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ABSTRACT

The anti-episcopal drive which took place during the first fifteen months of the Long Parliament has long been ignored as a problem worth studying for its own merits. Usually the episcopal crisis of 1640-1642 is considered to be part of a larger crisis since the expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords was a prelude to the English Revolution. Yet the anti-episcopal drive is of great interest and significance both in itself and in the fact that it was the first time in English history that a popular outcry changed the constitutional foundation of the English Government. It is difficult to isolate this subject from the many other political currents of which it is a part, but this study intends to do so as much as possible. However, the fact remains that in fifteen months, from 3 November, 1640 when the Long Parliament commenced, to 15 February, 1642 when the bishops were excluded from the Lords, a popular revolution had already taken place.

There were four major areas in which the popular voice expressed itself in the period under discussion. There were anti-episcopal riots in London. Hundreds of petitions came to Parliament from all over the country demanding that the bishops be removed from their temporal jurisdictions. Anti-prelatical sentiment was spread by means of pamphlets during the great pamphlet war of 1641. In Parliament, the anti-episcopal leadership wedded their
own cause of constitutional reform to the popular cause against the bishops. In the end, the combination of these four factors resulted in the successful passage of laws needed to deprive the episcopate of their constitutional right to sit in Parliament.

The anti-episcopal drive of 1640-1642 had its roots in the popular antipathy towards the episcopal office. The bishops were deprived of their voice in Parliament because the English people wanted them removed from the Lords. The English Revolution had already begun.
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INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE ANTI-EPISCOPAL DRIVE
AND THE BEGINNING OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

On 13 February, 1642, King Charles I signed into law an act for disenabling all persons in Holy Orders from exercising any temporal jurisdiction or authority. With a stroke of his pen the King yielded to overwhelming pressure, and enacted a constitutional change in the structure of the House of Lords by depriving the Lords Spiritual of their ancient privilege to vote in that House. In actual fact the English Revolution had already begun, because the momentum generated against the bishops constituted a popular revolution. The anti-episcopal opposition among the parliamentarians could not have carried such a program of constitutional reform without the help of the people. Ultimately, the bishops were removed because public antipathy for the episcopal office had reached such a pitch that the King's position would have been seriously threatened if he did not consent to his people's demand that he deprive the bishops of their temporal power.

Nothing very specific has ever been done by historians on this aspect of the episcopal crisis of 1640-1642. The idea of popular revolution as the fundament of the bishops' downfall was proposed by Brian Manning. His article, "The Nobles, The People, And the Constitution" in Past and Present (April, 1956) however, concerned a larger problem than the position of the bishops during the first fifteen months of the Long Parliament. None of the historians of this period of English history has traced the anti-episcopal drive solely
for its own merits. Gardiner's *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642* included an account of the episcopal crisis, but only as a part of a larger crisis. Trevor-Roper's *Laud*, and G. Soden's *Godfrey Goodman* are excellent works on two of the most controversial English prelates of the XVII Century. These studies take into account the episcopal crisis of 1640-1642, but in a limited way, since their subjects are individual bishops, not the episcopal order as a whole. W. Haller's book, *The Rise of Puritanism*, deals with the episcopal crisis only in a very general way since his topic is not the episcopal question. Masson's *The Life of John Milton and His Times* and Lamont's *Marginal Prynne* have the same limitations for a study of the anti-episcopal drive as have the works of Trevor-Roper and Soden since they too are concerned more with the lives of their subjects than with the episcopate.

This study will examine the anti-episcopal drive which began at the commencement of the Long Parliament and ended with the expulsion of the bishops from the Lords. An investigation of the episcopal crisis of 1640-1642 for its own merits is essential if one is to appreciate the full implications of the anti-episcopal momentum which was everywhere evident during the first fifteen months of the Long Parliament. The major consequence of the intense anti-prelatical sentiment during this period was a constitutional change which altered the fundamental structure of the English Parliament. The episcopate, as
Lords Spiritual of the realm, enjoyed a right to vote with the Peers. The bishops claimed that they represented the spiritual interests of the Kingdom, and the King defended their right to sit in the Lords, since he believed it his moral obligation to do so because of his Coronation Oath. Yet his defense of the episcopal order was anything but popular as evidenced by the flood of anti-prelatical petitions to the Parliament calling for the expulsion of the bishops from the Lords and the fierce anti-episcopal riots in London. The fact that the bishops were deprived of their seats in the Upper House showed that popular sentiment could change the constitutional foundation of English Government.

It is virtually impossible to remove the episcopal issue from the cross-currents of the political upheaval in England during the early 1640's. This study will try to isolate the anti-episcopal drive and concentrate only on those activities engaged in by the anti-prelatical forces which resulted in the bishops' expulsion from the Lords. The major theme of the essay will be the aspects of popular revolution which brought about a constitutional change, the first one ever brought about in this manner in English history. The perseverance of the anti-prelatical forces among the Puritan members of Parliament and their supporters outside the Houses were remarkable. Because of their masterful sense of politics, their knowledge of the basic prejudices of the majority of the nation and their
ability to remain undaunted regardless of any setbacks their program of reform met, the anti-episcopal opposition in the Commons were able to sustain their drive to remove the bishops from the Lords. The close cooperation between them and the Puritan clergy in London at the start of the Long Parliament bespoke the rudiments of a modern political party. Their basic aim was the same, the exclusion of the bishops. At that point the reason the parliamentarians or the clergy would have given for such a policy were not as important as their realization that without mutual cooperation so drastic a reform could never take place.

There is enough evidence to support the thesis that the expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords was the result of a popular revolution. Clarendon and D'Ewes both referred to this aspect of the crisis, as did many of the supporters of a limited episcopacy in the Commons. King Charles most certainly looked at the problem as one of revolution. The basic thesis of the pro-episcopal writers of the period was that anarchy in Church and State would be the result of anti-episcopal legislation. There must have been much fear that this observation was a plausible one, or else the anti-episcopalian presses would not have produced so many tracts refuting it. Arguments could be advanced that the anti-episcopal drive was only the work of a dedicated minority, or that popular feeling was strictly managed by the Puritan clergy and parliamentarians. Both arguments have some validity, but behind the anti-
episcopal legislation of 1641-1642 was a large popular base of support which was impressive enough to the Lords and the Kings. The result was dramatic: the Lords and the King agreed to expel the bishops from the Upper House, an action they had resolved would never take place.

There were four areas of anti-episcopal activity which together formed the wedge needed to pry the bishops out of the Lords. To facilitate the study, they have been presented as chapters. The first consideration is the popular demonstrations in London against the bishops. The anti-episcopal riots in 1640 and 1641 were among the worst tumults the city had ever seen. That the populace could be moved to such violence would suggest that the grievances they bore against the bishops were very deep. This essay will attempt to go beneath the riots to see why they happened and why they took the form they did, examining the inter-relationships between the Parliament, the Puritan clergy in London and the Londoners themselves. The tumults are being considered first because they demonstrate the intensity of popular hatred for the bishops and give a chronology for the crisis as a whole. The next consideration is the anti-episcopal petitions from all over the country. These petitions demonstrated the depth of the national outcry against the bishops. The number of anti-episcopal petitions reaching the Houses of Parliament during the first four months of the Long Parliament was staggering.
That they came when they were needed showed that there were ways in which the counties were aware of the needs of the Parliament and could respond to those needs in an effective way. There was a lag for almost a year in petition pressure on the House. It began again in the last three months of the crisis. At this stage of the investigation however, only the initial petitions will be considered. Another area of consideration is the pamphlet war of 1641-1642. The anti-episcopal presses poured out potent propaganda to keep anti-episcopal sentiment alive. The final area of investigation concerns the manoeuvring of the House of Commons to demonstrate how popular feeling was transformed into popular legislation against the bishops. Chapter Five, by way of conclusion, will show how all four of these elements worked together in the last three months of the period under discussion, resulting in the King's assent to the popular demand that he remove the bishops from the Lords.

This study is limited to the first fifteen months of the Long Parliament. The volume of anti-episcopal sentiment demands a time restriction if any sense is to be made out of the study. In this time period, 3 November, 1640 to 15 February, 1642, the anti-episcopal forces were able to begin from virtually nothing, reap the fruits of a seething national discontent and effect a constitutional revolution. The major source materials used were the Journals of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Clarendon's History of
the Rebellion, Rushworth's Historical Collections, and books and pamphlets from the McAlpin Collection at Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y. Thus, the essay will concentrate as much as possible on what those who witnessed the anti-prelatical drive thought they saw; it is hoped that new insight into an old problem will be gained.
CHAPTER I

ANTI-EPISCOPAL RIOTS IN LONDON

By the time of the commencement of the Long Parliament on 3 November, 1640, London had already seen two definitely anti-episcopal riots. On 22 October a mob entered the hated Court of High Commission while it was in session and disrupted the proceedings of the court by smashing everything they could and throwing furniture into the street. On the following Sunday another mob rushed into St. Paul's Cathedral and destroyed quantities of documents they found in an office, believing them to be records of the High Commission. It was in this tense atmosphere of public agitation against the secular employments of the Anglican episcopate that the Parliament met and, because of the violence of the London citizenry, was able to initiate proceedings necessary to destroy episcopal power.

To conclude that these outbursts of public hatred for the bishops' role in the Government were spontaneous would be to misread the known evidence. London was a centre of anti-episcopal sentiment. The clergy of the city were generally considered to be Puritan. Perhaps the most important Puritan divines during the episcopal crisis were London ministers: Edmund Calamy, a friend of the Puritan second Earl of Warwick, Richard Rich, was rector of St. Mary Aldermany; Henry Burton, whose anti-episcopal lectures cost him his ears in 1636, preached at St. Matthew's, Friday Street; Cornelius Burgess, who was later implicated
in inciting the city's apprentices to riot was rector of St. Magnus, London Bridge; Stephen Marshall, who preached for the parliamentary candidates of the Earl of Warwick, had a lectureship at St. Margaret's, Westminster. Many of the influential laity of the city were also Puritan. Two of London's aldermen who sat in the Long Parliament, Isaac Pennington and John Venn, were members of the distinctively Puritan parishes of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, and All Hallows, Bread Street, respectively. Men such as Pennington and Venn had little reason to love episcopacy. For example, the attempts of Archbishop Laud to increase the tithes of the city were deeply resented. His influence in having his successor to the See of London, William Juxon, appointed Lord Treasurer was a manifestation of the Archbishop's ill will since "the peace and quiet of the church depended much on the conformity of London, and London did as much depend in their trade the payments upon the love and justice of the Lord Treasurer." Therefore, the appointment of Juxon was the more likely way to conform the citizens to the direction of their Bishop, and the whole Kingdom unto them; no small encouragement being thereby given to the London clergy for the improving of their tithes. For with what confidence could any of the old cheats adventure on a public examination of the Court of Eschequer . . . when a Lord Bishop of London sate therein as the principal judge? The word "Puritan" therefore in 1640 did not mean merely a movement to steer the body of the English church into a more Calvinistic stream within the framework of the Anglican
Church. The word now had deep political overtones. The Laudian reforms in the 1630's helped to fuse lay opposition to the secular employments of the bishops with the Presbyterian divines' opposition to the ecclesiastical polity of the prelates. Thus, there was an effective anti-episcopal movement alive in London which looked to the Parliament as the happy vehicle of ecclesiastical reform. Since some of the wealthier Londoners augmented the meagre salaries of the ministers, the laity exercised some control over the pulpits; Puritan preachers helped broadcast the anti-prelatical sentiments expressed by the Puritan members of the Long Parliament all over London in an effort to sustain popular support for the anti-episcopal program of the Commons leadership.5

The influence of the preacher was not underestimated by those who viewed the anti-episcopal riots of 1640-1642. John Hacket, later Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry in Restoration times, wrote of the cooperation between the parliamentary opposition and the Puritan clergy. He felt that the Puritan members of the Long Parliament were rather heady over many things, among them "the mutinees of the City and Country." The mobs were "preached into disorder by Presbyterian Divines." This he considered very dangerous, and said it frightened his mentor, John Williams, Archbishop of York, because
a muffled Zeal for Religion hath a finger in all Combustions . . . Churchmen are the most dangerous Instruments to turn Male-contents into Swordmen who being prepossessed with an ill opinion of the Times, will quickly humble their Judgment under the Conscience of their ministers.  

There is another dimension to the collusion between the parliamentary opposition to episcopacy and the control of the London mob. Interestingly enough, some of the leaders had ready access to arms. The Honourable Artillery Company by 1639 had Alderman Thomas Soames as President and Captain John Venn as his deputy. Both these men were later M. P.'s for London and supporters of John Pym in the Long Parliament. By January 1642, the city's parliamentary Puritans took complete command of the city's trained bands.

There is a question about the support the four London M. P.'s had among their constituents. This extended to riot brigades. During the Short Parliament, one of the M. P.'s, Samuel Vassall, was imprisoned far from London by order of the Privy Council for stirring up "popular agitation among the citizens." Isaac Pennington once announced to the House that he could raise a citizen army in a day, armed, if need be, with swords. Pennington, whose home was a haven for the leaders of the Puritan movement, both for London and the nation, provided many services for the people of London, and in turn they served him and the cause of the parliamentary opposition well whenever he needed them.

The cooperation between the parliamentarian
opposition and the Puritan clergy was understandable enough. The status of episcopacy was of prime importance to both parties; its continuance was intolerable since it had a structure which defeated the aims of layman and cleric alike. Great pressure was needed to bring down an institution venerable in age and precedent so far as the bishop's parliamentary position was concerned. Thus the liaison between Westminster and the parishes was essential if the anti-episcopal faction hoped to gain popular support. The anti-prelatical M. P.'s and clerics were aware of each other's needs and their collaboration will become more apparent later in this essay. So far as the riots are concerned, the very nature of their fury, their timing, and their continued pressure all bespeak a well ordered plan, only possible through a great deal of cooperation on the part of the Parliament and the Puritan leadership in London. As has been seen, many of the M. P.'s and the city clergy were friends. In such an atmosphere the combined anti-establishment forces proved strong enough to force the bishops out of the House of Lords.

The first public manifestation of popular hatred of episcopacy during the Long Parliament was seen in London on 28 November, 1640. On that day the parliamentary opposition and their friends in the London churches proved their ability to mobilize anti-episcopal demonstrations among the citizenry when William Prynne and Henry Burton
returned to the city by order of Parliament from their long sojourn in prison. The cruel mutilation of these men, ordered by the Star Chamber at the instigation of some of the bishops who resented their very lively antiprelatical sentiments, made Prynne and Burton popular heroes.

The organized strength of the Puritan movement was revealed by the curiously good timing of the public welcome given Prynne and Burton. Two days before their arrival in London the two men met at the same inn. The next day they came to Colnbrooke, where many of their London friends met them, and great joy and feasting were the order of the day. At two o'clock on 28 November a procession gathered at Charing Cross, where a joyous reception tantamount to an "insurrection . . . and frenzy of the people" awaited them, ten thousand strong. The common people were

strewing flowers and herbs in the ways as they passed, making great noise and expressions of joy for their deliverance and return, and in those acclamations, mingling loud and virulent exclamations against the bishops 'who had so cruelly persecuted such godly men.'

A similar demonstration of anti-episcopal feeling was evident when John Bastwick, a doctor who had shared the same fate as Prynne and Burton, came to London by order of Parliament the following week. A similar reception was given him in London following his triumphal passage through Kent, Hampshire and Surrey, where many of the people
from these counties welcomed him. Deploring his suffering, caused by bishops, they uttered anti-episcopal cries as he passed by.

There is no doubt that the pro-episcopal Edward Hyde, later Lord Clarendon, interpreted these demonstrations to be rebellions against the establishment. Having noted that no "minister of justice or magistrate or the State itself [had] courage enough to examine or prosecute in justice any persons who were part of the riotous assembly, whereof there were many citizens of good estates," he saw that the Government's reputation had fallen so low in the eyes of many that their orders would have been disobeyed anyway.\footnote{13}

The force of this popular demonstration took the Privy Council and judges of the King's Council by surprise, and they were unable to stop the growing anti-episcopal momentum.\footnote{14} This would suggest that the elaborate apparatus Archbishop Laud had constructed to silence Puritan opposition to his High-Church policies had broken down. Nothing could stop the growing public demonstrations against episcopacy. For Clarendon noted that in the first week and a half of December the precious prerogative of episcopal \textit{imprimatur} and licensing of preachers was dead. Instead,
all pulpits were freely delivered to the schismatical and silenced preachers, who till then had lurked in corners or lived in New England; and the presses were at liberty for the publishing the most invective, seditious, and scurrilous pamphlets their wit and malice could invent.  

Emboldened by these successful expressions of anti-episcopal sentiment, the Londoners found a new way of exerting pressure to further discredit episcopacy. They could accompany their anti-episcopal petitions to the Parliament. The effect this had on some of the more conservative elements of the House of Commons was profound. The "Root and Branch" Petition, to be discussed in the next chapter, was brought to the House by fifteen hundred Londoners. That these people should have had the audacity to venture into the precincts of the House scandalized some of the conservative members of the House of Commons such as Sir Neville Poole. Poole felt that the people had no right to be about the House and for that reason alone the petition should be thrown out altogether. But he voiced the opinion of a minority of M. P.'s and the London crowd was to become a factor to be reckoned with, lurking about the Parliament whenever the success of anti-episcopal measures was at stake.

The bishops were not blind to the portent of these growing demonstrations. Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich, later wrote of the influence mob tactics had on progressive activities to destroy episcopacy:
Withal, the rabble of London, after their petitions cunningly and upon other pretences procured, were stirred up to come to the Houses personally to crave justice . . . against the Archbishop of Canterbury, and . . . lastly against the whole Order of Bishops.  

This observation is interesting, because the pro-episcopalian petitions, which never had popular support from either London or the counties, were usually deferred by the Houses. This aspect of the anti-episcopal drive will be more deeply investigated when petitions are discussed. At any rate it is evident that riot pressure could move the Commons to choose to read anti-episcopal petitions in the House.

One of more serious manifestations of riot pressure occurred when in 1641 the London citizenry agitated for the death of the Earl of Strafford. It is not the purpose here to show the reason why the populace hated him as much as they did. What is important to us now is his connection with the implementation of the policies of Archbishop Laud. Even though the Laudian system of Church management was not endorsed by all the bishops, the parliamentary opposition thought that the entire episcopate was guilty of Laud's crimes. Thus a petition against Strafford was one against Laud, which in turn was one against all the bishops. The same logic applied to the riots, as Hall so bitterly observed. Thus a petition to the House on 21 April, 1641, by ten thousand citizens under the leadership of three city captains of the London
trained bands (one of whom was the future member for the city, John Venn) calling for the death of "notorious offenders" and the reform of the Church, had special significance. The city wanted Strafford's death and, by implication, the bishops' deaths as well. Perhaps this is why the bishops so diligently manoeuvred their way out of Strafford's business before the House, saying that all matters in agitatione causae sanguinis were repugnant to their office. The riots during May of 1641 demanding Strafford's death far exceeded anything seen in London before that time, exceeding even the mob attack on Laud's carriage when he was on his way to the Tower of London on 1 March, 1641. The May riots, by all the evidence we have, were carefully planned.

The anonymous author of the pamphlet Persecutio Undecima gave an account of the collusion between the Puritan clergy and the parliamentary opposition. He claimed that the Puritan clergy would meet in Edmund Calamy's house to devise ways of propagating the godly cause in the House and to help the citizens further the cause. By way of their sermons and lectures the citizens could learn not only what was done the week before in Parliament but also what was to be done the week following; besides the information, which their pulpits gave the people, for coming in Tumults to the House for justice.

Two London men, one a cleric, the other an M. P., stand out as the probable leaders of the anti-Strafford riots in May: Charles Offspring, rector of St. Antholins,
and Isaac Pennington. Offspring, a friend and host of the Scottish Commissioners, was the pastor of a "missionary" church, where preaching ministers could train. He himself was an indefatigable preacher who not only hurled godly blasts from his pulpit, but also carried the good news into the crowded streets. He knew all the shops in London since he was forever collecting money to finance the preaching ministry. Pennington's position in London has already been established; it can be said that he was the city's chief spokesman in the House. Hacket spoke of them when he wrote concerning the May riots:

There is no equal temperature, or counterpoise of power against the Strong ingredient of a Multitude. I will not say, but how many of this Scum invited themselves unbidden to do a Mischief, but there was a Leader, a Presbyter Pulpiteer that bespoke them into an Uproar from Shop to Shop . . . I need not a time-hound to draw after him that was the chief Burgess of the Borrough who gathered this vain People to a head, that had no head: Silly Mechanicks;

The reason for the demonstrations was a popular fear that the King would spare Strafford. The earlier demonstrations for a bill of attainder were peaceful enough considering events to come. Belligerent citizens, some with placards calling for his execution, demonstrated outside Whitehall, but things degenerated when many of the "mechanick folk" from Southwark appeared with swords and clubs. Violence broke out on 3 May; seamen and apprentices joined the "mechanicks" and cried for justice. The mob even threatened to pull the King out of Whitehall if he did
not have Strafford executed. From 7 May until 9 May angry crowds were thick around Westminster. The situation looked grave for the King. In conscience he could not condemn Strafford and finally, hoping for a solution, he called in four bishops, Usher of Armagh, Williams of Lincoln, Morton of Durham, and Potter of Carlisle. These bishops stood for no lofty principles in this matter; they could see that great violence would be done if the King would not give in. Williams spoke of the King's public conscience which would reflect the judgment of the judges in law against Strafford. In his private conscience he could feel as he would, but in this case the public conscience should prevail, for the true question was not whether he should save Strafford's life, but whether he should die with him. Thus, mob violence had a dramatic effect on the hierarchy and the King. Charles signed Strafford's death warrant. On that same day the King also signed a bill which severely limited his prerogative: Parliament could be dissolved only when the M. P.'s wished it to be dissolved. An argument could have been made that due to coercion the Parliament was not free. Many of the Lords especially feared mob violence, and under the duress of the moment they stripped the King of a precious prerogative. Yet Parliament was considered free; the opposition had scored a major victory. The fact that no protest was made over the freedom of Parliament at the time
of the riots was of vital importance to the fate of the bishops. A violent expression of public will lost for the King a friend and a valuable prerogative. With this success, popular demonstrations could hope to destroy the political power of the episcopate.

It was months before the assistance of the populace was again needed. The anti-episcopal leadership in the Commons thought the Londoners had demonstrated potently enough in the May riots the depth of the public rage against Parliament's enemies. The bishops, whom these leaders considered to be their special enemies, were still sitting in the House of Lords and, with Strafford's business completed, the work against the bishops' temporal power began in earnest. This subject will be discussed at greater length in Chapter Four. Suffice it now to say, however, that the King, Lords, and pro-episcopalian members of the Commons seemed to have learned nothing of the popular mood, because they did everything possible to prevent a constitutional violation of the bishops' right as Peers Spiritual to vote in the Upper House. The anti-episcopal leadership tried and failed to get the Lords' approval of two Bishops' Exclusion Bills, and one "Root and Branch" Bill. The Lords and the King felt they had compromised by accepting the bills in July which had abolished the Court of High Commission and the Star Chamber. The anti-episcopal faction in the Lower House were not satisfied. Because of the uncooperative nature of the Lords, the Commons tried to
prod the Lords and the King into action by impeaching thirteen bishops in August for a breach of praemunire. But these impeached bishops continued to sit in the Lords. By November, when the news of the Irish rebellion frightened all of London, the destruction of episcopal power still seemed to be far away. Because of this the anti-episcopal leadership in the Commons deliberately linked the issue of the Irish rebellion and its popish terror with the bishops and popish lords in a document popularly referred to as the Grand Remonstrance. This document also accused the bishops of obstructing every bill for reform which came up from the Commons. It was imperative that a bill for the exclusion of the bishops be passed. The anti-prelatical members of the Commons had worked on the pro-episcopal faction in the Commons and Lords long enough. All hope that the two Houses would unite against episcopal tyranny and expel the bishops from the Lords had failed. By the end of November it was evident that the London mobs would be needed.

The anti-episcopal riots in London from the end of November, 1641, until the end of December, 1641, were organized and inspired by the Puritan leadership in Parliament and in the city. John Venn had sent his wife a letter saying the pro-episcopal party in the Commons was getting "the better of the good party, and therefore her husband desired his friends to come with their arms to help the good party." Some thousand men came, armed,
to help in whatever way they could. Clarendon noted that the populace would gather day or night during December "by the sound of a bell or other token, in the fields, or some convenient place, to consult and receive orders from those by whom they were to be disposed." One such case was noted in Southwark when a pro-episcopal constable noticed citizens arming themselves

in a place where their arms and magazine for that borough was kept... the constable... was no sooner espied but he was reproached with disdainful words, beaten, and dragged in so barbarous a manner that he hardly escaped with his life.

That the man was trying to prevent an armed insurrection was denied in the Commons when an investigation of this matter was made. The House was told that

that meeting in Southwark had been by godly and well affected men, only to draw up and prepare a petition against bishops, and that the constable, being a friend of bishops, came amongst them to hinder men from subscribing that wholesome petition.

The Puritan clergy also helped to keep the anti-episcopal feeling at a high pitch, for "no churches could be frequented but there [the bishops] were preached against as anti-Christian." The Londoners thought the bishops were implicated in the Irish rebellion, and in their fear of a Catholic uprising were ready to take the necessary means to be rid of episcopal power. The anti-prelatical leadership desired this very effect, for they could see no other way to be rid of bishops than to make their expulsion from the
Lords a popular cause. This could be seen by Pym's resolve on 2 December, 1641, that

> a committee . . . review what bills we had passed and the lords rejected, and the reasons why, and, if the lords would not joyne with us, then let us goe to the King, and make a declaration to the people, and let them see where the obstructions lie. . . .

Pym stated that those lords innocent of such activities could so declare themselves, but it was conceded that the bishops would be judged guilty by all.

There were two distinct phases of the December riots. The first phase, a continuation of the riots of late November, was aimed at three members of the Parliament who were pro-episcopal. Sir John Strangeways was especially harassed for several days. On Monday evening, 29 November, 1641

> hee was encompassed with above 200 sworded and staved, to whom hee asking what was the meaning. They told him that they came to him for his vote for the putting downe of the Bishops; to which hee told them that they must desire in a legall way what they would have legally done; and see drew himselfe from them and in his departure hee could hear them say, do you know who you spoke to; it was answered noe; why it was Sir John Strangeways one off the greatest ennimyes we have.

It was again recorded that Strangeways was stopped by one hundred people, receiving offensive words from them.

Clarendon noted that the mobs would form outside the Parliament, cheering those whom they liked and reading aloud the names of those they felt to be disaffected with the Kingdom. Among those in the latter category fell Sir
John Strangeways, Edward Hyde, Lord Falkland, and Sir John Culpepper, all of whom opposed the expulsion of the bishops. The crowds would gather at the doors of both Houses prevailing all of the members to expel the bishops. To add force to their demands the crown cried aloud,"No Bishops . . . calling them the limbs of anti-Christ."40

The mobs did affect the composure of the pro-episcopalian. Edmund Waller, a pro-prelatical M. P., on 2 December "much inveighed against the Londoners in coming down after soe tumultuous a manner, and crying openly 'Noe Bishopp, Noe Bishopp'."41 Sir Simonds D'Ewes, an anti-episcopal answered him that the Londoners were not causing tumults in expressing their grievances, explaining that their demands concerning bishops might relate to their sitting and having votes in the Lords house; against which there is a bill past this house and sent upp to the Lords; and the whole citie in one collective bodie did complaine of this to those gentlemen whom wee sent unto them to borrow the last 50,000£ of them, that they understood that many good Acts and motions which had past the vote of this house were stopped in the Lords house by reason of the Bishopps having votes and voices ther.42

The situation deteriorated so much that on 9 December, 1641, the King sent an order to the Lord Mayor of London demanding that he suppress the riots, routs, and unlawful assemblies which were upsetting the peace of the city. He further commanded that all justices of the
peace and sheriffs were to charge every householder henceforth
not to permit any of their Apprentices or servants to have the liberty of
going abroad to make any Tumults or unlawful meetings and assemblies
within the City or elsewhere upon any pretence whatsoever.\textsuperscript{43}

The King realized that the situation was becoming desperate.
On 12 December he ordered all members who were absenting
themselves from the Commons to return. The Commons struck
back by printing the Grand Remonstrance on 15 December.
Enraged, Charles replied on 23 December that the bishops'
presence in the House of Lords was justified by the
fundamental laws of the realm, and that he intended to defend
the Church with constancy so long as he should live.\textsuperscript{44}

To the anti-prelatical leadership in Parliament and in
London this was tantamount to a declaration of war. There
was only one course open to them. Since the Lords and the
King would not listen to the people's demands, the people
themselves would keep the bishops out of Parliament.

That the anti-episcopal faction in the House had
some part to play in the second stage of the December riots,
27 December to 30 December, was shown when Clarendon wrote

And when complaint was made to the House of Commons for this disorder and breach of privilege,
it was turned into merth, and the names of the persons required of those who complained, and who could not be supposed to know any of that rabble; which made very many of the members of the Houses forbear to give their attendance there\textsuperscript{45}

This would work to the advantage of the anti-episcopalian
faction in the Parliament. Because it was Christmastide, many of the non-Puritan members of the House would be out of the city for the holiday. If the anti-prelatical opposition could successfully manipulate the mob, there was a possibility that the bishops could lose votes in Parliament after all. If the bishops could be expelled, the anti-episcopal M. P.'s hoped that the way would be cleared for more drastic reforms which had hitherto been impossible to effect because the bishops' votes so often coincided with the interests of the King. The bishops had been warned by some of their friends in the city that they should absent themselves "in this licentious time of Christmas, though they had not the happiness to make use of the advice." The first inkling the bishops may have had that there trouble afoot was when Archbishop John Williams of York noticed on 26 December that his house, the Deanery attached to Westminster Abbey, was being surrounded by some of the apprentices and citizens who were "making a great notise and hubub." From this vantage point they could better watch the bishops coming to Parliament and gather up stones to hurl at them on the following day.

When the bishops set out for Parliament on Monday, 27 December, they were met by one of the ugliest mobs ever seen in London. According to Hacket, "all sectaries and desperate Varlets in City and Suburbs, flocked by thousands to Parliament . . . every Tinker and Tapster
called for justice."\textsuperscript{48} If the prelates hoped to escape the crowds by water they were sorely mistaken. On coming into dock, their barges were pelted with stones. These riots continued for two days. Duppa of Salisbury tried to dock on one of those days, but was greeted by companies of apprentices and others standing on the shore crying "no bishops."\textsuperscript{49} Curll of Winchester also tried to dock, but was met by swarms of apprentices who shouted the now all to familiar "No bishops", and was advised not to land. Instead, he turned back and escaped by coach.\textsuperscript{50}

The bishops were visibly upset by the violence of the mob. Williams of York went into a rage when the crowds insulted him and his brethren by jeering at them. The rioters formed two lines which the bishops had to pass through on their way into the House. The Archbishop took hold of one of the rioters. Some of the rioters retaliated by tearing off his episcopal gown from his back. Morton of Durham, a rather popular bishop, was almost dragged out of his carriage. Hall of Norwich recalled the incidents with a sense of horror. He was advised by the Marquis of Hertford to spend the night in the House, or else he and the other bishops might be torn to pieces by the mob, since the rioters would search every coach by torch light. All managed to escape. Many, like Hall, went to Williams' house. Only two had the courage to go to the House on the 28th, Goodman of Gloucester and Pierce of Bath and Wells. The absence of the other bishops was due to their "resolved
forbearance not to venture any more to the House without better assurance."

Better assurance was not forthcoming. The Lords tried to alleviate the situation by asking the Commons to join with them in dealing with the mob. The mood of the Commons was shown by Pym's remark, "God forbid the House of Commons should proceed in any way to dishearten people to obtain their just desires in such a way." But the tumults had reached such a stage that they were now beyond the control of any faction. Episcopalians and anti-episcopalians blamed one other for the responsibility of the disturbances. The riots reduced the bishops to such a state of panic, the Lords to such a state of fear, and the King to such a state of shock, that it was becoming clear that tumults would continue until the Lords cooperated with the anti-episcopal parliamentary forced, and excluded the bishops from the Upper House. All other attempts made by the Peers to have the Commons join with them in supressing the riots had failed. On the 28th while Archbishop Williams, who was hosting several beleaguered bishops, and his servants were repelling an attack on Westminster Abbey from "Wat Tylers and Round Robins being driven or persuaded out of White-hall," the question arose in the Commons whether or not an armed band should protect the House, and D'Ewes wrote that the question had been argued for over two hours. In the end, the majority decided "it [was] unreasonable to make any declaration at this time to
discontent the Cittizens of London, our surest friends. . . ." 54
From what has been said before, we can conclude that their
"surest friends" were, indeed, the Puritan London clergy,
giving credence to the persistent royalist rumour that the
leader of the apprentices in the recent tumults was Calamy's
brother divine, Cornelius Burgess, who continued to stir up
the apprentices in December, 1641. 55 The results of their
concerted efforts were not long in coming.

In the Lords on the 28 December, a motion was made
to declare the Parliament not free because of the riots.
The motion lost by four votes. 56 The absence of all but
two of the bishops most certainly affected the outcome of
this vote. This is important since, if the Lords had
decided not to sit, the Commons would have been unable to
do anything. But Parliament was declared free, and
business went on as usual.

Williams of York was furious over this vote in the
Lords, and given his state of mind after he had been mobbed,
one could say he was indignant beyond the point of cool
reasoning. As Archbishop of York, he was senior to all
the hierarchy, since Laud was in prison. Williams had
been popular with the Commons because he had been himself
imprisoned by Laud in 1637. But he had disappointed the
Puritan faction because of his excessive pride and his
recent defence of the "Lordly jurisdiction and secular
authority of our Prelates, without the least diminution or
reformation of their excesses which hath much eclipsed all
the honour and reputation he had gained from his former sufferings."\(^{57}\)

The Archbishop sent for the eleven other bishops then residing in the city on 29 December, and told them they must send a protestation to the House, stating that they were staying away from the Parliament because of force, and that all actions done there during their absence should be considered null and void.\(^ {58}\) Not to do this, he told the bishops, "would shamefully betray and abdicate the due right both of ourselves and of our successors."\(^ {59}\)

Hall signed the document with the understanding that further conferences would be had on the manner of presentation, assuming that Williams would have enough sense to know what to do since he had been at one time the Keeper of the Great Seal.\(^ {60}\) But Williams was in a very agitated state. Of all the bishops he had been the most severely treated by the mobs, and with an air of outraged dignity he presented the protestation, signed by himself and the eleven others, to the King. The Archbishop asked that the King himself send down the protestation, since the bishops themselves could not safely go to Parliament. The fact that this might seem like gross collusion between the King and the bishops to destroy the freedom of the Commons, and that it might look even more suspicious since the matters treated on those days concerned the repression of the Irish rebellion for which the bishops and popish lords were blamed,
did not occur to either the bishops or the King. The King probably knew the contents of the protestation; he would have been in agreement with the argument that because of the riots the Parliament was not free. In any event, whether or not the King read the document, it was given to the Lord Keeper, the Lord Littleton, the Speaker of the House of Lords. But this man

willing enough to take this advantage of ingratiating himself with the House of Commons and the Faction, to which he knew himself sufficiently obnoxious, finding what use might be made of it by prejudicate minds read the same openly in the House of Lords; and when he found some of the Faction apprehensive enough of misconception, aggravated the matter as highly offensive and of dangerous consequence; and thereupon, not without much head and vehemence, and with an ill preface, it was sent down to the House of Commons: where it was entertained heinously.  

The result was that the twelve bishops were accused of high treason, and were arrested that very day.

Clarendon felt the impeachments were unjust. However, the Lords were frightened. Since the mob even singled out those lords whom they considered friendly to the Puritan cause, such as the Earl of Warwick and Lord Brooke, and bullied those who were not, the Lords bowed to the popular pressure and joined the Commons in the impeachment of the twelve. The Lords had already declared themselves free on 28 December. However, had seven bishops been able to attend Parliament on that day instead of the two who did manage to escape the mobs and were present, the vote would have been different. According
to the bishops' protestation this vote was null and void. The parliamentarians feared that the King might consider null and void his signing in May the act against dissolving the Long Parliament without its own consent. Charles conceivably could argue that the tumults about the House over Strafford's fate did not leave the Parliament free. In the context of that December, it would also mean that more Protestants could be killed by the Catholic Irish, and the English Catholics would be emboldened to try the same course. Thus the impeachments were necessary and this work had to be done quickly.

The bishops' timing had been disastrous. Clarendon put most of the blame on the "pride and insolence of that anti-prelatical Archbishop Williams." He implied that the rioting and the blessings bestowed upon these tumults by the Commons should have warned the bishops about the danger of hasty and rash actions, since "the power of their adversaries was too great that the laws themselves submitted to their oppression." In other words, a popular revolution had helped to overturn an established institution. Anti-episcopal petitions and pamphlets helped to increase popular hatred of the bishops. The skillful management of this propaganda by the Puritan faction who were aided by the London mobs eventually brought an end to the bishops' votes in Parliament. That contemporaries saw all this as a dangerous revolution
threatening the very fabric of English law and Government will be made more evident later. This much is clear: the King had said he could not in conscience execute Strafford; then, because of the riots, he permitted the execution of his loyal servant to take place. The King also said that he would defend to the death the constitutional right of the bishops to sit in the House of Lords. The severity of the tumults so unnerved the bishops that they rushed into an action which caused the Lords to abandon them. The Lords' action frightened the King who committed a serious blunder when he attempted to arrest five members of the anti-episcopal opposition. Yet the people would not relent in their determination to be rid of bishops, so the King gave way once again by signing the Bishops-Exclusion Bill on 13 February, 1642. Clearly, he was faced with a revolution, for never before had the King given in so much on matters so vital to his prerogative and conscience as he did because of riot pressure. Hacket really pointed to the heart of the matter when he wrote "the King's arm was too weak to hold the balance of Justice. . . ." What the Puritan anti-episcopal faction then could not win by argument

. . . they would prevail by force. . . . And thus began the downfall of Episcopacy which was never heard, never suffer'd to plead at the Bar of the Parliament in its own Cause, but as one says pertinently, 'It was smother'd in a crowd'. 68
CHAPTER II

ANTI-EPISCOPAL PETITIONS

The most significant feature of the anti-episcopal petitions was the interpretation given them by the Puritan leaders of the anti-prelatical opposition in the House of Commons. The petitions were considered by John Pym to be "the voice or rather the cry of all England."¹ Since the anti-prelatical petitions were considered to be an expression of national discontent with the episcopal office, they were used by the opposition as an indication of popular support for the legislation necessary to effect a constitutional change in the structure of the House of Lords. In this connection the London or "Root and Branch" Petition and the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance are extremely important because they voiced the general expressions of popular hatred of the episcopal office. These two petitions also influenced the county petitions yet to come to the Parliament, all of which demanded a quick solution to the episcopal problem. Ultimately, the London and Ministers' Petitions were the basis for the legislation which was used to take away the bishops' votes in Parliament.

Where the "Root and Branch" Petition and the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance were an expression of London grievances, the county petitions indicated a national outcry against the episcopate. However, it was the town and parish petitions which usually singled out the
local bishop and catalogued his crimes. Petitions from individuals were usually not as influential as the larger petitions save in the cases of William Prynne, Henry Burton and John Bastwick. Because these men had attained the status of popular heroes, the public welcomed their accounts of the bloody proceedings of the bishops in the Star Chamber and copies of their petitions were circulated far and wide. The majority of anti-episcopal petitions usually had four major areas of concern. These were: episcopal crimes committed by virtue of the bishops' ecclesiastical polity against the fundamental law of the realm; episcopal attempts to "Romanize" the Church of England; the personal crimes and abominations of the episcopate; and the results of the bishops' policy to bring utter ruin to England. All of the anti-episcopal petitions were graciously received by the Parliament since the right of every man to ask redress for his grievances was upheld. The manner of procuring signatures had a special significance. If it could be proven that the signatures on any petition were false, the petition could be thrown out. Thus, as much as was possible, the Parliament tried to insure that all legitimate petitions would be received and would be used to help it in its efforts of constitutional reform.

A close examination of the London or "Root and Branch" Petition is important to our study since it was the prototype of many petitions which were to follow it
to the Commons. Even more important, however, is the bias the London Petition exhibited. Since so many petitions following it were similar to the original "Root and Branch" Petition, this bias cannot be overlooked. There is no doubt that the London Petition was the work of clerics. As Edmund Calamy's grandson noted, his grandfather's house "was a receptacle for all Presbyterian ministers, and the place in which the Remonstrance was framed against the prelates." Therefore, this petition had a distinctly clerical bias. It would be hasty, however, to conclude that because of its violent anti-episcopal nature and its radical solution to episcopacy the "Root and Branch" Petition exhibited a bias of the Independents, for as Baillie often noted, the majority of the London clergy were anxious not to be associated with the Independents. One major fear the Puritan clergy had was that Independents in the Parliament would frustrate their hopes, for as Baillie noted:

Sey and Brook in the Higher House, and these alone, and some leading men in the lower, were suspected by their inclination to the Separatists, would divide from the Presbyterians, and so weaken the party opposite the Bishops.5

Yet Puritans and Independents were united on the issue of episcopacy, and by 15 March, 1641, both factions agreed not to fight amongst themselves until episcopacy was destroyed. In a letter dated that day, Baillie wrote:
As for Brownists and Separatists of many kynds, have they [the London clergy] mislyke them weell near as much as wee: of these there is no considerable partie. Anent private meetings, we know here no difference we have with anie: Our questions with them of the new way, we hope to get determined to our mutual satisfaction, if we were ridd of Bishops; and till then, we have agreed to speak nothing of any thing wherein we differ. The plain fact was that the Puritan clergy wanted the episcopal office extirpated from English life, and considering the enthusiasm the Londoners showed in signing the petition, it can be assumed that such was the wish of many outside the clerical ranks.

In the "Root and Branch" Petition the bishops were accused of subverting the fundamental laws of the Kingdom because "They have claimed their calling immediately from the Lord Jesus Christ." Because of this episcopal claim the hierarchy controlled the clergy to the point of exempting them from the safeguard of the temporal law. They were encouraging the clergy "to despise the temporal magistry, the nobles and gentry of the land; to abuse the subjects, and live contentiously with their neighbours, knowing that they, being the bishops creatures, shall be supported." The preaching ministry was being destroyed because the bishops were thrusting out godly and able men from their congregations. Further, they disbanded the Feofees of Impropriations, who at least endeavoured to secure able ministers to maintain lectures and free schools; the bishops feared their glory would be darkened
and that minister would no longer be dependent on the episcopate if the Feofees were allowed to continue their good work.  By virtue of the last Convocation held during the Short Parliament, the bishops tried to thwart Parliament by holding sessions after Parliament was dissolved. They formulated a multitude of new canons to advance Catholicism and spoil God's people, "ensnare ministers, and other students, and so to draw all into an absolute subjection and thraldom to them and their government, spoiling both the King and the Parliament of their Power." Because the prelates had their own courts, they were circumventing the common law, especially by appointing ministers to parishes without the consent of the parishoners. They exercised the *ex officio* oath to the detriment of the subject and ignored *habeas corpus*. They justified all of these things by claiming to have their jurisdiction *jure divino*, all the better to refuse to submit to men or their laws. The "Root and Branch" Petition accused the bishops of trying to bring popery back to England. They were publishing popish tenets, stating such things as the Church of Rome was a true Church which never erred in fundamentals. Catholicism was increasing in strength as evidenced by the multitude of Jesuits and priests everywhere but especially about London. The bishops impeded the Reformation since the hierarchial structure of the Church had remained the same as it did in Catholic times.
All other Reformed Churches had thrown out the prelates as members of the Roman beast, while the English bishops, although formally not under the Pope, said he was not the anti-Christ. Liturgical practices were increasingly Catholic in nature, such as standing for the *Gloria Patri*, kneeling for Communion, consecrating churches and sacred vessels. The liturgy itself was fashioned out of the Roman breviary, ritual, missal, and the Book of Ordinations was framed out of the Roman pontifical. The prelates were also accused of forcing people to profane the Lord's Day and to observe the holy days, causing men to lose great sums of money from loss of work, and of abusing their use of excommunication for the sole purpose of silencing their opponents. That the bishops were criminal could be seen by their greed. They secured monopolies and patents by perjury, and they plotted to increase customs duties and ship money. In their courts, the bishops favoured whores and adulterers by taking their bribes. The major results of all these enormities were the discouragement and loss of good ministers and subjects who left England, damage to trade, and an increase of ignorance and superstition. Indeed, the dregs of society were entering the ranks of the clergy. These men, because of their ignorance, could not preach. Corruption was increasing in the Universities. Parents were discouraged from sending their children to school because of this.
Ungodly books and pamphlets were printed. Worst of all, England and Wales were losing their preaching ministry to all manner of profaneness. The remedy of the London Petition to all these ills was simple and direct: it asked that the Parliament abolish "the said government, with all its dependencies, roots and branches." 

Besides the London Petition's concern about the preaching ministry, the use of the Roman breviary, missall, ritual and pontifical, further proof of its clerical authorship is seen when we notice the document states that ministers were fainthearted
to preach the truth of God, lest they should displease the prelates; as namely the doctrine of predestination, of free grace, of perseverance, of original sin remaining after Baptism; of the sabbath, the doctrine against universal grace, election for faith forseen, free-will against anti-Christ, non-residents, human inventions in God's worship; all which are withheld from the people's knowledge because not relishing to the bishops.

The content of the "Root and Branch" Petition, therefore, was of a sophisticated theological nature. The liberty of subject was important, but the crux of the matter was that godly ministers were being persecuted for preaching God's word. It is not difficult, however, to see why the petition would have such great popular appeal. The petition constantly demonstrated to the average man the various ways in which he was being cheated by the bishops. Worst of all, denied a preaching ministry which could explain the intricacies of Calvinistic theology, one could hardly hope
to be saved. Thousands were leaving the country, trade was declining, monopolies and ship-money were increasing. The petition was a veritable catchall, so that almost anyone with a grievance against the bishops could identify with some injustice done him by these wicked men.

Baillie noted on 28 December, 1640, that a short petition against episcopacy was being prepared by some of the Puritan clergy, and he expected it to be ready in two weeks time. This was the famous Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance. This petition was an insurance measure, should the London Petition fail. By the end of December, then, the "Root and Branch" Petition was having difficulty. But there is no doubt that the authors of this milder petition, which asked that the bishops be relieved of all their temporal cares, were still intent on a full "Root and Branch" solution to the episcopal question. For one thing, it would be hard to believe that Edmund Calamy had a sudden change of resolve, yet he was one of the ministers who, along with Stephen Marshall and others, delivered the petition on 23 January, 1641, the day the King promised to uphold the bishops' constitutional right to sit in the Lords. Further evidence is given by Smectymnus in the book An Answer To A Book Entitled An Humble Remonstrance. The first four letters of the authors' name stand for Stephen Marshall and Edmund Calamy, who, together with the other three authors, addressed the Parliament with the exhortation "Let episcopacy be forever abandoned out of the Church."
The intent of the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance followed its title. Delivered by six or seven ministers on the day King Charles announced his resolve to keep the bishops in the House of Lords, 23 January, 1641, the petition prayed for a "redress of certain irregularities in the government of the Church. . . ." The Remonstrance set out the grievances, nineteen in number, dealing with the actual function of the diocesan in English life. It accused the bishops of controlling large dioceses and delegating their power to deputies. It claimed the bishops were encumbered with temporal affairs, for "they engraft themselves into civil corporations." This encouraged the episcopate to exercise all of their jurisdiction in their own names and not in the King's. Cuntry to law, the prelates imposed oaths of canonical obedience and deprived ministers for not subscribing to their canons. The bishops were engaged in a Romanizing campaign since they claimed that the power of the keys was given only to the ministers of the gospel, and therefore "noe layman is capable of a chancellorship, etc." They administered confirmation alone, forbade marriage during different times of the liturgical year, and insisted that if a church had not been consecrated, it was not holy. The bishops' behaviour was scandalous. For example, they claimed the sole right to probate wills; instead of carrying out the wishes of the deceased, the prelates often diverted money to their own purposes. Also they gave scandalous example
The Ministers' Petition was deliberately made less radical than the London Petition to ensure the success of the movement to expel the bishops from the Upper House. It was hoped that the pro-prelatical faction in the House would attach themselves to it. This did happen, for on 8 February, 1641, when the great debates were centering around the commitment of the two petitions, George, Lord Digby, a staunch episcopalian, declared that the Ministers' Petition was much more sensible because it gave a better index "without those mixtures of things contemptable, irrational, and presumptious wherein this [London] Petition abounds." On 9 February, it was decided that the question of episcopacy would be reserved to the House itself but that the major parts of the London and Ministers' Petitions and all petitions of a similar nature were to be referred to the Committee of Twenty-four. On that day this body became the Committee of the Thirty. Three men opposing "Root and Branch" were appointed to it, Roe, Palmer and Holbourne, while the forefront of the anti-prelatical opposition was represented by Denzil Hollis,
Nathaniel Fiennes and Sir Henry Vane, Jr. John Crew was the chairman of this committee. Cornelius Burgess was sent for as a *peritus*, and well he should have been, since by his own admission, he had been one of the framers of the Ministers' Petition. He explained in detail the ministers' reasons in bringing these charges against the bishops. Those articles dealing with the bishops' sole power of ordination and jurisdiction, the largeness of their dioceses, their delegation of power to deputies, their temporal power and their pretended support of the bishops' prerogative, as well as their claim to *jure divino* status, were all voted to be material fit to be considered by the House by 17 February, 1641. Burgess and the opposition did their work well because by 9 March, 1641, Crew announced that the bishops' secular employments were to be discussed "by which is intended their legislative and judicial power in Parliament. . . ." The next day, these matters were looked into and it was

resolved upon the question that the juridical Power of Bishops in the House of Peers in Parliament is a great Hinderance to the Discharge of their Spiritual Function, prejudical to the Commonwealth, and fit to be taken away by Bill; and that a Bill be drawn for that purpose.

Baillie wrote that Burgess had given the Committee "full contentment" and that "Mr. Crew made a favourable report to the House." Baillie then went on to say that they would first take off the roof, then knock down the walls, and finally rip up the foundations of episcopacy. To show
that he knew what he was talking about, the Scottish divine gave the Irvine Presbytery an outline of the progress of anti-episcopal activity. On 9 March, Crew's recommendation was made

in Parliament. The nixt day they did the same to the Star Chamber, High Commission, Counsell, and all other secular courts. One of these days they are to cast down their cathedral-deaneries, and prebendaries; also to spoyll them and their usurped ordination and jurisdiction, to erect presbyteries all over the land, and distribute att in one equall proportion, the rents among all of the paroches for preaching ministers.  

There is no doubt that this was the intention of his friends, the London Puritan clergy, all along.

The "Root and Branch" Petition did not remain in the Commons alone; copies of it were sent into the counties. D'Ewes had given his wife permission to lend any petitions he sent her to any of their friends. This she probably did with the London Petition, as she had done with the petitions of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick.  

No doubt others in the Commons sent copies of the London Petition into the country. That it was widely circulated was demonstrated to Sir Edward Dering when he received a letter from one of his constituents, Robert Robson. Robson wrote that he had received a copy of the petition through the help of some friends. Writing in the name of the inhabitants of the Weald, Robson mentioned that he and others had made the petition known "the same in this county of Kent, to the inhabitants thereof."  

The result was the Petition of the
County of Kent, presented on 13 January, 1641, which Dering accurately described as "the Spawne of the London Petition, yet finding it a Parat taught to speak the syllables of that, and by roate calling for 'Root and Branch'." The two petitions are identical. All of this is the more interesting when it is noted that Robson's letter was dated 1 December, 1640, ten days before the London Petition was presented to the Commons. This would argue that the London Petition was published well before its delivery. Its successful and dramatic presentation to the House would explain why so many petitions of a like nature were received and presented en bloc in mid-January, 1641, when the anti-episcopal opposition needed more national support if the "Root and Branch" Petition was going to have any success in bringing forth the necessary legislation to expel the bishops. Accordingly, after King Charles had made a speech on 23 January, 1641, declaring that he would not take away the bishops' votes in Parliament, many petitions of a "Root and Branch" nature were delivered on Monday, 25 January: Hertfordshire (read by Mr. Capell, 2,800 signatures), Bedfordshire (read by Sir Oliver Luke), Sussex, Surrey, Cheshire, Warwick, Suffolk (read by Sir Philip Parker, 4,400 signatures), Cambridgeshire (read by Mr. Chickelie, 1,000 signatures), Gloucestershire (read by a Knight of the Shire, 1,000 signatures) and Norfolk (read by Mr. Potts, 2,000 signatures). D'Ewes, who recorded with great
detail the anti-episcopal petitions from cities, towns and parishes, noted in his diary on 25 January, 1641, that all the petitions received that day "tend to the abolishing of the Bishops with their hierarchicall government." In all likelihood, they too were identical or very similar to the London and Kent petitions; otherwise D'Ewes would have followed his usual practice of noting the contents of the petitions. Thus, the anti-episcopal county petitions of 1641 were, in all probability, the same as or very similar to the London Petition.

The scores of anti-episcopal petitions pouring into London from the country makes any detailed study of them impossible for this essay. However, trends can be noted, and using the four points of view earlier employed, an attempt will be made to show the major areas of national discontent. The bishops were destroying the fundamental, basic laws of the land in a variety of ways. As proof of this, the petition from Yorkshire mentioned that the bishops enacted the "New Canons" without Parliament's consent. Many godly ministers were being driven out of the country because of the exertions of the bishops in the High Commissions Court. For example, Timothy Dalton, Minister of Wolverstone, Norfolk, was suspended and had to go to New England because he refused to read the Book of Sports. Ministers from Suffolk complained that their bishop, Matthew Wren, had forced them to take oaths of canonical obedience and was excommunicating many for
frivolous reasons. The bishops were destroying the preaching ministry. The city of Gloucester complained that they had only one preaching minister for eleven churches under the episcopate of Godfrey Goodman. Isaac Knight, a Puritan merchant, petitioned the Long Parliament concerning his sufferings at the hands of the bishops. He refused to take the hated ex officio oath and was promptly put in irons. When later released in 1626 on bond for £500, he fled to Holland "to the utter undoing of himself, his wife and children; and the bonds still remaines in force." A petition from Cheshire summed up the seething national antipathy for bishops when it accused the prelates of having abused their power, especially in their courts, doctrine, and discipline.

The most common anti-episcopal complaint expressed in the petitions dealt with "popish" innovations. A petition from Nottingham accused the bishops of fostering a popish hierarchy as well as encouraging papists. The town and parish of Beckington in Somersetshire complained that the parish churchwardens were excommunicated because they refused to set the communion table altar-wise. A petition from the ministers of the Church of England sent in September, 1641, decried the use of vestments, crucifixes, and rings in marriage. The town and parish of Tiveteshale, Norfolk castigated Bishop Wren for suspending their minister, Mr. Heremiah Burrough, because he would not bow his head at the Name of Jesus. The long list of liturgical grievances
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implied that the Laudian bishops were trying to bring England back to the Roman fold.

A major crime imputed to the bishops was that of greed. The Nottingham Petition said the episcopate had exorbitant fees for licences, and that church taxes were high. Churches which were not popish enough were fined. The City of Norwich said Bishop Wren kept rent monies which should have been used to pay his ministers. Many bishops held prebends, parsonages and vicarages along with their dioceses to the detriment of the preaching ministry, the Ministers' Petion of September 1641 charged. Two men from Ipswich accused Bishop Pierce of demanding excessive fees for the probating of wills. He would not publish a table of fees. He also brought things into his court which belonged elsewhere. The results of these and all the other excesses of the bishops indicated that the episcopate was reducing the nation to a state of misery. The bishops' claim to jure divino status generated all of the other crimes. They exceeded the jurisdiction of the law by wielding great power in their own courts. The episcopal habit of silencing preachers, fining them, imprisoning them, or for that matter doing the same to anyone who opposed their liturgical innovations, was driving thousands from England as the "Root and Branch" Petition also claimed. Although most of the petitions attacking particular bishops were confined mainly to the
obnoxious Laudian prelates, Wren and Pierce, complaints still were coming in from all over the nation. The genius of these petitions lay in their brilliant facility to describe in some detail how the average man was suffering under the tyranny of the bishops. The prelates continued their work of stifling godly preaching by persecuting ministers who objected to what was clearly believed to be a reactionary ecclesiastical program. Perhaps it was a striking coincidence that these petitions, like the London and Ministers' Petitions, also exhibited a clerical bias; it could be asked whether the general mass of the English populace was really as devoted to a preaching ministry as the petitions suggest, but one thing cannot be questioned: the average man in the parish resented episcopal interference, especially when good men were forced into self-exile and unquestionably evil men replaced them, as happened in the town of Wolverstone. As has been mentioned, Mr. Dalton, the original minister, was forced out of his parish of twenty years and emigrated to New England. Wren sent as his replacement a Mr. Skynner who bowed to the Sacrament and called his parishioners "hogs". He beat one woman to death and was the cause of another woman's death since he had excommunicated her. That all of these charges against episcopacy may have given an accurate account of the ecclesiastical dissatisfaction rife in England must be weighed against a very striking
factor. There were very few pro-episcopal petitions. One such petition from Cheshire, received by the Commons on 27 February, argued that a Church administered by twenty-six dioceasans, who were limited by canon and civil law and were responsible to Parliament, was a much saner way to govern the Church than to set up forty thousand Church governors who would not be responsible to Parliament. The latter system was not in agreement with the institution of monarchy, and would lead to anarchy with the disappearance of the nobility, gentry, order and religion itself. Significantly enough, this petition was read and never heard of again. This seems to have been the fate of all pro-episcopal petitions.

Petitions would have been worthless had people not signed them; and the more signatures, the more impressive the petition would be. Clarendon wrote that petitions would be prepared by attaching names signed to other petitions to a new petition, the contents of which the "subscribers" had no knowledge. This would not seem to be the case with the London Petition which was circulating as early as October, 1640. One Alderman's deputy is said to have summoned all from his parish to his house to sign the petition. Tavern Clubs also had copies to sign as did the city's shops whose keepers kept this petition on their counters for people to sign. Fifteen thousand people, then, in such an organized campaign, probably did sign the London Petition.
Clarendon had a case so far as the framing of the Ministers' Petition was concerned. He noted that many ministers had signed petitions against the "New Canons" only to find their names set to a "monster" petition calling for an alteration in Church Government. Many protested to Marshall, but were urged to keep silent "by threats and promises . . . and to pass by that indirect proceeding." The matter was brought before the Commons by the pro-episcopal faction, who hoped to prove the Petition was a fraud. D'Ewes seemed to be amused by all of this for he said he knew "that the hands sitt to this petition were not written by the parties themselves, but taken out of several autographicall or original petitions sent from each countie." However, Marshall testified along with six others that they had kept the context of all the smaller petitions in the larger, and the Ministers' Petition was accepted.

There is no doubt concerning the authenticity of the smaller petitions from the town and parishes. However, grave doubts were cast on the "monster" petitions from the counties by a pamphleteer who styled himself "W.I." in a work entitled *Petitions against Bishops And their Votes in Parliament*. He wrote that there were clandestine and surreptitious actions, going about from house to house by night and without the consent and commission of authority, to engage people to the breach of their Protestation and to make it as an act of a Countie or Towne, and in a manner to force men thereunto, are but
unlawfull workes of darknesse and will not endure the light. . . . It is justly to be feared that these wayes are sinister in the Undertakers being very probable that some of them doe it out of ill will, hatred and malice, as well as the Government and the governors. . . .

The author saw in the preparation of anti-prelatical petitions seeds of a revolution. He asserted that many in the counties signed petitions for profit, for fear of their landlords, for fear of losing business, and through fear of blackmail and intimidation. Using such tactics, anti-episcopal riots and demonstrations were encouraged among the humbler segments of society since obviously their betters were providing sophisticated means to coerce other men of means to do what they wanted them to do. Thus the authors of the anti-episcopal petitions and the tumultuous multitudes were using ways "without legall allegations and probations, to compass that by will, which you cannot obtenie by reason." Such activities were very dangerous since they threatened "the subversion of all Lawe, Government and Governors, for which of them, bee they never so good, shall be secure if the Multitudes of distempered people please to will the contrary." So far as W. I. was concerned, the general attack on the bishops occasioned by county petitions was a means of breaking up the unity of the nation, and would lead to a breakdown of law. However, the fact remains that the text of the "Root and Branch" Petition was circulating well before it was delivered. Probably most of the petitions
had the signatures they claimed. The very fact that petitions of such a nature arrived at the House at all would argue that the Laudian system was quiet dead and that Puritan preachers were in the ascendancy. That parishioners would write on behalf of their ex-pastors would show that they had probably expelled the Laudian incumbents. They might well have been just as satisfied to sign two anti-episcopal petitions as one.

The anti-episcopal petitions helped set up committees to investigate episcopal proceedings which eventually organized the mass of edited grievances into effective legal action. Because the London Petition and Ministers' Petition were so favourably received, they paved the way for the entire nation to take courage and express itself on this matter. The enthusiasm of early 1641 carried into 1642, when once again masses of petitions were needed by the Commons leadership to prove to the King and Lords that it was the will of the people that the bishops be barred from the Lords. Without their voice as expressed through the petitions, the bishops' exclusion would have seemed to have been the wish of the London mob only. Instead, it was the "cry of England" that was heard.
CHAPTER III
ANTI-EPISCOPAL PROPAGANDA AND THE
PAMPHLET WAR IN 1641

A major factor for the success of a popular revolution is an intelligent and effective use of the press. The popular antipathy to the episcopal office was kept ever fresh and alive by the techniques used by the bishops' enemies to win public opinion to their side. Thus the great phenomenon of the pamphlet war of 1641 was really a propaganda barrage. England had never seen such a campaign as the pro-and anti-episcopalian factions waged for the support of the public. Each side instinctively knew that if its position was to remain viable, the people would have to be behind it. For the anti-episcopal party, the pamphlet war presented many challenges, since they were championing a cause which was clearly revolutionary. They were seeking a constitutional change in the composition of the House of Lords, a notion opposed by the King and the majority of the Lords as well as the bishops. Indeed, the sufferings of Prynne, Burton and Bastwick were evidence enough of the bishops' opposition to those who sought to destroy episcopal jurisdiction in temporal affairs by printing works damaging to the Prelates. Yet the bishops were expelled from the Upper House, which demonstrated that in 1641 episcopal control over the press had ceased.

The extraordinary number of works published in
1641 shows that the pro-episcopal tracts had a considerable audience. If they had not, the anti-episcopal authors would never have gone to such pains to refute pro-episcopal arguments. It would be impossible, therefore, to appreciate why the anti-episcopal faction expended so much energy if the episcopal position in 1641 were not established. By far the most important pro-episcopal author was Joseph Hall, the then Bishop of Exeter (1627-1641), who was later translated to Norwich (1641-1656). Born in 1574, he had been a Fellow at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Although considered to be more Puritan and Low-Church in his leanings than Laud, Wren, or Pierce, in 1641 Hall was nevertheless championing a position which, as far as episcopal Church government was concerned, was definitely High-Church.¹ Thus in January, 1641, disturbed "lest the world should think the press had of late to speak any language other than libellous," Hall took up his pen to defend the truth with the result that "this honest paper hath broken through the throng. . . ."² The work, entitled An Humble Remonstrance To The High Court of Parliament By a Dutiful Son of the Church, began a long series of similar works trying to prove that episcopacy was compatible with the law of God and the law of the realm. Though eight pages were devoted to liturgical matters, Hall showed his grasp of the real situation at stake by devoting twenty-five pages to the defence of episcopacy. Everywhere in print, he declared, there were those who were trying to wound "that sacred government approved of by the
reformers and the Apostles uninterrupted unto this present age." A "Father forgive them" attitude pervaded the whole work, and, in the main, Hall tried to maintain that Apostolic episcopacy and Anglican episcopacy were one and the same entity. Thus, the episcopal office is from God; "the place and station and power wherein that office is exercised is from the King. It is the King who gives the Bishopricke; it is God that makes the Bishop." Concerning other Reformed Churches, Hall insisted that episcopacy jure divino was not an express law of God. The absence of episcopacy in the Church did not mean that they were not true Churches. But Hall stated emphatically that episcopacy was a divine institution which Christ wished to remain where it is and requiring it where it may be had.

Throughout the controversy, Hall continued to insist that prelacy was divinely established by Christ in primitive times, and therefore at least its form had to be retained. He really could not muster up the arguments necessary to combat the anti-prelatical forces with which he and his pro-episcopal collegues had to contend. That this is so is evident from the panic he later found himself in, saying the bishops were now between two millstones, one the Pope of Rome, the other the pope of the parish. He complained that these anti-prelatical tracts intended to destroy episcopacy by destroying the reputation of the martyr bishops. Hall had no illusions as to the spectre of revolution contained in the anti-episcopal propaganda.
pouring off the presses. He accused the enemies of episcopacy of introducing anarchy which would lead all to ruin and confusion. Hall felt that with all their braying in their pamphlets, the enemies of episcopacy were hoping that Parliament would change the face of the Church. They told the parliamentarians that they were doing God's work, "and shall not this ambition blow up the unconstant bulgar." If these grave statesmen would be stupid enough to believe the pamphleteers, all would lead to chaos, for to rail against the bishops was to execute Satan's strategy by deceiving the people into rejecting the King. In other words, they were inviting popular revolution. The crux of Hall's argument was that

religous forms prescribed by the Church were essential not to salvation but to the preservation of Church and State. Since they were inessential to salvation he held that no conscientious objection or disobedience might be properly raised against them, and if it were raised, it might be punished by the magistrate as sedition and rebellion.

Further pro-episcopal arguments were set forth by George Morley, future Bishop of Winchester. Born in 1597, he received his education at Christ Church, Oxford. He had Puritan leanings, but in 1641, though no friend of Laudianism, he wrote a dispassionate work called A Modest Advertisment concerning the Present Controversie about Church Government. Morley was calmer about the issue than was Hall. Concerning a "Root and Branch" solution to Church problems, he wrote that it was true that it was easier to pull up trees than to lop off branches. Yet it was also easier to pull down a
house than to repair it. For all that, "wee consider not what is easiest, but what is best to doe." To his way of thinking, government of bishops was most useful for kings and kingdoms for the preservation of peace and piety. Trying to refute all arguments against episcopacy, Morley concluded that abuses should be taken away and good things should be allowed to continue. Concerning bishops, however, three things had to be considered: their order, their jurisdiction, and their persons. Accordingly,

the first is antient and universal almost to all Christians, the second where it is extravagant may be limited by good and prudent Laws, and their persons are not so great but the offender may be corrected by a higher Authority.

Bishops therefore were reformable, but the basic structure had to remain unchanged. Morley could be considered a moderate in the controversy, not as structured in argument or belief as Hall, but far closer to a High-Church position than, for example, was the very popular Irish divine, James Usher, Archbishop of Armagh.

Usher, born in Dublin in 1581, graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, in 1600. Caught up in the events of 1641 while in England, he was begged by Bishop Hall to write a pamphlet defending Episcopacy. His views were Low-Church compared with the Laudians. Usher did not believe in the absolute divine right of episcopacy or "even of its essentially Apostolical origins, but only its high convenience and advantages." He maintained that in the primitive Church there was no distinction, or next to none between
presbyters and bishops. He felt a limited episcopacy would be most desirable where bishops would preside over assemblies aided by councils of presbyters and even controlled by synods of the same. For all of that, he was still a bishop, and he edited a pamphlet late in May, 1641 entitled The Judgment of Doctor Reignolds touching the original of Episcopacy, more largely confirmed out of Antiquity. The major thesis of the work was to prove that in antiquity the ministers, whose office it was to teach, "chose of their company one in every city, to whom they did especially give the title of bishop." Using Reignolds as his guide, Usher said nothing about the necessity of episcopal jurisdiction in the Church. The situation was deteriorating so quickly that any vestige of the office that could be salvaged was sought. Bishops, on the run from the great anti-prelatical controversy, in their haste used meaningless arguments in their attempt to counter the printed works of the anti-prelatical faction; they had nothing substantial to refute the barrage of intellectual arguments destroying the notion of spiritual or temporal need for the continuation of prelacy.

The most remarkable feature of the Puritan response to the pro-prelatical defense of the episcopal office was the unity of purpose among the anti-prelatical pamphleteers. Regardless of their station in life, men such as Robert Baillie, a Scottish divine, Stephen Marshall, an English minister, Robert Greville, Lord Brooke, a peer, and
William Prynne, a lawyer had one thing in common, a detestation of episcopacy and a desire to settle their grievances by destroying the office, "Root and Branch". Thus the removal of the bishops from the House of Lords and ultimately from the Church of England itself became their common cause. There is no doubt that the anti-prelatical pamphleteers knew each other very well and anticipated the pro-prelatical resistance in the Commons. It was evident by the end of January, 1641, that many members of the Lower House had strong reservations about a "Root and Branch" solution to the episcopal question and were ready to propose a limited episcopacy. In other words, men such as George, Lord Digby, Lord Falkland and William Plydell believed that the entire office was not corrupt because a few bishops were. A return to episcopacy as it existed at the time of the Apostles and early Church Fathers was desirable. Also, men such as Digby, Falkland and Plydell entertained very romantic notions concerning the role the martyr bishops, Cramner, Latimer, Ridley and Hooper, played in the history of the English episcopate. Hall's challenge did not worry the anti-episcopal faction as much as the one raised by the moderate episcopalian faction did. Hall represented a conservative Anglican position which had been abandoned by most of the influential Anglicans who now favoured a moderate or limited episcopacy. The lay episcopalian response to the prelatical question was by no means as triumphal as was the clerical. The Laudian episcopate had done much to
discredit the office and, where men such as Hall tried to keep things at *status quo*, most laymen advocated a limited episcopacy. In January, 1641, the majority of the English Puritan divines were not yet prepared to refute the arguments of the moderate episcopalianists, but those Scottish Commissioners who were ministers were very well prepared. Presbyterian unity was strong, for the Scots came to the aid of their English brethren. Anticipating moderate speeches so far as the fate of the bishops was concerned, the Puritan divines had to exert external pressure to champion their cause in the press. Accordingly, they enlisted the help of the Scots, who were only too happy to oblige. The works written left no doubt as to the absolute necessity of "Root and Branch", as the title of Alexander Henderson's book *The Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Prelacy or Perpetual Presidency in the Church* attests.19

Literary activity increased in February when the speeches of Lord Digby and Viscount Falkland calling for a limited episcopacy were published. Something had to be done to counteract the advantage these printed speeches were having among the reading public in advancing views of a limited episcopacy. To this end Baillie adapted his *Canterburians' Self-Conviction* for English readers. Henderson wrote a much needed shorter work on *The Discipline of the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland*. Two other members of the Scottish Commissioners, George Gillespie and Robert
Blair, joined in the work. Gillespie wrote a pamphlet on The Grounds of Presbyteral Government and Blair wrote a reply to Hall's Humble Remonstrance.  

The tone of these works can be gathered from a book of Baillie's printed before the end of January, 1641. Meant to complement Henderson's The Unlawfulness and Danger of a Limited Prelacy, this new work was identically worded. Baillie wasted no time in announcing "that this Prelacy may be removed, root and branch and the Ministry of Christ be established in purity and power is the purpose of this paper. . . ."  

Episcopacy was of human institution, had no place in the early Church, and therefore even limited episcopacy was unlawful. For, in truth, no matter what limitations were put on bishops to keep them in bounds, "yet still he is a plant as God never planted."  

Prelacy would continue to cause schisms in the land and would break the blessed Parliament into factions, because the prelate, by his power with prince and peer, and because of his tyranny over people, divided "betwixt the Rulers and the people making Civil Government heavy."  

The work ends by echoing phrases being used in the parliamentary debates: "we are zealous of our own liberties, let us be more zealous of the liberties of the Kingdom of Christ, that both we ourselves and the Posterity may have a well grounded and blessed Peace." The efforts of Baillie and his Scottish brethren helped the English Puritan divines at a crucial stage in the development of the anti-episcopal
drive. The fact that the anti-prelatical pamphleteers worked together in such close harmony suggests that they understood the advantage of a popular platform and in their efforts to win popular support for their program of ecclesiastical reform they were using some of the techniques common to a political party. They brought their case to the people. What the people did not know concerning the evils of episcopacy, the pamphlets would tell them. Since it would take some time to remove the bishops from the Lords, it was evident that the public should be informed about the true nature of episcopacy. To do this most effectively, the anti-episcopal pamphleteers printed works attacking the episcopal bench.

The anti-episcopal faction was fortunate in having the services of three of the most articulate laymen in the country, the afore-mentioned William Prynne, John Milton, and Robert Greville, Lord Brooke. As has been previously stated, these three men had one thing in common, an extreme hatred of bishops which extended not only to the office itself but also to the incumbents of the twenty-six English and Welsh sees. Their hatred stemmed from different sources. At one time Prynne had nothing but the deepest respect for the episcopal office, for to him the martyr bishops were the full folk heroes that Foxe had hoped to make them. It was not until 1641, several years after he had suffered so cruelly at the hands of the bishops, that he finally became convinced that the office and the
incumbents would always be corrupt, and therefore he devoted all of his energies to the total destruction of their power. His contribution to the growing antipathy towards the bishops rested on two facts: he was a national celebrity due to his misfortunes, and he had a modern newspaperman's knack of making the events of the day exciting and sensational. In 1641 he produced three books of a violently anti-episcopal nature. The first, A Catalogue, went so far as to praise three Roman Catholic saints for their disdain of the episcopal office while he lamented that the supposed leaders of the reformation in England in 1641 were intolerable tyrants who coveted honours and power and who were actually ruled by Satan. In his second book, A New Discovery, Prynne described his sufferings in most vivid detail lest anyone forget what bishops could do when thwarted. His third work, The Antipathy, is a veritable catalogue of horrors, in which Prynne tried to prove that the bishops were the origin of all that was base in England and, as long as they remained, the country would never be at peace. To bring the question from the abstract to the reality of the day, he actually included a scandal sheet, giving detailed references of the crimes of all the incumbents of English sees in 1641. Thus, for example, William Juxon of London was described as a creature of Laud who was the "first Prelate in our memory, who relinquished the cure of souls and preaching of Gods Word to become a Lord Treasurer and sit as a Publican at the receit of Customs."
Robert Skinner of Bristol was Bishop of that diocese by grace and favour of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Besides being popish in his liturgy, Skinner called the doctrine of the saints the doctrine of the devil. He had threatened a churchwarden who did not report a man who preached twice on Sunday. The bishop called ministers traitors, dogs, "Scottish-hearted raskalls" for teaching orthodox doctrine. He hated parliaments, forced his ministers to contribute towards the clergy's benevolence to the King and excommunicated many for not having taken the ex officio oath. The Bishop of Llandaff, Morgan Owen, was notoriously peccant and the affairs of William Roberts of Bangor were too tedious for Prynne to go into. He discredited the memory of the martyr bishops as well, for the purpose of his book was to show that at no time in English history did the bishops have a strong fidelity, sincerity, or piety to the King or the Church. As long as bishops remained, the nation would have no security or tranquility. The Antipathy was the testament of a person advocating a "Root and Branch" solution to the episcopal question. Prynne's works could not fail to affect many in the nation since he documented the crimes of every bishop he could who ever held an English see. His own eye-witness account of episcopal tyranny could not fail to contribute to the growing anti-episcopal feelings of the nation.

Milton hated bishops for another reason. He was, in 1641, an angry young man. He felt it was his vocation to
be a preaching minister, and for this he was trained. However, such a calling in the Laudian Church was impossible and he believed that he had been Church-outed by the prelates. He therefore lashed out with all the brilliant gifts at his command, with the intention of helping in the cause of the destruction of the bishops, "Root and Branch". He definitely hurt the episcopal cause. Hacket remembered him with a particular loathing for as he later wrote:

What a venemous Spirit is in that Serpent Milton, that black mouthed Zoilus, that blows his Vipers Breath upon those Immortal Devotions from beginning to end. This is he that wrote with all Irreverence against the Fathers of our Church.32

In all probability Milton had a hand in the preparation of Smectymnus' first answer to Hall. Thomas Young, one of the Smectymnans, had been his tutor, and Milton collaborated with him by contributing rough notes and material for about twenty pages of the work.33 But Milton had a mind of his own, and in 1641 he wrote four tracts of extreme importance to the anti-prelatical propaganda then present in England. His first book was published in June, 1641, when the Commons was having difficulties with the first Bishops' Exclusion Bill which had been rejected by the Lords. He destroyed any notion that the martyr bishops were to be honoured when he wrote that the names of Cramner, Latimer, Ridley and Hooper should be "utterly abolished, like the brazen Serpent; than that mens fond opinion should thus idolize them, and the Heavenly Truth be there captivated."34 Those helping the
bishops to perpetuate their tyranny are the antiquarians who try to exhaust history to prove that which cannot be proved, the libertines who suggest that the loss of episcopacy will mean a pope in every parish, and the politicians who try to prove that episcopal government conforms with civil polity. Yet the most unfortunate aspect of all this was that the promoters of episcopacy were making the nation ripe for rebellion, since the chief function of the bishops was to destroy liberty. Milton continued his attack throughout the year, and he was very serious when he advocated a "Root and Branch" solution to the episcopal issue. In his second and third pamphlets, he tried to destroy the arguments of Usher and Hall. In Hall's case, he attacked the man more than the man's arguments, accusing Hall of deliberately violating the sense of Scripture. To Hall's statement that no nation had clergy that yielded up "so many scholars, learned preachers, holy and accomplished Divines as this Church of England," Milton answered: "Ha, ha, ha," The niceties of argument were over: the strength of his attack was too deft and fatal. He had the conviction of one who was certain he was right, and he cared not for the consequences of his anti-episcopal sentiments, for he knew that then, in 1641, there would not be any reprisals. He was not going to suffer as did Prynne, Bastwick and Burton. Unwittingly he was also telling the nation and the bishops that the days of episcopacy in the English Church were fast coming to an end.
That Milton made a deep cut into episcopal sensibilities there can be no doubt, as is evident from the vehemence of Bishop Hall's reply to him in 1642. But the one work which above all visibly moved the entire episcopate to anger, distress and, to some degree, panic, was *A Discourse Opening The Nature of That Episcopacy Which Is Exercised In England*, by Robert Greville, Lord Brooke. That a colleague in the House of Lords should attack them was bad enough, but the manner in which it was done was clearly a calculated insult, and the bishops' reaction to the work was violent. Brooke was no ordinary peer. A leader of the Puritan opposition in the Upper House, he differed from the bishops not only in regard to Church practice, but far more significantly in his conception of the nature of the national Church. For, as he saw it, the bishops who had a suspicion of and a contempt for the hereditary aristocrat could conceive society only as an inclusive united Church whereas Brooke... had as his objective the organization of a nation within which religious differences, so long as they did not disturb political authority, were to be treated as matters without public significance.

It was now only too evident that the prelates were the "parents and patrons of most Errors, Heresies, Sects and Schismes, that now disturbe this Church and State." Church government had to be changed. In the final analysis all the bishops were guilty of these crimes; there were no exceptions. The arguments of those favouring a limited episcopacy were false ones. Robert Baillie summarized the feelings of the "Root and Branch" faction when he wrote:
Those of the Prelates who count themselves most orthodox and innocent, cannot be excused of these crimes, which by their connivance they did foster, and well neere as much promoove by their suffering, as the others who were esteemed more guiltee by their doing.46

The tracts of Prynne, Milton and Brooke did much to dis­credit episcopacy. In 1641, Prynne and Milton, neither of whom were in the Parliament, were calling for a constitutional revolution and they continued to write unmolested. And yet, four years before, Prynne had suffered mutilation for doing less damage than he was doing in 1641. Lord Brooke's contribution is even more exciting since he, a Peer of the Realm, admitted that the common people had rights, and had reason to despise his own colleagues. The bishops, he declared, came from the excrement of the nation. He made anti-episcopacy as much a popular cause as it was the cause of the anti-prelatical leadership in Parliament. The bishops knew that this latest broadside at their position was dangerous because they all felt obliged to reply to his accusation concerning their meaness of birth.47 Prynne, Milton and Brooke knew the prejudices of their countrymen and exploited them, much to the distress of the episcopate, who knew that their position had been weakened, for the Lords were insulting them in the House.48

The persons of the bishops were also discredited in poems and songs. Anonymous poets were not above contributing crude verses lampooning the bishops, some of which were very amusing and some very dangerous and effective. Obviously
written for a far more popular audience than any of the tracts we have heretofore considered, the rhymes were easy to memorise and their anti-episcopal import was deadly. Perhaps the best example of this type of literature was a poem called **Lambeth Faire** which appeared in the London book stalls in June of 1641. The poem tells of the impending doom of the bishops, and their haste to sell their wares before they fly to Rome:

```
Come buy lawne sleeves I have no money took
Here try them on, you'll like a Bishop looke
And may get honour both great and small
And Lord it ore your fellow Brethren all.
```

One bishop trying to sell a gown chirped "In this same gown did Canterburies Grace, At High Commission show his graceless face." Special lines were saved for the Bishop of Ely:

```
Then after that unto this Jolly Faire
A little Wren; came flying through the ayre
And on his back betwixt his wings he bore
A Minister stuff with Crosses, Altars store
With Sacred Fonts, and rare guilt Cherubins
And bellowing Organs, chanting curious Hymnes
The Hallow'd Host, dum Priests and singing boyes
With Antick Cringers; and a thousand toyes.
```

The "toyes" were the "New Canons", the *et cetera* oath, and other obnoxious things associated with episcopal government. But the pseudo-pope's holiday in England was soon to end, for a messenger brought the prelates this ominous message:

```
Away to Rome or Tiburn chuse you whether
I know your shoes are made of running leather,
For all of the Lawes oth' Land you have outrun
And I come hereto tell you what is done
The Parliament hath pulled your pride toth' ground
And by the House three times y'are voted down
Your war's not worth a ..., for all your coggung
See where the Hangman comes, away, be jogging.
```
All the animosity anti-episcopalian forebears held for the prelates were contained in the verses of *Lambeth Faire*. By June, an exclusion bill had passed the Commons, but had been thrown out of the House of Lords. The lampoon was significant inasmuch as it voiced an expectation of the people that the "popish" hierarchy would be destroyed by the good, reforming graces of Parliament, and that the bishops would be punished either by exile or execution.

The anti-episcopal sentiments in songs were unmistakably linked to the Laudian Reform. One such song called "The Scholar's Complaint" brought some of the more serious grievances the public had against bishops to light:

... I bowed, I have bended
And all in hope
One day to be befriended
I preach't, I printed
What ere I hinted
To please our English Pope. ... .

... Into some country village
Nowe I must goe
Where neither tithe nor tillage
The greedy patron
And coached matron
Swears to the Church they owe.
But if I preach and pray too on the suddaine
And conjure the Pope too, extempore without studying,
I've teene pounds a yeere, besides my Sunday pudding,
Alas, pore scholler!
Wither wilt thou goe? 53

The most potent help the bishops' cause had against the *Lambeth Faire* type of lampoon came from the pen of John Taylor, "the Water Poet", who was a man of the people, having been a waterman in his youth. Taylor, a staunch royalist, was also deft at versification. As far as his works are concerned, he did not seem to be any great lover
of episcopacy, but he feared mob violence, which he felt was upsetting the government of the Established Church. Wishing the Church would remain as the Gospel and the laws of England ordained it, he railed against malcontents in his poem *A Swarme of Sectaries*, saying that cobblers, tinkers, peddlers, weavers, sowgelders, and chimney sweeps were all finding a new vocation, that of preaching. He was very caustic in his appraisal of the situation, and that he believed such activity to be linked with anti-episcopal feeling can be seen in the following verses:

If Prelates have by fraud, or frailty slip'd
My Pen shall not in Gall of Aspes be dip'd:
I'le, pray we may have better in their places,
Whom Grace may guide, to shun the like disgraces
Let tradesmen use their trades, let all men be Imploy'd in what is fitting their degree.

It is clear that Taylor saw the spectre of a popular revolution in what he observed going on in London, for he was not so concerned about episcopacy as about the consequences of a popular take-over of the Church and its effect on the political structure of the nation. Yet interesting as his works are, they were hardly able to counteract the flood of anti-prelatical lampoons appearing so frequently. The theological claims of the episcopate could not be overlooked by the anti-prelatical pamphleteers. The most important work of the entire controversy was the book entitled *An Answer To a Book Entitled An Humble Remonstrance* by Smectymnus (Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcome, William Spurstow), which was ready for
sale around 20 March, 1641. These five men had decided on a joint project to answer Hall's defense effectively. The major author of the work, according to Baillie, was Thomas Young, the former tutor of John Milton. The work is a product of its time: endless quotations from the Fathers to prove that episcopacy was never found in Apostolic times; endless syllogisms and copious notes in the margins to further elucidate points made. The Smectymnans denied the Apostolical origins of episcopacy. Episcopal claims were more rooted in the papacy than in the Reformation. The primitive bishops that the moderate episcopalianists always praised had nothing in common with the Laudian bishops. To claim that the episcopal order was of Apostolic origin was to claim divine institution. Scripture proved that the episcopal and priestly office was one and the same. The three orders of bishop, priest and deacon were never given in Scripture. Elders who were "bishops" had no specific duty to perform, "and anyone who claims this to be hierarchy should be ever hooted out of the Church." In the early Church, there was "not one chiefe Bishope or President, but the Presidency was in many." Therefore the Anglican episcopate did not have an Apostolic foundation, but rather a Roman one, and when the bishops claimed the former their claim was based on a lie. The book was directed not so much against Hall, but rather against the position of moderate episcopalianists.
The book also sought a popular audience; the authors were clever enough to translate every Latin citation which appeared in the book into English. The Smectymnans turned to the Parliament, hoping it would be like Constantine of old and root out every plant in the Church not put there by God. They prayed that these usurpers, called bishops, would be brought to open and public punishment for crimes as, for example, their ungodly interest in secular affairs and their misuse of power in temporal offices. All of the bishop's crimes cried out to the highest court in the world. The Smectymnans discredited popular veneration of the martyr bishops by saying it was useless to claim that Cramner, Latimer, Ridley and Hooper were great men. Consequently, they were destroying the moderate episcopalian attempts to generate popular sympathy for episcopacy, a sympathy which was based on the martydom of these men by the Catholic Queen, Mary. Ridley was against Hooper because the former liked ceremonies. Ridley and Cramner permitted Princess Mary to keep the Mass. In the final analysis episcopacy had no origins from Christ. The office was inconsistent with religion and monarchy and so had no place in the secular or spiritual affairs of the nation. It was the humble prayer of the authors that episcopacy "should forever be abandoned out of the Church of God." This work was the prototype of many anti-episcopal works which appeared during the year.

The fast day sermons of 1640-1642, although not a
regular institution till late in the period under discussion, were another form of propaganda of an anti-episcopal nature. As Clarendon noted

It was an observation of that time that the first publishing of extraordinary news was from the pulpit; and by the preacher's text, and his manner of discourse upon it, the auditors might judge, and commonly foresaw, what was like to be next done in the Parliament or Council of State.

The fast day sermons of 1640-1642 were generally printed, so that the public were always conscious of the godly admonitions give the Parliament by the anti-episcopal divines. Thus at the beginning of the Long Parliament, Cornelius Burgess gave the first fast day sermon on the anniversary of Queen's Elizabeth's accession to the throne, 17 November, 1640. It was not enough that the Parliament punish those who were striving to destroy the law and liberties of the nation. There had to be "a thorough joining of themselves to God by covenant." In the sermon Burgess outlined the type of Parliament the leadership of the opposition expected it to be. They were to work together to bring about God's long awaited reformation of Church and State.

Henry Burton, a graduate of St. John's College, Cambridge, and a sharer in the fate of Prynne in 1637, delivered a sermon to the Commons on 20 June, 1641. His topic was England's Bondage, "the Archbishop in his Province, the Bishop in his Diocese." The entire government was in the "bondage" of the hierarchy which was really the "bondage" of anti-Christ. But the Parliament was the answer to the prayers of all England, and it was the hope of the
nation that that body would break off the episcopal yoke from God's people and set England free. 67

Thomas Case, who gave a fast day sermon in July, 1641, detested episcopacy. He had been in trouble before because of his anti-episcopal views and had been brought before the episcopal courts of both Bishop Wren and Bishop Bridgeman for his sermons attacking Church discipline in Norwich and Chester. 68 In his July sermon, he preached against the monarchical form of episcopal government in the Church, which he felt the episcopalianists foolishly championed in their "No Bishop, no King" maxim. Since the bishops had abandoned the reformation, it was his hope that "in future ages this may be called the happy Parliament, the holy Parliament, the Parliament of God, ... the reformers of the Reformation." 69

By December, 1641, it seemed to the parliamentary anti-episcopal opposition that the episcopate would never be expelled from their place in the Lords. The King's position in the city had strengthened. If the Parliament were to survive, the mobs would be needed. Accordingly, the divines appointed to preach on the fast day held on 22 December, 1641, Edmund Calamy and Stephen Marshall, prepared the way. Marshall told his audience that England had many sinners who wished the nation to remain in its unreformed state. He therefore urged his hearers to remember King Josiah who "meted out the justice and vengence of God with zeal and fervency to those who plotted the Kingdoms
ruin." This sermon was printed, and it was no small wonder that very many in the city turned out in such fury to attack the persons of the bishops on 27 December, 1641. The fast day sermons then spelled out the program of the Parliament and could be used to stir up popular demonstrations when needed.

Parliamentary speeches also served as a vehicle of anti-episcopal propaganda. Indeed, moderate episcopal speeches in 1641 were delivered and printed, such as Falkland's and Plydell's in February and Sir Benjamin Rudyerd's in June. But anti-episcopal speeches such as Nathaniel Fiennes' speech of 8 February, Lord Saye and Sele's speech of 27 May and Henry Vane, Jr.'s speech of 11 June, all advocating a "Root and Branch" solution to the episcopal question were printed with more regularity. However, as the year wore on nothing could upset the parliamentarians more than unauthorized publications of the proceedings of the House. The plain truth was that the Parliament was acting as its own ministry of propaganda, and finally only those speeches favourable to its image and ambition were allowed to be printed. To be sure, many tried to circumvent the usual process of official *imprimatur*, but the impeachment proceedings begun in the House against Sir Edward Dering who dared to have his speeches printed without permission served a strong notice to any pro-episcopal members that they too could be deprived of their seats if they should follow Dering's example.
It took some time before a controlled press actually took effect. The speeches of Digby, Falkland and others calling for a reformed episcopacy were printed easily at the beginning of 1641. However, after the indiscretion of the bishops' Protestation on 30 December, 1641, the parliamentary opposition was most determined in its efforts to deprive the bishops of their votes. Virtually every parliamentary speech which was delivered on the episcopal question was of a "Root and Branch" nature and many of these speeches were printed. For example, the anti-prelatical speeches of the following members were printed by order of the House: D'Ewes (Jan. 11), Thomas Bagshaw (Jan. 17), John White (Jan. 17), Oliver St. John (Jan. 17), John Pym (Jan. 25 and Feb. 8). With the voices of the pro-episcopalianthus silenced, the pressure against the bishops grew to such proportions that the Exclusion Bill's passage and assent by the King was inevitable.

In the final analysis, the anti-prelatical tracts prepared a reading nation for a revolutionary change in the constitutional framework of the Government. The parliamentary *imprimatur* did not entirely stop pro-episcopal literature, but it did severely limit it. What pro-episcopal literature had been available prior to the exclusion of the bishops, however, was often stogy and pedantic. The pro-episcopal writers tended to dwell more on the glories of the past than on the politics of the present. They rarely proposed any program of ecclesiastical reform under episcopacy which
would ensure a better future for England. The pro-
episcopalian did consider episcopacy's place in the realm,
but they were more concerned about monarchy without episcopacy
than they were about episcopacy itself. Theological
arguments on both sides were cumbersome, but the episcopalian
did not stress the freedom episcopacy could give the
individual conscience; the Puritan writers did stress the
theme of freedom and because of this the anti-prelatical
faction had a psychological advantage. The episcopalian
spoke of revolution and its dire consequences, while the
Puritans spoke of reformation and its temporal and spiritual
bliss. In short, the pro-episcopal writers defended the
office with negation; they wrote as though their cause was
in desperate straits. But the opposition, confident in the
Parliament, left nothing undone and took nothing for granted
in their efforts to deprive the bishops of their votes in
the Lords. The pamphleteers helped the opposition in
February with the tracts of the Scottish divines. They
kept up the barrage throughout the year. Lord Brooke did
his homework over the recess of Parliament, and shattered
any popular illusion that the Bishops, because they were
of high degree, should be respected. They had no degree.
The Parliament did the rest with the publication of the
speeches of its members who demonstrated as forcefully
as they could to the nation how the bishops were destroying
the law and intimidating all honest men with their swipes of
their croziers. Thus the tracts complimented the activities of the House. Together with tumults, petitions, and the legislation of the House itself, the pamphleteers played their part in making the popular revolution against the episcopal office a success.
CHAPTER IV

ANTI-EPISCOPAL MANOEUVRING
IN PARLIAMENT

To the anti-prelatical opposition in the House of Commons the most significant aspect of the episcopal question was the activity set in motion to effect a constitutional change in the structure of the House of Lords. Because the episcopate were thought to oppose any movement towards necessary constitutional reform, men such as John Pym, John Hampden, Oliver St. John, Denzil Hollis, Sir Henry Vane, Jr., and their supporters tried to organize an effective movement of unity in the Parliament, both among the members of the Commons itself and more importantly, between the two Houses, in order to deprive in a legal way the bishops of their ancient right to vote as Peers Spiritual of the Realm. For a year (November, 1640 to November, 1641), the Long Parliament saw four distinct phases of a carefully planned anti-prelatical drive which weakened episcopal power in secular affairs but which did not affect their right to sit in the Lords.

The first phase of this drive took place between November and May, 1640-1641. The many petitions expressing national discontent with the episcopal office were used to form the legislation that was needed to expel the bishops from Parliament. The "Root and Branch" Petition was debated in the Commons on 8 and 9 February, 1641. This solution
to the episcopal question was too drastic an action for many moderate episcopalian in the Commons and almost destroyed the resolve of the whole House to punish the bishops for their many infractions of the fundamental laws of the realm. Accordingly, after February, 1641, the episcopal opposition adopted the aims of the Ministers' Petition, since it only called for an expulsion of the Bishops from the Lords, not from the Church. However, when the first Bishop's Exclusion Bill reached the Lords on 1 May, the momentum for an early solution to episcopal interference in temporal matters came to an abrupt halt, for the Lords, deeply resenting the Commons' presumption to settle matters pertaining to the constitution of the House of Peers, threw out the bill on 8 June, initiating the second phase of the crisis. Even though the Commons sent up to the Lords nine reasons for joining the Lower House in expelling the Bishops, the Lords still refused to accept so revolutionary an action. As a result, the Commons exerted great pressure by introducing a "Root and Branch" bill which would have abolished the episcopal office in England. Originally introduced on 27 May, this bill, entitled "An Act for the utter Abolishing and Taking away all Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries," was supposed to frighten the Lords into accepting the less drastic Exclusion Bill of 1 May. Instead, it stiffened the resolve of the Lords and the King to defend the constitutional right of the episcopate
to vote in the Upper House. King Charles went so far as to send for Edward Hyde, an M. P. noted for his defense of a moderate episcopate, and to urge him to do all he could to stall the debate in the Commons on the "Root and Branch" bill.\(^2\) As Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Hyde was in a position to do as the King asked, and he complied very effectively. However, "Root and Branch" pressure did bear some fruit. In an attempt to placate the feelings of the Commons, who resented the Lords' rejection of the Exclusion Bill, the Peers and King raised no objections to a bill entitled "An Act=for repeal of a branch of a statute primo Elizabeth concerning commissioners for causes ecclesiastical," which Charles signed on 5 July. This act abolished the Court of High Commission, and on the same day, the King also signed another bill which abolished the Star Chamber.\(^3\) As a result, episcopal influence in temporal affairs was severely diminished, but not destroyed, as they still sat in the Lords.

Throughout July, the Commons became increasingly annoyed at the Lords' seeming indifference to the episcopal proceedings. The third crisis came when, on 29 July, the Lords threw out a petition of the Commons that all in the Upper House should take the Commons' Protestation of 5 May, 1641, to defend religion, the King, and the rights of Parliament. The Commons was furious at the snub from the Lords, and impeachment proceedings against thirteen bishops who had signed the "New Canons" were accelerated so that by
4 August all thirteen were impeached. The Commons thereby hoped to reduce the episcopal voice in the Lords.

In August, 1641, King Charles went to Scotland, and Parliament adjourned in September, but the Bishops' Exclusion Bill did not fall out of sight. When Parliament reconvened in October, Pym tried a more moderate tactic against the Bishops. On 21 October a new Bishops' Exclusion Bill was introduced; it passed the Commons in two days and was sent up to the Lords. However, the question reached a point of crisis when the Commons learned by 28 October that the King had no intention of changing the form of Church government as then established. To emphasize his determination, he proceeded to fill five vacant sees. Such tactlessness at this time was incredible, and the Commons could expect no help to block this move from the Lords.

The situation demanded drastic action and the anti-prelatical members of the Commons relieved their frustrations by planning the Grand Remonstrance in November. However, by November's end, the bishops were still in the House of Lords.

Throughout the episcopal crisis which overshadowed the first year of the Long Parliament, the anti-episcopal leaders did all they could to elicit popular support for their drive against the Bishops. The London Petition was graciously received, as were the petitions from the counties. Speeches damaging the unlimited episcopacy appeared in printed form, as did the sermons preached to the House on
the special days designated during the year. A vast propaganda campaign to portray the bishops in the worst light possible was launched by the Commons. As Robert Baillie wrote: "A short petition is formed by all the weell affected clergie for the overthrow of Episcopacie . . . against the Bishops corruptions in doctrine, discipline, life, and all." Nor were the bishops' friends among the clergy spared, for as Baillie further wrote: "The Episcopal clergie are made vile in the eyes of all manifold most shameful practices of harlotrie, drunkeness, and all prophaneness." But the ultimate compliment paid the people striving for a change in Church government came from Isaac Pennington and Nathaniel Fiennes. They defended the right of the common man to come to the Parliament to demand the laws which were unjust, such as those statutes upholding the establishment of episcopacy, be changed. Thus the anti-prelatical members of the Commons were turning their drive into a popular movement as well, linking their success with the hopes of the better affected people of the nation.

To achieve success, however, meant that the House had to be united in its resolve. On this point a distinction must be made. Two kinds of unity were sought, the unity of the members of the House of Commons, and the essential unity of both Houses. Unity among the members of the Commons was important to Pym, for, as he said to Edward Hyde,
the way to bring the country into a state of well-being would be to remove all grievances and pull up "the causes of them by the roots, if all men would do their duties." The theme of unity was stressed throughout the year. Burgess preached about the necessity of the House's entering into a covenant with God to continue His work of reform. On 11 June, 1641, Sir Henry Vane, conscious of the terrible split in the House over the episcopal question, reminded all his colleagues that God had called them together for a very special purpose and said: "Let us not then halt any longer between two opinions, but with one heart, and resolution give glory to God in complying with His Providence . . . by passing this Bill we are now upon." However, the unity of both Houses was much more important, since it was a formal and institutional necessity. Accordingly, Smectymnu urged the Lords and Commons to unite and purge the nation of bishops. The many conferences Pym desired, were, in fact, designed to provide a common resolve on the episcopal question. This was very evident in his speech to the Lords on 27 October, 1641, in which he urged the Peers to join the Commons in the impeachment proceedings against thirteen bishops accused on 4 August, 1641, for endeavouring to subvert the fundamental law of the Kingdom. Thus the call for harmony went out all through the year urging both kinds of unity. This was urged by parliamentarians, preachers and pamphleteers, for without solidarity England would never be rid of episcopacy.
At the beginning of the Long Parliament, the anti-prelatical forces inside and outside of the House had planned very carefully for the swift expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords. Capitalizing on the strength of popular hatred for episcopacy, and the House of Commons' resolve to redress the national outrage against the highhanded Laudian system, the anti-prelatical leaders did not see any great obstacle to a swift completion of their work. A barrage of speeches in November prepared the way for a total condemnation of all the proceedings of the late Convocation. Indeed, the bishops and clergy in the new Convocation did nothing but worry about the consequences of the last Convocation and, having no writ from the King, sat only till the end of February. Laud was accused of high treason in December, and by February, Bishops Manwaring, Pierce, Wren, Montague, Bridgemen and Juxon had all been singled out for their misdemeanors. There is no doubt that all this anti-prelatical activity greatly disturbed the Bishops. Rous noted in his diary on 17 November, 1640, that "the Bishops go to Convocation guarded with musket-men." Things were so bleak that Baillie clucked that the bishops could not expect any help from any corner, not even among those at the Universities or those famous for learning, for "there is great appearance that God will do his own work without these Rabbies help." Baillie, who was privy to all the anti-prelatical manoeuvring both inside and outside Parliament, voiced the common expectation of the anti-
prelatical leadership of a fairly swift completion of the episcopal problem.

The temporal Lords posed a different problem for the Commons. This House, traditionally in sympathy with the King's business, had a high proportion of Roman Catholics (20%) who would definitely support the King on all major issues, since his attitude towards them was very tolerant. The majority of the other peers would likewise support the King, but for different reasons. However, the Commons had fast friends in the Lords whom Baillie identified as "all commonwealth men". These "friends" included Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex, William Seymour, eleventh Earl of Hertford, Francis Russell, fourth Earl of Bedford, John Digby, first Earl of Bristol, William Fiennes, first Viscount Saye and Sele, Edward Montague, Lord Kimbolten (Viscount Mandeville) and Thomas Savile, first Lord Davile of Pomfret. Also to this list should be added Robert Rich, second Earl of Warwick and Robert Greville, Lord Brooke. As the year wore on, Essex, Warwick, Saye and Sele, and Brooke showed themselves to be anti-episcopal and were in sympathy and understanding with Pym, if not in open collaboration, on the issue of the expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords. Thus, with peers who were considered friends of the episcopal opposition (and therefore the "popular lords") firmly entrenched in the Upper House and in constant communion with the leaders in the Commons, it was expected that they would be able to help greatly in the anti-episcopal cause.
The King's stand on this issue was expected to be conservative, but the Commons knew he was in a difficult position with a Scottish army on English soil. At the beginning of the episcopal crisis, speeches in the Commons protested loudly and clearly the devotion the members had for the person, the estate, and the prerogative of his Majesty. The leadership in the Commons had little doubt that the King would strive to do all in his power to uphold the constitutional right of the bishops to remain active in the temporal affairs of the State. However, in the anti-prelatical speeches given in the early months of the Long Parliament, the King was exonerated from any of the guilt shared by the bishops. It was hoped that the King would join with the Parliament in the noble work of reformation. Thus, in brief, the anti-episcopal leadership in the Commons expected great popular support in their move to drive the bishops from the Parliament. The unity of a great part of the Commons itself was taken for granted, given the universal hatred of episcopal excesses. The welding of popular and parliamentary forces was expected to weaken the resistance of the bishops. With friends in the Lords, it was hoped they could influence the rest of the House to join with the Commons on this very delicate subject. Finally, it was hoped that the King would listen at long last to the advice of his true friend, the Parliament, and recognize the damage his false friend, the episcopate, had done him, and that he would join with Parliament to
remedy the situation.

Actually, the parliamentary anti-episcopal leadership experienced nothing but frustration. Although they maintained popular support, they found that the populace, when impatient, could be a liability. The unity of the House disintegrated in February, and a split occurred, leaving the House divided into three main factions: those who wished to leave the religious question as it was (i.e., leaving the bishops in the Lords), those seeking a moderate settlement (destroying the bishops' temporal authority but not their spiritual), and those working for "Root and Branch". This rupture was never healed. The bishops seemed to rise from the dead in their resilient ability to fight back. John Williams of Lincoln and Joseph Hall of Exeter were the leaders in the episcopal opposition to the Commons' designed against their order. The Lords, it transpired, had tender sensibilities so far as their parliamentary privileges were concerned, and they resented the use of bullying tactics to persuade them to join the Commons on any issue. Finally, mercurial as he may have been on most issued, King Charles was inflexible on one matter: he would not do anything to remove the bishops from the House of Lords.

Comforting as popular support for the destruction of the temporal power of the bishops was for anti-prelatical leadership, it was quite evident by mid-December that popular impatience could upset carefully laid plans and
jeopardize the entire movement. The joyous tumults greeting Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton on their return from prison did much to dramatize to both Houses of Parliament London's hatred of the bishops. However, the popular demonstration of over a thousand people within the confines of Westminster which accompanied the presentation of the London Petition on 11 December proved to be very embarrassing. The parliamentary opposition had urged the Puritan leaders of the London citizenry to delay the "Root and Branch" Petition's delivery "till first they had put the whole Bishops and their Covocation into a praemunire, for their illegal Canons which they are now about; also till they had brought down some prime Bishops for private faults."23 The reason was simple enough. At that time the majority of the House were not ready for so drastic a solution to the episcopal question, for, as Clarendon wrote; "without doubt, the major part of that body had no mind to break the peace of the kingdom, or to make any considerable alteration in the government of Church or State."24 But the Puritan leaders of the London citizenry were impatient. Laud and other obnoxious bishops were still unpunished. Fearful that the House would never punish the bishops at their present rate of deliberations, they disregarded the advice of their friends in the Commons and delivered the petition anyway.25 The repercussions of this hasty act were to damage a delicately fashioned time table and cause a split in the unity of the House.
However, the major lesson learned was that the London citizenry could not be controlled as easily as the House had thought, as was to become more evident towards the end of the crisis.

Another embarrassment to the Commons concerned the Puritan clergy's stand on the problem of the lands of bishops, deans and chapters. As part of the "Root and Branch" bill introduced on 21 May, this proviso to appropriate these lands was not well received by the Puritan clergy. The Universities had an inkling of what was afoot in early May when the House received petitions from Oxford and Cambridge. The latter petition stated that these lands were given the Church by both clerical and lay benefactors for the purposes of the "Advancement of Learning, the Encouragement of Students, the Preferment of learned men." The Oxford Petition called "for the Continuance of those pious Foundations of Cathedral Churches with their lands and revenues" for much the same reasons and gave, as well as a plea for those ministers, schools, hospitals, highways, "and other public and pious works" which depended on the revenues these lands provided.

That the Universities should be concerned about a major source of income was understandable enough. What embarrassed the anti-episcopal faction even more was the Puritan clergy's opposition. John Hacket, then Archdeacon of Bedford and chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln, represented the pro-episcopal faction on this matter at the bar and
Cornelius Burgess the anti-episcopal faction. When they were summoned on 12 May to answer questions concerning this matter to the House, Hacket defended the principle that the lands in question belonged to the Church by law. To the surprise of all, Burgess concluded with the utter unlawfulness to convert such endowments to any private person's profit. So that the same doctrine was delivered by both the doctors, only they differed in their application; the former being for the continuing such lands to their ancient - the latter for diverting them to other - but neither for alienating them from public and pious employments.

The bill was introduced anyway, but not without some soul searching. Clarendon noted that the Puritan clergy were intent on overthrowing the entire structure of episcopal government but felt that it was not lawful to alien those lands to any profane or lay use: which being so contrary to their ends who principally pursued the extirpation, caused them for a time to give over that violent prosecution, and suffer the bill to sleep.

The unanimity that Pym and his party felt so necessary if the House were to expel the bishops from the Lords deteriorated rather quickly because of the "Root and Branch" issue, for as Baillie wrote the Presbyters of Irvine: "their [the bishops'] utter abolition . . . is the knott of the question." There was a deep resentment among many members that the London Petition was delivered as it had been; this seemed to encroach upon the freedom of Parliament. The constitutional revolution involved in the bishops' expulsion from the Lords was another consideration.
The most serious objection to the whole issue of "Root and Branch" was the anarchy such a policy was sure to bring to Church government, by the Parliament's bending to the popular will.

The manner of presentation of the London Petition frightened some members of the House considerably. Sir Neville Poole feared that some Brownists had a large hand in the preparation of the Petition, and even worse than that, "hee was also scandalized that such a great number of the cittie came into Westminster hall with the same petition." 31 Sir Edward Dering registered his distaste of the manner of presentation of the London Petition when he presented the Kent Petition. On 13 January, 1641, he told the House that "your Petitioners themselves are all of them quiet and silent in their own house . . . here is no noyse - no numbers at your door. . . ." 32 But the most powerful objection came from George, Lord Digby, when he reminded the House on 8 February, 1641, that the present Church Government had been established by Parliament, and esteemed it "an irreverence and high pressumption in any, to Petition, point blank against a law or a government in force." 33 However, worse than anything else, the presentation of the London petition by enthusiastic citizens had all the trappings of a popular revolt. For, he said, if Parliament were to give "countenance to irregular and tumultuous Assemblies of people, be it never so good an end,"
the consequences for future generations could be drastic, given such a precedent.  

Early in the February crisis, Sir John Culpepper did not endear himself to the leaders of the Parliamentary opposition when he stated that episcopacy was not a matter to be dealt with lightly, since, constitutionally, episcopacy was a pillar of the realm. But Hyde, a lawyer, and strong defender of the bishops' constitutional right to sit in the House of Lords summed up the pro-episcopal position when he said:

It was changing the whole frame and constitution of the Kingdom and of the Parliament itself, that from the time that Parliament began, there have never been one Parliament when the Bishops were not part of it.  

Hyde insisted that the bishops made up one of the three estates of the Kingdom. Having no one in the Parliament to represent the clergy would be an injustice, and would leave the Parliament in a position to legislate in areas which did not lie in its competence. The bishops would be in a state whereby, being out of the Lords, "there was nobody who could pretend to represent the clergy, and yet they must be bound by their determination." Dering had no illusions concerning the determination of the opposition to drive the bishops out of the Lords. He bitterly declared on 20 November, 1640, that the House was going beyond the bounds of its competency in trying to expel the bishops. Believing the anti-episcopal drive was being waged with a crusading zeal, he said:
"Mr. Speaker, Wee cannot brag of an unerring spirit; infallibility is no more tyed to your Chaire than it is to the Popes."  

Anarchy in Church Government, ultimately leading to anarchy in the entire nation, was the most disturbing aspect of the anti-episcopal momentum in 1641. Sir Edward Dering voiced his concern when he mentioned the increase of tailors, shoemakers, brazilers, and feltmakers all climbing into public pulpits, and the occurrence of odd, irregular fasts being held for the private flatteries of some and slanders of other members of the House. He could see nothing but revolution in the entire matter since the bishops were accused of being part of "that visible Church of anti-Christ which did make the King Head of the Church."  

In other words, the Presbyterian attack against the bishops was encouraging the baser elements of society to outrageous boldness which had led to attacks against the King's position as head of the Church. William Plydell feared that if the bishops were removed from their offices, both temporal and spiritual, the barque of the Church would crash against the rocks. But it was Sir Benjamin Rudyerd who painted the darkest picture of an emasculated episcopacy. In a speech before the Commons in the height of the June crisis, he said that if the bishops were deprived of their temporal offices and lands, dioceses would be abolished, and with them cathedral churches and colleges for scholars, impoverishing the clergy
and opening the possibilities of creating an unlearned and barbaric nation.\footnote{41} As far as Clarendon was concerned, much of the concern for the sequestration of ecclesiastical property was sheer greed and not a zeal for reform.\footnote{42} Lord Digby summarized the fears of the pro-episcopal party when he spoke of the possibilities of anarchy. Admitting that to be anti-episcopal was to be popular, he said:

\begin{quote}
I beseech you, Gentlemen, let us not be led on by Passion to popular and vulgar terrors; it is natural . . . to the multitude to fly into extremes, that seems ever the best of them, that is most opposite to the present object of this hate.\footnote{43}
\end{quote}

The end result could be a pope in each parish and a group of assemblies that might take it upon themselves to excommunicate kings and thereby overthrow them, bringing the nation to a state of ruin.\footnote{44}

The pro-episcopal faction in the House used its own tactics to stop the anti-prelatical drive. In the first place, the parliamentary leadership was taken off guard by the strength of the pro-episcopalian members. This was first demonstrated during the February crisis. The parliamentary leaders expected a swift commitment of the London Petition, or if that failed, the Ministers' Petition. However, Baillie noted on the day of the beginning of the debate on the issue, 8 February, that

\begin{quote}
My Lord Digbie and Viscount Faulkland with a prepared companie about them laboured by prepared speeches and hott disputes, to have that petition cast out of the House as craving the rooting of Episcopacie against so many established lawes. The other party was not prepared. . . .\footnote{45}
\end{quote}
It did not take the anti-prelatical opposition long to rally and come back in full strength, but the arguments of Digby and Faulkland caused a temporary setback, forcing a compromise. The "Root and Branch" and the Ministers' Petitions would be put into committee for further study. The episcopal issue itself would be left for the whole House to discuss. After that time, it was evident that the chief strategy of the episcopalian was to try deliberately to slow down proceedings by confusing issues. Thus, in June, when Hyde was put in the Chair, and the "Root and Branch" Bill was before the House, Hyde did his best to confuse things by asking questions as that when he reported to the House the work of the day, he did frequently report two or three votes directly contrary to each other which, in the heat of their debate, they had unawares run into. And after twenty days spent in that manner they found themselves very little advanced towards a conclusion, and that they must review all that they had done, and the King being resolved to begin his journey for Scotland, they were forced to discontinue their beloved bill and let it rest; Sir Arthur Haselrigge declaring in the House that 'he would never hereafter put an enemy into the chair' nor had they the courage to resume the consideration of the bill untill after the war was entered into.

Delaying tactics continued into the crisis in October. At the time the second Exclusion Bill was prepared, Falkland and Hyde tried to prove to the Commons that the bill would never pass the Lords. When Pym attempted to get the Lords to join him in an action against the new bishops, Sir John Hotham tried to retard the proceedings by reminding the House that they themselves might be guilty of a praemunire in endeavouring to impede the creation of any bishops after the King had sent
Yet for all their activity, the proepiscopalian members of the Commons remained a minority group who lacked the political skills needed to destroy the anti-prelatical momentum. Through their efforts, the House was not united on this project, but they proved to be an irritant rather than an obstacle.

Where the fortunes of the bishops looked desperate in December, 1640, episcopal hopes suddenly came to life in February, because of the activities of two of the episcopate, John Williams of Lincoln and Joseph Hall of Exeter. Williams was in a strange position. Having been a mortal enemy of Laud, he became a hero to the anti-prelatical faction. They secured his release from prison in November, 1640, hoping that he would be an asset to their designs. But Williams had designs of his own. Clarendon, who detested him, wrote that the bishop had assured the King that he would do great things for his service in the House if released from prison. There is no doubt that great things were expected from him, for, as Oliver St. John remarked, he was a most esteemed prelate for his patient sufferings in prison, as well as for his endeavours to check the abuses of his fellow bishops. When in Parliament, he agreed with many who complained of the excesses of the bishops and even listened to the idea of a regulated episcopacy, but, in all truth, if ever there were a prelate who was a lord in heart and soul, it was the Bishop of Lincoln. Simply put, he knew how to stay alive, and he cared less for the fate of the Conge de lier.
persons of his brother bishops than he did for himself and the honour due to his office. Accordingly, he did things which he knew would please the opposition. He bullied the other bishops, egging them on to abstain from Strafford's business, "terrifying them with the censure that hung over their heads for making the "New Canons" till he persuaded them to ingratiate themselves by desiring to be excused in that matter, before an order should be made for their absence." In his attempt to blunt the effect of the proceedings concerning the drafting of the first Bishops' Exclusion Bill, however, his true colours came to light, for as Baillie noted,

The Bishops, to save the life of their office, have invented a trick which we trust shall irritate the lower House the more against them: they have moved the High House to appoint a committee for religion, to consider both of innovations, and what of the old is meet to be reformed, consisting of eight of ten Earles, as many Lords, and as many Bishops, with power to the Bishops of Lincolne, who shall sitt in the chyre of that committee, to summond . . . some of these who are reputed the most able and orthodox divines of the land, to witt, the Primate of Armagh, Prideaux, Ward, Prommerick [Brownrigge?] Holsworthy, Featly, Hacket, and Westfield; and of the Remonstrants, Tuisse, Burgesse, Young . . . Whyt, Marshall and Hill, to be present and give their advice. It is expected that this will be a spurr to the Commons, not by their accustomed slowness to suffer their committees to be prevented, and so frustrate, by this new devised one. Williams would not discuss the regulating of Church government since he said he was preparing a draft himself. But this attempt to avert a crisis only deepened it. The proceedings which had begun on 21 March, 1641, dragged on for two months. The prelatical party proved to be the most unbending. Having been prejudiced against the Presbyterians from the beginning,
they feared that one concession would destroy the entire episcopal position. Finally, on 2 July, Williams delivered his own solution to the problem: every bishop should preach once on Sunday; no bishop should be justice of the peace except himself as Dean of Westminster; every bishop should have twelve assistants as well as the dean and chapter, four to be chosen by the King, four by the Lords, four by the Commons, for jurisdiction and ordination; finally these twelve should present a list of names to the King when a vacancy occurred because of the bishop's death. It was a poor compromise at best, for "the anti-episcopal party conceived it needless to shave their beards whose heads they intended to cut off, designing an utter extirpation of Bishops." It was at this time that his influence ceased to exist. The importance of his tactics, however, lay in the fact that he did have an alternative for a limited episcopacy. His suggestion avoided the issue of the position of the bishops in the House of Lords. At first, although a bishop, he was respected and listened to by the Puritans because of his opposition to the Laudian Reform. However, he would not surrender his dignities, and instead of donning the armour of the opposition, he fought with the lordly prelates after all.

Joseph Hall's greatest contribution to the episcopal cause was his pen. Despite the attack made upon him both in print and on the floor of the Commons, it is evident that he had some following. However, of all the bishops, he was the most outspoken in the Lords, and was in no small
way responsible for the Upper House's action of 1 May, 1641. The first Bishops' Exclusion Act "strikes at the very Composition of this House, at the Style of all our Laws. . . . I beseech your Lordships to consider that this Honour is not done us [sitting in Parliament] but our profession." As the Lords were the eldest sons of the Church, they had a responsibility to defend it, for if, at that moment, they did not "the Misery will be the Church's; the Dishonour and Blur of the Act, in future Ages, will be yours." Indeed, William too spoke about the illegality of the bill but it was Hall who, like other pro-episcopalianists who projected into the future, feared anarchy both in the Church and ultimately in the nation.

The major difficulty with the House of Lords was its deep resentment of the Commons' interference with what it considered its own business. Pym and his party made the most of the unity issue, and all through the crisis of May, they repeatedly told the Lords "how much the House of Commons which knew best the temper and expectation of the nation would resent their not concurring with them in a remedy they judged so necessary." A split in the unity of the two Houses, the anti-prelatical leadership agreed, would obstruct the thorough reformation of the nation. But the majority of the Lords

inveighed with great sharpness, and blamed the House of Commons for presuming to meddle with an affair that so immediately concerned them: that if they might send up a bill this day at once to take out one whole bench from the House, as this would do the Bishops, they might tomorrow send another to take away
the barons, or some other degree of the nobility. Accordingly, the Lords tried to delay action on the bishops' affairs, adding to the frustration of the Commons. Matters with the King were impossible. Charles took his Coronation Oath to defend the Church seriously, as Williams reminded the Lords, and that was one reason for his obstinacy. More to the point, he feared the loss of so many loyal votes which he needed in his program to defend his concept of absolute rule. Thus he was willing to take away the power of the bishops in the Star Chamber and High Commissions Court, but he refused to do any more. The breaking point between the King and the Commons on this matter came in October with Charles' resolution concerning the government of the Church of England. His feeling was that if twenty-six bishops were to be swept away by the present Parliament, the next triennial Parliament would "strive to sweep away four-score Temporall Lords." Lord Car reported to the Parliament of Scotland that the King would not reform the Church of England on the lines of the Church of Scotland, for he knew for certain fact that Charles would keep the discipline and doctrine established by Queen Elizabeth and his father: "Nay more, His Majesty is resolved by the Grace of God to dye in the maintainance of the same." Given these many frustrations, the anti-prelatical leadership lost no time in remedying them. Popular support was necessary, especially the support of London. When the
London Petition was prematurely delivered, it was none the less graciously received. To keep up the fervour of the populace, the Puritan ministers constantly preached against the bishops, and the excesses of the prelates in the affairs of Prynne, Bastwick and Burton were loudly broadcast to further malign the episcopate. When Falkland and Digby and other pro-episcopal members of the Commons caught the anti-prelatical leaders off guard on 8 February, 1641, Baillie wrote to the Presbytery of Irvine that "all night our party solicited as best they could. Today, some thousands of the citizens, but in a very peaceably way, went down to Westminster Hall to countenance their petition." Pennington did his constituents full justice. Digby's doubts about the validity of the London Petition and its manner of presentation had become the pivot upon which the episcopalian reaction was swinging. Pennington countered by congratulating the Londoners and identifying his own aims with the humblest of them. He professed that men of worth had delivered the petition, quietly and respectfully. As the large crowd stood outside as if to give added force to his words, Pennington declared that the petition was not to be rejected simply because poor, hard-working men had promoted it. For "if there were mean mens hands to it, yet if there were honest men, there was no reason but these hands should be received." He himself had delivered the petition with the people, and had they really tried, they could have solicited fifteen times fifteen thousand signatures. In actual fact,
Pennington was telling the House that if the petition were thrown out, he too would have to be thrown out into the arms of the thousands waiting for him in the yard. In effect, the parliamentary cause was wedded to the popular cause.

The Puritan divines in the city worked hand in glove with the parliamentarian opposition all through February, preparing pamphlets to refute the arguments of Bishop Hall, and the arguments of the members of the House, such as Falkland and Rudyerd, whose speeches in favour of limited episcopacy had been published. Besides reviving his own work on the dangers of a limited episcopacy, Baillie wrote to Irvine on 28 February, 1641:

Think not we live any of us here to be idle; Mr. Henderson has readie now a short treatise much called for on our Church discipline; Mr. Gillespie has the grounds of Presbyteriall government well asserted; Mr. Blair, a pertinent answer to Hall's Remonstrance: all these are readie for the presse.

The efforts of the pro-episcopal party to save episcopacy turned into a fiasco. The main reason its efforts failed was because it lacked a popular base upon which to build. The controversy was deliberately channeled into the stream of the public good, not into one of precedent and law. Fiennes had said that people should be heard if laws upholding men of the type found on the present episcopal bench were to be honoured. Such laws should be changed. The episcopalian faction's failure to rally public support would suggest it lacked the dynamics of a political party.
The episcopalian did not have the machinery necessary to sustain a public policy; their policy was private, which was anything but the case with the anti-prelatical faction. Hall's book and the moderate episcopal speeches were taken seriously enough, but they won few, if any, converts to the bishops' side. Proof of this is given by the failure of the pro-episcopalian in London to present a petition in favour of episcopacy. A petition was circulated later in January, 1641, but it was later abandoned since no one would sign it. Continual pressure was exerted on the people by way of sermons. Their effectiveness was evident in the May riots, as attested by Whitlock who imputed the tumults to the pulpits. For the present, at least, the populace was controllable and helpful to the opposition in their efforts against the bishops.

National support was encouraged by way of the petitions. That so many were delivered to the House on one day, such as the eleven received on 25 January, 1641, definitely shows that the opposition were controlling popular expression to make it seem as significant as possible. Baillie confirmed that this was so when, writing about the Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance, he observed:

... it is now posting through the land for hands to make it stark; against it can come back it will be a fournight, at which tyme a large Remonstrance, by some dozen of hands chosen out of the whole number, will be readie, against the Bishops corruptions in doctrine, discipline, life, and all.
The absence of any similar activity on such a grand national scale shows that the episcopalianists lacked the basis of a political apparatus necessary to elicit public support for their position. In this particular question, this lack proved to be a mortal liability to the episcopal cause.

The pivotal anti-episcopal weapon in the Parliament was the threat of a "Root and Branch" solution to the prelatical problem. The Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance can be considered an extension of the London Petition. These two petitions were of vital importance to Pym's program. The anti-prelatical drive now could not be attributed solely to the hatred the anti-prelatical leaders in the House had for the bishops. The petitions were prepared by well-known and respected divines and had popular support. It was the people and their godly servants, the well affected clergy, who wanted the power of the bishops destroyed. Before these petitions were received, there was no substantial talk of debarring the bishops from the Lords. Now, one petition called for total extirpation, the other for a modified episcopacy. There is absolutely no doubt but that the London Puritan clergy wanted nothing less than a program of extirpation. However, when they saw the difficulties which the "Root and Branch" Petition was encountering, a milder solution was offered which pleased Pym's party. Its more immediate goal was expulsion of the bishops from the Lords rather than extirpation from the Church. Baillie, who was very close to the divines
behind the Ministers' Petition, records that they had a day of "private humiliation . . . for rooting out episcopacy." 69 Because of the blunder committed over the London Petition, the Ministers hoped that no hasty action would be taken on the Ministers' Petition "for they fear their friends in the house not strong enough to pull up that old oak." 70 The Ministers' Petition and Remonstrance was not a private matter in the eyes of the London clergy. The people of London knew its contents, for as Baillie wrote to Irvine "the Remonstrance is appointed to be read on Monday, a day of fasting in private, all over the Citie and many more places, for that day is appointed to consider the hard question of Episcopacie." 71 The parliamentarians were pleased with the two petitions because they served their purposes so well. The "Root and Branch" Petition served as a barometer. It quickly and effectively polarized the House's sentiments on the matter of episcopacy. At first distressed at the strength of the episcopal feeling, they quickly adopted tactics to meet the situation. In February a compromise solution was made, but when the Lords refused to countenance the first Bishops' Exclusion Act, Clarendon noticed that the opposition had already a remedy prepared: they introduced a "Root and Branch" bill to kindle those fires which might warm the Peers . . . that the bishops might see how little they had gotten by obstructing the other bill." 72 The strategy was simple enough; it was a deliberate act to frighten the pro-episcopal facti
into settling for the milder of the solutions. But the anti-episcopal parliamentary leaders had their own way of dealing with recalcitrant colleagues. They simply intimidated them. Those who voted against the attainder of the Earl of Strafford found their names printed on a poster, headed by the inscription "These are the Straffordians, Betrayers of their Country." The same method was planned to expose all those members who would not take the Protestation. But life was not pleasant for men such as Sir Edward Dering who changed his position from that of an anti-prelatical member to a defender of a limited episcopacy. Dering enjoyed being in the centre of things until, to his horror, he discovered that he was being used by the opposition leadership. Where once people would say as he passed them by "There goes Sir Edward Dering;" "That is Sir Edward Dering," and "God bless your worship," the populace reviled him when he decided that the popular cause was against his conscience. When he delivered a pro-episcopal speech on 21 June, his world seemed to collapse. Lord Brooke called him an apostate. Thomas Coke declared that he had lost his former honour and that his conscience was not as good as it had been in the beginning. Nathaniel Fiennes accused him of going over to their adversaries. Sir Arthur Haselrigge told him that the Primate of Ireland had infected him and he had drunk his poison. The saddest thing of all for Dering, who so desired to be popular, was the judgment given him by a stranger, who told Sir Edward
that by his speeches he had lost the prayers of thousands in
the city. Hyde was treated a little differently. He was
known to be an outspoken opponent of the anti-prelatical
program. When there was a second reading of the "Root and
Branch" Bill on 11 June, 1641, "they who wished well to the
bill . . . resolved to put Mr. Hyde into the chair, that he might
not give them trouble by frequent speaking, and so too much
obstruct the expediting the bill." Those who were against
the bill demanded that the anti-episcopal John Crew be
put in the Chair, but Hyde was finally commanded to take
the Chair.

One of Pym's most successful tactics was the use
of fear. When things would slacken in the House, he would
conveniently uncover plots against the Parliament in order
to keep the House at fever pitch. This was most effective
since the House was given "heats and colds by applying
parts of the [plots] to them upon emergent occasions. . . . "
In May it was the Army Plot; in November the Irish Plot.
The popish Lords and bishops were always implicated in
these proceedings. Thus skillful management of events,
together with the devoted assistance of clever men, helped
keep the House a vehicle of anti-prelatical propaganda.

Concerning the bishops, the Commons tried terror
tactics. With so many petitions received against them, and
committees set up to deal with these matters, one would
have thought impeachment proceedings would have moved more swiftly than they did. One by one various bishops were accused of abusing their office. By the end of December, 1640, Laud had been impeached, and proceedings had begun to investigate the affairs of Juxon of London, Pierce of Bath and Wells, Manwaring of St. David's, Potter of Carlisle, Bridgeman of Chester and Wren of Ely. But the parliamentary opposition was purposely delaying any drastic action affecting Laud lest other "grit men, if [he] were execute, would be freed of their fear and become hopeful of their place, and desireous more to pacify the irritant Prince, and comply with his desyre in keeping up Bishops. . . ." However, the leadership of the House wanted to capitalize on the fears of the pro-prelatical faction in the Commons, so that the anti-episcopalians: "of purpose keeps [this man] alive to make their feare, so long as [he] lives, a band to knitt all together for the common good."80

To sustain the momentum, anti-prelatical speeches became more personal and vitriolic as 1641 went on. During the crisis of May, 1641, Lord Saye and Sele answered Bishop Williams' reasons for throwing out the bill by saying:

The Question that will lie before your Lordships in passing of this Bill, is not, Whether Episcopacy (I mean this Hierarchical Episcopacy which the World now holds forth to us) shall be taken away Root and Branch; but whether those exuberant and superfluous Branches, which draw away the Sap from the Tree, and divert it from the right
and proper Use whereby it becomes unfruitful, shall be cut off, as they use to pluck up Suckers from the Root.\textsuperscript{81}

The objection that if the bishops left the Lords, the barons and earls would then be removed, Saye and Sele thought were preposterous, since the nobility had the honour invested in their blood and heredity; once a King had granted it, it could not be taken away. But the bishops sat by a barony which was dependent on an office. If the office were taken away, they could not sit.\textsuperscript{82}

In the Commons, the anti-episcopal speeches throughout the summer tended to be of a "Root and Branch" nature. Sir Henry Vane expressed the "Root and Branch" objections to the episcopal question by saying the whole tree was rotten: one could tell by the fruit. The unhappy condition of the civil state was due to the bishops' votes in the Lords "being there as sonmany obstructions, in our body Politike, to all good and wholesome Lawes tending to salvation."\textsuperscript{83} Divine Providence would be checked if they did not destroy episcopalian government, for God called the Parliament for precisely that work; rooting them up was the only possible course. After the articles of impeachment against thirteen bishops were presented to the Lords in August, 1641, the Bishops were rudely treated in the Lords, and could never be sure what they would be accused of next. Worst of all, they had so few friends. This was quite clear to them in June. Very few of the pro-episcopal members of the Commons could stand the
tedious debates on the "Root and Branch" issue, and often many of the pro-episcopalian members would be absent when important votes were taken, for, as Lord Falkland noted, "that they that hated bishops hated them worse than the devil, and that they that loved them did not love them so well as their dinner." The evidence supporting the anti-episcopal claims of prelatical tyranny could not be refuted by two bishops; they could not answer the hundreds of legal questions raised against them. Falkland gave the reason why the opposition succeeded: they tried much harder and worked as a united front claiming to represent the hopes of the people of England, while those who favoured episcopal government represented themselves, so much so that no unity or cohesive power was evident. Lacking a popular base and unity with their friends, the efforts of Williams and Hall could not stop the deep apathy and fear which gripped most of the bishops, a fear kept alive by new moves to unseat them.

The major means used by the Commons to thwart the Lords was questioning their sense of loyalty to the interests of the nation, since they were not cooperating with the Lower House in Parliament. The anti-prelatical Lords helped considerably by constant observations "that they seldom carry anything which directly opposed the King's interest by [reason of] the number of the bishops, who for the most part unanimously concurred against it, and opposed
many of their other designs." Pym believed that the popish lords and the bishops were an obstruction to his program. To name them would be no breach of privilege since the Commons often complained "of lords being away, and lords miscarriages." Pym most certainly wanted unity with regard to the removal of that special caste which continued their plot to destroy his program of constitutional reformation. Thus, "Root and Branch" became a most effective tool to pressure the Lords to see things his way so far as the temporal employments of the bishops were concerned. With Hall and Williams railing against the first Bishops' Exclusion Act in the Lords, the person of the vain and neutral Sir Edward Dering became most useful. Dering had had a good record until then in the Long Parliament, being a man who favoured a limited episcopacy, but one who could pepper his speech with anti-episcopal sentiments. The psychological advantage of such a man reading a "Root and Branch" bill was too much to lose, so on 21 May Sir Arthur Haselrigge flattered the baronet from Kent by giving him a copy of a bill brought to Haselrigge by Sir Henry Vane and Oliver Cromwell. Dering later wrote that Haselrigge "told me hee was resolved that it should goe in, but was earnestly urgent that I should present it." At that moment, Sir Edward Aiscough was reading an anti-episcopal petition from Lincolnshire. Dering, caught up with the emotion of the moment, read the radical act and regretted
it for the rest of his life. The import to the Lords was clear enough. Most of them were not Puritan, and a limited episcopacy was better than none. Even though this bill had trouble in the Commons, it would be resurrected again when needed. Williams wrote a pamphlet replying to the Commons' reasons why the bishops should quit the Lords. This reply was printed by 10 June, and on 11 June, Dering's bill was brought up again. So the battering continued; conferences with the Lords were always asked for in an effort to help the Peers to speed up the bishops' replies to their impeachments. It was hoped that, through fear and exhaustion they would see in limited episcopacy a better proposition than putting their House in danger by constantly thwarting the popular leaders of the Commons. Ultimately, the pressures exerted on the Lords by the Lower House prepared them to accept a proposition of an episcopacy which lacked temporal power, because, like many members of the Commons itself, they were persuaded that there were many good reasons to support an exclusion policy. Among these reasons were the great forces throughout the nation against the government of the Church, seeking to destroy it absolutely, and the presence of the Scots, who refused to leave English soil. The Scots would never agree to a true peace between the two nations unless the bishops were fully taken away. So the argument ran, that if an exclusion bill were passed

a greater number in both Houses would be so well satisfied that the violenter party would
never be able to prosecute their desires. And this reason did prevail over many men of excellent judgements and unquestionable affections, who did in truth, at that time believe that the passing this act was the only expedient to preserve the Church.

The necessary tactics needed to move the King were going to be of a very delicate nature. The matter would be difficult since, as Baillie noted, "the keeping up of episcopacie which we strove to have down, is the verie apple of his eye." The work was difficult for the opposition because by that time it was quite evident that the King needed constant badgering, because on matters concerning episcopacy he would always yield with reluctance, waiting for a time when he might reverse the trend if the pressure were removed. When he was in the city, mobs and parliamentary pressure could move him, as was evident at the time of Straffords' trial and execution. The King's original resolve not to tamper with the constitution of the Church was compromised somewhat by his consent in July to abolish the bishops' power as judges. However, away from London he showed a different spirit and courage, as seen by his resolve when in Scotland to appoint new bishops. The new bishops were "all of great eminency in the Church, frequent preachers, and not a man to whom the faults of then governing clergy were imputed, or against whom the least objection could be made." Thus the King tried to soften the blow by appointing popular, moderate clerics. The Commons was still annoyed. D'Ewes spoke on the matter
and said that both Houses should send a joint petition to the King in Scotland asking his Majesty to stay any future proceedings on this matter "for if at this time when there is a generall reformation expected before anie thing bee amended in Church matters, these new Bishopps shall be created I know into what desperation people may be drawen and what tumults may arise." But the King was not in a place where the Parliament's tumults could affect him as they had before. Nor were tumults any insurance that the King would ever accede to the demands made upon him that he be rid of the hated bishops. The only solution left was to inform the King in the strongest language possible, that if his policies were to continue, he would lose the obedience of the Parliament and the people. Such a threat, treasonable in nature, had to be carefully prepared, and the attempt was made in the preparation of the Grand Remonstrance.

The Grand Remonstrance was an act of the House of Commons. The Lords would have opposed it, so the Commons had to pursue the matter on its own. The debates concerning its content took place during the November rebellion in Ireland. The document was supposed to be for the King's eyes alone. Fears of Catholic plots against the Parliament abounded and were kept alive by the opposition leadership. The present policy of the Church of England was to return to Rome, they claimed, and thus the entire nation was being put into a state of misery. To remedy these manifold ills it would be best to purge the bishops from the Government. Debate reached its climax on 22 November when the
episcopalians made an effort to expunge the clause which
spoke of the Bishops' Exclusion Bill. Hyde affirmed that
the narrative part of the Remonstrance was true, but thought
it foolish to resurrect so many things done in the early
part of Charles' reign. Falkland thought the measures
dealt out to the bishops were too harsh. Dering objected
to the statement that idolatry had crept into the Church,
and Culpepper called the Remonstrance illegal without the
concurrence of the Lords and said that to change the
government of the Church would offend the people. By this
time, however, Pym was in no mood for their delaying
tactics. Playing on fears he knew would be felt by all,
he alluded to popish plots being near the King because the
Court was infested with the popish party. Popish lords
and the bishops were moving the King, Pym claimed, and the
Parliament was suffering as a result, and he wondered
why it should not be the Parliament that influenced the
King. In the final analysis, the declaration would "bind
people's hearts to us, when they see how we have been
used."95 These proceedings had gone on for twelve hours,
and at midnight the Remonstrance was put to vote and was
carried, 159 votes to 148, showing a deeper split than
might have been imagined. However, Hampden immediately
proposed that the Remonstrance should be printed and
published. Hyde was furious at this seeming breach of faith,
saying the Commons had no right to publish any debates or
determinations of the House which were not first transmitted
to the Peers. The Remonstrance was supposed to be a
vindication of the labours of the House; instead, now it was to be used as a means to excite the people. If the motion were carried, he demanded the liberty to enter his protestation. In the end, the King and the nation read in the Remonstrance a hope that his Majesty would be

... graciously pleased to concur with the humble desires of your people in a parliamentary way... for depriving the Bishops of their votes in Parliament, and abridging their immoderate power usurped over the clergy and other your good subjects, which they have perniciously abused to the hazard of religion and great prejudice and oppression to the laws of the Kingdom and just liberty of your people....

At the end of November the anti-episcopal parliamentary leaders saw all of their careful work in a state of collapse. The people of London received the King back with great joy. The House was bitterly divided over the matter of the absolutely necessary course of a national Remonstrance, representing national grievances, presented in the name of the House of Commons representing the nation. This Remonstrance needed the support of the nation if constitutional reform were to be realized. The bishops were still sitting in the Lords. On 12th November, the Roman Catholic Anglican Bishop of Gloucester, Godfrey Goodman, pleaded not guilty modo et forma to the charges against him, while the twelve other impeached bishops answered with a "plea and demurrer". They answered that the major part of the clergy at the Convocation voted for the benevolence to the King. Twelve out of an assembly of one hundred sixty members of the Convocation, all with equal voice, could not carry the
motion. The bishops asked why all who voted in the Convocation were not impeached as well. The Commons had not given any real evidence that the bishops had broken the law, that they had been working contrary to the King's prerogative, that they had endangered the liberty of the subject, or that they were encouraging sedition. They asked what law they had broken by the benevolence and what constitution had been broken by the "New Canons". Since these acts had never been promulgated, the bishops wondered what people had been injured. Insufficiencies and imperfections abounded in the articles of impeachment. It was evident that the episcopate had no concept of the better intentions of the House, nor had the Lords, least of all the King. If reform had to come, it would have to be done by a revolution. In December, 1641, the Parliamentary opposition was at last seasoned enough to know how best to exert pressure, and what mistakes of the past had to be avoided. Where persuasion had failed, brute force, it was hoped, would succeed.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

By 1 December it seemed to the parliamentary anti-prelatical opposition that their momentum had decreased greatly. The most serious fear was that they had lost the support of the London populace. King Charles had returned from Scotland amidst the universal joy of the city on 25 November, 1641. The Lord Mayor, Aldermen, Recorder and City Council had all gone out to meet the King "with Bells ringing at 121 parish Churches, where there were no failings in expressions of love and loyalty but the people as appeared by their shouts and acclamations."¹ The reaction of the leadership of the Commons was not a happy one, for as Clarendon noted, the welcome much troubled them "and the entertainment given to him by the City of London, in which their entire confidence was, much dejected them, and made them apprehend their friends there were not so powerful as they expected."² The Commons itself was seriously divided over the matter of the Grand Remonstrance. The "plea and demurrer" of the thirteen bishops impeached for the "New Canons" halted further proceedings against their order, and the Lords were most uncooperative on the episcopal issue. Most of all, the King was exhibiting a certain boldness as a result of the reception given to him by the city. Clearly then, new tactics had to be devised, and quickly, if the reforming program of the anti-prelatical faction was to succeed.
By 1 January, 1642, the situation had drastically changed. The "Root and Branch" issue had been set aside for the time being. The Irish rebellion was attributed to the ill will of the popish lords and the bishops. Popular fear was played upon, and the devastating riots of December had their part in weakening the episcopal structure. Londoners again brought their petitions to the House of Commons. Extirpation was no longer the key issue; too much time had been wasted on that. Instead, the popular belief was that the best solution to the nation's ills was the swift removal of the episcopate and the Roman Catholic peers from the House of Lords.3 The panic over Ireland, and the riotous mood of London, coupled with the absence of many members for the Christmas holidays, gave the anti-episcopal faction an advantage which they used to destroy episcopal power. The Archbishop of York's blunder, committed no doubt from the sheer fright of the mob's attack on his person, unnerved the entire episcopate and severely split their common front. The Lords' action against the bishops who had signed the Protestation of 30 December, 1641, had so shocked the King that Charles committed an even more serious blunder than had those bishops. On January 4, 1642, he invaded the House of Commons because he felt his own position was in jeopardy.

By 15 February, 1642, the bishops had lost their seats in the Lords. Popular sentiment against the King was
sealed by his ill-fated attempt to arrest Pym, Hollis, St. John, Strode and Haselrigge, all of whom escaped arrest and became popular heroes. On 11 January, 1642, the King left the city, fearing for his own safety and that of the Queen. When the five members returned to the House, they were joyously welcomed by the populace. Proceedings against the bishops moved swiftly. Group petitions from the counties poured into London again, as they had a year before. Pym used these to the greatest advantage. The bishops impeached in December were refused bail and answered their charges of treason on 17 January. In the meantime, Pym prepared his case against the bishops and brought the evidence of national discontent to the Lords on 25 January. The Upper House, weary of all the abuse it was receiving, finally passed the second Bishops' Exclusion Bill on 5 February, 1642. All else rested with the King who, under the severest pressure, finally consented to the bill. The impossible of 1 December, 1641, was made possible.

It was quite evident that Pym had learned from past mistakes. His passion for unity of purpose was beginning to bear fruit. Fear was a potent tactic and, as news filtered into the city concerning Irish atrocities against the Protestants there, the London citizenry was given the full details of the rebellion's progress. As if to canonize this fear, the Grand Remonstrance was printed for public consumption on 15 December, 1641, when it was
becoming clear that the King would not be moved on the episcopal issue. Summarizing every complaint made against episcopal government during the year, the Grand Remonstrance presented to the people a new way to view the abominable tyranny of the episcopate. The bishops and the popish lords in the Upper House had delayed the prosecution of delinquents and hindered the progress of "good Bills passed in the Commons house, concerning the reformation of sundry great abuses and corruptions both in Church and State." Having laboured to seduce and corrupt some of the members of the House of Commons and hoping that the members might sabotage the liberty of the Parliament, they even tried to win the King's army over to their wicked designs. Their plan was simple enough: to keep up the episcopal votes and functions "and by force to compell the Parliament to order, limit and dispose their proceedings in such manner as might best concur with the intentions of this dangerous and potent faction." They could not make the Scots army neutral, so it was the hope of the bishops and the recusant peers to entice the English army to join in their plans to subvert the Protestant religion and to destroy the Government. Their plots were everywhere, and Ireland was the best example. The bishops lied about the anarchy to come in Church and State if their temporal power were taken away; the "golden reins discipline and government in the Church" would not be forsaken. But in
the work of reformation the Lower House was always thwarted for

what can we, the Commons without the conjunction of the House of Lords, and what conjunction can we expect there, when the Bishops and Recusant Lords are so numerous and prevalent, that they are able to crosse and interrupt out best endeavours for Reformation, and by that means give advantage to this malignant party to traduce our proceedings.

It is little wonder, then, that during the December riots the cries "Noe Bishops, noe magpies, noe Popish Lords . . ." were often heard. However, it was the bishops whom the opposition wanted expelled at this time. Linking them with the Papists was a convenient tactic for keeping alive the panic over the Irish rebellion.

The same successful tactics of the previous year were once again employed by the anti-prelatical faction. On the anniversary of the delivery of the "Root and Branch" Petition, Pennington informed the House that there were divers grave citizines of London attending without the present this howse, with the formable petition wee had been tolde off that should be brought us by 1,000 persons: but hee said that a small number were come out with it, and that in a peaceable and humble manner.

The leaders were so anxious to avoid any riotous assembly of a frightened London that the hour of the delivery of this new petition was constantly changed so that it could be presented in an orderly way. Written in the name of the Aldermen, Common-Councilmen and other inhabitants of London, and containing some fifteen thousand names, it would have had more signatures had not the Lord Mayor, Sir
Richard Gurney and others opposed it. Indeed Gurney and the City Recorder, Sir Thomas Gardiner, held a dim view of this petition. To them it was a fallacy to remove the bishops; such a policy was fraught with dangers. Ignorant and idle persons, they claimed, had put their hands to the petition. Those responsible for it deserved to be disfranchised because what they wanted tended to sedition, and the drawing of people together to sign amounted to a tumult. It did not seek peace but rather "it is for blood and cutting of throats, and if it cam to cutting of throats, thanke yourselves, and your blood bee on your owne heades." 10 In the petition a compliment was paid the House for the many good laws it had passed, but the petitioners understood that there were other good laws passed by the House,

which by reason that the Bishops and the Popish Lords had votes in the Peers House were stopped there, and therefore they humblie besought this house to be Suters to his Majestie for the taking away of their votes out of the said house. 11

Once again, the cruelties in Ireland were cited in such a way that the bishops and Catholic lords seemed to be behind such proceedings. Immediate action had to be taken against this faction before all England would be engulfed in bloody plots against the liberties of the subject. 12

The same thème was behind all other petitions arriving at the Parliament from around the country. Gurney's
fear of a violent solution to the episcopal problem did not disconcert the leadership. Instead, they encouraged petitions, as was evident by the way they received them. On 4 February, "The Humble Petition of the Gentlewomen, Tradesmen's Wives, and many others of the Female Sex, all Inhabitants of the City of London and the Suburbs thereof" was received. The women complimented the members for their courage in bringing Church and State to safety

notwithstanding that many worthy Deeds have been done by you, great Danger and Fear do still attend us, and will, as long as Popish Lords and superstitious Bishops are suffered to have their Voice in the House of Peers. . . .

Recalling episcopal cruelties in the past, the Women's Petition spelled out most explicitly the fear of the common person in the city:

. . . we humbly signify that our present fears are, that unless the blood-thirsty are hindered in their Designes, ourselves in England, as well as they in Ireland, shall be exposed to that Misery which is more intollerable than that which is already past; as namely, to the Rages, not of men alone, but of Devils incarnate. . . .

Pym felt constrained to answer the women after their Petition had been read in the House. He thanked them for bringing the Petition at so seasonable a time, and assured the women that the House would give satisfaction to their just desires. Identifying with the popular movement, he declared:
for we have been, are, and shall be ready to
relieve you, your husbands, and Children; and
to perform the Trust committed unto us, towards
God, our King and Country, as becometh faithful
Christians and loyal Subjects.\textsuperscript{15}

The London Ministers were still active with their
friends in the Parliament. On 20 December, 1641, Captain
Venn presented a petition on behalf of certain ministers,
protesting an order from the King that the law of the
Church should be obeyed until altered.\textsuperscript{16} The petition
argued that since Parliament agreed with their program of
reform, it should be enacted. They called for a National
Synod to give advice to Parliament; Convocation really
represented the bishops, and no one else. Cornelius Burgess
delivered the petition, and said he could have obtained
many more signatures had he wanted to.\textsuperscript{17}

By this time in the crisis it had been proven that
the most efficacious way to use petition pressure was to
have groups of people deliver the petitions and then have
the Commons commit them \textit{en bloc}. Accordingly, on 11
January, 1642, some five thousand petitioners from
Buckinghamshire rode into London and presented petitions
to the Lords and Commons asking that Bishops and popish
lords lose their votes.\textsuperscript{18} The Commons were delighted
by their resolve to "live by you, or to die at your feet,
against whomsoever shall in any sort, illegally attempt
upon you."\textsuperscript{19} Petitioners from Warwick and Coventry had a
similar plan in mind for the presentation of their petitions,
when, \textit{en route}, they heard that the Lords had passed the
second Exclusion Bill. The substance of their petitions had to be changed, and now they urged the Houses to continue their happy cooperation in reforming the Church and State. On 11 February, they rode into London as a body, and on the next day, met at a fixed place, and "thence went on foote, two in a ranke to Westminster, where the said Petitions were most thankfully accepted by both Houses." They went home in a happy frame of mind, since they had been assured that their request would be taken into speedy consideration, and their desires fulfilled.

The en bloc technique was cleverly used by Pym on 25 January, 1642, when he asked for a conference with the Lords. The occasion was the receipt of the petitions from the City of London, from Middlesex, Hertford and Essex, all expressing fear of the Irish rebellion, and demanding that the bishops and popish lords be cast from the Upper House. Pym declared that these petitions represented the voice and cry of all England. Riots could ensue if action were not speedily taken. Parliament had done its best to ease these tensions, but as long as the bishops continued to obstruct good bills thus damaging any hope of freedom, evils would endure. Whatevsoever mischief the bishops' obstructions would produce, the Commons were free from it? "we may have our part of the Miserie, we can have no part in the guilt of dishonour."21 The will of the people demanded the expulsion of the bishops; only the Lords could help by hearing their cry. Apprentices, mariners and
seamen, London women, Aldermen and Common-Councilmen, cities and counties, all called for the same thing, the expulsion of the bishops from the Lords. It was a national outcry.

The war of the presses continued. Anti-prelatical speeches were printed, and Dering was impeached for publishing his own speeches without the permission of Parliament. The proceedings against the twelve bishops impeached in December were published. Prynne's books were in circulation, and Milton was publishing his fourth anti-prelatical tract, The Reason of Church Government urg'd against Prelaty. Many anonymous works against the Bishops were pouring off the presses: Conspiracy of 12 Bishops in The Tower, January, 1642; Apprentices Advice to 12 Bishops, January, 1642; Bishops' Last Vote, February, 1642; Bishops' Last Good Night, February, 1642. The most important petitions also were in print. The pro-episcopal presses, with the exception of Dering's publication, were silent.

The sympathies of the Londoners were on the side of those who were bent on the destruction of bishops and their party. They rioted against the bishops, and allowed men from the counties to ride unmolested through the streets on their way to present petitions. There were no pro-episcopalian delegations from London. The optimism of the King over his triumphal entry into the city was a false one. He enraged the populace by his attempts to arrest the
five members. Thus he was helpless to defend the bishops. Pym had, in fact, become a king in his own fashion for, as Sir Edward Dering wrote to his wife, "If I could be Pym, with honesty, I had rather be Pym than King Charles." The petitions had widespread support in the city and, given the alacrity evidenced by the attack on the persons of the bishops who tried to go to the Parliament on 27, 28 and 29 December, 1641, the movement was not only popular, but could be at times spontaneous in its expression. Bramston summed up the major issue, pointing to the momentum of a popular revolution, when he wrote that the attack on the bishops' persons was made knowne to the Lords and Commons by several members, and by the King too; but noe course taken to suppress or punish any of them, soe that the King might justly feare dainger to his person if he stayed longer, as did the Bishops, whoe, haveing made knowne to the Lords the dainger they runn in comeinge to the House, and yet could not obtaine any remedie, forbeare to come. . . .

Ultimately the King was unable to ignore the popular demand to send the bishops down from the Lords since his own position and freedom would have been endangered had he not signed the second Exclusion Bill.

The genius of the anti-prelatical faction in the Commons lay in their identification with the aspirations of the populace, whose hatred of bishops was so helpful in their own campaign against episcopacy. The pro-episcopalian members of the Commons were either physically stopped and surrounded by the mob, as was Sir John
Strangeways, or verbally abused, as were Edward Hyde, Lord Falkland, and Sir John Culpepper. But this was the people's fight and, as has been seen before, Pym felt it an obligation of the House not to dishearten the populace, who were obtaining their just desires in their own manner. Thus the arguments assumed that the bishops were intent on destroying the good relations between the King and his people. Denzil Hollis warned that if the twelve bishops impeached for their December Protestation were not punished, a division between the King and his people would be the result, causing great uproars and tumults in the City and about Westminster of those citizens who so hated the bishops. Such a state of affairs was against the interests of peace in the country and would hinder the reforming work of the Parliament. It was not the people who were at fault, but, rather, the bishops and their arbitrary government. Sir Simonds D'Ewes argued that if the business of the impeached bishops did not proceed immediately, utter ruin and destruction could envelop the State, because the bishops were incendiaries, and the London citizens and indeed all people throughout the whole Kingdom wanted them brought to justice. To D'Ewes, the tumults were really the work of the bishops, but his message was clear enough; unless the episcopal question were settled soon, tumults and uproars might destroy the Parliament, for the episcopal party was responsible for the impeachment of the five members by the King. John White likened the times to the days of the Wars of the Roses. The bishops were imposing tyranny on
the saints of God for they were ready to strike cities and
towns with powder plots. White further claimed that the
prelates had always been enemies of both King and people.30

The King's attempt to arrest Pym, Hollis, St. John,
Haselrigge and Stroud on 4 January, 1642, strengthened
the anti-prelatical opposition's identification with the
popular cause. When the King left the city on 10 January,
1642, the five came out of hiding the next day amidst
cheering crowds. As the five accused members passed by
Whitehall, the crowds cried out "What has become of the
King and his cavaliers ... where is he gone?"31 In
their own defence, some of the members gave strong speeches
in the House upholding their positions. To the charge
that he had "cast aspersions upon his Majesty and his
Government, to alienate the Affections of his people, and
to make his Majesty odious unto them",32 Pym answered that
if by publishing a Remonstrance identifying those who were
labouring to disaffect the King from Parliament, namely

those ill-affected Bishops that have innovated
our Religion; oppressed painful learned, and
godly Ministers, with vexatious Suits and
Molestations in their unjust Courts; by cruel
Sentences of Pillory and cutting off their
Ears, by great Fines, Banishments, and
popetical Imprisonment; if this ... be the
cast Aspersions upon his Majesty and his
Government, and to alienate the Hearts of his
loyal Subjects, good Protestants and well-
affected in Religion, from their due Obedience
to his Royal Majesty; Then I am guilty of this
article.33
Haselrigge declared that he had never encouraged or countenanced tumults and riots about the House, but had always considered these illegal and had voted for their suppression. At this point, Sir Arthur completely reversed direction to show that, in his mind at least, tumults were spontaneous expressions of popular hatred, and behind them lay a legitimate right of the populace to petition the Parliament. He said "I have assented to all Orders for their appeasing; agreed with the Parliament, in all Things, concerning their Petitions and Requests." These people, according to Haselrigge, did not break any laws, for they came unarmed, humbly, by petition, asking for redress of their grievances "which is one Privilege, and one of the greatest, to make their Grieves known to a Parliament, and by them to be relieved." Indeed

they offered no Assault, but being assaulted, preserved themselves and departed . . . the matter of their Clamour was not against the King, nor any of his Council, it was not against the Lords, nor the House of Commons; it was only against Delinquents, against such as had been the greatest Oppressors of them.

Strode placed the blame for the impeachment of the five members squarely on the heads of the bishops impeached in December. He argued that these bishops wished the five members to be accused of treason, only to procure our Absence from this Honourable House, that we may not have our free Votes in the Trial of the twelve Bishops accused; by whom I verily believe, these Articles were drawn, and only by their Advice, and such as favour their Cause, exhibited.
One thing all of these speakers denied was the King's suggestion that they were fomenting a revolution by turning his people away from him, trying to establish an arbitrary government. They all affirmed that they were preserving the fundamental laws of the land against those who would enslave the nation.

The five leaders of the opposition really dramatized their concern for the popular sentiment when they went into hiding in the city, where there was no fear for their security. According to Clarendon, this was deliberately planned so "that the city might see that they relied on that place for a sanctuary of their privileges against violence and oppression, and so might put on an early concernment for them." It took the King little time to realize he had lost the city. By 7 January, "their seditious ministers were despatched to inflame the neighbour counties", and to be sure, it was no happy accident that the Buckinghamshire men arrived, five thousand strong, to offer their lives for the freedom of Parliament on the day the five members came out of hiding. The populace of the city and the neighbouring counties was theirs, and work against the bishops could begin in earnest.

The episcopal position at the beginning of December seemed secure enough. The "plea and demurrer" tactic of the bishops impeached in August would delay any legal proceedings against them for some time, and the Lords were
in no mood to cooperate with the Commons on this matter. Where lengthy legal harangues had failed, terror would not. The physical attacks against the persons of the bishops then resident in London shocked them out of their wits. The impeachment proceedings completely unnerved them. On 30 December, 1641, the twelve who had signed the Protestation fashioned by the Archbishop of York were called to the Bar. Williams refused to answer at that time. Morton of Durham considered the impeachment the greatest misery that had ever befallen him. He had gone to Williams' house two days previously and had seen the Protestation already signed by many bishops. He had read it over since he was asked to sign it, and took some exceptions to it, "but was drawn in by Inducements, or rather Seducements, and that he did subscribe it only to preserve his right of voting in Parliament." Joseph Hall of Norwich was next called in, and said that the charge was the heaviest affliction ever given him since he would not have committed an offence of so great a nature. He mentioned that he had cautioned the rest of the bishops to dwell on the petition a little longer before it was presented. Robert Wright of Coventry and Litchfield professed that he had not intended to commit treason. The other bishops answered in similar fashion.

Walter Curll, Bishop of Winchester, who had not signed the Protestation, was asked had he also been part of Williams' proceedings. He utterly disclaimed the
Protestation, and was allowed to sit in the Lords. 44

With the fatal blunder of the Archbishop of York, the last battle against episcopal votes began. Their strength in the Lords was devastated. The five new bishops felt they should listen before they began to speak, so, in effect, their votes were already lost. Of those bishops who could sit, only John Warner of Rochester went to the House with any frequency, and it was he who gave the "last groan" for his order in February, 1642. 45 The King's naive hope that popular divines as bishops would soothe Parliamentary feelings towards the episcopal bench was shattered on 30 December, 1641. On that date John Rous reminded the House that to accede to the making of new bishops would be to defy the will of the good people who were sending in petitions against the episcopate, showing that the latter, besides their exactions outside of Parliament, were trying to destroy the good work of Parliament by their votes in the Lords. 46 In January, anti-episcopal speeches continued. D'Ewes gave such a speech on the 11th, and on the 17th (the day the twelve bishops were to enter their plea to the December impeachments), the members of the Commons were reminded of the bishops' crimes in speeches given by Thomas Bagshaw, John White and Oliver St. John, all of whom demanded that justice be done.

The impeached bishops denied that they were guilty of the treason charged in the impeachment, and asked that bail be set for them and a speedy trial be had. Both
requests were denied. Feeling against them was very high, and a clue as to why their requests were denied is found in an anonymous pamphlet published that day. The pamphlet claimed that both Houses had found the twelve "vehemently peccant and intolerably delinquent." The reasons were the usual: disregarding the privileges of the Parliament, denying the liberty of the subject and, worst of all, endeavouring to alienate the King from Parliament. The interesting thing is that the pamphlet rejoices in the new-found harmony of the two Houses in their resolve to punish the delinquents.

The trial was delayed and not held until after the King had signed the bill for the exclusion of all bishops from the Lords. No doubt bail was refused and the trial delayed to insure that Williams or Hall, or any of the others, would not get near the King to influence him while both Houses were working for the exclusion. Besides, it would be wise not to rush proceedings at that point, for, if the sentence against the bishops was too harsh, the King might be angered and moved to stay all anti-episcopal legislation. On the other hand, if it were too lenient, he might think it safe to further countenance their activities. As it was, the trial began on 17 February. That Williams and the others had presented "an humble petition and protestation of all the Bishops and Prelates present around London" was blasted to shreds by the testimonies of Brian Duppa of Durham, Walter Curll of
Winchester, and William Juxon of London. Duppa said that he was absent from the Lords, not because of the riots, but because he was in attendance of Prince Charles, and that he knew nothing about the Protestation and never consented to it. Curll admitted that the tumults had kept him away one day, but on 29 December, when he had landed near the Parliament stairs, the Earl of Newport told him that none of the bishops were in the House that day, so he went home. He had seen a draft of the Protestation but did not sign it. Juxon simply said the frost had kept him out of London, and that he had not seen the Protestation till after it had been delivered. For all of their fear, it was noted that Goodman of Gloucester and Pierce of Bath and Wells managed to get to the Parliament in the heat of the tumults, so the petition was far from telling the truth of the matter.\textsuperscript{50}

Far more serious, however, were the offences Glynn then accused the delinquent bishops of having committed. On the days the bishops were absent, those days on which they said no free Parliament had taken place,

\begin{quote}
there was a great Rebellion in Ireland; and the Remedy to subdue that Kingdom to Obedience was Aids and Supplies, as the Wisdom and Power of Parliament should provide, which was well known to the Bishops; therefore their Petition and Protestation was a direct Act to endeavour the Loss of that Kingdom.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

Thus, for popular consumption, the bishops were in league with
the enemies of the Protestant religion, and the trial only confirmed the great wisdom of the King's assent to the exclusion of the episcopate from the Lords.

The Lords' cooperation with the Commons on matters concerning episcopacy was predictable. To demonstrate this it should be noted that at the beginning of December the House of Lords was as a whole set against the expulsion of the bishops. However, the December riots produced a dramatic abandonment of the majority's resolve to uphold the bishops' constitutional right to deliberate with them. Riot pressure, it was hoped, would insure the necessary cooperation essential if a constitutional change was to be effected. The August impeachment proceedings against the thirteen accused of high treason had dragged on into the early winter. On 6 December, John Glynn gave a report on the history of the case, and resolved that a "plea and demurrer" should not be accepted, that the bishops should appear before the Commons, that the Lower House should be called in on the case, and that the Lords themselves should take care to see that a matter of fact, not a "plea and a demurrer", should be presented by the bishops. The Lords replied on 13 December that the "plea and demurrer" still stood, since the impeachment was an act of the Committee and not of the House. Glynn replied to the Lords that it was a vote of the House. By then it was clear that the Upper House had no mind to cooperate with the Commons on this project, since the opposition
in the Lords was too formidable. Clarendon noted that the anti-episcopal opposition in the Commons were to their wits' end, so that, being without any other hope, they resorted to their last remedy, which had once before served their turn in the destruction of the Earl of Stafford. And the rabble of prentices and inferior people of the city flocked in great multitudes about the House of Peers crying out even at the doors of the House that they would have no bishops . . . And those with whom they were displeased, when they could sever them from the rest, they crowded, and pressed, and trod upon. . . .

Besides the cries of "Noe bishops, noe popish lords," many peers were now greeted as "false, evil, and rotten-hearted lords." Things finally reached the stage where "no man could pass but whom the rabble gave leave to crying 'A good Lord,' or "A good man--let him pass'." Notwithstanding, the Lords considered their proceedings to be free in the height of the tumults, on 28 December, albeit by a majority of four. But they had suffered so much over the episcopal question that when the bishops' Protestation came on 30 December, they suddenly lost all patience with the matter, and, at long last, showed their willingness to cooperate with the Commons. They even consented, on 31 December, to consider the second Exclusion Bill "at some convenient time."

To be sure, there were still many in the Lords who were favourable to the bishops' place in the Upper House, among them the Marquis of Hertford, the Earl of Southampton, the Earl of Bristol, the Earl of Bath and Lord
Digby. Bristol tried to do the bishops a service by reminding the House that once a bill had been once cast out, it could not be brought in again during the same session. Since the previous vote against exclusion had been carried by so many decisive votes, it was clearly against parliamentary rules to try and reintroduce it. But the time of such niceties was over. Pym took advantage of the new situation by calling for a conference with the Lords on 31 December, 1641. Lord Digby had given out a report that the present Parliament had been a forced one, and any acts or laws passed without the consent of the bishops' votes were null and void. This report was a clear breach of Parliament, since it was a privilege of Parliament to redress the grievances of the nation.

But so long as the bishops remained unpunished, the King's loyal subjects would continue to be oppressed, since

> if no Laws can be binding to the Subject, but such as are voted and assented to by the Bishops, then none can be expected but such as are destructive to the State; their Affections being altogether averted from free Parliamentary Proceedings, and their Designs only agitated for the opposing the Government thereof; and we cannot but daily fear the utter Confusion of the same thereby.

In his conference with the Lords on 25 January, Pym stressed the fact that all the people of England demanded the removal of the bishops. The proposition was one of saving the Kingdom, and Pym asked that they act according to their consciences. Petitions were stressing the need of cooperation between the two Houses, as could be seen in a
petition from Surrey which besought them to continue their unity with the Commons by expelling the bishops "who are obstructing good bills." But, far more to the point, the Londoners were really against the bishops, and in their petitions to the Commons, pledged their solidarity with them in the work against the bishops. One such petition was that of the Mariners and Seamen, subscribed to "by many thousands and presented to the Committee of the Honourable House of Commons at Grocers-Hall, 8 January, 1641-1642." The petitioners put the blame for the slump in trade and general unemployment of the time on the popish lords and bishops, whom they considered to be fostering the Catholic plots to overthrow the fundamental laws of the land by reason of their votes in Parliament. They really feared a plot against their lives if the popish party and bishops remained unchecked, so they asked that the Commons be a means to the King's Majesty and the House of Peers, that life might be given to your good endeavours by their concurrence with you in the punishment of delinquents and redressing the pressures and grievances in the Church and Commonwealth: And for the better effecting thereof, that the Popish Lords and Bishops, may be removed out of his House of Peers.

The Women's Petition of 4 February also complained of the hard times, and it was evident enough that riots could commence again. Given all these pressures, the Lords on 5 February finally passed the second Bishops' Exclusion Bill. The only dissenting votes were cast by the Bishops
of Winchester, Rochester and Worcester. The Commons was jubilant, and Sir Robert Harley on 7 February declared to the Lords

that the House of Commons did much rejoice in that clear Concurrence and Correspondency between both Houses; that they desired their Lordships would send some Lords to the King humbly to request, That he would be pleased to crown this Bill with his Royall Assent, as one of the chiefest Means of Giving Satisfaction to Men's Minds, and exceedingly conducting towards settling the Distractions of the Kingdom; which was the rather desired, because the Bill was to commence, and be of Force, on the 15th of this Instant February.64

Concerning the pressures exerted against King Charles, it is virtually impossible to divorce his actions from the great personal danger he felt himself and his family to be in from the disorders in London from 7 December, 1641, till the time he left the city on 11 January, 1642. His attempted arrest of the five members resolved around his personal crisis. When the Lords had abandoned the bishops, Charles had panicked and his rash behaviour in entering the Commons had made him more unpopular than ever. However, this essay is limiting itself to the episcopal question and the King's last-ditch efforts to save the episcopal office. He definitely linked his own personal fortune to the bishops' fate and in saving them was hoping to save himself. But Clarendon insisted that one reason why the second Exclusion Bill passed the Commons in October was the "fatal negligence of those who could never be induced to attend the service
which their country had trusted them, and to which, in all truth all the calamities that afterwards befell the Kingdom are to be imputed. . . .”65 The King felt this to be the case, for on 12 December, 1641, he issued a proclamation ordering the numerous members absenting themselves from the Commons to return to the House. However, as Clarendon noted, it was to no avail.66

The strength of the King's position on the episcopal question lay in the constitutional aspects of the issue. His answer to the Grand Remonstrance proved this. Furious that the Commons should have published it before he had sent an answer, the King, after chiding the Commons for their disrespect, said it was his intention to give all his people satisfaction for their desires in a parliamentary way. He said that he was not aware of any wicked and malignant party in his Government, in the Privy Council, or associated with his children; if such had been the case, he would have dismissed them. Charles felt that he was doing all he could to save the Kingdom from the popish party, but as far as the bishops' votes were concerned, "their right is grounded upon the Fundamental Law of the Kingdom and Constitutions of Parliament."67 He showed his contempt for the Parliament by declaring that he would call whom he willed to his council table, and his contempt for the city by saying he would defend so long as he lived the Church of England, not only against popery, "but also from the irreverence
of those many Schismaticks and Separatists wherewith of late this Kingdom and this City abounds to the great dishonour and hazard of both Church and State," expressing the hope that Parliament would join him in suppressing them. 68

Such was not the will of Parliament. The tumults were used to unnerve the King as well as the friends and members of the episcopate. As of 10 December, the King was unmoved, for he issued "A Proclamation for Obedience to the Lawes ordained for establishing of the true Religion in this Kingdom of England." 69 The publishing of the Grand Remonstrance was used to counter this, showing in detail how the King's conception of the Established Church was in great fashion helping to destroy the State. His response was expected. Not quite expected was his own apologia "to all his loving subjects." 70 By now it was evident that Charles felt he had been pushed far enough. In going to the people, he was admitting that the anti-episcopal drive had as its base a broad popular rejection of the episcopal office. He had taken care of civil liberties, as was evident in the anti-episcopal legislation he had signed in July, 1641. He was willing to join with the Parliament in altering ceremonies. But he could not stand by and countenance

the bold Licence of some men in Printing of Pamphlets, in Preaching and Printing of Sermons, full of bitterness and malice against the present Government, against the Lawes established, so full of sedition against our Selfe and the peace of the Kingdom. 71
He asked the people to join with him and his ministers to punish those libelling him and the establishment or, in other words, the Parliamentary opposition. As in his reply to the Grand Remonstrance, Charles declared he would deal with unjust ceremonies but he would uphold the institution of episcopacy.

The defection of the Lords, the King's fears for his wife and family, and his loss of popularity in London because of his entry into the House of Commons, put unbearable pressure on the King after he had left London. The signs were everywhere evident; the people wanted the bishops out of the House of Lords. Even though it was becoming evident that if Charles would not accede to the wishes of the people as expressed in Parliament, he might lose his crown, the King was reluctant to change his position. He had sworn at his coronation to uphold the Established Church. To consent to the expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords would be to act against the dictates of his conscience. Sir John Culpepper urged the King to sign the second Bishops' Exclusion Bill, which was sent to the King along with the Bill concerning the Militia. No one expected Charles to sign either, but Culpepper, fully aware of the King's deflated popularity urged that he do this because the Militia Bill was far more dangerous than the former bill, and his acquiescence to the Exclusion Bill would show his good will to all. The King would not give in, and when he heard that Hyde
agreed with his resolve, he became even more obdurate. In desperation, Culpepper turned to the Queen. 72

Culpepper terrified the Queen by telling her that if her husband did not give in, her journey to France might be stopped. The King wanted her out of the Country, mainly so that she could be out of the reach of his enemies who wanted to impeach her. The Queen, no lover of the hierarchy of a religion she considered to be heretical, refused to board the ship at Dover until Charles had signed the bill against the bishops. 73 Culpepper had assured her that this action would redound to her advantage. What effect all this pressure had on the King's scruples concerning his Coronation Oath no one knows. Bramston asserted that the King signed the bill because he was "willinge to please his people and to preuent [sic.] if possible any occassion of breach. . . ." 74 However, by mid-February, one can be sure that Charles was worn down by the never-ending anti-prelatical pressure which was clearly now a popular movement. Fearful for the safety of the one he loved and trusted more than anyone on earth, and believing Culpepper's assurances that the Commons and Lords would never again send him a bill of so unpleasant a nature, the King finally signed on 13 February "An Act for disenabiling all Persons in Holy Orders to exercise their Temporal Jurisdiction or Authority," stating that it was his will to desire nothing more than the satisfaction of his Kingdom. 75 When the news
reached London, Hacket sadly observed that the people "fell to Bells and Bonfires, and prophaned the Name of God, that He had heard them, whose Glory was not in their thoughts from beginning to end."76

The implications of the exclusion of the bishops from the affairs of the English Government were vast. Never before in English history had the popular will changed, in a substantial way, the institution of Government. The entire order was cast into disgrace because of the exertions of a few people. The lessons learned were important ones. Those who, because of their office, seemed answerable only to God and the King, found themselves answerable to the nation. Through careful manipulation by the management of the House, popular sentiment brought enough pressure to remove the obstruction of these, the most miserable of the King's supporters. Without his bishops, popular criticism could fall on no one other than the King. If bishops could be removed, so could their head. In truth, the English Revolution had already begun.
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