHAPTER X.

FROM THE REASSEMBLING OF THE PARLIAMENT, TO THE KING’S LEAVING HIS PALACE OF WHITEHALL, JANUARY 10, 1641‒2.

Before his majesty left Scotland, advice came to London [November 1] of a general insurrection of the Papists in Ireland, and of a most cruel and bloody massacre of the Protestants of that kingdom.[[1]](#footnote-1) The project of an insurrection was formed in the months of March and April 1641, not without the privity of the English court, and executed October 23 following; no information of it having been given to the Protestants till the very night before it was to take place, when it was too late to prevent the effects of it in the country, and almost to save the city of Dublin itself. When the express that brought the news was read in the house, it produced a general silence for a time, all men being struck with horror. When it was told without doors it flew like flashes of lightening, and spread universal terror over the whole kingdom. Every day and almost every hour, produced new messengers of misery, who brought farther intelligence of the merciless cruelty of the Papists towards the poor Protestants, whose very name they threatened to extirpate out of the kingdom.

On the day appointed, between twenty and thirty thousand of the native Irish appeared in arms in the northern counties, and having secured the principal gentlemen, and seized their effects they murdered the common people in cold blood, forcing many thousands to fly from their houses and settlements naked, into the bogs and woods, where they perished with hunger and cold. No ties of friendship, neighbourhood, or consanguinity, were capable of softening their obdurate hearts, in a cause which they called “the cause of loyalty and religion.” Some they whipped to death; others they stripped naked and exposed to shame, and then drove them, like herds of swine, to perish in the mountains; many hundreds were drowned in rivers; some had their throats cut; others were dismembered. With some the execrable villains made themselves sport, trying who could hack deepest into an Englishman’s flesh. Husbands were cut to pieces in the presence of their wives; wives and young virgins abused in the sight of their nearest relations; nay, they taught their children to strip and kill the children of the English, and dash out their brains against the stones. Forty or fifty thousand were massacred after this manner in a few days, without distinction of age, sex, or quality, before they suspected their danger, or had time to provide for their defence. In a few weeks the insurrection was so general, that they took possession of whole counties, murdering the inhabitants, plundering their houses, and killing or driving away their cattle. Multitudes of poor distressed creatures and families fled naked and half starved, first to Dublin, and from thence to England, with death and despair in their countenances. At length the Irish army having ravaged all the northern counties, blocked up the city of Dublin itself, with all the poor distressed Protestants who had taken sanctuary in it; but not being masters of the sea, the city was relieved, and part of the country secured, till the parliament was at leisure to pour out all their vengeance upon the heads of the murderers, by the hands of the victorious and terrible Oliver Cromwell.

The frequent expresses which pressed one after another to England, with the multitudes of distressed creatures that got passage into several parts of the kingdom, filled the hearts of all true Protestants with infinite conjectures, and prodigious imaginations of treasonable designs against this, as well as the neighbouring kingdom. They were afraid, and not without reason, that a second part of this tragedy might be acted on themselves; the parliament therefore ordered themselves a guard of train-bands, and entered immediately into measures to secure the nation from the impending storm.

But before we dismiss the Irish insurrection and massacre, it will not be improper to trace it from its original, and inquire into the authors, and the several parties concerned in it. The earl of Antrim, and sir Phelim O’Neal, who were at the head of the Irish Catholics, having acquainted the pope’s nuncio, and some of the priests about the queen, how easily they could assume the government of Ireland, and assist the king against the English Puritans, letters were written in the queen’s name, and perhaps in the king’s,[[2]](#footnote-2) authorizing them to take up arms, and seize the government.[[3]](#footnote-3) The Irish received the orders with pleasure; and concluded farther among themselves, that it was necessary at the same time to extirpate the Protestants out of that kingdom before they could with safety transport their army into England. That this was their design, appears from their remonstrance, published upon the very day of the insurrection, in which they say, “that having some liberty of religion granted them by the king, they perceived the parliament was wresting his majesty’s prerogative from him, in order to extinguish their religion; therefore to support his majesty’s prerogative, and to confirm his royal and ever happy love to them, they had taken up arms; and accordingly bound themselves to one another by the following oath:

“That they would maintain the Roman-Catholic religion; that they would bear true faith and allegiance to the king and his heirs, and defend him and them with their lives and estates, against all persons that should endeavour to suppress the prerogative, or do any acts contrary to regal government, to the power and privilege of parliaments, and to the rights and privileges of the subject.”

They called themselves the queen’s army, and published a proclamation from their camp at Newry, declaring that they acted by the king’s commission, under the great seal of Scotland, dated at Edinburgh October 1, 1641, and by letters under his sign manual, of the same date with the commission; which I believe, with lord Clarendon, was a forgery; though it is a little unaccountable, that his majesty should never, by any public act or declaration of his own, clear himself of so vile a calumny. However, though the king gave out no commission, there is too much reason to believe,[[4]](#footnote-4) that the queen and her Popish council, and even the king himself, were not unacquainted with the design of an insurrection before it took place; and that her majesty gave it all the countenance she could with safety; but when these bloody butchers overacted their parts to such a degree, as to massacre near two hundred thousand Protestants in cold-blood, to make way for their tyranny, it was time for all parties to disown them.

Bishop Burnet observes, “that in the first design of an insurrection there was no thought of a massacre; this came into their heads as they were contriving methods of executing it; and as the people were governed by the priests, these were the men that set on the Irish to all the blood and cruelty that followed.” There was a consultation at the Abbey of Multifernan in the county of West-Meath, where it was debated, what course should be taken with the Protestants; some were for expelling them, as the king of Spain did the Moors; others pressed to have them universally cut off; but not coming to a conclusion they left the army to act at discretion.[[5]](#footnote-5) How far the pope’s nuncio and the queen’s council might be consulted about the massacre is a secret: if we distinguish between the insurrection, in order to assume the government into the hands of the Irish Papists, and the massacre which attended it, we may conclude without any breach of charity, that the English court[[6]](#footnote-6) admitted of the former, though they might wash their hands of the latter.

The parliament, in their declaration of March 9, 1641, say that the rebellion in Ireland was framed and contrived in England, and that they had taken several depositions, proving, that the English Papists were to rise about the same time;[[7]](#footnote-7) that the rebels said they acted by the king’s authority: that they called themselves the queen’s army, and declared, that “their purpose was to come to England after they had done in Ireland, to recover the royal prerogative, wrested from him by the Puritan faction in the house of commons.” Mr. Pym declared in parliament, that several disbanded officers and soldiers of the king’s army went over to Ireland, and listed among the rebels by the king’s express warrant, which his majesty denied; but when the matter was examined, it appeared that his authority had been abused by some who were very near his person.

The concern of the court in this dark affair is farther evident, from the relation of the earl of Essex, who told bishop Burnet, “that he had taken all the pains he could to inquire into the original of the Irish massacre, but could not see reason to believe the king was accessory to it; but he did believe that the queen did hearken to the propositions made by the Irish, who undertook to take the government of Ireland into their hands, which they thought they could easily perform, and then they promised to assist the king against the hot spirits at Westminster.” With this the insurrection began, and all the Irish believed the queen encouraged it.

There was farther discovery of this fact at the restoration of king Charles IL when the marquis of Antrim, who had been at the head of the rebellion, and whose estate had been confiscated, finding himself likely to be excluded the act of indemnity, came to London to petition his majesty to examine the warrants he had acted upon. Accordingly a committee of council was appointed, and the marquis produced some letters from the king, which did not amount to a full proof; but in one of them the king says, that he was not then at leisure, but referred himself to the queen’s letter, and said, that was all one as if be writ himself.[[8]](#footnote-8) Upon this foundation the marquis produced a series of his own letters to the queen, in which he gave her an account of every one of those particulars that were laid to his charge, and showed the grounds he went upon, and desired her majesty’s direction to every one of these: and he had answers ordering him to do as he did. This affair, says the bishop,[[9]](#footnote-9) the queen herself, who was then at court, espoused with great zeal, and said, she was bound to save him. So a report was drawn up by the committee, declaring, that he had fully justified himself in every thing; but the earl of Northumberland, who was chairman, refused to set his hand to it, saying, “he was sorry the marquis had produced such warrants; but he did not think that they ought to serve his turn, for he did not believe that any warrant from the king or queen could justify so much bloodshed, in so many black instances as were laid against him.” Upon the earl’s refusing to sign the report the rest of the committee declined it, and there it dropped; whereupon the king himself wrote over to the duke of Ormond, that he had so vindicated himself, that he must get him included in the act of indemnity; but the lord Mazarine and others not being satisfied to give their vote in favour of such a criminal; notwithstanding the instructions they had received from England, the marquis was obliged in his own defence to produce in the house of commons a letter from king Charles I. wrote with his own hand, giving him express orders to take up arms;[[10]](#footnote-10) upon which he was pardoned, and his estate restored.

In the letter of king Charles II. to the duke of Ormond above mentioned, under his majesty’s own hand, and entered in the signet-office July 13, 1663,[[11]](#footnote-11) there is this remarkable passage, “that the referees who had examined the marquis [of Antrim’s] case, had declared to him, they had seen ‘several letters, all of them of the hand-writing of our royal father to the said marquis,’ and several instructions concerning his treating with the Irish in order to the king’s service, by reducing them to their obedience, and by drawing some forces from them for the service of Scotland. That besides letters and orders under his majesty’s own hand, there was sufficient evidence and testimony of several messages and directions sent from our royal father and our royal mother, with the privity and direction of the king our father, by which it appears, that whatever correspondence or actings the said marquis had with the confederate Irish Catholics, was directed and allowed by the said letters and instructions: and that the king himself was well pleased with what the marquis did after he had done it, and approved of the same.”

I have been more particular in accounting for this insurrection, because whoever were the authors of it, they are, in the judgment of lord Clarendon, answerable for all the calamities of the civil war. “It was Ireland (says his lordship[[12]](#footnote-12)) that drew the first blood. If they had not at that time rebelled, and in that manner, it is very probable all the miseries which afterward befell the king and his dominions, had been prevented.” At whose door then the guilt of all this blood must be laid, I freely leave with the reader.

Upon the first news of the Irish massacre the commons turned themselves into a committee of the whole house, and came to the following resolutions, “that all Roman Catholics of quality in in the several counties of England be secured, and that all Papists depart from London to their respective places of abode in the country; that the house of lords be desired to join with the commons in a petition for dissolving the convent of Capuchins, and sending them out of the kingdom; that the foreign ambassadors be desired to deliver up such priests of the king’s subjects as are in their houses; that a list be brought in of the queen’s servants; and that a proclamation be issued out for all strangers that are not Protestants, to give an account of their names and places of abode, or depart the kingdom.” They also despatched a messenger to the king, beseeching him to concur with them in securing the nation against any further attempts of the Papists; and not to employ any in his councils who were favourers of Popery, superstition, or innovation in religion. They voted £200,000 to be borrowed immediately for the service of Ireland, and appointed the train-bands of Westminster to guard them from the insolence and affronts of vagrant soldiers about the court, and to secure them from other designs which they had reason to suspect. The lords ordered all Romish recusants to remove out of the inns of court and chancery. The commons ordered the oaths of allegiance and supremacy to be tendered to all Irish gentlemen within those courts; “for it now appears (says Mr. Pym) that the religion of the Papists is incompatible with any other religion, it is destructive to all others, and will endure nothing that opposes it. There are other religions that are not right, but not so destructive as Popery, for the principles of Popery are subversive of all states and persons that oppose it.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

When the king returned from Scotland the latter end of November, and had been received with the acclamations of the citizens of London,[[14]](#footnote-14) he was prevailed with by the queen and her faction to check the proceedings of the two houses, since the Scots were easy, and the hearts of the English nation seemed to be with him; his majesty had recommended the suppressing the Irish rebellion to the Scots representatives, and by letter had committed the care of it also to the English parliament; whereupon the house of commons, in the king’s absence, authorised the earl of Leicester, by an ordinance of their own, to raise forces, and the lord-high-admiral to provide shipping for their transportation from Chester, and other ports; but when the king came to Whitehall he seemed so unwilling to act against the Papists, that the parliament were afraid of sending Protestant soldiers out of the kingdom, lest his majesty should take advantage of their absence, and break up the constitution;[[15]](#footnote-15) for he had already commanded away the parliament’s guard, telling them they had nothing to fear from the Papists, and that their jealousies of plots and massacres were imaginary.[[16]](#footnote-16) He pardoned seven Popish priests who were under sentence of condemnation, contrary to the petition of the house of commons. He turned out the earl of Leicester, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and sir William Parsons, one of the most active Protestant justices in that kingdom. He intercepted the parliamentary supplies in their way to Chester, and received a deputation from the Irish Catholics with greater ceremony and respect than from his Protestant subjects. Nor could his majesty be prevailed with to issue out a proclamation declaring the Irish, rebels, till the beginning of January, and even then only forty copies were printed, and not one to be dispersed till farther orders.[[17]](#footnote-17) Indeed, the king proclaimed a monthly fast, and offered to raise an army of English for the relief of Ireland, which the commons declined; and instead thereof appointed a committee to treat for ten thousand Scots, which the house of lords, by direction from the king, put a stop to;[[18]](#footnote-18) so that between both, the relief of Ireland was neglected. The king would have persuaded the parliament to send over ten thousand English, that they might find it more difficult to raise forces in case of a breach with him; but the commons prevailed with the Scots to offer ten thousand of their nation, that they might not be obliged to leave themselves naked and defenceless in so critical a juncture.

Upon the whole it seems to me, that this barbarous insurrection and massacre was formed either here or in Ireland, to distress the parliament, after the failure of the design of doing it by the English army. The king seems to have been willingly ignorant[[19]](#footnote-19) of the progress of the affair, having intrusted the correspondence with the queen and her council; but when he heard how the Irish had overacted their part he was surprised, and thought it necessary to declare against them; yet when he came to his queen he appeared too favourable to their persons and conduct, and instead of going briskly into the measures that were proposed to subdue them, his majesty played the politician, and would have made use of the Irish rebellion to put himself at the head of an army to break up his English parliament.

While the king was in Scotland, it was given out by some ill-designing people, that since his majesty had yielded so much to the Scots, he might be persuaded to introduce presbytery into England at his return; upon which his majesty sent the following letter to Mr. Nichols, clerk of the council:

“I hear it is reported that at my return I intend to alter the government of the church of England, and to bring it to that form it is in here; therefore I command you to assure all my servants, that I will be constant to the discipline and doctrine of the church of England established by queen Elizabeth and my father; and that I resolve, by the grace of God, to die in the maintenance of it. Edinburgh, October 18, 1041.”[[20]](#footnote-20)

Accordingly his majesty resolved to fill up the vacant sees, and ordered five *congé d' élires* to be drawn for five clergymen therein named; but the two houses joining in a petition to his majesty to suspend his commands till he came home, the matter was delayed; however, soon after his return, he made the following removes and promotions.

Dr. Williams bishop of Lincoln, was translated to the province of York, in the room of Dr. Neile deceased, and Dr. Winniffe dean of St. Paul’s, a grave and moderate divine, was made bishop of Lincoln; Dr. Duppa bishop of Chichester was translated to Salisbury, vacant by the death of Dr. Davenant; and Dr. King dean of Rochester was promoted to Chichester. Dr. Hall was translated from Exeter to Norwich, in the room of bishop Montague; and Dr. Brownrigge master of Catherine-hall, Cambridge, an eminent and learned divine, was advanced to Exeter. Dr. Skinner was translated from Bristol to Oxford, vacant by the death of Dr. Bancroft; and Dr. Westfield archdeacon of St. Alban’s, a very popular preacher, was promoted to Bristol; Dr. Prideaux, king’s professor of divinity in Oxford, was made bishop of Worcester, in the room of bishop Thornborough deceased. The bishopric of Carlisle being vacant by the death of Dr. Barnabas Potter a Puritan bishop, commonly called the penitential preacher, was given *in commendam* to the most reverend Dr. Usher archbishop and primate of Ireland, during the commotion in that kingdom. Most of these divines stood well in the opinion of the people, but their accepting bishoprics in this crisis did neither the king nor themselves any service. After this his majesty nominated but two bishops throughout the course of his reign; one was Dr. Frewen, dean of Gloucester, and president of Magdalen-college, Oxon, to the bishopric of Coventry and Litchfield, 1644, and Dr. Howel prebendary of Windsor to Bristol, about ten months after.

A committee had been appointed above a twelvemonth ago, at the motion of lord Digby, “to draw out of all the grievances of the nation such a remonstrance as might be a faithful and lively representation to his majesty, of the deplorable state of the kingdom;”[[21]](#footnote-21) but it was laid aside till this time, when the prospect of an agreement between him and his parliament being almost at an end, after the breaking out of the Irish insurrection and massacre, it was perfected and read in the house of commons November 22, when it met with so strong an opposition, that it was carried only by nine voices,[[22]](#footnote-22) after a long debate from three in the afternoon till three in the morning, which made one[[23]](#footnote-23) say, “it looked like the verdict of a starved jury.” Many were of opinion, that those grievances which had been redressed by the late acts of parliament ought to have been covered, lest the reviving them should make the breach wider between the king and parliament; while others thought the mentioning them could do no harm if it was done with respect, and that it was in a manner necessary in order to introduce the intended limitation of the royal power. However, this was the crisis that discovered the strength of the two parties, and was managed with such warmth, that Oliver Cromwell is said to tell lord Falkland, that “if the remonstrance had been rejected he would have sold all he had next morning and never have seen England more.”

It is difficult to say which side of the question was right.[[24]](#footnote-24) Mr. Rapin[[25]](#footnote-25) will not take upon him to determine, whether it was necessary for the welfare of the kingdom, to put it out of the king’s power to govern for the future in the same arbitrary manner as he had done for fifteen years; but he thinks the reason for it very plausible, and does not well see what security they could have who were for leaving the king in possession of the same power he had before enjoyed; especially if it be considered, that his majesty had still the same arbitrary principles, and the same inviolable attachment to his queen and the Popish faction, besides the current report that the court had fomented the Irish insurrection, which had filled the minds of the people with distracting terrors. It is certain the king had conceived an implacable aversion to the leading members of the Puritanical party in both houses, and having quieted the Scots, was determined to make them examples; of which they were ignorant. After all, whether these and the like reasons were sufficient to justify the whole of the parliament’s conduct in this affair, I will not presume to determine.

The remonstrance was presented to the king at Hampton-court [December 1, 1641] about a week after his majesty’s return from Scotland, with a petition for redress of the grievances therein contained. It is easy to suppose it was not very acceptable, but the king gave the committee his hand to kiss, and took time to return an answer.[[26]](#footnote-26) The remonstrance enumerates the several grievances, oppressions, and unbounded acts of the prerogative, since his majesty’s accession, to the number of almost two hundred, and charges their rise and progress, (1.) On the Jesuited Papists. (2.) On the court, bishops, and corrupt part of the clergy. (3.) On such corrupt counsellors and courtiers as for private ends had engaged themselves in the interest of some foreign princes, to the prejudice of the king and state. These ministers are said to carry on their designs, (1.) By suppressing the power and purity of religion, and of such persons as were best affected to it. (2.) By cherishing the Arminian party in those points wherein they agree with the Papists, in order to widen the difference between the common Protestants and those called Puritans; and by introducing such opinions and ceremonies as tend to an accommodation with Popery. (3.) By fomenting differences and discontents between the king and his parliament, and by putting him upon arbitrary and illegal methods of raising supplies.

I omit the grievances of the state; those which related to the church were such as follow:

1. The suspensions, excommunications, deprivations, and degradations, of divers painful, learned, and pious ministers of the gospel, by the bishops; and the grievous oppression of great numbers of his majesty’s faithful subjects.

2. The sharpness and severity of the high-commission, assisted by the council-table, not much less grievous than the Romish inquisition.

3. The rigour of the bishops’ courts in the country, whereby great numbers of the meaner tradesmen have been impoverished and driven out of the kingdom to Holland and New England. The advancing those to ecclesiastical preferments who were most officious in promoting superstition, and most virulent in railing against godliness and honesty.

4. The design of reconciling the church of England with Rome, and imposing upon the church of Scotland such Popish superstitions and innovations, as might dispose them to join with England in the intended reconciliation.

5. The late canons and oath imposed upon the clergy under the severest penalties; and the continuance of the convocation by a new commission, after the dissolution of the parliament, wherein they raised taxes upon the subject for the maintenance of what was called “bellum episcopale.” The rooting out of the kingdom by force, or driving away by fear, the Puritans; under which name they include all that desire to preserve the laws and liberties of the kingdom, and to maintain religion in the power of it.

6. The exempting Papists from penal laws, so far as amounted to a toleration, besides conferring upon them many other privileges and court-favours; these, say they, have had a secretary of state of their own religion, and a nuncio from the pope, by whose authority the Popish nobility, clergy, and gentry, have been convocated after the manner of a parliament; new jurisdictions have been erected of Popish archbishops; taxes have been levied; another state moulded within this state, independent in government, and secretly corrupting the ignorant professors of our religion, &c. The Papists have been furnished with arms and ammunition, listed in the king’s service, and encouraged by the weekly prayers of their priests for the prosperity of their designs, to promote the Catholic cause. They complain farther of a party of bishops and Popish lords in the house of peers who have caused much opposition and delay in the prosecution of delinquents, and hindered the passing some good bills for the reforming abuses and corruptions in church and state; and of a malignant party that has countenanced the rebellion in Ireland.

After the recital of these grievances, they acknowledge with thankfulness the many acts that his majesty has passed this session for the public good, and put his majesty in mind of the large sums of money they had raised for his service, amounting to no less than a million and a half. They declare, “that it is far from their purpose or desire to let loose the golden reins of discipline and government in the church, to leave private persons or particular congregations to take up what form of divine service they please; for we hold it requisite (say they) that there should be throughout the whole realm a conformity to that order which the laws enjoin, according to the word of God; and we desire to unburden the consciences of men from needless and superstitious ceremonies, to suppress innovations, and to take away the monuments of idolatry. To effect this intended reformation, we desire there may be a general synod of the most grave, pious, learned, and judicious divines of this island, assisted with some from foreign parts professing the same religion with us, who may consider of all things necessary for the peace and good government of the church, and represent the result of their consultations to the parliament, to be allowed and confirmed, and to receive the stamp of authority.—It is our chief care to advance and promote learning, and to provide a competent maintenance for conscionable and preaching ministers throughout the kingdom.—We intend likewise to reform and purge the fountains of learning—the two universities; that the streams flowing thence may be clear and pure, and an honour and comfort to the whole land. And seeing that the religion of Papists has such principles as certainly tend to the destruction and extirpation of all Protestants, when they have opportunity to effect it, it is necessary to keep them in such a condition, that they may not be able to do us any hurt.”

In the petition that attended this remonstrance, after having assured his majesty, that they had not the least intention to lay any blemish upon his royal person by the foregoing declaration, but only to represent how his royal authority and trust had been abused, they humbly beseech his majesty to concur with his people in a parliamentary way, I (1.) For the depriving the bishops of their votes in parliament, and abridging their immoderate power, usurped over the clergy, and other your good subjects, to the hazard of religion, and prejudice of the just liberties of your people. (2.) For the taking away such oppressions in religion, church-government, and discipline, as have been brought in and fomented by them. (3.) For uniting all such your loyal subjects as agree in fundamentals, against Papists, by removing some oppressions and unnecessary ceremonies, by which divers weak consciences have been offended, and seem to be divided from the rest.” (4.) They conclude, “with beseeching his majesty to remove from his counsels, all favourers of Popery and arbitrary power, and promoters of the above-mentioned pressures and corruptions, and to employ such as his parliament might confide in: and that in his princely goodness he would reject all solicitations to the contrary, how powerful and near soever.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

His majesty in his answer to this petition, about a week after, complains very justly of the disrespect of the commons in printing their remonstrance before he had time to return an answer. To the preamble and conclusion of the petition, he says, that “he knows of no wicked, arbitrary, and malignant party prevalent in the government, or near himself and his children;” and assures them, that the mediation of the nearest to him has always concurred in such persons, against whom there can be no just cause of exception. To the several articles his majesty replies: first, concerning religion, “that he is willing to concur with all the just desires of his people in a parliamentary way, for preserving the peace of the kingdom from the designs of the Popish party.

“That for depriving the bishops of their votes in parliament, he thought their right was grounded on the fundamental laws of the kingdom, and constitution of parliament, but since you desire our concurrence in a parliamentary way (says the king) we will give no further answer at present.

“As for abridging the extraordinary power of the clergy, if there remain any excesses or usurpations in their jurisdictions, we neither have nor will protect them.

“Concerning church-corruptions, as you style them, and removing unnecessary ceremonies; we are willing to concur in the removal of any illegal innovations which may have crept in; and if our parliament advise us to call a national synod for that purpose, we shall take it into consideration.

“But we are very sorry to hear, in such general terms, corruption in religion objected, since we are persuaded in our own conscience, that no church can be found upon earth that professeth the true religion with more purity of doctrine than the church of England doth; nor where the government and discipline are jointly more beautified, and free from superstition, than as they are here established by law, which by the grace of God, we will with constancy maintain, while we live, in their purity and glory, not only against all invasions of Popery, but also from the irreverence of those many schismatics and separatists wherewith of late this kingdom and this city abound, to the great dishonour and hazard both of church and state; for the suppression of whom we require your timely aid and active assistance.”

Some time after [December 15, 1641] his majesty published his answer to the remonstrance,[[28]](#footnote-28) with a declaration to all his loving subjects, in which he professes himself fully satisfied, “that the religion of the church of England is most agreeable to the word of God, and that he should be ready to seal with his blood, if God should call him to it. That as for ceremonies in religion, which are in their own nature indifferent, he is willing in tenderness to any number of his subjects, that a law should be made for the exemption of tender consciences from punishment, or prosecution for such ceremonies, as by the judgment of most men are held to be indifferent, and of some to be absolutely unlawful, provided the peace of the kingdom be not disturbed, nor the present decency and comeliness of God’s service established in the church discountenanced; nor the pious, sober, and devout actions of those reverend persons, who were the first labourers in in the blessed Reformation, be scandalized and defamed. His majesty then adds, that he cannot without grief of heart, and some tax upon himself and his ministers for not executing the laws, look upon the bold licence of some men, in printing pamphlets and sermons so full of bitterness and malice against the present government, and the law established, so full of sedition against himself and the peace of the kingdom, that he is many times amazed to consider by what eyes these things are seen, and by what ears they are heard; he therefore commands again all his officers and ministers of justice to proceed against them with all speed, and put the laws in execution.”[[29]](#footnote-29) Agreeably to this declaration his majesty issued out his royal proclamation December 10, requiring obedience to the laws and statutes ordained for the establishing true religion in this kingdom, and commanding that divine service be performed as heretofore; and that all officers and ministers, ecclesiastical and temporal, do put the said laws in due execution against all wilful contemners and disturbers of divine worship, contrary to the said laws and statutes.

Thus matters stood between the king and parliament, when all men expected the court-interest in the house of peers would be broken, by the issue of the impeachment of the thirteen bishops, for compiling the late canons, which was now approaching. The lords had resolved that such bishops as were impeached, should not sit in the house when the merits of their cause was in debate, but that when the manner of proceeding was to be settled, they might be present but not vote. To enable them the better to make their defence, it was resolved farther that the bishop of Rochester with one other bishop, might have access twice to the archbishop of Canterbury in the Tower, to consult with him about their answer to the impeachment; and that all the lords-bishops may have access to and have copies of any acts and records in any of his majesty’s courts of justice, that may serve for their defence. On the 10th of November the bishops put in their answer, consisting of a plea and demurrer, in which they neither confess nor deny the fact, but endeavour to show that the offence of making canons could not amount to a premunire; which was certainly true, provided they had been made in a legal convocation, and that the canons themselves had not been contrary to the king’s prerogative and the fundamental laws of the land. The answer was signed with all their hands except the bishop of Gloucester’s, who pleaded not guilty *modo et forma*.[[30]](#footnote-30) The commons were dissatisfied with the bishops, for not pleading directly to their charge; and with the lords, for receiving a demurrer when they were not present, contrary to the request which they sent up with the impeachment, especially when the nature of the case, being a mere matter of fact, could not require it; they therefore prayed the lords by serjeant Glyn to set aside the demurrer, and to admit them to make proof of their charge without any farther delay; or if they were satisfied with the charge, and the bishops would not plead to it, to proceed immediately to judgment; but the lords, instead of complying with the commons, gave the bishops their option, and ordered them to declare by Saturday, whether they would plead to the impeachment, or abide by their demurrer, when they declared they would abide by their demurrer; upon which the lords appointed Monday following [December 11] to hear them by their counsel in presence of the commons; but the house resenting this dilatory method of proceeding in a case which they allege was so apparent and manifest to the whole world, would not appear; the most active members declaring among their friends with a sort of despair, that they would be concerned no farther against the bishops, for they now saw it was in vain to attack a number of men whom the court and the house of lords were resolved to protect.

When this was rumoured in the city it alarmed the people, whose fears were already sufficiently awakened with the apprehensions of a Popish massacre and insurrection within their own walls. The aldermen and common-council immediately assembled, and drew up a petition to support the courage of the commons, and went with it to Westminster in sixty coaches, attended by a great number of the lower people.[[31]](#footnote-31) The petition prays, “that the house of commons would still be a means to the king and the house of peers, to concur with them [the commons] in redressing the grievances of church and state, and for the better effecting hereof, that the Popish lords and bishops may be removed out of the house of peers.” The speaker returned them thanks in the name of the house, and promised to take their address into consideration in due time. A few days after great numbers of the people assembled at Blackheath, to sign a petition to the same purpose; and within a fortnight the apprentices of London went up with a petition signed with a multitude of names, complaining of the decay of trade, occasioned by Papists and prelates, and by a malignant party that adhered to them; and praying, that the Popish lords, and other eminent persons of that religion, might be secured, and that prelacy might be rooted out, according to their former petition, commonly called the root and branch. The commons received their petition favourably; but the king, instead of calming the citizens, increased their jealousies and suspicions, by removing at this very time sir William Belfour from the lieutenancy of the Tower, and putting colonel Lunsford into his place, a suspected Papist, of no fortune, who had been once outlawed, and was fit for any desperate attempt; this unseasonable promotion occasioned petitions to his majesty for his removal, which with much difficulty, after some time, was obtained, but the jealousies of the people still remained.

The petitions above mentioned against the bishops were confronted with others out of the country, in their favour. November 18, the humble petition of the knights, esquires, gentlemen, parsons,[[32]](#footnote-32) vicars, curates, &c. of Rutlandshire, was presented to the house, signed by about eight hundred and forty hands, praying for the continuance of episcopacy, as the only government of apostolical institution sealed with the blood of martyrs, admirably suited to the civil government of this kingdom, and affirming, that no presbyter ever laid on hands without a bishop. December 8, a petition of the like nature was presented from Huntingdonshire, and two days after another from Somersetshire, signed with above fourteen thousand names.[[33]](#footnote-33) [[34]](#footnote-34)

On the other hand, the ministers appointed to solicit their remonstrance formerly mentioned, addressed the house, December 20, 1641, acknowledging “their piety and zeal for the true religion, against Popery and superstition; in countenancing the sacred ordinance of preaching; in encouraging painful and godly ministers, formerly set aside, but now profitably employed in many congregations; in discountenancing of bold intruders, who, without a sufficient call, have thrust themselves into the sacred office; as also, of all unworthy and scandalous ministers; in freeing divers godly ministers from prison and exile, and others from heavy censures; in preventing the utter ruin of the petitioners, by setting aside the late oath and canons, the high-commission, and other illegal pressures of ecclesiastical courts; in making an order to take away all superstitious rites and ceremonies, images, pictures, and other innovations, out of churches; in conducting the late peace with Scotland to a happy conclusion, and in their vigorous endeavours for the relief of Ireland, &c. But whereas there still remain a great many grievances to be removed, they are necessitated to renew their former suit for redress of the aforesaid evils, and for taking away whatever shall appear to be the root and cause of them. And whereas the petitioners, and many others, are desirous in all things to submit to the laws, so far as possibly they may, yet merely out of tenderness and scruple of conscience, they dare not continue, as formerly they did, the exercise of some things enjoined; not only because they have more seriously weighed the nature and scandal of them, and because sundry bishops, and other grave divines, called to their assistance by order of the house of peers, have, as they are informed, discovered divers particulars which need alteration in the liturgy; and because there is not, as they humbly conceive, at this day, commonly extant, any book of common prayer without so many alterations and additions, as render it in many parts another thing from that which is by law established; but chiefly, because the house, from a sense of its defects, has taken the reformation thereof under consideration, which they hoped would be some shelter against the strict pressing the use of it, till their pleasure was declared in a parliamentary way. But though the petitioners have been comfortably assured of some ease herein, yet now to their great sorrow they apprehend that the same things are anew enforced, which may occasion much trouble and vexation to sundry peaceable and worthy ministers, some of whom have been indicted upon the statute of 1 Eliz. cap. 2, since the beginning of this present parliament, and others threatened for omissions of some things complained of to this high court and still depending before you. The petitioners therefore pray the house to resume the consideration of their former petition, and to commit the same to the debate of a free synod, and in the mean time to be mediators to his majesty for some relaxation in matters of ceremony, and of reading the whole liturgy. They farther pray, that a monthly fast may be appointed and religiously observed, during the present sessions of parliament, and they will be ready at any time to offer reasons why there should be a synod of a different constitution from the convocation now in being, when they shall be required.”[[35]](#footnote-35)

The carrying up these petitions to Westminster, and especially that of the London apprentices, occasioned great tumults about the parliament-house. The king was at his palace at Whitehall, attended by a great number of disbanded officers, whom his majesty received with great ceremony, and employed as a guard to his royal person. These officers insulted the common people, and gave them ill language as they passed by the court to the parliament-house, crying out, No bishops, no Popish lords! If the people ventured to reply, the officers followed their reproaches with cuts and lashes, which, says lord Clarendon,[[36]](#footnote-36) produced some wounds, and drew blood. Mr. Baxter says, they came out of Whitehall, and catched some of them, and cut off their ears. From these skirmishes, and from the shortness of the apprentices’ hair, which was cut close about their ears, the two parties began first to be distinguished by the names of Roundhead and Cavalier. David Hyde, one of the reformades, first drew his sword in the Palace-yard, and swore he would cut the throats of those roundheaded dogs that bawled against the bishops. Dr. Williams, bishop of Lincoln, lately promoted to the see of York, going by land to the house of peers in company with the earl of Dover, and hearing a youth cry out louder than the rest, No bishops, no Popish lords! stepped from the earl and laid hands on him, but his companions rescued him, and about a hundred of them surrounded the bishop, hemmed him in, and with a universal shout cried out, No bishops! after which they opened a passage and let his grace go forward to the house.[[37]](#footnote-37) The same day colonel Lunsford coming through Westminster-hall in company with thirty or forty officers, drew his sword and wounded about twenty apprentices and citizens: others walking in the abbey while their friends were waiting for an answer to their petition, were ordered by the vergers to clear the church, lest the ornaments of the cathedral should suffer damage; upon which most of them went out, and the doors were shut, but some few remaining behind, were apprehended and carried before the bishop, which occasioned another skirmish, in which sir Richard Wiseman was killed by a stone from the battlements; after which the officers and soldiers sallied out upon the mob with sword in hand, and obliged them to retire. The news of this being reported in the city, the whole populace was in arms, and resolved to go next morning to Westminster with swords and staves. The lord-mayor and sheriffs raised the train-bands, and having ordered the city-gates to be kept shut, they rode about all night to keep the peace; but it was impossible to hinder the people’s going out in the day. On the other hand, the king commanded the militia of Westminster and Middlesex to be raised by turns, as a guard to his royal person and family; upon which several gentlemen of the inns of court offered their service, in case his majesty apprehended any danger.[[38]](#footnote-38) The house of commons being no less afraid of themselves, petitioned for a guard out of the city of London, under the command of the earl of Essex, which his majesty refused, but told them, he would take as much care of them as of his own children; and if this would not suffice, he would command such a guard to wait upon them as he would be answerable to God for; but the house not being willing to trust to the king’s guard, declined his majesty’s offer, and not prevailing for one of their own choosing, they ordered halberds to be brought into the house, and resolved, in case of an assault, to defend themselves.

The lords exerted themselves to disperse the tumults, by sending their gentleman-usher of the black rod to command the people to depart to their homes; and by appointing a committee to inquire into the causes of them. His majesty also published a proclamation [December 28, 1641] forbidding all tumultuous assemblies of the people. But the commons being unwilling to affront the citizens, were not so vigorous in suppressing them, as it is thought the circumstances of things required; for as the king relied upon his guard of officers, the commons had their dependence upon the good-will of the citizens. Not that the house can be charged with encouraging tumults,[[39]](#footnote-39) for the very next day after the king’s proclamation they sent a message to the lords, declaring their readiness to concur in all lawful methods to appease them; but being sensible their strength was among the inhabitants of London, without whose countenance and support every thing must have been given back into the hands of the court, they were tender of entering upon vigorous measures.

While these tumults continued the bishops were advised to forbear their attendance upon the house, at least till after the recess at Christmas; but this looking too much like cowardice, their lordships determined to do their duty; and because the streets were crowded with unruly people, they agreed to go by water in their barges; but as soon as they came near the shore, the mob saluted them with a volley of stones, so that being afraid to land, they rowed back and returned to their own houses. Upon this repulse, twelve of them met privately at the archbishop of York’s lodgings in Westminster, to consult what measures were to be taken. The archbishop advised them to go no more to the house, and immediately in a heat drew up the following protestation against whatsoever the two houses should do in their absence, which all present signed with their hands, except the bishop of Winchester.

“To the king’s most excellent majesty, and the lords and peers now assembled in parliament.

“The humble petition and protestation of all the bishops and prelates now called by his majesty’s writs to attend the parliament, and present about London and Westminster for that service.

“Whereas the petitioners are called up by several and respective writs and under great penalties to attend the parliament, and have a clear and indubitable right to vote in bills, and other matters whatsoever debatable in parliament, by the ancient customs, laws, and statutes, of this realm, and ought to be protected by your majesty quietly to attend and prosecute that great service: they humbly remonstrate and protest before God, your majesty, and the noble lords and peers now assembled in parliament, that as they have an indubitable right to sit and vote in the house of lords, so are they, if they may be protected from force and violence, most ready and willing to perform their duties accordingly. And that they do abominate all actions or opinions tending to Popery and the maintenance thereof; as also, all propension and inclination to any malignant party, or any other side or party whatsoever, to the which their own reasons and conscience shall not move them to adhere. But whereas they have been at several times violently menaced, affronted, and assaulted, by multitudes of people in their coming to perform their services in that honourable house, and lately chased away and put in danger of their lives, and can find no redress or protection, upon sundry complaints made to both houses in these particulars: they humbly protest before your majesty, and the noble house of peers, that saving unto themselves all their rights and interest of sitting and voting in that house at other times, they dare not sit or vote in the house of peers, until your majesty shall farther secure them from all affronts, indignities, and dangers, in the premises. Lastly, whereas their fears are not built upon fantasies and conceits, but upon such grounds and objections as may well terrify men of resolution and much constancy, they do, in all humility and duty, protest before your majesty, and the peers of that most honourable house of parliament, against all laws, orders, votes, resolutions, and determinations, as in themselves null, and of none effect, which in their absence, since the 27th of this month of December 1641, have already passed; as likewise against all such as shall hereafter pass in that most honourable house, during the time of this their forced and violent absence from the said most honourable house; not denying, but if their absenting of themselves were wilful and voluntary, that most honourable house might proceed in all the premises, their absence, or this protestation, notwithstanding. And humbly beseeching your most excellent majesty to command the clerk of that house of peers, to enter this their petition and protestation among their records,

“And they will ever pray God to bless, &c.

“John Eborac. George Hereford, Tho. Duresme, Rob. Oxon, Ro. Cov. Lichf. Mat. Ely, Jos. Norwich, Godfrey Gloucester, Jo. Asaph, Jo. Peterborough, Gul. Bath and Wells, Morice Landaff.”

This protestation was presented to the king by archbishop Williams,[[40]](#footnote-40) who undertook to justify the lawfulness of it; but his majesty declining to appear in so nice an affair, delivered it into the hands of the lord-keeper Littleton, who by his majesty’s command read it in the house of lords the next morning. After some debate the lords desired a conference with the commons, when the keeper in the name of the house of peers declared, that “the protestation of the bishops contained matters of high and dangerous consequence, extending to the intrenching upon the fundamental privileges and being of parliaments, and therefore the lords thought fit to communicate it to the commons.”[[41]](#footnote-41) The protestation being communicated to the house of commons, they resolved, within half an hour, to accuse the twelve bishops of high treason, “for endeavouring to subvert the fundamental laws and being of parliaments,” and sent up their impeachment by Mr. Glyn, who having delivered it at the bar of the house of lords, the usher of the black rod was ordered to go immediately in search of the bishops, and bring them to the house; the bishops appearing the same evening [December 30] were sequestered from parliament, ten of them being sent to the Tower, the bishops of Durham and Norwich,[[42]](#footnote-42) by reason of their great age and the service they had done the church of God by their writing and preaching, being committed to the custody of the black rod, with an allowance of £5 a day for their expenses.[[43]](#footnote-43)

The adversaries of the bishops in both houses were extremely pleased with their unadvised conduct; one said, it was the finger of God, to bring that to pass which otherwise could not have been compassed. There was but one gentleman in the whole debate that spoke in their behalf, and he said, “he did not believe they were guilty of high treason, but that they were stark mad, and therefore desired they may be sent to Bedlam.” Lord Clarendon[[44]](#footnote-44) censures this protestation, as proceeding from the pride and passion of archbishop Williams; he admits that the eleven bishops were ill advised, in going into his measures, and suffering themselves to be precipitated into so hasty a resolution, though he is certain there could be nothing of high treason in it. However, their behaviour gave such scandal and offence, even to those who passionately desired to preserve their function, that they had no compassion or regard for their persons.

The objections that I have met with against the protestation, are these; First, That it tended to destroy the very being of parliaments, because it put a stop to all laws, orders, votes, and resolutions, made in the absence of the bishops. Secondly, The presence of the bishops is hereby made so essential that no act can pass without them, which is claiming a negative voice, like the king’s. Thirdly, The bishops desiring the king to command the clerk of the house of peers to enter their protestation on record, was derogatory to the rights of parliament, as though the king by his command could make a record of parliament. Fourthly, The annulling all laws that might be made at this time, when Ireland was in so much danger from the breaking out of the Irish massacre, was a sort of conspiring with the rebels to destroy that kingdom. Fifthly, It was said, that besides the unwarrantable expressions in the protestation, the form of presenting and transmitting it was unjustifiable.

On the other hand it was said on behalf of the bishops, that here was a manifest force put upon them; and a violence offered to the freedom of one member of parliament, is a violence offered to the whole; that therefore they had a right to protest, and guard their privileges, without being accountable for the ill consequences that might follow. Yet surely this manner of asserting their privilege was irregular; should they not have petitioned the lords to secure their passage to parliament, rather than have put a negative upon all their proceedings? I have met with only one learned writer who commends the bishops upon this occasion, and he advances them, in romantic language, to the rank of heroes: his words are these; “Had the bishops done less, they had fallen short of that fortitude which might justly be expected from them. They had reason to conclude the root and branch work would certainly go forward, and therefore to be silent under such an outrage would look like cowardice. When the prospect is thus menacing, and a man is almost certain to be undone, the most creditable expedient is to spend himself in a blaze, and flash to the last grain of powder. To go out in a smoke and smother is but a mean way of coming to nothing. To creep and crawl to a misfortune is to suffer like an insect. A man ought to fall with dignity and honour, and to keep bis mind erect though his fortune happens to be crushed. This was the bishops’ meaning, and for making so handsome a retreat they ought to stand commended upon record.”[[45]](#footnote-45) But with due regard to this reverend divine, was there no medium between being silent, and taking upon them in such a crisis to stop all the business of parliament? For if the proceedings of the house of peers are null without the bishops, it is no less certain, that those of the house of commons are null without the peers; from whence it must follow, that the whole parliament was incapable of acting. Mr. Rapin[[46]](#footnote-46) is of opinion, that the king hoped “that this affair might occasion the dissolution of the parliament.” But if he did, his majesty was much mistaken, for the bishops and Popish lords being now absent, the majority of the whole house of peers was against the court; which vexed the queen and her faction, and put them upon such an extravagant piece of revenge as effectually broke the peace of the kingdom, and rendered the king’s affairs irretrievable.

His majesty having been assured that the lord Kimbolton, and five of the most active members in the house of commons, viz. Denzil Hollis, Sir Arthur Haslerigge, John Pym, John Hampden, and William Stroud, Esqrs. had invited the Scots into England, and were now the chief encouragers of those tumults that had kept the bishops and Popish lords from the house; that they had aspersed his government, and were endeavouring to deprive him of his royal power; in a word, that they were conspiring to levy war against him, resolved to impeach them of high treason; accordingly his majesty sent his attorney-general to the house with the articles [January 3, 1642], and at the same time despatched officers to their houses to seal up their trunks, papers, and doors; but the members not being ordered into custody, as his majesty expected, the king went himself to the house next day in the afternoon [January 4] to seize them, attended with about two hundred officers and soldiers, armed with swords and pistols; the gentlemen of the inns of court, who had offered their service to defend the king’s person, having had notice to be ready at an hour’s warning.[[47]](#footnote-47) The king having entered the house, went directly to the speaker’s chair, and looking about him, said with a frown, “I perceive the birds are fled, but I will have them wheresoever I can find them, for as long as these persons are here, this house will never be in the right way that I heartily wish it; I expect therefore, that as soon as they come to the bouse, that you send them to me.” Having then assured the members, that he designed no force upon them, nor breach of privilege, after a little time he withdrew; but as his majesty was going out, many members cried aloud, so as he might hear them, Privilege! privilege![[48]](#footnote-48) The house was in a terrible panic while the king was in the chair, the door of the house, with all the avenues, being crowded with officers and soldiers: as soon therefore as his majesty was gone they adjourned till the next day, and then for a week. It was happy that the five members had notice of the king’s coming, just time enough to withdraw into the city, otherwise it might have occasioned the effusion of blood, for without doubt the armed soldiers at the door waited only for the word to carry them away by force. Next day his majesty went into the city [January 5] and demanded them of the lord-mayor and court of aldermen then assembled by his order at Guildhall, professing at the same time his resolution to prosecute all who opposed the laws, whether Papists or separatists, and to defend the true Protestant religion which his father professed, and in which he would continue to the end of his life.[[49]](#footnote-49) But though his majesty was nobly entertained by the sheriffs, he now perceived, that this rash and unadvised action had lost him the hearts of the citizens, there being no acclamations or huzzas, as usual, only here and there a voice, as he went along in his coach, crying out, Privilege of parliament! privilege of parliament! However, he persisted in his resolution, and January 8 published a proclamation, commanding all magistrates, and officers of justice, to apprehend the accused members and carry them to the Tower.

It is hard to say with any certainty, who put the king upon this unparalleled act of violence, a species of tyranny which the most arbitrary of his predecessors had never attempted. If his majesty deliberated at all upon what he was going about, we must conclude, that he intended to dissolve the parliament, and to return to his former methods of arbitrary government; because by the same rule that the king might take five members out of the house he might take five hundred; besides, several of the articles laid against them were equally chargeable on the majority of the house. It now appeared, says Rapin,[[50]](#footnote-50) that the king was resolved to be revenged on those that had offended him; and that there was no farther room to confide in his royal word. Some say that this was lord Digby’s mad project, who, when he found his majesty, after his return out of the city, vexed at his disappointment, offered to go with a select company and bring them dead or alive; but the king was afraid of the consequences of such an enterprise; and Digby being ordered to attend in his place in the house, thought fit to withdraw out of the kingdom. Mr. Echard,[[51]](#footnote-51) with greater probability, lays it upon the queen and her cabal of Papists; and adds, that when the king expressed his distrust of the affair, her majesty broke out into a violent passion, and said, “Allez, poltron,” &c. “Go, coward, and pull those rogues out by the ears, or never see my face any more;” which it seems, says the archdeacon, determined the whole matter.

The citizens of London were so far from delivering up the five members, that they petitioned the king that they might be at liberty, and proceeded against according to the methods of parliament. At the same time they acquainted his majesty with their apprehensions of the ruin of trade, and of the danger of the Protestant religion, by reason of the progress of the rebellion in Ireland, and the number of Papists and other disbanded officers about the court. His majesty, finding he had lost the city, fortified Whitehall with men and ammunition, and sent cannoniers into the Tower to defend it, if there should be occasion.[[52]](#footnote-52) When the citizens complained of this, his majesty replied, “that it was done with an eye to their safety and advantage; that his fortifying Whitehall was not before it was necessary; and that if any citizens had been wounded, it was undoubtedly for their evil and corrupt demeanour.” But they had no confidence in the king’s protection. A thousand mariners and sailors offered to guard the five members to Westminster by water upon the day of their adjournment [January 11], and the train-bands offered the committee at Guildhall to do the same by land, which was accepted; and the offer of the apprentices refused. Things being come to this extremity, his majesty, to avoid the hazard of an affront from the populace, took a fatal resolution to leave Whitehall, and accordingly, January 10, the day before the parliament was to meet, he removed with his queen and the whole royal family to Hampton-court, and two days after to Windsor, from whence he travelled by easy stages to York; never returning to London till he was brought thither as a criminal to execution.

By the king’s deserting his capital in this manner, and not returning when the ferment was over, he left the strength and riches of the kingdom in the hands of his parliament; for next day the five members were conducted by water in triumph to Westminster, the train-bands of the city marching at the same time by land, who, after they had received the thanks of the house, were dismissed; and serjeant Skippon, with a company of the city-militia, was appointed to guard the parliament-house; “from this day (says lord Clarendon[[53]](#footnote-53)) we may reasonably date the levying war in England, whatsoever has been since done being but the superstructures upon these foundations.” It must be considered that two days after [January 12] the king sent a message to the house, waiving his proceedings with respect to the five members, and promising to be as careful of their privileges as of his life or crown; and a little after offered a general pardon; but the commons had too much reason at this time not to depend upon his royal promise; they insisted that the accused members should be brought to their trial in a legal and parliamentary way; in order to which they desired his majesty to inform them, what proof there was against them; it being the undoubted right and privilege of parliament, that no member can be proceeded against without the consent of the house; which his majesty, refusing to comply with, removed farther off to Windsor, and entered upon measures very inconsistent with the peace of the kingdom.[[54]](#footnote-54)

To return to the bishops: About a fortnight after their commitment [January 17, 1642] they pleaded to the impeachment of the house of commons, “Not guilty in manner and form,” and petitioned the lords for a speedy trial, which was appointed for the 25th instant, but was put off from time to time, till the whole bench of bishops was voted out of the house, and then entirely dropped; for the very next day after their commitment, the commons desired the lords to resume the consideration of the bill that had been sent up some months ago, for taking away all temporal jurisdiction from those in holy orders, which the lords promised: it had passed the commons without any difficulty, about the time of the Irish insurrection, and was laid aside in the house of lords, as being thought impossible to pass while the bishops’ votes were entire: when it was revived at this juncture, the earl of Bedford and the bishop of Rochester made a vigorous stand against it.[[55]](#footnote-55) His lordship urged, that it was contrary to the usage of parliament when a bill had been once rejected to bring it in a second time the same session. To which it was replied, that it was not the same bill [having a new title], though it was to accomplish the same end. Besides, the distress of the times required some extraordinary measures for their redress; and farther, since the king had been graciously pleased to pass an act for the continuance of this parliament as long as they thought fit to sit, and thereby parted with his right of proroguing or dissolving them, the nature of things was altered, and therefore they were not to be tied down to the ordinary forms in other cases. The question being put, whether the bill should be read, it passed in the affirmative; upon which the consideration of it was resumed, and after some few debates the bill was passed by a very great majority, February 6, 1641–2; the citizens of London expressing their satisfaction by ringing of bells and bonfires. But it was still apprehended that the king would refuse his assent, because when he had been pressed to it his majesty had said, it was a matter of great concernment, and therefore he would take time to consider; however, the commons, not content with this delay, sent again to Windsor, to press his compliance upon the following reasons: “Because the subjects suffered by the bishops exercising temporal jurisdiction, and making a party in the house of lords; because it was apprehended that there would be a happy conjunction of both houses upon the exclusion of the bishops; and the signing this bill would be a comfortable pledge of his majesty’s gracious assent to the future remedies of those evils which were to be presented to him.”[[56]](#footnote-56)

This message from the house of commons was seconded by those of greatest trust about the king, who argued, “that the combination against the bishops was irresistible; that the passing this bill was the only way to preserve the church; and that if the parliament was gratified in this, so many persons in both houses would be fully satisfied that they would join in no farther alterations; but if they were crossed in this, they would endeavour an extirpation of the bishops and a demolishing of the whole fabric of the church.” They argued farther, “that force or indirect means having been made use of to obtain the bill, the king might by his power bring the bishops in again when the present distempers were composed.” An argument by which his majesty might have set aside all his concessions, or acts of grace (as he pleased to call them), to his parliament, at once. But none of these reasons would have prevailed, had not the queen made use of her sovereign influence over the king. Her majesty was made to believe by sir J. Culpeper, that her own preservation depended upon the king’s consent to the bill; that if his majesty refused it, her journey into Holland would be stopped, and her person possibly endangered by some mutiny or insurrection; whereas the using her interest with the king, would lay a popular obligation upon the kingdom, and make her acceptable to the parliament. These arguments carrying a face of probability, her majesty wrested the king’s resolution from him, so that the bill was signed by commission, February 14, together with another against pressing soldiers, his majesty being then at Canterbury, accompanying the queen in her passage to Holland. But his majesty’s signing them with so much reluctance did him a disservice.[[57]](#footnote-57) All men took notice of his discontent; and lord Clarendon says,[[58]](#footnote-58) he has cause to believe that the king was prevailed with to sign them, “because he was told, that there being violence and force used to obtain them, they were therefore in themselves null, and in quieter times might easily be revoked and disannulled.” A dangerous doctrine, as it may tend to overthrow the most established laws of a country! To give the reader the act itself:

“Whereas bishops and other persons in holy orders, ought not to be entangled with secular jurisdiction, the office of the ministry being of such great importance that it will take up the whole man. And for that it is found by long experience, that their intermeddling with secular jurisdictions hath occasioned great mischiefs and scandals both to church and state, his majesty, out of his religious care of the church and souls of his people, is graciously pleased that it be enacted, and by authority of this present parliament be it enacted, that no archbishop or bishop, or other person that now is or hereafter shall be in holy orders, shall at any time after the 15th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1642, have any seat or place, suffrage or vote, or use or execute any power or authority, in the parliaments of this realm, nor shall be of the privy-council of his majesty, his heirs or successors, or justices of the peace of oyer and terminer or jail-delivery, or execute any temporal authority, by virtue of any commission; but shall be wholly disabled, and be incapable to have, receive, use, or execute, any of the said offices, places, powers, authorities, and things aforesaid.

“And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all acts from and after the said 15th of February, which shall be done or executed by any archbishop or bishop, or other person whatsoever in holy orders; and all and every suffrage or voice given or delivered by them or any of them, or other thing done by them or any of them, contrary to the purport and true meaning of this act, shall be utterly void to all intents, constructions, and purposes.”

Thus the peerage of the bishops and the whole secular power of the clergy, ceased for about twenty years; how far they contributed to it by their pride and ambition, their sovereign contempt of the laity, and indiscreet behaviour towards their Protestant brethren, has been already observed. Their enemies said the hand of God was against them, because they had given too much countenance to the ridiculing of true devotion and piety, under the name of godly Puritanism;[[59]](#footnote-59) because they had silenced great numbers of ministers eminent for learning and religion, for not complying with certain indifferent rites and ceremonies, while others who were vicious and insufficient for their office, were encouraged; because they made a stricter inquiry after those who fasted and prayed, and joined together in religious exercises, than after those who were guilty of swearing, drunkenness, and other kinds of debauchery; because they discouraged afternoon sermons and lectures, and encouraged sports and pastimes on the Lord’s day; because they had driven many hundred families out of the land; and were, upon the whole, enemies to the civil interests of their country. Others observed, that most of them verged too much towards the see of Rome, and gave ground to suspect that they were designing a union between the two churches, which at a time when the Roman Catholics in Ireland had imbrued their hands in the blood of almost two hundred thousand Protestants, and were so numerous at home as to make large and public collections of money to support the king in his war against the Scots, was sufficient to make every sincere Protestant jealous of their power. Besides, the bishops themselves had been guilty of many oppressions; they had in a manner laid aside the practice of preaching, that they might be the more at leisure for the governing part of their function; though even here they devolved the whole of their jurisdiction upon their chancellors and under officers.[[60]](#footnote-60) They did not sit in their consistories to hear complaints, or do justice either to clergy or laity, but turned over the people to registrars, proctors, and apparitors, who drew their money from them against equity and law, and used them at discretion. Few or none of them made their visitations in person, or lived in their episcopal cities: by which means there was no kind of hospitality or liberality to the poor. Divine service in the cathedrals was neglected or ill performed, for want of their presence and inspection. Instead of conferring orders at the mother-church, they made use of the chapels of their private houses, without requiring the assistance of their deans and chapters upon such solemn occasions; they pronounced the censures of deprivation and degradation in a monarchal and absolute manner, not calling in the deans and chapters to any share of the administration. And upon the whole, they did little else but receive their rents, indulge their ease, consult their grandeur, and lord it over their brethren. These were the popular complaints against them, which made the citizens rejoice at their downfall, and attend the passing the bill with bonfires and illuminations. However, if all these things had not concurred in a nice and critical juncture of affairs, the attempts of the house of commons would have been in vain; neither the king nor peers being heartily willing to deprive them of their seats in parliament. This was one of the last bills the king passed; and the only law which he enacted in prejudice of the established church.[[61]](#footnote-61) Here his majesty made a stand, and by a message sent to both houses, desired not to be pressed to any one single act farther, till the whole affair of church-government and the liturgy was so digested and settled, that he might see clearly what was fit to remain, as well as what was fit to be taken away.

1. A fair judgment of this horrid affair, it may be observed, cannot be formed without considering it in connexion with the causes that led to it. It should be viewed as the result of various circumstances, which for a course of years had irritated the minds of the Irish, and at last raised them to a pitch of frenzy and cruelty, of which we cannot read without being shocked at the recital. The Irish had been pursued with a constant, rigorous, and unremitting persecution. They had suffered extortions, imprisonments, and excommunications. Their estates had been seized under the pretext of a judicial inquiry into defective titles, in which inquiry verdicts against them were extorted from jurors. They had been heavily taxed for their superstitions, and totally precluded the exercise of their religion. Their application to Charles 1. for a toleration had been scornfully rejected, in consequence of a protestation against it, drawn up by the primate Usher, and twelve bishops. The detail of their sufferings may be seen in “Jones’s letter to the united societies of Belfast.” By which it will appear, that from the Reformation they had been the victims of religious persecution and civil devastation; as, to use the author’s words, almost to justify, but certainly to extenuate, the dreadful ensuing period of 1641,—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Dr. Grey is severe in his animadversions on Mr. Neal’s insinuation, that the English court and even the king were privy to the Irish insurrection. Bishop Warburton, on the same ground, has impeached our author’s candour and impartiality: our reply to whom, in the two following notes, will serve as an answer to Dr. Grey. I will add here, that Mr. Baxter says, “that the soberer part could not believe that the Irish rebels had the king’s commission.” His Life, p. 29, folio. A deed was passed on the credulous with that name, by affixing to it the great seal taken off from some grant or patent. The distinction which Mr, Neal afterward makes between the insurrection and the massacre, is justified by what bishop Burnet asserts in a passage quoted in the beginning of the paragraph, where this distinction occurs. Rushworth’s Collection, part 3. vol. 1. p. 402.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Prynne's Introduction, p. 220—252. Burnet’s History, Life, and Times, vol. I. p. 55. Edinburgh edit. Rushworth, vol. 4. p. 398, &c. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Bishop Warburton taxes the following insinuations against the king as being “certainly very unjust and groundless.” The reader will observe, that Mr. Neal’s insinuations go no farther than that the king was acquainted with, if he did not encourage, the design of the Irish to appear in arms. He by no means charges him with consenting or being privy to the massacre. As to the hand he had in the rebellion, two modern historians have, with great candour, fully stated the evidence *pro* and *con.* Dr. Harris in his Life of Charles I. p. 336. 351. And Mrs. Macaulay, vol. 3. p. 84—93, the note. From the arguments stated by these writers it will appear, that there were certainly grounds for Mr. Neal’s insinuations, and if so, they cannot be very unjust.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 633. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. If by the court here be meant the king, bishop Warbuton condemns Mr. Neal, as, “scandalously uncharitable.” It is more reasonable to explain Mr. Neal by himself; and the parties whom he particularized, in this very sentence, are, the queen and the pope’s nuncio.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 419, 420, folio edition. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. To invalidate the argument drawn from the defence which the marquis of Antrim set up, Dr. Grey urges, that the marquis had not the least concern in the massacre or first insurrection, and refers to the evidence of this produced by the Rev. Thomas Cart, in a piece entitled, “The Irish massacre set in a true light,” 1715. Dr. Harris notices the same argument, as advanced by Mr. Hume: but he denies the matter, and says, that “nothing is more certain than that Antrim had a hand in the first rebellion in Ireland.” Of this he brings various proofs. Life of Charles I. p. 350.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Burnet’s Hist. Life, and Times, vol. 1. p. 54, 55. Edin. ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Here Dr. Grey asks, “And what is all this to the Irish massacre? The letter it is plain, related to his joining Montrose in Scotland.” To prove this the doctor appeals to the letter of king Charles II. quoted in the next paragraph; in which his majesty expressly allows, that the marquis was instructed to draw some forces from Ireland for the service of Scotland. And, on the authority of Mr. Cart, he refers to an act of parliament, anno 1617, 1618, Car. II. in which the king, speaking of his letter to the duke of Ormond, says, “It was only to declare, that the marquis of Antrim was employed in Ireland to procure what forces he could from thence, to be transported into Scotland for his late majesty’s service, under the late marquis of Montrose.” Whoever reads king Charles II.’s letter which is given at full length in Ludlow’s “Truth brought to light,” a pamphlet printed in 1693, in answer to Dr. Hollingworth, will not think the limitation of his majesty’s meaning, here offered, consistent with the strain and tenor of that letter, which refers to the Irish rebellion in the most general terms, as well as speaks of “drawing some forces from the Irish for the service of Scotland;” and alludes to various other actings of the marquis with the Irish confederates. It was proved, on the trial of the marquis’s claim to be included in the act of indemnity, that he was to have had a hand in surprising the castle of Dublin, in 1641; and seven other charges were substantiated against him. After a trial of seven hours, the king’s letter being opened and read in court, Rainford, one of the commissioners, said, “that the king’s letter on his behalf was evidence without exception;” and thereupon he was declared an innocent Papist. Truth brought to Light, p. 15. The plea of this letter, was the instructions given to the marquis by Charles I. and, as Mr. Neal’s quotation states, it applied to every transaction with the Irish Catholics. Ludlow avers it as a well-known fact, that the marquis had his head and hands deeply and early engaged in the bloody work of the rebellion, and was amongst the first in it. Memoirs, 4to, p. 423, edition of 1771. As to the act of parliament, to which Mr. Cart refers, it is not to be found in the statutes at large, 4to, nor in Pickering’s statutes.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Ludlow’s Memoirs, vol 3. p. 353. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Vol. 1. p. 299. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 620. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Ibid. p. 675, &c. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 386, 387, folio. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Ibid. p. 388, folio. Nalson, vol. 2, p. 400. 684. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 401, folio edition. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. “The king (says Dr. Grey) was not concerned in it, as appears from Rapin, the author he (i. e. Mr. Neal) refers to.” The doctor then relates, in Rapin’s words, the three questions on this point, debated by the lords. In which statement there is, it is true, an entire silence about the king’s interference. But the doctor had overlooked the preceding paragraph, which establishes Mr. Neal’s assertion; in which Rapin says, “the king had found means to gain the peers.” —Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. “This (says Bishop Warburton) is a villanous accusation, destitute of all proof and likelihood.”—His lordship might have spared some of his warmth and bitterness. For if it be an accusation, it comes forward as a conclusion arising from the facts and authorities stated in the preceding pages. It is properly the opinion of the author, and the reader will judge how far it justly flows from the evidence laid before him.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 683. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Bishop Warburton asks here, “Why are we told this but to mislead us? A year ago, before the king had made full satisfaction for his misgovernment, such a remonstrance was seasonable: now he had made full satisfaction, it was factious and seditious.”—To this question of his lordship it may be retorted, Why should a design to mislead be insinuated against Mr. Neal? Has he not in the same paragraph informed his readers, that “many were of opinion, that those grievances which had been redressed ought to have been covered?” Doth he not fairly state the whole business? And doth he not, with candour and impartiality, avoid biassing his reader, while he waives giving a decided opinion on the conduct of the parliament in this affair? All this appears, in the hurry of his remarks, at breakfasttime, to have escaped his lordship’s notice. Had he read on before he wrote in the margin of his book, it would have precluded his censure.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. This is a mistake copied from lord Clarendon. The numbers for passing the remonstrance was one hundred and fifty-nine, against it one hundred and fortyeight, so it was carried by eleven voices. Harris’s Life of Oliver Cromwell, p. 74.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Dr. Harris supposes this was sir Benjamin Rudyard, who, according to Willis, was in three parliaments, the representative of Portsmouth, and was afterward returned for Old Sarum once, for Dowton once, and for Wilton twice.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Clarendon, vol. 2. p. 312. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 388, fol. edit. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 438. Nalson’s Collection, p. 694. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 692. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2; p. 647, &c. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 456. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 715. 731. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 733. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. “And householders in the county of Rutland, in behalf of themselves and families:” omitted. Dr. Grey. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. There were also petitions from the counties of Cheshire, Nottingham, Devonshire, Stafford, Kent, the six shires of North Wales, the counties of Lancaster, Cornwall, and Hereford. Of these petitions, that from Devon had eight thousand signatures; that from Stafford three thousand; and those from the six shires of North Wales thirty thousand. Amongst the petitioners were computed, where the different ranks of the petitioners were classed, to be five peers, two hundred and twenty-five knights, three hundred and ninety-nine divines, one thousand five hundred and eighty-eight gentlemen, and twenty-eight thousand three hundred and thirty-six freeholders. Dr. Grey’s Examination, vol. 1. p. 312, 314. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 726, 727. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Nalson’s Collection, vol. 2. p. 764. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Vol. 1. p. 339. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 463. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Ibid. p. 456. 471. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Bishop Warburton is very warm on this assertion, and calls it “a notorious falsehood.” The house, he says, “has been charged by all mankind with encouraging the tumults, though not with publicly avowing that they did encourage them.” The truth or falsehood of Mr. Neal’s assertion will depend on the explanation of the word “encourage;” if it means connivance at, and giving countenance to, the tumults, its veracity maybe impeached. For when the lords desired, on December 27, the house to join in publishing a declaration against the tumults, and in petitioning the king for a guard, they waived taking the request into consideration, on the plea, that the hour was too late for it. When the next day came, they adjourned the matter to the succeeding. The mob being again assembled on the 29th, they sent their message to the lords. Mr. Neal does not immediately state these circumstances, but he represents the commons as not acting with vigour in suppressing the riots, and as placing some dependence on the spirit which the people showed. Mr. Neal therefore, by encouraging the tumults, must be understood to mean, as Rapin expresses it, “taking any resolution to encourage these tumults,” or avowing an approbation of them: then his assertion is, in the judgment of even bishop Warburton, just and true. The reader cannot but observe, that Mr. Neal thought that the tumults were not, at first at least, disagreeable to the commons. Yet it should be observed, that Whitelocke, speaking of them, says, “it was a dismal thing to all sober men, especially members of parliament, to see and hear them.” Memorials, p. 51.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 351. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 467. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Morton and Hall. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Fuller, b. 11, p. 188. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Vol. 1. p. 355. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Collyer’s Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 819. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Vol. 1. p. 405, folio. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Whitelocke’s Memorials, p. 50. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Ibid. p. 51 [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p, 479. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Vol. 2. p. 408, 409, folio edition. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Bishop Warburton is much displeased with Mr. Neal for quoting the authority, and giving in to the opinion, of Echard. For he says, “It was a known and uncontroverted fact, that the advice was Digby’s. ”To invalidate the supposition, that the measure proceeded from the queen’s counsels, his lordship urges, that the queen was not capable of any vigorous steps, being intimidated with the fear of an impeachment, and actually projecting her escape: as if danger and alarm were incompatible with concerting and adopting the means of avoiding the threatening evil; as if Digby might not be the ostensible adviser of measures which others suggested and instigated. That he was the sole author of this measure, is not so uncontroverted a fact as the bishop conceived it to be: and it may be alleged in favour of Mr. Neal and Echard, that amongst the divers excuses made for this action, some imputed it to the irritation and counsel of the women telling the king, “that if he were king of England he would not suffer himself to be baffled about such persons.” The notice of this intended step was given to these five gentlemen by a great court lady, their friend; who overheard some discourse about it. Whitelocke’s Memorial, p. 50, 51.—Ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. Rapin, vol. 2. p. 408, folio edition. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Vol. 1. p. 383. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Rushworth, part 3. vol. l. p. 492 [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Clarendon, vol. 1. p. 302. 416. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. Ibid. p. 427. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 552. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Vol. 1. p. 429, 430. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Baxter’s History, Life, and Times, p. 33. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Collyer’s Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2. p. 820. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Rushworth, part 3. vol. 1. p. 554. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)