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CHAPTER XI.

FROM THE KING’S LEAVING WHITEHALL TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE CIVIL WAR.

All things now tended to a rupture between the king and parliament; the legislature being divided and the constitution broken. While the royal family was at Hampton-court, the officers and soldiers who were quartered about Kingston, to the number of two hundred, made such disturbances, that the militia of the country was raised to disperse them. After a few days the king removed to Windsor, where a cabinet-council was held in presence of the queen, in which, besides the resolution of passing no more bills, already mentioned, it was further agreed, that her majesty being to accompany the princess her daughter to Holland, in order to her marriage with the prince of Orange, should take with her the crown jewels, and pledge them for ready money; with which she should purchase arms and ammunition, &c. for the king’s service. She was also to treat with the kings of France and Spain for four thousand soldiers, by the mediation of the pope’s nuncio. It was farther resolved, that his majesty should come to no agreement with the parliament, till he understood the success of her negotiations, but should endeavour to get possession of the important fortresses of Portsmouth and Hull, where the arms and artillery of the late army in the north were deposited. Mr. Echard says it was resolved, that the queen should remove to Portsmouth, and the king to Hull; that being possessed of those places of strength, where his friends might resort to him with safety, he should sit still till the hot spirits at Westminster could be brought to reason;[[1]](#footnote-1) but this important secret being discovered, the parliament entered upon more effectual measures for their safety: they sent to Col. Goring, governor of Portsmouth, not to receive any forces into the town but by authority of the king, signified by both houses of parliament. Sir John Hotham was sent to secure the magazine at Hull; and a guard was placed about the Tower of London, to prevent the carrying out any ordnance or ammunition without consent of parliament. Lord Clarendon, and after him Mr. Echard, censure the two houses for exercising these first acts of sovereignty; how far they were necessary for their own and the public safety, after what had passed, and the resolutions of the councils at Windsor, I leave with the reader.

The command of the militia had been usually in the crown; though the law had not positively determined in whom that great power was lodged, as Mr. Whitelocke undertook to prove before the commissioners at Uxbridge;[[2]](#footnote-2) the king claimed the sole disposal of it, whereas the parliament insisted that it was not in the king alone, but in the king and parliament jointly; and that when the kingdom is in imminent danger, if the royal power be not exerted in its defence, the military force may be raised without it. But waiving the question of right, the parliament desired the command of the militia might be put into such hands as they could confide in only for two years, till the present disorders were quieted. This the king refused, unless the house would first give up the question of right, and vest the sole command of the militia in the crown by form of law; which the parliament declined, and voted the advisers of that answer enemies of the kingdom.

Multitudes of petitions were presented to the houses from the city of London, and from the counties of Middlesex, Hertford, Essex, &c.[[3]](#footnote-3) beseeching them to provide for the safety of the nation, by disarming Papists, by taking care of the Protestants in Ireland, by bringing evil counsellors to punishment, by putting the kingdom into a posture of defence, and by committing the forts and castles of the kingdom to such persons as both houses could confide in; but their hands were tied, because the king, who has the sole execution of the laws, would act no longer in concert with his parliament. The commons, encouraged by the spirit of the people, petitioned a second time for the militia, and framed an ordinance, with a list of the names of such persons in whom they could confide. His majesty, in order to amuse the house and gain time, told them, “that he could not divest himself of that just power that God and the laws of the kingdom had placed in him for the defence of his people, for any indefinite time.” After this they presented a third petition to the king at Theobald’s [March 1], in which they protest, “that if his majesty persists in that denial, the dangers and distempers of the kingdom were such as would endure no longer delay; and therefore, if his majesty will not satisfy their desires, they shall be enforced, for the safety of the kingdom, to dispose of the militia by authority of both houses of parliament, and they resolve to do it accordingly:”[[4]](#footnote-4) beseeching his majesty at the same time to reside near his parliament. The king was so inflamed with this protestation, that he told them, “he was amazed at their message, but should not alter his resolution in any point.”[[5]](#footnote-5) And instead of residing near his parliament he removed to Newmarket, and by degrees to York. Upon this the commons voted, March 4, “that the kingdom be forthwith put into a posture of defence by authority of both houses, in such a way as is already agreed upon by both houses of parliament;”[[6]](#footnote-6) and next day they published an ordinance for that purpose. March 9, both houses presented a declaration to the king at Newmarket, “expressing the causes of their fears and jealousies, and their earnest desires, that his majesty would put from him those wicked and mischievous counsellors, that have caused these differences between him and his parliament; that he would come to Whitehall, and continue his own and the prince’s residence near his parliament, which he may do with more honour and safety than in any other place. We beseech your majesty (say they) to consider in what state you are, and how easy the way is to happiness, greatness, and honour, if you will join with your parliament: this is all we expect, and for this we will return you our lives and fortunes, and do every thing we can to support your just sovereignty and power. But it is not words alone that will secure us; that which we desire is some real effect in granting those things that the present necessities of the kingdom require.” They add farther, “that his majesty’s removal to so great a distance not only obstructed the proceedings of parliament, but looked like an alienation of the kingdom from himself and family.”[[7]](#footnote-7) His majesty’s best friends advised him to take this opportunity of returning to London; “and it must be solely imputed to his majesty’s own resolution (says lord Clarendon) that he took not that course;” but instead of this he broke out into a passion, and told them, he had his fears for the true Protestant profession and the laws as well as they: “What would you have? (says his majesty). Have I violated your laws, or denied to pass any bill for the ease of my subjects? I do not ask what you have done for me. God so deal with me and mine, as my intentions are upright for maintaining the true Protestant profession and the laws of the land.” Being asked by the earl of Pembroke, whether he would not grant the militia for a little time, his majesty swore by God, “No, not for an hour.” When he was put in mind of his frequent violation of the laws, his majesty replied, “that he had made ample reparation, and did not expect to be reproached with the actions of his ministers.”[[8]](#footnote-8)

As his majesty insisted upon the militia, he claimed also an inalienable right to all the forts and garrisons of the kingdom, with an uncontrollable power to dispose of the arms and ammunition laid up in them, as his proper goods. This the parliament disputed, and maintained, that they were his majesty’s only in trust for the public, and that in discharge of this trust the parliament sitting are his counsellors; for if the king had such a property in the forts and magazines as he claimed, he might then sell or transfer them into the enemy’s hand as absolutely as a private person may his lands and goods; which is a strange maxim, and contrary to the act of 40 Edw. III.

Many declarations passed between the king and his parliament on this argument, while each party were getting possession of all that they could. The king was contriving to make sure of the magazine of Hull, but the parliament were beforehand with his majesty, and not only secured that important fortress, but got the command of the fleet [March 31], which submitted to the earl of Warwick, whom the parliament appointed to be their admiral.

The ordinance of March 5, for disposing of the militia by both houses of parliament without the king, in cases of extreme danger to the nation, of which danger the two houses were the proper judges, with the subsequent resolution of March 16, were the grand crises which divided the house into two parties. Mr. Hyde, afterward lord Clarendon, Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. Palmer, and other eminent lawyers and gentlemen, having given their opinion against the ordinance, quitted their seats, and retired to the king. On the other hand, serjeant Maynard, Whitelocke, Glyn, Selden, the lord-keeper Littleton, Mr. Lee, St. John, Grimston, and divers others of no less judgment in law, and of a superior interest in their country, accepted of commissions in the militia, and continued in the service of the parliament. Many retired to their country-seats, and were for standing neuter in this nice conjuncture; but those that remained in the house were about three hundred, besides fifty that were employed in the country, and about fifty more absent with leave; the rest went over to the king, and were some time after expelled the house. But from this time the sitting members were more resolute, and met with less opposition.

March 15, his majesty acquainted the houses from Huntingdon, with his design to reside for some time at York; and adds, that he expected, “they should pay a due regard to his prerogative, and to the laws established: and that none of his subjects should presume, under colour of any order or ordinance of parliament to which his majesty is not a party, to do or execute what is not warrantable by the laws.” His majesty’s intention, by this message, was to put a stop to all farther proceedings of the parliament, for their own and the nation’s security, till they had digested all their grievances into a body. Upon receiving this declaration both houses came to these resolutions among others:

March 16, Resolved, “That those who advise his majesty to absent himself from the parliament, are enemies to the peace of the kingdom, and justly suspected to be favourers of the rebellion in Ireland.”[[9]](#footnote-9)

Resolved, “That the ordinance of parliament for the militia is not inconsistent with the oath of allegiance; but that the several commissions granted by his majesty under the great seal to the lieutenants of the several counties, are illegal and void.”[[10]](#footnote-10)

Resolved, “That in cases of extreme danger, and of his majesty’s refusal to act in concert with his parliament, the people ought, by the fundamental laws of the kingdom, to obey the ordinance of both houses concerning the militia; and that such persons as shall be appointed deputy-lieutenants, and are approved by both houses, ought to take upon them to execute their offices.”

It was resolved farther, “That the two houses of parliament being the representative body of the whole nation, and two parts in three of the legislature, were the proper judges of the state and condition of it.”

Resolved, “That when both houses agreed that the nation was in extreme danger, as they now did, the king was obliged, by the laws of nature as well as by the laws of the land, to agree to those remedies which they who are his great council should advise him to. This seems evident from the statute of *25* Edw. III. entitled, the statute of provisors of benefices, which says, “that the right of the crown of England, and the laws of the realm, are such, that upon the mischiefs and damages that happen to this realm, our sovereign lord the king ought, and is bound by his oath, with the accord of his people in parliament, to ordain remedy for removing thereof.’[[11]](#footnote-11)

Resolved, “That if in such a time of danger his majesty deserts his parliament, or refuses to concur with them in ordaining such remedies as are absolutely necessary for the common safety, then the two houses ought to look upon themselves as the guardians of the people, and provide for their defence.

Resolved, “That when the lords and commons, which is the supreme court of judicature in the kingdom, shall declare what the law of the land is; to have this not only questioned but contradicted, and a command that it should not be obeyed, is a high breach of the privilege of parliament.”

His majesty on the other hand averred, “that the kingdom was in no danger, but from the arbitrary proceedings of the parliament, who were invading the royal prerogative, and subverting the constitution in church and state.

“That if the kingdom was really in danger, he was the guardian and protector of his people, and was answerable to God only for his conduct; but that parliaments were temporary and dissolvable at his pleasure: that he should therefore consider them as his counsellors and advisers, but not his commanders or dictators.”

His majesty admitted, “that in some doubtful cases the parliament were judges of the law, but he did not think himself bound to renounce his own judgment and understanding, bypassing laws that might separate from his crown that which was in a manner essential to it, viz. a power to protect his subjects.”

To which the commons replied, “that the king alone could not be judge in this case, for the king judges not matters of law but by his courts; nor can the courts of law be judges of the state of the kingdom against the parliament, because they are inferior; but as the law is determined by the judges, who are the king’s council, so the state of the nation is to be determined by the two houses of parliament, who are the proper judges of the constitution. If therefore the lords and commons in parliament assembled declare this or the other matter to be according to law, or according to the constitution of the kingdom, it is not lawful for any single person or inferior court to contradict it.”[[12]](#footnote-12)

But instead of tiring the reader with a long paper war in support of these propositions, I will make one general remark, which may serve as a key to the whole controversy. If we suppose the kingdom to be in its natural state, after the king had withdrawn from his parliament, and would act no longer in concert with them—If the constitution was then entire, and the most considerable grievances redressed—If the laws in being were a sufficient security against the return of Popery and arbitrary power, and there was good reason to believe those laws would have their free course;— then the king’s arguments are strong and conclusive; for in all ordinary cases, the administration of justice, and the due execution of the laws, is vested in the crown; nor may the lords and commons in parliament make new laws, or suspend and alter old ones, without his majesty’s consent. But on the other hand, if in the opinion[[13]](#footnote-13) of the lords and commons in parliament assembled, who are the representatives of the whole nation, the constitution is broken; by the king’s deserting his two houses, and resolving to act no longer in concert with them, or by any other overt acts of his majesty’s council, inconsistent with the constitution; or if both houses shall declare[[14]](#footnote-14) the religion and liberties of the nation to be in imminent danger, either from foreign or domestic enemies, and the king will not concur with his parliament to apply such remedies as the wisdom of his two houses shall think necessary;—then certainly, after proper petitions and remonstrances, they may from the necessity of the case provide for the public safety, as much as in the case of nonage or captivity of the prince. In order therefore to decide in the present controversy, we must make an estimate of the true condition of the nation; whether it was in its natural state; or whether the constitution being divided and broken by the king’s deserting his parliament, the legal form of government was not dissolved? In the former case I apprehend the king was in the right; in the latter, the parliament.

This unhappy controversy was managed with great warmth and mutual reproaches, though with this decency, that the king did not charge his parliament with criminal designs, but only a malignant party in both houses; nor did the parliament reproach the person of the king, but laid all their grievances upon his evil counsellors; however, it is easy to observe, that it was impossible the two parties should agree, because they reasoned upon a different principle; the king supposing the nation was in a sound state, and that therefore the laws ought to take their natural course; the parliament apprehending the constitution broken, and that therefore it was their duty to provide for the public safety, even without the king’s concurrence. But we shall have more light into this controversy hereafter.

To return to the history. Though the Scots were made easy at home, being in full possession of their civil and religious rights, yet they could not remain unconcerned spectators of the ruin of the English parliament, partly out of gratitude for the favours they had received, and partly from an apprehension that the security of their own settlement, as well as the introducing their kirk-discipline into England, depended upon it. While the king was at Windsor, the Scots commissioners at London offered their mediation between his majesty and his two houses: in their petition they tell his majesty, “that the liberties of England and Scotland must stand and fall together;” and after some expressions of grief for the distractions of England, which they conceive to arise from the plots of the Papists and prelates, whose aim has been not only to prevent any farther reformation, but to subvert the purity and truth of religion; they offer their service to compose the differences, and beseech his majesty “to have recourse to the faithful advice of both houses of parliament, which will not only quiet the minds of his English subjects, but remove the jealousies and fears that may possess the hearts of his subjects in his other kingdoms.” In their paper of the same date to both houses of parliament, January 15, “they return thanks to the parliament of England for the assistance given to the kingdom of Scotland in settling their late troubles; and next to the providence of God and his majesty’s goodness, they acknowledge their obligations to the mediation and brotherly kindness of the English parliament; and now by way of return, and to discharge the trust reposed in them, they offer their mediation between them and the king, beseeching the houses to consider of the fairest and most likely methods to compose the differences in church and state.” Bishop Burnet says, their design was to get episcopacy brought down and presbytery set up, to the first of which most of the members were willing to consent, but few were cordial for the latter.

The king was highly displeased with the Scots mediation, and sent them word that the case of England and Scotland was different; in Scotland, says his majesty, episcopacy was never fully settled by law, and is found to be contrary to the genius of the people; but in England it is rooted in the very constitution, and has flourished without interruption for eighty years; he therefore commands them not to transact between him and his parliament, without first communicating their propositions to him in private. At the same time his majesty sent letters into Scotland, and ordered the chancellor to use his utmost efforts to keep that kingdom to a neutrality. On the other hand, the parliament threw themselves into the arms of the Scots; they thanked the commissioners for their kind and seasonable interposition, and prayed them to continue their endeavours to remove the present distractions, and to preserve the union between the two kingdoms. They wrote likewise into Scotland to the same purpose; the effects of which will appear at the next meeting of their parliament.

In the meantime, the lords and commons, in order to encourage the expectations of their friends in both kingdoms, published the following declaration of their intentions:

*“Die Sabbati, April 9, 1642.*

“The lords and commons declare, that they intend a due and necessary reformation of the government and discipline of the church, and to take away nothing in the one but what will be evil and justly offensive, or at least unnecessary and burdensome; and for the better effecting thereof, speedily to have consultation with godly and learned divines; and because this will never of itself attain the ends sought therein, they will use their utmost endeavours to establish learned and preaching ministers, with a good and sufficient maintenance throughout the whole kingdom, wherein many dark corners are miserably destitute of the means of salvation, and many poor ministers want necessary provision.”

This declaration was ordered to be published by the sheriffs of the several counties, for the satisfaction of the people.

The distance between London and York increased the misunderstanding between the king and his parliament; numbers of passengers travelling between the two places with secret intelligence, the parliament appointed the following oath to be taken by all who came from the king’s quarters.

“I, A. B., do swear from my heart, that I will not, directly or indirectly, adhere unto or willingly assist the king in this war, or in this cause against the parliament, nor any forces raised without consent of the two houses of parliament, in this cause or war. And I do likewise swear, that my coming, and submitting myself under the power and protection of parliament, is without any manner or design whatsoever to the prejudice of the proceedings of this present parliament, and without direction, privity, or advice, of the king, or any of his council or officers, other than I have made known. So help me God and the contents of this book.”

This was called the negative oath, and was voted April 5, 1642.

As soon as the correspondence was thus interrupted, numbers of libellous newspapers, mercuries, and weekly intelligencers, began to appear full of scandal and reproach, whereby the conduct of great and wise men was aspersed, innumerable false reports spread through the nation, and the spirits of the people sharpened for war. On the side of the king was Mercurius Aulicus; and on the side of the parliament Mercurius Britannicus: when the king fixed his court at Oxford, the learned garrison drew their pens for the king, as the politicians of London did for the parliament; and while the armies were in the field, these gentlemen employed themselves in celebrating their wonderful exploits to the people; so that beside the above-mentioned weekly papers, there appeared Mereurius Rusticus—Pragmaticus—Publicus—diurnals and intelligencers without number. The pulpits also were employed in the same work; the preachers dealt too much in polities, and made free with the characters and actions of their superiors: there were incendiaries on both sides: the king’s preachers enhanced his majesty’s character, and treated the parliament as rebels and traitors;[[15]](#footnote-15) and the parliament-ministers were no less culpable, for though they avoided speaking disrespectfully of the person of the king, they declaimed against the hierarchy, against evil and Popish counsellors, and glanced at the queen herself, as preventing the harmony between his majesty and the parliament, and pushing him upon measures that were destructive to the Protestant religion and the constitution of their country; which, how true soever in itself, was a subject very unfit for the pulpit.

The great resort of the nobility and gentry to the court at York, gave his majesty new life, and encouraged him to treat his parliament with very sovereign language; he sent them word, that “he would have nothing extorted from him; nor would he grant them anything farther that the law had put into his hands, ”[[16]](#footnote-16) At the same time his majesty attempted to seize upon the magazine of Hull, pursuant to the scheme formed at Windsor in January last; and accordingly appeared before the town with three hundred horse, April 23, but was denied entrance with more than twelve attendants; whereupon, after an hour’s time allowed for deliberation, his majesty caused sir John Hotham the governor to be proclaimed a traitor by two heralds at arms, and then retired to York full of resentment for the affront he had received, which he did not fail to communicate to the parliament, demanding justice against sir John Hotham according to law; however, the parliament stood by their governor, and ordered the arms and ammunition in Hull to be removed to the Tower of London, except what was necessary for the defence of the place.

Upon his majesty’s return to York, he commanded the committee of parliament, which were spies upon his actions, to retire to London, but they excused themselves, as being ordered to continue by those who employed them. His majesty also summoned the nobility and gentry of the northern counties to meet him at York [May 12], when he acquainted them with his reasons for refusing the militia-bill, and with the treasonable behaviour of sir John Hotham in keeping him out of Hull, and depriving him of his magazine, being his own proper goods. “Since treason is countenanced so near me (says his majesty,) it is time to look to my safety; none can blame me to apprehend danger, I am therefore resolved to have a guard—.” The gentry were divided in their sentiments about the king’s conduct, and gave answers as they were differently affected, though all were willing to serve his majesty according to law. After several other assemblies of the nobility, gentry, freeholders, and ministers of York, had been held by his majesty’s command, in all which he declared, that “he was resolved to defend the true Protestant religion established in the reign of queen Elizabeth; to govern by law for the future; and that he had no intention to make war with his parliament, except it were in way of defence;”[[17]](#footnote-17) a regiment of horse was raised for the security of his majesty’s person, and the command given to the prince of Wales. This was the first levy of troops in the civil war, his majesty having as yet only a regiment of the militia of six hundred men, besides the reformadoes that attended the court.

About the same time [May 17] the king ordered the courts of justice to remove from Westminster to York, and sent for serjeant-major Skippon, an old experienced officer, to attend him in person, which the parliament prevented; but were not so successful in relation to the great seal, which the keeper sent privately to the king by the messenger that came for it [May 22,] and next day followed himself. This was a sensible disappointment to the parliament, especially as it was attended with the loss of nine other peers, who deserted their stations in the house about the same time, and went over to the king, as did considerable numbers of the commons, his majesty having now given orders to all his friends to leave the house and repair to him, which, instead of breaking up the parliament, as was intended, strengthened the hands of the country party, and gave them an opportunity after some time of expelling the deserters.

Things being come to this crisis, the parliament voted, May 20, “that it was now apparent that the king, seduced by wicked counsel, intended to make war upon the parliament.—That whensoever the king maketh such war it is a breach of trust, contrary to his coronation oath, and tending to the dissolution of the government.—That whosoever shall serve or assist his majesty in such war are traitors, and have been so adjudged by two acts of parliament, 11 Rich. II. and 1 Henry IV.—May 28, they ordered all sheriffs and justices of peace, &c. to make stay of all arms and ammunition carrying to York, and to disperse all forces coming together by the king’s commission.”

To justify their respective proceedings, both parties published their reasons to the world; a summary of which being contained in the parliament’s memorial of May 19, and the king’s answer, I shall give the reader an abstract of them.

The parliament in their memorial avow, in the presence of the all-seeing Deity, “that the sincerity of their endeavours has been directed only by the king’s honour and the public peace, free from all private aims, personal respects and passions whatsoever. They complain of his majesty’s being drawn into the north, far from his parliament, which has given occasion to many false rumours and scandalous reports, to the interrupting the good understanding between the king and his parliament.—They take notice of those evil counsellors which have prevailed with his majesty to make infractions upon his royal word, as that, ‘On the word of a king, and as I am a gentleman, I will redress the grievances of my people.—I am resolved to put myself on the love and affection of my English subjects.—We do engage solemnly, on the word of a king, that the security of all, and every one of you, from violence, is and shall be as much my care, as the preservation of us and our children.’ Since which time the studies and chambers of some of the members had been broken open, and six of them attempted to be seized in the parliament-house, the blame of which they are willing to impute to his evil counsellors. And though the king disavows such counsellors, we hold it our duty (say they) humbly to avow, there are such, else we must say, that all the ill things done in his majesty’s name have been done by himself, wherein we should neither follow the direction of the law, which says, the king can do no wrong; nor the affection of our own hearts, which is to clear his majesty as much as may be of all misgovernment, and to lay the fault upon his ministers.[[18]](#footnote-18) If any ill be done in matters of state the council are to answer for it, and if any matters of the law judges. They acknowledge the many excellent acts that his majesty had lately passed for the advantage of his subjects,” but then add, “that in none of them have they bereaved his majesty of any just, necessary, or profitable prerogative of the crown. They declare their disallowance of all seditious libels, but complain of many mutinous petitions that have been presented to the king to divide him from his parliament; and whereas the king had insinuated, that the church was to be destroyed to make way for presbytery, they aver, that they desire no more than to encourage piety and learning, and to place learned and pious preachers in all parishes, with a sufficient maintenance. Upon the whole they aver the kingdom to be in imminent danger from enemies abroad, and a Popish and discontented party at home, and that in such a case the kingdom must not be without means to preserve itself. They aver that the ordinary means of providing for the public safety is in the king and parliament;[[19]](#footnote-19) but because the king, being only a single person, may be liable to many accidents, the wisdom of the state in such cases has intrusted the two houses of parliament to supply what shall be wanting on the part of the prince, as in cases of captivity, nonage, or where the royal trust is not discharged; which the lords and commons having declared to be the present case, there needs no farther authority to affirm it; nor is it in the power of any person at court to revoke that judgment. They then mention some proofs of the nation’s danger, and conclude with praying for the protection of Almighty God upon the king, and beseech his majesty to cast from him his evil counsellors, assuring him and the whole kingdom, that they desire nothing more than to preserve the purity and power of religion, to honour the king in all his just prerogatives, and to endeavour to the utmost of their power, that all parishes may have learned and pious preachers, and those preachers competent livings. And they doubt not to overcome all difficulties, if the people do not desert them to their own undoing; and even in this cause, they declare they will not betray their trust, but look beyond their own lives and estates, as thinking nothing worth enjoying without the liberty, peace, and safety, of the kingdom, nor anything too much to be hazarded for the obtaining of it.”[[20]](#footnote-20)

His majesty, in his answer, is not willing to charge his parliament with misbehaviour, but only a malignant party in both houses. He denies the several plots and conspiracies mentioned in their declaration, and takes notice of their misapplying the word “parliament” to the vote of both houses, whereas the king is an essential part of the parliament. His majesty confesses that his going to the house of commons to seize the five members was an error in form, but maintains the matter of the accusation to be just, and therefore thinks he ought not to be reproached with it. He neither affirms nor denies the design of bringing the army to London, but quibbles with the words “design” and “resolution,” as Rapin observes, king Charles I. being very skilful in such sort of ambiguities. His majesty made no reply to the parliament’s reasoning upon the head, of the king’s neglecting to discharge his trust, but seems to insinuate, that the parliament should in no case meddle with the government without an express law. He denies his knowledge of any evil counsellors about him; and declares that he did not willingly leave his parliament, but was driven away by the tumults at Whitehall; and adds, that by the help of God and the laws of the land, he would have justice for those tumults; nor does his majesty own the promoting or retaining in his service any who are disaffected to the laws of the kingdom; but he will not take a vote of parliament for his guide, till it is evident they are without passion or affection. The king charges them home with the greatest violation of the laws and liberties of the subject.

“What is become of the law that man was born to? (says he). And where is magna charta, if the vote of parliament may make a law?” His majesty concludes with a severe remark on the parliament’s calling the petitions presented to him “mutinous.” “Hath a multitude of mean inconsiderable people about the city of London had liberty to petition against the government of the church, against the Book of Common Prayer, &c. and been thanked for it? And shall it be called mutiny in the gravest and best citizens in London, and gentry of Kent, to frame petitions to be governed by the known laws of the land, and not by votes of parliament? Is not this evidently the work of a faction? Let heaven and earth, God and man, judge between us and these men!”

The reader will judge of the weight of these declarations according to a former remark. The parliament supposes the “nation in imminent danger, and the royal power not exerted in its defence;” in which case they, as guardians of the people, apprehend themselves empowered to act in its defence. The king supposes the nation to be in its natural state, and in no manner of danger, but from a malignant party within the two houses, and that therefore the laws should have their free and ordinary course. Upon these contrary suppositions the arguments on both sides are invincible: but (as has been already observed) it was impossible they should produce any good effect, till it was first agreed whether the nation was in danger, or whether the royal promise might be relied upon with safety.

On the 2nd of June the parliament presented the king with the sum of all their desires for the reformation and security of church and state, in nineteen propositions, according to his majesty’s command in January last. Those which relate to the state are built upon the supposition above mentioned, that the nation was in imminent danger; and that after so many infractions of the royal word, it was not to be relied upon for the execution of the laws but in conjunction with the parliament. They therefore pray, “that his majesty’s privy-councillors, commanders of forts and garrisons, and all the great officers of state, may be approved by the two houses; that the judges may hold their places *quam diu se bene gesserint;* that the militia may be in the hands of the parliament for the present; that all public business may be determined by a majority of the council; and that they may take an oath to maintain the petition of right, and such other laws as shall be enacted this present session. They pray that the justice of parliament may pass upon delinquents; that the lord Kimbolton and the five members may be effectually cleared by act of parliament, and that his majesty would enter into alliances with foreign princes for the support of the Protestant religion,” &c. It is hard to express his majesty’s resentment against all these propositions (except the two last), which he says were fit only to be offered to a vanquished prisoner; that he were unworthy of his noble descent if he should part with such flowers of the crown as are worth all the rest of the garland, “If these things are granted (says he) we may have the title of a king, and be waited upon bareheaded; we may have our hand kissed, and have swords and maces carried before us, but as to real power we should remain but the outside, the picture, the sign, of a king.” His majesty therefore rejected them in the gross, with this sovereign reply, “Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.”

The propositions relating to religion are these:

Prop. 4. “That he or they to whom the government and education of the king’s children shall be committed, be approved of by both houses of parliament, and in the intervals of parliament by the majority of the privy-council; and that such servants against whom the houses have any just exception be removed.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Prop. 5. “That the marriages of the king’s children be with consent of parliament, under penalty of a premunire on such as shall conclude them otherwise, and not to be pardoned but by parliament.

Prop. 6. “That the laws in force against Jesuits, priests, and Popish recusants, be strictly put in execution, without any toleration or dispensation to the contrary; and that some more effectual course may be enacted by authority of parliament, to disable them from making any disturbance in the state, or eluding the laws by trusts or otherwise.

Prop. 7. “That the votes of Popish lords in the house of peers may be taken away, so long as they continue Papists; and that your majesty will consent to such a bill as shall be drawn, for the education of the children of Papists by Protestants, in the Protestant religion.

Prop. 8. “That your majesty will be pleased to consent, that such a reformation be made of the church government and liturgy as both houses of parliament shall advise, wherein they intend to have consultation with divines, as is expressed in their declaration for that purpose; and that your majesty will contribute your best assistance for the raising of a sufficient maintenance for preaching ministers through the kingdom; and that your majesty will be pleased to give your consent to the laws, for the taking away of innovations and superstitions, and of pluralities, and against scandalous ministers.”

To these propositions his majesty replied as follows:

To the fourth and fifth, concerning the education and disposal of his children, “that he had committed them to the care of persons of quality, integrity, and piety, with special regard to their education in the principles of the true Protestant religion, but that he would never part with that trust, which God, nature, and the laws of the land, had placed in him; nor would he suffer any to share with him in his power of treaties; but he assured them, that he would not entertain any treaty of marriage for his children without due regard to the Protestant religion, and the honour of his family; and that he would take such care of the prince of Wales, and his other children, as should justify him to God as a father, and to his dominions as a king.”

To the sixth proposition, concerning Popish recusants, his majesty admitted, “that if they could find any more effectual course to disable them from disturbing the state, or eluding the laws, by trust or otherwise, he ought to give his consent to it.”

To the seventh, concerning the votes of Popish lords, his majesty replied, “that he was informed, those lords had prudently withdrawn from the house of peers, but he did not conceive that a law against the votes of any, where blood gave them their right, was so proper, in regard of the privilege of parliament; however, his majesty was content, that as long as they did not conform to the doctrine and discipline of the church of England, they should not sit in the house of peers, but only vote by proxy. As for a bill for the educating the children of Papists in the Protestant religion, be should be very glad of it, and would encourage it.”

To the eighth proposition, touching reformation of church government and liturgy, his majesty refers them to his declaration of December 1, in which he had declared, “that he was willing to remove illegal innovations; that if his parliament advised him to call a synod to examine into such ceremonies as gave offence, he would take it into consideration, and apply himself to give due satisfaction therein; but he was persuaded in his conscience, that no church could be found upon earth, that professed the true religion with more purity of doctrine than the church of England; nor where the government and discipline are more beautified, and free from superstition, than as they are here established by law; which his majesty is determined with constancy to maintain, as long as he lives, in their purity and glory, not only against all innovations of Popery, but from the irreverence of those many schismatics and separatists wherewith of late this kingdom and the city of London abound, for the suppression of whom his majesty requires the assistance of his parliament. As for such matters in religion which were in their own nature indifferent, his majesty refers them to his first declaration, printed by advice of his privy-council, in which he had declared, that he was willing, in tenderness to any number of his loving subjects, to admit that some law might be made for the exemption of tender consciences from punishment or prosecution for such ceremonies; provided it be attempted and pursued with that modesty, temper, and submission, that the peace and quiet of the kingdom be not disturbed, the decency and comeliness of God’s service discountenanced, nor the pious, sober, devout actions of the first reformers scandalized and defamed. His majesty adds, that he had formerly referred the composing the present distractions about church government and liturgy to the wisdom of the parliament, but desired he might not be pressed to any single act on his part, till the whole be so digested and settled by both houses, that his majesty may clearly see what is fit to be left as well as what is fit to be taken away. His majesty observes with satisfaction, that they desire only a reformation, and not, as is daily preached in conventicles, a destruction of the present discipline and liturgy, and promises to concur with his parliament in raising a sufficient maintenance for preaching ministers, in such manner as shall be most for the advancement of piety and learning; but as for the other bills, against superstitious innovations and pluralities, his majesty can say nothing to them, till he sees them.”

It was now apparent to all men, that this controversy, which had hitherto been debated by the pen, must be decided by the sword; for this purpose the queen was all this while in Holland negotiating foreign supplies: her majesty pledged the crown jewels, and with the money arising from thence purchased a small frigate of thirty-two guns, called the Providence, and freighted it with two hundred barrels of powder, two or three thousand arms, seven or eight field-pieces, and some ready money for the king’s service, all which were safely conveyed to his majesty at York, about the beginning of June. The parliament had been advertised of the queen’s proceedings, and acquainted the king with their advices; which at first he was pleased to disown, for in his declaration of March 9, he tells the parliament, “Whatsoever you are advertised from Paris, &c. of foreign aids, we are confident no sober honest man in our kingdom can believe, that we are so desperate, or so senseless, as to entertain such designs as would not only bury this our kingdom in certain destruction and ruin, but our name and posterity in perpetual scorn and infamy.”[[22]](#footnote-22) One would think by this that the king did not know what was doing with the crown-jewels, though they were carried over with his leave, and, as Mr. Whitelocke[[23]](#footnote-23) says, that with them and the assistance of the prince of Orange, a sufficient party might be raised for the king. But in this answer, as in most others, his majesty had his ambiguities and reservations.[[24]](#footnote-24)

It was the king’s great misfortune never to get possession of a convenient place of strength upon the coast. The governor of Portsmouth declaring for him, the parliament immediately ordered the militia of the county to block up the place by land, while the earl of Warwick did the same by sea, so that it was forced to surrender for want of provisions, before the king could relieve it. The like disappointment befell his majesty at Hull, which he besieged a second time, July 4,[[25]](#footnote-25) with three thousand foot and about one thousand horse, while sir J. Pennington the king’s admiral blocked it up by sea; but the governor drawing up the sluices laid the country under water, and obliged the army to retire. This was a severe disappointment, because his majesty had sent word to the parliament, June 14, that “by the help of God and the law, he would have justice upon those that kept him out of Hull, or lose his life in requiring it.”[[26]](#footnote-26)

On the other hand the commons, upon the desertion of the king’s friends, ordered a general call of the house, June 16, and that every member should answer to his name on forfeiture of £100. The lords ordered the nine peers that went after the great seal, to appear at their bar, June 8, and for their nonappearance [June 27] deprived them of their privilege of voting in the house during the present parliament. As the commons had taken all imaginable precautions to hinder the king from getting the forts and magazines of the kingdom into his possession, they ordered all suspected places to be searched for arms and ammunition; in the archbishop’s palace at Lambeth they seized arms for about five hundred men, and lodged them in the Tower of London; in Cobham-hall they seized five cart-loads of arms; and below Gravesend about one hundred pieces of cannon. As soon as they heard the king had received supplies from beyond sea, and was preparing to besiege Hull, they ordered their ordinance for raising the militia to be put in execution in Essex [June 7] when all the regiments appeared full, besides a great number of volunteers, who declared they would stand by the parliament in this cause with their lives and fortunes. The king forbade the militia’s appearing in arms without his consent, according to the statute 7 Eliz. cap. 1, and issued out commissions of array, according to an old statute of 5 Henry IV. appointing several persons of quality to array, muster, and train the people in the several counties: but the parliament by a declaration endeavoured to prove these commissions to be illegal, contrary to the petition of right, and to a statute of this present parliament; and went on with mustering the militia in several other counties, where the spirit of the people appeared to be with them. The execution of these counter-commissions occasioned some skirmishes wherever the two parties happened to meet.

On the 10th of June, 1642, the parliament published proposals for borrowing money upon the public faith at eight per cent interest, allowing the full value of the plate, besides one shilling per ounce consideration for the fashion. Upon information of this, the king immediately wrote to the lord mayor of London, to forbid the citizens lending their money or plate, upon pain of high-treason; notwithstanding which such vast quantities were brought into Guildhall within ten days, that there were hardly officers enough to receive it. Mr. Echard computes the plate at £11,000,000. which is monstrous, for in reality it was but £1,267,326: the gentry of London and Middlesex brought in the best of their plate, and the meaner sort their gold rings, thimbles, and bodkins. Lord Clarendon says, this zeal of the people arose from the influence and industry of their preachers; which might be true in part, though it was rather owing to a quick and feeling apprehension of the danger of their liberties and religion, by an inundation of Popery and arbitrary power.

The king also tried his credit with the people, by publishing a declaration inviting his subjects to bring in their money, plate, horses, and arms to York, upon the security of his forests and parks for the principal, and eight per cent interest, with very little success, except among the courtiers and the two universities.

July 7, his majesty sent letters to the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges in Oxford, desiring them to lend him their public stock, engaging upon the word of a king to allow them eight per cent, for that and all other sums of money that any private gentleman or scholar should advance. Hereupon it was unanimously agreed in convocation, to entrust his majesty with their public stock, amounting to £860. which was immediately delivered to Mr. Chaworth, his majesty’s messenger. The several colleges also sent his majesty their plate; and private gentlemen contributed considerable sums of money, to the value of above £10,000.[[27]](#footnote-27) The two houses of Westminster being informed of these proceedings, published an ordinance, declaring this act of the university “a breach of trust, and an alienation of the public money, contrary to the intent of the pious donors, and therefore not to be justified by the laws of God or man;” that it was also contrary to their engagements, for the university being yet in the hands of the parliament, the lord Say, and his deputy-lieutenants had been with the several masters and heads of houses, and obtained a solemn promise from each of them, that their plate should be forthcoming, and should not be made use of by the king against the parliament; and yet contrary to their engagement they sent it away privately to York, where it arrived July 18, as appeared by his majesty’s most gracious letter of thanks.[[28]](#footnote-28) As soon as the two houses were informed of this, they sent for the four principal managers of this affair into custody, viz. Dr. Prideaux bishop of Worcester, Dr. Samuel Fell dean of Christ-church, Dr. Frewen, and Dr. Potter, who absconded, and the scholars, encouraged by their principals, bought arms, formed themselves into companies, and laying aside their academical studies, were instructed in the art of war, and performed the military exercises under their respective captains and leaders. Such was the zeal of the vice-chancellor Dr. Pink, that not content with marshalling the university, he promoted the king’s commission of array among the townsmen, and received one of his majesty’s troops of horse into garrison, for which he was afterwards apprehended and committed to the Gate-house at Westminster. The parliament, provoked with this behaviour of the university, threatened to quarter some of their own regiments upon them, which frightened away half the scholars, and put the rest into such a terrible panic, that the vice-chancellor thought proper to write the following submissive letter to the earl of Pembroke their chancellor:

“Right honourable:

“May it please your lordship to know, that this university is now in extreme danger of suffering all the calamities that warlike forces may bring upon it.[[29]](#footnote-29) Such forces, we hear for certain, are some of them already on their march, and others are raising to assault us; and if they may have their wills, to destroy us! My lord, you have been solicitous whom to appoint your chancellor for next year, but if these forces come forward, and do that execution upon us that we fear they intend, there will be no use at all for a vice-chancellor, for what will be here for him to do, where there will be no scholars for him to govern? Or what should scholars do here, having no libraries left them to study in, no schools to dispute in, chapels to serve God in, colleges or halls to live or lodge in, but have all these ransacked, defaced, demolished, so as posterity may have to say, See! here was for a long time, and till such a year, a university of great renown and eminence in all manner of learning and virtue, but now laid utterly waste, and buried in her own ruins. And then the question will be, What! had we no lord chancellor? or was he not able to protect us?—We are all confident that if your lordship would interpose for us to the honourable houses of parliament for our safety and security, all would be well with us. The delinquents that were sent for are not one of them here at this time. Sir John Byron, with his regiment of troopers, we shall soon prevail with to withdraw from us, if he may with safety march back to the king, who of his own gracious care of us sent him hither. And if your lordship shall be secured, that no other forces shall be here imposed upon us, that will take the liberty to exercise that barbarous insolence with which the illiterately rude and ruffianly rabble of the vulgar threaten us; against such only our young men have lately taken in hand the arms we have (a very few God knows, and in weak hands enough) to save themselves and us from having our libraries fired, our colleges pillaged, and our throats cut by them, if they should suddenly break in upon us. And this, my lord, is all the sinful intent we have had in permitting them to train in a voluntary and peaceable manner so as they have done. Good, my lord, that which I most earnestly beg of your honour is, that at the humble request of the university you would put in action with all speed, what may be most prevalent with the parliament for the peace and security of this place, and for the staying of our students, a great part of whom (such stout and hardy men are they), upon alarms and frights, such as have been hourly here of late, are fled away from us home to their mothers. The disciples, when in danger of drowning, clamoured our Saviour, ‘Master, carest thou not that we perish?’ But I am bold to assume for your honour, and to assure all of this university under your happy government, that you will not suffer us to perish; and that you will at this time give us a clear and real evidence of it, having this representation of the peril we are now in, made to your honour by me,

“Your lordship’s humble servant,

“Sept. 12, 1642.”  “Provost, vice-chancellor of Oxford.'”

This letter being sent two months after the university had conveyed their plate and money to the king; after they had refused to send up such principal managers of that affair as the parliament had demanded; after they had taken up arms, and received a regiment of his majesty’s forces into garrison, the earl of Pembroke only returned the following angry answer:

“Sir,

“If you had desired my advice and assistance in time, I should willingly have contributed my best endeavours for your safety and protection, but your own unadvised counsels and actions have reduced you to the straits you are now in: and in discretion you might have foreseen, that the admitting cavaliers, and taking up arms, could not but make the university a notorious mark of opposition against the parliament, and therefore to be opposed by it. If you had contained yourselves within the decent modest bounds of a university, you might justly have challenged me, if Ihad not performed the duty of a chancellor. The best counsel I now can give you is, that you presently dismiss the cavaliers, and yield up to the parliament such delinquents as are among you; then the cause being taken away the effect will follow. When you have put yourselves into the right posture of a university, I will be a faithful servant to you, and ready to do you all the good offices I can with the parliament, as I am now sorry you have brought upon yourselves these troubles.

“Irest your very true friend,

“Sept. 13, 1642.”    “Pembroke and Montgomery.”

Cambridge university followed the example of Oxford, for upon reading his majesty’s letter of June 29 to the vice-chancellor Dr. Holdsworth, they readily agreed also to intrust the king with their public money: what the whole sum amounted to does not appear; but may be guessed by the particulars of one college, a receipt for which is preserved among the archives, and is as follows:

“July 2, 1642.

“Received, the day and year above written, of Wm. Beale, doctor in divinity, master of St. John’s college in the university of Cambridge, for the king’s use (according to the intendment and direction of his majesty’s letters of the 29th of June last, to the vice-chancellor of the said university) the sum of £150. I say, received from the treasury of the said college by me,[[30]](#footnote-30)

“John Poley.”

This Mr. Poley was fellow of Pembroke-hall, and one of the proctors of the university. When the king had secured their money, he sent to borrow their plate, under pretence of preserving it from the parliament; for this purpose he wrote another letter to the vice-chancellor, with directions to take an exact account, not only of the weight but also of the form of every piece, together with the names, arms, and mottoes, of the respective donors, that if his majesty should not preserve it as entire as it was, he might restore it hereafter in the same weight and form, and with the same marks, all which he ensured upon his royal word. There is no account remaining of what plate the colleges delivered up for his majesty’s use, though many wished, says Mr. Fuller, that every ounce had been a pound for his sake; but in the treasury of St. John’s college there are the particulars of what plate that college delivered in, together with the weight, forms, and names, of the chief benefactors, which amounts in the whole, according to avoirdupois weight, to two thousand sixty-five ounces and a half, as expressed in the following receipt:

“August 8, 1642.

“I do acknowledge that there has been delivered to me, in the name and on the behalf of the master, fellows, and scholars, of St. John’s college in Cambridge, two fir boxes, marked with these three letters, S. J. C , containing in them all the several pieces of plate above written, which said plate weigheth, as appears by the particulars, two thousand sixty-five ounces and a half, more or less, which they deposited into the king’s hands for the security thereof and his majesty’s service, according to the tenor of his majesty’s letters, written and directed to the vice-chancellor of the university.[[31]](#footnote-31) John Poley.”

According to this calculation the king might receive from all the colleges together about 8 or £10,000. in plate, besides money. Colonel Oliver Cromwell with his company of soldiers endeavoured to intercept the convoy, but under the conduct of Mr. Barnaby Oley their guide, who was acquainted with all the bye-roads, they escaped the enemy, and delivered up their charge to the king about the time when he was setting up his royal standard at Nottingham. Cromwell having missed the convoy returned to Cambridge, and took possession of the town and university for the parliament, who, being acquainted with what was done, sent them an angry message, as they had done to Oxford, full of resentments for their disposing of the public money, contrary to the trust reposed in them. The masters and fellows excused themselves, by alleging the royal mandate; whereupon the two houses sent a mandate of their own to the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges in convocation assembled, desiring them to contribute their assistance to the cause in which they [the parliament] were engaged; but though, as Dr. Barwick observes, the commander of the garrison kept them sitting till midnight they would lend nothing, because they apprehended it to be contrary to religion and a good conscience; the houses therefore ordered Dr. Beal, Dr. Martin, and Dr. Sterne, masters of St. John’s, Jesus’, and Queen’s college, into custody;[[32]](#footnote-32) upon which many of the scholars deserted their stations, and listed in the king’s service.

Besides the two universities the king applied under-hand to the Papists, who were firm to his interest, though he durst not as yet avow his correspondence with them; for in his declaration of June 3, he assures the ministers and freeholders of Yorkshire, that he would not make use of foreigners, or of persons disaffected to the Protestant religion.—Again, we have taken order that the power of the sword shall not come into the hands of Papists[[33]](#footnote-33)—August 10, his majesty commands that no Papist should be listed as a soldier in his army; which was expedient, to avoid as much as possible the reproach of an alliance with those people, who were at this time become infamous by the Irish massacre. Though his majesty had but few Roman Catholics among his own forces, the duke of Newcastle’s army was filled with them, and Popery was countenanced to that degree at York, that mass was said in every corner of the street, and the Protestants so affronted, that they were almost afraid to go to church.[[34]](#footnote-34) The king applied to his Roman-Catholic subjects to advance two or three years of the rent that they paid as a composition for their estates as recusants; which they not only complied with, but wrote to their friends abroad to borrow more; proclamation was made at Bruges, and other parts of Flanders, that all people who would lend any money to maintain the Roman Catholics in England, should have it repaid in a year’s time with many thanks.

The Lancashire Papists, having been lately disarmed by order of parliament, petitioned his majesty, that since the war was begun, their arms might be re-delivered, that they might be in a capacity to defend his majesty’s royal person, and their own families. To which his majesty consented in the following words:

“—The laws for disarming recusants being to prevent dangers in a time of peace, but not intended to bar you from the use of arms in time of war for your own safety, or the defence of our person—Our will and command therefore is, and we charge and require you upon your allegiance, that with all possible speed you provide sufficient arms for yourselves, your servants, and your tenants, which we authorize and require you to keep and use for the defence of us, yourselves, and your country, against all forces raised against us, under colour of any order or ordinance of parliament; and we shall use our utmost power to protect you and yours against all injuries and violence.[[35]](#footnote-35)

“Given under our signet at Chester, September 27, in the eighteenth year of our reign.”

Agreeably to this, Mr. George Tempest, a priest, writes to his brother in the king’s army, “Our priests at Lancaster are at liberty; Catholic commanders are admitted, and all well enough that way; God Almighty, as I hope, will better prosper the cause.” And another adds, “that there is no prosecution of priest or Papist in Northumberland.”

When the parliament objected this to his majesty, and named the very officers, he was highly displeased, and in his answer makes use of these solemn expressions: “for that continued dishonest accusation, of our inclination to the Papists, which the authors of it in their own consciences know to be most unjust and groundless, we can say no more, and we can do no more, to the satisfaction of the world.—That any priests or Jesuits imprisoned have been released by us out of the jail at Lancaster, or any other jail, is as false as the father of lies can invent. Neither are the persons named in that declaration, to whom commissions are supposed to be granted for places of command in this war, so much as known to us; nor have they any command, or to our knowledge are present in our army. And it is strange, that our oaths and protestations before Almighty God, for the maintenance of the Protestant religion, should be so slighted.—We desire to have our protestations believed by the evidence of our actions.”[[36]](#footnote-36) Surely this solemn appeal to Almighty God was ambiguous and evasive! or else we must conclude, that his majesty was very little acquainted with what was done in his name, and by his commission.

It was only five days after this, that the mask was thrown off, for his majesty confesses, in his declaration of October 27, that the malice and fury of his enemies had reduced him to the necessity of accepting the service and affection of any of his good subjects, whatsoever their religion was; that he did know of some few Papists, whose eminent abilities in command and conduct had moved him to employ them in his service: but he assures his good subjects, that he would always use his endeavours to suppress their religion, by executing the laws already in force against Papists, and in concurring in any other remedies which his two houses should think proper.

As the king was reduced to the necessity of accepting the service and affection of the Papists; so on the other hand, the parliament took all imaginable care to cultivate a good correspondence with the Scots, and to secure that nation in their interests. We have remembered that the Scots commissioners at London offered their mediation in the beginning of the year, which the parliament accepted; but the king, from his extreme hatred of the presbyterian discipline, refused, commanding them to be content with their own settlement, and not meddle in the affairs of another nation. But the breach between the king and his two houses growing wider, the council of Scotland sent their chancellor in the month of May to renew their offers of a mediation between the two parties, which the king rejected as before;[[37]](#footnote-37) and the rather, because they still insisted upon the abolishing of episcopacy, which his majesty believed to be of divine institution, and upon a uniformity of presbyterian government in the two nations: whereas the majority of both houses, being of Erastian principles, were under no difficulties about a change of discipline, apprehending that the civil magistrate might set up what form of government was most conducive to the good of the state. The parliament therefore treated the chancellor with great respect, and not only accepted the mediation, but wrote to the general assembly which was to meet in July, acquainting them with the crisis of their affairs, and desiring their advice and assistance in bringing about such a reformation as was desired. To which the assembly returned an answer, dated August 3, 1642, to the following purpose:

“After giving God thanks for the parliament’s desire of a reformation of religion, and expressing their grief that it moves so slowly—They observe, that their commissioners, far from arrogance and presumption, had, with great respect and reverence, expressed their desires for unity of religion, that there might be one confession of faith, one directory of worship, one public catechism, and one form of church-government.[[38]](#footnote-38) The assembly (say they) now enter upon the labours of the commissioners, being encouraged by the zeal of former times, when their predecessors sent a letter into England against the surplice, tippet, and corner-cap, in the year 1566, and again in the years 1583 and 1589. They are now farther encouraged by the king's late answer to their commissioners in their treaty for Ireland, wherein his majesty approves of the affection of his subjects of Scotland, in their desires of conformity of church-government; by his majesty’s late practice while he was in Scotland, in resorting to their worship, and establishing it by act of parliament. They are also encouraged by a letter sent from many reverend brethren of the church of England, expressing their prayers and endeavours against everything that shall be prejudicial to the establishment of the kingdom of Christ. They therefore advise to begin with a uniformity of church-government; for what hope can there be (say they) of one confession of faith, one form of worship and catechism, till prelacy be plucked up root and branch, as a plant which God had not planted? Indeed, the reformed kirks hold their form of government by presbyters to be *jure divino,* and perpetual, but prelacy is almost universally held by the prelates themselves to be a human ordinance, and may therefore be altered or abolished in cases of necessity, without wronging any man’s conscience; for the accomplishing of which they promise their best assistance.”

In the parliament’s answer to this letter, “they acknowledge the friendship of their brethren of Scotland, and express their desires of unity in religion, that in all his majesty’s dominions there might be but one confession of faith and form of church-government;[[39]](#footnote-39) and though this is hardly to be expected punctually and exactly, yet they hope, since they are guided by the same spirit, they shall be so directed, as to cast out everything that is offensive to God, and so far agree with the Scots, and other reformed churches, in the substantials of doctrine, worship, and discipline, that there may be a free communion in all holy exercises and duties of public worship, for the attaining whereof they intend an assembly of godly and learned divines, as soon as they can obtain the royal assent.―We have entered into a serious consideration (say they) what good we have received by the government of bishops, and do perceive it has been the occasion of many intolerable burdens and grievances, by their usurping a preeminence and power not given them by the word of God, &c. We find it has also been pernicious to our civil government, insomuch as the bishops have ever been forward to fill the minds of our princes with notions of an arbitrary power over the lives and liberties of the subject, by their counsels and in their sermons. Upon which accounts, and many others, we do declare, that this government, by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending upon the hierarchy, is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, a great impediment to reformation, and very prejudicial to the civil government; and that we are resolved the same shall be taken away. And we desire our brethren of Scotland to concur with us in petitioning his majesty, that we may have an assembly of divines; and to send some of their own ministers to the said assembly, in order to obtain uniformity in church-government, that so a more easy passage may be made for settling one confession of faith, and directory of public worship, for the three kingdoms.”

The king, being alarmed with the harmony between the two kingdoms, sent a warm remonstrance to the council of Scotland August 26, the very week he set up his standard at Nottingham, in which he declares,

“That he desired uniformity as much as they, in such a way as he in his conscience thought most serviceable to the true Protestant religion; but that his two houses of parliament had never made any proposition to him since their meeting, concerning uniformity of church-government; so far (says his majesty) are they from desiring such a thing, that we are confident the most considerable persons, and those who make the fairest pretensions to you of that kind, will not sooner embrace a presbyterial than you an episcopal.[[40]](#footnote-40) And truly it seems, notwithstanding whatsoever profession they have made to the contrary, that nothing has been less in their minds, than settling the true religion, and reforming such abuses in the church as possibly may have crept in, contrary to the established laws of the land, to which we have been so far from being averse, that we have pressed them to it. And whenever any proposition shall be made to us by them, which we shall conceive may advance the unity of the Protestant religion, according to the word of God, or establish church-government according to the known laws of the kingdom, we shall let the world see, that nothing can be more agreeable to us than the advancing so good a work.”

Here his majesty explains the uniformity he all along intended, and very justly observes, that the parliament no more believed the divine institution of presbytery, than others did of diocesan prelacy; for though they were content, in order to secure the assistance of the Scots nation, to vote away the power of archbishops and bishops, yet when they had conquered the king, and had nothing to fear from their neighbours, they could not be prevailed with to establish the Scots presbytery without reserving the power of the keys to themselves.

Lord Clarendon very justly observes, “that the parliament were sensible they could not carry on the war but by the help of the Scots, which they were not to expect without an alteration of the government of the church, to which that nation was violently inclined, but that very much the major part of the members that continued in the parliament-house were cordially affected to the established government, at least not affected to any other.”[[41]](#footnote-41) But then to induce them to consent to such an alteration, it was said the Scots would not take up arms without it; so that they must lose all, and let the king return as a conqueror, or submit to the change. If it should be said, this would make a peace with the king impracticable, whose affection to the hierarchy all men knew, it was answered, that it was usual in treaties to ask more than was expected to be granted: and it might be, that their departing from their proposition concerning the church, might prevail with the king to give them the militia. Upon these motives the bill to abolish episcopacy was brought into the house and passed the commons September 1, and on the 10th of the same month it passed the lords. The noble historian says, that marvellous art and industry were used to obtain it; that the majority of the commons was really against it, and that it was very hardly submitted to by the house of peers. But the writer of the Parliamentary Chronicle, who was then at London, says, the bill passed *nullo contradicente,* not a negative vote being heard among them all; and that there were bonfires and ringing of bells for joy all over the city.[[42]](#footnote-42)

The bill was entitled, “An act for the utter abolishing and taking away of all archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries,” &c.

It ordains, that “after the fifth of November 1643, there shall be no archbishop, bishop, chancellor, or commissary, of any archbishop or bishop, nor any dean, sub-dean, dean and chapter, archdeacon, nor any chancellor, chanter, treasurer, sub-treasurer, succentor, or sacrist, of any cathedral or collegiate church, nor any prebendary, canon, canon-residentiary, petty canon, vicar choral, chorister, old vicars or new vicars, of or within any cathedral or collegiate churches in England or Wales.—That their names, titles, jurisdictions, offices, and functions, and the having or using any jurisdiction or power, by reason or colour of any such names and titles, shall cease, determine, and become absolutely void.

“That all the manors, lordships, castles, messuages, lands, tenements, rents, and all other possessions and hereditaments whatsoever, belonging to any archbishopric or bishopric, shall be in the real and actual possession and seisin of the king’s majesty, his heirs and successors, to hold and enjoy in as ample a manner as they were held by any archbishop or bishop within two years last past, except impropriations, parsonages, appropriate tithes, oblations, obventions, pensions, portions of tithes, parsonages, vicarages, churches, chapels, advowsons, nominations, collations, rights of patronage and presentation.

“That all impropriations, parsonages, tithes, &c. and all other hereditaments and possessions whatsoever, belonging to any dean, sub-dean and chapter, archdeacon, or any of their officers, be put into the hands of trustees, to pay to all and every archbishop, bishop, dean, sub-dean, archdeacon, and all other officers belonging to collegiate and cathedral churches, such yearly stipends and pensions as shall be appointed by parliament. And they shall dispose of all the aforesaid manors, lands, tithes, appropriations, advowsons, &c. for a competent maintenance for the support of such a number of preaching ministers in every cathedral and collegiate church as shall be appointed by parliament: and for the maintenance of preaching ministers in other places of the country where such maintenance is wanting; and for such other good uses, to the advancement of religion, piety, and learning, as shall be directed by parliament.

“Provided, that all revenues and rents as have been, and now ought to be paid, for the maintenance of grammar-schools or scholars, or for the repairing any church, chapel, highway, causeway, bridges, school-house, alms-house, or other charitable uses, payable by any of the persons whose offices are taken away by this act, shall be continued. Provided also, that this act shall not extend to any college, church, corporation, foundation, or house of learning in either of the universities.”

It may seem strange that the parliament should abolish the present establishment before they had agreed on another, but the Scots would not declare for them till they had done it. Had the two houses been inclined to presbytery (as some have maintained,) it would have been easy to have adopted the Scots model at once; but as the bill for extirpating episcopacy was not to take place till above a year forward, it is apparent they were willing it should not take place at all, if in that time they could come to an accommodation with the king; and if the breach should then remain, they proposed to consult with an assembly of divines what form to erect in its stead. Thus the old English hierarchy lay prostrate for about eighteen years, although never legally abolished for want of the royal assent , and therefore at the restoration of king Charles II. it took place again, without any new law to restore it; which the Presbyterians, who were then in the saddle, not understanding, did not provide against as they might.

While the king and parliament were thus strengthening themselves, and calling in severally all the succours they could get, the scene of the war began to open; his majesty travelled with a large retinue into several of the northern and western counties, summoning the people together, and in set speeches endeavouring to possess them of the justice of his cause, promising, upon the word of a king, that for the future he would govern by law. Upon this assurance about forty lords, and several members who had deserted[[43]](#footnote-43) the house of commons, signed an engagement to defend his majesty’s person and prerogative, to support the Protestant religion established by law, and not to submit to any ordinance of parliament concerning the militia that had not the royal assent. Great numbers listed in his majesty’s service, whereby an army was formed, which marched a second time to the siege of Hull.

A week after the king was set down before this fortress, and not before [July 12] the two houses, after long debates, came to this resolution, that an army should be raised for the defence of the king and parliament, that the earl of Essex should be captain-general, and the earl of Bedford general of the horse, who were empowered to resist and oppose with force all such whom they should find in arms, putting in execution the king's commission of array. The reasons of this resolution arising from the king’s extraordinary preparations for war were published at the same time; and in their declaration of August 4, they say, “that they would have yielded up everything to the king, could they have been assured, that by disarming themselves they should not have been left naked, while the military sword was in the hands of those evil counsellors who they had reason to fear had vowed the destruction of the two houses, and, through their sides, of the Protestant religion; but being well acquainted with their designs, they apprehend that their duty to God and their country obliges them to hazard everything for the maintenance of the true religion, the king’s person, honour, and estate, and the liberties of England.”

On the 9th of August the king proclaimed the earl of Essex and all his adherents traitors, unless they laid down their arms within six days; and in another manifesto declared both houses of parliament guilty of high treason, and forbid all his subjects to yield obedience to them. The parliament also, on their part, proclaimed all who adhered to the king in this cause traitors against the parliament and the kingdom.[[44]](#footnote-44) August 12, the king by proclamation commanded all his subjects on the north of Trent, and within twenty miles south of it, to appear in arms for the suppressing the rebels that were marching against him; and about the same time issued out another proclamation, requiring all men who could bear arms to repair to him at Nottingham, where he intended to set up his standard on Monday August 22. In the mean time his majesty gave out new commissions to augment his forces, and marching through Lincoln took away the arms of the train-bands for the use of his troops. At length, being arrived at the appointed place, he caused his standard to be erected in the open field, on the outside of the castle-wall at Nottingham, but very few came to attend it: and the weather proving stormy and tempestuous it was blown down the same evening, and could not be fixed again in two days. Three weeks after this [September 9,] the earl of Essex, the parliament’s general, left London, to put himself at the head of their army of fifteen thousand men at St. Albans. The king, with an army of equal strength, marched from Nottingham to Shrewsbury, and having refreshed his forces there for some time, broke up October 12, in order to march directly for London, but the earl of Essex putting himself in the way, both armies engaged at Edgehill near Keinton in Warwickshire, on Sunday October 23, the very same day twelvemonth after the breaking out of the Irish massacre; the battle continued from three in the afternoon till night, with almost equal advantage, the number of slain on both sides being about four thousand. Thus the sword was drawn which was drenched in the blood of the inhabitants of this island for several years, to the loss of as many Protestant lives as perished by the insurrection and massacre of Ireland.
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