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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the pamphlets which defended Parliament’s resistance against the King in the first English civil war (1642–1646), and the development of Parliament’s legal case in response to the pressures of mobilisation, ideas and events. The civil war was explained, narrated and defended in cheap print, which was consumed by the reading public who were hungry for news, ideas and justifications. Increasingly, pamphlets used the device of an implied reader to construct obedience and solve the political problems thrown up by the debate, but this unprecedented opening-up of legal issues to public debate further complicated the parliamentary cause.

The thesis also integrates the printers and publishers who facilitated this public debate into its account of legal, political and religious ideas. By using typographic and bibliographic techniques, the thesis suggests that printers and publishers held coherent political and religious identities, and could exert influence over not only the pamphlets they produced, but increasingly the way that the parliamentary cause was understood.

As the concept of allegiance becomes more problematic, and as histories of the civil war focus more on the concept of mobilisation and the construction of the parliamentary cause, this thesis argues that closer contextualisation and a chronological examination of the debate elucidates in greater detail the complexities and complications of the parliamentarian position. By tracing the way that Parliament’s case developed throughout the conflict and the ways in which their justification had to flex to accommodate new ideas and events, this thesis examines the legitimising frameworks that pamphlet authors used to explain the civil war, which through the course of the conflict became increasingly contested and destabilised under the weight of the polemical pamphlets themselves.

The collapse of these legitimising frameworks, combined with a partisan press willing to intervene in the debate and a jury of readers willing to bring their own legal understandings to the issues of the day, left the parliamentary cause fractured and ultimately created a political environment where settlement could not be achieved.
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ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

CJ  Journal of the House of Commons

CSP Ven  Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, ed. Allen B. Hinds (1925).

EEBO  Early English Books Online

ESTC  English Short Title Catalogue

LJ  Journal of the House of Lords

ODNB  Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
NOTE ON DATES AND TRANSCRIPTIONS

Dates are given in old style, but with the new year taken to be on 1 January. While original spelling and grammar have normally been preserved in quotations, they have been updated to clarify meaning if necessary. All seventeenth-century works in the footnotes and the bibliography either have the Thomason Tract reference or the Wing reference when first used, along with a shortened title. The first reference to seventeenth-century works also include, if available, the ‘Thomason date’ in square brackets. These dates, written by George Thomason on the title page of his works, do not necessarily denote the day of publication, as Thomason may have also written it according to the day of acquisition or cataloguing. If this is not available, the ‘Fortescue date’ is used and is denoted by the prefix ‘FD’. This relies on the dates given in G.K. Fortescue, Catalogue of the pamphlets, books, newspapers, and manuscripts relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth and the Restoration, collected by George Thomason, 1640-1661 (1908). While the ‘Fortescue date’ can be a good guide to chronology when there is no ‘Thomason date’, occasionally Fortescue ordered the works according to events that the works describe, rather than following Thomason’s ordering, and so again should not be considered to be an absolutely accurate date.
INTRODUCTION

In September 1642 Peter Bland, a young lawyer from Grays Inn, composed a pamphlet to ‘convince others more ignorant’ that no act ‘yet done’ by Parliament was illegal, but rather that their actions had been necessary and just. In the pamphlet he appealed to common, statutory and natural law, and concluded that ‘if the King forsake’ the Parliament, and ‘deny to passe those Bills they bring him for the good of the Kingdome’, then ‘necessity enables, nay commands them [the Parliament] to doe it without him’.

His contradictory and at times inflammatory pamphlet began a short publishing career of only eight pamphlets over six months, yet offered his readers a glimpse into the way that the law worked. Through his writing, Bland invited the public to engage with and learn about the law, and summarised precedents and cases that were otherwise inaccessible to them. He also demonstrated how counterarguments might be made against his arguments, and showed where the ‘fallacie’ and ‘mistake’ lay in those counterarguments. It was, in short, a whistle-stop tour of legal argument; a manual on how to defend Parliament and its actions that offered the reader a tantalising taster of legal rhetoric. Bland’s writing and style of argument, however, was lacking in finesse – he had quickly got himself in hot water by attempting to demonstrate that a Parliament could overrule the King through examples of depositions and regicides. A few weeks after his first pamphlet, he had to publish – at his own cost – a redaction that blamed a missing leaf at the printers to distance himself from the perception that he had declared that it was lawful for the Parliament to depose the King.

Bland then turned his legal argument to focus on the way that hereditary powers were inherited. His prefatory writings in his first few pamphlets revealed his motivation for

---

1 Peter Bland, *Resolved upon the question: Or A question resolved concerning the right which the King hath to Hull, or any other fort or place of strength for the defence of the kingdom.* VVherein is likewise proved, that neither the settling of the militia as tis done by the Parliament, nor the keeping of Hull by Sir Iohn Hotham, nor any other act that the Parliament have yet done is illegall, but necessary, just, and according to that power which the law hath given them (Printed for Matthew Walbancke, [29 September] 1642) E.119[4], pp. 15-6.

2 Ibid., p. 9.

3 Peter Bland, *A royall position, whereby ’tis proved, that ’tis against the common laws of England to depose a king: or, An addition to a book, intituled, Resolved upon the question: or, A question resolved concerning the right which the King hath to Hull, or any other fort of place of strength for the defence of the kingdom* (Printed for John Field, 1642) Wing B3163.
going to press – he wrote not to suggest that ‘Parliament knew not Law sufficient to
justifie their own actions, but to destroy their wonder whom he hath heard admire that
the Parliament did not prove their own actions by visible Law, as well as disprove the
Kings’. Bland assumed that ‘time and greater engagements will not permit [Parliament]
to shew every private man the publicke necessities’, so he joined a growing number of
parliamentarian writers who aimed to do just that. He (and others like him) wrote to
resolve for his reader that Parliament was acting legally, and would often stress that the
responsibility lay with the reader to catch up with Parliament’s argument, rather than
with the Parliament to make their argument clearer. His writings shine a light on a
number of hitherto under-explored aspects of the civil war: the way that legal and
constitutional argument was used in the partisan pamphlets; the way in which
pamphlets offered the reader a glimpse of the complexity of the law and expected them
to understand it; and how the reader was expected or even obliged to follow these
debates. Bland’s writings suggest a relationship between the mechanics of political
pamphlet debate, and the arguments that the pamphlets were making, as well as a
relationship between the way that the law was written, and the audience that it was
intended for.

This thesis is an investigation into the methods, limitations and consequences of the
efforts of the parliamentarian writers who tried to defend Parliament in their resistance
against the King. By examining political pamphlets printed within the first English civil
war, from 1642 to 1646, this thesis responds to the recent lack of examination of legal and
constitutional argument from the early 1640s. In doing so, it works towards setting out
not just an account of the political debate, but also an account of how political debate
worked in such a turbulent period.

This thesis also responds to the recent transformation in the understanding of allegiance
and political thought; both have undergone refashioning, which has led to a need for a
greater degree of political contextualisation above and beyond the scope of conventional
studies of political thought during the civil war. Political conversations describing
events, justifying measures and mobilising the reading public took place not just in
extra-ordinary works, but in ephemeral pamphlets, too.

---

4 Bland, Resolved upon the question, p. 4.
5 Ibid.
Analysis of the political debate through these ephemeral pamphlets reveals three interconnected themes. The first is the changing relationship between an implied reader constructed by the political pamphlets and the argument presented in them, and the parameters of the acceptable role that the implied reader could play within the parliamentarian case. The second explores the relationship between legal theory and politics in a period when the inconsistencies and contradictions of the law coincided with unprecedented public debate and scrutiny of politics within Parliament itself. The third theme is the relationship between those that made pamphlets – the printers, booksellers, and publishers – and the arguments that their output made. By considering the interplay between the role of the implied reader, the open and sustained debate of intellectual issues in public forums, and the sociological and political processes by which these debates became public, the analysis helps to shine light on the pressures faced by those that wrote, made and read the pamphlets that tried to make sense of the first English civil war.

I. REVISIONISM, POST-REVISIONISM AND THE FLUCTUATING MARKERS OF ALLEGIANCE

Over the last 40 years, the historiography of allegiance has been transformed. The ‘Whig’ and the ‘Marxist’ tradition, which emphasised either the larger constitutional and structural problems of the state or a bourgeois revolution that was driven by social upheaval, have been discarded as determinist and teleological.6 Revisionism revolted against these ‘materialist or determinist histories and historiographies’,7 and instead historians such as John Morrill looked towards religious factors as being key in determining how a certain side was chosen.8 Throughout the second half of the 20th century, historians have been fascinated with the question of what made people fight for a certain side, and for some this has led to re-examination of the localities. For example, David Underdown has argued that those localities who favoured popular royalism were normally arable and conservative, and those who supported popular parliamentarianism

---

were mainly from the woodlands and the uplands, and driven to reform. Such studies found that allegiance could be related to pre-existing social, political and cultural forces.\textsuperscript{9}

Increasingly, however, historians have argued that these accounts rely too much on a fixed understanding of allegiance that does not accurately reflect the experience of war.\textsuperscript{10} In recent scholarship, the participants of the conflict have become less binary, and words such as ‘factionalism’ and ‘coalition’ have become much more prominent in the accounts of parliamentarian politics.\textsuperscript{11} Historians no longer see allegiance as a rational choice between two sides that remained constant throughout the conflict, and recognise that to fight for the Parliament in March 1642 and in July 1646 was to fight for two very different ideologies. Morrill has highlighted the series of challenges that contemporaries faced – whether to act under the Militia Ordinance or the Commissions of Array, to obey orders from those who had, to pay loans, and so on – and called it ‘a continuous stream of options’.\textsuperscript{12} Allegiance as a concept is now much more complex and, as Jason McElligott and David Smith have recently argued, is not a ‘fixed, unchanging and unchangeable entity’.\textsuperscript{13}

Furthermore, some historians have contested a too simplistic notion of allegiance, and have suggested that an individual might be shown to have different allegiances displayed separately through external actions and internal beliefs. Rachel Weil has argued that the "idea that allegiance existed in a person’s "heart of hearts" may be anachronistic with


\textsuperscript{10} On this, see Ian Gentles, \textit{The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652} (Harlow, 2007), pp. 140-4; Andrew James Hopper, \textit{Turncoats and Renegades: Changing Sides During the English Civil Wars} (Oxford, 2012), pp. 2-6.


\textsuperscript{12} John Morrill, \textit{The Nature of the English Revolution} (London, 1993), p. 188.

\textsuperscript{13} Jason McElligott and David L. Smith, 'Introduction: Rethinking Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum', in Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (eds), \textit{Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum} (Manchester, 2010), p. 15.
respect to early modern mentalities’, and that instead allegiance should refer to external actions.\(^{14}\) Weil suggests that we should embrace the examination of external actions, rather than becoming obsessed with the uncovering of a ‘purely internal and purely political belief’, bereft of ‘external perception, malicious accusation, financial circumstance, and bureaucratic procedure’.\(^ {15}\) The suggestion took as inspiration work by Ann Hughes in the 1980s which argued that the Warwickshire Indemnity Committee ‘encouraged and helped construct political division’, and that circumstantial conditions forced people to act in certain ways by making them choose between polarised markers of allegiance.\(^ {16}\) More recently, Hughes has argued that contemporaries acknowledged it ‘was painfully obvious that political obligation was not natural or innate, but a matter to be negotiated and constructed’.\(^ {17}\) A historian is now required to examine the circumstances of the events that forced the historical actor to make a decision in order to understand what that decision might signify, meaning that there is a need for study of particular campaigns and the polarised markers of allegiance that were constructed either by institutions or, increasingly throughout the civil war, print.

In the wake of these criticisms, Michael Braddick has suggested using the concept of mobilisation – the ‘influenc[ing] or bypass[ing of] the formal institution of government through appeal to opinion outside them’ – rather than a notion of fixed allegiance in examinations of historical actors.\(^ {18}\) Braddick writes that those involved in attempts to mobilise through printed pamphlets ‘competed for control of standard languages and metaphors’, corroding the ‘authority and legitimacy of the formal institutions of government’, but also prompting intellectual creativity and wider distribution of arguments and ideas.\(^ {19}\) Print could generalise incidents and give them national


\(^ {19}\) Braddick, ‘Mobilisation’, p. 176.
consequences, but it could also, when challenged, lead to escalation of ideas.\textsuperscript{20} Print had to explain what was happening, what it meant, and who to believe, and could lead to the possibility of multiple mobilisations within both royalist and parliamentarian coalitions.\textsuperscript{21} In short, the concept of mobilisation allows a historian to examine how people reacted to specific developments as they happened without pigeonholing the actor into a binary category, or needing to find a political or religious coherence in their beliefs.

The concept of mobilisation allows a historian to focus not on attempting to understand what people thought, but rather investigating how they responded to certain situations. Political ideas are to be considered in tandem with the political events that prompted them, ensuring a clear emphasis on an individual’s choices. Focusing on responses to particular problems, rather than fixed markers of allegiance, allows us to examine the process by which decisions are made – decisions which are later (and often anachronistically) categorised into a binary by historians. Decisions have consequences that might appear on one side or another of a binary, but the decision itself should not necessarily be seen as an active marker of allegiance. By examining actions with due attention to the immediate climate of the political decisions that they were being forced to respond to, we can understand the context in which historical actors took these decisions, what might have prompted them to do so, and what it meant at the time to make such a decision.

A focus on the specific events that necessitated decisions, rather than a broader categorisation of actions, means that the focus should be on the way that a historical actor’s actions were justified. Rather than reconstruct the actor’s motivations – which may have been lost to time – Quentin Skinner has recommended that we consider the way that they legitimate their actions. By this, he is referring to the means by which people justify their actions, and their use of ‘intersubjectively normative’ vocabulary – intersubjective in the sense that the words are defined by a community, rather than an individual, and normative in the sense that they are ‘words that not only describe, but, in describing, also evaluate’.\textsuperscript{22} Thus, the process of legitimisation requires an agent to not

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 182, 190.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 192.
\end{itemize}
just ‘tailor his normative language in order to fit his project’, but also to tailor ‘his
projects in order to fit the available normative language’.\textsuperscript{23} Legitimisation then can have
two roles: ‘repressive and productive’ – productive in the sense that it could empower
action, and repressive in the twin senses that actions needed to be either restricted and
curtailed to correlate with the initial project, or the project itself could be dictated by the
vocabulary surrounding it.\textsuperscript{24} Applying this methodology, Barbara Donagan has
convincingly demonstrated how, by focusing on the way that actions were legitimated, a
historian can examine how the action of supporting Parliament shifts without presuming
(or imposing) a cause for supporting Parliament.\textsuperscript{25}

Because actions were legitimated by appeals to the law, the central authority and ability
of the law to interpret and guide was challenged and negotiated. This, as Skinner assures
us, happens to most legitimising vocabularies which are intersubjective by nature, but its
effect is particularly noticeable in the law. The law operated both as a vocabulary and as
a source of authority, and these roles bled into each other. As actions were legitimated
using the law, the authority of the law was eroded.

II. POLITICAL THOUGHT

In the 1960s, the history of political thought came under increasing attack for failing to
examine the context in which ‘great’ works of political thought were created. The ‘status
quo’, according to Skinner (a pioneer of the Cambridge School), was to read texts ‘as
though they were written by a contemporary’, and use that reading to examine
‘fundamental concepts’ that were timeless.\textsuperscript{26} The ‘fundamental concepts’ that were being
appealed to were actually modern creations, and by searching for a ‘doctrine’ that was
‘constitutive of the subject’, historians were constructing rather than discovering
coherence, and condemning writers for failing to meet anachronistic expectations of the

\textsuperscript{23} Quentin Skinner, \textit{The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Vol. I. The Renaissance}

\textsuperscript{24} Tully, ‘Pen Is a Mighty Sword’, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{25} Barbara Donagan, ‘Casuistry and Allegiance in the English Civil War’, in Derek Hirst and
Richard Strier (eds), \textit{Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England}
(Cambridge, 1999), p. 90.

\textsuperscript{26} Quentin Skinner, ‘Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas’, in Quentin Skinner
In order that these ‘dangers might be avoided’, Skinner argues that if ‘we wish to understand a text, we need to give an account not merely of the meaning of what was said, but also of what the writer in question may have meant by saying what was said’.\(^\text{28}\) However, in order to understand the ‘illocutionary intentions’ of the author, ‘we need first of all to grasp the nature and range of things that could recognisably have been done by using that particular concept, in the treatment of that particular theme, at that particular time’.\(^\text{29}\) The examination of language, then, is crucial for the reconstruction of context.

J. G. A. Pocock also used linguistic analysis in order to recover context, although broadly his method focused less on the individual author. His work *The Ancient Constitution* uncovered what he called the ‘common-law mind’, which was the shared language of politics that dominated the early 17\(^\text{th}\) century, and Pocock emphasised the importance of vocabulary in political thought.\(^\text{30}\) For him, language (or in his later works, ‘discourse’) was the vocabulary of politics, and the historian should ‘show how it functioned paradigmatically to prescribe what [the contemporary] might say and how [the contemporary] might say it’.\(^\text{31}\) In other words, language could constrain behaviour, as well as convey meaning, and thus for Pocock texts get their meanings from language, rather than the author.\(^\text{32}\)

In the wake of these important interventions, attention is increasingly being paid to the importance of ‘minor’ works. According to Richard Ashcraft, political theory should not be ‘confined to a few great books that [are] the conceptual property of a few extraordinary individuals’, but rather a ‘more descriptively diverse characterization of political theory is needed precisely in order to appreciate the breadth and scope as a

\(^{27}\) Ibid., pp. 59-67.

\(^{28}\) Ibid., p. 79.


cultural phenomenon’. Lesser contemporary political writers, Ashcraft has argued elsewhere, have been ignored which has meant that a picture of a ‘genius isolated’ has developed, and this needs to be challenged. To understand these great works, we need to understand that they were engaged in a dialogue with the texts surrounding them. This is, in essence, what the Cambridge School attempts to rectify, but in doing so it risks continuing to denigrate ‘minor’ works, and in practical terms, the focus remains somewhat anachronistic. As Mark Knights puts it, disciples of the Cambridge method stress the importance of contextual methodology not because they are ‘interested in the minor works’, but rather to use the minor works to better inform the account of the ‘major works’. He continues that ‘minor works are only minor if one is interested in exploring canonical writers’, or if it is believed that these canonical writers ‘are the main motors of linguistic and conceptual change’. However, as Knights’ study and others have demonstrated, minor works often make important interventions into the meaning of languages, concepts and theories that underpin politics. The ongoing dialogue and conversation, in other words, are worthy of examination on their own terms, not just as a precursor to understanding ‘great’ works.

As such, the methodological treatises of Pocock and Skinner were written to ‘justify an existing historical practice’, rather than to necessarily transform who or what should be examined. Indeed, Skinner has since explained that he aimed to do ‘for Hobbes what [Peter] Laslett had done for Locke’. Because of this, the Cambridge School method often creates an account of political thought that looks broadly similar to those that

36 Ibid., p. 46; A similar point is made by Kevin M. Sharpe, Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies (London, 1989), pp. 4-9.
38 Skinner quoted in ibid.
preceded it, and the canonical texts have remained canonical. Mark Goldie, commenting on Skinner’s *Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, has emphasised that his style of scholarship has paradoxically led to a focus on discourses, rather than authors and texts. At the same time, it is often difficult to distinguish how that approach differs from examinations by political theorists. Skinner has been criticised for the questions that he is asking of sources – John Coffey has argued that his historical practice consistently neglects religion for a secularised politics, as has Keith Thomas. Indeed, Thomas suggests that the reason for this may be because Skinner aims to examine past solutions and apply them to modern problems – teleology is inevitable because of the conversation that Skinner wants to take part in: the nature of liberty and republicanism.

At times, then, there is a disparity between the methodological aims of the Cambridge School, and the histories that those following the Cambridge method have achieved. By looking more broadly than the canonical works and significant figures, and focusing on the ‘minor’ as well as the ‘major’, there can be a new contextualised political history of the civil war.

Scepticism towards the notion of a clear elite/popular divide has led historians to discuss more complex models of social order, which has in turn impacted the places where politics might be seen. A less strict division can help account for the middling sort, and

---


also account for pamphlet culture and its contents being available to a very wide population, both socially and geographically. While their experience of exposure to print would vary in its intensity, it was possible for audiences to interact with print without necessarily purchasing the pamphlets themselves, meaning that unprecedented levels of print were available to an unprecedented audience. While sharp distinctions were still drawn by contemporaries between polite and plebeian culture, and those who were involved in collecting and collating a wide range of pamphlets such as Thomason would distinguish between the two, this simple binary has been supplanted in recent analysis by a more complex picture.

One of the consequences of Revisionism was that the social depths of politics became shallower. The ‘principle-centred’ account of politics was replaced by one that focused on a high political culture based in the court. Regions and localities which once were seen by historians such as Brian Manning as geographical-economies that could help explain popular politics were repainted in accounts that tended towards either a lack of awareness of political debates, or stressed a neutralism and passivity. The focus of politics was drawn to ‘high’ political actors, rather than a wider political consciousness, which might in part be attributed to the Revisionist suspicion of printed material, preferring to focus on manuscript sources instead. However, as work by historians such

---


46 Peacey, Print and Public Politics, pp. 80-8.

47 Harris, ‘Popular, Plebian, Culture’, p. 52.


as Thomas Cogswell, Alastair Bellany and Jason Peacey demonstrates, a wider range of sources can greatly inform our understanding of politics in early Stuart England.\(^{51}\) Work by historians such as Andy Wood has highlighted that early assessment of the population of the lower orders as pre-political was misguided. Rather, while elites pored over tomes, ‘more humble individuals were making their own appeals’ to the past in order to prove their undeniable rights, revealing themselves to be just as political.\(^{52}\) The laws could be used proactively, and to legitimate action. For example, agrarian protests ‘drew justification from the law’, and claimed to be defending the law rather than subverting it.\(^{53}\) Those involved in enclosure riots could exploit ambiguous legal definitions by ensuring that just two people were involved in disputes rather than more, meaning that they would be charged with the much lesser crime of trespassing, rather than the charge of rioting which required three or more people.\(^{54}\) Legal institutions provided an arena in which actors could plead their poverty, and Steve Hindle has shown that they would often do so, showing political savvy and understanding.\(^{55}\) On a bigger scale, Mark Goldie has described an ‘unacknowledged republic’, where there was a supreme monarch, but also citizens who saw themselves as ‘self-governing communities’. The chance of an adult male holding office was high, and they were invited to take part of the governing of the state.\(^{56}\) Furthermore, historians such as John Walter and Ted


\(^{55}\) Steve Hindle, The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, c.1550-1640 (Basingstoke, 2000).

Vallance have stressed the importance of the state oaths. Walter has argued that the Protestantation was the culmination of a ‘call to active citizenship’ to ‘provide the support in the form of money and men to fight a civil war’. It was both a ‘call to duty’ and a ‘call to conscience’. The Protestantation was a legitimising tool that empowered behaviour and action, which reciprocally empowered and, at times, could be used against the Parliament. Vallance has examined the use of state oaths, and has argued that they enjoyed a much wider breadth of participation than had previously been thought. Prior to the civil war, popular culture was imbued with political meaning, and the civil war helped create a space where this political culture could be performed. Early seventeenth century England, then, has been shown to be a much more political nation than had previously been considered.

Studies of politics and cheap print take inspiration from research that has examined wider reading practices. In a number of studies, historians have clearly demonstrated that common and shared languages could have great depth, and reading practices could demonstrate real engagement with topical issues at hand. Work by Margaret Spufford has emphasised that cheap books were not just consumed by the middling or lower sorts, but rather they were consumed by a much wider audience than is sometimes given credit, and Tessa Watt has argued that there was a ‘two-way cultural flow’ between London and the country. Alexandra Walsham has shown that providentialism was not just the beliefs of some ‘zealous Protestants’, but was rather a much wider phenomenon. Peter Lake and Michael Questier has demonstrated that ‘murder pamphlets’ had a complex relationship with the popular, and used their violent and pornographic content in order to make sophisticated arguments about the nature of


Protestantism, politics and providence. Through their work on Protestantism, these historians have emphasised the benefit of the study of 'cheap' print, and demonstrated that it can reveal two-way relationships between readers and authors. Printed works could bring divinity, theology and liturgy to a wide and practically engaged audience.

Transformations in the understanding of political thought, an expansion of the political nation and the recent scholarship on reading and Protestantism have shown that by widening the scope of studies, we can develop a more nuanced account of the politics of the early seventeenth century.

Previous studies of the pamphlet debates of the civil war normally involve examination of the same authors and their significant pamphlets: Henry Parker, William Prynne, Charles Herle, Philip Hunton and Edward Bowles as defenders of Parliament; Henry Ferne, Edward Hyde and John Bramhall as its attackers. On occasion, certain anonymous pamphlets are also considered important, namely Touching the Fundamentall Lawes (1643), and Remonstrans Redivivus (1643). Examination of the political thought of the early 1640s has remained focused on pamphlets of known authorship, with a few exceptions.

This is partly due to a lack of investigation into the political thought of the 1640s more generally. Often, studies on the topic stop either in 1640 or in 1642. Those works that do continue into the civil war have their focus either on specific well-known writers, such as Prynne or Parker, or are wider survey studies encompassing the century, rather than the decade. Establishing more exactly the nascence and nature of these political ideas

---

63 Glenn Burgess, British Political Thought, 1500-1660: The Politics of the Post-Reformation (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 193-211.
64 For example in Rachel Foxley, The Levellers: Radical Political Thought in the English Revolution (Manchester, 2013), pp. 35-6.
66 William Lamont, Marginal Prynne, 1600-69 (London, 1963); Michael Mendle, Henry Parker and the English Civil War: The Political Thought of the Public’s “Privado” (Cambridge, 1995); Burgess,
would not only inform our account of the war itself, it could also help us understand how these political ideas emerged, and what precipitated their development.

Studies have tended to view parliamentarian political theorising as monolithic and unanimous, but a coherent Parliamentary political position is often difficult to find, and at times was explicitly contradictory (compare, for example the declarations of the 19 May and the 26 May 1642). Increasingly, it is becoming clear that there was not necessarily a consistent Parliamentary position, but rather that parliamentarianism was a coalition bound together mainly by the fact that they were fighting against the King. Because parliamentarian thought was so scattered, it becomes even more important to look at the granular detail. Many historians who have examined the political thought of the early 1640s use the period as a precursor to the theories of later groups such as the Levellers, rather than examining the thought of the early 1640s itself. Such an approach can create both teleological and episodic accounts of the debate – teleological in the sense that it is assumed that ideas, once arrived at, remained constant and not tied to context, and episodic in the sense that often months are suggested as having gone by without polemical developments. Ernest Sirluck, Louis G. Schwoerer and David Wootton are exceptions to the rule in that they have examined a much wider number of pamphlets, allowing a historian a glimpse into the confusions, contradictions and incoherence of pamphlet debates in the early 1640s.

Sirluck, in an introduction to the debates of the 1640s that arguably has never been surpassed, describes the 'Debate-at-Law', grouping an impressive number of pamphlets into lines of attack. Royalist tracts either argued that the public would suffer just as much under Parliament as they had under Charles, that the power entrusted to Parliament could be withdrawn, that they should follow the divine rights of kings, or
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67 See below.

68 Foxley, 'Varieties', p. 420.

argued that natural law was insufficient. Parliamentary defences either claimed Parliament’s supremacy over positive laws, attempted to argue that their actions were in fact following positive law, attacked the notion that the people could withdraw their trust, or attempted to reimagine the constitution so that the people had to obey Parliament because it acted for their preservation. Ultimately this work stands as a contextual essay for examination into John Milton’s works, but remains an excellent companion to early legal debates. Schwoerer has examined the militia crisis and argued that the debates helped polarise the nation, and led to ‘probing examinations of political and constitutional questions’. The article’s strength is that rather than belittling the inconsistency of the debates, it often relishes the incoherence of the works, allowing authors autonomy to change their opinion, and for them to hold multiple and often incompatible views. Wootton has looked to the same period, and argued that the transition from rebellion to revolution occurred in the winter of 1642/3, where pamphlets suggested changes to the constitution. Such studies show how productive it can be to acknowledge, rather than smooth over, the inconsistencies of political thought in the period when building a picture of the legal-political landscape.

The recent focus on the concept of mobilisation, rather than allegiance, has changed the way that we need to approach political thought in the early 1640s. If we cannot identify clear markers of allegiance with which to categorise participants because the decisions they made were continuous, active and flexible, then we must apply the same caution to the political print that guided and fuelled these choices. Those who were being asked to make immediate and complex decisions with inevitable consequences relied on pamphlets that were context-specific – works that were prompted by events, rather than self-sufficient theses – and therefore the pamphlets should be studied as part of an ongoing and closely contextualised conversation. If historians isolate the ideas from that conversation, we are at risk of stripping away the reasons why the process of the debates in the civil war was so demanding on the shared political languages, and why these decisions were so agonising. People were being forced to make choices to which there was no easy answer for the problems posed to them. More often than not, printed works

71 Ibid., pp. 38-45.
72 Schwoerer, ”The Fittest Subject for a King’s Quarrel”, p. 46.
73 Wootton, ‘From Rebellion to Revolution’.
were interventions – moments in an ongoing process of political thinking – rather than works of political thought intended for posterity.

To pay attention to such detail is in one sense a continuation of the trend started by the Cambridge School towards contextualisation, and immersion in a wider pool of texts. Often, however, the practice of this method does not go far enough – pamphlets were first and foremost a response to contemporary political events, to what happened last week in the streets surrounding the Houses of Parliament, or to the experience of a military disaster at Brentford, and unless the pamphlets are contextualised in their individual political moments, there is a danger of either misinterpretation, or over-interpretation. Examining the political, military and financial contexts is vital in reconstructing why pamphlets argued what they did, partly because the relationship between ideas and events is not a simple one. Ideas presented in pamphlets were dependent on events because often the conviction in the righteousness of a cause and the ideas that justified it had a reciprocal relationship – both reinforced and confirmed the other. As Kevin Sharpe reminds us, events could necessitate new ideas, as measures taken by the Parliament needed to be defended and justified, rather than vice versa. Much as the concept of mobilisation encourages the historian to examine the context of the decisions by the actors, contextualising the political ideas of the civil war requires the historian to also examine what events prompted those ideas and, to some degree, made those ideas necessary.

Alongside ideas and events, the mechanics of pamphlet debate itself also served to fuel political debate. Pamphlets not only worked to mobilise, but also to maintain momentum, and they often operated to justify pre-formulated opinions that the reader either already held, or needed to hold. This was, in part, because the concepts that legitimated mobilisation were constantly contested, needing protection and reiteration to maintain a favourable meaning. Control of language and a need to respond to opposing pamphlets, thus, was as key a part of the production of print as was arguing over abstract intellectual principles or making sense of events.
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75 Sharpe, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England*, pp. 3-10, 63-8.
This study will examine the complexities of these arguments and their contexts with a focus on the law. The law was an important mechanism for political thought – indeed it was arguably the most crucial framework for discussions of justice, sovereignty and religious truth in seventeenth century England. A focus on legal themes in polemical pamphlets can therefore help elucidate in new detail the ways that politics worked during the civil war.

III. LEGAL POLEMIC

In order to examine the way that the pamphlets work, this thesis distinguishes between frameworks and polemic in the following way. Frameworks were the arena within which the political discussion took place, and were established by official Parliamentary sources. The frameworks relied either upon one or several claims to authority, for example the law, and set the languages and parameters of the political debate. On a secondary level, the polemic utilised a set of justificatory tools based on the established framework to demonstrate their case for their chosen side. In these works there was space for creative licence – pamphleteers could push the boundaries of the framework, and do so to further their own political or, increasingly, their religious ends. While the polemic was dependent on the framework in order to construct argument, there was a reciprocal relationship between the two, where the process of constructing polemical pamphlets inevitably shaped and distorted the frameworks that the arguments relied upon.

As is almost a cliché in works that discuss the law, it is important to stress that early modern England was bound in a universal faith in the law, and that it regulated every aspect of life. The law was used to both extend the authority of the state, and was also its claim to authority, and the English believed their law was eternal, impartial, and perfect. By far the most influential analysis explaining this phenomenon, and the way that the law was so treasured, remains Pocock’s account of the ‘common law mind’. He argued – largely based on the works of jurist Edward Coke – that immemorial custom was revered by early modern English society, and because it had existed for so long


78 Pocock, The Ancient Constitution.
reason dictated that it should not be changed. As generations had considered the common law to be suitable and profitable to their existence, why should later generations challenge it, and deny the logic of their inheritance? Glenn Burgess has reinforced this concept against attacks by historians such as Johann Sommerville by highlighting the deep-set consensus, and has described a ‘shared language of an entire political nation’ based on the common law.\(^79\) By appealing to this ‘shared language’ – what this thesis refers to as a framework – politicians were appealing to the dominant ideological concept.

However, it is important to recognise that, despite its centrality to the language of politics, the law had several fundamental qualities which made it remarkably unsuitable as a framework for sustained polemical debate. Firstly, there was an inherent tension between ‘artificial reasoning’ – the method that lawyers had developed to truly appreciate the ‘rationality and coherence of English law’, and in turn to ‘interpret the world plausibly to contemporaries’\(^80\) – and the need for arguments to be persuasive. Reasoning was being used to persuade the reader, but that reasoning was expected to persuade the reader while simultaneously denying that the reader could meaningfully acknowledge the reasoning unless they were trained lawyers. Thus, the glorification of the common law based on reason often in practice sat uneasily with the lawyers’ monopoly of understanding.\(^81\) The system as a whole relied on consensus, rather than disputes. Harris has emphasised that often rather than fighting against the system, participants were working within it to try and get it to work again.\(^82\) Similarly, the arcana imperii drew power from the fact that it could solve problems, and when this broke down efforts were made to repair it.\(^83\)


\(^{82}\) Tim Harris, 'Revisiting the Causes of the English Civil War', Huntington Library Quarterly, 78 (Winter 2015), pp. 620-5; A similar argument is made by Sharpe, Political Ideas in Early Stuart England, pp. 63-8.

Secondly, the process of printing the law in text form meant that it increasingly became open to interpretation, threatening the lawyers’ legal monopoly. Jerome de Groot suggested that the royalists constructed a ‘legal space’ in which to argue their political position through their pamphlet publications, and as a result of this, the law that was publically read and debated ‘was no longer innate and inviolate, but normative and contingent, subject to qualification and discussion’. He focuses on propaganda (that is to say, sanctioned works) rather than wider polemic but highlights that authors, by challenging those who disagreed with their legal understanding, were able to accuse their opponents of threatening to destroy society itself. Textualising the law also meant that the author could exert influence over the law itself. The author of published work could ‘project intellectual power better than the writer of manuscripts’, and in doing so claim their own authority over the law. As controls over the transmission of texts were reduced, lay readers would read what they wanted, not simply what they were told to read by lawyers. Tied to this, Sharon Achinstein has argued that writers created a ‘revolutionary reader’ when ‘writers sought to arm readers with equipment with which to fend off enemy opinions’, invited them to enter a political debate ‘by learning how to read and understand political rhetoric’, and equipped them ‘to deal with propaganda’ and polemic. Readers could be used to disarm opposing views, and once trained might be trusted to maintain a ‘correct’ understanding.

Thirdly, the process of printing gave the printer power to decide which legal works should be reproduced and which ignored, and introduced economic imperatives. Legal works increasingly became commodities, and thus the reasoning within the pamphlets was dependent on market as well as intellectual forces. In short, by writing and printing the law, authors and printers were able to be directly involved in changing what it said if
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they could get enough people to read and agree with their understandings. To print the law was ‘both the dissemination and exercise of power’.89

These features of the law – a claim to rest on a singular truth, and its vulnerability to change both through writing and printing – meant that it was a fundamentally unstable framework. The most significant consequence of this was that in order to continue to appear omniscient, the law was required to mutate – the law was therefore both unchanging and constantly in flux. The problem in the early 1640s was that both sides had learned lawyers and divines fighting their respective cases, and declaring each other wrong or misguided; those well-educated men, pamphleteers argued, were either naturally ignorant, or were wilfully and maliciously ignorant. The efforts to disguise, protect, or advertise the law’s mutations depending on the political point intended all had destabilising impacts on the framework of the law.

IV. HOW THE DEBATE EVOLVED
In order to capture and analyse this shifting, unfixed characteristic of the law, this thesis focuses on the process of political thinking, rather than on political thought. Political thinking was the active process or conversation that took place day-to-day, and made sense of the events that occurred. Of course, political thinking and political thought were intimately linked, and the distinction between thinking and thought should by no means be considered a binary. Indeed, the active process of political thinking developed problems that needed to be resolved by political thought: the nature of sovereignty, the extent of Parliamentary power, the role of the public in the constitution. They are different parts of the same approach, rather than fundamentally distinct. As our understanding of what it meant to fight for Parliament or for the King becomes more complex, we need to adapt our understanding of the political thought and thinking that rationalised these decisions.

Because the conversation was taking place to make sense of unfolding contemporary events it had to respond with agility to the rapidly shifting political, military and financial circumstances. As war aims changed, so did the political discussion that was taking place, because often the discussion was a political, rather than an intellectual,

exercise. As such, political thinking in the pamphlets needed to be reactive to shifting contexts and circumstances, rather than proactive, suggesting that it was events, rather than ideas, that drove the pamphlet debate. To understand these events is to help reconstruct why the political debate charts the course that it did, and is to help identify why shared political languages were put under such strain that they broke down. In short, the micro-contexts are key to understanding the political ideas of the first civil war.

To account for this focus on micro-contexts, the texts studied were chosen using George Fortescue’s catalogue of the Thomason Tracts, which offers an imperfect but useful chronology of George Thomason’s pamphlets. This allows the historian to go through the printed works month-by-month, meaning that it is possible to be both sensitive to the shifting focus of the pamphlet discussion over time, while also identifying periods of intense printing activity. Pamphlets were selected when they offered an account of the conflict, or explicitly promised a discussion of the church or the law. As commodities as well as texts, pamphlet titles more often than not are instructive of their contents, advertising their subject to those browsing a bookseller’s shelves. The pamphlets selected through this method – normally consisting of around a quarter of Thomason’s monthly collection – were supplemented by those found in secondary reading, and by internal references or retorts within the texts themselves.

Attending to the process of political thinking necessitates expanding the scope of historical investigation to include not only authors but also other participants. Firstly, while political thinking could take place between authors who were explicitly involved in pamphlet debate, it could also take place between different printers and publishers who attempted to intervene in the political debate more implicitly. Work by Peacey has demonstrated that political ideas were repackaged and reiterated by partisan printers
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90 Peacey, Politicians and Pamphleteers, pp. 5-8.
working in collaboration with politicians in attempts to manipulate the pamphlet market. While anonymously printed pamphlets can obscure these efforts to influence the market, this thesis uncovers several printers with clear political and religious identities through the collection of the ornamental initials of individual printers between 1640 and July 1646. By using the attributed woodcuts, reproduced in the appendices, anonymously printed pamphlets can be examined and attributed likely printers. Thus, this thesis argues, printers were able to maintain coherent political identities, and present ideas about politics and the constitution in serial, and in doing so were political actors in themselves.

Secondly, readers played a crucial role in constructing and negotiating meaning, and could be used to legitimate parliamentary resistance against the King. Throughout the conflict, the role of the implied reader was contested and renegotiated – at the beginning of the conflict, the idea of an implied reader was used by pamphleteers to provide an extra-Parliamentary confirmation of who was best to judge the law. But increasingly, as the conflict developed, the implied reader was used to solve intellectual and theoretical problems about its political justifications, and was able to play a bigger role in the constitution, and in the understanding of the law and politics as a whole.

The political thinking that this thesis examines, then, took place within conversations that were constructed and negotiated by the triple pressures of authors, printers and publishers, and readers. The conversations that constitute this process of political thinking acted as both the means to define the purpose and nature of the conflict, and also offered the reader ways to understand the events and give them a broader meaning. As allegiance is being understood as a concept that is more fluid, our understanding of political thought similarly needs to be changed to account for the fluctuations and shifts in the meaning of the conflict. In light of these historiographical developments, this thesis has been written and the ideas presented in a broadly chronological way. Writing in this way means that the historian is forced to confront the gaps in the conversations as well as the continuations, and account for why topics might disappear from the political conversation. Such an approach means that we can see more clearly how ideas emerge, and how the way that the cause was defined changed the way that the cause was understood both by the polemic and by the readers more generally.
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Therefore the chapters take the following format, following the civil war through four chronological sections, separated when the debate changed significantly. Chapter One explores the legal and constitutional arguments of the paper war by focusing on the way that subjects were mobilised, and examines how the arguments made were formed under the pressure of polemical debate. In this debate, both sides claimed to be the ultimate arbiters of legal propriety, revealing and creating tensions in legal and constitutional views. Increasingly, as events pushed people into active choices, as pre-war posturing was transformed into preparation for war, and as the presses became open to more voices through the collapse of regulation, a meta-argument emerged over who was the ultimate arbiter in legal and constitutional dispute. Tensions over this question were to divide the parliamentary alliance throughout the 1640s, and also served to limit the power of Parliament’s claims.

Chapter Two examines the debate after the outbreak of actual war, and the effects of the associated military and political demands upon these uncertain foundations. By the summer of 1643, tensions within parliamentarianism over the question of arbitration had led to a fracturing of the parliamentary coalition. The Vow and Covenant of June 1643 was an attempt to resolve these issues by placing parliamentary legitimacy not on the basis of contested arguments about the law and constitution, but on a collective oath which at the same time would reveal who were the enemies of the parliamentary cause.

The Parliamentary forces’ military failures in the first half of 1643 and the threat of moves for peace led to a military alliance with the Scots that created a new framework for the polemical argument: the Solemn League and Covenant. Chapter Three examines the extent to which this new framework avoided contested arguments about the law and instead grounded the parliamentary cause on the future of Protestantism. This political and military alliance shifted the conversation dramatically within a new framework, and reversed the early Stuart achievement of the common law which had made the law the guardian of the true religion. Instead, parliamentary legitimacy now rested on its pursuit of the true religion rather than its legal claims.

Chapter Four examines the role that printers and publishers played in the development and understanding of the parliamentary cause. The logic of a developing public argument and the use of the imagined reader who was increasingly invoked as an arbiter meant that the cause of the conflict was continuously in flux. By using typographic and bibliographic techniques, this chapter examines the printers and publishers that
facilitated this public argument, and argues that some of them can be seen as being political agents in their own right.

Chapter Five examines the arguments at the end of the war, which culminated in the Newcastle Propositions. By July 1646, the parliamentarian polemic had become incoherent to all but Parliament’s most ardent followers, and the parliamentary coalition was deeply divided on fundamental questions in which there was considerable radical potential. At the heart of these divisions was the issue of the potential for Parliaments to act illegally or tyrannically, something that was being increasingly dramatized in prison writings. Furthermore, the attempt to ground Parliament’s claims on a version of true Protestantism had become equally problematic by 1645.

In the process of writing about Parliament’s case at the beginning of the conflict, Bland had opened himself, and the Parliament, up to criticism of not only the judgments that they reached, but also the means by which they reached the decisions, and the legitimacy of others to follow their decisions. By facilitating and encouraging public debate over statutes, legal reasoning and conscience, the polemic had constructed and came to rely upon an adjudicative and informed reader, who eventually proved unable to be contained by the parameters of the official frameworks.
Resolved, &c. That in this case of extrem danger, and of his Majesties refusall, the Ordinance agreed on by both houses for the Militia, doth oblige people, and ought to be obeyed by the Fundamentall Laws of this Kingdome.94

Houses of Parliament, ‘Severall Votes Resolved upon by both Houses of Parliament, concerning the securing of the Kingdome of England and Dominion of Wales’, (March 1642).

Concerning the Militia two quare’s are ordinarily made; to wit,
1. Whether it be lawfull for the Parliament to settle it without the Royall assent.
2. Whether it be lawfull for us to obey it, so setled by Them?95


This chapter examines the period between March and October 1642, in which debate was conducted for the benefit of the reading public over the legality of Parliament’s resistance against the King. The previous two years had seen the emergence of a
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94 Edward Husbands (ed.), An exact collection of all remonstrances, declarations, votes, orders, ordinances, proclamations, petitions, messages, answers, and other remarkable passages betweene the Kings most Excellent Majesty and his high court of Parliament beginning at His Majesties return from Scotland being in December 1641 and continued untill March the 21, 1643 which were formerly published either by the Kings Majesties command or by order from one or both Houses of Parliament : with a table wherein is most exactly digested all the fore-mentioned things according to their severall dates and dependancies (Printed for Edward Husbands, T. Warren, R. Best, FD: 21 March 1643), E.241[1]&E.243[1], p. 112. It should be noted that the construction and publication of An exact collection itself was a political intervention – see Braddick, God’s Fury, England’s Fire, pp. 272-3. To this end, whilst I have cited An exact collection for ease of access, I have also read the original pamphlets but found no difference in the text unless otherwise stated.

95 Richard Ward, The Vindication of the Parliament and their proceedings, or, Their military designe prov’d loyall and legall a treatise wherein these things are ingeniously and sincerely handled: to wit, 1. that the militia as setled by the Parliament is lawfull : 2. that it is lawfull for us to obey it, so setled by them : 3. that the Parliament is not to be deserted : 4. that in aiding the Parliament the King is not opposed : 5. that the Parliament, as the case stands, may not confide in the King : 6. that this necessary defensive warre of theirs is indubitably justifiable (s.n., [15 October] 1642) E.122[19], p. 2.
constitutional crisis driven by religious fears, in which Parliament and the King fought over executive powers. This led to the adoption of emergency custodial powers by the Houses of Parliament, with significant constitutional ramifications. During this crisis the King and the Parliament, and then later anonymous pamphleteers, began to produce works that justified their side’s position, and proved the opponent’s works wrong. The use of legal language as a framework for debate in these works opened the door to significant division and conflict over key legal concepts and terminology. Fundamentally, the process of framing debates within a legal framework, and the printing of legal arguments, meant that settlement between the King and the Parliament would be made much more difficult, and ultimately that the understanding of the law and the constitution as a whole would be transformed.

The constitutional crisis had brought with it a collapse in the meaningful authority of the law as a political language. Within politics, the law relied on consensus to provide solutions to political problems, but when opinion was divided and lawyers disagreed on fundamental points, a vacuum was created that had to be filled. This collapse was exacerbated by the process of printing and disseminating legal ideas so that it was not possible to disguise disagreements behind *arcana imperii*. Rather, readers were exposed to, and had to deal with, contesting legal claims of authority in an era of unprecedented printing of pamphlets.

The first section of this chapter examines how the theory of the Great Council, by which Parliament had justified their opposition to the King from 1640 to 1642, became increasingly problematic, and suggests that Parliament began to actively include the implied reader in its rhetoric in order to construct a positive imperative that the public were required to follow.

The conversation in the long summer of 1642, then, focused on the question of who should be the ultimate judge in the dispute between the King and his Parliament. Initially, the implied reader was appealed to in order to observe between two rival judges. They were to read different interpretations of statutes, and decide whose legal understanding was correct and whose was misguided. For example, according to the Parliament in their *Third Remonstrance*, ‘The case is now truly stated, and all the world may judge where the fault is, although we must avow that there can be no competent
Judge of this or any the like case but a Parliament'.\textsuperscript{96} However, the constitutional complexity of the debate, and the political needs of either side, led to the implied reader’s role expanding to a role of arbitration. The effect of this process was to expand the judicial space with which the public interacted, and in some cases to legitimise them to interpret and interact with the central concepts of the law.

However, there was a new complexity to this development. Both parliamentarians and royalists constructed legal cases that attempted to persuade the reader of their own legality through the printing of statutes and legal theories, while simultaneously emphasising that the reader had little or no legitimacy to decide on legal matters. Pamphleteers attempted to equip the reader with enough legal understanding to dismiss the opposing side’s sophistry, while maintaining that their pamphlet’s own legal arguments were unassailable, thus keeping the reader at arm’s length from the legal discussion. This contradiction – requiring an active critiquing of the opposing view but a passive acceptance of the pamphlet’s own case – was the inherent flaw in use of the law as the framework of the debate between the parliamentarian and royalist polemic, and was a key reason why the framework was unsustainable in the long term.

The second section will examine the way that the figure of the reader had became wholly integrated into the legal debate. References to readers were included in the rhetoric of authors in order to justify works going to press, and to validate the Parliament’s actions. As implied readers became an increasingly intrinsic part of the polemic, they could be used as solutions to, as well as excuses for, some of the political problems that writers, propagandists and theorists faced.

Between March and October 1642, the ‘paper wars’ saw the vacuum, which had been created by the collapse of meaningful authority of the law as a tool by which to resolve the constitutional crisis, filled by the inclusion of implied readers who played an increasingly key, but also frustrated, role in the construction of meaning. In short, the public were being constructed as arbiters, rather than observers.

\textsuperscript{96} A remonstrance or the declaration of the Lords and Commons, now assembled in Parliament, 26 of May, 1642 in answer to a declaration under His Majesties name concerning the businesse of Hull, sent in a message to both Houses the 21 of May, 1642 (Printed for Iohn Franke, FD: 26 May 1642) E.148[23], p. 18.
I. THE CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS

In the summer of 1642, the constitutional crisis in England reached a crescendo. Religious fears had driven Parliament to enact measures which had put pressure on accepted beliefs and practices, and had in turn revealed significant divisions in the understanding and process of the law. Parliament’s initial justification for resisting the King, based on the Great Council, did not contain any imperatives for the public to act, and therefore over the next several months more complex understandings of the law were sought out to ensure that the public would obey commands. Legal disagreements over who should judge the law would mean that a solution to the conflict became not only difficult, but increasingly untenable without a significant reassessment of the understanding of ‘the law’ and its place in the constitution.

1. RELIGIOUS FEARS AND THE GREAT COUNCIL

In 1640–42, the Houses of Parliament were driven to claim unprecedented emergency powers by a climate of intense anti-papery; prompted by elite and popular fears of papists, Parliament took control of the militia as a precautionary measure. Arguments for the necessity of these measures were initially based on theories of the Great Council and pervasive ‘evil’ counsellors within the King’s court. But the process of taking control of the militia would need to be legal, and required engagement with legal concepts and theories.

Parliament’s desire for control of the militia had been spurred on by fears that had religious origins, and this terror of papists was maintained throughout the civil war that ensued. The popular fear of papists was ‘extra-legal’, meaning it was not principally concerned with law, but at its highest level the threat they were seen to pose was towards the ‘fundamental laws and principles of government’.97 In addition to the papist threat to the everyday practice of Protestantism, it was feared that papists could subvert the established law, and thus shake the very foundation upon which the Protestant religion was based. The threat that papists represented was thus simultaneously religious and secular.

A significant component of the Ten Propositions in June 1641 were the measures to ensure that papist influence was stemmed. This included restricting the Queen’s

freedom to practise her religion or to have papists in her service; the education of the King’s children (‘especially in matters of religion and liberty’); and ensuring that papal influence at a court level was curbed.\textsuperscript{98} Indeed the leader (in all but name) of the House of Commons, John Pym, and the rest of the Parliamentary leadership seem to have been obsessed with the idea of a papist conspiracy.\textsuperscript{99} Likewise, the Irish Rebellion in late October 1641 had fed the public’s fears, and had provided their imaginations with armed papists committing religious atrocities. This crisis, carefully maintained by Pym, showed the public that there was a popish plot. Pamphlet literature, often accompanied with recycled woodcuts from Protestant suffering on the Continent and tales from John Foxe’s ‘\textit{Book of Martyrs}’, catalysed this hysteria.\textsuperscript{100}

The culmination of this trend of anti-popery was \textit{The Grand Remonstrance}, a declaration of Parliamentary grievances, which had attacked the Catholics for their part in a plot for the ‘eminent ruine and destruction’ of England and Scotland.\textsuperscript{101} Indeed, its list of concerns was prefixed first and foremost with complaints of ‘Jesuited Papists, who hate the laws, as the obstacles of that change and subversion of religion which they so much long for’.\textsuperscript{102} It gave a full account of the state of the kingdom, and claimed that Charles had been duped. However, it was also divisive. It passed in the Commons by a handful of votes, and it was decided that it could not be printed – the Lords did not give it their support at all.\textsuperscript{103}

These fears had led to the passing of legislation relating to the militia, which was then rejected by the King in February 1642. By rejecting the bill, the King had inadvertently given justification to Parliament to push the bill through as an ordinance, as Charles’s

\textsuperscript{98} ‘\textit{Die Jovis, 24 Junij, 1641. A Large Conference with the Lords, Concerning Several Particulars About Disbanding the Army, the Capuchins, &c’}, in John Rushworth (ed.), \textit{Historical Collections of Private Passages of State}, vol. 4. \textit{1640-42} (1721), pp. 279-303.

\textsuperscript{99} Fletcher, \textit{Outbreak}, p. 64.


\textsuperscript{101} ‘\textit{A Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdom presented to the King at Hampton Court, 1. Dec. 1641. in the Name of the Commons House of Parliament’} in Rushworth (ed.), \textit{Historical Collections of Private Passages of State}, vol. 4, pp. 436-471.

\textsuperscript{102} \textit{Ibid}.

rejection of the bill was used as the proof that Parliament needed to show that the King was absent and that there was an emergency. Parliament claimed its authority to act came from its traditional role as the Great Council, which was entrusted with ensuring the safety of the kingdom; by doing nothing, Parliament would not only be allowing the popish plot to continue, but also would mean that it, as a body, it was neglecting its role in a national emergency. During 1641 the theory of the Great Council had developed from a ‘Council in Parliament’ to a ‘Council of Parliament’, and meant that Parliament as a whole could now assume similar powers to the medieval concept of baronial councils. Parliament conceived itself as having a custodial role rather than a legislative one, that was empowered to solve the King’s absence until he was willing to cooperate with them once again.

This did, however, create a problem in constitutional law. Subjects could not be forced to accept any order that was not signed by the King, because he maintained a negative veto on legislation, regardless of common danger. According to Charles, ‘His Subjects cannot be Obliged to Obey any Act, Ordinance or Injunction to which His Majesty hath not given His consent: And therefore Hee thinks it necessary to publish, That Hee expects, and hereby requires Obedience from all His loving Subjects, to the Laws established’. For parliamentarians there lacked an obligation for positive action – legally, at least, if the King refused to sign the bill, the subject should do nothing. With Parliament’s taking control of the militia, this theoretical impasse became a reality, in which Parliament needed to find legal justification that overrode the King’s negative veto in order to force the subject to obey their commands. Thus, while Parliament could act as the Great Council in extraordinary times, this solution lacked the power to force the subject to obey.

Parliamentary declarations mirrored public fears, and charged Charles with thinking the crisis ‘causelesse, and without any just ground’. Parliament’s case was reliant on the supposition that the King was either unwilling or unable to deal with the papists, and therefore they needed to assume that power temporarily. Despite Parliament’s efforts,

---

this argument went, Charles was unwilling to see what a danger the kingdom was in, and was refusing to act in a suitable manner to solve the problem – in other words, he had rejected the bill because he thought it was unnecessary. The King responded to this accusation by arguing that he did not disagree that there was a need to settle the militia, but that the use of an ordinance was the wrong method. Indeed, Charles quickly retorted that he wanted an ‘Act of Parliament, rather than an Ordinance’, and later that ‘We never denied the thing ... We onely denied the way’.\textsuperscript{108} This would prove to be a powerful refrain, and particularly useful when it came to Charles’s measures to raise forces later in the year.

The figures of ‘evil counsellors’ received the brunt of the accusations, and were blamed by the Parliament for the King’s wrongdoings. They were supposed to be the ones who had encouraged the King to reject the Militia Bill, and were ‘Enemies to the State, and mischievous Projectors against the defence of the Kingdom’.\textsuperscript{109} While ‘his Majesties wisedome and goodnesse kept them from the heart’, Pym argued, ‘they could not be kept out of the Court’.

It was an argument that had grounds in recent judicial history (such as in the case of Strafford, indicted by the Parliament the previous year), but also one that was provided for by constitutional theory. The legal maxim that the ‘king could do no wrong’ had stemmed from the medieval period, and in the seventeenth century was interpreted to mean that if the king attempted to order something illegal, the order would be void.\textsuperscript{110} This was something of a legal necessity – if the king was to have extra-legal powers yet be constrained by the law, it followed that none of his actions could be termed illegal. It also provided an explanation for malpractice. If the king himself could not be committing the illegal acts, then his advisors were, and therefore they would be liable to be attacked.

The threat of evil advisors was also used by the Parliament to legitimise extra-ordinary acts. Parliament was able to justify John Hotham’s refusal to grant access to the King at

\textsuperscript{108} Ib\textit{id.}, pp. 91, 125–6.

\textsuperscript{109} Ib\textit{id.}, p. 95.

\textsuperscript{110} John Pym, \textit{Master Pyms speech in Parliament. Wherein is expressed his zeal and reall affection to the publike good. As also shewing what dangers are like to ensue by want of their enjoying the priviledges of Parliament} (Printed for Andrew Coe and Marmaduke Boat, FD: 17 March 1642) E.200[37], p. 6.

Hull by arguing that he could not let the King enter the town ‘with such Counsellours and Company as then were about [him]’.112 Parliament made their position even clearer in July, when they argued that despite ‘so many Declarations ... of their loyalty and fidelity to his Majesty’, he was still being ‘misled by the suggestions of evil Counsellours’ – to Parliament, it seemed the King refused to see that they were attacking his advisors, not him.113 Given the events preceding the winter of 1641, Parliament were unwilling to trust Charles to sort out the problems facing the kingdom, given the popular fear that his court was infected with papists. If the King was left to it, the Parliamentary argument went, his advisors would see that they and other malignants were protected.

All the peace propositions had provisions that Parliament would have at least some say in the selection of the King’s advisors, in either the form of nominations or confirmations. By questioning Charles’s ability to choose his own advisors, Parliament was challenging his ability to make sound decisions about those that surrounded him. This would leave Parliament as the only other body that could reasonably nominate advisors for the King. This issue would prove to be non-negotiable for Charles, who seems to have been resolved to retain his freedom to select who advised him, regardless of the consequences.

Parliament, then, believed they needed to take control of the militia to ensure the safety of the kingdom, due to Parliamentary and popular fears of papists and an uncooperative King besotted with evil advisors. By contrast, the King saw a Parliament acting beyond its purview, and threatening to unking him. However, the problem at law was how to get the subject to act, rather than do nothing. As things stood, the subject was not compelled to do anything, as theoretically the Militia Ordinance did not have the status of legislation.

II. THE POSITIVE IMPERATIVE

Since the theory of the Great Council of Parliament lacked the ability to compel the public to act, the Houses of Parliament found a solution within their established legal purview that allowed them to seize executive power and require the public to obey their commands. On 15 March 1642, the Houses of Parliament printed votes that explained that the King’s refusal to sign the Militia Bill ‘doth oblige people’, and that Parliament

113 Ibid., p. 387.
The exploitation of a higher, more fundamental law should be seen as a logical extension to the hierarchical jurisdictions in England as a whole. Both Braddick and Clive Holmes have shown the extent to which subjects were content to utilise and exploit the multiple jurisdictions available to them when involved in litigation to ensure they received the judgement they desired (or their opponent was bankrupted by the cost of the simultaneous legal proceedings). Similarly, Coke was relatively comfortable with the idea of a fundamental law in the sense that it was part of the common law, believing it to be part of the ‘basic principles of the constitution’ (including, for example, Magna
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96 Simonds D'Ewes in V. F. Snow and A. S. Young (eds), Private Journals of the Long Parliament, 7 March to 1 June 1642 (London, 1982), pp. 40-1. D'Ewes' account also reveals that the clause 'cost a long dispute', and 'Divers spake against it and said that nothing but a law could bind the subject'.

Thus Parliament appealing to a higher law made sense within the legal framework of England.

This imperative to act, put forth by Parliament, was justified by the 'most ancient Law of the Kingdome' which was self-preservation.\textsuperscript{119} It would be illogical that the kingdom could be left unable to defend itself if the King had abandoned his Parliament, and therefore it must have had a 'most ancient Law of this Kingdome, even that which is fundamentall and essentiall to the constitution and subsistence of it'.\textsuperscript{120} If, as legal understanding at the time would have it, the common law was the most reasoned and best system imaginable, nurtured through countless years of reasoning, then there would have to be not only prerogative powers placed in the King in order for the country to operate,\textsuperscript{121} but also the capacity for self-preservation if the King proved unwilling or unable to act to defend it. Following this reasoning, logically there had to be a fundamental law to appeal to, which would invalidate the King's veto. The Houses were claiming the sole power to judge a group of higher laws, and had established themselves as ultimate arbiter because of their status as the highest court in the land – to challenge their judgement, according to the votes published in March 1642, was to be seen as a 'high breach of the priviledge of Parliament'.\textsuperscript{122} This would, as Michael Mendle highlights, effectively give Parliament executive power through adjudicative means.\textsuperscript{123}

Parliament's defence of their actions rested on the idea that the Houses were acting as a court, and thus their actions had to be legitimated through this specifically judicial framework. However, by tying the justification to a public image of a court, they had inherited the blurred distinctions between judicial and legislative powers and were restricted in how the Houses were allowed to be seen to be acting by the public. The uneasy relationship between judicial and legislative power which Parliament was exploiting was immediately seized upon by the King, who exclaimed that he would never
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\textsuperscript{122} Husbands (ed.), \textit{An exact collection}, p. 114.
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‘allow Our Subjects to be bound by your printed votes’, or that ‘under pretence of declaring what the Law of the Land is, you shall without Us make a new Law, which is plainly the case in the Militia’. If Parliament were acting in deference to these higher laws, argued the King, why had they not ‘told Our good Subjects what those Fundamental Laws of the Land are, and where to be found’? The Houses were not acting in a judicial manner, the King charged, but rather they were exploiting judicial power in order to make new laws, and disregard old ones.

The Houses also had to maintain the idea that they were acting in their role as a court. This was a particularly pertinent issue, as memories of injustice were repeated to the public by both King (to show his affection to his Parliament, and how far he had committed himself to the rule of law) and by the Parliament (to demonstrate how necessary the supreme court of Parliament was to prevent further injustices). The King made this point explicit when he argued that, while he did not deny that the Houses had a right to judge what the law said when there was a ‘particular doubtfull case brought before them’, they could not ‘make a generall Declaration’ which contradicted the written law. If they could indiscriminately choose what laws to judge on, Charles argued, then Parliament would not need the power to make laws, because they could ‘suspend Statute’ and make ‘this Order, which is no Statute, to be obeyed and executed’. This was a key point of contention. As Parliament were borrowing a shared public image of a court in order to explain why it was acting as it was, the reading public would also be able to compare its proceedings to the highly ritualised and structured proceedings of courts that they were aware of. The idea that a court could initiate its own investigations and cases could seem eerily similar to that of Star Chamber, still fresh in the public memory. Charles’s attacks reveal how important this argument was seen to be to Parliament’s defence. He needed to prove that Parliament was acting as a bicameral legislature, rather than merely a court, as it claimed. To this effect, he was able to call upon the public conception of what made a court, and the way that it should act.
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The contemporary understanding of the king’s judicial power was that it was placed in his courts. This was a key component in the theory of the king’s two bodies, in which it showed that the king’s power could be divested from him to someone else.\(^{130}\) For example, a judge could rule with royal authority, and even if the king disagreed, it remained the king’s authority.\(^ {131}\) By extension, parliamentarians argued they could pass judgement against the King’s consent, because all inferior courts could also do this.\(^ {132}\) Parliament was thus able to argue that the King, when out of his courts, was not allowed to speak on matters relating to law. Hence, for the King to proclaim that Hotham was guilty of high treason without using his courts, for example, was to act beyond his jurisdiction.\(^ {133}\) Parliament claimed that the King had no authority to judge Hotham because the fact that the case was being considered in the highest court meant that, theoretically at least, the King had already passed his judgement in his inferior courts but that judgement had proved to be indecisive. One writer argued that it was not a problem that the King was excluded from the highest court, because he was excluded from inferior courts too.\(^ {134}\) The King questioned the validity of this argument, by stating that they had not enquired ‘the opinion of the Judges’ at all before using an Order of Parliament to declare Hotham innocent of treason.\(^ {135}\) However, the principle stuck. The Parliament, (that is, the Lords and Commons), formed the ‘supreme court of judicature’, and for it to be challenged was to be a ‘high breach of the priviledge of parliament’.\(^ {136}\) For all intents and purposes, then, the King was already excluded from judging the law.

In practical terms, the power to claim jurisdiction over the law proved to be the power to act with executive authority. The King, being geographically distant and estranged from his Parliament, was unable to have access to any part of the judicial powers. While some


\(^{132}\) *Reasons why this kingdome ought to adhere to the Parliament* (s.n., [01 August] 1642) E.108[30], p. 10.
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scholars such as Corrinne Weston and Janelle Greenberg have presented the King's *Answer to the XIX Propositions*, where Charles abandoned his claim to be above the three estates of Parliament, as the moment when Charles uttered the words that could be used to 'dethrone him', their account has been criticised for overplaying the importance of the *XIX Propositions* in the development of the idea of the monarchy as an estate.\(^{137}\) Weston and Greenberg’s account of the *Answer to the XIX Propositions* as a tactical error has been challenged by historians such as Alan Cromartie, who has argued that the exclusion of the King from the court of Parliament meant that Charles was willing, as expressed in his *Answer*, to sacrifice his position above the estates to ensure that he was involved in Parliament, where ‘you must admit Us to be a part’.\(^{138}\) In this reading, therefore, Charles had recognised the peril of his position at the beginning of June 1642 – he had well and truly lost the power of the negative voice, as he could have no say in judicial matters outside the court.\(^{139}\) However, it can be argued that by positioning the monarch (and replacing the bishops) alongside the Lords and Commons as one of the three estates, Charles challenged the validity of the court of Parliament, and was able to have at least some influence over the executive power. If it is taken that the judicial power was being used as an executive and the King was included within the court of Parliament, it would mean that the consensus of the Lords and the Commons could be challenged, and thus their use of the executive stopped.

The Parliament’s decision to frame their justifications using the fundamental law, and to construct a positive imperative with it, was to oblige the subject to follow Parliament in defence of an as-yet-undescribed law. However, it also tied Parliament to the language of the judiciary, which could be explicitly compared with other courts whose jurisdictions had over-reached, such as the Star Chamber. By making its own actions reliant on the fundamental law, Parliament had bound the conflict to a legal framework. By doing so, the central concepts of the law could be and were openly contested, rather than just the


\(^{139}\) Indeed, this was a theme that Charles had peddled before – in his *Answer* to the Parliamentary *Remonstrance* of 19 May, he argued that 'If, as in the usage of the word Parliament, they have left Us out of their thoughts, so by the word *Kingdom*, they intend to exclude all Our people, who are out of their wals'. Husbands (ed.), *An exact collection*, pp. 242-3.
manifestations of it. Parliament had appealed as high as the common law could go to make their case – if and when the King refused to agree that their interpretation was correct, the basis of the common law would be proved ambiguous, expanding the debate from a spat between various estates of government towards one that rested on a disagreement over the basis of the common law. In other words, the conflict was framed in such a way that the authority of the law was going to be called into the political debate.

III. THE ‘PERILL OF THE LAW’

The process of Parliament taking executive power would not only require flexible interpretations of the law, but would bring about a debate over who exactly should be interpreting the law. Paradoxically, the debate about who should be permitted to interpret the law manifested itself in the public’s being given an increased space in which they could assess legal argument.

During the ‘paper wars’ of the spring and summer of 1642, statute law was publicly interpreted for a reading audience.\(^{140}\) Considering his position after being denied entrance to Hull, it is not surprising that Charles was particularly eager to debate the interpretation of statutes. After proclaiming Hotham a traitor, the King published a letter to the ‘Major of Kingston upon Hull’, justifying his accusation with reference to the statute of 25 Edw. III, and appended the statute 11 Hen. VI c.1, ‘lest a mis-understanding of Our intentions, or of the Law may misguide any of Our loyal and well-affected Subjects’.\(^{141}\) By highlighting the ‘Perill of the Law on the one side’, and his own compassion on the other,\(^{142}\) Charles showed the public the letter of the law, challenging both the public themselves and the Parliament to construct defences that went directly against it. For Charles, to deny a particular line of reasoning was one thing; to reject a quoted legal definition in statute was another.

---


\(^{141}\) Husbands (ed.), *An exact collection*, pp. 154–5.

In these cases, Parliament proved happy to follow this trend, and published works explaining at significant length where Charles’s interpretation of statute law was mistaken. For example, in the Houses’ *Third Remonstrance* of 26 May, they explained that the problem was not so much that the statute was wrong, but rather that the King had misunderstood what it meant. They challenged Charles’s interpretations of both statutes, arguing that the former really meant that war against the King was war ‘against his Lawes and Authority’, not necessarily his personal commands, and that the latter statute must refer to wars that have been ‘allowed and received by the Parliament in behalf of the Kingdom’.

Parliament, therefore, styled itself as the custodian of the law – they had shown that they were aware of the statutes and had considered them, but they had decided that their actions were agreeable to the ‘scope and purpose’ of the law, even if the King had demonstrated that they were ‘expressly contrary’ to statute. This reading, however, would not mean that the Parliament was above condemning the King’s Commissions of Array issued on 12 July for incorrectly quoting a statute. They argued that the text that the King had used had later been deemed ‘grievous and dangerous’, and as the King had failed to use the corrected text, it was ‘void, and not warranted by that Law’, even if the scope and purpose was agreeable in law.

Printing and contesting statute law before the reading public meant that statutes increasingly became open to challenge and qualification. By making public the difference of opinion, statute law could be seen to be flexible according to definition and interpretation. While it was in Charles’s interests to allow the public to see the law and read it at face value, Parliament’s defence often relied on the law being read in a particular way to justify their actions – otherwise their actions could be shown as being against statute law. However, both Parliament and King were able to maintain multiple understandings of what the law meant, and what part of the law should be appealed to. This polysemic use of the law is of great significance, and suggests that the law was being used as a political tool, rather than being used simply as a guide and a reference.

---

Similarly, interpretative readings of the law forced both Parliament and the King to decide who should be judging what the law said. In turn, this would reveal significant breaches in understanding both of the nature and the meaning of the law between both King and Parliament, even at this early stage in the conflict. The King argued that he was not asking the people to judge which side was right or was wrong in the eyes of the law, but rather that he was appealing to the people so that they might demand that the law would be the judge – it was the Parliament who were guilty of appealing to the public in order to ignore the law. The King, responding to a petition from subjects in York in which they lamented their ‘unfitnesse to become Judges betwixt your Majesty and Parliament in any thing’, explained that he had ‘never intended to have you be Judges betwixt him and his Parliament’. Rather he wanted to ensure that the law was upheld and maintained, and to ‘Let the Law be judge’ of who is right and who is wrong.

Similarly, in May, Charles’s letter to his Privy Council in Scotland stressed that ‘We did not require of you, that you should sit as Judges upon the affairs of another Kingdom: We onely intended to have both Our Sufferings and Our Actions ... made thoroughly known unto you’. Charles therefore argued that the law should be the judge, but the people could play a role in ensuring that it was followed.

The Houses, however, claimed that in their judicial capacity they had the power to judge the law, and also went further still. Because the King’s judicial power was located within the courts, for the King to challenge the supreme court of Parliament would be similar to the ‘Kings-Bench’ being challenged by the Common-Pleas – it would not make sense in the judicial hierarchy in which the body politic was understood. Equally, however, the court metaphor could be restrictive, and this needed to be challenged. For example, questions were raised about whether a judge could also be a witness in a case that he was presiding over. The parliamentarian propagandist Henry Parker argued that the law was its own interpreter in ‘perspicuous, uncontroverted things’; however, if it was

---
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challenged, Parliament had to interpret the law, because otherwise the King would be ruling over other courts.  

Parliament’s position flirted with increasingly flexible readings of the law. The anonymous pamphlet *A Question Answered* (which later appeared in Edward Husbands’s *Exact Collection*, suggesting a Parliamentary sanction), and other works following it, argued ‘That there is in Laws an equitable, and a literall sence’. If the letter of the law is ‘taken abstract from its originall reason and end, [it] is a shell without a kernel, a shadow without a substance, and a body without a soule’. Laws should be executed ‘according to their equity and reason’, which (as I may say) is the spirit that gives life to Authority, the Letter kills. In other words, the equity of each individual law had to be assessed, and had to be considered in the context of what the original purpose of the law was. This could also be seen in the wider debate over the understanding of political liberty as highlighted by Skinner. His conceptualisation of liberty in the 1640s is two-fold: firstly, rights and liberties could be enjoyed ‘without undue interference’; and secondly, if anyone else could interfere with your liberties, you were not free. In this sense, positive law could not force anyone to abandon or subvert their own rights. Charles believed this to be the stuff of chaos. His objection was both to the idea that the public had a role to play in assessing which legal case – his or the Houses’ – was right, but also to the increasingly pervasive notion that works such as *A Question Answered* promulgated: that ‘*humane lawes doe not binde the conscience*’.  

Already, then, there was a significant division in the way that both sides were willing to understand the law, and at its heart, this was a discussion over whether the law was understood as a controller, or something to be controlled. The King maintained that the law should judge who was right (‘Let the law judge by whom it is violated’), and the

---
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Parliament believed that they alone should have that ability. This was not only an intellectual debate, but a political one with real potential consequences for both sides; as soon as the debate was resolved in favour of one side, they could accuse the other of acting illegally. Mendle reminds us that in the seventeenth century opponents of royal power had failed to win major cases, and the King could and would put pressure on judges in key cases.\textsuperscript{157} Similarly, it would be unlikely that Parliament would judge against itself.

IV. THE CONSTITUTION

In the process of constructing legal cases to defend their actions, Parliament was being forced to reassess how they presented the constitution as a whole. As Russell demonstrates with his close readings of the declarations and proclamations of the 'paper wars', Parliament utilised English land law and the concept of trust in order to define the powers and limitations of the King's prerogative.\textsuperscript{158} The King, by making war against his Parliament, was breaching the 'trust reposed in Him by his people', and he was only entrusted with his properties for the good of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{159} The good of the kingdom, of course, was placed in the trust of the Lords and Commons, along with the power of defending laws and making new ones as they saw fit.\textsuperscript{160} However, their relationship with the laws was becoming much closer. Previous thought often had it that the King was the fountain of justice.\textsuperscript{161} Increasingly, however, Parliament was being given that credit. For example, according to Denzil Holles, Parliament had originally created the law, and was the sole body allowed to act to 'preserve the Law'.\textsuperscript{162} The same month, A Short Discourse
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also presented this understanding, and argued that the cavaliers aimed to ‘root up the foundation of the Law, the Parliament it selfe’.\textsuperscript{163}

Much of the debate surrounding the trust of kingship, and Parliament’s relationship with that trust, probed issues surrounding Charles’s Coronation Oath. On 26 May 1642, the Houses had declared that Charles had acted ‘contrary to his Oath’ by refusing to ‘assent to good laws as their people shall chose’, (the laws that Parliament had ‘chosen’), and as proof published a copy of the Oath in Latin.\textsuperscript{164} Charles had countered that they had produced it in Latin as ‘they knew many of Our good Subjects could not’ understand, and reproduced a different translated version.\textsuperscript{165} Charles’s version did not promise to provide new laws, but rather only committed him to ‘hold and keepe the Laws and rightfull Customes’.\textsuperscript{166} A month after the Houses had produced their version of the Oath, Edmund Prideaux, D’Ewes, Roger Hill, and William Constantine were sent to the Exchequer see what oath Charles had actually taken at his coronation.\textsuperscript{167} This was a significant point of contention, because as the writer John Marsh would later identify, and as Charles feared, in the former version to deny laws would be to automatically break the Coronation Oath, which in turn would strip the King of the negative voice.\textsuperscript{168} In other words, if it could be shown that the King had breached the trust placed in him, control of the militia could be rightly taken from him by the Parliament.

Discussions over the constitution, then, had major impacts on the types of arguments that each side could make. Disagreements that appeared at first to be minor – for example the text of the Oath – led to wildly differing relationships between the estates of government. Two works, produced late in the summer of 1642, demonstrate why it was
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so important to establish the original trust of kingship. Marsh, writing in September 1642, dedicated a significant portion of his work to proving that the King had refused to act for the common good, and hence was not acting in accordance with the ‘trust reposed in him’. In these cases, the ‘Law will in its own defence … unable the two Houses of Parliament, to put the Kingdome into a posture of warre’. He listed the breaches, which included denying protection by refusing to settle the militia, refusing to support the laws, not maintaining peace, and denying justice by, among other misdemeanours, harbouring delinquents. A few weeks later, Richard Ward’s understanding of the militia in The Vindication of the Parliament was explicitly based on the Parliament having entrusted the King with the militia ‘by a Law … for the weale of the Commonwealth, not the woe’. If the King should try to ‘enslave us [and] to tyranny over us’, then the ‘equitie of the Law’ demonstrated that he was misusing that trust, and so it could be taken off him. In other words, after the King’s rejection of the Militia Bill, the trust was already broken, and Parliament was acting to fix and re-impose that trust. Their interpretation was one that put the King in an impossible position – to invoke the negative voice was to breach the trust, as was to act in a way that did not seem compatible with the law, which of course Parliament would judge. Thus, the debates in the ‘paper wars’ were over the very core of the constitution, and any form of compromise or conceding of a point could result in significant constitutional changes.

V. THE OBSERVING IMPLIED READER

The Great Council theory had proved to be ineffective because it lacked any imperative for the public to act. Because of this, other legal concepts and understandings of state had been utilised to ensure that Parliament’s case was both within Parliament’s jurisdiction, and that people were obliged to follow their orders. However, Parliament needed to retain a monopoly on the power to act that currently depended on the King being unable or unwilling to do so. To achieve this, Parliament needed to ensure that the King remained insufficient, and made efforts to widen the definition of what would make him ‘absent’. Charles’s choice not to abandon his advisors gave Parliament a powerful
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weapon with which to strike at him, and provided them their defence that justified physical force – the menace of the evil counsellors.

The control of the interpretation of the law had become synonymous with the control of the executive, and Parliament’s interpretation left it infallible and unquestionable, ensuring that it could retain power over the Militia. To challenge this, the King proved himself willing to relegate his role in the political system to have at least some influence within the court that was Parliament.

On the face of it, it would seem that the debate had crystallised into different understandings of the limits of legislation, and the powers of the judiciary. Politics in this period was empowered, justified and utilised by reference to precedents, and blurring the distinction between judiciary and legislative powers may not just have been a justificatory tactic, but also a contemporary understanding.\(^\text{74}\) However, it seems that in the public debate, the King and Parliament relied on different conceptions of the way that the law should be understood. While consensus may have superficially existed, the pressure of mobilisation and maintaining momentum meant that divisions, however small initially, would be probed by the opponent, and emphasised by propagandists. Fundamentally, then, there was a divergence in the understanding of the law, between whether the law should be left to run its course, or whether the law was in crisis and the Parliament needed to judge what it said. While the King denied Parliament the legitimacy to judge the higher law, he maintained a commitment to written laws and statutes. At the same time, Parliament denied the King the right to judge the law in his person.\(^\text{75}\) These pragmatic positions, not intended as models for posterity, were transformed into relatively concrete positions by the process of printing and public

\(^{74}\) See, for example, David L. Smith, *The Stuart Parliaments, 1603-1689* (London, 1999), p. 38. However, it should be noted that the *Answer to the XIX Propositions* made this divisions clear, and often the Royalist attack line would be based on denying certain elements of Parliament constituted a court of record. See, for example Edward Hyde, *A complaint to the House of Commons, and resolution taken up by the free Protestant subjects of the cities of London and Westminster, and the counties adjacent* (s.n., FD: 02 January 1643); Stephen Marshall, *A copy of a letter written by Mr. Stephen Marshall to a friend of his in the city, for the necessary vindication of himself and his ministry, against that altogether groundlesse, most unjust, and ungodly aspersion cast upon him by certaine malignants in the city, and lately printed at Oxford, in their Mendacium Aulicum, otherwise called Mercurius Aulicus, and sent abroad into other nations to his perpetuall infamy* (Printed for John Rothwell, [18 May] 1643) E.102[10], p. 14.

\(^{75}\) On this, see Cromartie, *Constitutionalist Revolution*, pp. 260-70.
debate. The disagreement over how the law should be used would be a huge point of contention in the years that followed. The legal framework meant that a clear binary was constructed, but in order for the binary to retain legitimacy, one side or the other had to be declared illegal. Thus, the price of negotiated peace would be significantly higher.

By constructing a positive imperative, the public was being made to choose by Parliament which side was acting legally – the public were empowered to decide whether the King’s, or the Parliament’s, case was right. In doing so, the pressure for the public to act was not just *de facto*, but also (because the public could decide) *was de jure*. Although both sides would try to restrict the extent to which the public could examine the law, they were both complicit in developing, and failing to establish clear parameters for, this legal role.

**II LAW, PUBLICITY AND POLITICS**

The constitutional crisis was conducted in front of an audience hungry for news and scandal. While these debates were part of a more general explosion of print, authors also had to deal with specific issues that arose when printing legal debates, and the process of making these legal debates public created meta-discussions which forced theorists, writers and readers alike to re-assess their own understandings of the law, and the place that it should occupy within the constitution. The ongoing debate would also require both authors and the public to question why the law was proving unable to solve the conflict between King and Parliament. By using the law to frame political debates, pamphleteers on both sides found themselves developing problems in the legal framework which needed to be solved.

1. **SELF-VALIDATION, AND THE PARLIAMENT IN THE THIRD PERSON**

The ‘paper wars’ were structured as a dialogue between two very distinct sides, the King and the Parliament, conducted in clear public view. Failures to reply to charges, arguments or entire works were at best openings for attack, and at worst admissions of guilt.\(^{176}\) The pamphlets produced by King and Parliament were each written in a univocal style, which meant that the debate that was presented to the reading public appeared to be a debate between two single voices, rather than many. Each side made attempts to undermine the univocal style of the other. Parliament’s works, for example, inherently

\(^{176}\) See, for example, Husbands (ed.), *An exact collection*, p. 163.
implied that everyone within the Houses had agreed on the published votes, and the power of the King’s works relied upon them conveying his voice, rather than those of his councillors. Conversely, the King’s declarations took care to blame the ‘fiery spirits’ that were cajoling and manipulating Parliament, rather than blaming Parliament as a whole. For his part, Charles had to continually defend against the notion that his advisors were penning his declarations for him. This emerged in part because of the legal maxim discussed earlier: that it was constitutionally impossible that the King himself was producing these works to abuse the public’s minds, and therefore it must be the handiwork of the scheming councillors that surrounded him.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}; \textit{An appeale to the world in these times of extreame danger} (s.n., [12 July] 1642) E.107[26], p. 2.} It was an effective solution for Parliament’s problem that the King was saying one thing, and the Parliament in its declarations was contradicting him. If the King’s input was proved to be in doubt, then it could be shown that evil advisors were ‘hindering the proceedings of Parliament, by provoking and instigating his Majestie to send severall Papers in the forme of declarations and messages’ to perplex the Parliament and make them spend time answering their objections.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 7.}

Eventually, however, the univocal style would prove to be limited, and polyvocal works would make increasingly important interventions. Even though the authorship of works could be brought into question, responses still engaged with the legal arguments that were within the ‘falsified’ pamphlets – the ideas, it seems, still needed to be pacified. Thus Parliament’s charge that advisors (not the King) were penning declarations was planted within much longer defences.\footnote{Husbands (ed.), \textit{An exact collection}, p. 208.} In other words, even though the arguments were supposed not to be the words of the King himself, the words and ideas were deemed worthy of a response by the Parliament and its defenders, or at least it was thought unwise to leave them unchallenged. The arguments were dangerous as well as those who were making them.

It was, to some degree, an easier task for the King to strip the parliamentarians of their apparent unity because of the composition of the Houses as a whole – they were two different bodies, yet their authority came from them operating together. He had achieved some success earlier in the year by highlighting the disagreements between the
Lords and the Commons, and as James Hart has emphasised, the Houses required unity to continue to operate as a Great Council.\textsuperscript{180} In these new contexts and with Parliament’s new judicial defence, Charles could take advantage of this and draw attention to times when the Houses had disagreed with each other as part of their now public decisions – for example, he would highlight the Lords’ reluctance to pass the Militia Ordinance in February, having ‘refused it two or three times’.\textsuperscript{181} This argument could also work at a more constitutional level. In the Answer to the XIX Propositions, the understanding of the three estates allowed clearer divisions to be drawn between the Lords and the Commons: a division that placed the judicial power in the House of Lords, relegating the Commons (‘an excellent Conserver of Libertie, but never intended for any share in Government’) to be interested in ‘Levies of Moneys’ and to impeach evil advisors.\textsuperscript{182} In other words, Charles suggested if the two Houses were united and acting as a judicature, the Commons was acting beyond its remit.

By June 1642, Parliament’s defences had become bound up with the nature of the assembly itself. The process of extended polemical debate, and the proliferation of printed statutes that had accompanied it, had led several Parliamentary declarations to admit that it was acting beyond the precedents set by its predecessors, justifying it by saying that ‘we have suffered more than ever they have suffered’, and that it believed that no precedent ‘can be limits to bound our proceedings’.\textsuperscript{183} The public needed to be persuaded that this power, even though it was already appropriated, should indeed be placed in Parliament’s hands, along with the power to judge the law and to defend them and the true Protestant religion. In other words, there came about an urgent need for the Parliament to self-validate in order to legitimate itself.

An argument of this nature would have appeared immodest if it came from Parliament itself – that would be an institution praising itself on its own excellent makeup. Pamphlets authored by a wider range of authors or published anonymously could supply this need – multiple works could simultaneously praise the Parliament, implying

\textsuperscript{181} Husbands (ed.), An exact collection, p. 196.
\textsuperscript{182} Charles I., ‘His Majesty’s Answer to the Nineteen Propositions of Both Houses of Parliament, Tending Towards a Peace.’, in John Rushworth (ed.), Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, vol. 4, pp. 722-751.
\textsuperscript{183} Husbands (ed.), An exact collection, p. 265.
consensus amongst many authors. Indeed, Peacey has shown that politically-motivated printers could release multiple pamphlets with the same message in order to saturate the marketplace, both restricting the choice of reading offered to the reader and creating a narrative favourable to a certain side. At the centre of Peacey’s print campaign is Parker’s *Observations* of July 1642, which justified an arbitrary power in the Houses of Parliament and entrusted them to protect the laws as they saw it because they were absolutely representative of the country at large. This message was repackaged and repeated throughout the second half of 1642, and operated with the help of the Parliamentary leadership – thus, they were complicit actors in this shift. Since these works did not appear to come from the Parliament itself, the works could justify publication not just as responding to the dialogue with the King, but increasingly the pamphlets could respond to external events.

Parliament was portrayed in supportive pamphlets as a body that was worthy of deference. Lord Willoughby, for example, argued that he had settled the Militia ‘according to the Ordinance of Parliament’ because the Parliament were more ‘versed in the Lawes then myself, passed as a Legall thing’. By citing the combined legal expertise of ‘those great Lawyers’, Willoughby could present his position as being one of humble submission, and argue that the legal judgement came from Parliament’s judgement, rather than his own. Similarly, another reminded the reader that Parliament consisted of ‘all the Judges and chiefest Lawyers in the Land’. This deference is reminiscent of the King’s objection to the actions of Hotham at Hull, in his charge that Hotham was implicating Parliament rather than taking responsibility for his own actions. This time, however, deference to Parliament was actively encouraged by the pamphlets, because Parliament knew best. Pamphlets could therefore use Parliament’s legal expertise as a shield to defend individual actions.

This style of argument builds upon Parliament’s successful campaign attacking the King’s authority to judge, or even utilise, the law. In May, Charles had allowed his
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186 A plea for the Parliament, or, Considerations for the satisfaction of such, who are apt to be misled by the malignant party against the Parliament, with a palpable and evident declaration of their chiefest designes therein (s.n., [June] 1642) E.152[11], p. 6.
rhetoric to get the better of him, and had stated that ‘We doe not pretend to understand much Law’.

The full sentence was designed to show how clear the laws on treason were, and how Hotham was clearly guilty even to someone who was not trained as a lawyer, but the damage was done, and had sparked a wave of parliamentarian responses. Parliament’s case could now be that it was a choice between themselves, or the King’s unknown lawyers. Hence, A Short Discourse could argue that while the ‘Commons doe know’ the Parliament, ‘they know not their Persons or names’ of ‘those who expound the Laws to his Majesty’ – it was likely, it speculates, that they were ‘Men of darknesse’. Indeed, another work argued that the King’s view was the misinformation of others.

Perhaps the most successful work inspiring deference to the Parliament was that of Parker. His pamphlets were particularly interested in bolstering support and confidence in the body as a whole in order to justify an arbitrary power within Parliament. He did this by appeals to recent memory, showing that the law on its own was insufficient, and there needed to be a body of some sort with the power to judge it to stop the law being a ‘livelesse fond thing’. There had to be, therefore, an arbitrary power because ‘tis necessary’ for a state. This was not something to fear, argued Parker, because Parliament itself was the state and the people, and therefore could not harm itself. If power was inherent in the people, it was only logical that they would have some ability to judge who would be best to exercise it. Parker, because he was outside the Parliament, was able to compliment the make-up of the Parliament and thus could argue that they were acting as a legislature. So long as Parliament remained simultaneously both infallible and representative, Parker’s argument was by far the most appealing and complete.

These were not the only ways in which Parliament was presented as being worthy of deference: the quantity and quality of its members, its wisdom and reliability, its history and past successes, and even its proximity to the presses were all offered as points in its favour. Parker’s Observations argued that the ‘many eyes of so many choyce Gentlemen
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out of all parts, see more then fewer’. Earlier, Parker had argued that Parliament was both ‘more knowing than other privadoes’, more responsible and less likely to make an error. They also had history on their side: ‘let all Chronicles be searched’, asked one work, ‘and let one Story be cited of any Parliament, which did tyrannize over King and Subject, or ordain anything to the mischief of both’. Similarly, Thomas May had written that ‘no one Prince was ever yet happy without the use of them’. Finally, the pamphleteers argued that as they were based geographically closer to the Parliament, they would be able to work out if it was acting with sinister intent.

Pamphlets were also written condemning how some members of the public had seemingly abandoned their Parliament. The anonymous Reasons why this Kingdome ought to adhere to the Parliament, for example, lamented that the people ‘almost forgot how our Religion, Lawes, liberties, and properties in our estates, lay bleeding almost to death at the feete of a Malignant partie’ (the royalists), and continues on to examine why there was such ‘inconstancy and ingratitude’.

The fault, it seems, was partly because ‘we grow weary of Physicke before our Physisians can perfect the cure’. The fear was that people had abandoned Parliament without having considered all the good that it had done. Lists of what had been done by Parliament were created, stressing how important that was, but also how much work was still to be done. Secondly, it was explained that when royalists had been unable to disband the Parliament, they had been forced to ‘render [it] odious and suspected to the people’. In a sense, this was a

93 Ibid., p. 11.
94 Henry Parker, Some Few Observations Upon His Majesties Late Answer to the Declaration, or Remonstrance of the Lords and Commons of the 19. Of May, 1642 (s.n., [May] 1642) E.151[23], p. 5.
95 The general resolution of the two kingdoms of England and Scotland, concerning, His Royall Majesty, the prince, and the evill incendiaries which are now about them (Printed for I. Tompson and A. Coe, FD: 24 June 1642) E.152[9], sig. A2v.
96 Thomas May, Observations upon the Effects of Former Parliaments (s.n., [18 July] 1642) E.107[13], p. 3.
97 Henry Parker, A Petition or Declaration, humbly desired to be presented to the view of his Majesties Most Excellent Majestie (s.n., [17 July] 1642) E.107[29], p. 2.
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continuation of the Parliament’s trope that evil counsellors had tried to turn the people against its Parliament. The difference in this case was that the identification of this came from outside the Parliament, and within the body of the people instead.

Polyvocal legal cases allowed pamphleteers to continue to support Parliament and its defences by proclaiming that it was the most suited to either act as the judicative arbiter, or be the sole body entrusted to protect the law. These were arguments that Parliament, in its various Remonstrances and Declarations, could not make for itself, either because the justifications needed to praise the learned members of Parliament, or because the style of Parliamentary declarations required a single voice. As pamphleteers assumed the role of the people, claiming to speak with the public’s voice, they were able to construct the people as giving willing deference to the Parliament, setting the template of behaviour that would be crucial to the parliamentarian case. This provided opportunity for new types of works, often anonymous, that reinforced similar themes – legal knowledge and trustworthiness – to flood the market over the summer of 1642.

II. The Opening of the Presses

Although anonymity provided opportunities for Parliament to be praised, it could also prove destructive to the legal arguments that justified resistance against the King. While Parker’s works are given importance in the historiography, in-depth analysis of anonymous printing in this period allows greater understanding of the limitations of this type of printing, and the ways that authors and printers attempted to deal with these problems. As Peacey has shown, in the summer of 1642 a press owned by George Bishop and Robert White was producing works that were ideologically coherent, and had the support of, and connections to, the ‘fiery spirits’ within Parliament. During June and July, this press was interested in manipulating the public’s perception of the polemic in order to push forward a certain sanctioned constitutional argument, in the process intervening with both the language and the content of the debates. Peacey’s work reminds us to consider not just the pamphlets themselves, but also the context of their creation – both the way that printers were able to manipulate the public’s reading, and the way that the impact of the production of pamphlets would affect the nature of the debates.
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As more printers and authors emerged, so too did tensions within the parliamentarian defences printed in June and July. When more presses engaged with the issues, the conformity of the constitutional understanding and its implications was challenged, and the issues that had been so skilfully navigated by Parker were approached by those less skilled in the art of propaganda. As has been argued above, in June and July Parker and the related press campaign were interested in ensuring that there was an arbitrary power to protect the law, and arguing that the body that was best suited to that role was Parliament (being the highest court). The central purpose was to show that Parliament, being the best to defend the law, were in turn the best body to defend the people. This conception of Parliament is the parallel of the idealised maxim that the King could do no wrong. According to this maxim, the concept of infallibility did exist in law, and situations in which the King did do wrong could be, and were, explained away by blaming evil advisors. Similarly, as Parker argued, because the two Houses were representative of the Kingdom itself, they could not possibly damage the kingdom. But borrowing this concept also duplicated its central problem: pamphleteers needed to find a way to legitimate Parliament while at the same time conceding that the ‘perfect’ constitution could create imperfect consequences.

This was a prickly issue, and one that threatened to dilute the strength of Parker’s defence. Parker had already gone some way to defend past Parliaments for acting against the public interest when he argued in his Observations that ‘Tis denied, That any King was deposed by a free Parliament fairly elected’. Parliament, then, could theoretically be unfree, and could act in anti-monarchical ways (and thus harm the people), but if the Parliament was fairly elected and free (as this Parliament was assumed to be), then they would not damage the monarchy. Indeed, several works in August were interested in stressing how fairly the Parliamentary elections were run, and efforts were made by some, such as May, to account for and pacify historical anomalies that could be used to undermine the Parliament’s justification. By emphasising the distinction between free and unfree Parliaments, and by providing evidence that this current Parliament was both
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free and fairly elected, the uncomfortable actions of previous unfree Parliaments could be swept under the carpet.

This argument was closely tied to a need to react to the fear that the public would be unwilling to submit themselves to an arbitrary power. *Considerations for the Commons*, for example, argued that ‘There is not any age that can produce a story of a Parliament, freely elected and held, that ever did injure a whole Nation, neither have we ever heard of Prince or people that casting themselves upon this well constituted Assembly that they were ever defrauded or prejudiced by them’.\(^{205}\) The problem for defenders of Parliament’s actions was that they were reliant on the people submitting themselves completely and totally to an arbitrary power in the two Houses of Parliament. As one royalist writer pointed out, ‘was their [the people’s] grant so absolute, and so irrevocable, that they dispossess themselves wholly of taking or exercising that power, [in] their owne proper persons?’\(^{206}\) Parliamentarians were unclear about whether Parliament could actually be a tyrant, or whether this was a hypothetical, and if so whether this made any difference. *The General Resolution* complained that the King does ‘not say that this Parliament tyrannizeth’ and thus ‘pronounces their vote invalid’ but rather states that ‘because Parliaments may tyrannize ... they have no power in their Votes at all, at any time whatsoever’.\(^{207}\) Evidence that could help resolve this question was damning – if Parliament could be shown to have damaged the people as a whole in the past, how then could they be trusted with an arbitrary power? And furthermore, if a Parliament abused their trust, who was to judge them?

One solution to these problems, according to the anonymous *A Discourse upon the Questions in Debate*, was to tackle the issue head on. While the people of the kingdom had never been forsaken by their Parliament, ‘if they [the Parliament] would they cannot, for when they forsake the dutie of their place, and the interest of the Kingdome, the Kingdome will forsake them’.\(^{208}\) The pamphlet never discusses how the ‘Kingdome’

\(^{205}\) *Considerations for the Commons, in this age of distractions* (s.n., [17 August] 1642) E.112[17], sig. A3r.

\(^{206}\) *Animadversions vpon those notes which the late observator hath published upon the seven doctrines and positions which the King by way of recapitulation, he saith, layes open so offensive* (Printed for William Sheares, [09 July] 1642) E.107[22], p. 12.

\(^{207}\) *The general resolution*, sig. A3r.

\(^{208}\) *A discourse upon the questions in debate between the King and Parliament*, (s.n., [15 September] 1642) E.117[8], p. 13.
would be able to ‘forsake them’, nor exactly what form the ‘Kingdome’ would take to express its displeasure, but the implicit condition was used for the explicit defence: the trust in Parliament was not necessarily permanent, and could be revoked if the Houses acted incorrectly or betrayed that trust.

Crucial to understanding this development is that at this early stage these problems are not necessarily only being identified by royalist writers though not for want of trying. Rather, they are being created within the Parliamentary defenders’ works themselves through a lack of moderation. Parker’s theories needed continual restatement and rejuvenation. Because of the anonymous nature of the debate that ran through the summer, when an argument was being put forward, to the reader it may well have been Parker’s rhetoric, or the words of Pym. The texts had no justification other than their own internal arguments. In a way, the parliamentarian case had become a shared cumulative project that was initially started by a few presses, but was eventually adopted by many others, who in turn exposed and attempted to account for the practical implications of their, and previous authors’, arguments.

In sum, the experience of the summer of 1642 demonstrates that if there was no moderation, multiple printers could be, and often would be, destructive to an argument. The central concept needed to be absolute for the defence to work – Parliament had to be infallible – and if the notion that it might be fallible was introduced, the defence fell to pieces. The opening of the presses had transformed the parliamentary case, and had brought in multiple inharmonious voices that revealed and widened cracks in Parliament’s claims both to legitimacy and to wielding an arbitrary power. By offering the implied reader caveats to make Parliament’s argument more palatable, they had diluted and weakened Parliament’s case.

Therefore by the end of September there was a need for new defences of Parliament’s actions. The defences needed to be comprehensive, and permanent; they should aim to be the answer, rather than an answer. To this end, potential objections needed to be identified and invalidated, and meticulous references provided. The pamphlets needed to have some form of defence against words or arguments being reused – something that the previous works had lacked. Three particularly striking legal pamphlets were collected by Thomason in late September and early October 1642: Bland’s Resolved upon a
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Question, Marsh’s An Argument or Debate in Law, and Ward’s The Vindication of the Parliament. These works attempted to present a full justification of Parliament’s actions, not just in terms of constitutional theory, but by visible law, which they referenced either in text or in the margins. ‘Peter Bland of Grays-Inne Gent’ prefaced his argument by explaining to the reader that he intended not to imply that ‘Parliament knew not Law sufficient to justify their own actions’, but rather to ‘destroy their wonder whom he hath heard admire that the Parliament did not prove their own acts by visible Law, as well as disprove the Kings’.  

Marsh assured the reader that he had ‘not used any affected style’, but rather had ‘invested the law with its owne plainese and integrity’, and Ward explained that ‘(being no lawyer)’ he would not search and interpret cases, but he could still show the ‘lawfulness of this designe, as far as the law of Nature, Reason and experience, and my small knowledge in Religion, will dictate unto me’. Thus these works were all protected in some form, and presented the law as both already clear, and definitive. Bland put his name and position on his work; Marsh had his initials of both his name and his position as Chancellor of Lincolns Inn; and Ward dedicated the first portion of his pamphlet to a damning indictment of other authors’ writing styles, blaming a ‘compendious kind of writing’, an ‘abtruse, sublime and high style’, ‘confused’ and ‘superficial writing’, and above all a ‘tимерous and half handling of case in controversie’. By distinguishing themselves from the work of other authors, they demonstrated their superior qualifications to judge the situation. By placing themselves and their works as exceptions to the pamphlet debate, Bland, Marsh and Ward attempted to present their own personal legal case, rather than presenting it as part of a wider parliamentarian justification – theirs were to be considered exceptional.

In general, however, works from the summer of 1642 were seen as part of a continual argument, rather than each pamphlet being clearly defined. The lack of distinctions between various anonymous works meant that it was unclear what works should be given precedence, and what works should be ignored as potentially useless, or even dangerous. In this sense, anonymity was both a blessing and a curse, with opportunities for the exploitation of the marketplace of print on the one hand, and the risk of theories being watered down on the other.

210 Bland, Resolved upon the question, p. 4.


III. THE ROLE AND PURPOSE OF THE IMPLIED READER

The ‘paper wars’ were an open dialogue between King and Parliament, published for a reading public to consume. However, print was not seen as a refined medium, and authors often still felt the need to justify why they had resorted to the press.\footnote{Peacey, Politicians and Pamphleteers, pp. 31-91.} Justifications for printing in the ‘paper wars’ emulated the tactics of previous pamphleteers by vilifying earlier obfuscatory pamphlets.\footnote{Ibid., p. 39.} The King, for example, claimed that he strove to ‘undeceive [the people] of specious mischievous Infusions which are daily instilled into them’, and that while he knew it was ‘below the high and Royall dignity to take notice, much more to trouble ourself with answering these many seditious pamphlets and printed papers … we are contented to let Our Self fall to any Office that may undeceive Our People’.\footnote{Husbands (ed.), An exact collection, pp. 239, 173.} Similarly, the Parliament claimed they wanted to ‘disabuse the people’s mindes’ in order to ‘prevent them from being their own executioners’, and to ensure that they understood the case fully before making up their mind.\footnote{Ibid., p. 263.} These actions amounted to a legitimising ritual, in which the excuse to publish more arguments could be justified under the pretence of contradicting opponents’ arguments. It was a cyclical process – if the opponent replied, the public’s minds would be ‘abused’ again, and therefore another argument was required. It also meant that the protagonists adopted a position of detachment, and claimed to be debating for the good of the people rather than to further their own ends. In this way, authors used the public to legitimise and justify continued press interventions in the ‘paper wars’ themselves.

The perceived potential for confusion in the reading public catalysed the continuing developments of the debate so that pamphlets could not simply be imperative calls for action. According to the pamphlets, the literate public were already intrinsically part of the debate because their minds had been abused, and if they failed to engage with it their minds would remain abused. Similarly, pamphlets themselves were necessitated and justified by both the imagined response of the reader and the impact that it would have on the understanding of the law as a whole. The public had to take part, and the ephemeral pamphlets had to be part of this debate.
A wide variety of legal concepts were made available to authors, and formulaic sentences had become something of a code which needed to be deciphered by the reader. For example, by early June there was a relatively common distinction between the terms of ‘loyalty’ and ‘obedience’. The county of Cheshire had resolved that they firstly would be ‘Loyall to his Majesty’, and secondly ‘obedient to the Parliament’. These resolutions are seemingly mutually exclusive, and it is later revealed that by this, they mean that they agree with the Parliament’s decision to take control of the militia. Similarly, in the anonymous City of Londons resolution, they decide to maintain their loyalty to the King, but also to ‘promise all due and cheerfull Obedience’ to the Parliament. Loyalty was being understood as something passive, whereas obedience was being understood as something active – there was no real contradiction in being both loyal and obedient to the different sides.

Both King and Parliament maintained that the public could not make a legal judgement. The official Parliamentary case was that the reader had no role to play, because Parliament was the highest court and was absolutely representative of the people – thus, Parliament’s judgement and adjudication would have been the same as the people’s judgement. Similarly, the King’s case was that the judges would adjudicate on the law, and that the people were being appealed to in order to demand that justice be done. By publishing these arguments for public consumption, however, both the Parliament and the King were actually already appealing to a restricted implied reader. A passive, compliant and homogenous implied reader was used to confirm retrospectively what the Parliament and the King were doing, and thus the reader was already summoned by the debate, and required to play a role.

The role of the implied reader in the polemical debate became increasingly explicit by August 1642, and the opening of the presses acted as a catalyst to the process that had begun with the use of the implied reader, and resulted in the passive reader being more and more required to be an active one. The opening of the presses and the flood of

217 A Discourse or dialogue between the two now potent enemies: the Lord Generall Militia, and his illegall opposite Commission of Array (Printed for Thomas Bates, [07 October] 1642) E.240[28], sig. A2r-A2v.

218 Ibid., sig. A3r.

219 The City of Londons resolution, concerning their loyalty to the King, and their love and affection to the Parliament, in laying down their lives, liberties, and goods for the maintenance of the true Protestant religion (Printed for I. Tompson and A. Coe, FD: 22 June 1642) E.151[21].
anonymous texts pushed the already-summoned implied reader into the foreground because of the mechanics of the printed debate, pressure to construct convincing yet expandable justifications, and fundamental problems of the legal framework.

A common refrain employed by authors to justify both the necessity of their works, and their justification for going to press, was the idea that only those who had been trained as lawyers could understand the reasoning behind the judgements and arguments presented in the pamphlets.\(^{220}\) Because the common law was ancient custom, generations of lawyers must have found it ‘ideally suited to the needs of the commonwealth’, or else it would have been changed before.\(^{221}\) However, the common law needed an ‘artificial reason’ to understand its nuances and intricacies, which was ‘an exclusive professional “art”’ – only with extensive ‘training and long study’ could the true ‘rationality and coherence of English law’ be appreciated or understood.\(^{222}\) The authors argued that those most suited to understand the debates already knew how to respond. Those who were not lawyers needed it explained in more depth – hence the pamphlets.

The premise of many works was that those who had diligently read the various works would understand how they should respond. The problem, according to A Plea for the Parliament, was that ‘some people hav[e] seen [the Remonstrances], others but some of them, and others none at all’. Arguments along these lines would often be supplemented with a list of works that they should consult. The King, for example, wrote in May that to be ‘truly informed’, the reader should be familiar with both his and Parliament’s messages on Hull, and his messages explaining why he refused to sign the Militia Bill.\(^{223}\) Similarly, one parliamentary defender wrote that readers should examine the Parliament’s Remonstrances and Declarations, ‘those most excellent Observations’, and various other anonymous works.\(^{224}\) The reader had something of a duty to keep up with the debate to ensure that they were making informed choices. What’s more, these lists also demonstrate that pamphlets were able to retrospectively attribute significance to
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certain works, and tacitly discredit other ones, editorialising the substantive from the ephemeral.

Other pamphlets feared that the ‘unlearned’ minds of the readers could not possibly hope to understand the various legal theories being presented to them. Worse still, the ‘unlearned’ were being persuaded by arguments that appeared to contemporaries to be blatantly wrong: ‘Some opinions, though in themselves weak enough ... come into the hands of the more ignorant vulgar, who ... are not able to pierce into their falsities, or confute them’ – meaning the ‘vulgars’ did not challenge the arguments in the work.

The public readers had not yet developed mechanisms to read and process the phenomenon of political and legal disputes, simply because political and legal argument had not been available to them in such a quantity before thanks to censorship – in short, they had not been armed to deal with propaganda. This in turn generated a fear that the public were being bamboozled by legal terminology – for example, the King repeatedly argued that Parliament was failing to explain what their ‘fundamental law’ meant. This simultaneously acted as an attack on theory, and also highlighted a fear of specific ploys to exploit the public with their Parliamentary language.

In order to justify fresh interventions and apologise for the failures of previous works to provide answers to the conflict, many works argued that it was not that positions had been explained incorrectly, but rather that the reader had failed to understand them. A Plea explained that in the ‘late Remonstrances there is sufficient satisfaction given to every judicious and intelligent Reader’; Reasons Why argued that if the suggested works were read diligently even the King would be satisfied; and An Advertisement concluded that the Parliament had given answers ‘sufficient to satisfie a world of Wisemen’.

The solution was clear, these parliamentarian pamphlets argued, and if the public read these works diligently and correctly, they would be able to make logical, informed and...
ultimately legally correct choices. This rhetorical trick managed the readers’ response, so that they were forced either to admit themselves insufficient, or to agree with the author.

Fortunately for the reader who had failed to keep up with the unprecedented deluge of tracts, these pamphlets would often present a distillation of the debates, with key points taken into consideration. These arguments would be key points of contention between the King and Parliament, providing lengthy arguments on particulars, such as in William Prynne’s *Soveraign Antidote*, or the anonymous *Short Discourse*.229 Of particular sophistication was one of the royalist retorts to Parker’s *Observations*, which not only quoted the ‘Observer [Parker]’, but also translated the quotation into a generalised position which the ‘Animadversion’ attacked. This aimed to make the radical potential of the rhetoric clear to the reader – while a reader might agree with Parker’s words, they might not so readily agree with the distilled legal position behind them.230 In a sense, this changed what pamphlets were trying to do, and shifted the problem that pamphlets were trying to solve. Rather than the reader being duty bound to examine pamphlets to keep up with debates (even though they still should), anonymous works offered their services and their interpretations of the law to the reader in order to explain what the problem at law was, and what the solution was. These pamphlets provided solutions in themselves, because they could set the parameters for their own debates and they could dictate what problem they were trying to solve.

Naive and unconsidered responses by the reader were feared. Authors, such as the writer of the anonymous *A Plea for Moderation*, warned against the ‘ceca obedientia’ (blind obedience) that plagued the nation before the Long Parliament.231 Many defences included the ‘ignorant’ when compiling lists of those who had seduced the King, and they were defined in one pamphlet as either failing to understand, or even failing to consider what they were doing.232 In a similar way, the King continually reiterated that he was publishing the law not to persuade people, but rather to ensure that they understood the decision that they were being asked to make, and would not make it
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rashly. By encouraging the readers to question the authorities of those commanding them, the pamphlet transcended social hierarchies in appealing for mobilisation. At times, this was made more explicit. For example, several pamphlets explained that treason (however defined) in a noble man was a worse crime than if it was committed by a common man. The problem, argued The Right Character, was that their crimes were ‘more conspicuous’, and could be ‘examples, whereby the vulgar will be either more confirmed in their allegiance, or pricked forward to a rebellion’.233 Deference to social hierarchies was not sufficient, and the subject, ‘Be he of what rank so ever’ had to make up his own mind, and settle it with both his conscience and his allegiance.234 This meant that the allegiance of subjects in areas with a partisan lord might still be contestable, and would be particularly important in more rural areas, where hierarchy was less fluid, and county grandees could demonstrate more power. The implied reader could be used to challenge the possibility that social order would determine a subject’s allegiance.

While the opening of the presses accelerated the active importance of the implied reader, it can be argued that a lot of the reasons that an implied reader was required at all had their roots in the inherent problems of the legal framework that was being applied to a political problem. Ross has examined printed legal texts, and shows that legal discourse, if left unchallenged, could potentially be understood as ‘law’. By printing the law, the author was engaging in two power plays. Firstly, the law itself was being diluted from the centralised forces of either a legal mindset or the arcana imperii itself. Secondly, the work that was created claimed authority in its own right, and might be used to create further arguments with potentially dubious legal basis.235 To print the law was to explicitly challenge previous legal treatises, and to present a new solution and case – this in turn would become part of the collective memory that made up the common law. This relationship between the law and the press would prove to be a dangerous one, as not only were there polemical matters at stake, but also the very definition of what the law actually was.

Throughout the summer of 1642, then, there was a continuous relationship between the author and the implied reader in the pamphlet debates. The reader was simultaneously

233 The Parliaments lamentation, p. 3.
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appealed to, and their responses feared. Readers were expected to be well-versed and engaged with the debates, but simultaneously they were offered strategies to understand and to codify their arguments. Perhaps the most common distinction between the royalist and the parliamentarian case was between the fundamental and the known laws, respectively. The Parliament’s fundamental laws referred to the ancient laws that logically must exist for the purposes of the protection of the kingdom. The King’s known laws, by contrast, referred to all the statutes and laws understood in the traditional manner, by which he meant without being manipulated by Parliament’s equitable readings. These terms acted for each side as constitutional and legal shortcuts – a way to quickly summarise months of prolonged debate, and to describe the significant breach in the way that the law was understood by both sides. However, they also show how language and phrases became laden with legal and constitutional baggage. Words in themselves were divisive and polarised, meaning that the author could be acting in a partisan way even with their choice of vocabulary. Hence, when the anonymous author said that a party in York pretended to maintain ‘the knowne lawes of the land’, he was making a legal point about their understanding of the law, as well as attacking them for acting illegally.²³⁶

Pamphleteers used the implied reader not only to persuade people and encourage mobilisation, but also to protect the law and the legal framework, and its failure to solve the conflict. Authors, struggling between two sides that both claimed to be in the legal right, looked to spaces where the binary of the legal framework could be painted as something less definitive. Thus, the implied reader was, in part, introduced as a response to a crisis in the law – when works were unable to use the legal framework to distinguish clearly between two sides, the device of the implied reader was able to prolong the framework’s survival by suggesting that these problems still might be solved. The implied reader could be used to paper over some of the cracks in the legal framework, because the authors presented the solution to the conflict as a concluded problem, rather than an ongoing one, but argued that the reader just did not understand it. The polemic was therefore just waiting for the reader to catch up and understand it. This fiction relied on the premise that the law could solve the conflict in order to argue that it had already done so, even though it demonstrably had not.

²³⁶ *Intelligence from Yorke*, p. 3.
IV. THE CULPABLE IMPLIED READER

The legal framework through which the conflict was understood had developed a pervasive binary between ‘legal’ and ‘illegal’, but this began to be challenged by the polemic. By the autumn of 1642, there had been a shift away from the positive command of 15 March 1642, where the people had to support the actions of Parliament because of the ‘fundamental’ laws. Increasingly, the public were expected to be able to do two things: first, defend the legality of their side’s actions; and secondly, defend their own legal position in support of that side. The public became increasingly responsible for the positions that they, and the side they supported, held – they had become culpable implied readers.

People were being actively involved by the rhetoric of the pamphlets. *The Right Character*, for example, rhetorically asks the reader ‘Are we not competent judges?’237 The pamphlet presents itself as first a mediator and then an arbiter, and uses these devices to engage the reader in the examination of each side’s case – suggesting if one side cannot conclusively prove the other wrong, then a third party can look at the facts again and decide who is correct. Rather than remaining a detached spectator of the debates, the reader is invited to take part, and help solve the conflict. Similarly, *A Short Discourse* writes as the whole body of the kingdom, and while at first it laments that both sides profess to want the same thing, concludes that Parliament have done all they can possibly do, and that the duty of ‘appealing [of] all differences, and prevention of all dangers, falls upon his Majesty’.238 These works present themselves as attempts to find solutions to the debates – like a moderator between two extremes. They do later reveal themselves to be partisan, helping to reveal and construct divisions weighted towards one side. But these pamphlets lead the reader through the act of mediation, and while the pamphlet’s authors are partisan, they seem equally interested in showing the reader how to process and examine propaganda.239

Pamphlets were codifying the choices that the public were being asked to make daily as either ‘treasonous’ or ‘loyal’, and they were forcing people to place themselves on one side or another of a dichotomy that they themselves were helping to create. This should
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be seen within the context of continual crisis, which was increasing in pressure day by day. Authors wrote almost in disbelief that so many were ‘arguing themselves into Civil War’, while themselves contributing to the chaos, and it is tempting to believe their sincerity. De debates and arguments developed at such speed that to align oneself to the Parliament in June or July could have meant adherence to different set of values and arguments than you would find yourself needing to defend in September or October. Questions of an arbitrary Parliament, the possibility of a public withdrawal of trust, and the origins of kingship would each need to be answered, each time diluting and endangering the original arguments that were relied upon. To this effect, new arguments were constantly required to maintain each side’s claim to legality.

By September and October 1642 there was an additional question that parliamentarian defences were trying to answer. Of course, they were still interested in persuading the reader that Parliament’s actions were legal, but a result of the pressures of the debates in the summer was that there was a need to address the question of people’s legal judgement. Marsh distinguishes between the legal case for Parliament’s action, and reasons why it would be legal for the public to support Parliament. Similarly, Ward makes this distinction perfectly explicit when he says that there are two questions: ‘Whether it be lawfull for Parliament to settle it [the militia] without Royal assent’; and secondly ‘Whether it be lawfull for us to obey it, so seted by Them’. The parliamentarian case, due in part to lack of moderation, had buckled to allow the ‘people’ a degree of autonomy, which meant that theoretically they could withdraw their trust if they believed Parliament was acting against the commonweal. Of course, these arguments were presented to bolster support for the two Houses, not undermine it, and they were accompanied by warnings, such as the threat that the Parliament could ‘set little Laud upon your eares again’, or that ‘This Kingdome hath very seldome relinquesht its representative, elected, intrusted Councell, and when it hath, it hath soon found cause to repent that Treachery, and instability’ which had ‘proved fatall both to King and kingdom’. But manipulations and warnings aside, this was a remarkable shift from the positive command of 15 March, where the people had to support the actions of
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Parliament because of the ‘fundamentall’ laws. The public were expected to both have their own legal positions, and to be able to justify them, as well as that of their chosen sides. The issue of whether the public would agree something to be legal had become detached from the factual legality itself; the Observator was becoming the arbiter.

In response, there was a marked shift in the tone of the discussions. Lists of precedents were created, which discussed at length what actions were legal or not. Works from September 1642 appealed to an older authority, but provided the author or compiler with a tool to construct a contemporary argument while exploiting the reverence that older written works were held in. These could then be editorialised, such as A Collection of the Rights and Priviledges, which while presenting itself as an impartial list ‘Informing the willing Man’ was in fact highly polemical. A reader might approach it for impartial information from ‘Ancient Writers, both Divine and Morral’, but when they reached the end of the work, it would be clear that the work was in favour of the ‘great assembly and wisedome of our State’, the Parliament.

Much more common were works that were openly partisan. For example, the title page of Articles and Acts of Parliament, dated by Thomason in early October promised the reader accounts of ‘how Traytors have seduced the King by wicked Counsell to take him from his Parliament’, but in reality reproduced one work giving an account of Richard II’s council. A Collection of Records advertised that it would tell the reader of ‘great Misfortunes that hath hapned unto Kings that have joyned themselves in a near alliance with forrein Princes’, and ended its impressive title page with the statement that ‘the best
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Support for the Crowne of England, is the two Houses of Parliament. The argument is displayed on the front cover, so that the purchaser already knows the conclusion.

In light of this, certain works might be better considered as resources offered to the already-persuaded reading public, rather than works of persuasion. They were attempting to bolster enthusiasm and maintain opinion, rather than necessarily change it. Indeed, it is often clear from the title page what a certain work is going to argue, as in the case of the royalist Vindication of the King or the parliamentarian Commission of Array Arraigned and Condemned. It would have been very possible for a London reader to avoid parliamentarian works, for example, and choose pamphlets that resonated more with their own opinion. Pamphlets were offering the reader a way to justify why they had chosen to side with either King or Parliament, not so that they will be persuaded to change allegiances, but rather to ensure that they are able to satisfactorily defend their allegiance. For example, the author of A Discourse or Dialogue between the two now potent enemies presented a choice between the Militia Ordinance and the Commission of Array, demonstrating that the conflict could be understood as a choice between two processes, rather than just between two sides, and exposing the mechanics of justifications to the reader. The process of choosing a side, or even having chosen a side in the past, was considered as an act that involved making a judgement in law, and that judgement needed to be defended from attack and scrutiny – the implied reader had become culpable for the decisions that they had made. Pamphlets were able to offer themselves as solutions to this dilemma.

Pamphlets, then, could be used as resources, deployed to encourage and bolster preformed opinions. For example, one pamphlet imagined a dialogue 'betwixt a Courtier and a Scholler', and concluded that even though 'you [the Scholler] have persuaded me [the Courtier], I will not be persuaded, although you have convinced me, I will not be
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Works may not have seriously believed that anyone would be persuaded at this later stage – the political, financial and military demands on the reader were continuing to increase – but rather that those who had made a choice needed to have access to the best possible defences against potential criticisms and attacks.

III CONCLUSION: ARBITRATION

The period from March to October 1642 had fundamentally changed the relationship that the reader had with the legal polemic. Their projected role in the pamphlets had shifted from being a passive spectator, to an abused and confused agent, and eventually, if they had read and truly understood authoritative works, a principled arbiter. Implied readers were increasingly being expected to justify their own choices, and have access to legal arguments that would defend why they had made that decision. To this end, pamphlets not only served either the King or Parliament, but increasingly offered themselves to the reader as a defence for the reader’s own actions. By choosing a side, the public had made a choice between two legal interpretations, and were now being required to defend that choice. The implied reader’s subjective reading played a crucial role in solving this crisis, and they were employed to arbitrate which side’s case was ultimately right.

The implied reader played this increasingly crucial role in the polemic because pamphlets had to continually justify why they, and the combined legal reasoning and expertise of both sides, were proving unable to solve the crisis. To do this, pamphlets were constructed in ways that helped manage the reader’s response. The implied reader was charged with being duped if they disagreed with the author, partisan if they used certain pieces of vocabulary, insufficient if they had failed to keep up with or understand debates, or just plain ignorant. It was the reader not the law that was at fault in this case, argued the pamphlets, justifying both their own failure to resolve the conflict and the continuation of the debate. Thus efforts were made to retain faith in the system that was failing to operate as it had promised to by improving the reader, rather than the framework.

Even before the opening of the presses each side’s political positions required flexible legal definitions and concepts with which to work, because no one knew what would
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need to be argued next. Whilst the central legal framework needed to remain intact and recognisable to the reader, this did not mean that Parliament managed to avoid contradictions – for example their two Remonstrances in May were wholly at odds with each other in legal reasoning. However, as the debate became public and works became increasingly anonymous, pamphlets began to be treated as if they were autonomous works, rather than part of a much larger defence. Therefore, contradictions within the parliamentary polemic could be rhetorically excused by pointing out they were written by different authors, or by saying they were written by someone less educated and without full command of all the facts. During this diversification of authors and arguments, readers were exposed to the contradictions and nuances of the law as a political language, and were expected to give weight to certain arguments while simultaneously being told to ignore or reject others. The law was exposed as being something plural and ultimately subjective, dependent on political reasons rather than timeless truths.

The constitutional crisis was developing in ways that meant legal solutions were becoming increasingly out of reach. The legal framework demanded an absolute rhetorical victory – one that both sides would prove unwilling to surrender to. The law demanded a dichotomy of innocent and guilty, right and wrong, legal and illegal, in a way that ran at odds with the continuous exclamations of loyalty to both the King and Parliament in both sides’ arguments. With the law developing into new complexities of legality and the polemic multiplying into a plurality of arguments which grew increasingly partisan, the chasm between legal and illegal that constituted the framework appeared increasingly uncompromising and impossible to bridge.

As the law became increasingly complicated, at its heart it retained its impossible simplicity. Similarly, as the polemic became increasingly multivocal and frenzied, it pushed at the fractures caused by the framework’s essential contradiction. The law was unable to solve the crisis that faced the state, but for many, to believe that the law was unable to solve the problem would be akin to believing that the problem was unsolvable. The alternative and possibly a much more tempting conclusion was to believe that a true account of the law had not yet been produced. This meant that authors would try to compose it, and readers would try to purchase it.
CHAPTER 2: FROM PARLIAMENTARY SOVEREIGNTY TO THE VOW AND COVENANT, OCTOBER 1642 TO JUNE 1643

*How then can the People think the Parliament doth any thing contrary to Law, when they are the Judges of it? This is to make them Arbitrary; and all their commands Lawes, and to lead the people after them by an implicit faith.*


This chapter focuses on the first period of real warfare from the end of October 1642 to July 1643. Parliamentarian authors, printers and publishers continued to construct justifications to obtain political, financial and military support in the wake of the increasing demands of mounting an effective war effort. The need for large field armies led to expansive powers of taxation and methods to seize property, which in turn led to concerns over the powers that Parliament were claiming for themselves. Parliament’s official case – and that of its close propagandists – made increasingly strenuous demands on the subject, and rhetoric that was used in pre-war posturing began to have demonstrable effects on the subject’s liberty and property. Tensions over the extent and nature of Parliamentary sovereignty led to some authors exploring the invocation of the implied reader to empower Parliament to act on the people’s behalf. By examining first the theoretical, and later the political, divisions within the parliamentarian case, this chapter argues that there was a struggle between a minority of authors that were willing to place absolute sovereignty in Parliament, and a majority that struggled to construct theories that both enabled Parliament to fight the King yet maintained that obedience could be conditional. Later in the conflict, when parliamentarians looked to this period again for intellectual inspiration, they were attempting to construct the same thing: conditional obedience to the Parliament.

Facing huge financial and administrative challenges, Parliament needed new powers to obtain resources from the City and the counties to pursue the war effectively. War brought sequestrations and compositions, and new taxes were levied on top of each other – assessments, the fifth and twentieth part, and later the excise – using the traditional county machinery to raise revenue. This meant that some areas could see
unprecedented levels of taxation through multiple means. Many who were against or neutral to the parliamentary cause could consider such taxation unjust, especially in the case of the fifth and twentieth part, because past behaviour dictated how high future Parliamentary taxation would be, which set an alarming precedent. Not actively helping the Parliament would often be seen as justification for condemnation. War brought unprecedented levels of taxation, and obligations to Parliament that had hitherto only been legal were now becoming financial.

Furthermore, actual war made obedience to the Parliament a more literal act. Before the Battle of Edgehill (29 October 1642), Parliament could comfortably use the threat of military action as encouragement for Charles and his supporters to come to the negotiating table, and to argue that they were acting to protect the King’s natural body, not attack it. War made this presupposition difficult to sincerely maintain. Haphazard military structures were erected, balancing trained bands and militias against the Earl of Essex’s field armies, and complex overlapping jurisdictions had been put in place to ensure that Parliament maintained overall control at some level.

These political and military escalations were concurrent with efforts to deliver peace, and for many in Parliament the aim was to negotiate with the King from a position of strength – war and peace were not mutually exclusive. The Earl of Essex – the leader of the two parliamentarian field armies – had been in written communication with the royalist Earl of Dorset throughout September on the Parliament’s behalf, but formal attempts at negotiation had failed once the King had made clear that he refused to deal with those he believed were traitors. Negotiations in the spring of 1643 faltered when Charles refused to compromise with regards to the restoration of expelled MPs, revenues, magazines, forts and ships. Outside these official negotiations there was a continuous pressure for peace. Within London, often taken to be the stronghold of parliamentarianism, the beginning of actual conflict had a profound effect. The
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experience of battle at Edgehill, the sacking at Brentford and London losses took its toll on City morale. There was fear in December 1642 amongst Parliament's most committed advocates that those inclined towards peace would 'cut [their] losses' and settle, and Keith Lindley and Julia Merritt have detailed the extent to which peace petitions in the winter of 1642/3 managed to capitalise on the concerns of many in London by offering a return to a normal existence.

Parliament were adopting increasingly arbitrary measures, which could profitably be compared by royalist propaganda to the 1630s – most notably the assessment of Ship Money. Constitutional royalists, most notably Edward Hyde, condemned the previous decade of Charles's rule as unconstitutional, which allowed them to draw direct comparisons between his personal rule on the one hand and Parliament's actions on the other. Declarations by Charles promulgated a narrative of victimhood – his declaration of 8 December 1642 charged the 'Disturbers of the publike peace' with wanting to 'pursue, kill and slay Us and all who wish well to us', and requiring subjects to 'supply them with such summes of money as they thinke fit, upon the penalty of being plundered with all extremity of War ... and by such rules of Arbitrary power, as are inconsistent with the least pretence or shadow of that Property it would seem to defend'.

War and the military effort, then, required administrative and financial innovations, and Parliament were able to use these innovations to solicit obedience. The ideas that justified these measures, however, developed at a much slower pace because of a fundamental disagreement amongst parliamentarians over two interrelated questions: is Parliament arbitrary? And what role (if any) do people's consciences have in the
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constitution? These questions came about because of a dispute within parliamentarianism over the understanding of the constitution – not aided by the fact that for the majority of this period, unlike in the paper wars, Parliament itself contributed very few works to the debate. Rather, Parliament relied on private voices to defend their case, reserving the majority of their declarations for administrative effects, meaning that the parameters of parliamentarianism were not clearly moderated.

The first section of this chapter will examine this tussle over the extent and nature of Parliamentary sovereignty. It will examine how certain writers such as Charles Herle, Parker, and Prynne were much more willing to locate a final sovereignty in Parliament. For them, Parliament was arbitrary and their decision final. However, their theories made up the minority of the pamphlet literature as a whole. Far more common in the pamphlets were arguments that used conscience, personal legal examination and, in some cases, extra-Parliamentary measures to empower their implied readers to fight for Parliament. These thinkers were able to tally past and present Parliamentary actions with the notions of the three estates and the mixed constitution, and in doing so developed means by which the implied reader could continue to support the Parliament whilst also maintaining that Parliament was not an absolute sovereign. In political thinking, these challenges were critical because they were in fact trying to marry the abstract principles of sovereignty (that absolute obedience was due to a body or ruler for order in society to be maintained) to the practicalities of the case at hand (that this might mean being forced to do something that was unpalatable or against conscience). The complex intellectual question of sovereignty was thus being dealt with in a political moment where it would have immediate literal consequences.

This section also charts the range of acceptable roles that the implied reader could play in the polemic, and examines how ideas of conscience were appealed to in order to enable support of the Parliament. The majority of pamphlets were unwilling to confront the fact that the acts that Parliament was doing, and the pressures of the war itself, meant that Parliament was acting as a sovereign. By relying on the implied reader, these pamphlets were able to empower Parliament to act as sovereign without necessarily bearing the consequences of that sovereignty – suggesting a much wider dissatisfaction
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with Parliamentary absolutism than has been hitherto recognised, but also a desire for a form of conditional obedience. Arguments that were created for expedience rather than posterity would need to be amalgamated into wider parliamentarian thought, creating constitutional situations that seemed a far cry from the necessities of March 1642.

The second section focuses on April to June 1643, and examines how events within and surrounding Parliament transformed the polemical debate and the role that the reader was permitted to play. It culminates with an account of the ‘Waller plot’ in June 1643, a failed attempt to take London covertly for the King. The discovery, once several days old and fully pacified, was used by Commons grandee Pym in the first few weeks of June 1643 to skilfully steer through the Vow and Covenant, which was intended to bind the nation together in a collective oath and help identify those who failed to engage with the parliamentarian cause with enough zeal.262 In doing so, the London royalist movement and those that either pushed for peace or refused to admit a Parliamentary absolutism were conflated into a single malignant ‘other’ that threatened the Parliamentary cause.263 By manipulating popular and elite fears of a crypto-royalist plot, Pym and his allies managed to shift the political conversation away from the implied reader acting as an arbiter, and back towards their role as readers being simply observers. This shift, rather than being a legitimate solution to the problems in political thought that had been raised by the political thinking of the polemical debate, was rather an abandonment of the legal and constitutional problems raised. The reconstruction of Parliamentary absolutism and the subject’s unconditional allegiance, tied to the condemnation of those that found themselves unable to subscribe to this, would mean that those who found themselves unable to support Parliament absolutely in conscience were pushed towards increasingly radical consequences.

I The Nature of Parliamentary Sovereignty

I. The Issue of Parliamentary Absolutism

In the autumn of 1642, the royalist Henry Ferne penned his Resolving of Conscience and argued that his role as a divine meant that he might consider whether the law the public


had been told by the Parliament had been ‘against Gods law’, and if so whether he could ‘accordingly instruct his people’. Since the opening up of the presses in the summer of 1642, pamphlets and political thought more generally had introduced significant concessions in order to make their works more palatable to the reading public. Ferne’s work skilfully placed itself in the middle of increasingly fractious parliamentarian justifications, and was able to expose rifts in constitutional and legal thought, both in the work itself, and the efforts of parliamentarians to respond to it. Some authors found components of Ferne’s argument worthy of retort, others found the entire thing unworthy of consideration. It was the fragmentary responses that revealed the wide spectrum of opinion within the parliamentarian coalition, and led to parliamentarians coming to rhetorical blows amongst themselves to justify their positions. Ferne’s work and the responses to it illuminate a clear divide between factions of political thought within the parliamentarian coalition, and their views on the role of the people and their consciences within the polemical debate.

Often credited by historians with being the most important Parliamentary propagandist, Parker had imagined the origins of power to be completely and absolutely from the people, but was keen to ensure that the only way that this power could be legitimately used was through the Parliament, the truly representative body. As Mendle reminds us, Parker’s justification based on this conception of the constitution was reliant on two factors remaining constant – first, that the emergency threatened the ‘very being of the state’, and secondly that the Parliament remained the only legitimate power that could protect it. By maintaining these two factors, Parker was able to demonstrate that Parliament (because it was representative) could wield an arbitrary power, and that in wielding an essentially quasi-unconstitutional power, it was in fact protecting the
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264 Henry Ferne, The resolving of conscience, upon this question whether upon such a supposition or case, as is now usually made, (The King will not discharge his trust but is bent or seduced to subvert religion, laws, and liberties.), subjects may take arms and resist? and whether that case be now? (s.n., 1642) Wing F803, p. 1.

265 Powers to be resisted: or A dialogue arguing the Parliaments lawfull resistance of the powers now in armes against them; and that archbishops, bishops, curates, neuters, all these are to be cut off by the law of God; therefore to be cast out by the law of the land (Printed for Henry Overton, [28 December] 1643) E.79[15], p. 15; Allen, English Political Thought, 1603-1660, p. 478.

266 Sirluck, 'Introduction', pp. 21-2; Foxley, Levellers, pp. 21-2.

267 Mendle, 'Great Council', p. 160,
Parker’s conception, then, was an arbitrary and fully representative Parliament that could not be questioned or disobeyed by those it represented.

A similar argument was made by Herle, whose *A Fuller Answer* to Ferne was dated by Thomason in December 1642. Through his flexible understanding of the mixed constitution, Herle argued that the two Houses of Parliament could ‘supply’ the defect of the third estate (the king) especially when the third estate refused to act for the purpose of the state, the safety of the people. Two estates (in this case, the two Houses) could work together to decide when the situation arose where they might need to supply the defect of a third estate (in this case, the King), and therefore had a ‘power of last Resolution’. Herle did not shy away from stating that ‘as the Government in the forme of qualification of it was, at first an act of will, and so Arbitrary, so it still remaining the same it must remaine some where arbitrary still’. However, that Parliament was arbitrary was not a concern to Herle because they had interest within the kingdom, and for him, ‘Interests are better state security then oaths’. While the circumstance was extraordinary, the legitimacy to act was not from ‘the cause’, but rather ‘the constitution of government’, a power reserved to ensure that the government was preserved. Later, Herle would remove the pragmatic language of ‘supply’ to make his point clearer. In his *Answer to Doctor Fernes Reply*, he argued that ‘The supremacy consists not in declaring
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269 Parker later the point clearer in his *The contra-replicant, his complaint to His Maiestie* (s.n., [31 January] 1643) E.87[5], pp. 29-30; and in Henry Parker, *Jus populi, or, A discourse wherein clear satisfaction is given as well concerning the right of subiects as the right of princes shewing how both are consistent and where they border one upon the other* (Printed for Robert Bostock, [16 October] 1644) E.12[25], pp. 18-9. A similar reading of Parker is given in Alan Cromartie, ‘Parliamentary Sovereignty, Popular Sovereignty, and Henry Parker’s Adjudicative Standpoint’, in Quentin Skinner and Richard Bourke (eds), *Popular Sovereignty in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, 2016), p. 157; Cromartie, ‘Hobbes, History, and Non-Domination’, p. 175.

270 Charles Herle, *A fuller answer to a treatise written by Doctor Ferne, entituled The resolving of conscience upon this question, whether upon this supposition, or case (the King will not defend, but is bent to subvert religion, lawes, and liberties) subjects may with good conscience make resistance* (Printed for John Bartlet, [29 December] 1642) E.244[27], pp. 3, 8-9.

271 Ibid., p. 17.


law, for every Court hath it in this power’ (although, he admits, not to the same extent as Parliament) but rather ‘tis the making of law that supremacy especially consists’.\textsuperscript{274} Herle described a mixed constitution, but one where it was possible for the Commons and Lords to supply the defects of the third estate of the King. Thus, supremacy was mixed, but could be combined against the King if necessary, because ‘hee [Ferne] need not buy an Almanack (as he speakes) to reckon by, that one is lesse then three’.\textsuperscript{275} This power of ‘supply’, or later supremacy, was to Herle reserved wholly in the Parliament, and ‘the people have reserved no power in themselves from themselves in Parliament’.

While the style of argument differs, the implications of both Herle and Parker were the same: that Parliament had a power to act arbitrarily in this emergency, that this power derived from the constitution, and that there was to be no possibility of appeal against their judgement. This constitutional understanding correlated with the (admittedly sporadic) declarations of Parliament itself in the early war period. In November 1642, for example, Parliament belatedly responded to Charles’s reply to their Remonstrance of 26 May 1642, which had thus far only been answered by anonymous authors. In the November Declaration, Parliament argued that their judgement was unquestionable, that it was unbound by precedents, and that the Coronation Oath meant that the King was obligated to pass the laws that attempted to remedy the ‘mischiefes and dammages’ of the Kingdom.\textsuperscript{277}

In his persuasive study, Lee Morgan has argued that Parliament were able to develop this constitutional account by appropriating the ‘fiction’ of popular sovereignty from English royals. Morgan argued that the royals had initially used this ‘fiction’ in order to deny subjects the ability to question government policy, because by arguing that the subjects were represented by Parliament, the subjects had been involved in the decision-making,

\textsuperscript{274} Charles Herle, \textit{An answer to Doctor Fernes reply, entitled Conscience satisfied: especially to as much of it as concerned that answer to his treatise which went under the name of the Fuller answer} (Printed by Tho. Brudenell for N. A., [17 May] 1643) E.102[3], p. 20, but cf. Judson, \textit{The Crisis of the Constitution}, pp. 401-2, who contests that that Herle ever understood that the legislative power was really supreme, perhaps because she mainly makes use of his first \textit{fuller answer}.

\textsuperscript{275} Herle, \textit{A fuller answer}, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{276} Ibid., p. 25.

\textsuperscript{277} Husbands (ed.), \textit{An exact collection}, p. 714. According to the journals of the Commons and the Lords, it was Pym who negotiated this Remonstrance through the Houses, which is not surprising given recent work on the political thought of Pym by historians such as Peacey and Adamson, below. CJ, ii, p. 832; LJ, v, p. 431.
and thus had waived their right to object. Morgan has argued that Parliament was able to 'invent' the sovereignty of the people in the early 1640s in order to 'claim it for themselves ... to justify their own resistance' against the King. By doing so, Parliament could simultaneously legitimate their actions while also restricting the ability of those whom they represented to object to what was being done in their name. Parliament was fully representative, and thus those whom it represented were excluded from participation. This was the argument of Herle and Parker – in Herle's words, the people 'have reserved no power in themselves from themselves in Parliament'.

The work of Parker and Herle and those that agreed with them might for ease be called Parliamentary absolutism, though it should be noted that their absolutism came from a conviction that the King's legal power was not separated from the Parliament, and that his legal commands, if he was free from obfuscation to make them, would surely correlate with the suggestions of the Houses anyway. Parker, Herle and their adherents saw themselves as defending a constitutionalist position and so upholding the legal principles upon which society depended, and it was impossible that so lawful and representative a body such as Parliament could produce advice that was wrong, or that the King could lawfully ignore it. In this sense, their Parliamentary absolutism was constructed as being the natural outcome of the exceptional case at hand, rather than being an all-encompassing doctrine of absolutism. Their absolutism was thus constitutionalist, and rested upon a principle of protecting the law as they saw it, rather than destroying it.
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Historians of political thought have long emphasised the clear differences between the theories of Parker and Herle and other writers such as William Bridge, Jeremiah Burroughs and Philip Hunton, although studies have mainly examined these writers only as a context to later writers such as John Locke or James Harrington, or the Levellers. J. H. Franklin, for example, has argued that Parker, Herle and others were pushed to Parliamentary absolutism by ‘a real theoretical dilemma’ – that they could find no other way to ‘legitimate resistance’. Arihiro Fukuda has argued that the Answer to the XIX Propositions introduced a Polybian notion of a balanced state into political thinking, and that this description could be exploited by Herle and Parker as it meant that they could claim that Parliament was sovereign because two estates were more than one. These studies emphasise that other writers – such as Bridge, Burroughs and Hunton – essentially agreed with Ferne’s description of the constitution, but that the solution that they had come to differed in that the people must have a theoretical right to resist.

The most important recent intervention in the debates over the nature of Parliamentary sovereignty, however, has been that of Rachel Foxley. Examining the origins of the Levellers’ explicit ‘appeal to the people’ over and above the House of Commons in 1647, Foxley shows that the Levellers drew on two distinct variants in parliamentarian thought – that of Parker and Herle, and that of ‘Presbyterian’ writers such as Hunton, Herbert Palmer and other mixed constitutionalists – to develop their political thought. This was an innovation because the act of ‘appealing to the people was fundamentally at odds with Parliamentary sovereignty’, and by combining them the Levellers were able to construct a parliamentary sovereignty that still allowed an appeal to the people. By May 1649, they had developed ‘proposals which sought to provide a halfway house between the sovereignty of the people and that of their representatives in Parliament’.

Foxley’s account demonstrates the merit of further substantive study of the mixed constitutionalists in the early 1640s, but also makes clear the need to integrate this
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287 Foxley, Levellers, pp. 52-4.
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account into the political history of the civil war, rather than extract it out from the conflict. Historians have generally focused on the Parliamentary absolutists, and have often under-emphasised both how constitutionally radical and restrictive their argument was, to the detriment of examining those who remained committed to a mixed constitution. Indeed, the majority of the pamphlets seem to have used an implied reader to empower the Parliament with a conditional obedience in a way that Parliamentary absolutists would have found abhorrent. We do not yet have a satisfactory account of why the intellectual creativity of 1642 and 1643, especially with regards to the constitution, did not continue into 1644. By more clearly establishing what distinguished Parliamentary absolutist and mixed constitutionalist thought, the theoretical problems that authors were facing, and the mechanical processes by which their arguments were produced, an account of why the political, legal and constitutional conversation changed so dramatically may be sketched.

II. EMPOWERING A NON-SOVEREIGN PARLIAMENT

Mixed constitutionalists – those that did not place a sovereign power in the Parliament, but rather shared it between three estates – were faced with a significant intellectual hurdle. Their works had to get the constitution to work in a way that could answer hypothetical objections and examples from observable practice, and to empower Parliament to act against the King while maintaining that Parliament did not, in whatever circumstances it chose, have the ability to overrule the King. Mixed constitutionalists did this in two ways. Firstly, they appealed to the implied reader’s conscience as an arbiter to decide which side’s case was lawful, the King’s or the Parliament’s. Secondly, they argued that Parliament was disobeying the King’s unlawful commands, and that because the subject was not obliged to follow unlawful commands the subject’s obedience was to the Parliament, whose commands were lawful. In the process of making these two arguments, the mixed constitutionalists again appealed to the implied reader to arbitrate between lawful and unlawful, and this led some to question whether the Parliament itself could make unlawful commands, and whether if Parliament did tyrannise, obedience was still due. By using these techniques, the mixed constitutionalists empowered the Parliament to act while maintaining that it was not an absolute sovereign, and in doing so were legitimising a complex legal and casuistic space where the implied reader ultimately was relied upon to choose a side.
Ferne’s *Resolving of Conscience* had drawn on casuistry as a political language in order to bolster his legal and scriptural argument. His work resolved that ‘no Conscience ... can find a safe and cleare ground for such resistance’, and that ‘no man in Conscience can be truly perswaded’ that the case for resistance was safe.\(^{289}\) Ferne drew a parallel between his choice to defend the King and those who decided to defend the Parliament, and argued that both had come, ultimately, from a point of conscience. To him, ‘all Misse-led People in this land’ were ‘told, the Gospel and your Liberties and all you have are in most imminent danger, and without taking Arms for the defence, irrevocably lost; and that this is lawfull by the Fundamentals of the Kingdom’, an argument that Ferne believed was being pressed ‘upon trust, without an expresse and particular warrant, to rule and secure your Conscience against the expresse words of the Apostle forbidding resistance, *Rom. 13*.\(^{290}\) Thus the submission to Parliament’s adjudication that was required by the Parliamentary case was, to Ferne, an act of conscience.

Parliamentary absolutists and mixed constitutionalists fundamentally disagreed over the issue of the role of the individual’s conscience in the constitution, and to understand the roots of this disagreement, it is instructive to look at the differences between two Parliamentary Declarations in May 1642. While Parliament in its Declarations maintained the veneer of being resolutely united,\(^{291}\) these two Declarations reveal that under the surface there were fundamental differences of opinion. On 19 May 1642, Parliament argued that because the courts had to decide which side was lawful, and because Parliament was the highest court, it was not ‘in the power of any person or Court to revoke that judgement’.\(^{292}\) Parliament could raise a guard, and the King’s protestations could be ignored because Parliament’s judgement ‘is in the eye of the Law the King’s Judgement in his highest court, though the King in his person be neither

\(^{289}\) Ferne, *Resolving of conscience*, title page.

\(^{290}\) Ibid., sig. Aiv


\(^{292}\) Husbands (ed.), *An exact collection*, p. 208.
present nor assenting thereunto'. A week later, however, on 26 May 1642, Parliament made a new Declaration that argued a very different case. Parliament had called for ‘all men to judge’ whether the ‘King’s verball commands, without any such stampe of his Authority, and against the order of both Houses of Parliament’, should be followed. Conrad Russell has argued that focusing on the legality of commands and the separation of the King’s two bodies meant the Declaration of Parliament could avoid ‘the need to argue any case for Parliamentary sovereignty’, something that the Declaration of 19 May 1642 had done just a week before. In other words, focusing on lawful commands was a way of avoiding attributing sovereignty to Parliament, and could be used to challenge the King while also not granting Parliament an absolute power. Parliamentary Declarations, then, were split over the extent to which the subjects could examine Parliament’s arguments, between the arguments of the Declaration of 19 May, which broadly corresponds with Parliamentary absolutism, and the arguments of the Remonstrance of 26 May, which was much more tentative over the issue of parliamentary sovereignty.

Parliamentary absolutists believed that conscience did not play a role in this process because of their conception of the role that Parliament was playing. Cromartie has argued that the ‘adjudicative’ understanding of parliamentary sovereignty apparent in the Declaration of 19 May 1642 can also be found in Parker, and that his Observations should be considered through the lens of Parliament establishing that it could not only interpret the law, but also make it. Because Parliament was the highest court, this trend of parliamentarian thought went, it could declare the law, and rather than an investigation of conscience, it was a simple case of accepting the supremacy of the
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293 Ibid., pp. 206-9; Hill’s response to the declaration can be found in Willson Havelock Coates, Anna Steele Young, and Vernon F. Snow (eds), The Private Journals of the Long Parliament, vol. II (1987), p. 346, where it is detailed that some objected that this made the Parliament the supreme power. Charles replied that this argument was ‘of a very new Nature and Learning’, and that Parliament was claiming an ‘infallibility of a now major part of both Houses’. Husbands (ed.), An exact collection, p. 240.

294 A remonstrance or the declaration of the Lords and Commons, now assembled in Parliament, 26 of May, 1642, pp. 9-11. According to D’Ewes, the printer, John Frank, was called into Parliament because it was alleged he had printed it with errors. Coates, Young and Snow (eds), Private Journals, ii, p. 375.


Parliament over other courts. Herle’s case corroborates this, and rather than engaging with Ferne’s argument, rejects the premise and argues that Ferne was resolving ‘upon a question that never came in question; That no conscience upon such supposition was ever undertaken’.297 Herle’s rejection of casuistic methods in his responses means that he is able to focus on natural and constitutional law, and his work concludes as Parker’s did, albeit with more focus on a mixed (and unbalanced) constitution. Later in the work, Herle argued that “tis not the cause, ‘tis the constitution’ that empowered Parliament to act, and was clear that he believed that the Houses were not disobeying nor actively obeying the King, but rather that they were fulfilling their coordinate role.298 Alongside Parker, Herle and the Declaration of 19 May 1642, some later Declarations also conformed to this constitutional understanding. According to a Parliamentary Declaration at the beginning of November 1642, decisions that were taken by Parliament ‘ought not afterwards to be questioned by his Majesty, or any of his Subjects’, for Parliament were the highest Court of Justice and ‘competent Judges thereof’, rather than ‘the pleasure and interpretation of private persons, or of publick in a private capacity’.299 This argument was parroted a few weeks later by an anonymous work entitled Truth and Peace Honestly Plead’d, which argued that Parliament had ‘the supreme power to judge and condemn’.300 In sum, Parliamentary absolutists, both in Parliament and in pamphlets believed that conscience had no role to play in the constitution, and because of this, Parliamentary absolutists were unable to be substantially involved in the political conversation.

For many mixed constitutionalists, however, the language of lawful and unlawful commands offered opportunities to avoid the need to declare Parliament sovereign, and


298 Herle, A fuller answer, pp. 21-2.

299 Husbands (ed.), An exact collection, p. 726.

300 Truth and peace honestly pleaded, and rightly sought for, or, A loyall subjects advice vsefvll to confirm, convince, calme, condemne honest ignorant passionate malicious men (s.n., [26 November] 1642) E.128[14], p. 10.
they instead argued that the men of Parliament, and the readers outside Parliament, were simply investigating what the King said and judging whether it was lawful or not. The language of lawful and unlawful commands offered a stepping-stone to resistance theories, and from these could be drawn justifications for disobeying one magistrate and obeying another.301 This, John Goodwin reassured his readers in October 1642, did not mean that all authority was impossible, but rather that ‘An unlawful command from a superior Magistrate’ that was against the rule of God ‘dissolves’, and rather ‘we stand bound to obey the inferior, that which is lawfull’, even if (as in this case) it contradicted the superior.302 Goodwin reasoned that ‘it is no dishonour to Kings or Rulers to have their commands examined’, and that to fail to do so was ‘to make men equal to God, and to judge them as unerringly, as universally righteous and holy as he, which a man of conscience will hardly forbear to call blasphemy’.303 Ward, in the same month, argued that ‘I dare not say, that with a blind obedience we should actively obey them in whatsoever they command: for as Councels in Divinity, so Parliaments in Policy, may erre: and therefore inquisition, disquisition, examination, and conference are not forbidden us in any Acts or Statutes’.304 Therefore the reader had an obligation to investigate the demands of both the King and the Parliament to see if they were lawful, and from investigation the Parliament could be empowered at the expense of the King. The next year in February 1643, Maximes of Mixt Monarchie argued that ‘For as much as Royall and Politique powers are Supreme, but not infallible, all men must be armed with patience as well to suffer for well doing forbidden as to doe well when it is commanded and so God and the King are alwaies obeyed, when they are contrary or at concord in commands and prohibitions’.305 They were fighting against ‘his personall


302 John Goodwin, Anti-cavalierisme, or, Truth pleading as well the necessity, as the lawfulness of this present vwar for the suppressing of that butcherly brood of cavaliering incendiaries, who are now hammering England, to make an Ireland of it (Printed by G.B. and R.W. for Henry Overton, [21 October] 1642) E.123[25], p. 27.

303 Ibid., pp. 18-20; On this, see also Coffey, John Goodwin, pp. 86-7.

304 Ward, The Vindication of the Parliament, p. 7. This extract was also reprinted the next year as A further enquiry for truth, for the better satisfaction of scrupulous consciences (s.n., [25 March] 1643) E.94[8].
commands, the persuance of them’, rather than against the King himself. In this trend, the King’s actions continued to be described as ‘illegal’ commands, and those that followed them as following ‘personall commands’, rather than ‘legall’ ones. Francis Cheynell, in a sermon to the House of Commons, pleaded that it ‘Be knowne to all the world that we doe still Reverence both his person, and Authority, and are ready to obey any lawfull Commands which he shall send us in a Legall way’. Mixed constitutionalists, then, could rely on the implied reader to adjudicate whether the commands were lawful or not, rather than relying on the judgement of Parliament alone.

This investigation was, in some way, an extension of some of the common law eccentricities that readers were already familiar with, and that helped make sense of the English constitution. For example, Burroughs had argued that a law only existed (and thus commanded obedience) if it was lawful. If, Burroughs wrote, ‘one that is in authority command out of his own will, and not by Law, I resist no power, no authority at all, if I neither actively nor passively obey, no I do not so much as resist abused authority’. This, he conceded, ‘may seem strange at the first; but if you think of it, you wil beleive it’. A similar point was made by William Bridge, and the anonymous
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309 Jeremiah Burroughs, ‘A briefe Answer to Doctor Fernes Booke, tending to resolve Conscience, about the Subjects taking up of Arms’ in The glorious name of God, The Lord of Hosts opened in two sermons, at Michaels Cornhill, London, vindicating the Commission from this Lord of Hosts, to subjects, in some case, to take up arms: with a post-script, briefly answering a late treatise by Henry Ferne, D.D. (Printed for R. Dawlman, FD: 1642) Wing 732:12, p. 3. Burroughs’ answer appears as an appendix to The glorious name of God, and the page numbers are not sequential. For ease of use, however, I have used them as they are printed.
author of Briefe Collections out of Magna Charta, who argued that ‘a Kings Grant which is either repugnant to Law, Custome, or Statute, is not good nor pleadable in the Law’.310

To discuss law and conscience was also to question how obedience was due, and the relationship between passive and active obedience. The distinction was clearly drawn by Hunton in May 1643, who argued that obedience can be ‘Positive and active, when in conscience of an authority we doe the thing commanded’, and ‘Negative and passive, when though we answer not Authority by doing, yet we doe it by contended[ly] undergoing the penalty imposed’. If an absolute monarch commanded something ‘forbidden by Gods Law, then it bindes not to active obedience, because the Apostles rule is true, it is better to obey God then men, the law inferior gives way to the superior’.311 For Burroughs, because the King was acting by his will rather than by law, to disobey his commands was legitimate, and to follow them illegitimate. However, the crucial question was where one drew the line, and thus from the very beginning of the conflict some parliamentarians were willing to investigate and question commands to ensure their legality and to legitimate parliamentary resistance, even when to do so went expressly against the Parliament’s argument.312 Although the works in question aimed to secure a practical obedience to the Parliament, the interpretations seem to have genuinely allowed, or at least considered, potentially disobeying a hypothetically tyrannous Parliament.

310 William Bridge, The wounded conscience cured, the vveak one strengthened, and the doubting satisfied. By way of answer to Doctor Fearne: where the maine point is rightly stated, and objections throughly answered, for the good of those who are willing not to be deceived (Printed for Benjamin Allen, [11 February] 1643) E.89[8], p. 20; Briefe collections out of Magna Charta: or, the knowne good old lawes of England: Which sheweth; that the law is the highest inheritance the King hath; and that if his charter, grant, or pattent, be repugnant to the said lawes, and statutes, cannot be good, as is instanced in the charter of Bridewell, London, and others. By which it appeares; that the King by his charter may not alter the nature of the law, the forme of a court; nor inheritance lineally to descend; nor that any subject be prot[ected] from arrests, suites, &c. (Printed for George Lindsey, [19 May] 1643) E.102[11], p. 4.

311 Philip Hunton, A treatise of monarchie, containing two parts: 1. concerning monarchy in generall. 2. concerning this particular monarchy. Wherein all the maine questions occurrent in both, are stated, disputed, and determined: and in the close, the contention now in being, is moderately debated, and the readiest means of reconcilement proposed (Printed for John Bellamy, and Ralph Smith, [24 May] 1643) E.103[15], pp. 8-10.
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As historians have noted, it was royalist writers who found this line of argument particularly concerning.\(^{33}\) John Spelman, a constitutional-royalist writing primarily against Parker, had lamented that other writers ‘made such impressions in the mindes of many as that they will never be perswaded, but that they may disobey and resist Authority, if they ever finde it faulty, or the commands thereof not agreeing with their Conscience’. Through this, ‘they themselves will be the judges [of] what commands are lawfull, and what not; what things good, and what evill; and so they make obedience arbitrary, and government (by pretending Conscience) at the discretion of the subject’. This, according to Spelman, was wrong – armed resistance could never be justified.\(^{34}\) The anonymous author of \textit{Obedience Passive and Active} agreed with Spelman and argued that power was from God, so therefore God’s servant (the King) had to be obeyed. \textit{The Soveraignes Desire} followed a similar line of reasoning.\(^{35}\) A similar distinction was made by the royalist John Bramhall in his \textit{Serpent Salve}: if a king commands something contrary to the ‘Law of God or Nature’, then ‘It is better to obey God [rather] then Men’, and hence grant active obedience. However, this was to be followed ‘in plain cases onely, where the Law of God, of Nature, or the Land is evident to every mans capacity’. To ‘disobey the King upon Surmise, or probable pretence, or an implicit dependence upon other Mens judgements, is to disobey both God and Man’.\(^{36}\) Passive obedience, according to Bramhall, was limited to three methods: ‘cease from sinne’, ‘prayers and tears’ and ‘flight’ to another location within the land.\(^{37}\) In this, these writers agreed with Ferne – denying obedience to commands and laws when they were against the law of

\(^{33}\) For their attempts to pacify these arguments, see David L. Smith, \textit{Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c.1640-1649} (Cambridge, 1994).
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\(^{35}\) Thomas Swadlin, \textit{The soveraignes desire peace: the subjectes dutie obedience} (s.n., [07 February] 1643) E.88[22], p. 24; \textit{Obedience active and passi ve due to the supream powver, by the word of God, reason, and the consent of divers moderne and orthodox divines; written not out of faction, but conscience, and with desire to informe the ignorant, and undeceive the seduced} (Printed by Leonard Litchfield, [24 February] 1643) E.90[19].

\(^{36}\) John Bramhall, \textit{The serpent salve, or, A remedie for the biting of an aspe wherein the observators grounds are discussed and plainly discovered to be unsound, seditious, not warranted by the laws of God, of nature, or of nations, and most repugnant to the known laws and customs of this realm : for the reducing of such of His Majesties well-meaning subjects into the right way who have been misled by that ignis fatuu s} (s.n., 1643) Wing B4236, pp. 50-1.

\(^{37}\) \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 51-3.
God or the land was expected, but the actual raising of arms was another matter, and expressly forbidden by the gospel.\textsuperscript{318}

As it became necessary for Parliament to justify their decisions to the public, it became possible for pamphleteers to engage with, defend, or even attack, the judgement that Parliament had reached. Because of this, new demands were made on the implied and actual reader, and some authors required their readers to perform duties of personal casuistry and legal investigation, rather than relying on the form or means by which commands were delivered. There was, in other words, a space in which the people had an ability to question and test the legality of commands from a governor, and in which their own conscience could have some agency. Indeed, some parliamentarians were forced to begin to wrestle with the idea that their own commands could be challenged, and that at some point, they would need to justify why Parliament’s commands were unquestionable.\textsuperscript{319} Parliament was unchallengeable from other courts due to its role as the highest judicature, but by explaining why their decisions were correct, they had invited their own actions to be questioned by the people, even though these ideas were designed to empower rather than diminish the Parliament. In other words, their justifications, even if the King’s were proved to be wrong and unlawful, were increasingly required to stand up to the private examination and personal conscience of the reader. The debate around conscience was one that Parliamentary absolutists could not be involved in, and thus it was left to the mixed constitutionalists to counter Ferne’s claims, often doing so by deferring to an increasingly relied-upon implied reader.

The mixed constitutionalists, then, believed that Parliament had the right to resist the King in this case, but did not believe that Parliament had an absolute power. In order to empower Parliament they used the implied reader either to examine their conscience and declare that Parliament should be supported, or through the individual’s scrutinising of commands given by magistrates.

Many of Ferne’s objections, and the responses that he received, contested the nature and origins of power. Ferne had separated the ‘Power it selfe from the designing of the Person to beare that power’.\textsuperscript{320} Since this ‘power is of God originally and chiefly’, as soon as the

\textsuperscript{318} Bland, \textit{Resolved upon the question}, pp. 5-6.

\textsuperscript{319} Foxley, ‘Varieties’, pp. 422-3.

\textsuperscript{320} Ferne, \textit{Resolving of conscience}, p. 12.
power is placed by the people ‘they can not reassume it’. As Rom. 13. 1 said, ‘The powers are of God’. Ferne’s interpretation of the parliamentary justification relied on the idea that the Houses were reassuming the power that the people had invested in the King, and the sting in his work was his theorising that if that was the case, the Houses could therefore be threatened with the people doing the same thing to them. While it is tempting for historians to view Ferne’s work as the typical re-assertion of the divine right of Kings, it needs to be acknowledged that Resolving of Conscience was particularly politically savvy, and forced parliamentarians to deal with the consequences of justifications that emphasised the people being the origin of political power. Ferne used the parliamentarians’ own legitimisation tactics to create for them further problems in political thought. By challenging parliamentarians to elaborate on their understanding of the constitution in an open debate, Ferne was able to highlight the inconsistencies and contradictions between them in his Conscience Satisfied in April 1643. Ferne’s pamphlet posed parliamentarians two challenges: his first was that you could not reassume powers that were originally of God, and his second was that if you could reassume power, then the Parliament itself was threatened. To tackle these claims, several mixed constitutionalist writers started by drawing a distinction between the idea

---
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323 An important point made by Sanderson, ‘Answer to the Nineteen Propositions Revisited’, Henry Ferne, A reply unto severall treatises pleading for the armes now taken up by subjects in the pretended defence of religion and liberty by name, unto the reverend and learned divines which pleaded scripture and reason for defensive arms : the author of the Treatise of monarchy : the author of the Fuller answer his reply (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [01 November] 1643) E.74[9], pp. 12, that ‘It was never my intent ... to plead for absolutenesse of Power in the King, if by absolutenesse of power be meant (as it should be) a power of Arbitrary command, but if by Absolutenesse of Power this Author means (as he doth sometimes) a power not to be resisted or constrained by force of Armes raised by Subject, such a power we plead for’. For assertions that Ferne pushes for the divine right of kings, see, for example, Sirluck, ‘Introduction’, pp. 30-1; Janelle Greenberg, The Radical Face of the Ancient Constitution: St. Edward’s ‘Laws’ in Early Modern Political Thought (Cambridge and New York, 2001), pp. 182-3; Judson, The Crisis of the Constitution, pp. 393-5.

324 Henry Ferne, Conscience satisfied. That there is no warrant for the armes now taken up by subjects. By way of reply unto severall answers made to a treatise formerly published for the resolving of conscience upon the case (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [18 April] 1643) E.97[7].
of authority, and the idea of power itself.\textsuperscript{325} Many conceded that at some point, power must have come from God (and the King was thus anointed), but argued that Ferne was oversimplifying the transaction and missing out a key step. For example, Bridge distinguishes between ‘the power abstractively considered from the qualifications of that power, and the designation of a person to that power’, and decides that while the power is from God, the authority was from people.\textsuperscript{326} Likewise, Hunton and Goodwin argued that while God had made clear that there should be a government, he did not specify what form it should take, and left it to the people to decide.\textsuperscript{327} In other words, even if the power was from God originally, this was not important because it was authority that gave Parliament the legitimacy to act. As Burroughs put it, ‘There is no body here that yet hath attempted to take any power away from the King that Law hath given him’.\textsuperscript{328}

In arguing against the first challenge – that you could reassume powers that were originally of God – these mixed constitutionalist writers were more confident. Palmer pointed to the case of Hezekiah as proof that it was wrong that ‘there is no power of recalling any thing devoted to God’, as Hezekiah had taken gold ‘from the Doores of the Temple and the Pillars which he had overlaid’ to attempt to pay off the ‘King of Assyria’.\textsuperscript{329} Later in the work, Palmer pointed out the practical problems of Ferne’s logic

\textsuperscript{325} The need for this distinction is emphasized by Allen, \textit{English Political Thought, 1603-1660}, p. 459; and by Burroughs, ‘A briefe Answer to Doctor Fernes Booke’, pp. 7-8. The last few months in 1642 had seen a public spat over Psalm 105.15, ’Touch not mine anointed’. According to William Prynne, the Psalm was being misconstrued ‘to cry up the absolute irresistable Prerogative of Kings in all their exorbitant proceedings, and beat down the just liberties of the Subject’, when in reality the text is ‘a direct precept given to Kings themselves, not to oppress or injure their faithful subjects’ in William Prynne, \textit{A vindication of Psalme 105.15, touch not mine anoynted, and doe my prophets no harme, from some false glosses lately obtruded on it by royallists proving that this divine inhibition was given to kings not subjects : to restraine them from injuring and oppressing Gods servants and their subjects} (s.n., [06 December] 1642 E244[1]) sig. Aiv. A Royalist retort argued that the ‘dangerous Tenet’ had been ’buzzed into the eares of the people, as if they onely were Anointed, none but they’, and that rather the ‘forcible resistance’ against the King meant that they were, in fact, touching an anointed: \textit{The Soveraignty of kings: or An absolute answer and confutation of that groundlesse vindication of Psalme 105. 15}, (s.n., [21 December] 1642) E.244[17], sig. Aiv, Aqr.

\textsuperscript{326} Bridge, \textit{Wounded conscience cured}, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{327} Hunton, \textit{A treatise of monarchie}, pp. 3-4; Goodwin, \textit{Anti-cavalierisme}, pp. 7-9; Judson, \textit{The Crisis of the Constitution}, p. 397.

\textsuperscript{328} Burroughs, ‘A briefe Answer to Doctor Fernes Booke’, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{329} Herbert Palmer, \textit{Scripture and reason pleaded for defensive armes: or The whole controversie about subjects taking up armes. Wherein besides other pamphlets, an answer is punctually directed
– if all power was originally from God, were the judges who held the power that was, at some point, from God also holders of that power irrevocably? Similarly, Burroughs had argued that if ‘the King gives power to an inferior magistrate, the power that this Magistrate hath is likewise from God, for so the Scripture says, Rom. 13. All power is from God: may not this power be re-assumed therefore?’ Because it was permissible for the King to take power from lesser magistrates, ‘therefore his [Ferne’s] consequence [was] not good’. Even if this was not the issue at hand, power could be reassumed.

In arguing against Ferne’s second challenge – that Parliament itself was under threat if power could be reassumed – more caution was needed. As Foxley has shown, the ‘Presbyterian’ writers Hunton, Palmer et al., and Samuel Rutherford understood sovereignty as shared between three estates, and described the way that none of them could dominate the other. For Foxley, Palmer and the other divines who composed *Scripture and Reason Pleded* maintained a true mixed polity, rather than a ‘parliamentary sovereignty’. Foxley also highlights the importance of Hunton, whose *Treatise of Monarchie* comprehensively examined various systems of government and attempted to demonstrate that the power of the monarchy was limited and mixed, and hence no one estate should control the others. On the question of arbitration, Hunton felt a need to distance himself from Herle and other ‘Officious Propugners’ who ‘overdoe their worke, and give more to them [the Parliament] whose cause they plead, then they ever intended to assume’, warning against giving ‘power to one of these three to crush and undoe the other at pleasure’. Hunton’s work, then, was targeted not just at Ferne, but also at the Parliamentary absolutists. Rather, arbitration had to come from ‘our Consciences’ having the ‘evidence of the Truth to guide them’, and although Hunton made it clear that he was supporting Parliament because they ‘in likelihood should see

to Dr. Fernes booke, entituled, Resolving of conscience, &c. (Printed for John Bellamy and Ralph Smith, [14 April] 1643) E.247[22], pp. 35-6.


most’, his constitutional understanding did not allow Parliament to dominate the other estate.\textsuperscript{335}

The problem faced by parliamentarian writers who focused on the mixed constitution, however, was to consolidate their commitment to a mixed constitution without threatening either the authority of the Parliament, or its ability to act against the royalist forces. Many historians, drawing from work by Wootton, have argued that the threat of reassumption was an explicit threat to Parliament.\textsuperscript{336} However, many parliamentarian apologists who attempted to have the best of both worlds – a mixed constitution while maintaining the right of Parliament to defend itself against the King – did this by considering the hypothetical (and, they assured their readers, near impossible) situations where trust could be withdrawn from the Parliament. This was an issue that was best approached tentatively. For example, Burroughs challenged Ferne’s assertion that the people could reassume power from the Parliament because if Parliament could grow tyrannical the ‘condition of such a State would bee very dangerous’, and speculated that the ‘Law of Nature’ might allow the people to ‘discharge them of that power they had, and set up some other’, but that he would ‘leave it to the light of nature to judge’.\textsuperscript{337} Palmer argued that ‘It is lawfull for the people to resist even the Tyranny of a Parliament, when altogether outrageous, (as in our Question) not else’.\textsuperscript{338} As we have seen, Hunton was willing to allow the people an active role in deciding where power should lie in cases of dispute. Bridge argued that it was the ‘most naturall work in the world for everything to preserve itselfe’, and argued that just as it was ‘Naturall for a man to preserve himselfe, naturall for a Community’, and hence when trust was placed in a ruler, then ‘that act of their trust is but by positive law, and therefore cannot destroy the naturall law, which is selfe preservation’.\textsuperscript{339} Although he argued that Parliament should be followed, he implicitly maintained that individual self-preservation (which derived from natural law)

\textsuperscript{335}Hunton, \textit{A treatise of monarchie}, p. 73.


\textsuperscript{337}Burroughs, ‘A briefe Answer to Doctor Fernes Booke’, pp. 9-10. He later said that this was ‘not properly to resist the power, but to discharge the power, to set the power elsewhere’.

\textsuperscript{338}Palmer, \textit{Scripture and reason pleaded}, p. 50.

\textsuperscript{339}Bridge, \textit{Wounded conscience cured}, p. 2.
could not possibly be destroyed by a positive law which derived from the community. Rather, what prevented Bridge’s community from withdrawing their trust was three-fold – Parliament should be trusted in any case, Parliament were elected to protect the Commonweal, and to reassume power would ‘leave themselves [the community] naked of all authority’. Mixed constitutionalist arguments of this nature were presented as contingent and conditional, but by even considering the possibility, they were a marked step away from the arguments of Parliamentary absolutists such as Parker and Herle, who denied that a tyrannical Parliament was possible at all.

Those writers who denied that Parliament was absolutely sovereign seem to have attributed sovereignty to a fictitious body of ‘the people’, and by doing so they were able to empower Parliament to justify their resistance against the King while simultaneously denying that Parliament was absolute. For them, sovereignty was supra-Parliamentary, but the marks of sovereignty could be found within Parliament. It was a constructive argument that was intended to legitimate obedience while not restricting Parliament’s authority, and by appealing above and beyond the Parliament to a fictitious sovereign people these writers were able to have the benefits of a Parliamentary sovereignty without unbalancing the mixed constitution. Therefore, while practically they believed that Parliament could act as sovereign in this case, they stopped short of arguing that Parliament was absolute.

Such a conception of sovereignty has been put forward by scholars such as Richard Tuck, who has argued that Hobbes’s discussion of a monarch who was asleep constitutes a clear contradiction of Hugo Grotius’s understanding of the marks of sovereignty – a dictator, and thus other rulers, were sovereigns. According to Tuck, Hobbes argued that there was a ‘Bodinian distinction between sovereign and government’, whereby even though legislation could be passed by a monarch, sovereignty did not necessarily lie with them. The people, like a sleeping monarch, could remain sovereign even though government was held elsewhere, and thus ‘all elective monarchies of Europe were (by implication) really either aristocracies or democracies’.

_____________________
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sovereignty, then, might awaken and restore order or condemn the old regime, but in normal day-to-day activities their presence would go unnoticed. Similarly, Daniel Lee has argued that the people were appealed to in order to avoid actually defining where sovereignty lay. The appeal to popular sovereignty was a ‘conceptual placeholder for kingship in the modern mind, by playing the constitutional role of the imagined fictive bearer of a depersonalised sovereignty’ – where sovereignty could be denied to kings and placed elsewhere. In other words, it was a practical solution to a theoretical problem, which would allow action by the Parliament while not empowering it to be an absolute sovereign.

There was, then, a clear divide between absolutists and mixed constitutionalists, which meant that parliamentarian defences disagreed over the role the reader and conscience could play in the constitution. Although the absolutist argument was often made by the more competent writer, the argument itself was ill-suited to pamphlet form. The crux of the problem was that, given that the argument had been made in its entirety in May and June 1642, and because nothing that the reader could do could make a difference, the absolutist argument did not progress – Parliament was absolute and their power could not be reassumed. The nine months of debate between the autumn of 1642 and the summer of 1643 was a discussion about the mixed constitutionalist problems of conscience and obedience, and they could not get involved with this. Ferne had made every aspect of the parliamentary case – even deferring to the judgement of Parliament – one of conscience, which meant that the implied reader’s conscience could be courted and cajoled by pamphleteers. By conceding that Parliament could do wrong and using the implied reader to solve the constitutional fallout, mixed constitutionalists were able to engage with and attempt to counter Ferne’s case. By contrast, Parliamentary absolutists, however, could not be involved in this debate because they denied not just the premise of the question – that conscience had to be consulted to follow Parliament – but also the premise of the debate – that it was a case of conscience at all.

IV. CONCLUSION

This unstable constitutional situation had arisen partly because of the pressure of describing perfect constitutions in polemical and military circumstances, but also


344 Although historians continually have to reiterate these readings. See, for example, Cromartie, ‘Hobbes, History, and Non-Domination’, pp. 174-5
because of a genuine disagreement about whether Parliament could be trusted absolutely. There was an increasing strain imposed on the reader as terminology and concepts of the law and the constitution, both of which claimed authority from age and immemorial reasoning, were continually being changed and adapted to suit political needs. According to the Parliament’s later Declarations, their verdict as the supreme judicature was unchallengeable, but as both the royalist and more moderate parliamentarian pamphlets show, it was possible to admit their power as a supreme judicature, yet still object to their actions – you could deny the Commons alone was a Court of Record, or that they had authority to judge on any case they chose. Hunton had shown that the unfeasibility of this constitutional fix was that it was impossible for any one body to have a final say on the law without that body becoming an arbitrary power. Ultimately, the reader had to rely on ‘our Consciences’ having ‘evidence of Truth to guide them’. The problem was unsolvable, and Hunton, although supporting Parliament because they ‘in likelihood should see most’, had made this perfectly clear to the reader.

In part, some of the reason for the impossibility of the problem was because of the nature of Ferne’s argument. By tying his argument to conscience, he had allowed himself a distinct understanding of the relationship of the law and the case at hand, and offered the reader a different way of thinking about the conflict itself. By blending maxims of casuistry with legal argument, Ferne was able to argue that, as in cases of conscience, in contested cases of law ‘it is better we follow what the known Law commands us to, and that there be a suspension of such a declaring till all that are entrusted for us can

345 See, for example, their declaration of 3 November 1642, in Husbands (ed.), An Exact Collection, p. 704.
346 See, for example, Hyde, A complaint to the House of Commons. Of course, this argument could be deployed tactically depending on the relationship between the two Houses. For example, the Venetian Secretary Gerolamo Agostini detailed in March 1643 that ‘The Lords are moving steadily towards peace’, and thus denying that the Commons a voice in the proceedings could play into the King’s favour. Gerolamo Agostini, Venetian Secretary in England, to the Doge and Senate in CSP Ven, xxvi, pp. 247-259.
347 Hunton, A treatise of monarchie, pp. 68-72; On this, see also Judson, The Crisis of the Constitution, pp. 402-5.
agree’. By using the logic of casuistry, Ferne was able to create a narrative that escaped the binary that was inherent in legal argument – that one side is legal, the other illegal. Rather than a choice between these two opposites, Ferne’s understanding offered the reader a safer option.

As well as royalists, some parliamentarians felt compelled to use this space. For some, such as Goodwin, it allowed commands to be disobeyed while maintaining a commitment to Parliament, and for others, such as Hunton and Burroughs, it offered a constitutional fix that allowed the Parliament to act as necessary while remaining within a mixed and balanced constitution. However other parliamentarians (such as Herle and Parker) because of their understanding of the constitution, were unable to engage with this space because they denied that it existed.

Ideas that attempted to balance the constitution were often positive ones to enable support of Parliament while maintaining some form of safe-guard. The implied reader, and the public at large, were being informed of new duties that they were expected to fulfil because of the increasing demands of the parliamentary cause. The failure of the law to provide a constitution that was all things to everybody meant that the implied reader was being required to play a vital role in the construction of the constitution, and their subjectivity allowed the Parliament to be both legitimated and limited.

Herle and Parker were evidently very important thinkers, but increasingly their work is seen as exceptional rather than normal in parliamentarian thought. By refocusing on those who maintained a conviction in the mixed constitution – those that believed that cause and conscience justified Parliament – it is possible to understand some of the problems that readers would face when attempting to subscribe to Herle and Parker’s theories, and why the legal framework came to be unsustainable.

II PARLIAMENTARIAN POLEMIC AND LEGAL PRINCIPLES

Parliamentarian authors used a wide range of tactics in order to justify resistance against the King. The mechanics of pamphlet debate meant that the political conversation continually examined and re-examined the circumstances surrounding the conflict, and pamphlets needed to repeat, reiterate and reapply their legal arguments. This process revealed tensions within parliamentarianism more generally. The legal case that they
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needed to construct in order to resist the King threatened to overrule and challenge the very constitution that Parliament endeavoured to protect, and the Parliamentary absolutists in particular struggled to explain exactly why the case they made applied only to the present necessity, rather than to posterity.

1. The Original Contract and the Fundamental Laws
Parliamentarian writers were consistently challenged to establish what the original contract that constituted the relationship between the people and the King was. The problem was significant for two reasons. Firstly, there had been increasing pressure on the Parliament’s understanding of the origins of government, and parliamentarian writers proved to be unable to describe exactly what powers had originally been invested in Parliament, and what powers had been reserved. Ferne was thus able to emphasise the radical consequences, and with incredulity argue that all the people got together and agreed on a contract was preposterous – did they decide to ‘spring on a suddain out of the earth’, and what was the ‘likelyhood they would not so well agree; or to live dispersedly in caves & wood’? The parliamentarian defence, in other words, was reliant on knowing something that could not possibly be known and was absent in historical record.

Secondly, Parliament’s defence of protecting the ‘fundamentall law’ was suffering from sustained attacks. For the sympathetic reading public, it maintained a hierarchical supremacy over the written law, yet remained complementary to it, mirroring a judge’s verdict setting precedent in the common law. However, Ferne was able to highlight to great effect the disparity between these ‘Fundamentalls’ and the written law. Rather than simply justify action in extreme circumstances, the ‘government we see used in this Land, and the written Laws which we reade, must have a corresponderdency and analogie of reason to these Fundamentalls, and they to these’, or else they must be considered wrong. For him, they had to be completely compatible, or else the law was written against the fundamentals (and therefore illegal), or the understanding of the fundamentals was wrong. Ferne framed his discussion for the reader as a simple choice between unknown and known, and in doing so reflected what he viewed as the
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352 Ferne, Resolving of conscience, p. 12.
incompatibility of the royalist and the parliamentarian cases. He challenged the reader to choose between something codified that gave structure and order to the state, or some imagined laws that ‘lie low and unseen by vulgar eyes’, and were to be judged only by the remaining members of Parliament.\textsuperscript{353} Ferne’s argument highlighted the problems of separate but overlapping legal systems coexisting, to the extent that to side with the Houses of Parliament was to agree that all acts of Parliament could potentially be wrong, and to challenge the status of all legislation. Other royalists followed Ferne’s lead. The fundamental laws, wrote an anonymous author ventriloquising Sir Henry Garroway, were being used to raise levies without the King’s permission in ways that even ‘Sir Simon Dewes himself cannot produce one record’ for.\textsuperscript{354}

In what has been described by John Sanderson as ‘Ascending’ politics, parliamentarians undertook an effort to prove that the original form of government, and the original contract as a whole, must have survived in some form because they differed so much from other conquered states.\textsuperscript{355} Building on various antiquarian works, mixed constitutionalists such as Hunton were able to argue that ‘the English libertie existed before the Norman Invasion, not withstanding the Danish interruption’.\textsuperscript{356} He argued that the conquest that took place was only ‘partiall’, and that to make it a full conquest the people needed to agree to submit ‘to a composition and contract of subjection to the Invader’.\textsuperscript{357} This contract, he continued, must have kept certain ‘fundamentalls of Government, wherein the English freedom still exists’, and does so ‘till this day’.\textsuperscript{358} Likewise, Burroughs argued that the ‘right comes not from power to conquer, or the act of conquering, but from some agreement, precedent or consequent’, which he assumed took place after the fighting had stopped.\textsuperscript{359} Conversely, Bridge had argued that William
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the Conqueror actually received his crown from Edward the Confessor, and therefore continued, rather than subverted, the liberties enjoyed prior to the ‘conflict’. Anonymous works such as *A Briefe and Exact Treatise* explained how sheriffs were elected in continuity since Saxon times, and others such as *The Definition of a Parliament* described a continuous history of Parliament from King Alfred to the present King. The continuity, in other words, was enough to prove that there was a contract before, and therefore that at some level, the contract (regardless of what was said) was a precursor to the monarchy. This meant that the people had been crucial in empowering the King, and thus could have maintained certain liberties and privileges.

While the majority of parliamentarians may have agreed that power came from the people, there were important distinctions between mixed constitutionalists and absolutists about what this meant in practice. The Parliamentary absolutists faced the issue of proving that Parliament could act as sovereign above the King, and that Parliament had done this before in the historical record. For example Herle had shifted the definition of the ‘fundamentall’ laws from a set of potentially codifiable laws towards the ‘original frame’ of government that was consented to, and agreed to, by the people. In doing so, he was able to link the fundamentals with his own understanding of the constitution, allowing him to assert his belief that the Houses were coordinative with the monarchy in acting with supremacy, and that Parliament were able to ‘supply’ the defects of the King. The fundamental laws that Herle referred to were unchanging because ‘a foundation must not be stirr’d while the building stands’, and those that pointed to ‘superstructive’ or ‘written Laws’ in order to challenge his understanding were referring to things ‘that were not Lawes before written’. In order to continue to justify resistance, Herle’s conception blurred the lines between extreme circumstances.

---
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justifying resistance in this particular case, and a constitution that empowered the Parliament to act anyway. This argument was made more clearly by an anonymous pamphlet from December 1642, which stated that the misunderstanding was caused by past Parliaments being too polite to emphasise the extent of their supremacy, rather than this current Parliament claiming unprecedented powers.\textsuperscript{364} The idea of the fundamentals being the original constitution allowed Parliament some extra leeway when it came to overriding written, statutory law.\textsuperscript{365} They had the authority to act in protection of the original contract, and could disregard the (positive) laws when they hindered or contradicted this understanding, because they were a construct rather than the basis of the state.

As proof of his understanding of the relationship between the Parliament and the King, Herle drew upon the King’s Coronation Oath to provide confirmation of what the King’s side of the bargain was with the people in the original contract. Herle’s \textit{Fuller Answer} argued that the constitution was evident in ‘the mutuall Oathes the King and people are to take’, and that by examining those, it was possible to understand the nature of the relationship between King and people.\textsuperscript{366} As we have seen, this had been employed by the Parliament earlier in the year to great effect, leading to a public spat over which version of the Coronation Oath had been taken. The main problem with the argument was one that Bland had already struggled with, and Ferne was more than happy to repeat – that ‘Our King is King before he comes to the Coronation, which is sooner or later at his plasure’.\textsuperscript{367} Herle charged that the King had taken ‘the same Oath as his predecessors, because it is hereditary Law that gives him the crown’, and in doing so ‘virtually binds him’ and his predecessors before the oath is taken.\textsuperscript{368} In other words, the trust of kingship and the Oath taken are the same, reflecting the original transfer of
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\textsuperscript{365} On this term, see also Stuart E. Prall, \textit{The Agitation for Law Reform During the Puritan Revolution, 1640-1660} (The Hague, 1966), pp. 15-9.

\textsuperscript{366} Herle, \textit{A fuller answer}, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{367} Peter Bland, \textit{The priviledges of the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. Wherein ’tis proved their power is equall with that of the House of Lords, if not greater, though the King joyn with the Lords. However it appears that both the houses have a power above the King, if he vot contrary to them} (Printed for J.R., [31 December] 1642) E.83[39], pp. 7-9; Ferne, \textit{Resolving of Conscience}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{368} Herle, \textit{A Fuller answer}, p. 5.
power from the people to the King. Because of this, even if the specific version that the King had taken was not the same as the one recorded in the Parliamentary rolls (as, indeed, it was not), it did not matter, because the trust that it represented was the same as the contract of the King’s predecessors.

By tying his argument to the constitution, Herle blurred the lines between actions driven by necessity and actions performed in normal circumstances, which meant that arguments along these lines could quickly develop into radical ideas about the nature of the King’s power. For example, in Touching the Fundamentall Lawes, the anonymous author denies the negative voice by arguing that because the King by his Coronation Oath is bound to grant what the public ‘shall chose to be observed, not hath chosen’, he cannot reasonably be considered to have one.369 This pamphlet is often quoted as being a radical denial of the negative voice, but when considered alongside the previous nine months of debate it might better be seen as a logical extension of Herle’s constitutional understanding. Works had already discussed the extent to which the King could have a negative voice, and it had been established that it was Parliament’s opinion that if he rejected a bill that was recommended by the representative body for the public safety, he had already broken his trust. However, the Coronation Oath that they relied on stated that this was not specific to just public safety, but rather any law that the public demanded. If, according to this understanding, it is taken that the Coronation Oath is crucial to the constitution, and that the Oath itself needs to adapt to changes in the needs and wants of the public, then the negative voice would be inherently unconstitutional. Touching the Fundamentall Lawes and works such as Soveraigne Salve were comfortable in applying a parliamentary justification based on the constitution directly without distinguishing between extraordinary times and ordinary times, because a royal veto would constitute an extraordinary situation.370 According to the author of A

---

369 Touching the fundamentall lawes, or politique constitution of this kingdome, the Kings negative voice, and the power of Parliaments. To which is annexed the priviledge and power of the Parliament touching the militia, (Printed for Thomas Underhill, [24 February] 1643) E.90[21], p. 9.

370 A soveraigne salve to cure the blind, or, A vindication of the power and priviledges claim’d or executed by the Lords and Commons in Parliaments, from the calumny and slanders of men, whose eyes (their conscience being before blinded) ignorance or malice hath hoodwinkt. Wherein the fallacie and falsity of the anti-parliamentary party is discovered, their plots for introducing popery into the church and tyranny into the state are manifested: the pretended fears of danger from seperatists, Brownists, &c. blowne away. And a right way proposed for the advancing the just honour of the King, the due reverence of the clergy, the rights and liberty of the people: and the renewing a golden age (Printed by T.P. and M.S., [27 April] 1643) E.99[23], p. 20.
Sovereign Salve, ‘in such a case as ours by virtue of the legislative power residing in the Parliament it may make new Ordinances, at least for the time, as it sees occasion and judges to be in order to that supreme and immutable Law [the safety of the people]’, a point that was proved by the Oath that the ‘Kings of England at their Coronation take, or ought to take’. The point was made most clearly by Prynne, who argued that the ‘kingdomes Soveraignty and supreme jurisdiction above the King is most apparent by those Coronation Oathes, which Parliaments and the kingdom anciently, long before, or at leastwise in King Edwards dayes, before and ever since the Conquest, have prescribed to our Kings ere they would accept of them for their Soveraignes’, and later concluded that the King ‘hath no absolute negative voyce’ because of his oath. The Oath was not just a sign of royal good will, as royalists might wish to portray it, but rather a contract that needed to be fulfilled by the King, and if necessary protected by Parliament.

Transforming the basis of the Parliamentary justification in such a way left a blurry distinction between what was being done because of necessity, and what was permitted because of the constitution regardless of context. For some writers – particularly those who were Parliamentary absolutists – this described, rather than threatened, the constitution. Following the line of this argument and definition of these fundamental laws, writers could argue that it was impossible to maintain that Parliament could be bound up in statute or written law because it would be ‘absurd’ to suggest that they could not work towards the salus populi. Parliament could not be thought of as an arbitrary power, because in reality they were never expected to follow the law – the ‘law was not made betweene Parliament and people, but by the people in Parliament betweene the King and them’, and they could call upon the laws of nature, equity and the need for ‘public preservation’.

371 Ibid., pp. 19-20.
372 William Prynne, The treachery and disloyalty of papists to their soveraignes, in doctrine and practise. Together with an exact parallel of the jurisdiction, power, and privileges claimed and exercised by our popish Parliaments, prelates, Lords and Commons in former times, with those now claimed and practised by the present Parliament, Lords and Commons, which are here manifested to be farre more loyall, dutifull, moderate; more consistent with, lesse invasive on, and destructive to the Kings pretended soveraigne power and prerogative, then those of popish parliaments, and subjects (Printed for Michael Sparke, Senior., [16 March] 1643) E.248[1], pp. 52, 73-87.
373 Touching the fundamentall lawes, pp. 7-8.
374 Ibid., p. 8.
Parliament could be limited by ‘no Customes, no Presidents, nor Statutes’. At times, this understanding threatened to destroy the constitution itself. The parliamentarian Privileges of the House of Commons, which explicitly asked whether it was within ‘the power of a Parliament called by Writ to alter pre-established State-government?’, concluded that if the ‘diversity of times, and necessity of the State ... so require’, the Parliament has the power to do so. These extraordinary arguments grew out of the initial premise of the work of Herle and Parker – that Parliament held the sovereign power, and that there was no right to resist this power.

By confronting questions over whether the constitution had been changed, other parliamentarian works attempted to use the framework of the fundamental law to justify Parliament’s position, while maintaining a mixed, rather than Parliament-dominated, constitution. As Maximes of Mixt Monarchy made clear, only the law of nature was higher than the fundamentals, and while nature’s laws could absolutely not be changed, the fundamental laws potentially could, although ‘no power ought to change, neither can they be changed without injurie to any Nation’. To drive the point home, the work referenced two rulers that had attempted to change the fundamentals: ‘Antiochus the Type, and Antichrist the Antitype, both changers of Laws and Customes against all right and reason of Nations where they prevailed’. For this anonymous author, ‘politicall power’ lay within the three estates, who were ‘co-essentiall, co-equall, co-ordinate, and co-workers’, and the ‘Co-ordination of the three estates’ could only occur ‘in Parliament’. That the King was absent in body did not change the fact that the ‘three Members co-essential continue in power, and may proceed as they are in a Parliamentary

375 Remonstrans redivivus: or, An accompt of the remonstrance and petition, formerly presented by divers citizens of London, to the view of many; and since honoured by the late conspirators, to be placed under their title of extreame ill designes, with the remonstrance it selfe (Printed by T.P. and M.S. for John Rothwell and Thomas Vnderhill, FD: 25 July 1643) E.61[21], p. 4.

376 The priviledges of Parliament, or, A modest answer to these three questions: I. Whether it be in the power of a Parliament, called by writ, to alter pre-established state-government? II. Whether it be in the power of a Parliament to alter church-government? III. Whether it be in the power of a Parliament (whene [sic] their right and just priviledges be undermined, and sought to be subverted by private stratagems, or publike warre) to take up armes in defence of themselves and the whole kingdome? (Printed for Thomas Harrison, [18 February] 1643) E.89[19], p. 3.

377 Maximes of mixt monachie, sig. A2r.
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379 Ibid., sig. A2v-A3r.
The fundamentals, then, were to remain constant and untouched, or else the country risked ruin, but could still be used to justify Parliament’s position. According to the anonymous author of *A New Plea*, the law was ‘all former acts of Parliament never yet reserved, together with the privilege of Parliament’, not what Parliament decided was best at the time. Tensions, then, existed over the extent to which the constitution was being changed, and whether Parliament was able to ignore the laws. As we will see, this was a recurring theme in both royalist propaganda and parliamentarian responses.

The idea of the fundamental law was used most simply and effectively when the term – already an established totemic phrase that described their broad difference from the royalists – could be weaponised and used in short pamphlets to confirm the pre-existing suspicions of the reader. For example, one pamphlet in February 1643 argued that Prince Rupert was a danger to the King because of Charles’s own understanding of the law. If the King won, the pamphlet reasoned, Rupert would be able to exploit the royalists’ own language and demand of the King ‘what Written Law He can produce to make him King of England?’ If, it continued, the King responded that ‘the Fundamentall Laws put him in that office’, he would be told that his legal position is that ‘those Fundamentall Laws must be known Laws, explicit and written, else not to be trusted or urged in Plea’. The King’s understanding of the law not only did not make sense, but it also threatened to de-throne him, and left him even more vulnerable to exploitation. A similar argument was made by an anonymous response to a declaration by the Duke of Newcastle. Newcastle had been accused by Thomas Fairfax of having raised an army ‘contrary to the Lawes of the Land’, to which Newcastle retorted that Fairfax should ‘cease at length telling us of laws in the clouds, or laws written in the Sybylls Books, which no men have heard of but yourselves’. The anonymous reply argued that Newcastle was focusing on

---
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381 *A new plea for the Parliament: and the reserved man resolved: from the serious consideration of the state of the controversie, betwene the King and the Parliament. Together with several answers to some common objections about this subject. With advice to those who are yet unsetled in their thoughts hereabout* (Printed for Henry Overton, [05 January] 1642) E.244[38], p. 2.
382 *An item to his Majestie concerning Prince Rupert and his cavaliers* (s.n., [03 February] 1643) E.88[7], p. 4.
383 Ibid., pp. 4-5.
384 William Cavendish Duke of Newcastle, *A declaration of the Right Honourable the Earle of Newcastle His Excellency, &c in answer of six groundlesse aspersions cast upon him by the Lord*
the ‘primae’, the ‘Lawes of Parliament’ and ‘primis ortae’, the ‘Lawes in Parliament’. The latter, the anonymous author argued, were ‘dispensible by ordinance and a fundamentall power’, for ‘in Parliament a man sits as a Law-maker, out of it, as a Law-observer’. Had Newcastle remained in the Parliament, he too would be a ‘Law-maker, whereas now you are a Law-breaker’. By confusing the laws of Parliament and the laws in Parliament, Newcastle had confused statute law with a higher law, and assumed that Parliament was subject to the same laws as those it represented. By focusing on the royalist misunderstandings, then, parliamentarians could avoid the need to actually establish what these laws were, but rather could define the laws by what they were not: codified, statutory, restrictive. They could, therefore, condemn the royalist understanding as dangerous.

Thus shifting definitions of the fundamental law could offer parliamentarians some justifications for resistance against the King, and had managed to demonstrate that the King needed to act in a certain way to maintain the trust with his people, but this could also lead to significant problems. Rather than ‘just’ acting arbitrarily for a short period, there seemed to be no limit on the damage to the constitution that the Houses could cause. Of course, for some writers such as Herle and Parker, and the press campaigns that went with them, this was to be expected. Changing the constitution, or rather shaping the real-world state to the idealised constitution of their conception, need not be feared, because in reality the constitution that was being challenged was a bastardisation of the parliament-sovereign polity that should exist anyway, and had been corrupted by an over-bearing King. For those still tied to the idea of a mixed system, the constitution (or at least, the workings of the state that they were familiar with) had undoubtedly been changed by the actions of the Houses, and the people needed some way to defend themselves. Royalist propaganda was not only having its intended effect, but also parliamentarian theories were imploding of their own accord.

III. STATUTES

The constitutional divide in parliamentarian thought was exacerbated by an increasingly complex understanding of statute law, and readers were often required to maintain two contradictory understandings of statutes simultaneously: firstly, statutes were infallible

_Fairefax, in his late warrant bearing date Feb. 1642_ (Printed by Stephen Bulkley, [02 February] 1643) E.92[17], p. 3. Fairfax’s original charge is printed on p. 10.

385 _Observations Vpon the Earle of New-Castles Declaration_, p. 4.
in the correct circumstances and application, and secondly, they could be overruled when required either by necessity or reason of state. Statutes could thus be both a guide and an obstacle, and as such their use to explain the legality of actions often confused rather than clarified matters.

Among the Parliamentary absolutists, nowhere is this contradiction clearer than in Prynne’s epic *Soveraigne Powers of Parliament*. The work, commissioned by Parliament throughout 1643, consisted of four volumes with citations of precedents which justified Parliament’s actions, and condemned the actions of papists.386 The work itself was a retort against both royalist attacks on parliamentarians’ understanding of the law, and also those more lukewarm parliamentarian defences.387 As such, it supported the idea of statutes indicating how people should act, but maintained simultaneously that ‘Old Statute Lawes, yea and the common Law of England may be, and oft are repealed and altered by Parliaments, (though above the King and his Prerogative) when they become mischievous or inconvenient’.388 While statutes could be used to determine what action should be taken, it did not mean that they could not be broken, or even that they should be treated with too much reverence. The work as a whole attempted to demonstrate the need for the sovereignty of Parliament, without any possibility of the public appealing their judgement. Above all, Prynne revealed the contradictory political mileage that was possible with arguments based on statutory and precedentary law. There appeared to have been a desire to prove, using this style of argument, that Parliament’s actions were legal, but increasingly the particulars of the conflict made it difficult to do so.

The impact of this style of argument was striking, especially considering what it was asking the reader to accept about the relationship of the Parliament to the constitution as a whole. As Prynne made clear, Parliament was so supreme that it was above the law itself. However, new understandings of the nature of the fundamental law, and especially the increasing tendency to define these fundamentals as the original constitution rather than an unchangeable fixed series of laws, meant that Parliament was absolutely not

386 It has recently been re-examined by Warwick K. George, ‘Lame Jack His Haultings: J. H. Hexter, the ’Middle Group’ and William Prynne’, *Historical Research*, 89 (2016), pp. 17-23.

387 See, for example, James Howell, *A discourse, or parly, continued betwixt Partricius and Peregrine (upon their landing in France) touching the civill wars of England and Ireland* (s.n., [21 July] 1643) E.61[14], p. 6; Bland, *Resolved upon the question*, pp. 3-4.

bound by any written laws. This was normally treated with a certain amount of care, exemplified by Palmer’s *Scripture and Reason Pleadled*, where he argued that while ‘[written] Lawes must flow from those Principles, which are transcendentals to all particular Lawes, but not if [Ferne] meant that they must be ever limited by particular Lawes’.  

However, if no laws were fixed, a key touchstone for making sense of society would be lost. For example, Prynne argued, perhaps swept up in his rhetoric, that Parliament had ‘an absolute Soveraignty over the Laws themselves (yea, over Magna Charta, and all other objected Acts) to repeale, alter, determine and suspend them’.  

This phrase was used in an argument which justified ‘Parliaments Right and Jurisdiction to impose Taxes and Contributions on the Subjects’ – to defend the liberties and rights of the whole commonweal, individuals may be required to sacrifice their own. Trust needed to be placed in the Parliament to fulfil what was undoubtedly a new role, and it meant placing an irrevocable trust that could never be withdrawn. If the reader was sure of the intentions of Parliament, of course, this would not be problematic, but this was a big ‘if’.  

Never fearful of bold arguments, Prynne had declared that ‘Even if [Parliament] was capable of the guilt of treason, it could not be arraigned or judged for it, having no supeirour or adequate Tribunall to arraigne it’.

---

389 Palmer, *Scripture and reason pleaded*, p. 28.

390 William Prynne, *The fourth part of The soveraigne powver of parliaments and kingdomes*. Wherein the Parliaments right and interest in ordering the militia, forts, ships, magazins, and great offices of the realme, is manifested by some fresh records in way of supplement: the two Houses imposition of moderate taxes and contributions on the people in cases of extremity, without the Kings assent, (when wilfully denied) for the necessary defence and preservation of the kingdome; and their imprisoning, confining of malignant dangerous persons in times of publicke danger, for the common safety; are vindicated from all calumnies, and proved just (Printed for Michael Sparke, Senior, [28 August] 1643) E.248[4], p. 15. In making this argument, Prynne was of course contradicting Coke, who believed that the Magna Carta was a fundamental law – see Gough, *Fundamental Law*, p. 41.


392 Especially when, for example, the consideration was the September 1642 discussions about the legality of depositions, which had been reignited by Prynne’s work.

393 William Prynne, *The soveraigne powver of parliaments & kingdomes*. Or Second part of the Treachery and disloialty of papists to their soveraignes. Wherein the Parliaments and kingdomes right and interest in, and power over the militia, ports, forts, navy, ammunition of the realme, ... their right and interest to nominate and elect all needfull commanders, to exercise the militia for the kingdomes safety, and defence: as likewise, to recommend and make choise of the Lord Chancellor, Keeper, Treasurer, Privy Seale, privie counsellors, judges, and sheriffs of the kingdome, when they see just cause: together with the Parliaments late assertion; that the King hath no absolute negative voice in passing publicke bills of right and justice, for the safety, peace, and common benefit of his
The internal contradiction of Prynne’s argument represents the theoretical leaps that the reader was required to make in order to place an arbitrary faith in Parliament. Statutes and laws implied, but did not make explicit, that Parliament had a power above what it claimed in normal circumstances, but simultaneously implied that these statutes and laws could and should be ignored when they contradicted the *salus populi*. Clearly at some point the law had failed to run its normal course – the case of Shipmoney and the Five Knights, still very much in the public memory, had proved that much – but the question posed to the reader was whether that was enough to justify supporting a constitutional revolution. Parker, in his *Contra-Replicant*, argued that ‘When the King could set up any taxes he wanted, the fault was not in the laws, it was in the judges’. The laws were not wrong, yet subversion had taken place, and therefore, there had to be a way to protect them. Rather than displaying outright hostility to the law, Parker argued against a ‘Vaine confidence in the law’, and demanded that our laws be ‘secured to us’ – for Parker, the problem was the way the law had been enforced, rather than the letter of the law. The problem was the fact that there was no way to protect the law, or ensure that the law worked the way that it should. Likewise, the anonymous author of *Soveraigne Salve* argued that Prynne in his *Soveraigne Powers of Parliament* had demonstrated that ‘Lawes are made on weak assurances’, and that ‘Kings break them all the time’, and therefore Parliament needed to be able to protect the laws as it saw fit.

To protect the laws, Parliament had to be able to break the visible manifestation of the law. The reader was being asked to believe in an ancient, original constitution, that was ‘lost in the mists of time’, but unlike earlier in the century, the reader was deprived of the

---

394 Parker, *Contra-replicant*, pp. 6-8. In this argument, Parker makes a similar point to the Parliamentary Declaration in August 1642, where the Parliament argues that ‘The Laws were no defence, nor protection of any mans right’, *A declaration of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament setting forth the grounds and reasons that necessitate them at this time to take up defensive armes for the preservation of His Majesties person, the maintenance of true religion, the lawes and liberties of this kingdom and the power and priviledges of Parliament* (Printed by Thomas Banks and William Lee, FD: 02 August 1642) E1451, p. 3.


396 *The kingdoms case: or, The question resolved, whether the kings subjects of this realm of England may or ought to ayd and assist each other, in repressing the persons now assembled together, under the name of the kings army* (Printed for John Wright, FD: 01 May 1643) E.100[9], p. 11; *Soveraigne salve*, p. 6; Prynne, *The soveraigne power of parliaments*, p. 39.
potential to glimpse what ‘had survived in statutes and common law’. Rather, the surviving fragments of the statute and common law were challengeable, and thus their glimpse of this ancient constitution and contract had become more fragmentary still. In other words, the reader’s understanding of the constitution and contract were based on sources that they had been trained to question and be willing to discard if necessary.

IV. THE KNOWN LAWS

For royalists, the term the ‘known laws’ offered a suitable alternative for the understanding of the law. Constitutional royalists had refashioned the King as one who would rule by the law, and Charles had used the concept of the ‘known law’ against the Houses of Parliament’s justifications. Royalist pamphleteers used the term to lament how far England had fallen, and the degree to which ‘the known Lawes of this our Nation [are] most strangely, either wrested, misconstrued or impugned’. However, it also demonstrated just how far parliamentarian and royalist understandings of the law had diverged, and how key phrases and terminology were vital in conveying constitutional subtext to the reader.

Terms such as the ‘known law’ could be used to attack the way that the parliamentarian case had been presented, and demand that justifications were presented in more concrete terms. For example, in December 1642, there was a petitioning campaign in London calling for peace which seems to have been remarkably well received that followed a formulaic structure, calling for an adherence to the ‘knowne Law’, and lamenting the ‘decay of trade’, the ‘invasion of the Subjects Liberty’ and the ‘violation of our Religion’. The petitions were deemed to pose a threat to Parliament, and that the

398 A speech to the people. Or A briefe and reall discovery of the unhappy estate of these most distracted times. With a necessary caution to all good subjects (Printed for H.B., [29 October] 1642) E.200[66], p. 3.
399 The Londoners petition To the Right Honorable the Lords and Commons novv assembled in the high court of Parliament. The humble petition of divers inhabitants of the City of London and the liberties thereof (Printed for Adam Bell, [23 December] 1642) 669.f.6[95]; The petition of the most substantial inhabitants of the citie of London, and the liberties thereof; to the Lords and Commons for peace. Together with the answer to the same. And the reply of the petitioners (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [06 January] 1643) E.244[39]; A Modest petition for a happy peace offered to all such as have no other intent then union in their petitioning: and do carry peace and the good of the state in their hearts as well as their hands: and if it may be thought fit, may be serviceable to the common-wealth, if it shall be suddenly presented to the high ad honorable court of Parliament by a considerable number of such as are resolved upon such a course (Printed for Robert Bostock, FD: 13
pamphlets were so clear in their choice of the particular legal terminology of ‘knowne lawes’ implies that there was some dissatisfaction with the way that Parliament’s case had been presented thus far. The peace petitions were widely condemned by defenders of Parliament, and were charged with being ‘drawn up in Oxford’ and indoctrinating many otherwise ‘honest and well meaning Citizens’. Capitalising on this moment of Parliamentary susceptibility, A Complaint to the House of Commons, purporting to be composed by ‘free Protestant subjects’ (although possibly by Hyde), in very similar language called for the ‘known law’ and demanded that Parliament’s case be made in this manner. There seems, then, to have been some tension within London over the way that the parliamentary case was presented, and this tension could be probed. For royalists, reliance on statutes had worked well in the paper wars, and had made Parliament squirm when they attempted to respond to specific statutes that they were blatantly ignoring, and increasingly towards the end of 1642 the King’s declarations ramped up pressure and reliance on known laws.

For some parliamentarian works, the phrase the ‘known laws’ was itself thought sufficient to identify the malignancy of royalist pamphlets. The premise was that Parliament had already considered the known laws, found them wanting, and had reasoned that further action needed to be taken beyond that which the known laws accounted for. For example, A Frivolous Paper, a response to the London Petitions and specifically one that it charged as being particularly frivolous, asked the reader to ‘consider whether the Malignancy of this Petition doth not appeare in many phrases and expressions scattered up and down therein ... such as The known Law of the Land’. The

December 1642) E.130[5], p. 6; John Hinton, The humble petition of the peacefull obedient and honest Protestants of this kingdome, presented unto the honourable House of Commons, by the gentlemen of the foure innes of court [December] 1642) E.181[37].
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Hyde, A complaint to the House of Commons. On Hyde’s authorship, see Graham Roebuck, Clarendon and Cultural Continuity: A Bibliographical Study (London, 1981); Mendle, Henry Parker, p. 115. If Hyde was the propagandist, the work seemed to have been particularly effective – Agonstini wrote that A Complaint was ‘generally read and approved by the unprejudiced’. CSP Ven, xxvi, pp. 230-1.

Smith, Constitutional Royalism, pp. 179-82.

A frivolous paper, in forme of a petition: framed and composed by a disaffected party in this citie of London, intende by them to be presented to the honourable House of Commons. With certaine considerations propounded by way of advertisement and caution unto those who through
London Petitions, the work continued, seemed to imply that Parliament was either ‘ignorant’ of these laws or ‘impotent’.\(^{404}\) Parker had argued that royalists falsely implied that Parliament ‘cannot pierce into these knowne obvious Lawes, yet every Sophister can’.\(^{405}\) The preamble to Bland’s *Resolved upon a Question*, addressed to John Pym, argued that he wrote to ‘satisfie them, that for want of knowledge, lay scandalous imputations, not only upon the honourable House of Parliament in generall whereof you are a member, but especially and in particular upon your upright selfe’, and to the reader Bland argued that he wrote ‘not as if the Parliament knew not Law sufficient to justifie their own actions, but to destroy their wonder whom he hath heard admire that the Parliament did not prove their own acts by visible Law, as well as disprove the Kings’.\(^{406}\)

For Parliament, their justifications were dependent on the notion that while these known laws clearly existed, they were accessible to Parliament alone, rather than to royalists or the public. They needed to keep the reader wary of the term the ‘known laws’ because they were trying to argue that ‘we wil not admit that to be the known Law of the Land, which those men have declared to be so, contrary to the Judgement of both Houses of Parliament’.\(^{407}\) However, when polemic and rhetoric demanded, parliamentarian authors could be more flexible. The language of the ‘known laws’ could be appropriated by writers and used against the royalists, especially when arguments could be made in a style to specifically counter certain attacks that used it. When the *Convinc’d Petitioner*, received by Thomason in the wake of December petitions, attempted to defend the Houses of Parliament, it argued that of course if ‘legall and just profe of these mens malignancy, and breach of the knowne Lawes of the Land’ was found to have been committed by the ‘persons his Majesty meanes’ (supposedly Isaac Pennington, John Ven, Henry Mainwaring and John Fowke), action would be taken by the ‘Magistrates of London’, but if not they should be considered innocent.\(^{408}\) Likewise,
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\(^{408}\) *The convinc’d petitioner: from the serious consideration of a late printed answer to the cities petition for peace; presented to His Majesty at Oxford* (s.n., FD: 13 January 1643) E.245[9], p. 6.
the defence of Isaac Pennington made clear that ‘wee have neither practised, or attempted ought, which was not warrantable by the knowne Lawes and constitutions of the Kingdome’. By appropriating the language of these charges, the works were able to refute the royalist claims using their own legal terminology and logic, while at the same time claiming some ownership over the terms. This could be particularly effective after, on 6 March 1643, Charles repeated his view that none should be imprisoned ‘otherwise than according to the known laws of the land’. By appropriating this terminology, Parliament could claim to be acting legally in Charles’s own terms. In May 1643 the Commons published a work denouncing ‘John Brooks’, along with a number of ‘fellow-Cavaliers, Rebels and Traitors’, and charged them with seizing estates ‘contrary to the known Laws of this Kingdome’. The work later continued with this style of argument, arguing that ‘according to the known Laws of the Land, as both Houses of Parliament ... have declared’, no member of either House can be ‘proceeded against without the consent of Parliament’. By contesting these terms, Parliament and their defenders were able to pacify royalist terminology either by demonstrating that Parliament had already considered these laws and decided them false, or by deflecting royalist charges back against the King.

Several press interventions attempted to wrest the legal high ground from the royalists. Two works dated by Thomason on subsequent days in March, for example, were interested in challenging the royalist notion that only they were aware of the known laws. ‘[L]et us examine what hath been done by them either agreeable to the known Law of the land’, Englands Diurnall invited, before giving a list of seven charges, each with the supposition ‘By what known Law’, including questions over the legality of Commissions
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409 The declaration and vindication of Isaack Pennington, now Lord Mayor of the citie of London, of Colonell Ven, Captain Manwaring and Mr. Fowke. Wherein is set forth their loyaltie to His Majestie, and the integritie of their proceedings in serving the King and Parliament. In answer to sundry scandalous pamphlets, wherein they are charged to be the maine incendiaries of these present troubles in the citie of London (Printed for Humphrey Johnson, FD: 11 February 1643) E.89[11], pp. 3-4.
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of Array, arming papists, entertaining Irish rebels, and several others.\textsuperscript{433} Dated by Thomason the next day, \textit{A Miracle} asked ‘by what knowne Lawes hath the adverse party proceeded by in all this law?’, before another list of charges each prefixed with ‘by what knowne Laws’, including ‘by what knowne Laws his Majesty without the consent of Parliament levyed Arms’, and how ‘Delinquents to known law have been invited and detained from the Houses power of judgement’ amongst many others accusations.\textsuperscript{434} In another campaign in June, Richard Oulton and Gregory Dexter printed two pamphlets, again dated by Thomason on subsequent days, that also attempted to strip the royalists of the terms the known laws and the ‘will of the King’. The royalists, \textit{Will and Law} argued, used the terms ‘will of the King, and the knowne Laws of the Kingdome’ to ‘deceive the people’; the pamphlet then launched a tirade against the terms and denounced the ability of the reader to understand the laws.\textsuperscript{435} Similarly \textit{The Discovery of Malignants}, dated by Thomason the next day, attempted to demonstrate that ‘the knowne Lawes urged by ignorance against them’ and the ‘will of the King urged with as great error as the former’ were used to abuse the people.\textsuperscript{436}

These targeted interventions show that there were calculated efforts to remove this terminology from the royalists, but also hint that this terminology was feared and considered dangerous to the reader by some parliamentarian printers. These interventions followed intensifications of terminology and debates by the royalists. For example, the June intervention of \textit{Will and Law} and \textit{The Discovery of Malignants} followed the printing of the King’s declarations which recounted his lamentation that ‘every Subject that would not submit to any new extravagant, extemporary, legislative Declaration, or Order of one or both Houses against the ancient knowne Law of the Land, was become, sent up for, and imprisoned as a Delinquent … against the known

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textit{Englands diurnall, or Passages of state, executed by (and against) the knowne law of the land} (s.n., [04 March] 1643), sig. A3r-A3v.}{433}
\footnote{\textit{A miracle: an honest broker, or, Reasons urging a more liberall loane towards the maintenance of religion, law, and the kingdomes safety in them both} (s.n., [06 March] 1643) E.246[34], p. 23.}{434}
\footnote{\textit{Will and law, reason and religion, treason and rebellion, peace and war, payments and punishments, people and Parliament, are words of wonder to weake and wise men, and by them malignants deceive the multitude} (s.n., [13 June] 1643) E.105[30], p. 1.}{435}
\footnote{\textit{The discovery of malignants. By the known lawes, and will of the King, absurdly urged against the Parliament, by the people, lawyers, judges, jury, divines, and King forced from the truth by willfull errour} (s.n., [14 June] 1643) E.106[5], p. 1.}{436}
\end{footnotes}
While there was a desire to repair the public’s perception and understanding of these terms, this was often done in particular interventions, rather than prolonged campaigns. In doing so, the public were presented with a fragmentary and incomplete understanding, rather than a coherent one.

As a general rule, the royalist argument presented an understanding of the law which remained the same as that presented in the paper wars, focused on what specific statutes said, whereas the parliamentarians were being continually forced to adapt their interpretation. This distinction typified an increasing tension within the law between longstanding interpretations of the constitution and contemporary reinterpretations which were becoming increasingly prevalent in the public legal cases. If the law that was being appealed to was the ‘full and perfect Conclusions of reason’, as argued by the author of the anonymous *Briefe Collections*, then essentially anything deemed ‘reasonable’ by whoever controls the judiciary is, *de facto*, the law. The lack of a fixed point of reference when it came to the law was a major point of contention, and one that went to the heart of the polemical debate. The line between describing what the law actually said, and employing some form of judicial review was one that had long been blurred, but it was having a significant impact on the role of individual members of the Parliament. One royalist pamphlet, purporting to be from one MP to another, made the distinction clear. When lamenting the ‘decay in the Reputation of both houses’, the writer asserts that ‘You and I were, both at once, both committed about the Loanes, and put out of the Commission of the Peace for opposing Shipmony’, and in those situations the ‘Question was not what was best to be Law, but what was Law’. Parliamentarians, this account argued, had shifted from acting judicially towards acting legislatively, and that was the problem at hand. If this was now the case, argued the author of *Certain Materiall Considerations*, and if this shift meant that the judgement of the major part of the House was the judgement of Parliament, and so the unquestionable judgement of
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47 Charles I, *The King’s Majesties declaration to all his loving subjects of his kingdome of Scotland with an act of the Lords and His Majesties Privy Councell for the printing and publishing thereof: and a letter of the Lord Chancellour of Scotland and of other Lords and others of His Majesties Privy Councell in that kingdom to His Majesty* (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [03 June] 1643) Wing C2245A, pp. 2-3.

48 *Briefe collections out of Magna Charta*, p. 1.

49 *A letter from a grave gentleman once a member of this House of Commons, to his friend, remaining a member of the same House in London. Concerning his reasons why he left the House, and concerning the late treaty* (s.n., [19 May] 1643) E.102[13], p. 2.
the kingdom, the author would ‘resign not my judgement but my obedience to the
Parliament’.420 This was partly because he believed the ‘Burgesses of my own Town ... [to be] very unfit, and who were chosen against my will’, but mainly because they had been
elected under the notion of being ‘subordinate with the King, and to joyn with the King
and the Lords (not without, or against both, or either of them)’.421 Parliament thus lacked
the mandate to make these changes. Likewise, another author argued in A Letter from a
Private Gentleman that the Houses of Parliament had either broken their trust by passing
the Triennial Act (hence changing the constitution), or had abused their trust by forcing
Charles to pass it.422

Arguments of this type followed the continuing royalist attacks that questioned the
validity of a vote in the Houses being interpreted as a law. In essence it challenged the
notion that the Houses could act with both executive and legislative power, but was
presented as indignant expositions about the various instances where the Houses have
voted one way before, and ‘upon a second Vote may passe the contrary way’, – due,
argued the author, to absent MPs.423 Herle had tried to defeat this argument when he
imagined a vote of ‘200 of one side and 201 of the other’, and had argued that even
though ‘the odde is carryed by the one, yet the Vote by the whole 201’, and thus ‘201
chosen men engaged in the equity and fitnesse of the Vote.424 It was hardly a rousing
defence. A challenger had argued that ‘If the major part of the Votes of both Houses be
only Declarative of the Law, then in reason the first Voting should stand’, before citing
the Militia case as a prime example of this, because it had been ‘first, and twice
countenanced by the House of Lords’.425

In challenging the Parliament, royalists could thus attempt to make Parliament admit
that they were making law. Continued royalist use of the term the ‘known laws’ acted as

420 Certain materiaill considerations touching the differences of the present times, collected by a
faithfull pursuer of peace and truth (s.n., [06 February] 1643) E.246[4], p. 5.

421 Ibid.

422 A letter sent from a private gentleman to a friend in London, in justification of his owne
adhering to His Majestie in these times of distraction: with arguments inducing him thereunto,
both from the law of God and man (Printed for V. N., [28 November] 1642) E.128[24], p. 4.

423 Certain materiaill considerations, p. 5.

424 Herle, A fuller answer, p. 16.

425 Certain materiaill considerations, p. 6.
a challenge both to the parliamentarian understanding of the legal process, and their respect for the law as a whole. The terminology represented the on-going conflict of the relationship between Parliament and a constitution that was based on customary practices, and the term was able to exploit an increasingly desirable middle ground between a parliament able to judge the law, and a parliament above the law. By appealing to known, written law, writers were demanding that the two Houses maintained reverence for statutory law, at least while it remained on the statute books, and subjected the Houses to the constitution, insofar as that constitution was visible by the laws that had been built upon it.

V. CONCLUSION

In January 1643, the anonymous author of A New Plea lamented that both sides had their own lawyers, who would claim their own side’s lawfulness. Parliament and the King ‘Both affirme the same thing, I am where I was, I cannot judge the heart, what shall I doe?’426 It was a recognition that the conflict had fractured the law as a political language, and there was an increasing tendency to distinguish between the law and the arguments of professional lawyers.427 Whereas in the first few months of the ‘paper wars’, Parliament’s authority to judge the law was intrinsically linked to their members consisting of the best lawyers in the land,428 pamphlets became more comfortable with referring to lawyers with increasingly hostile tones. Some Considerations tending to the Undeceiving, for example, called them ‘devouring Locusts, no lesse ravening than the Ægyptrian ones that overspread the Land’, and The Discovery of Malignants argued that lawyers ‘for their Fee feare not to say anything’.429 Indeed, in May, the House of Commons went so far as to argue that the lawyers were ‘Inns of Court Sycophants and Flatterers ... the moths of Kings and Kingdoms’.430 The failure of lawyers to have solved

426 A new plea for the Parliament, p. 3.
428 See, for example, A plea for the Parliament, p. 6.
429 William Walwyn, Some considerations tending to the undeceiving those, whose judgements are misinformed by politique protestations, declarations, &c. (s.n., [10 November] 1642) E.126[45], p. 2; The Discovery of Malignants, p. 4.
430 A disclaimer and answer of the Commons of England, of and unto a scandalous libell, lately published against the Parliament, and espicaily the House of Commons and their proceedings: intituled The remonstrance of the Commons of England to the House of Commons assembled in Parliament, and falsely suggested to be preferred to them by the hands of the speaker (Printed by G. M., [04 May] 1643) E.100[23], p. 15.
the problem was indicative of their untrustworthiness, but there is also a sense in which
the problem was that lawyers refused to consistently judge that Parliament was right. For
example, The Grand Case of England calls for the ‘learned in the law [to] shewe and
declare themselves’, before stating that if they decide incorrectly (in this case, against
Parliament), the law is defective, and then the representative will ‘supply that defect’.43
The problem, perhaps, was not so much lawyers but rather that lawyers might disagree
with Parliament.

The political conversation was fast-paced, fuelled by a hunger and desire for legal works.
As news and events prompted the creation of new pamphlets, those who argued that
Parliament was absolute found themselves with two problems. Firstly, their
understanding lacked any clear differentiation between times normal and exceptional,
which meant that the application of their past arguments to new circumstances created
radical new constitutional outcomes. Arguments were made for expediency, but because
absolutism empowered Parliament to act whenever the King disagreed with the Houses,
their arguments in posterity threatened anything that went against them. The negative
voice, the constitution and the law itself all appeared under threat according to
absolutist arguments. Secondly, Parliamentary absolutist polemic suffered because
ultimately, it denied the implied reader the ability to make a decision in matters of law,
and thus the reader’s approval of Parliament’s action was not actually necessary. While
their works could go some way to explain the reasoning behind the judgements of
Parliament, ultimately it came down to the fact that Parliament had the authority to
resist the King anyway. These arguments, then, did not need to be adjusted to new
situations because the constitutional and judicial situation which authors such as Herle
and Parker had described remained, in the eyes of the absolutists, truthful.

III APRIL TO JUNE 1643: PEACE, PLOTS AND PAMPHLETS

This chapter has argued thus far that within the first nine months of the conflict there
were clear divisions within parliamentarian thought, and that these divisions can be
distilled down to a question over the nature and extent of parliamentary sovereignty. It
has argued that the polemical debate was dominated by those who remained wedded to
a mixed constitution, and that Parliamentary absolutists were restricted in their

43 The grand case of England, so fiercely now disputed by fire and sword, epitomized [08 February]
1643) E.88[27], p. 7.
engagement with the day-to-day polemical debate because they fundamentally denied that anyone but Parliament could judge supreme matters of law. Those who argued for a mixed constitution increasingly found that they could employ the implied reader as an arbiter in order to solve the constitutional, political and religious problems of parliamentary sovereignty while maintaining the ability to support Parliament and its efforts. Appealing to the implied reader and the people could be – and indeed, may have developed as – a constructive mechanism for obedience, rather than a destructive mechanism for disobedience.

An implicit problem in the history of the political debates of the early 1640s is why, when there was such an explosion in pamphlets that discussed political theory in 1642 and the first half of 1643, arguments with radical potential were discarded and lay abandoned until picked up again by proto-Levellers and those in the political Independent movement in 1645 and 1646. Historians have often accounted for this break in political thought by looking closely at the winter of 1642/3, and arguing that this period, when the war looked increasingly lost for Parliament, was crucial in the development of radicalism. For example, Wootton has argued that the threat of peace fuelled increasingly radical pamphlets, which threatened the Parliament if they settled for an unsatisfactory resolution with the King. At the crux of his argument is the anonymous work *Plaine English*, which argued that power could be reassumed by the people in order to protect themselves from the Parliament and the King working against them. The work targeted the prospect of a too-easy peace and, according to Wootton and other historians, would be relied upon for later radical thought.

However, Wootton’s thesis needs to be qualified. This chapter has argued that rather than threatening the Parliament, the hypothetical reassumption of power was initially developed to encourage obedience. This suggestion can be substantiated by investigation into the typographical details of *Plaine English*. The printer of the work also printed *A Discourse upon the Questions*, which as we have seen in the previous chapter speculated

---

432 For such an account, see Foxley, *Levellers*; Sabbadini, 'Popular Sovereignty'. For an important intervention, see Michael J. Braddick, 'History, Liberty, Reformation and the Cause: Parliamentary Military and Ideological Escalation in 1643', in Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (eds), *The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland: Essays for John Morrill* (Cambridge, 2011), who argues that there was revolutionary potential in 1643, and that attention should be paid to how the Parliamentary cause developed.

433 Wootton, 'From Rebellion to Revolution', pp. 663-4.
that the ‘Kingdome will forsake [the Parliament]’ if ‘they forsake the dutie of their place, and the interest of the Kingdome’ in order to encourage obedience to the Parliament. While this does not mean that Plaine English was an empty threat, it built upon concepts that were also used to construct obedience, and in doing so joined a number of works that attempted to turn the mixed constitutionalists’ arguments against the Parliament. For example, the anonymous author of The Remonstrance of the Commons argued that the people ‘are still the true body of the Commons of England; you, but the representative’, and that the people had no desire to make ‘you perpetuall Dictators’ or ‘imbark us all in a Civil War’. Similarly, Hyde’s Complaint to the House of Commons argued that unless the war and the parliamentary tyranny stopped, the people would reassume power from them. These works built on the potential of the mixed constitutionalists’ arguments, and it is exactly because they built upon these arguments, revealing the potential of them, that they were so threatening for Parliamentary absolutists.

While Wootton’s influential work might oversimplify the shift that occurred in the political conversation, the changes he describes – a disappearance of mixed constitutionalist ideas by the summer of 1643, in both anonymous pamphlets and in the sporadic Parliamentary publications – seem accurate. In order to account for these changes, this section focuses on explaining why these ideas disappeared, rather than why they emerged. This disappearance occurred for two reasons: a failure of the Oxford negotiations in the spring of 1643 and the subsequent shift in attitudes within Parliament itself; and the conflation of the London peace movements and the royalism that manifested itself in the discovery of the Waller Plot of June 1643.

The Oxford negotiations began on 1 February 1643, but quickly stalled after it became clear that Charles was unwilling to agree to a cessation of arms without being restored
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434 A discourse upon the questions p. 13. For the typographic evidence, see Chapter Four.

435 Henry Walker, The Remonstrance of the Commons of England to the House of Commons Assembled in Parliament preferred to them by the hands of the speaker (s.n., [07 March] 1643) E.92[5], pp. 1-2. The work was slapped down by A disclaimer and answer of the Commons of England. This work argued that they were ‘absolutely intrusted with our persons and estates, and by law invested with a power to dispose of them, not only by making new laws’, pp. 2-3.

his ‘own revenue, magazines, towns, forts and ships’. Parliament replied that the pre-condition would be the appointment of ‘senior military officials in whom they could confide’, and this fundamental disagreement caused the negotiations to stutter to a halt, and eventually be called off on 14 April. Concurrent to these negotiations, Parliament had renewed efforts to control the presses, and on 9 March, the Committee for Examinations had been invested with new investigatory powers to search ‘any House or Place, where there is just Cause of Suspicion that Presses are kept, and employed in the Printing of scandalous and lying Pamphlets’. A week later, Henry Walker was called in front of the Committee, in part for printing The Remonstrance of the Commons, in which he distinguished between the people and the House of Commons: the people ‘are still the true body of the Commons of England; you, but the representative’. Parliament thus began to make sincere efforts to limit the plurality of parliamentary pamphlets, especially those that questioned parliamentary sovereignty.

Study into the factions in Parliament in the early period of the conflict has, for the last 50 years, been dominated by Jack Hexter’s theory of a ‘middle’ group led by ‘King Pym’, which sat between a ‘peace’ group, led by Holles, who wanted peace no matter the cost, and a ‘war’ group including members such as Alexander Rigby, Henry Ludlow and Henry Marten who would refuse peace no matter the price. In Hexter’s theory, Pym demonstrated immense political skill and transformed the ‘war machine’ over the winter of 1642/3, and his group aimed to defend the constitutional settlement wrestled from the King in 1641. Work by historians such as Valerie Pearl has extended the life-span of the middle group into the middle of 1644, and has argued that Oliver St. John took over in the summer of 1643 when Pym’s health failed him. Although some such as Mark Kishlansky emphasise the consensus, rather than the conflict, that existed within Parliament in the early 1640s, the theory of the middle group achieved something close
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437 Smith, Constitutional Royalism, pp. 112-3. Quotation at p. 113.
438 Ibid., pp. 113-114
439 While Peacey reminds us that this was done through the Stationers’ Company, he also argues that it was factionalised, especially after 1643. Peacey, Politicians and Pamphleteers, pp. 142-50. CJ, ii, pp. 996-7.
441 Hexter, The Reign of King Pym, p. 9.
to orthodoxy until work by Adamson on the importance of the relationship between Pym and his ‘King-makers’ (headed by Lord Saye-and-Sele) in the Lords, and a careful re-evaluation of Pym’s role in 1642/3 by Morrill. More recently, work by David Scott has described instead two groupings of Saye-Pym and Northumberland-Holles, and has discarded the ‘middle’ group entirely. Reconstruction of the political beliefs of Pym and Saye, too, has challenged elements of Hexter’s account. Hexter argues that the ‘middle’ group’s constitutional understanding was summed up in Hunton’s *Treatise of a Monarchie* of May 1643, although he provided no real evidence for this theory. Recently, more substantive work on the political affinities of those at the head of the Saye-Pym group have challenged this account. Work by Adamson on a draft declaration by Pym in March 1643 demonstrates that he attempted to stress that as the King’s sovereignty lay within Parliament, and that his refusal to agree with them demonstrated the illness that the King must be suffering, and thus Parliament should assume sovereignty. By comparing Pym’s complete text with that which eventually went through the committee, Adamson has argued that Pym’s beliefs are revealed to be in correlation with what this thesis terms Parliamentary absolutism. Such an understanding of Pym’s political beliefs correlates with Russell’s account of Pym’s efforts to pass the Declaration of 19 May 1642 (before the war had truly begun), which argued that because the King was absent, Parliament must be sovereign. The work continued that absence could include ‘nonage, natural disability, and captivity’, and that Parliament ‘needs not the authority of any person or Court to affirme
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444 David Scott, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637-49* (Basingstoke, 2004), pp. 40-2. For an account of the current state of the field, see also George, ‘Lame Jack His Haultings’.


447 Ibid., pp. 134-6.
According to Russell, Pym had spent a good part of a month attempting to get the Declaration through Parliament, and was eventually forced to remove a certain choice phrase which would amount to ‘accusing the King of laying a “scandal” on the Parliament’. Furthermore, Pym’s dealings with Parker have been uncovered by Peacey. Looking at the press campaign of Bishop and White, Peacey argues that a coherent constitutional and political message was propagated with help from Pym and Saye. Their output emphasised the absolutism of Parliament, and consistently argued against peace. Finally, further work by Adamson – this time focusing on Saye – has examined the *Vindiciae Veritatis* (1654) and has argued that the majority of it was composed in 1646 and 1648, and that the main author was Saye, not his son Nathaniel Fiennes as has often been suspected. From this work, Adamson argues that Saye believed that Parliament, through its role as the high court, was the supreme power and that the King could not be separated from it. Furthermore, Adamson argues that Saye believed that the subject had an ‘absolute’ duty of obedience to the Parliament, and therefore believed that the people could not recall their trust. This account of the political beliefs of Saye and Pym correlates with those of Parker, Herle and Prynne, and recent historiography has emphasised clear – and at times working – relationships between these politicians and authors. If the Saye-Pym group had a political creed, it argued for a clear parliamentary sovereignty in which the representative was unchallengeable by the represented.
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448 Husbands (ed.), *An exact collection*, p. 208.


Once a vocal minority, the political affinities of Saye and Pym and those writers that argued for a Parliamentary absolutism became increasingly prevalent from April to June 1643 before becoming mainstream parliamentary thought. In a large part, this was down to a transformation of the power dynamic within the Houses of Parliament. The failure of the peace proposals led to a period of ‘slim’ war party control within the Parliament from April 1643, as members frustrated by the King’s refusal to negotiate looked towards other ways to bring about an end to the conflict.\textsuperscript{455} This coincided with a rejuvenation in Parliamentary licensed pamphlets that argued for Parliamentary absolutism, and the production of a series of parliamentary defences printed with authority, each of which focused on a different part of Parliament’s case. For example, at the beginning of May 1643 \textit{The Kingdomes Case}, licensed to be printed by the Committee of the House of Commons, argued using statutes that Parliament was ‘a Court of Record’, it was ‘quasi Jurisdiction’, and that it could ‘dictate the law’.\textsuperscript{456} All were to ‘believe and obey the Judgement’, and ‘none shall be admitted to contradict it, or to say that it is not true ... until it was reversed’; even if the Parliament could do wrong, ‘whatsoever they doe therein is lawfull, and [ju]stifiable, and may not be admitted to dispute or question the illegality thereof’.\textsuperscript{457} Later that month, \textit{The Political Catechisme}, again given permission by the Committee of the House of Commons in Parliament concerning printing, used the King’s answers to the XIX Propositions in order to argue that the advice given by the Houses was never intended to be optional. To have the power to defend against ‘Tyrannie’, the Parliament must be able to raise arms, to ‘Command their judgement to be obeyed’, to tax and if necessary raise the ‘Power of the whole Kingdome’ to move against the ‘Delinquents’.\textsuperscript{458} The next month, again with permission of the Committee,}

\textsuperscript{455} George, ‘Lame Jack His Haultings’, pp. 315-6.

\textsuperscript{456} \textit{The kingdoms case}, p. 9. It was given permission by the Committee of the House of Commons concerning Printing on 24 April 1643 to be printed, but it does not appear in the Commons Journals.

\textsuperscript{457} Ibid., pp. 10-1, 3.

\textsuperscript{458} A political catechism, or, Certain questions concerning the government of this land, answered in His Majesties own words, taken out of his answer to the 19 propositions, Pag. 17, 18, 19, 20. of the first edition; with some brief observations thereupon. Published for the more compleat settling of consciences, particularly of those that have made the late protestation, to maintain the power and priviledges of Parliament, when they shall herein see the Kings own interpretation what that power and priviledges are (Printed for Samuel Gellibrand, [20 May] 1643) E.104[8], pp. 8-10. As Weston and Greenberg note, this was one of the pamphlets that Henry Vane turned to in order to defend himself after the Restoration, \textit{Subjects and Sovereigns}, pp. 155-6.
came *A Few Propositions*, which made the case using the law of nature and reason. It argued that according to the law of nature ‘it is lawful for anyone to defend themselves against any private person that assaults them to take away their lives or puts them in danger’, but that the right to do this collectively as a nation rested solely within the Parliament. The Parliament’s ‘authority reaches throughout the whole kingdom … to command all inferior officers and magistrates and private persons to do their duties respectively … for the necessary defence of themselves, neighbours and the whole kingdom’.\(^{459}\) Crucially, this work concluded by suggesting that if the reader has ‘any desire further to see how this agrees with the particular constitution of government in this nation I shall refer him for that to the *Political catechism* and the *Kingdom’s Case*.\(^{460}\) Thus, the parliamentarian reader was provided by these three pamphlets with a clear, coherent and sanctioned understanding of the constitution from the House of Commons: one defended Parliament’s actions using statutes and cases; the second used the constitution as written by the King himself; and the third used the laws of reason and nature. The House of Commons Committee concerning printing had begun to produce works that clearly defined the extent of Parliamentary absolutism, and the extent to which the subject was obligated to follow the representative Parliament absolutely. These views correlate with the views of Saye and Pym, and the arguments of those advocating Parliamentary absolutism, at a time when the Commons was increasingly leaning towards a more committed pursuit of war.\(^{461}\)


\(^{461}\) The Committee of the House of Commons concerning printing also produced several other works under authority in April where we might find some more evidence of Saye and Pym’s influence. For example, two sermons were printed by John Tombes that described popish plots in Bristol in March, and the discovery of them by Nathaniel Fiennes, Saye’s second son. John Tombes, *Fermentvm Pharisaevm*, or, The leaven of pharisaicall wil-worship declared in a sermon on Matth. 15.9 Novemb. 24, 1641 at Lemster in Herefordshire (Printed by Richard Cotes for Andrew Crooke, [01 July] 1643) E.56[16]; John Tombes, *Iehovah Iireh*, or, Gods providence in delivering the godly opened in two sermons in the citie of Bristoll on the day of publike thanksgiving in that citie March 14, 1642 : for the deliverance of that citie from the invasion without, and the plot of malignants within the city, intended to have been acted the Tuesday night before (Printed by Rich. Cotes, for Michael Sparkes Senior, FD: 14 March 1643) E.100[31]. For Fiennes, see Marc L. Schwarz, ‘Fiennes, Nathaniel (1607/8–1669)’, in *ODNB*. 
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The final nail in the coffin of mixed constitutional arguments was the discovery of the Waller Plot. During the Oxford negotiations in March 1643, Charles had sent commissions to London citizens empowering them to raise the Militia. Edmund Waller, an MP who was broadly in favour of a negotiated peace and with connections to the Great Tew circle, was tasked with capitalising on the growing peace movements in London. In 1643, the realities of long-term warfare and taxation had settled in, and several military failures, including the Earl of Stamford’s defeat at Stratton, meant that the parliamentarian morale was low.

On 31 May 1643, in his typical theatrical fashion, Pym informed MPs on the fast day of a plot to raise forces for the King within London. Speaking at greater length on 8 June 1643 at Common Hall, Pym charged the conspirators with acting ‘under pretence of procuring peace’, and saying ‘they would have made themselves Masters of the City, yea of the whole kingdom’, and that while ‘the pretences was peace, the truth was blood and violence’. According to Pym, those who pushed for peace did so to undermine the Parliament, rather than for the good of the kingdom. Normally described either as a botched job half-planned or a stitch-up, Scott has recently argued that the plot explicitly targeted Saye-Pym grandees who ‘were to be seized in their beds’ and that Northumberland ‘was privy to the design’, and has suggested that the plot may have been to ensure that the ‘Northumberland-Holles’ faction had a ‘free hand to conclude a soft peace with the King’. If this is the case, it would fit within the timeline of a decline in the influence of those pushing for peace and an increase in arguments for Parliamentary absolutism.
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462 For the peace movements, see Gentles, ‘Struggle for London’; for Waller, see Geoffrey Smith, Royalist Agents, Conspirators and Spies: Their Role in the British Civil Wars, 1640-1660 (Farnham, 2011), p. 50.

463 Cicely Veronica Wedgwood, The King’s War, 1641-1647 (London, 1958), p. 183; Ronald Hutton, ‘Hopton, Ralph, Baron Hopton (Bap. 1596, D. 1652)’, in ODNB.

464 John Pym, A discovery of the great plot for the utter ruine of the city of London. And the Parliament (Printed for Peter Cole, FD: 08 June 1643) E.105[21], sig. A2r, B3r. This built upon criticisms of the December peace petitions – see, for example, The convinc’d petitioner, pp. 1-2, which charged the petitions with attempting to ‘create division’, and Richard Williams, Peace, and no peace: or, a pleasant dialogue betweene Phil-Eirenus, a Protestant, a lover of peace. And Philo Polemus, a separatist, an incendiary of War, suitable to the times (s.n., [05 January] 1643) E.84[18], pp. 1-2.

465 Scott, Politics and War, pp. 61-2.
While discussing the details of the Waller plot at Common Hall a week after it was first revealed, Pym argued that two Covenants – one for the Parliament, and another suitable to be taken ‘by the Citizens, by the Army, and the rest of the people generally in all places’ – should be enacted, both of which had already passed through the Commons and were being considered by the Lords. The Vow and Covenant required the subscriber to acknowledge before God belief in the popish plot and to oppose and resist any future efforts against the Parliament, to continue to fight for Parliament against the King’s forces, and help all those who did the same. Both Houses had been consistently reminded of the plot – Waller himself addressed the House on 4 June 1643, and had declared that ‘you governe in Chiefe’ – and many historians have emphasised the degree to which Pym exploited and exaggerated the danger posed by Waller’s plot to London and the Parliament. Pym had been attempting to pass a covenant for a long time. Work by Holmes and Vallance has stressed the efforts of Pym and his allies to ape the Scottish Covenant in the English political nation, believing that a ‘firme bond and union’ would bring together the nation, distinguish the devoted from the indifferent, and force the binary choice that was being offered between the King and Parliament, or the King and his counsellors alone. Efforts to bring the nation together under a clear parliamentarian banner had been successful with the Protestation of 1641. The swearer had been required to ‘promise, vow and protest, to maintain and defend, as far as lawfully I may, with my life, power and estate, the true reformed protestant religion, expressed in the doctrine of the Church of England, against all popery and popish innovation within this realm’, to defend ‘his majesty’s royal person, honour and estate’

466 Pym, A discovery of the great plot, sig. B4r-B4v.
468 Edmund Waller, Mr. Wallers speech in the House of Commons, on Tuesday the fourth of July, 1643. Being brought to the Barre, and having leave given him by the speaker, to say what hee could for himselfe, before they proceeded to expell him the House. July 14. 1643 (Printed by G. Dexter, FD: 14 July 1643) E.60[11], p. 2.
and the ‘power and priviledges of Parliament’, the ‘lawful rights and liberties of the subject, and every person that maketh this Protestation’. Importantly, the Protestation expanded those who were directly involved in politics – creating a ‘collective public engagement’ intended to bind together the political nation against a perceived and defined threat.

Work by Walter has recently argued that the Protestation was a ‘call to active citizenship’, and that through it ‘hitherto marginalised groups could claim membership of an enlarged political nation and, in performing the Protestation, challenge an active role in reforming church and state’. However, while shibboleths could be an empowering tool to define allies and enemies, they could also blur these distinctions by offering subscribers the opportunity to empower their own actions, and to read their own views between the lines. If they failed to subscribe fully to either side, subscribers could include caveats to problematic sections of the Protestation to ensure that the Protestation did not threaten their allegiance, or else could use it to justify acts of iconoclasm and push for a further reformation. Indeed, the Protestation aided ‘discord and division’ by helping to create space in which criticisms could be levelled, and Walter has argued that the Protestation was crucial in promoting the use of conscience in politics in the later 1640s. Efforts had been made to create a covenant in the late summer of 1642, and by October a Declaration was produced that had emphasised the religious nature of the struggle. However, attempts to impose it failed, and enthusiasm waned during the winter of 1642/3.

The Vow and Covenant cemented the shift from a parliamentarianism that accepted some form of mixed constitutionalism, towards one that required a belief in an absolute Parliament. In doing so, the cause was lifted out of the now-much contested legal framework, and placed within the hands of those within Parliament. Contemporary
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responses recognised the significance of this development – David Martin-Jones has highlighted that the Venetian Secretary Gerolamo Agostini noted in response to the Vow and Covenant that councilmen were attempting to obtain ‘absolute political power’ and ‘make themselves masters of the goods and lives of all’.\textsuperscript{477} Similarly, Holles argued that it would ‘test the adherence to the parliamentary cause’ and that they phrased it ‘in such a way that it forced moderate men who wished to remain neutral to choose between king and Parliament’.\textsuperscript{478}

The shift in acceptable parliamentarian theories can also be found in the carefully managed press campaign. Parliamentary committees were tasked with producing vindications of the Covenant, and the renewal of press licensing in June 1643 ensured that the message was clear and unchallenged.\textsuperscript{479} By studying these vindications, it is possible to see just how demanding this Vow, which was to be made ‘in the presence of Almighty God’, actually was, especially to those who had proved reluctant to accept an unbalanced constitution.\textsuperscript{480} The Covenant demanded acknowledgement that there was a ‘wicked and treacherous Design’, and that the oath-taker swore to ‘oppose and resist’ any plots against the Parliament.\textsuperscript{481} This was expanded by one commentator, who specified that the plot included ‘the attempt made against the five Members’; ‘the setting up of Masses in York, and Oxford’; and ‘the granting of so many Commissions for Array, which were so destructive to the Subjects Liberty’.\textsuperscript{482} The Vow and Covenant itself was ‘A mixt Covenant’, ‘partly Religious, and partly civill’, in which the oath-taker was engaged ‘both to God and men’.\textsuperscript{483} The oath-takers were engaged to have a ‘religious and conscientious persuasion, and belief of the lawfulness of the Parliaments taking up Armes’, and a ‘reall, and confident perswasion, that the Forces, and Army raised by the King, are raised both against the Parliament, and Protestant Religion, and Lawes, and to destroy and take

\textsuperscript{477} CSP Ven, xxvi, p. 287, quoted in Martin-Jones, \textit{Conscience and Allegiance}, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{478} Ibid., p. 120.
\textsuperscript{480} Firth and Rait (eds), \textit{Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum}, pp. 175-6.
\textsuperscript{481} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{482} Samuel Clarke, \textit{Englands covenant proved lawfull & necessary also at this time, both by Scripture and reason. Together, with sundry answers to the usuall objections made against it} (Printed for Henry Overton, [13 June] 1643) E.60[5], p. 9.
\textsuperscript{483} Ibid., p. 5.
away the Liberties of the Subject’.\textsuperscript{484} In sum, not only was the commitment one of an agreed narrative, but it was also one of shared and unshakable belief – a proclamation that the Parliament’s actions were legal, they would remain to be, and that the oath-taker would continue to help in their actions. Thus commitment to the cause was irrevocable.

The legal implications of this Vow were made clear when one work listed potential objections, among them, ‘What if they [Parliament] doe any unlawfull Act in the persuance of it?’ to which the reply from a vindication pamphlet was ‘In the persuance thereof doth necessarily imply that it must be done lawfully, and therefore that Word was inserted in the late Protestation, & must be understood here also’.\textsuperscript{485} The pamphlet continued, when the legality of Parliament’s current position was questioned, by referring the reader to other published justifications:

\begin{quote}
This question is so full, and largely discussed, and the thing proved to be lawfull both in case of Law, and Conscience, by Mr Pryn. of his third part, and by diverse of our Divines in their Answers to Dr. Ferne, that I shall refer the Reader to seeke for satisfaction there, where it may bee had abundantly if they come with unballanced Judgements and shut not their eyes against that light which shineth therein.\textsuperscript{486}
\end{quote}

It was no longer sufficient to be convinced of the legality of Parliament’s case – the subscriber was required to be convinced that anything the Parliament had done, was doing or might do in the future was legal, and to declare so in the eyes of God. The Parliament’s actions were legal, and the King’s were illegal. This was an attempt to sweep away the last year of constitutional and legal debate, which had left a cloudy constitution but a jury of readers willing to examine their own consciences and to square justifications against their own internal understanding of the law.

\textsuperscript{484} Richard Ward, \textit{The analysis, explication, and application, of the sacred vow and Covenant, enjoyned by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, to be taken by every man throughout the whole Kingdome. Very usefull and profitable for to be read, observed, and kept by all who take the said Covenant} (Printed by Richard Bishop for John Dallam, [07 July] 1643) E.59[14], pp. 5-6.

\textsuperscript{485} Clarke, \textit{Englands covenant}, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{486} \textit{Ibid}. 
For those writers sympathetic to Parliament, the Vow and Covenant shifted the debate in a crucial way. It lifted the ability to judge legality out of the hands of the reader, and required the oath-taker to swear before God that Parliament was acting legally. The legal and constitutional rhetoric, which had been sharpened over the previous year of debate, was therefore stripped from pamphleteers, or became useless to them. At the same time, due to the military defeats over the summer, Parliament desperately needed to maintain momentum and support. Both these factors were represented in the parliamentarian pamphlets over the summer. For example, *The Reformed Malignants* imagined a lengthy conversation between a ‘Cavalier’ and a ‘Convert’, but the best defence that the ‘Convert’ could offer was that the Scots were ‘in preparation for Comming’; it was a call for parliamentarians to hold on a bit longer in their military effort, rather than any sort of rousing defence of Parliament’s actions. A similar argument was made by the anonymous author of *A Strange and Terrible Sight Forseene*, who manipulated Parker’s complaint of January 1643. While Parker called for the writing of Parliament’s case to be taken out of the hands of ‘Sots’, and praised the royalist presses for having the ‘pen and the lance ... in the same hand’, the later work complained that ‘*Our pens have beene to busie and our swords too sloe*’, and speculated if ‘we had taken every occasion to fight as we did to write, the warre (in all probability) would have been put to an end long ere this time’. The rest of the work encouraged further participation in the war effort, or else the royalists would (among other crimes) enter London and ‘Husbands should see your Wives ravished before your faces’. Without the legal framework, parliamentarian arguments were reduced to scaremongering.

The conflict was beginning to be painted in more religious terms – which had previously been conspicuous in their absence. For example, *Great Britains Misery* promised to vindicate the ‘Lawfulnessse and Necessity of Raising Arms by the Parliament, and the
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Kingdom’ on the title page, but inside the work argued that ‘The efficient and first cause of all misery is God’, and that there was a need to investigate personal sin to understand why God had started this war to punish them.491 Another argued that by embracing Parliament’s side and taking up arms, participants would ‘Chronicle your names on earth, in Heaven for ever, for fighting valiantly for the Lord of hosts against his enemies’.492 These striking and emotive works suggest that pamphleteers lacked the persuasive means to convince their readers.

This development left the reader exposed to royalist challenges without a clear understanding of what measures they were allowed to take to challenge them. The royalist John Jones produced his Examination of the Observations upon his Majesties Answers in August and demonstrated that there was still mileage in challenging and opposing Parker’s natural law reasoning. Jones extracted Parker’s contention that the King was ‘singulis major universis minor’ and therefore ‘Salus populi Suprema Lex’, and exaggerated its logic to reach the fallacy that ‘Wine maketh a man drunk, therefore Wine it selfe is more drunke than man’. By extrapolating Parker’s conception of natural law to absurdity to reveal its weakness – the ‘inference holdeth not’ – Jones was able to challenge the key tenets of Parker’s justification for Parliament. Parker’s reliance on explainable reason, and Parliament’s reliance on Parker’s work, opened rhetorical avenues with which royalists could interact (occasionally with flair).493 Thus, the aim of the royalists remained essentially the same: to prove Parliament’s case illegal using parliamentarian logic against them. Doing this would prove the Vow and Covenant illegal, and therefore justify their objection to it. In addition, royalists found themselves able to attack the way that the Vow and Covenant was commanded to be taken,

491 Great Britains misery; with the causes and cure. Described first, as it is from the justice of God the authour, who is now in controversie with the inhabitants of the land for sin: especially for eight capittall crimes, all which are aggravated by sundry circumstances. Secondly, the injustice and malice of the instruments of this misery, Satan and his agents: their main aime, and particular ends, moving them therunto. Vindicating, plainly and fully, (by way of answer to severall objections) the lawfullnesse and necessity of raising arms by the Parliament, and kingdom; for the defence of the King, kingdom, religion, laws, and known rights of the subject: against that viperous generation of papists, atheists, delinquents, and licentious men, who have at once invaded all (Printed for Laurence Chapman, [21 August] 1643) E.250[4], pp. 1-5.

492 A strange and terrible sight, pp. 4-5.

493 John Jones, An examination of the observations upon His Majesties answers. Wherein the absurdities of the observators positions, and inferences are discovered (s.n., [14 August] 1643) E.65[7], pp. 7-8. He later argued that it was clear that Parliament had the potential to do wrong, as they had in the past, p. 18.
complaining that (amongst other things) it might destroy community cohesion as ministers and churchwardens were forced to ‘betray their poore Parishoners and neighbours’. Their objections were therefore able to follow the same pattern as royalist objections from the previous year – accusing Parliament of being an arbitrary government that was threatening to destroy society, while an ill-treated King was fighting to defend his subjects – but also introduce new evidence to confirm their protests. The disappearance of the legal framework left the parliamentarian reader with few resources to counter these newly-strengthened royalist arguments.

The Vow and Covenant was an attempt to solve the polemical products of the legal framework, rather than the legal framework itself, and rather than engaging with the reader, it imposed. The reader was expected to subscribe to the Covenant before God, and therefore the Covenant transcended potential objections that might have existed in the legal framework based on historical precedents and statutes. By attempting to escape these hesitations, the Vow and Covenant failed to acknowledge that the solution it offered – that Parliament must be right, and therefore it could act as an arbitrary power – was exactly the same problem that pamphleteers had been attempting to solve for nearly two years, and had already been considered and rejected by the process of pamphlet debate. Rather than introducing a new debate, the Vow and Covenant reimposed the absolutist case that had proven to be problematic in the polemic, and shut down the potential for a mixed constitutionalist defence of Parliament.

\footnote{494 
Observations upon the instructions for the taking the vow and covenant throughout England (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [07 August] 1643) E.64[9], p. 8.}
We reade of it as a great aggravation of sinne, that men frame iniquity by a Law: This they have done too farre as in them lyes, but not content with this, they have now proceeded farther to frame iniquity by an Oath and Covenant. That as they kill mens bodies on the one side, so they may destroy soules too on the other ; as if they would goe about to confute our Saviour, where he telleth us, that men are able onely to destroy the body, and doe no more, and shew that they can in some sense destroy both body and soule in hell.495

_A Briefe Discourse, Declaring the Impiety and unlawfulnesse of the new Covenant with the Scots_ (October 1643).

Over the summer of 1643, the royalists enjoyed a series of victories in the North and the West country. The Duke of Newcastle had defeated Fairfax on Adwalton Moor (30 June), giving the royalists effective control over Yorkshire. Henrietta Maria, having obtained arms for forces raised by Newcastle and unblighted by attempts by the Commons to impeach her for High Treason, was able to march from York to Newark, and from there to Oxford, reuniting with the King in July. William Waller’s defeat at Landsdown (5 July) and Roundway Down (13 July) gave an opportunity for Prince Rupert, reinforced with new troops from Oxford, to march and take Bristol at the end of July.496 Already in a position of military weakness, Parliament feared that royalist efforts for a cessation in Ireland which had begun earlier in the year would allow Charles to bring back troops that were fighting in Ireland to England.497

Substantive and detailed discussions between Parliament and Scottish commissioners began in the summer of 1643, and six months later in January 1644, the Scots crossed the River Tweed. This isolated the Duke of Newcastle in the North and drew him from

495 _A Briefe discourse declaring the impiety and unlawfulnesse of the new covenant with the Scots together with the covenant it selfe_ (s.n., [26 October] 1643) E.73[1], pp. 7-8.


Yorkshire, where he had been reeling after an ultimately failed attempt to reduce the parliamentarian garrison at Hull. The price (aside from the exorbitant cost – some £30,000 a month) of this invasion was the introduction of the Solemn League and Covenant, a religious, military and political alliance between Parliament and the Scots. According to an ordinance of February 1644, ‘both Nations are engaged in one common Cause, against the Enemies of Religion and Liberties’. The Committee of Both Kingdoms, in which sat representatives from the Lords, Commons and Scotland, became the dominant executive body, and operated a broad range of functions to harmonise English parliamentarian and Scottish military strategy and resources. What’s more, the Westminster Assembly, having been charged to deliberate on the future nature of religion over the summer (as a demonstration to the Scots of the English commitment to further reformation), began detailed discussions over the future of the church in England.

The Solemn League and Covenant redefined the parliamentarian war aims. What bound the Scots and the English was not the desire to protect the fundamental law, or reinstate the true constitution, but rather the pursuit of ‘true’ religion. By replacing the increasingly contested legal framework that had given meaning to the conflict, the parliamentarian cause was now grounded instead in the defence of the future of Protestantism.

The Solemn League and Covenant was read to the Commons on 26 August, and was sent to the Westminster Assembly of Divines who were to read it as a ‘grand case of conscience’. The Houses of Parliament had formed the Westminster Assembly the previous year in part to discuss the future of the Church of England, and what form the reforms might take. The Assembly first met on 1 July 1643, and consisted of 121 ministers, a selection of MPs and Peers, and eight invited Scottish commissioners. Their task was
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to determine a system of church government ‘most agreeable to Gods Holy Word’ to replace the now dismantled Episcopalian system.\textsuperscript{503} According to the procedural instructions given by the Parliament, ‘What any Man undertakes to prove as necessary, he shall make good out of the Scriptures’.\textsuperscript{504} However, Parliament was keen to stress that the Assembly’s role was advisory rather than binding, and ‘at every point in the ordinance, parliament asserted its governing and determining role in the synod’.\textsuperscript{505} The Assembly’s instructions were coupled with fresh attempts to impose pre-publication controls on printing, and the Assembly was warned not to publish their findings without the express permission of the Houses of Parliament.\textsuperscript{506} Even though the body was tasked with determining a new church according to ‘scriptural authority’, the Assembly’s findings were to remain strictly under the Parliament’s control.\textsuperscript{507}

The Westminster Assembly, after some initial reluctance, deemed the Solemn League and Covenant to be both lawful and compatible with the Word of God. On 25 September, a service was held at St. Margaret’s Church, where both members of Parliament and the Assembly signed the Covenant.\textsuperscript{508} It called for (I) the protection of the Church of Scotland and further reformation of the Church of England in line with the ‘Word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches’; (II) ‘the extirpation of Popery, prelacy ... superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness’; (III) to ‘preserve the rights and privileges of the Parliaments, and liberties of the kingdoms, and to preserve and defend the King’s Majesty’s person and authority’; (IV) to ‘endeavour the discovery of all such as have been or shall be incendiaries, malignants or evil instruments’; (V) to
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\textsuperscript{508} \textit{Ibid.}; Dixhoorn (ed.), \textit{Minutes and Papers}, vol. I, p. 150. For speeches by Henderson and Phillip Nye, see \textit{The Covenant: with a narrative of the proceedings and solemn manner of taking it by the Honourable House of Commons, and reverent Assembly of Divines the 25th day of September, at Saint Margarets in Westminster} (Printed for Thomas Vnderhill, [13 October] 1643) E.70[22]. For an in-depth study of the Westminster Assembly examining the Solemn League and Covenant, see Paul, \textit{The Assembly of The Lord}, pp. 87-100.
encourage a ‘blessed peace between these [three] kingdoms; and (VI) to ‘assist and defend all those that enter into this league and covenant’.\textsuperscript{509}

In granting their approval of the Solemn League and Covenant, the Westminster Assembly had performed two practical functions that were interrelated. Firstly, they confirmed that the Solemn League and Covenant was a covenant with God, and therefore that Parliament’s efforts were synonymous with God’s. Politically, Parliament was legitimated to continue to pursue a war against the King because it was a godly struggle, therefore justifying resistance against the King. It was this political function that would underpin the religious framework upon which much of the pamphlet debate would be based until the end of the civil war, transformed from the legal framework that had been the basis so far. By confirming the Covenant was compatible with the word of God, the Westminster Assembly helped construct a non-contested framework that parliamentarian pamphleteers could use to defend Parliament’s past and future actions and bring together the parliamentarian effort.

Secondly, the Solemn League and Covenant had confirmed that religion should be transformed according to the ‘Word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches’.\textsuperscript{510} The Covenant walked a fine line between fully endorsing the Scottish Presbyterian system, necessary for the Scots’ military and financial support, and keeping open the possibility of an alternative settlement. Robert Baillie, the Scottish divine, wrote that ‘the English were for a civill league, we for a religious Covenant’.\textsuperscript{511} As an act of collaboration, ambiguous language was employed in its writing which allowed a number of different interpretations to be projected onto the document, or different emphases stressed when being advertised to different bodies. For example, when the Covenant was preached to the House of Lords, it was stressed by Thomas Coleman that by ‘prelacy’ it meant ‘not all Episcopacy, but only the form here described’.\textsuperscript{512} Likewise, the phrase the ‘Word of God’ disguised a wide spectrum of various church settlements. Those who wanted to read the Covenant as supporting the Scottish Kirk could conflate the clause to protect the Scottish Kirk with that of the best reformed churches; those who believed
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that a Scottish settlement might be unconscionable could lay more stress on the Word of God.

This chapter begins by examining how the Solemn League and Covenant superseded and replaced the legal framework to create a new framework that could more firmly and simply legitimate the Parliament and their cause. The Solemn League and Covenant was an agreement with God that had been confirmed lawful by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and that demanded due obedience to Parliament and their efforts not just by law, but by religion too. While the framework had changed the polemic found itself in familiar terrain, and debates raged over the extent to which the implied reader could make their own subjective readings of the Covenant, and how far they should be allowed to examine their own conscience before obeying the commands of a magistrate.

By shifting the framework by which the conflict was understood, the Covenant required readers either to change their understanding of the conflict to conform to the new framework, or risk being excluded from the ‘sanctioned’ understandings of why the conflict was being fought. The latter half of the chapter examines what impact the Solemn League and Covenant, and its political and religious usage in the polemic, had on the understandings of the law and the constitution. The Solemn League and Covenant acted as a fundamental shift in the way that the parliamentary cause was defined and as pamphlets continued to debate and discuss the impact of these changes, the polemic began to pose uncomfortable questions to Parliament, a body whose authority was legitimated by its judicative, rather than religious, role.

The Solemn League and Covenant was a dramatic shift in the way that the war was understood, which royalist writers attempted to capitalise on. The anonymous author of *A Briefe Discourse*, for example, argued that ‘We reade of it as a great aggravation of sinne, that men frame iniquity by a Law: This they have done too as farre as in them lyes, but not content with this, they have now proceeded farther to frame iniquity by an Oath and Covenant’.\(^{513}\) With ‘not a word of the Law in the whole oath’, Parliament had revealed ‘how they mean to governe’.\(^{514}\) This transformation fragmented further the

\(^{513}\) *A Briefe discovrse declaring the impiety and unlawfulness of the new covenant*, pp. 7-8.
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parliamentarian coalition, and would eventually lead to those who found themselves unable to fully subscribe to the Solemn League and Covenant developing new and radical theories with which to support Parliament.

I THE RELIGIOUS FRAMEWORK

I. THE SUBJECTIVITY OF THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT

The Solemn League and Covenant, in replacing the law as the framework with which the conflict was to be understood, empowered the parliamentarians to conflate their cause with that of God. This was because the Covenant was understood as a Godly ordinance, in which God was ‘an active party in a contract containing mutual obligations’. The Solemn League and Covenant was presented by parliamentarians as being equivalent to the word of God, and was therefore to be treated with the same reverence as scriptures were. Smith, for example, wrote that a ‘religious Covenant, is a Divine and sacred Ordinance of God’, and that ‘God himselfe was the author of it’. Elsewhere The First Search, when arguing against Common Prayer, listed some twenty-two objections from ‘the word of God, and the late Covenant’, weaving both together without feeling the need to distinguish between the two. As the author of Powers to be Resisted put it when challenged that Charles protested that he was fighting to protect religion and liberty, ‘we have enquired of the Lord touching this matter’, ‘and wee have our answer: That the Lord and King is very angry’. According to Hezekiah Woodward, it was ‘remarkable... how the Lord has forced His People, has used a kind of violence to bring up his people to this Covenanting Work’. The Lord, he continues, ‘suffered it to be, That His People might stir-up themselves’, to protest to God. Eventually, ‘God heard their groans
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notwithstanding, pittied His people', and showed that he had respect for their Protestation, and stepped in to help them.\textsuperscript{520} God, then, had both instigated and authored this Covenant.

The Solemn League and Covenant also empowered parliamentarian authors to underline the approval of the Westminster Assembly for their cause. Their approval was confirmation of the highest authority, and determined that the Covenant was indeed instigated by and contracted with God. For example, \textit{A View of the Solemn League} argued that the authority was from the ‘Assembly of learned and godly Divines [who] have, after serious examination, and weighing every sentence [sic] and word of it’ considered it fit to be taken.\textsuperscript{521} Or, as \textit{The Three Kingdoms Healing-Plaister} could reassure the reader, ‘It has also been accepted by the Kingdom of Scotland, and the Assemblies of Divines in both Kingdomes, Reverend, Learned, Orthodox, and godly men’.\textsuperscript{522}

The Solemn League and Covenant was being sold on its impeccable credentials and divine absoluteness. But the nature of the oath, the religiously vague language and potential political ramifications meant that a problematic subjectivity was embedded in the document, which was to cause problems throughout the following decades. The Solemn League and Covenant was published into a reading environment that was attentive to detail and highly interrogatory. The pamphlet debate of the last year and a half had sought to train a population of amateur lawyers who had knowledge enough to challenge arguments based on the law, though not enough to understand the nuances used by qualified common-lawyers to stop the law being openly contradictory. This had led to the breakdown of the legal framework as, in the face of myriad contradictions, authors because increasingly rhetorically dependent on the implied reader. In order for the Solemn League and Covenant to bind the community together against a common enemy, it would have had to close off the opportunities for subjectivity and dependence on an implied reader which had so beleaguered the legal framework in the preceding debates. However, the process of negotiating the Solemn League and Covenant had
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meant that this non-subjectivity and the exclusion of the implied reader were only
fictional. Henry Vane, Parliament’s chief negotiator during discussions of the Solemn
League and Covenant, had struggled to ensure that there was a provision for an
Independent reformation according to the ‘Word of God’, and not just towards a
Presbyterian church settlement.\textsuperscript{523} Vane’s success in redrafting the clauses allowed some
flexibility and at least the potential for divines to propose a different church system than
the Scots’ when they concluded their debates. From the very beginning, then,
subjectivity was written into the document, and those who subscribed to it could give
different weight to certain words and phrases in order to favour their own preferred
church settlement. Because the authority of the Covenant was reliant on the fiction that
religion could mean one singular thing to all readers, the meaning of the Covenant
proved to be ultimately dependent on the reader.

The oath-taker was being asked to swear that the current form of the Church of Scotland
would be protected, and this became a major point of contention. Many objections noted
that neither the subscriber, nor the people at large, really understood how the Scottish
system worked. For example, \textit{The Anti-Confederacie} argued that ‘Not one in a thousand,
nay of ten thousand, knowes what the \textit{Doctrine, Worship, Discipline} ... is’, and in light of
that, asked how then could they swear to protect it.\textsuperscript{524} Going further, \textit{A Letter from A
Member of the House of Commons} (referring to the Oxford Parliament) argued, ‘No law
bindes me to preserve this, and Christian duty forbids me to sweare defence of that
which I know not’, and that if the people actually understood what they were subscribing
to ‘they would rather desire to destroy’.\textsuperscript{525}

Defences were thus stunted by the ambiguous language that was employed in the
Covenant itself, an attempt towards some degree of flexibility for the future of church
government. By extension, this flexibility could be emphasised in order to protect the
Covenant. Parliamentarian defences such Thomas Mocket’s \textit{View of the Solemn League
and Covenant} argued that they were only being asked to protect the Scottish system as ‘it

\textsuperscript{523} Woolrych, \textit{Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660}, p. 271.

\textsuperscript{524} \textit{The Anti-Confederacie, or, An extract of certaine quaeres concerning the Solemne League and
Covenant framed according to those rules of an oath, prescribed by God himselfe : Jerem. 4.2, thou
shalt sweare, the Lord liveth in truth, in judgement and in righteousnesse} (s.n., [06 April] 1644)
E.40[29], p. 1.

\textsuperscript{525} \textit{A letter from a Member of the House of Commons, to a gentleman now at London, touching the
new Solemne League and Covenant} (Printed by H. Hall, [06 May] 1644) E.45[8], p. 5.
doth or shall appear to us to be according to the Word of God’, and ‘no further than as it is according to the Word of God’. Mocket invited the reader to educate themselves, by writing in his marginalia that ‘There are Books of it [descriptions of the Scottish religious system] almost in every Stationers Shop’. By engaging with the reader and encouraging them to become more informed, Mocket was able to dismiss the idea that people were bringing their own meaning to the Covenant: the document was not subjective, but rather the responsibility lay with the reader to ensure that their understanding correlated correctly with the Covenant, not vice versa.

These criticisms were connected to a much wider argument about the ability of oaths to bind when they were not completely understood by the oath-taker. The very significant number of pamphlets that accompanied the Solemn League and Covenant, both in the months surrounding its initial composition, and its imposition in the parishes, implies that there was a legitimate fear that the text of the Covenant alone was not enough. Furthermore, there is evidence that there were specific press campaigns to manage the reception of the Covenant. Some such as Woodward praised the Solemn League and Covenant for being particularly understandable. He started his pamphlet encouraging the reader to read the Covenant again, and then chastised them for not understanding it, because ‘is a very clear Covenant; indeed it is the clearest that ever man Penned here below’. This was followed by several pages explaining what the ‘very clear’ Covenant actually meant. Expediency and lack of ‘limits’ could spark more potential objections. What would be done, asked one pamphlet, if the Scots decided to change their system of church government? Would England be forced to ‘indeavour the contrary’?

Woodward retorted that you did not need to swear that the Scots’ system was perfect, but rather

---

527 Ibid.
528 See below.
529 Hezekiah Woodward, *The Solemne League and Covenant of three kingdomes, cleared to the conscience of every man, who is not willingly blinde, or wilfully obstinate. The antiquity of the Covenant on the Scots-side; the seasonablenesse of it on the English side; the admirable wisedome of God, in stirring-up the spirits of men on all sides, at such a time as this; all this with other things mightily conducing to, and promoting of the militia of kingdomes, and the posturing every person there, is referred to a place, where it may take up more room* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, [14 October] 1643) E.71[13], sig. A2v.
530 *Anti-confederacie*, p. 2.
only that it was as ‘close to perfect as Possibly, their Light could bring them’. That
difference, however, did little to stop royalist and Independent scepticism. There was
therefore an opportunity for royalist writers to probe the ambiguous terms and phrases
in the Covenant, and in doing so reveal some disputes within the otherwise relatively
united parliamentarian defences.

_The Iniquity of the Solemne League_ explained to the reader that the problem was not just
what they understood the Covenant to mean, but ‘the known and notorious meaning
and intention of them that impose or require it’. Even if the reader had good
intentions, and had read one of the many explanations, they could not necessarily be
sure that they understood the original purpose, and the reader would have to be held
responsible by God for being forsworn. There was no way for the reader to ensure that
they were not being exploited. This criticism was in part a challenge to the
parliamentarian equivocation that if the Covenant turned out to be unlawful, it was null
and void in the eyes of God: it ‘bindes not’ – and hence there was little risk in individuals
taking it. As _The Iniquity_ continues, its purpose becomes clear to the reader – if the
reader ‘through his owne ignorance, and the cunning of others, has been seduced’, by
‘threats and Menaces forced, or by any other means brought on to enter this Covenant’,
then the reader ‘is not bound to the performance of the Contents’, but rather by having
taken it ‘contracted their guilt of a grevious sinne’. The problem for the author was not
so much that the Covenant was unlawful and being forced upon the people, but more
that people might think it was not binding, take it without due care, and thus forswear
themselves, believing ‘If it binds not, then we may take it, and theres no harme done’.

---

531 Woodward, _Solemne League and Covenant_, p. 4.

532 _The iniquity of the late Solemne League, or Covenant discovered: by way of a letter to a
gentleman desiring information upon the poynt. Whereunto is subjoyned the Covenant it selfe_ (s.n.,
[03 March] 1644) E.36[10], p. 2.

533 Mocket, _A view of the Solemn League and Covenant_ ivstified against an infectious and libellous pamphlet intitvled, _The iniquity of the late Solemne League and Covenant discovered as it was lately sent from Oxford and intercepted by the way to London_ (Printed for Iohn Field, [29 March] 1644) E.39[20]. Of course, as both
the Houses of Parliament and the Westminster Assembly had declared it lawful, there was supposed
to be no chance of it being unlawful.

534 _The iniquity of the late Solemne League, or Covenant discovered_, p. 2.

535 _Ibid._, pp. 2–7. For similar uses of caveats for state oaths, see Cressy, ‘Protestation Protested’. On
the former point of oaths being forced, see Vallance, _Revolutionary England and the National
The Solemn League and Covenant threatened to be not only subjective, but also dangerous in its ambiguity.

These several weaknesses are perhaps why royalists were so willing to engage with a debate surrounding the Covenant, even though they so vehemently denied it was legitimate. For them, they could prosper simply by sowing doubt around the taking of the Covenant. Unlike the legal framework, where there were so many facets that it had proved practically impossible to prove or disprove anything, the Covenant’s authority existed in a way that was all-or-nothing: if any component of it was doubtful, the entire authority upon which the document rested would be proved false.

The Solemn League and Covenant was presented as a non-subjective ideal, a continuation of the aims of the Protestation and the oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance that reflected an immemorial attempt to work with God, not against Him. However, from its very inception, the Solemn League and Covenant had to allow room for subjectivity, and gave a space for differing and contrasting convictions – a space which was gleefully exploited by critics of the Covenant who invoked problematic implied readers to erode its certainties. The religious framework used by the Solemn League and Covenant was designed to inscribe the parliamentary case in stone, but was being revealed to be just as porous as the legal framework had been.

II. THE POLEMIC AND THE NEW RELIGIOUS FRAMEWORK

This section focuses on the way that authors were able to use the new religious framework to both defend and attack the Solemn League and Covenant, and the cumulative effect that this conversation had on the parliamentary cause as a whole. The Solemn League and Covenant, like the Vow and Covenant before it, was accompanied by an outburst of pamphlets that explained at length the implications and stressed the legality of the document. These works appeared both in September and October 1643 when it was taken by the Parliament, and in early 1644 when it was introduced in the parishes. Given the enduring nature of the Covenant – it was an oath sworn before God – the effort to defend it was often strikingly fleeting and episodic, meaning that there was a burst of activity one month, and then a scarcity of justifications the next. The political imperative that faced the parliamentarian war effort – to extract money and arms from the Scots – often meant that the implications of the arguments that were made to justify the Covenant created turmoil with their wider case. Ultimately, attempts to defend the
Covenant meant that concepts and language which had been previously contested within parliamentarianism became increasingly intrinsic to the parliamentary case, thus fragmenting further the public audience who were able to fully subscribe to their cause.

The new religious framework gave parliamentarian pamphlet writers much-needed new tools to defend Parliament and its actions. Over the summer of 1643 the parliamentarian pamphleteering effort had suffered because of the stifling of the implied reader – the works were dependent on Parliament declaring their case was right, rather than an explanation of their legal position or an appeal to readers’ consciences. The Solemn League and Covenant offered pamphleteers a new and wide range of rhetorical tropes that could empower the Parliament and their effort, and condemn the royalists. Increasingly, this rhetoric could be used in attempts to solve some of the problems that had been unearthed in the process of using the previous framework.

There was increasing confidence amongst parliamentarian justifications in conflating imperative commands from God and lawfulness. The Solemn League and Covenant allowed authors to build upon a fixed notion – the Word of God – while being able to maintain and describe fluidity in practice, because God had constructed and entered a covenant with Parliament in which he had given his approval to their past, present and future actions. In the polemic, to deny Parliament’s authority became the same as directly opposing God. In April 1644, for example, The Souldiers Cathechisme argued that ‘surely the high Court of Parliament must needs bee the higher power, which not to obey, is to resist the Ordinance of God’, and as A View of the Solemn League and Covenant put in January 1644, because the King ordered that which was ‘destructive to His Parliament, Laws, People and Religion’, it was best to ‘obey God [and therefore Parliament], rather than man [the King]’. By establishing that Parliament’s cause was God’s cause, these parliamentarian writers were able to argue that even if the King was the supreme magistrate, God was a higher magistrate still.

While pamphleteers were able to use the Solemn League and Covenant as a confirmation that Parliament was doing God’s work, they could also point to military successes as

---

536 Robert Ram, The souldiers catechisme: composed for the Parliaments Army: consisting of two parts: wherein are chiefly taught: 1 the iustification 2 the qualification of our souldiers. Written for the incouragement and instruction of all that have taken up armes in this cause of God and his people; especially the common souldiers (Printed for J. Wright, [08 April] 1644) E.1186[1], p. 5; Mocket, A view of the Solemn League and Covenant, p. 37.
further proof. For example, *A Looking-Glasse for Malignants* praised ‘Our good successe ever since the Covenant with Scotland’, and exhaustively listed times that God’s hand could be seen as working against the enemies of the Parliament, and attacking ‘Malignant persons’. The work culminated in the claim that ‘Almighty God declares himselfe a friend to our Party’, and that ‘Parliaments cause is unquestionably Gods cause’.537 Furthermore, in each of the *Six speeches spoken in the Guild-hall*, the speakers credit God as granting victory to Waller - a striking difference to similar works produced a year earlier.538 This shift, from legality to divine support, was reflected too in salutations that were produced at the beginning of political speeches. Rather than declaring support for the law of the land as had been the norm prior to the summer of 1643, the *Declaration of Commissary Generall Behr* in May 1644 began with ‘By the Law of God and Nature’, demonstrating how quickly new understandings of legal discourse had penetrated ritualistic phrases.539

The Solemn League and Covenant offered pamphleteers opportunities to show that Parliament was accountable to a new authority, and if the Solemn League and Covenant was unquestionably true, anyone or anything that opposed it must be false. As *The Oxonian Antippodes* clarified in February 1644, ‘The Law of God exprest in holy Scripture, is a Law that is written in the conscience of every man, in the conscience of the King so well as in the conscience of a Subject, which Law the Philosophers called the Law of Nature, and the Lawyers call it the Law of Nations’.540 This fed into, and appealed to, a wider trend in legal thought, which reflected the idea that there must be a trickle-down effect of the law: a divine law, which was perfect and complete; a natural law, in which humans glimpsed parts of divine law and attempted to reconstruct it on earth; and a

537 John Vicars, *A looking-glasse for malignants, or, Gods hand against God-haters containing a most terrible yet true relation of the many most fearefull personall examples, in these present times, since the yeere, 1640, of Gods most evident and immediate wrath against our malevolent malignants: together with a caveat for cowards and unworthy, either timorous or treacherous, newters: collected for Gods honour and the ungodlies horror* (Printed for John Rothwell, [19 February] 1644) E33[18]., pp. 5-10, 12, 31

538 Six speeches spoken in the Guild-Hall, London, upon Tuesday in the afternoon, Aprill 9 1644 printed in the same order they were spoken one after the other (Printed by Richard Cotes, for Stephen Bowtel;,, [12 April] 1644) E.42[18].

539 Hans Behr, *The declaration of Commissary Generall Behr, against divers slanders and lies spread abroad against him* (s.n., FD: 01 May 1644) 669.f.10[3].

statute law, in which this logic was explained and expressed.\textsuperscript{541} These laws must, drawing on the works of legal philosophy such as that of Christopher St. German, be compatible upwards, as statute law must be compatible with natural law, but not have the completeness and cohesiveness of natural law.\textsuperscript{542} By conflating these notions into one ideal, the author was making a claim for complete uniformity – for an action, statute or ordinance to be legal, it must directly correlate with the current understanding of religion. As the understanding of religion was no longer fixed, however, in practical terms to be in control of religion was \textit{ipso facto} to control the law, and as understandings of religion changed, so too should the law. For example, one work by Woodward argued that because bishops had been ‘by the law of God, cut off from the earth; These ought, by the law of man, to be Cast-out of the Land’.\textsuperscript{543} To disagree with this argument, and to continue to support ecclesiastical settlement, was to be a man ‘not satisfied from reason, or Scripture, not from the mouth and command of God’.\textsuperscript{544} Parliament, then, was legitimated by the pursuit of true religion, not the laws of men.

The shift in the relationship of the law and religion meant that pamphleteers no longer needed to be restrained by presenting Parliament as bound by historical precedent or practice, and thus the way that the Houses of Parliament were understood to operate changed. According to Alexander Henderson, the Covenant ‘hath in it a kinde of Soveraignty, and is a Law above all Lawes, and therefore is said to have no Law’ – the Parliament was legitimated by their adherence to the Covenant, rather than their adherence to the law or because of their constitution.\textsuperscript{545} Works like the \textit{Oxonian Antippodes}, after attacking the premise of the Oxford Parliament as a whole, argued that ‘Lawfull Parliaments reforme Kings, and their Lawes, if they be not grounded upon the Law of God, they have power to repeal them, and choose such Lawes as shall be rules

\textsuperscript{541} Hamburger, \textit{Law and Judicial Duty}, pp. 25-6.

\textsuperscript{542} On this, see Christopher St. German, \textit{St German’s Doctor and Student}, ed. Theodore Plucknett and John Barton (London, 1974).

\textsuperscript{543} Hezekiah Woodward, \textit{A dialogue, arguing that arch-bishops, bishops, curates, neuters, are to be cut-off by the law of God; therefore all these, with their service, are to be castout by the law of the land. Notwithstanding, the world pleads for their own, why some bishops should be spared; the government maintained; the name had in honour still; but the word of God is cleare against all this, for the casting-of-all-forth} (Printed by T. P. and M. S., [26 February] 1644) E.34[10], p. 1.

\textsuperscript{544} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{545} Henderson and Nye, \textit{The Covenant: with a narrative of the proceedings and solemn manner of taking it}, p. 30.
whereby the King shall rule his people according to the revealed will of God’. Woodward explained that this was possible because the Covenant was a ‘willing resigning this government up, and leaving of where it is, and it must be when all is done ... be now called The Lords Kingdom’. Parliamentary pamphleteers could argue that, as those best placed to determine the policies most coherent with religion, Parliament (with the advice of the Westminster Assembly) must have the authority to reshape the laws to suit those of God.

For many writers, then, the Solemn League and Covenant fundamentally changed the relationship between law and religion and, rather than being established and protected by law, religion became the marker with which to judge all laws and ordinances. This could also be used by parliamentarians to define the acceptable limits of the King’s behaviour. For example, Ward’s *Analysis, Explication and Application* argued that the best way to preserve the King’s person was to defend the true religion, ‘so long as he really endeavours the preservation, and defence of the true Religion’. Allegiance to the King was therefore conditional on his commitment to defend ‘true Religion’, a concept that was being shifted by both the Parliament and the Westminster Assembly, and for Ward, the Covenant aped the Scottish National Covenant of 1638, where allegiance was dependent on the King’s protection of the Scottish church. If the goalposts of ‘true religion’ were now in the hands of the parliamentarians, Parliament had control over when and how the King’s subjects could be disobliged of their allegiance. Appeals to authorities, precedents and histories lost value because they might be incompatible with this ‘true’ religion, and this therefore stripped the English religion of its fixed, legal and established form. This was a reversal of the relationship that had been prevalent during the early Stuart period, where the religion was protected by common law – according to Burgess, the ‘greatest triumph of the early Stuart common law’.

---


549 On this point, see Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, p. 73.

By conflating the religious rhetoric afforded by the Solemn League and Covenant with the struggle against the King, parliamentarian pamphleteers were able to present Parliament’s case as one that absolutely corresponded to a Godly struggle. This meant that recurring problems with the previous framework could appear resolved by appeal to this higher authority – for example, questions over whether Parliament was innovating, or the need to explain to the reader exactly why Parliament was right; both could be avoided by emphasising the closeness of Parliament’s judgement to God’s word. Instead of a legal framework that was open to intersubjective definition by the implied reader, the Solemn League and Covenant gave a legitimacy to Parliament which was based on the defence of the ‘true religion’. This was a useful concept, the meaning of which could be reconfigured in order to reform the understanding and operation of the Parliament as required by new circumstances. In these parliamentary pamphlets it appeared that the Solemn League and Covenant was providing a more solid foundation for the case than the legal framework had done, while also allowing convenient flexibility in parliamentary policy.

III. NEW DEFENCES, NEW ATTACKS

While the Solemn League and Covenant had rejuvenated the parliamentarian polemic, it also offered an opportunity for royalists to make their propaganda resonate with those who found themselves either unwilling or unable to subscribe to its contents. To attack the Covenant was to attack the parliamentary case, but being parliamentarian and anti-Covenant was not mutually exclusive. Therefore, royalists were able to put pressure on cracks in the parliamentary coalition, and highlight tensions between the idealised civil bond supposed to bring together a Protestant nation, and the realities of a unitary religious covenant.

The Solemn League and Covenant could be used by anti-Covenant pamphleteers to challenge the role that Parliament should play in the constitution. For example, the confirmation that the Presbyterianism system of the Scots was compatible with the Word of God, and that the Church of England needed to be reformed, meant that it was much more difficult to maintain that the Church of England had been compatible with the Word of God. Because of this, royalist pamphleteers were able to put pressure on parliamentarian pamphleteers to concede one of two things: either Parliament had erred in believing that episcopacy was legal in the past, or what was acceptable to God had changed, and thus the law had to be changed to match it. Both these options were
problematic for the parliamentary case. The former would mean that the Parliament had erred and had damaged the people, thus undermining the claims for Parliamentary absolutism which rested on the assertion that Parliament was unable to damage those it represented; the latter would mean that religious truth was subject to change. Either way, pamphleteers opposed to the Solemn League and Covenant could forcefully argue that the Covenant should not be trusted. If ‘immediately after the Apostles time, all the Christian Churches universally maintained Episcopall jurisdiction’, how could the parliamentarians be so sure episcopacy was unlawful, asked the royalist Anti-Confederacie, and how could a new church system be trusted to be lawful when Parliament had made a mistake in the past?551 Alternatively, Anti-Confederacie continued, what was deemed religiously acceptable had shifted, because the Church of England had previously been compatible with God’s word.552

To defend against such attacks, pamphleteers were forced to weaken the argument of Parliamentary absolutism in order to protect the Covenant. For example, Woodward explained that while it was the law of man that put Bishops on their thrones, ‘man is wiser now’.553 Similarly, Mocket argued that ‘An Oath to things unlawful, Antichristian, and contrary to the Rule of the Lord Jesus, bindes not, is to be repented of, not observed, and such a thing is Prelacy, or Government by Archbishops, Bishops &c.’. If this was not the case, then ‘all the learned, godly, and reverend Divines of the Assembly are forsworn, and the two Houses of Parliament also, which were wonderfull strange’ – thus, laws only bound the conscience when they were compatible with God’s law, but no longer.554 By this reasoning, Parliament had erred in the past, but could now see the errors of their ways – but this still left uneasy questions over how effectively Parliament had protected the souls of the people in the past, which had implications for whether Parliament was best placed to protect the people in the future.

Those defending the Solemn League and Covenant also struggled to demonstrate how it could correlate with previous oaths. Early in the conflict, parliamentarians had printed a number of versions of the Coronation Oath in an effort to pressure the King into passing

551 Anti-confederacie, p. 7.
552 Ibid.
553 Woodward, Three kingdoms made one, p. 10.
554 Mocket, A view of the Solemn League and Covenant, p. 44.
the laws that Parliament recommended. This was an important parliamentarian rhetorical triumph, as it gave a definitive proof that the King’s negative voice was conditional on granting the laws that his subjects demanded.\footnote{Vallance, Revolutionary England, pp. 75-81.} However, a significant number of the King’s coronation oaths had included provisions to protect the church, clergy and bishops – how then could Parliament be claiming to protect the King and maintaining their Oath of Allegiance, when they were in fact forcing him to fail his initial oath?\footnote{Anti-confederacie, pp. 8-9. On this, see Anthony Milton, ‘Sacrilege and Compromise: Court Divines and the King’s Conscience, 1642-1649’ in Michael J. Braddick and David L. Smith (eds), The Experience of Revolution in Stuart Britain and Ireland: Essays for John Morrill (Cambridge, 2011).} If subjects were sworn to protect the King’s natural body, the logic went, they must also be required to protect his spiritual body.

The closeness of the law to God’s word could also be used to challenge, or even invalidate, Parliament’s role in law-making. If God had demanded a certain course of action be taken and this was clear in scripture, what role did the Parliament have in considering it? Or, as The First Search put it in June 1644, if reformation of the church is contested due to it being against the ‘Laws of this Kingdome’, ‘Then it would follow, that it is not lawfull for any man to follow the word and Law of God, till the law of the Magistrate give him leave, and disobliged him’. Rather, it argued, ‘all humane lawes receive their equity and authority from their commensuration to the Law of God, and as the powers which are to be obeyed, are from God, so must the lawes be too, or else they are invalid’.\footnote{The first search, p. 5.} The work aimed to challenge objections based on the unlawfulness of further reformation, but in the process of doing so constructed arguments which, when taken to their logical conclusion, challenged the judicative authority of the Parliament.\footnote{Samuel Rutherford, The divine right of church-government and excommunication: or a peacable dispute for the perfection of the holy scripture in point of ceremonies and church government (Printed by John Field for Christopher Meredith, [03 March] 1646) E.326[1]; Johann P. Sommerville, ‘Conscience, Law, and Things Indifferent: Arguments on Toleration from the Vestrian Controversy to Hobbes and Locke’, in Harald Braun and Edward Vallance (eds), Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700 (Basingstoke, 2004).}

The Solemn League and Covenant was defended as both a religious and a civil bond, but anti-Covenant pamphleteers were able to argue that the Covenant was both too strict and yet too impotent to actually help the Parliament. Rumours circulated about people...
taking the Covenant while thinking it unlawful, believing themselves to be absolved of the consequences of forswearing.\(^{559}\) As has been mentioned above, the author of *The Iniquity of the Late Solemn League and Covenant* expressed concern for subjects who might too casually take the Covenant, believing that there was no risk in taking it because it was illegal: ‘*it binds not, then we may take it, and theres no harme done*’. The work warned that by taking the unlawful Covenant they were committing a ‘grevious sinne … against God, whose name and Majesty they have abused in taking such a Covenant, and against the King their Soveraigne, to whom they were bound by the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy’.\(^{560}\) Similarly, the anonymous author of *A Letter from a Protestant in Ireland* emphasised that men were being ‘compelled to take it, and so absolved from the obligation at the instant they are forced to sweare’. It also warned that it was a poor marker of allegiance because ‘you have no reason to expect that they should observe this Oath, who have broken the former’ – meaning the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy.\(^{561}\) Another concern was that people might be tempted to ‘take it with expresse Reservations of their owne framing – for example stating that *I take this Covenant, so farre forth, as it doth not contrary the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance*’, which was an evasive equivocation rumoured to be in circulation.\(^{562}\) Anti-Covenant pamphlets thus charged the Covenant with both failing to distinguish the disloyal from the loyal, but also only commanding the loyalty of those who were now foresworn.

The Solemn League and Covenant also allowed royalists to exploit the new close association of those who had taken it. The Solemn League and Covenant had required the swearer to ‘assist and defend all those that enter into’ it, which led to debate over whether taking the Covenant was firstly sufficient to act as an effective shibboleth, and secondly whether it meant that those who had nefariously taken the Covenant were also to be assisted. Also since each member was sworn to help each other, any questionable morals of individual parliamentarians could be used as an attack against parliamentarians as a whole. *A Medicine for Malignancy* defended against such charges in

\(^{559}\) On this, see Vallance, *Revolutionary England*, p. 120.

\(^{560}\) *The iniquity of the late Solemn League and Covenant*, p. 8.

\(^{561}\) *A Letter from a protestant in Ireland to a member of the House of Commons in England vpon occasion of the treaty in that kingdome* (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, FD: 03 October 1643) E.75[4], pp. 7-8.

\(^{562}\) *The iniquity of the late Solemn League and Covenant*, p. 7.
May 1644 that while of course there were ‘bad Members as with the King, and as corrupt Souldiers’ fighting for the Parliament, firstly ‘there are not so many’, and secondly they are ‘punished as occasion is offered’.\textsuperscript{563} The Covenant was thus not enough to ensure that individual members would act impeccably, and therefore those that had taken the Covenant needed to examine whether those they were committed to assisting were acting properly. A more refined, but ultimately more problematic, solution to this problem was to exploit the maxim of the King’s two bodies, and apply it to Parliament. For example, *Allegiance not Impeached*, dated by Thomason in April 1644, argued that ‘there is a naturall and politcall capacity in people’: the former being the ‘men themselves’, and the latter being ‘their Laws and Liberties, which are mens constitutions’ – the Parliament in general.\textsuperscript{564} Even if some individual cases could be highlighted that did not conform to the wider safety of the people, it was in their political capacity that Parliament could do no wrong. Such an understanding of Parliament threatened to play into royalist hands, especially those eager to defend the legitimacy of the Oxford Parliament, and one author argued that ‘The Members at Westminster sit, not in a politique, but a naturall capacity onely, and so have no power or authority to act or command any thing’.\textsuperscript{565} To defend against anti-Covenant attacks in which the impropriety of individual parliamentarians could be used against all those who had taken the Covenant, parliamentarians needed to distinguish between the Parliament and the represented – the blurring of which was a key component of claims for Parliamentary absolutism. The civil bond of the Solemn League and Covenant, then, threatened not only the Covenant itself, but also the Parliament as a whole.

\textsuperscript{563} A medicine for malignancy: or, Parliament pill, serving to purge out the malignant humours of men dis-affected to the republick. Wherein by way of dialogue or discourse between a Royalist & a Loyalist, the common pleas of the kingdom are out-pleaded. All our vulgar scruples and anti-parliamentary allegations most clearly and fully answered, whether they bee neutrall, malignant; civil, or religious (Printed for Ralph Smith, [02 May] 1644) E.45[2], pp. 4-6. Ultimately the pamphlet encouraged readers to ‘not look so much altogether what the persons are, as what the Cause is, if it be a good cause, we must rather side with it, then to look who are imployed in it’, pp. 6, 57.

\textsuperscript{564} Robert Austin, Allegiance not impeached: viz, by the Parliaments taking up of arms (though against the Kings personall commands) for the just defence of the Kings person, crown and dignity, the laws of the land, liberties of the subject: yea, they are bound by the oath of their allegiance, and trust reposed in them, to doe it (Printed by Rich. Cotes, for Joh. Bellamy, [12 April] 1644) E.42[12], p. 9.

\textsuperscript{565} An orderly and plaine narration of the beginnings and causes of this warre. Also a conscientious resolution against the warre on the Parliaments side, (s.n., [08 July] 1644) E.54[3], p. 19.
Therefore, in these several ways the religious framework was significantly less flexible than the law had been, and was creating problems in the parliamentary case. It was one thing to accept that the law could have been wrong in the past – the common law system of thought included artificial reasoning, which gave potential for the law to develop and be improved – but the same logic could not be applied to God’s scriptures and ‘true’ religion with such ease. Furthermore, by binding together the parliamentarians into one group of those who had taken the Covenant, individual parliamentarians threatened the collective whole of the Parliament, and the ability of the Parliament to dictate the law was challenged. The religious framework, then, struggled to clearly refine the parliamentary war effort, and those against the Covenant were able to apply significant pressure on the central tenets of the parliamentary cause – that Parliament could judge the law, and that Parliament was fully representative.

II THE LEGAL-RELIGIOUS FRAMEWORK

IV COMPOUNDED DISSONANCE IN THE LEGAL-RELIGIOUS FRAMEWORK

Even though parliamentarians had a new religious framework with which to legitimate resistance, Parliament’s case still relied on the premise that their case within the legal framework was lawful, and that they were legitimately acting as sovereign. This compound framework combined the legal and the religious frameworks’ problems, meaning that the Covenant could make it more difficult, rather than easier, to subscribe to Parliament’s case.

Parliamentarians needed to demonstrate that the Solemn League and Covenant was not at odds with any of the other oaths that the public had been asked to take. This was a thorny issue, and one that parliamentarian writers had struggled with when justifying the Vow and Covenant. At its heart, the problem rested upon the issue of the public being required to take yet another oath to demonstrate their loyalty. Royalist writers asked ‘Whether it be by the Word of God, that you impose Contradictorie Oaths, under gentle tearms of Covenants, upon the Consciences of men’, and pointed out that the taking of this oath was clearly in breach of the ‘Oaths of Allegiance and Supremecy, which bindeth men to observance and preservation of the Kings authority as

566 Vallance, Revolutionary England, pp. 68-70.
567 On this point more generally, see ibid., p. 72.
The challenge posed, therefore, was one that questioned the Solemn League and Covenant’s legal and religious relationship with previous oaths and, as *Certain Queres, Not Unfiting to be Read* contended, whether it dispensed with all the oaths that held society together – Allegiance, Supremacy, offices, Protestations, and ‘dueties of Loyalty’.

For some royalist writers, it confirmed once again the fact that Parliament was claiming powers to be sovereign – not just as an expedient in a time of great necessity, but rather they were playing with the souls of the people. By swearing that malignants should be punished by the ‘supreme judicatories of both kingdoms respectively’, the *Anti-Confederacie* speculated ‘whether this branch of the Covenant be not directly contrary to our Oath of Supremacy?’ If, the work continued, this meant the Lords and Commons ‘separated from the King’, and if they took an oath that meant they would be ‘so considered, [as] the Supreme Judges, and, by consequence, the Supreme Governours of this Realme in all Causes, as well Ecclesiasticall as Civill, and not the King’, then surely they were breaking past oaths.

In other words the justifications, still diluted with references to extraordinary circumstances, were juxtaposed with the spiritual timelessness of oaths, meaning that danger could be found in every word and phrase.

Parliamentarians faced this challenge using a variety of arguments. One of the earlier works in September argued that the royalists’ reliance on the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy was futile, because of a misunderstanding about what the oaths were originally for. According to Richard Hollingworth, ‘The Oath of Alleagiance [was] intended for Papists’, and the ‘Oath of Supremacy was intended to thrust out the Pope, and to discover Papists, and not to determine the present difference between the King and Parliament’.

Other writers were slightly more restrained when discussing the previous oaths. In the *Three Kingdoms Healing-Plaister*, Smith made clear that he understood the Solemn League and Covenant as an attempt to fix a covenant that had
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568 *Observations upon the instructions; A Briefe discovrse upon the impiety and unlawfulnesse*, p. 8.

569 *Certain queres not vnfitting to be read and taken into serious consideration by all His Majesties subjects in these disloyall times* (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [19 September] 1643) E.67[23], p. 3.

570 *Anti-confederacie*, p. 21.

571 Richard Hollingworth, *An answer to a certain writing entituled, Certain dovbts and qvaeres upon occasion of the late oath and covenant, with desire of satisfaction for tender conscienced people to whom it may be exhibited* (Printed for Luke Fawne, FD: 11 September 1643) E.67[5], pp. 5-6.
already been broken.\cite{Smith} He warned the reader that to refuse to take a covenant was ‘a great sin’, but because they as a nation had already entered into an earlier covenant, to not observe it was a ‘greater sin’\cite{Ibid}. The solution was clear: ‘Now when a people have broken Covenant with God, and caused God to part from them, the sureway to find God, is to seeke him by renewing the covenant’.\cite{Hollingworth} Hollingworth argued that it was important, as the ‘Jews of old, and Christians of late did often’, to renew their covenants with God, and to reassert their intentions and commitment to Him.\cite{Ibid} In this case, the kingdom had already undertaken the Covenant – it was nothing new, but rather something that had been forgotten, and the objections misunderstood what the public were being asked to do. To parliamentarian writers, the Solemn League and Covenant was complementary rather than contrary to the previous oaths. The Equity of the Solemne League, for example, argued that the covenant ‘is so far from crossing the Oathes of Supremacy and Allegiance, that it binds all, and more strongly engageth them to preserve, and defend’ the King, ‘true Religion and Liberties of the Kingdomes’\cite{Equity}. Woodward encouraged the reader that it could work with other oaths to make ‘the Kingdom like a wall of brasse’\cite{Woodward}. Responding to royalist criticisms, parliamentarians emphasised that many of the objections against the Covenant could have also been made against the Protestation of May 1641, and that to object to that now would be ridiculous\cite{Ibid}. By appealing to past practice, parliamentarians were able to defend their Covenant, and argue that they had been effective and safe in the past, and so could be trusted.

To truly swear to the Solemn League and Covenant, the swearer would have to believe that Parliament was acting legally as sovereign. According to the anonymous author of A Briefe Discourse, in order for the Parliament to be able to construct the Solemn League and Covenant, Parliament needed to be the supreme sovereign, which was a contention
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that parliamentarians were still struggling with.\textsuperscript{579} For this royalist author, the simple matter was that the King had ‘supreme authority in the ordering of Religion as in all other things’, and thus the Covenant was unlawful and against the ‘suprme and absolute authority of God’.\textsuperscript{580} Because the religious and the legal framework worked together, the religious framework presumed that Parliament was absolute and that the legal debate was completed. Mocket in \textit{A View of the Solemn League and Covenant} stressed that ‘Parliament which is the Kingdoms representative, is above the Law, hath power of the whole Realm, can question, alter, and repeal any Law, when it sees just cause, and make any new Laws’. He invites the reader to ‘See [Prynne’s] \textit{Soveraigne Power of Parliament and Kingdoms} on multiple occasions to confirm statements as fact, which he supposes that ‘no rationall man, shall be able to contradict’.\textsuperscript{581} For Mocket, Prynne’s mammoth work could be presented as the definitive answer on the question of Parliament’s supremacy, needing no further clarification. Smith argued in \textit{The Three Kingdomes Healing-Plaister} that the proof that the Covenant was fit to be taken was two-fold: firstly, ‘it is Gods command’; and ‘Secondly the Parliament, the highest Court of Magistracy, of Soveraigne authority, and the representative body of the Kingdom’ who ‘doe sweare with us never to forsake us, nor betray the trust we have committed to them’ deemed it fit to be taken.\textsuperscript{582} To take the Covenant in good conscience a belief in parliamentary sovereignty was therefore presumed, even though many authors prior to the summer of 1643 seem to have found this unconscionable.

Even though the substantive legal debate had stagnated, royalists were still able to attack the idea that Parliament was sovereign, and by doing so challenge the legitimacy of the Covenant itself. These works mainly emerged a few months into 1644, when Parliament made efforts to ensure the Covenant was taken in the parishes. For the most part, Prynne was the main target, as for at least a year his work was regularly cited as the reference for proof of the full legality of Parliament’s case. For example, in March 1644 Peter Heylyn’s \textit{The Rebells Catechisme} attacked Prynne for misinterpreting and disregarding the statute of 25 Edw. III because it only referred to the individual committing treason, rather than
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According to Heylyn, Prynne had suggested that the 'Members of the two Houses were not men but gods’, and hence ‘freed them from the guilt’ of the statute. He concluded that Prynne’s ‘sophistrie and trimme distinctions touching their qualitie and numbers will but little helpe them’. Similarly, The Fallacies of Mr William Prynne, dated by Thomason a few days before Heylyn’s work, was entirely dedicated to expanding Prynne’s famed marginal notes and demonstrating that his authorities were misquoted, out of context, and proved nothing. In it, the anonymous author demonstrated that even though Prynne was claiming authority from much longer texts, he was constructing new and contradictory arguments from these precedents. Prynne, it charged in an explosive conclusion, ‘saith out of Bracton, (and what hee doth thence transcribe, he doth also subscribe to) The King is Legislator; and againe, The King is Fons justitiae; and againe, The King is Gods, and Christs Vicar upon earth.’ In other words, Prynne was exploiting authorities, contradicting himself and constructing a case out of works that argued the opposite. Similarly, Ferne was able to attack Prynne for simultaneously attempting to show the ‘disloyalty of Papists, and yet prove the Soveraigne power of Popish Parliaments’, and argued that Prynne’s argument, even if ‘his Records [were] faithfully alleadged’, was ‘inconsequent’ anyway. By attacking Prynne’s Soveraigne Power, both these works were attacking a narrative that was crucial to parliament’s legal position, and thus the legality of Parliament imposing the Covenant.

Although the framework had now shifted from the legal toward the religious, in November 1643 Ferne produced responses to the ‘severall treatises’ of Prynne, Hunton, Herle, and Palmer, which had been published the previous spring. However, in contrast to the previous reception of such replies, Ferne’s rebuttal seems strangely detached from the day-to-day political debate. Ferne attacked Hunton’s justification of resistance because if the community had ‘reserve[d] a power’ which could be wielded by the Parliament, it would have needed to hold it ‘before Government established’ – Hunton had, in other words, mixed the ‘natural power of private Resistance’ with the ‘power of a
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583 Peter Heylyn, The rebells catechisme composed in an easy and familiar way : to let them see the hainousnesse of their offence, the weaknesse of their strongest subterfuges, and to recall them to their duties, both to God and Man (s.n., [06 March] 1644) E.35[22], p. 19.
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community or politque power’.\textsuperscript{587} As the embodiment of the community, the Parliament had ‘not Military power’, but ‘a Legall restraining power’, and therefore their power was to prevent attempts to ‘change the laws without their consent’ rather than start a war.\textsuperscript{588}

To Ferne, Hunton’s case rested upon the supposition that a community might place powers that they had by natural law into a representative body that was unnatural – whereas the Parliament had ‘no more power to withstand the illegal proceedings of the Monarch, then as private men by deniall of active obedience’.\textsuperscript{589} Against Palmer, Ferne replied that he was arguing ‘a Resolution of a particular Case’, rather than writing a ‘just Tractate of Resistance’; against Herle, Ferne argued that the ‘Judicatory power’ upon which Parliament’s case rested lay in the Lords alone, not the Commons (as had been argued in the Answer to the XIX Propositions), and thus ‘one is lesse then all three’ – the Commons could not ‘supply’ in this case.\textsuperscript{590} These debates, which took place outside rather than within the religious framework (Ferne does not mention the Covenant, nor does Hunton in his Vindication of 1644), seem in practice to have lost their validity and worth in the polemical debate – the debates seem academic, even irrelevant, whereas before they had been timely, incisive and important. Works such as Rutherford’s Lex, Rex explicate this new irrelevance. If the new authority was accepted, and along with it also the conflation of rhetoric between Parliament’s actions and Godly ordinances, then if the constitution was any point proven to be against the will of God, then it should simply be changed to make it compatible.\textsuperscript{591} There was no longer much point in describing constitutional errors, because the Parliament was empowered by the Solemn League and Covenant to fix them. Thus, the debate had moved on.

For some, in order to subscribe to the Solemn League and Covenant, the reader needed to believe that Parliament was acting as the lawful sovereign power, but also that the
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\textsuperscript{591} Samuel Rutherford, Lex, rex The law and the prince: a dispute for the just prerogative of king and people : containing the reasons and causes of the most necessary defensive wars of the kingdom of Scotland and of their expedition for the ayd and help of their dear brethren of England : in which their innocency is asserted and a full answer is given to a seditious pamphlet intituled Sacro-sancta regum majestas (Printed for Iohn Field, FD: 07 October 1644) E.11[5]; Edward Vallance, ‘Preaching to the Converted: Religious Justifications for the English Civil War’, Huntington Library Quarterly, 65 (2003), p. 401.
new framework had the power to supersede the legal framework. This meant, for example, that the reader might be required to believe that Magna Carta or the fundamental laws gave certain rights that could not be challenged, but equally that anything that the Houses of Parliament determined should be considered as God’s command, even if they later decided to overrule it. For Mocket, ‘our Laws, Just Liberties, and Religion’ were wholly invested in Parliament’s ‘Rights and Priviledges’, and could not exist outside of Parliament. Similarly, Richard Austin argued that the ‘liberties and priviledges’ are the ‘politick capacity’ of the two bodies of the Parliament, the other being simply the natural body. The rights and liberties were not timeless, but rather subject to Parliament’s approval. This tension could be exploited by royalists, who were able to demonstrate that to side with the King was to resolve to be ‘a loyall Subject to thy Soveraigne, a faithfull Servant of the Parliament, a true English Protestant, and a freeborn English-man’, and that the King had long argued to preserve the liberty of the subject, and warned against an arbitrary Parliament. In doing so, An Orderly and Plaine Narration blended previous and present frameworks, and made an anti-Scottish and anti-Covenant appeal towards certain rights that the author deemed were unquestionable. Likewise, the anti-Covenant An Appeale to Heaven argued that even if it was accepted that laws that were not consistent with the laws of God should be repealed, there must still be ‘a perpetuall Law, and obtained by the bloud of many thousands of our ancestors. By which they freed themselves and us from being slaves, and thereby have made us free-borne Subjects’. In The Anti-Confederacie the author attacked the Covenant for referring to the ‘Liberties of the Kingdomes’, rather than the Subject’s liberties themselves. Because Parliament could be portrayed as arguing that the Solemn League and Covenant empowered them to override all rights and privileges, the Covenant could be characterised as being incompatible with the rights and privileges that Parliament was eager to be seen to be protecting.
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The ongoing debate, therefore, was cumulative, and wove multiple legal understandings and justifications together. In doing so, however, it risked excluding those who found themselves struggling with parliamentary claims of absolutism, and rather than offering them a new religious framework with which to resolve their consciences, instead the debate made subscribing to Parliament’s case even more demanding.

V PARLIAMENT’S LAW, GOD’S LAW AND THE ASSEMBLY’S LAW

Parliament’s combined legal-religious structures of legitimisation came under particular stress in the judicial arena. As we have seen, Parliament had found itself adopting stronger claims to sovereignty and with them the ability to repeal and enact legislation, initially according to the fundamental law, then by natural law fuelled by necessity, and finally following the direct ordinances of God. However, Parliament could not continue, as it had done before, to make judgements in its role as highest judicature without running into contradictions resulting from their indebtedness to the religious framework. The two frameworks merged into each other, leaving behind unclear boundaries between God’s law and England’s law.

For certain practical purposes, parliamentarians were still able to use exclusively legal vocabulary and terminology to make their case. For example, when passing the Ordinance to create a new Great Seal, Parliament did so under the manner of being the supreme judicature, rather than appealing to the Covenant. Hence, they demanded that the Great Seal ‘ought to attend the Parliament, being the suprem Court of Justice and Judicature within this realme’, and that by having the Seal back, they would be able to enforce the law properly.597 Likewise, Prynne’s Opening of the Great Seale detailed lists of precedents that showed that it was extraordinary that it had been taken from the Houses of Parliament.598 On a different topic, Prynne chose to rely on legal precedents when developing his prosecution of Fiennes in the winter of 1643. Rather than any religious language, Prynne relied on a single published collection of martial law and explained that the ‘Law is very punctuall, and penall; yea so plaine, that it needs no explanation’

597 ‘Ordinance for making a New Great Seal, and for annulling the King’s’, in Firth and Rait (eds), Acts and Ordinances, pp. 340-2.

when it comes to the case of yielding up towns to the enemy.\textsuperscript{599} Parliament, when it acted as the supreme judicature, was able to use the same tactics and rhetoric of legal legitimacy as it had before the religious framework.

However, the spiralling religious polemic meant that as parliamentarian justifications were conflated with Godly commands, Parliament’s monopoly on judicative powers could be challenged. Since the Westminster Assembly, not the Parliament, were presumably the most qualified to determine divine sanction, the Assembly could be a second court of appeal to ensure that law conformed with the Word of God, providing pamphleteers multiple jurisdictions with which to interact. Throughout 1644, anonymous pamphleteers increasingly appealed to the Westminster Assembly to exercise God’s justice and laws, arguing that the Houses of Parliament had failed to tender sufficient punishment. For example, \textit{Justice’s Plea} called on the Assembly so ‘that they would be a means to the High and Honourable Court of PARLIAMENT, that Justice may be speedily and severely executed upon all the most disloyall and treacherous enemies’, the Catholics.\textsuperscript{600} It was the Assembly’s duty, the work continued, to watch ‘not only the Soules of men, but the very safety and peaceable and happy condition of the whole Nation and kingdom where in yee live’, and to give ‘timely and serious warning’, especially to ‘those superior Magistrates’.\textsuperscript{601} The pamphlet was, in essence, calling for the Westminster Assembly to intervene with Parliament, and police their justice. Other works went further still. Anthony Burgess, a Presbyterian member of the Assembly, had argued that ‘Punishments are of two kinds’. Firstly, there were those which were ‘immediately commanded by the Law of God, or are evidenced by the Law of Nature’. According to Burgess, although these punishments were subject to some debate amongst divines, they should be followed because that ‘opinion seemes safest’, and to release the

\textsuperscript{599} William Prynne, \textit{The doome of cowardize and treachery or, a looking-glasse for cowardly or corrupt governours, and souldiers, who through pusillanimity or bribery, betray their truths, to the publick prejudice. Containing certaine domestick lawes, heretofore, lately made, and judgements given against such timorous and treacherous persons; fit to be known in these unhappy times of warre} (Printed for Michael Spark Senior, [03 November] 1643) E.251[6], p. 13.

\textsuperscript{600} \textit{Justice’s plea, or A serious, seasonable and most submissive motion (back’d with many weighty motives) most humbly tendered by one of the meanest sons of his deare mother England, to the reverend synod, or Assembly of Divines at Westminster, that they would be a means to the high and honourable court of Parliament, that justice may be speedily and severely executed upon all the most disloyall and treacherous enemies of the kingdom, the unnaturall paricides of their mother England} (s.n., [01 August] 1644) E.254[8], p. 1.
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guilty party from the punishment would be to disobey God. The second kind of
punishment was those ‘by a meere positive Law’, and in these ‘much moderation may be
used without any guilt upon the Kingdome’, for ‘humane Lawes are imperfect, and men
could not possible forsee all causes and circumstances’.\footnote{Anthony Burgess, \textit{Judgements removed, vwhere judgement is executed. Or A sermon preached to
the Court Marshall in Lawrence Jury, London, the 5th of Septemb. 1644. Being the day of their
solemn seeking of the Lord for his blessing upon their proceedings} (Printed by M. Simmons for
Thomas Underhill, [26 November] 1644) E.18[15], pp. 10-4.}

Meant was catching up with the rhetoric – and if authority had come from Godly ordinances, then surely those
ordinances had to be followed to the letter.

This jurisdictional overlap could thus be exploited by anti-Covenant pamphleteers, and
demonstrates the increasingly complex relationship between the Parliament and the
Westminster Assembly, created by unclear boundaries of jurisdictions and the
dissonance of the present and past frameworks. For example, \textit{An Appeale to Heaven},
produced in September 1644, petitioned the ‘most Reverend Pastors of Gods Word, Now
assembled in the Synode of England’ that ‘imprisonment of men for Debt, is contrary to
the Law of God: The law of Nations: as also, the fundamentall Lawes of this
Kingdome’.\footnote{\textit{An Appeale to heaven}, p. 1.} The author had previously attempted to petition Parliament, but this had
fallen on deaf ears, and so they were now appealing to the Westminster Assembly. In
doing so, they were intentionally appealing to various jurisdictions to maximise the
impact of their case, and in the process demonstrating that although they were appealing
to the highest law – God’s law – this came with hierarchical implications on earth.
Because of the transforming understanding of the law, if Parliament’s case proved to be
‘contrary to the Law of God’, legal reasoning and logic demanded that it would also be
against all other earthly laws – they were appealing to the root, not just the branch.

The Solemn League and Covenant, and the religious framework that supported it, meant
that Parliament’s monopoly on judging the law, which was still vital to their opposition
to the King, would prove to be unsustainable. Because of the dissonance and tension
between the two frameworks, Parliament was losing control of its own rhetoric, and as
judicial and religious language became conflated there emerged multiple jurisdictions
that could be appealed to by pamphleteers, and contradictions that could be exploited.
As frameworks converged, and as Parliament found itself adopting stronger claims to
sovereignty, subscribing to the Covenant and the parliamentary cause more generally was becoming more demanding. The Solemn League and Covenant was not binding together the nation, but rather helping to divide it further.

VI PRESBYTERIANS AND INDEPENDENTS – FROM JUNE TO OCTOBER 1644.
The Solemn League and Covenant relied on the authority of the Westminster Assembly to interpret the Word of God, and the idea that the Assembly could be in agreement about what God wanted. This fallacy was perpetuated by the contemporary printed pamphlets, which for the most part avoided discussing matters of the future church settlement, and rather focused their attention on attacking Laudianism. In 1641, a meeting of leading divines at Edmund Calamy’s house in Aldermanbury agreed to focus their attacks on popery rather than infighting about the future of church government.604 However, the military and political involvement of the Presbyterian Scots had led to the increased chance of a military victory over the King, and forced questions over the future of the church to the fore.

The Scottish invasion from the Northern border had transformed the parliamentarian armies’ fortunes. Royal forces had been crushed at Marston Moor in early July, and by the end of 1644 the King had lost the North. In the South, Charles had enjoyed some successes – an embarrassing defeat for the parliamentarians at Lostwithiel,605 and a victory at Newbury in October – but was unable to challenge the numbers of the newly bolstered parliamentarian forces. For parliamentarians, the ‘increasing likelihood of a military victory that would force the King to agree a settlement’ propelled the issue of church debate into the public domain.606 Both the Earls of Manchester and of Essex were slow to capitalise on royalist losses in the middle of 1644, which led some to doubt their commitment to military victory. Within the army, Oliver Cromwell clashed with the Presbyterian Manchester over whether an absolute victory was possible, or even
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desirable, and as Woolrych has emphasised, the more likely an Independent settlement was, the more reluctant the Scots became for a potential military victory.\textsuperscript{607}

Factions within Westminster itself further stirred this religious struggle between a Presbyterian and an Independent church settlement. Scott has described a faction surrounding Saye and St. John that feared a Scottish Presbyterian settlement, and was eager to remove Essex from military command. In September, Scott argues, they began to act – promoting toleration and pulling away from their close alliance with the Scots.\textsuperscript{608} The same month, Parliament asked its committees in contact with both Scottish commissioners and the Westminster Assembly to consider what church system would be best fitted to God’s Word, adding further to Scottish speculation that England was not destined for a Scottish-style settlement.\textsuperscript{609}

The pamphlet conversation over church settlement is normally seen to have been ignited by the publication of \textit{An Apologetical Narration} in the first few days of 1644.\textsuperscript{610} In this work, leading London ministers encouraged examination of ‘the congregational way’, in which local church congregations were independent from central control as had been practised in New England.\textsuperscript{611} By introducing a genuine discussion about the future of the church, the traditional account goes, the \textit{Apologetical Narration} legitimised conversation about religion in the pamphlet literature.\textsuperscript{612} Increasingly, however, historians have begun to see the publication of \textit{An Apologetical Narration} not as the beginning of divisions between Independents and Presbyterians, but rather an attempt to ‘protect the unity’ of 1641, and have emphasised that it received no real condemnation by either the Parliament or the Assembly.\textsuperscript{613} Indeed, the authors of the \textit{Apologetical

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{607} Woolrych, \textit{Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660}, pp. 299-300; Braddick, ‘War and Politics’, pp. 104-5.


\textsuperscript{609} Woolrych, \textit{Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660}, p. 300.


\textsuperscript{613} Hunter Powell, \textit{The Crisis of British Protestantism: Church Power in the Puritan Revolution, 1638-44} (Manchester, 2015), pp. 91, 8.
\end{footnotesize}
Narration had signed the *Certaine Considerations to Dis-swade Men* which had appeared late in December 1643, which had emphasised the importance of unity.  

Over the summer of 1644, however, it is undeniable that there was an open discussion about the differing church systems that might be adopted if, or increasingly when, Parliament won the war. Thomas Hill identified that there were two ongoing debates by August 1644. Firstly, there was ‘controversion ... betwixt congregationall and classicall Divines, (who are called Independents, and Presbyterians) in point of Church government’, to which Hill stated that there ‘seemes to bee some good hopes of a faire accomodation betwixt them’.  

Secondly, however, there was a more complicated meta-argument amongst others ‘who vehemently cry down not only the power of Ecclesiasticall Synods, but likewise the Authority of the Civill Magistrate, in matters of Religion’. On the latter topic, works such as Roger Williams’ *The Bloudy Tenet* argued in July that the state held only civil power and were ‘not Judges, Governours or Defendours of the Spirituall or Christian slate and Worship’, and the anonymous *M.S to A.S* argued that while Parliament might be able to advise what religion should be followed, it could not enforce it.  

The prospect of an unsatisfactory church settlement had led some authors to discuss whether the Westminster Assembly or the Parliament could impose a single religion on the nation.

By considering the possibility that Parliament could support a church settlement that went against the author’s conscience, pamphlets began once again to appeal to the
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64 Narration had signed the *Certaine Considerations to Dis-swade Men* which had appeared late in December 1643, which had emphasised the importance of unity.


66 Ibid.

67 Roger Williams, *The bloudy tenet, of persecution, for cause of conscience, discussed, in a conference betweene truth and peace, who, in all tender affection, present to the high court of Parliament, (as the result of their discourse) these, (amongst other passages) of highest consideration* (s.n., [02 February] 1644) E.32[8]; John Goodwin, *M. S. to A. S. with a plea for libertie of conscience in a church way against the cavils of A. S. and observations on his considerations and annotations upon the apologetical narration, humbly submitted to the judgements of all rationall and moderate men in the world* (Printed by F. N. for H. Overton, [03 May] 1644) E.45[3], pp. 32-6; Sirluck, 'Introduction', p. 110.
implied reader to have a role in determining whether the Parliament was right. This created a conditional obedience to the Parliament in matters of obedience, and empowered an informed, conscientious reader to consider when a parliament might be mistaken.

Indicative of this struggle was the clash between Prynne and Goodwin. Prynne's work, *Twelve Considerable Serious Questions Touching Church Government*, had asked 'Whether, if any Kingdome or Nation shall by a Nationall Councell, Synod and Parliament, upon serious debate, Elect such a publicke Church-Government, Rites, discipline, as they conceive to be most Consonant to Gods Word', all those in the kingdom would be 'actually obliged in point of ... Conscience & Christianity, readily to submit thereto, and no ways to seeke an exeption from it, under paine of being guiltie of Arrogancie, Scisme, Contumacie, and lyable to such penalties as are due to these offences'. At the end of the work, Prynne became specific, and challenged if the 'Independents can produce any one solid reason, why they ought not (in point of Conscience) willingly to submit to a Presbyteriall Government' if it was decided that it would be 'most consonant to Gods word' by the 'General consent of the Synod and Parliament'. Goodwin countered that no-one should be expected to 'yeeld blinde obedience', and if he found the church government against the word of God, then he was forced to 'be a Schismatick, to be guilty of arrogancy' or 'to contradict the Word, to oppose an ordinance of God' – which was surely as bad as popery. Later in the work, he pleaded to 'Remember, neither you [Prynne] nor the Synod are infallible, but as subject to errors as others'. At last, he brilliantly goaded the 'Marginal' Prynne whether he would give himself up to episcopacy if another synod had demanded it, forgoing his
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618 William Prynne, *Twelve considerable serious questions touching church government: sadly propounded (out of a reall desire of vnitie, and tranquillity in church and state) to all sober-minded Christians, cordially affecting a speedy setled reformation, and brotherly christian vnion in all our churches and dominions, now miserably wasted with civil vnnaturall wars, and deplorably lacerated with ecclesiasticall dissentions* (Printed by F.L. for Michael Sparke, Senior, [16 September] 1644) E.257[1], p. 2.

619 Ibid., p. 6.

620 John Goodwin, *Certain briefe observations and antiquaeries: on Master Prin's Twelve questions about church-government. Wherein is modestly shoune, how un-usefull and frivolous they are, how bitter and unchristian in censuring that way; whereas there are no reasons brought to contradict it* (s.n., [04 October] 1644) E.10[33], p. 3.

621 Ibid., pp. 12-3.
beloved references and notes. Prynne was forced to sheepishly reply that ‘their resolutions could not binde my judgement absolutely, so farre as to subscribe their opinion as undoubted truths, unlesse they could satisfie my arguments and authorities to the contrary’. Prynne, then, defender of Parliamentary absolutism, had conceded that conscience must have a role in the constitution, and that the implied reader must have some form of conditional obedience to the Parliament when it came to religion.

III CONCLUSION

From September 1643 to the end of 1644, the polemical debate used a framework based on the Solemn League and Covenant which transformed the meaning of the conflict. To subscribe to the Covenant, the oath-taker relied on the recommendation of the Westminster Assembly and the Parliament, and the idea that the study of scripture could provide a unitary religious truth. However, royalist and anti-Covenant attacks had begun to apply pressure on this fiction, and the vague and flexible language that had been designed to make the Covenant acceptable to a wide section of society meant that readers were bring their own meaning to the Covenant, and therefore each reader was swearing to different ends. As the anonymous author of A Briefe Discourse argued, in the pursuit of ‘the best Reformed ... Doth not the Independent meane one thing, and the Presbyterian another’ By revealing the Covenant to be subjective, those who opposed it could charge it with being unlawful, ineffective, and endangering the souls of those that took it.

The Solemn League and Covenant conflated law and religion, which gave parliamentarian pamphlets rhetorical opportunities, but this conflation at times threatened the parliamentary case as a whole. Arguments over past and present lawful religion had, for example, led to pamphleteers conceding that Parliament had erred in the past, thus weakening the arguments of parliamentary supremacy to protect new religious realities. Dissonance between the legal and religious frameworks meant that

622 Ibid., p. 11.
623 William Prynne, A full reply to certaine briefe observations and anti-queries on Master Prynnes twelve questions about church-government: vwherein the frivolousnesse, falsenesse, and grosse mistakes of this anonymous answerer (ashamed of his name) and his weak ground s for independency, and separation, are modestly discovered (Printed by F.L. for Michael Sparke Senior, [19 October] 1644) E.257[7], p. 14.
624 A Briefe discovrse declaring the impiety and unlawfulnesse of the new covenant, p. 11.
Parliament was losing sole authority over the ability to declare the law, as well as its supremacy over religion.

Far from bringing together the political nation, the Solemn League and Covenant acted to crystallise the differences between those who felt able to trust the Parliament absolutely, and those who felt that they could only trust the Parliament conditionally. By making the Solemn League and Covenant discursively cumulative in its legitimating tactics, rather than breaking with the past framework, the Covenant could demand that those who took it believed Parliament absolute, and that anything they did would be legal. The Covenant combined this belief in parliamentary sovereignty with the realities of a religious settlement that looked towards a uniformity of religion. By implying that the Scottish system was compatible with the Word of God, a Presbyterian settlement looked inevitable, and because of Parliamentary absolutism, Parliament could enforce uniformity. The Solemn League and Covenant thus threatened to make secular and religious obedience absolute.
CHAPTER 4: PRINTERS, PUBLISHERS AND THE PRODUCTION OF PAMPHLETS

The previous three chapters have charted the polemic through its authors, whether anonymous or identified, and have focused on climactic moments when the nature of the conversation shifted, or the framework of the discussion was transformed. It has described how some authors used an imagined reader in order to solve problems caused by the polemical debate, and the extent to which this technique came to influence and direct how the argument was conducted. This chapter will focus on the parliamentary publishers and printers who facilitated this public argument, the study of which has often been neglected by historians of political thought and thinking. Through examination of the ways that they interacted with and could attempt to influence the political conversation, it becomes apparent that printers and publishers played two crucial roles. Firstly, printers and publishers were the means by which authors, and other political actors, could speak to the reader – they were the gatekeepers by which ideas could be distributed. Secondly, printers and publishers had a number of choices that they could make which had significant impact on the nature of the polemic that was produced. The decision to print or finance a work, or refuse to, was itself a political as well as a business choice, and evidence increasingly suggests that printers and publishers were able to maintain an impressive degree of coherence in their output, either through eagerness to print certain types of works, or remaining silent on issues that they found objectionable. This chapter argues that publishers and printers emerge as key actors in the transformation of abstract principles to concrete positions, and that methodical study of their works reveals them to be important political agents in the early 1640s.

A methodical study of individual publishers and the works on which they put their imprint allows for an examination of the kinds of arguments they had affinities with, and what arguments they had aversions to. For certain publishers in particular, it is possible to see clear and coherent political imprints and biases that shape their output. Printers, too, can be seen to act politically, either through press campaigns or through reluctance
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625 This chapter focuses on Parliamentary printing because it is understudied compared to that of royalist printing in Oxford – on this, see Falconer Madan, Oxford Books: A Bibliography of Printed Works Relating to the University and City of Oxford or Printed or Published There, with Appendixes, Annals and Illustrations (Oxford, 1912), an exhaustive study of books produced in Oxford, but also containing details of re-productions in London.
to print certain kinds of works. Such a focus offers snapshots of the kinds of demands that were being made on political actors in this period, and the ways that certain publishers and printers responded to them. However, while the studying of publishers through their imprints restricts the material available to historians to material that was given their imprint, the study of printers offer further opportunities. Because of the physical evidence that is left by printers’ use of woodcuts, a historian can establish who printed a certain work without any other identificatory evidence. Such analysis allows us to examine in greater detail how political events, ideas and expediencies acted to divide the parliamentary coalition. In this way, this chapter identifies a series of political principles that certain printers and publishers had to face and square themselves with in order to continue to construct meaning in response to the conflict, while remaining committed parliamentarians. It argues that we need to consider printers and publishers as political agents who simultaneously distributed and constructed meaning, rather than just relaters of pre-packaged information.

Historians have only recently begun to truly explore the possibilities that printers themselves were political agents. The most important contribution to this has been Peacey’s work on the collaboration between the presses of Bishop and White, the propagandist Parker, and parliamentary grandees, which constituted a radical mouthpiece from within Whitehall.626 David Como has emphasised the importance of the June 1643 ‘Ordinance for the regulation of printing’ as a catalyst for discussion, and described an underground environment where ‘new ideas bled into each other’. As ‘parliamentary enthusiasts of different ideological shadings rubbed shoulders and debated in an increasingly volatile environment’, there was an expansion of the parameters of religious discussion.627 Como’s work is particularly important as it emphasises the role that printers played within this escalation. In his study, printers are given agency to make choices about the works they were willing to print, and have the potential at least to be increasingly partisan.628 Similarly, work by Braddick on John Hammond has argued that his imprint had a political identity that he did not deviate

626 Peacey, “Fiery Spirits”.
from, and that he himself was a political agent within the turbulent events of the
1640s.\footnote{Michael J. Braddick, 'John Hammond and the Explosion of Print: Commercial and Political Opportunities', in Jason Peacey and Giles Mandelbrote (eds), Collecting Revolution: The History and Importance of the Thomason Tracts (forthcoming).} Hughes’s examination of Gangraena delved into and revealed a much wider Presbyterian printing culture, and has encouraged focus to be drawn away from just the ‘radical’ printers towards a more methodical survey of print.\footnote{Hughes, Gangraena, p. 401; Ann Hughes, 'Approaches to Presbyterian Print Culture: Thomas Edwards’s Gangraena as Source and Text', in Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (eds), Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies (Philadelphia, 2002), pp. 102-3.} Work by McElligott on royalism in the later 1640s attempted to uncover an underground royalist print network, and emphasised that their motivations could be ideological, rather than just financial.\footnote{Jason McElligott, Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 127-49.}

Complementing this work, Tubb examines Independent presses from 1648–9, and argues that the motivation to print often came from the fact that printers believed in what they were printing.\footnote{Amos Tubb, 'Independent Presses: The Politics of Print in England During the Late 1640s', Seventeenth Century, 27 (2012), p. 300.} Rather than impartial and profit-driven, printers are increasingly seen as politically motivated and partisan.

Historians undertaking this kind of study have done so in two ways. The first group of historians attempt to identify and attribute anonymously printed works to printers. Historians such as Como and David Adams examine the proto-Leveller printing movement through ornaments and type, and Peacey uses factotums and printers’ marks to identify the printers of pamphlets. The second group of historians use surviving historical evidence – whether detailed imprints or surviving manuscripts – to define their sample of texts, such as Hughes, McElligott and Braddick. Both these approaches have limitations. The former method produces conclusions that are open-ended unless the entire body of surviving works are consulted – more works from the presses of interest might be found, for example, that contradict the conclusions that the historian comes to. Furthermore, working with anonymous works often risks presupposing that printers worked anonymously because they were acting in an actively political way, or that they were acting alone. Anonymity on the part of the publisher does not necessarily mean it was the printer who was acting with agency.
The latter method is often reliant on the information that can be found in imprints, and so can be limited to studying works that printers or publishers either chose to put their name to, or decided were not of a nature that they needed to anonymise the title page. In this sense, what a historian is studying may be just a small part of what may have been a much larger printing operation, with a number of works that might contradict these studied. Either approach can, however, produce important results that shine much-needed light onto printing practices in the 1640s, and until a methodical survey has been conducted on the Thomason Tracts using attributed printer’s stock to identify which presses produced the anonymous material, it is necessary to accept the limitations that either method brings with it.

The purpose of this chapter is to assess how typographic and bibliographic study can contribute to our understanding of print in the early 1640s. It will do this by using the output of two prolific parliamentarian publishers – Henry Overton and Thomas Underhill – who have been identified as being on either side of the Independent/Presbyterian split. These publishers were selected because they were the third and fourth most active publishers from March 1642 to July 1646, coming after Husbands and John Wright (who were frequently employed by Parliament to produce works), and because their output provides a regular number of works throughout the period in question. (A similar technique could be used on publishers that produced fewer works, such as Christopher Meredith and Robert Bostock, who were also able to maintain clear identities throughout the period.) By comparing their outputs, this study will identify three points of departure between Overton and Underhill: the nature of parliamentary sovereignty, the Solemn League and Covenant, and the future form of church settlement.

Using Overton and Underhill as a springboard, this chapter will then examine the printers who created the anonymous works which were published around the times when Underhill’s and Overton’s political and religious positions diverged in order to demonstrate in greater detail how these moments of frantic printing operated, and
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633 This is, of course, to suppose that printers were self-aware enough of their output to consider doing this.

634 Coffey, John Goodwin, p. 121; Hughes, Gangraena, pp. 374-5.

635 Henry Overton had at least 88 works printed for him, not including those that he collaborated with other publishers on, followed by Thomas Underhill with 84.
investigate which printers were printing anonymously at those times, and what they were arguing. By examining these in greater detail, we can see much wider divisions within printers and publishers, which fed off and into contemporary conversations. Only 15 percent of Thomason’s collection of pamphlets, published between March 1642 and July 1646, have both an attributed printer and publisher, and 36 percent do not have information about who the work was either printed for or financed by. 68 percent of Thomason’s pamphlets in this period were anonymously printed, but by using bibliographic and typographic methods, it is often possible to ascertain who printed the work, and thus reconstruct in more detail how the printed polemic worked.

I HENRY OVERTON

Overton has been noted by various historians as having been an important Independent publisher. However, the extent to which his imprint provided a clear and coherent political identity has been understated. Overton put his name to some 88 works between March 1642 and July 1646. At the beginning of the period he published a number of works on Ireland, detailing the horrors in the aftermath of the Irish Rebellion and encouraging more efforts to raise a proper military force there. Over the autumn of 1642 he published several works that detailed the preparations for war in Portsmouth,
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636 See, for example, Coffey, John Goodwin, p. 121. For a list of works published by Overton, see Appendix 33.

637 See George Goring, A Relation of the sundry occurrences in Ireland from the fleet of ships set out by the adventurers of the additional forces by sea. With the names of the ships, and the commanders of them, and their severall burdens, and number of men in every ship (Printed by E.G. for Hen. Overton, [13 August] 1642) E.239[4]; Severall passages of the late proceedings in Ireland. Being taken out of certaine letters newly received from thence, which were sent to a merchant here in Colemanstreet London (Printed for Henry Overtonn [sic], FD: 16 September 1642) E.117[17]; Alexander Forbes, A true copie of two letters brought by Mr. Peters, this October ii. from my L. Forbes from Ireland (Printed by L. N. for Henry Overton, [12 October] 1642) E.121[44]. Other works include A confusion of the Earle of Newcastles reasons for taking under his command and conduct divers popish recusants in the northerne parts; wherein is shewed both the unlawfulness, and danger of arming of papists: being a thing of main consequence for all true Protestants to take present and speciall notice of (Printed for Henry Overton, [26 January] 1643) E.86[13]; Speciell nevves from Ireland newly received in a letter from a Gentleman of good worth in Dublin to a Friend in London ; shewing the present condition of that poore Kigdome, and the manner of the great victory, which God, most miraculously, hath given to the poore Protestants there (Printed for Henry Overton, FD: 01 March 1643) E.91[18]; A full and true relation of the late great victory, obtained by the Protestants against the rebells in Ireland; in which is declared the manner of the fight, with the number of those that are slaine; and the names of such men of ranke and qualitie, that are either slaine or taken prisoners. All which was sent from Dublin in a letter, dated the 5. of this instant moneth of Aprill, and received the 11. of the same, 1643 (Printed for Hen: Overton, and Edward Blackmore, FD: 12 April 1643) E.96[6].
London and Dorchester, as well has a work by Goodwin urging the citizens of London to hold fast as they were the ‘great barre’ between the malignants and ‘their desires’, and a great example to the rest of the country.\textsuperscript{638} In December 1642 he published \textit{Neutrality Condemned}, which attacked the recommendations for pacification from Banbury and warned against an ‘unnatural’ peace.\textsuperscript{639}

Committed readers of Overton’s publications, then, would be well informed about the conflict in Ireland, and have read many works that linked royalists to the rebellion there.\textsuperscript{640} They would have read a number of works that encouraged the continuation of the war, none that contemplated peace, and works that attacked the cavaliers both individually and as a group.\textsuperscript{641} From 1643, Overton’s readers would have increasingly encountered works that painted the conflict as a godly conflict, between good and evil. This ranged from Goodwin’s initial reframing of the conflict as one of supreme religious significance to works that argued that the conflict was ‘God’s unquestionable cause’.\textsuperscript{642} Overton was a member of Goodwin’s church which seems to have impacted many of his publications and his understanding of the conflict – most notably in the anonymously

\textsuperscript{638} John Goodwin, \textit{The butchers blessing, or The bloody intentions of Romish cavaliers against the city of London above other places, demonstrated by 5. arguments, to the Right Honourable the Lord Major, the sherifbes, and other the religious and worthy inhabitants of the said city} (Printed for Henry Overton, [04 November] 1642) E.242[4], p. 3; \textit{A true relation of the late proceedings of the London Dragoneers, sent down to Oxford, consisting of foure companies under the command of Sir John Seaton} (Printed for Henry Overton, [24 Sep 1642]) E.118[39]; \textit{A relation from Portsmouth, vwherein is declared, the manner how the castle was taken on Saturday night last; as it was sent in a letter by one there present} (Printed for Henry Overton, [08 September] 1642) E.116[15]; \textit{An abstract of some letters, sent from Dorchester, to some friends in London, dated the 3. of Septem. 1642} (Printed for Henry Overton, [06 September] 1642) E.115[22].

\textsuperscript{639} \textit{Neutrality condemned, by declaring the reasons why the deputy-lieutenants, intrusted by the Parliament for Cheshire, cannot agree to the treaty of pacification made by some of that county: at Bunbery, December, 23. 1642. And may serve to prevent the like in other counties} (Printed for Henry Overton, [06 January] 1643) E.244[41].

\textsuperscript{640} As in, for example, \textit{A confutation of the Earle of Newcastles reasons.}

\textsuperscript{641} George Lawrence and Christopher Love, \textit{The debauched cavalleer: or the English Midianite. Wherein are compared by way of parallel, the carriage, or rather miscarriage of the cavalleers, in the present reigne of our King Charles, with the Midianites of old} (Printed by L. N. for Henry Overton, [18 October] 1642) E.240[43]; \textit{Speciall nevews from the army at Warwicke since the fight sent from a Minister of good note, to an alderman here in London} (Printed for Henry Overton, FD: 27 October 1642) E.124[33].

\textsuperscript{642} Goodwin, \textit{Anti-cavalierisme; Price, Spirituall snapsacke; Powers to be resisted}. On the first work, see Coffey, \textit{John Goodwin}, pp. 85-9. On the third work, see Allen, \textit{English Political Thought, 1603-1660}, pp. 477-81.
authored *Powers to be Resisted*. J. W. Allen is correct to link this pamphlet to Goodwin’s work, stating that ‘in both there is visible the same belief in a glorious coming reformation and the triumph of the Lord and His saints’, but does not make the connection that Overton published both. Overton’s readers would also have struggled to find references to the Solemn League and Covenant. On the rare occasion that they do mention it, the works he published took the precarious line that it was possible to refuse to take the Covenant and remain trustworthy. For example, *Powers to be Resisted* argued that ‘A conscientious man may scruple the Covenant and refuse it’, but he could not advise against it and remain honourable. Similarly, *The Independents Militarie Entertainment* produced the next year argued that just because soldiers refused to accept the Covenant, that did not mean that they wanted to betray the kingdom.

Readers of Overton’s output would also have been well informed on the benefits of Independency, even before the *Apollogetical Narration*. In October 1643, Overton published *Satisfactions concerning Mixt Communions*, which detailed the lack of discipline in many parishes and encouraged congregationalism, and John Coffey has noted that while Goodwin may not have written it, he certainly endorsed it. Through 1644, Overton’s output becomes almost universally about religious toleration and Independency, publishing Richard Mather and William Tompson’s *Modest and Brotherly answer to Mr. Charles Herle his book against the Independency of Churches; M.S to A.S*. With a plea for Libertie of Conscience, which defended the Dissenting Brethren from attacks by Adam Steurt; and John Cotton’s *Keyes of the Kingdom*, which in part was written to challenge the authority of synods. Thomas Weld’s *Answer to W.R* defended New England churches from printed attacks; Goodwin’s *Theomachia* in the autumn of


644 *Powers to be resisted.*

645 *The independants militarie entertainment. Or, Certaine reasons and arguments why independants ought not only to be admitted into the army raised for defence of church and state, but also both by law of God, nature, and nations, are required to put their hands to the plough of the kingdome* (Printed for Henry Overton, [24 April] 1645) E.278[28], pp. 5-6.


1644 argued that the suppression of some doctrines could threaten ‘fighting against God’, and his *Innocencies Triumph* defended his works against attacks from Prynne.\(^{648}\) Overton also produced works such as Henry Burton’s *Vindication of Churches commonly called Independent*, and William Dell’s *Power from on High* (which argued that ‘To preach the Word, that is the true Spirituall and living Word of God’ and that a minister who could not preach according to his conscience would run a ministry that was ‘cold and hath no heate in it’).\(^{649}\) His works constituted the bulk of pro-toleration and pro-liberty of conscience works in this period. Overton’s output, however, also had a clear political identity before the polemical split of the Independents and Presbyterians. His products believed that the Parliament were fighting a godly war, and were sceptical about the Covenant, and his output closely mirrored the opinions of Goodwin.

**II THOMAS UNDERHILL**

Like Overton, Underhill has been identified as a partisan bookseller, in this case broadly for Presbyterianism.\(^{650}\) From the beginning of the conflict, his name appears on many key pamphlets such as *The Speech of Denzell Holles* from the summer of 1642, parts of which were rehashed and repeated as part of Bishop and White’s press campaign. This work argued that Parliament ‘creates the Law’ by which society is governed, protecting religion and the subject alike, and this tone was followed in the works to which Underhill put his name as publisher, whether they were theory, poetry or news.\(^{651}\) After

---


\(^{650}\) Hughes, *Gangraena*, pp. 374-5. For a list of works published by Underhill, see Appendix 34.

\(^{651}\) Holles, *The Speech of Denzell Holles*, p. 1; Marsh, *An Argument, or Debate in Law; Thankes to the Parliament*, (Printed for Thomas Underhill, FD: June 1642) 669.f.6[30]; *The Rider of the White Horse and His Army Their Late Good Success in York-Shiere, or, a True and Faithfull Relation of That Famous and Wonderfull Victory at Bradford Obtained by the Club-Men There with All the Circumstances Thereof and of the Taking of Leeds and Wakefield by the Same Men under The 178
the first few months of conflict, in which Underhill had produced several newspieces and a copy of Henrietta Maria’s letter from the Hague, Underhill put his name to a pamphlet entitled Equitable and Necessary Considerations, in which it was declared that ‘It is apparent to al (who are not naturally stupid, or wilfully blinde) that of late there is risen up (in arms) a combination of boysterous and violent men’ aiming to divide the King and Parliament and rip down privileges of the free-born Subjects.652 Those who sympathised with the idea of a peaceful settlement threatened ‘submitting our necks to an Iron Yoake; No Parliament but such as would establish oppression and tyranny by Statute Law, and (besides other deposed pressures) would restore the Tyrannical Prelacy, High-Commission, and Star-Chamber’.653 A few months later, as the polemical debate questioned whether trust could be reassumed, Underhill published A Plain Fault in Plain English, whose author skilfully steered himself and the reader between Ferne and the author of Plaine English (‘like two ships sailing, one going West and the other East, they must meet together in the wrong end of the world’) to the ‘moderation’ of submitting their judgement to the Parliament.654 Later on in that month, Underhill published Touching the Fundamentall Lawes, an explosive tract that argued that it would be ‘absurd’ if the Parliament were bound by written laws.655 Building on this premise, the work later argued that because of the powers that Parliament should have, and the newly publicised Coronation Oath, it was difficult to see how the King’s negative voice was sustainable.656 This theme was continued in later works that Underhill put his name to, including Remonstrans Redivivus, which argued that Parliament was limited by ‘no Customes, no Presidents, nor Statutes’, and ‘from whose judgements there is no appeale’.657 Dedicated readers of Underhill’s publications in 1642 and 1643, then, would
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652 Equitable and necessary considerations and resolutions for association of arms throughout the counties of the kingdom of England and principality of Wales against the now professed combination of papists and other enemies of the protestant religion and English rights and liberties (Printed for Thomas Underhill, FD: 26 December 1642) E.83[20], p. 1.

653 Ibid., p. 3.

654 A Plain fault in plain-English, (Printed for T. Vnderhill, [09 February] 1643) E.88[30], p. 3.

655 Touching the fundamentall lawes, p. 7.

656 Ibid., pp. 9-11.

657 Remonstrans redivivus, p. 4.
have been well versed in arguments that demonstrated the dangers of adherence to statute law alone, and would have been reading a coherent and consistent understanding of the relationship between King and Parliament. For Underhill’s readers, Parliament could be trusted to make the right decisions, and the people should not be allowed the ability to reassume power (and would have no reason to anyway). Their news focused on local struggles against Royalism and royalists, especially Prince Rupert and Henrietta Maria.

Underhill’s output in 1643 shifted from predominantly anonymous works on the law towards works that were increasingly religious in nature. For example, in February 1643 his imprint appears on Woodward’s *The [Cause Use Cure] of Feare*, which encouraged the reader not to judge the events that God had made come to pass as individual horrors, but rather to ‘live by faith, and do not make haste, untill GOD hath wrought His whole worke, till we can put all together’. In March of the same year he published
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658 See, for example, *Remarkable passages from Nottingham, Lichfield, Leicester, and Cambridge declaring what the Kings standard is, and the time and manner of its setting up* (Printed for T. Underhill, FD: 01 September 1642) E.669.f.6[75]; John Paulet, *The Latest remarkable truths from Worcester, Chester, Salop, Warwick, Stafford, Somerset, Devon, Yorke and Lincoln counties most of which was sent up poste from judicious men of purpose to be printed : among other things there is a cruel and bloody speech of the Lord Paulets which he spake to his fellow souldiers in Sherbourne the 7 of September wherein he gives them order to kill men, women and children without mercie but to reserve such ministers as they could take that were well-wishers to the Parliament for to be flead alive and such like exquisite torments* (Printed for T. Vnderhill, FD: 17 September 1642) E.119[5]; A true relation of the late bataille before Worcester, taken on Sunday last, Sept. 25 by a gentleman of the Innes of Court, (now in his Excellences armie) from the mouthes of Master Nathaniel Fynes, and many other commanders who were in the said skirmish, and sent up to Master Pym (Printed for T. Vnderhill, FD: 30 September 1642) E.669.f.6[80]; The Queens Majesties message and letter from the Hague in Holland, directed to the Kings most excellent Majesty, &c, being sent in that ship which was forced to put in at Yarmouth by reason of a leake which she sprung at sea, and was bound for Newcastle, who had in her fifty commanders, besides other common souldiers, 400. barrels of powder, ten peeces of ordnance, and great store of other armes and ammunition, all which was sent to his Majesty (Printed for T. Vnderhill, FD: 14 October 1642) E.122[12]; *The Rider of the white horse; The vnfaithfulnesse of the cavaliers and commissioners of array in keeping their covenants* (Printed for Thomas Vnderhill, FD: 11 January 1643) E.84[37]; *Prince Ruperts burning love to england: discovered in Birminghams flames,* (Printed for Thomas Vnderhill, [01 May] 1643) E.100[8].

659 Hezekiah Woodward, *The [cause vse cure] of feare. Or, Strong consolations (the consolations of God) cordiall at all times, but most comfortable now in these uncomfortable times, to fixe, quiet, and stabilish the heart, though the earth shake, and make it stand stil* (Printed for Thomas Underhill, [25 February] 1643) E.90[23], pp. 66-7; *A staffe of comfort to beare up the spirit under the heaviest outward cases: with some answer from the Lord, to the deserted soule in Hemans case. Whereunto is annexed a speciall preservative against the hurtfull sword, of speciall use in these hard and fierce times, that the sword may doe us no hurt* (Printed for Tho: Underhill, [04 August] 1643) E.1184[2] p. 1.
Woodward’s *The Kings Chronicle*, a politicised account of the Kings of Judah and their ‘ordering of the Militia’.\(^{660}\) In July and August, Underhill’s name appears on all of the imprints of the three-part *Englands Alarm to Warre*, which encouraged the war ‘by command from heaven’ – a mammoth undertaking that pitched Parliament’s David against the devil-corrupted Saul, King Charles.\(^{661}\) While faith in God and the Parliament would see the people through their ordeal, their struggle was a religious one of biblical proportions. After the Vow and Covenant, Underhill had his name on two imprints – *The Harmony of our Oaths*, and *The Late Covenant Asserted*, which worked to reassure their readers’ consciences that the Vow was consistent with the word of God.\(^{662}\) Furthermore, the *Third Alarm to Warre* made it clear that the Vow was about attacking the ‘Evill Spirits’, and that standing with the Covenant would make the devil and his children ‘mad with rage’ as it could ‘destroy Satans Kingdome’.\(^{663}\) Consistent readers would have been able to draw parallels with David’s struggle against Saul and the contemporary events around which the conflict was increasingly being framed.

From August 1643, Underhill’s works take on a pro-Presbyterian angle that was not immediately apparent before. Presbyterian writers such as Burgess, Palmer, Woodward and Simeon Ashe make up a large portion of Underhill’s output, and they produced

\(^{660}\) Hezekiah Woodward, *The Kings chronicle: in two sections; wherein we have the acts of the wicked and good kings of Iudah fully declared, with the ordering of their militia, and grave observations thereupon* (Printed by G.M. for George Miller and Thomas Underhill, [08 March] 1643) E.92[16]; Underhill also appears on the imprint on the second version of these series, Hezekiah Woodward, *The Kings chronicle latter section. Wherein the way, the good kings, priest and people have taken for the well-posturing the kingdom, is fully declared, and made glorious before the eye of the beholder by Gods own right hand, for the encouragement of all, who will walk in the same way, observe the same steps and motions there; and fixe their eye upon the same marke, the glory of God; their owne and the peoples safety* (Printed by G.M. for George Miller and Thomas Underhill, [10 April] 1643) E.95[11].


\(^{662}\) *The Harmony of our Oathes. Shewing, an argument betwixt the Oathes of Supremacie, Allegence, the freemans oath, protestation and covenant* (Printed by T. Pain, and M. Simonds for Thomas Underhill, [28 July] 1643) E.62[5]; *The Late Covenant Asserted* (Printed for Thomas Vnderhill, [14 August] 1643) E.250[2].

\(^{663}\) *Englands third alarm to vvarre: stirring up the whole land as one man, to help the Lord, and his servant David (all the faithful in the world) against most blody adversaries, mighty hunters before the Lord* (Printed for Thomas Vnderhill, [03 August] 1643) E.63[9], p. 3.
works that proclaimed the benefits of the Presbyterian system. Later, when the informal agreements that restricted open hostility between Independents and Presbyterians broke down, Underhill’s output also played a key role in the fight against tolerationist works. For example, his name appears on the imprint of A Review of a Certain Pamphlet that defended Prynne and attacked John Lilburne early in 1645, and also appears on the title page of A Friendly Check to Dr Bastwick, which argued for a harder line to be taken against the Independents. In July 1646, a work with Underhill’s imprint argued that ‘all the Sects in the Kingdom shelter themselves under the wings of Independents’, and a work earlier in the year had argued that while Independents pretended to be fighting for toleration, really they wanted to ‘bine such a Catalogue upon the Presbyterians’. Underhill seems to have been committed in both the fight to defend against and condemn Independent attacks, and explain the benefits of the Presbyterian system.


666 A glasse for weak ey’d citizens: or a vindication of the pious, prudent and peaceable petition (to the Honorable the Lord Mayor, aldermen and commons in Common-Councel assembled) now in agitation, from the false aspersions and calumniations of a seditious pamphlet, intituled, A dialogue, &c. (Printed for Tho: Underhil, FD: 19 June 1646) E.341[5], pp. 4-5.
Furthermore, Underhill’s output was absolutely in favour of the Solemn League and Covenant, from its inception and throughout the time period of the study. Published by Underhill, Palmer wrote in August 1644 that there was a need for a ‘more careful observation of our late COVENANT’, and Underhill twice published Philip Nye’s defence of the Covenant – that it was solemn, and its end great and honourable – once in 1643 and again in 1646. The anonymous *A Glasse for Weak Eye’d Citizens*, dated by Thomason in June 1646, argued that there was no danger to fear so long as the Covenant was unbroken. Importantly, then, nothing in Underhill’s output from summer 1643 onwards argued in favour of an Independent settlement, and neither did it move away from supporting the Solemn League and Covenant.

Overton and Underhill were two of the most prolific publishers in the early 1640s, and both had a clear, coherent identity in their output. We can see how their works were made up of broadly similar material from the beginning of the conflict, and became increasingly religious in nature from the spring to the summer of 1643. The key point of departure between Overton and Underhill seems to have been in September of 1643, and concerned support of the Solemn League and Covenant – Overton was clearly not interested in discussing the benefits of the Covenant, whereas Underhill was interested in ensuring that the Covenant was kept. However, while Underhill was able to put his name to several works that argued a clear understanding of the constitution, there is something of a dearth in Overton’s output of political texts. By investigating the differences between Underhill’s and Overton’s output, and that of their preferred printers, it is possible to see an increasing fragmentation within the parliamentarian coalition, and how issues of the nature of parliamentary power split parliamentarian works in this period.

667 Palmer, *The glasse of Gods providence towards his faithfull Ones*; Henderson and Nye, *The Covenant: with a narrative of the proceedings and solemn manner of taking it by the Honourable House of Commons, and reverent Assembly of Divines the 25th Day of September, at Saint Margarets in Westminster*; Philip Nye, *The excellency and lawfulness of the Solemne league and covenant. Set forth in a speech, or exhortation made by Mr. Phillip Nye to the Honorable House of Commons and reverend assembly of ministers at their taking the said Solemne league and covenant* (Printed by W. Wilson, for Tho. Vnderhill, [26 January] 1646) E.318[7].

668 *A glasse for weak Ey’d citizens*, p. 2; *Toichoructa: Or, Independents razing their owvn foundation. By which all (that will not shut their eyes) may see deep iniquities, long veiled under pretence of conscience, clearly discovered* (Printed for Tho. Vnderhill, [19 March] 1646) E.328[23], p. 3.
III PRINTERS AND PARLIAMENTARISM

I. THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF PARLIAMENTARY POWER

From 1642, and especially towards 1643, Underhill’s output was predominantly in favour of an absolutist Parliament. His publications consistently warned the readers of a tyranny of statute law if the meaning was ignored for the letter. This was presented, especially by the anonymous author of *A Plain Fault in Plain English*, as a fundamental difference in how to understand the power of Parliament. For the anonymous author of *A Plain Fault*, if members of Parliament were required to focus too much on public opinion, then they voted ‘like men in chains, not their owne votes and consciences, but the votes and opinions of others’.669 Those such as the anonymous author of *Plaine English* threatened the power of Parliament by suggesting that Parliament needed to directly follow the demands of the people. Parliament, rather, was supreme and their choices irresistible. Underhill’s political and constitutional position can be compared to, and at times overlaps with, the press campaign described by Peacey which was run by Bishop and White between May and December 1642. Peacey argues that it was an orchestrated and constitutionally coherent campaign that aimed to encourage reluctant parliamentarians to openly profess that they had the power to justify their actions against the King.670 After showing that the presses of Bishop and White produced key works by Parker, Peacey argues that this was done with the support of the very highest of parliamentarian grandees, Pym and Saye, and suggests that several of the works may have been completed at the behest of the Parliament to ‘stir up the people’.671 Alongside this vivid description of a single press campaign, Peacey’s network provides an important lesson in early-1640s propaganda: ideas could be repeated, repackaged and reiterated to maximise their persuasiveness.672 Peacey’s study observed a concentrated and deliberate campaign by two printers in the period, and this chapter aims to extend and also complement Peacey’s work by examining the campaigns of other printers which have hitherto been disguised by anonymity.

669 *A plain fault*, p. 6.
670 Peacey, ‘Fiery Spirits’.
671 Ibid., p. 15.
672 Ibid., p. 17.
Peacey’s account culminates in *A Discourse Betweene a Resolved, and a Doubtfull Englishman*, a work which encouraged those in Parliament to give a ‘more open admission of their demands and a clearer statement of Parliament’s power’. It could be that, after this work, it was thought that the press had completed its task. However, further investigation into Bishop and White, and one of the factotums that Peacey uses to identify their works, shows that their presses also printed the first edition of Herle’s *A Fuller Answer* [Appendix 1:4&3] in December 1642. In addition, the press continued to work with Herle through the next month, producing his *Convinc’d Petitioner* [Appendix 1:11] a few days later. Parker continued to author works such as the *Contra-Replicant*, although likely under a different printer. The two major works that defended parliamentary absolutism, then, came from the same press which had clear and decisive connections to Pym and Saye, who also seem to have held these views. As was discussed in Chapter Two, parliamentary absolutism had an unsteady relationship with the polemic, and this evidence shows that many of the absolutist works were part of a closely controlled campaign that drip-fed ideas.

The constitutional line promulgated by Bishop and White’s press unequivocally placed absolute power in the Parliament. As Peacey acknowledges, this was an extreme position, and was an effort to emphasise that Parliament could (and should) be sovereign. A number of printers, however, proved willing to follow this line of argument and echo the sentiments of Bishop and White’s output. Most important of these was Miller, who either benefited from a relationship with Bishop and White, or was willing to print very similar works. For example, early in the printing campaign he printed texts that were then lifted by Bishop and White in order to argue that the Parliament, not the King, was the foundation of the Law. His press was willing to echo Parker’s theories almost word for word, and eventually in early January 1643 printed the second edition of Herle’s *A

673 Ibid., p. 21.


675 The convinc’d petitioner, p. 1.

Quentin Skinner's study of the nature of political liberty in the civil war gives us further evidence of printers and publishers who were willing to give increasing powers to Parliament. Skinner argues compellingly that in the early 1640s the Parliament was becoming increasingly concerned that the existence of the royal prerogative was incompatible with the classical interpretations of liberty that many in the House were becoming increasingly reliant on. When the King rejected the Militia Bill, the Parliament decided to 'dig in its heels' and attempted to free the nation. According to Skinner, then, when Parker argued against the negative voice being pivotal to the constitution, he was arguing that the English people were not free, and when Goodwin defined what it was to be free, he was making a specific point about the constitution and its flaws. More generally, Skinner argues that there was 'broad agreement over two elements in the ideas of liberty' amongst parliamentarian writers. Firstly, that by nature men are 'free from subjection to positive law', and secondly that it was possible to 'live as a free man' even under the 'rule of law', so long as certain conditions were met. The conditions mainly centre around the crucial idea that you could enjoy your liberty without being dependent on another's will. To Skinner, then, the beginning of the civil war was accompanied by extensive discussion about liberty.

From a bibliographic point of view, it is particularly interesting that the vast majority of the works that Skinner references come from just two print houses. The first printing

---

677 Charles Herle, *A Fuller Answer to a Treatise Vvritten by Doctor Ferne, Entituled the Resolving of Conscience Upon This Question, Whether Upon This Supposition, or Case (the King Will Not Defend but Is Bent to Subvert Religion, Lawes and Liberties) Subjects May, with Good Conscience, Make Resistance* (Printed for Iohn Bartlet) Wing H1558, sig. A2r, A3r.

678 Quentin Skinner, 'Classical Liberty and the Coming of the English Civil War', in Martin Van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds), *The Values of Republicanism in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2002); Skinner, 'Rethinking Political Liberty', Skinner does not tackle the question of whether Parliament in this case would be arbitrary. For important rebuttals, see Cromartie, 'Hobbes, History, and Non-Domination'; Thomas, 'Looking for Liberty'; Coffey, 'Quentin Skinner'.


press was that of Bishop and White, discussed above and by Peacey, and printed Parker’s Observations, the anonymous An Honest Broker [Appendix r:4] and Goodwin’s Anti-Cavalierisme. The second was operated by Thomas Paine and Matthew Simmons, and they printed the Debate-in-Law (for Underhill) and A Soveraigne Salve. If Skinner’s debate over political liberty did take place, it did so from presses that were heavily invested in the parliamentary cause, and from presses that were sympathetic to the idea of investing Parliament with increasingly arbitrary powers. Works from Bishop and White’s presses have been briefly discussed above, and might benefit from being considered as part of that campaign. The works from the presses of Paine and Simmons which Skinner references seem to be more complex in their nature. Marsh’s description of the law sits a little uneasily with the idea of liberty as it bound everyone and their property towards the idea of the commonwealth, which could and would mean that personal liberty was sacrificed to the idea of a commonwealth that was wholly controlled and judged by Parliament. A similar message was given by Truth and Peace Honestly Pleaded (discussed above), anonymously printed by Paine and Simmons [Appendix 5:Mi], and by The Subject of Supremacie, which was also anonymously printed by their partnership [Appendix 5:Ii]. Furthermore, the Soveraigne Salve that was published the next year argued that Parliament should not be bound to the laws that existed, but rather had the power to create new laws whenever they wanted, with little to no protection of the people from it. A similar point is made by Remonstrans Redivivus, also printed by Paine and Simmons and with Underhill on the imprint, which argues that there may be no appeal from Parliament’s decisions.

Multiple anonymous works on similar themes can indicate a wider debate, but they can also be signs of a campaign to manipulate the print market and their readers. Indeed, Skinner’s campaign overlaps with Bishop and White’s to the extent that it is possible that

682 A miracle: an honest broker, or, Reasons urging a more liberall loane, sig. A2r.


686 Soveraigne salve, p. 9.

687 Remonstrans redivivus.
Skinner is attributing a higher purpose to works that have been shown to be political interventions. The presses that created these works were not neutral – rather, they were partisan presses that were actively participating in the contemporary politics of the time, and which maintained a clear absolutist message. Because of this, they may have been willing to ignore the consequences of their arguments in order to score political points. In other words, rather than describing a general debate, it is possible that Skinner is actually describing the output of two highly politicised presses, both of whom believed that Parliament should claim increased powers.

Overton’s preferred printers, Oulton and Dexter, might be studied to identify another way of understanding power and Parliament. Like the other printers discussed, they were committed parliamentarians and published accordingly, but did so in a way that distanced them from Parkerian arbitrariness. This might be seen most clearly in their response to the peace petitions of the winter of 1642/3. The aftermath of the Battle of Edgehill and the sack of Brentford had a significant impact on the morale of London, and peace petitions in December called for adherence to the ‘knowne law’ and lamented the ‘decay of trade’, the ‘invasion of the Subjects Liberty’ and the ‘violation of our Religion’.688 Retorts to these peace petitions speculated that they originated in Oxford, and Thomason made a note that one text purporting to be by sincere peace petitioners was actually devised by the royalist Chillingworth.689 Anonymous responses came quickly from multiple print houses without bibliographical information provided on title pages. Bishop and White printed An Answer to the London Petition [Appendix 1:3],690 and

---

688 The Londoners Petition; John Hinton, The humble petition of the peacefull obedient and honest protestants of this kingdome, presented unto the honourable House of Commons, by the gentlemen of the foure innes of court (s.n., [December] 1642) E.181[35]; A Modest Petition for a Happy Peace O offered; To the Right Honorable Assembly of Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the House of Commons the Humble Petition of the Inhabitants of the Citie and Libertie of Westminster, (Printed for Thomas Purslow, FD: 15 December 1642) 669.f.6[96].

689 Thomason’s annotation is on a pamphlet which collected a petition, a parliamentary reply and a further retort from the petitioners. The note suggests that Chillingworth was the author of the latter. The pamphlet is The petition of the most substantiall inhabitants of the citie of London, and the liberties thereof, to the Lords and Commons for peace. Together with the answer to the same. And the reply of the petitioners. Also a letter from a country gentleman to a member of the House of Commons, concerning the taking of Marlborough (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [06 January] 1643) E.244[39]; Peacey, Politicians and Pamphleteers, p. 256.

690 An Answer to the London Petition, (s.n., [14 December] 1642) E.130[18], p. 1. On the former work, see Peacey, "Fiery Spirits", pp. 19, where it is argued that Parker received and responded to the peace petition before it reached Parliament.
Richard Cotes printed *An Exact and True Relation* [Appendix 24:15] a few days later. However, the retort that seems to have had the most impact was *A Frivolous Paper* [Appendix 10:T7&A3] from the presses of Oulton and Dexter. Much more so than the other responses, this work focused on the terminology and content of the petition, rather than the act of petitioning at all. *A Frivolous Paper* claimed that 'Malignant nature' of the work could be uncovered by the suggestion that Parliament was ignoring the known laws, and that they thought that their predecessors could have been at fault. The work concluded that by watching out for 'phrases and expressions' such as the known laws, the reader could protect themselves from malignant interference.

Royalists were able to use the term the 'known laws' in order to appeal to a legal certainty, which both emphasised the justness of their own cause, and the unprecedented nature of Parliament's actions. Indeed, throughout the latter half of 1642, the language of royalism seems to have shifted towards focusing on the known laws rather than the language of the three estates, and Charles's proclamations increasingly defer to the 'knowne lawes', perhaps thanks to the influence of Hyde. The term also acted as bait – to admit that Parliament could disregard the 'knowne lawes' sounded a lot

---

691 *An exact and true relation of that tumultuous behaviour of divers citizens and others at Guild-Hall, December the 12. 1642. vwherein is related the businesse they pretend, their conference with my lord Major and court of common counsell, their cruelty to the soldiery, their breach of peace, and shamefull abuse to the citizens, with other remarkeable things* (Printed for B. A. & R. D., FD: 13 December 1642) E.130[15], sig. A2r.

692 *An Answer to the London Petition; An Exact and True Relation of That Tumultuous Behaviour of Divers Citizens and Others at Guild-Hall.*

693 *A frivolous paper*, pp. 2–3. In many works that followed, the petition was also referred to as the 'Frivolous Petition', and Thomason annotated many of the pamphlets that referred to the peace petitions using similar terminology. *The Convinc'd Petitioner; For Thomason's annotations, see An Exact and True Relation of That Tumultuous Behaviour of Divers Citizens and Others at Guild-Hall; The Londoners Petition.*


695 Ibid., p. 7.

696 This is unsurprising, given that, as Herle emphasised, two was more than one. For a similar argument, see Weston and Greenberg, *Subjects and Soveraigns*, p. 101. They argue that Ferne came to 'correct' the King's language in the XIX Propositions away from the language of the mixed constitution. See also Ashton, who has highlighted a transition in the language of Royalism towards the condemnation of Parliament for relying on arguments based on necessity, in 'From Cavalier to Roundhead Tyranny, 1642-1649', pp. 186–7.
like they could disregard the laws in general. The term acted as a catalyst, and forced Parliament sympathisers to define exactly what the relationship between these laws and the three estates was in increasingly extreme ways.

For absolutist parliamentarians, this posed little challenge. Parker attacked the way that the law had been enforced, and argued that it needed to be enforced by a better body (by which he meant not judges, who in his eyes had failed to stop the King arbitrarily taxing, but rather the Parliament).\(^{697}\) Arguments along these lines – which focus on the judicial process rather than the legislative – may have been misinterpreted by many historians as an aversion to the law, but can (and arguably should) be read in a constitutional way.\(^{698}\) Replying to *A Complaint*’s charge that Parliament was ignoring laws, a parliamentarian forgery argued that ‘God will strengthen you to make precedents for posterity on better grounds of reason and law than your predecessors have made for you’, and another argued that in order to ‘maintaine and defend’ the ‘Lawes and Liberties’, it was sometimes necessary for ‘suspention’ of these laws and liberties ‘if occasion shall require’.\(^{699}\) For Parliamentary absolutists, Parliament could do what it wanted without redress because it could not betray the people.

However, the works printed by Oulton and Dexter demonstrate how Parliament could be obeyed yet not given absolute powers. According to works printed from their printing press, the peace petitions were ‘frivolous’ because they charged the Parliament with ‘ignoring the known laws, as if they were ignorant ... or impotent’, and this implied that the current Parliament might ‘accuse the past Parliaments of folly’.\(^{700}\) In *A New Plea* the argument became clearer – the law was ‘all former acts of Parliament never yet reserved [sic], together with the privilege of Parliament’ – rather than whatever the Parliament

---

\(^{697}\) Parker, *Contra-Replicant*, p. 6.

\(^{698}\) Mendle, *Henry Parker*, ch. 6.

\(^{699}\) Hyde, *A complaint to the House of Commons* (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [12 Jan] 1643) E.245[5], pp. 3-4; *A Iust complaint or lowd crie of all the well-affected subjectes in England against that false and scandalous pamphlet intituled, A complaint to the House of Commons and resolution taken up by the free Protestant subjectes of the cities of London and Westminster and the counties adjacent* (s.n., [31 January] 1643) E.245[27] p. 3. The forgery duplicated the title page, supposedly to dupe potential customers of the genuine pamphlet into purchasing a parliamentarian retort.

\(^{700}\) *A frivolous paper*, p. 4.
believed to be so at the time.\textsuperscript{701} Knowne Lawes [Appendix 10:S2], \textsuperscript{702} produced later in the month, argued that the term was used to ‘amuse and abuse the simple with new epithets and ambiguous words’, and emphasised the need for the study of the law to understand it.\textsuperscript{703} Knowne Lawes had argued that ‘It is a knowne truth that the principles of Arts and Sciences are knowne only to those that by great industry and study search after them’, and its arguments were repeated twice almost word for word in July in Will and Law [Appendix 10:T1]\textsuperscript{704} and The Discovery of Malignants [Appendix 11:S1].\textsuperscript{705}

The works in Oulton and Dexter’s output seem unwilling to shed the fiction that Parliament was simply judging the law, rather than acting as the executive, and saw the royalist invocation of the 'known lawes' to be the main threat to this fiction. By challenging the terminology, they could avoid discussing the real implications of the parliamentary case – that it was acting as sovereign. Their reluctance to grant Parliament absolute sovereignty may reflect a broader affinity to a notion that people might conscientiously object to actions taken by an estate on their behalf. For example, A New Plea argued that ‘the law of God, Nature, and Nations doth not bind me to beleeve anything against experience’, and Maximes of Mixt Monarchie [Appendix 10:T1]\textsuperscript{706} argued that ‘For as much as Royall and Politique powers are Supræme, but not infallible, all men must bee armed with patience as well to suffer for well doing forbidden as to doe well when it is commanded’.\textsuperscript{707} Both these arguments borrowed heavily from Goodwin’s reiteration of active and passive obedience, which gave space for personal conscience

\textsuperscript{701} A new plea for the Parliament. For attribution to Oulton and Dexter, compare the ornament on p. 1 with that in A triall of the English lyturgie. Wherein all the materiall objections raised in defence hereof are fully cleared and answered (Printed for Ben. Allen, [21 April] 1643) E.99[8], p. 1. Both woodcuts, on the title page and p. 1, can be found in Oulton and Dexter’s pamphlets [Appendix 10:Woodcut 1&Woodcut2].

\textsuperscript{702} Knowne lawes, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{703} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{704} Will and law, sig. A1r.

\textsuperscript{705} The discovery of malignants. By the known lawes, and will of the King, sig. A1r. For example, The Discovery argued that ‘The truth is that the knowledge of the Lawes is removed from common capacities, and they are as principles of Arts and Sciences’ \textit{ibid.}, p. 2; Knowne lawes, p. 1. See also A new plea for the Parliament, p. 4, which argued that royalists wanted to discourage learning.

\textsuperscript{706} Maximes of mixt monarchie, sig. A1r.

\textsuperscript{707} A new plea for the Parliament, p. 8; Maximes of mixt monarchie, sig. A3v.
when making these decisions (although for these decisions to be correct, the reader should side with Parliament).\textsuperscript{708} Their printing consistently stressed the importance of the mixed constitution. For example, in July 1642, they reprinted John Ponet’s \textit{A Short Discourse of Politique Power},\textsuperscript{709} which emphasised the importance of the ‘mixed state’, with a preface that explained that while the ‘Printer is not sure whether the Author be gone to God already ... or yet still in this life’, the printer ‘is pleased to put forth the worke, to the intent the travell of the doer be not lost, neither true English hearts frustrate at so worthy an instruction, unlesse they will willingly neglect their owne safegard, the state of their Countrey, and the preservation of their posterity’.\textsuperscript{710} Their most important printing, of course, came towards the summer of 1643 after this groundwork had been laid. Hunton’s \textit{Treatise of Monarchy} refused to put an arbitrary power in Parliament, but rather argued that at some point, people had to choose in their own conscience whether what Parliament was doing was right, rather than simply be forced to go along with them.\textsuperscript{711}

By refusing an arbitrary power in Parliament but acknowledging that they had the power to act the way that they did, Oulton and Dexter’s output invested the people with an important autonomy to judge the Parliament’s actions. This autonomy could be used to condemn previous parliaments (those that deposed monarchs, or those that condoned popery), but also protect against a hypothetical parliament that could tyrannise. Margaret Judson’s reading of Hunton describes him as writing ‘constitutionally’, not just ‘politically’ like Parker and Herle, and if so, it might be that we need to consider Oulton and Dexter’s output in a similar, if anachronistic, category.\textsuperscript{712}

\textsuperscript{708} The reader is directed to Goodwin and Burroughs in \textit{A new plea for the Parliament}, p. 11. On challenging commands, see Goodwin, \textit{Anti-cavaliersme}, pp. 18-9.

\textsuperscript{709} John Ponet, \textit{A short treatise of politique power; and of the true obedience which subjects owe to Kings, and other civill governours} (s.n., [July] 1642) E.154[36] For attribution, compare ornament on p. 3 with that in \textit{A new plea for the parliament}, p. 1, and see fn. 702 for evidence that this was owned by Oulton and Dexter.


\textsuperscript{711} Hunton, \textit{A treatise of monachie}.

\textsuperscript{712} Judson, \textit{The Crisis of the Constitution}, p. 405.
This affinity to mixed constitutionalism might be understood a little more when we consider the next work to come out of the Oulton/Dexter collaboration in February 1643, *A Short Discourse* [Appendix 10:13]. This work has been briefly examined by Sirluck and Wootton, but without the knowledge of who the printers were, it was impossible to properly compare its arguments with Oulton and Dexter’s other constitutional works. For the anonymous author, the differing spiritual interests of the country might not be so easily resolved because individuals had to settle with their conscience. As the work continued, ‘We may safely conclude, that ... true Religion is a supernaturall thing, and a meere gift of God, not possible to be forced into mens soules’. Sirluck argues that this was both the first ‘serious’ demand for toleration, but also a clear recognition that without it, settlement might be impossible. While their constitutional and political affinities might have been derived from their religious pragmatism – which Dexter certainly had in abundance – it is also possible that their output reflected a reluctance to grant to an estate an infallible power due to the parallel problems that some parliamentarian writers were already struggling with. In other words, it is possible that Oulton and Dexter’s output was aware that Parliamentary absolutism could be incompatible with religious toleration.

Oulton and Dexter, then, seem to have had a distinct and coherent understanding of the conflict and constitution, and were willing to make constitutional, political and religious interventions. Their work balanced fervent parliamentarianism with reluctance to invest an irrevocable power in Parliament. This manifested itself in their output attacking the royalist language that could (and eventually would) drive a wedge between their constitutional and legal understanding and that of parliamentarianism.

---

73 *A Short discourse, touching the cause of the present unhappy distractions; and distempers in this Kingdome, and the ready means to compose, and quiet them* (s.n., [08 February] 1643) E.88[28], sig. A1r.


75 *A Short discourse, touching the cause of the present unhappy distractions*.


77 For Dexter after July 1643, see Como, ‘Print, Censorship, and Ideological Escalation’.

78 See for example, the struggles of Peter Bland in *Resolved upon a question* and *A royall position*, where his legal argument was interpreted as justifying a regicide.
This constitutional faultline was tackled by other important interventions by both authors and printers. The printer Felix Kingston printed multiple works that took Parker’s theories and attempted to make them palatable to the reading public, and in doing so introduced fail-safes and caveats to their absolute power. In September 1642, his press went further than other contemporaries in a debate around a hypothetical tyrannical parliament, and printed *A Discourse upon the Questions in Debate* [Appendix 23: Woodcut 1] which argued that the people must be able to forsake if it tyrannised.\(^{719}\) Kingston’s press also produced the much-examined later work *Plaine English* in January 1643, using the same ornamental letter as *A Discourse*.\(^{720}\) This pamphlet argued a similar point as *A Discourse*, and has been seen by some historians such as Wootton and Mendle to have been created to pressure the Parliament against vying for a too-easy peace settlement.\(^{721}\) That these two works each relied upon the same understanding of the relationship between Parliament and the people, and came from the same anonymous press, seems to suggest that the choice to print these works was in itself a political act. Furthermore, it demonstrates that discussions of Parliament being arbitrary may have taken place before the possibility of an undesirable peace.

Other authors, such as Burroughs, faced head on Ferne’s challenge to define what would happen if Parliament were to tyrannise. He supposed that the ‘light of nature’ would have to judge, but that it must be possible if the constitution was to be whole.\(^{722}\) Burroughs was published by Robert Dawlman, who lent his imprint to several important interventions that might be categorised as ‘conservative Independent’ while working with the printers William Ellis and John Grismond, including *An Apologetical Narration*\(^{723}\) and several works by Thomas Goodwin and Bridge.\(^{724}\)

---

\(^{719}\) *A discourse upon the questions*, pp. 1, 13.


\(^{721}\) *Ibid*.; For attribution, see Wootton, ‘From Rebellion to Revolution’, p. 655.

\(^{722}\) Burroughs, ‘A briefe Answer to Doctor Fernes Booke’, p. 10.

\(^{723}\) Although there is no direct evidence, the woodcut on the title page is identical to that found on E.79[11], which on sig. A2r has an ornament that can be directly connected to William Ellis and John Grismond [Appendix 9:A1].
The positions of Oulton and Texter, Kingston and Burroughs make up part of a tradition of utilising the premise of an appeal to the people in order to justify siding with the Parliament without abandoning the ability to disagree with their past or potential future judgements. Until the Vow and Covenant of June 1643, printers, publishers and authors could have it both ways – Parliament could obtain their support, and an appeal to the people meant that a hypothetical but impossible tyranny could not lead to the slavery of the people at large. These theories could be used to support, not discredit, the Parliament. Looking at these works has further suggested that coherent constitutional and legal beliefs could be maintained in the first year of the conflict. Without investigating these anonymous printers, these connections are not apparent, and uncovering the interconnectedness of publications changes our picture of the political polemic.

II. THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT

The most visible rift between Underhill’s and Overton’s output is their differing responses to the Solemn League and Covenant, and this split mirrored the wider responses to the Covenant. Like the Vow and Covenant a few months before, the Solemn League and Covenant was accompanied by a press campaign that attempted to alleviate concerns about its contents, and persuade readers that divines and laypeople alike found it suitable to their consciences. When we consider the polemic alone, the shift in the framework of the debate seems to be seamless – there are a trickle of works discussing the Solemn League and Covenant and its benefits over the following few months, and the parliamentary polemic seems to have embraced the Solemn League and Covenant wholeheartedly. John Saltmarsh’s *Solemn Discourse* argued that the Covenant was ‘the last resort of the godly and wise Christian’, and that within it there were ‘such maxims as will make a kingdome holy and happy’. Ward’s *Analysis, Explication and Application of*...
the sacred and Solemn League and Covenant emphasised three main points: that it was possible to defend the King by protecting religion and liberty; that reluctance towards Reformation or attempting to divide the kingdoms were signs of malignancy; and the importance of remaining with the Scots. The Three Kingdomes Healing-Plaister focused much more on England that the other works, and emphasised again that attempts to divide subjects or fight against Reformation were signs of malignancy, although it allowed that ‘Kingdemes should not in every particular agree in government; that is no breach of the Covenant’. Woodward’s Solemn League and Covenant begins by chastising the reader for not understanding the Covenant before constructing a dialogue that attempted to persuade readers that they were not being urged to swear that the Scottish church system was perfect, ‘but it is as perfect as Possibly, their Light could bring them’. Woodward’s later work, Three Kingdomes Made One, was more conciliatory, and argued that the Covenant would make ‘the Kingdom like a wall of brasse’, engaging all men together as one.

Curiously, however, none of the works that Thomason collected in these few months which explicitly defended the Solemn League and Covenant attributed a printer on their title pages, though all had publishers – John Dallam, Lawrence Blaiklock, Meredith, Francis Coles and Luke Fawne. But examination and comparison of the printer’s stock used for these pamphlets reveals concealed connections, and this is perhaps the reason behind the anonymity. At least two of the pamphlets – A Solemn League [Appendix 26:1t&2T] and Quarrell of the Covenant [Appendix 26:2T2&3T] – have woodcuts that can be identified as being John Raworth’s, and another (Ward’s Analysis [Appendix 24:I5]) uses one owned by Cotes. Furthermore, an ornament on Three Kingdoms Made One

---

728 Smith, The three Kingdomes healing-plaister, p. 9.
729 Woodward, Solemn League and Covenant, pp. 1, 4.
732 Case, The quarrell of the covenant, with the pacification of the quarrell, sig. A1r, A3v.
One [Appendix 25:L1] was used in a printing collaboration between Raworth and Cotes in November 1643, while the Three Kingdomes Healing-Plaister [Appendix 31:L1] was printed by Hammond. Cotes, with the assistance of Raworth, was producing a large number of works for both the City Common Council and the Parliament in October and November 1643, producing multiple works that bear his imprint (although without any attributed publisher). It was not usual for Cotes nor Raworth to print anonymously, and a comprehensive study by Braddick has suggested a similar conclusion about Hammond.736

The Solemn League and Covenant should not at this time have been a controversial topic to print discussion of – especially as efforts by Vane had given flexibility to the possibility, at least, of a non-Presbyterian church settlement – and therefore should not have required anonymous printing. Parliament were quick to endorse the Covenant and use it to justify their resistance in various declarations. As such, the decision to anonymously print these works looks to have been a tactic to imply a greater sense of consensus surrounding the Solemn League and Covenant than really existed.

The pamphlets – all visually distinct from each other, and often with separate publishers – would have been difficult to connect without knowledge of the ornamental stock of printers, and so would have effectively given the appearance of widely distributed and independent consensus. Furthermore, other individual or collaborating printers that had been adept at press campaigns seem to have been reluctant to help defend Parliament’s new Covenant, suggesting that there was a void which pro-Covenant printers felt the need to fill. The reception of the Solemn League and Covenant was crucial to the parliamentarian war effort – the Vow and Covenant had stripped polemicists and readers alike of the ability to use the law to justify their choices, and the summer of 1643 had

---

734 Woodward, Three kingdoms made one, p. 1.

735 Smith, The Three Kingdomes healing-plaister, p. 1. It should be noted that this ornament was previously owned by Richard Oulton [Appendix 10:L2], before Oulton left the print trade in June 1643 and sold his press.

736 Braddick, 'John Hammond'.
seen a dearth in the production of pamphlets.\textsuperscript{737} It can be concluded that the endorsement of the Solemn League and Covenant in the polemic, then, was mainly managed by a few presses with clear City and Parliament workloads, and may have been purposefully anonymised in order to appear to be the product of many presses, rather than just a few.

The absence of activity from other presses suggests an ideological discord to the direction that parliamentarian justifications were going, and a further fragmentation of the parliamentary war effort. There were very few works – other than ones identifiable from Oxford – that openly attacked the Solemn League and Covenant. Indeed, we can make some sense of why certain printers proved reluctant to be forthright about the Solemn League and Covenant’s importance when we consider (albeit relying on a teleological point of view) the later trajectories of the printers that had up to this point been crucial in defending Parliament: Como has focused on Dexter after June 1643 who was willing to print heterodox works, and the print careers of Paine and Simmons have received much attention especially from scholars of Milton.\textsuperscript{738} It would be surprising to see printers that have later been identified as having ’Independent’ leanings defending a work that, despite the efforts of Vane, seems to have at least favoured a Presbyterian settlement.\textsuperscript{739}

The silence of some presses, combined with the anonymization tactics of others, both worked to disguise the extent of dissatisfaction and discord in the parliamentary cause. Interestingly, printers and publishers who objected to the Solemn League and Covenant seem to have been able to refuse to print works that openly supported it, and could do this without openly undermining the overall parliamentary war effort. This subtle but deliberate identity might be thought of as a politics of silence – by refusing to engage with a point, their readers were stripped of the ability to comprehend it, and therefore would either have to go elsewhere for information, or join the printer and publisher in their position. Picking either option changed the shape of the political conversation, or

\textsuperscript{737} Thomason collected only 63 pamphlets in August, and 71 in September of 1643. By contrast, he had collected over 80 pamphlets for each the previous few months, and before then his monthly collections were over 100.

\textsuperscript{738} Como, ’Print, Censorship, and Ideological Escalation’; Sharon Achinstein and Benjamin Burton, ’Who Printed Milton’s Tetrachordon (1645)?’, \textit{The Library}, 14 (2013).

\textsuperscript{739} On this, see Coffley, \textit{John Goodwin}, p. 121.
restricted the ability of political actors to get their message through the presses, thereby influencing the way that these actors were able to act and present their case. What is crucial, however, is the speed at which certain printers were able to establish their own political position on this subject, which suggests that certain printers had a clearer political identity that they are sometimes allowed, and that their sense of it was developing before the Solemn League and Covenant. The responses (or lack of responses) that had been triggered by political events were the manifestation of the ideals of printers and publishers, not vice versa.

III. CHURCH SETTLEMENT

By January 1644, the relationship between Presbyterians and Independents, and their agreement that polemic should focus on popery rather than settlement, came to a catastrophic collapse with the printing of An Apologetical Narration. Modern scholarship has suggested that within the Westminster Assembly there might not have been the animosity that the dichotomy of the polemic suggests, and Hunter Powell has emphasised in his recent monograph based on minutes from the Assembly the lengths that the clergymen were willing to go to find compromise and accommodate differing opinion. This understanding of the religious debate significantly contrasts with the furious battle taking place in pamphlets. Outside of the assembly, the polemic may have been written by partisan authors, financed by partisan booksellers and printed by partisan printers. Much of their business was predicated on these struggles, and these religious debates could have been as much constructed and sustained because of these warring printers and publishers as because of open warfare between two opposing 'sides'. The publication of An Apologetical Narration, and other polemical pamphlets like it, meant that the friendliness and accord of the Assembly was never represented in the polemic, and so soon came to an end.

That printers and publishers should be thought of as partisan is most clearly demonstrated by their religious views, and by examining works with 'similar' views on religious settlement, it is revealed that certain publishers were particularly interested in certain outcomes. For example, we can see various publishing collaborations between Bostock, Meredith and Gellibrand. Their religious output might be categorised within

---

Coffey’s ‘Presbyterians’, or Jordan’s ‘irreconcilable orthodox Presbyterians’. The focus of this exercise is not to argue that there are problems with these categories, but rather to emphasise that publishers could have clear allegiances that were visible to their readers.

Those that read the works imprinted with Bostock’s name, for example, would have read works that pushed for an increasingly Scottish religious settlement, and a reluctance to engage with any negotiation or watering down of their system. Bostock began his publishing interest in Scottish affairs from early on in the conflict, producing works such as The Scots Declaration to the Lords and Commons which suggested that Parliament’s problems might be solved if they ‘bestir themselves in the best way for a Reformation of Religion’. Later on in the year, he published Letters of Consequence from Scotland, which stressed the importance and godliness of the Scottish commissioners, and emphasised how well the Covenant was received in Scotland. So began a series of works that kept English readers up to date with the Scots’ impending move into England – The Readinesse of the Scots to advance into England; Scotlands Alarmie, or, Some Considerations tending to demonstrate the necessitie of our speedie marching; and finally in January 1644, The Scots Army Advanced into England – and news of this type was a staple for Bostock throughout the period. Readers could expect to be kept up to date with developments in Scotland, be that preparations for war or Scottish opinion on the


743 Letters of consequence from Scotland, the first from the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly there, to the Scots Commissioners here in England (Printed for Robert Bostock, [30 October] 1643) E.74[5].

744 See, for example, The readinesse of the Scots to advance into England. The policie and practise of the French agent there to hinder it. Exprest in three propositions (Printed for Robert Bostock, [25 November] 1643) E.77[1]; Scotlands alarme. Or, Some considerations tending to demonstrate the necessitie of our speedie marching to the assistance of our brethren in England, notwithstanding all difficulties and necessities, reall or pretended (Printed for Robert Bostock, [11 December] 1643) E.77[5]; The Scots army advanced into England certified in a letter dated from Addarston (Printed for Robert Bostock, FD: 24 January 1644) E.30[16].
proceedings of England, as well as Declarations made by the Parliament thanking the Scots.\footnote{See, for example, An act and ordinance of the Convention of Estates of the kingdom of Scotland, for the speedy raising of moneys by way of excise, for supplying the forces raised in this kingdom, for defence of religion, crown, and kingdoms, and payment of the debts for which the publick faith shall be engaged to that end (Printed for Robert Bostock, [01 March] 1643) E.35[5]; Die Veneris 2 Feb. 1643: It Is This Day Ordered That Publicke Thankes Be Given Unto God in All the Churches of London, Westminster, Suburbs, and within the Bills of Mortality, Upon the Next Lords Day, (Printed for Robert Bostock, FD: 02 February 1644) 669.f.7[62].}

Not only was Bostock’s news predominantly focused on the Scots, but so too were the arguments on religion that he published. The works adamantly defended an orthodox, Scottish Presbyterian settlement, either against the dissenting brethren or against English Presbyterians who were flirting with the idea of toleration.\footnote{For the general point about Scottish Presbyterians encouraging English Presbyterians to a more orthodox position, see Sirluck, ‘Introduction’, pp. 92-106. For attacks against the brethren specifically, see Reformation of church-government in Scotland, cleered from some mistakes and prejudices, by the Commissioners of the Generall Assembly of the Church of Scotland, now at London (Printed for Robert Bostock, [24 January] 1644) E.30[5]; Alexander Forbes, An anatomy of independency, or, A briefe commentary, and moderate discourse upon the apologetical narration of Mr Thomas Goodwin, and Mr Philip Nye, &c. By argument, laying naked the dangers of their positions; and from experience, discovering their spirits and ways (Printed for Robert Bostock, [14 June] 1644) E.50[36], pp. 1-3; William Prynne, Faces about. Or, A recrimination charged upon Mr. John Goodwin, in the point of fighting against God, and opposing the way of Christ (Printed for Robert Bostock, [21 October] 1644) E.13[17]. For works that push against English Presbyterians, see Henderson, A sermon preached; Forbes, An Anatomy of Independency. Alexander Henderson, A sermon preached before the Right Honorable the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament: at Margarets Church in Westmi[2]nster, upon Thursday the 18. day of July, 1644 (Printed for Robert Bostock, FD: 18 July 1644) E.3[2].} Crucially, any form of dissen\footnote{See Reformation of church-government in Scotland, pp. 21-4; George Gillespie, A late dialogue betwixt a civilian and a divine, concerning the present condition of the Church of England (Printed for Robert Bostock, [30 October] 1644) E.14[17], pp. 25-9.}sion should be suppressed, and the use of civil powers to enforce uniformity was not only necessary, but was a good thing.\footnote{Forbes, An anatomy of independency, p. 2.} Toleration, no matter how mild, would lead to increased sectarianism, a point proven by the fact that while some ‘will not own the name of Independency yet if we speak or preach against Independency, they [the ‘chief Authors, and abbettors’] will tell us we preach against them’.\footnote{Reformation of church-government in Scotland, p. 7; George Gillespie, A sermon preached before the Honourable House of Commons at their late solemn fast Wednesday March 27. 1644 (1644), p.} There needed to be a commitment that the Scottish Church was right in the eyes of God, as informed by the Covenant.\footnote{749} Bostock’s output, therefore, was marketed to those who favoured a Scottish
Presbyterian system, and with the aim of pushing English Presbyterians to an increasing orthodoxy. Indeed, on Thomason’s copy of *Faces About*, printed for Bostock, above the cryptic publisher’s credit line Thomason made the insertion ‘Published by [a Scots: man] Authority’.750

If Bostock’s focus was on Scotland, Meredith’s was on England. The works that he printed which have been attributed authors were mainly by Englishmen who were similarly committed to an orthodox Presbyterian settlement.751 When he printed it, his news was focused on England, although his main interest was in printing sermons.752

---


751 Woodward, *Solemne League and Covenant*; Arthur Salwey, *Halting stigmatiz’d in a sermon preached to the Honorable House of Commons on the monethly fast day, Octob. 25. 1643, at Margarets Westminster* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, FD: 25 October 1643) E.77[13]; William Mewe, *The robbing and spoiling of Jacob and Israel: considered and bewailed, in a sermon preached at Westminster before the Honourable House of Commons, at the late solemn fast, Nov. 29. 1643* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, [26 December] 1643) E.79[10]; Mocket, *A view of the Solemn League and Covenant*; Thomas Hooker, *The faithful covenanter. A sermon preached at the lecture in Dedham in Essex* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, [10 January] 1644) E.81[18]; Constantin Jessop, *The angel of the Church of Ephesus no Bishop of Ephesus, distinguished in order from, and superior in power to a presbyter. as it was lately delivered in a collation before the Reverend Assembly of divines* (Printed by G. M. for Christopher Meredith, [13 April] 1644) E.42[22]; Edmund Staunton, *Rupes Israelis: The rock of Israel. A little part of its glory laid forth in a sermon preached at Westminster before the honorable House of Commons, at their monthly fast, Apr. 24. 1644* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, FD: 24 April 1644) E.48[6]; Humphrey Hardwick, *The difficulty of sions deliverance and reformation: together with the activitie which her friends should manifest during the time that her cause is in agitation. Delivered in a Sermon at Margarets Westminster, before the Honourable House of Commons on Wednesday Morning, the Twenty-Sixt Day of Iune. 1644* (Printed by I. L. for Christopher Meredith, FD: 26 June 1644) E.2[9]; Matthew Newcomen, *Jerusalems watch-men, the Lords remembrancers: a sermon preached at the Abbie at Westminster, before both Houses of Parliament, and the Assembly of Divines, upon their solemn fast, July 7. 1643* (Printed by M. F. for Christopher Meredith, [23 August] 1643) E.63[7]; George Gipps, *A sermon preached (before God, and from him) to the Honourable House of Commons. At a publike fast, Novemb. 27* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, [27 November] 1644) E.23[3]; Edmund Calamy, *Englands antidote, against the plague of civil warre. Present in a sermon before the Honourable House of Commons, on their late extraordinary solemn fast, October 22. 1644* (Printed by I.L. for Christopher Meredith, FD: 22 October 1645) E.17[17]; Thomas Coleman, *Gods unusuall answer to a solemn fast. Or, some observations upon the late sad success in the west, upon the day immediately following our publique humiliation* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, FD: 12 September 1644) E.16[2].

752 A true and exact relation of the kings entertainment in the city of Chester. With the recorders speech at his entering the city. Sent from a citizen of note in Chester, on purpose to be printed, to 202
Gellibrand was between the two – he mainly printed works that focused on England, but was also the publisher to Baillie, the Scottish minister based in London.753 Gellibrand and Meredith’s works also focused on an orthodox Presbyterian position, and they had been some of the first to produce works to encourage the taking of the Covenant.754 Their works remained faithful to the Covenant, encouraging both that it be taken and that it be used as the basis of church settlement.755 Towards 1646, their output increasingly concerned an Erastian settlement, and argued that Parliament’s flirtation with lay control was delaying further Reformation.756 According to their output, Independency
was a schism, and attempts to reconcile with Independents would only lead to further error.\textsuperscript{757}

Occasionally Bostock, Meredith and Gellibrand openly worked together, and there are times when their collaboration might be seen as part of a wider campaign. A prime example is the printing of several sermons within a few days of each other in June 1643, when four preachers (Stephen Marshall, Calamy, Obadiah Sedgewick and Herle) over two days encouraged greater commitment to the godly cause, and encouraged further reformation.\textsuperscript{758} Furthermore, they frequently used the same printers, either legally or illegally. Thomas Badger, Raworth, George Bishop, Richard Bishop and White were used at various times by all of the publishers, as were Miller, John Legate, Cotes and Miles Flesher. Even if the printers were not themselves partisan, a large portion of their business relied upon a willingness to produce these works.

These three publishers all had a consistent religious line – an orthodox Presbyterian settlement – and as there are no surviving works produced with these imprints that deviate from this religious line, a reader could probably assume that any work with their name on would defend a certain religious position. As such, Bostock, Meredith and Gellibrand might be thought of as having curated works as well as financing and selling them. This position should not necessarily be surprising – Meredith and Gellibrand were committed Presbyterians within London, the former acting on City committees, and the latter signing various petitions against parliamentary moves to prevent eldership control.\textsuperscript{759}

On the opposite side of the settlement question, Dawlman might be considered the most important of the conservative independents, as he had consistently openly intervened in the debate over church settlement. He had published the important intervention the

\textsuperscript{757} A letter of the ministers of the city of London, presented the first of Ian. 1645. to the reverend Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster by authority of Parliament, against toleration (Printed for Samuel Gellibrand, [02 January] 1646) E.314[8], p. 3; Coffey, 'The Toleration Controversy During the English Revolution', p. 46; Obadiah Sedgwick, \textit{An arke against a deluge: or, Safety in dangerous times. Discovered in a sermon before the honourable House of Commons, at their late extraordinary fast, October 22. 1644} (Printed by J. Raworth, for Samuel Gellibrand, FD: 22 October 1644) E.17[18], p. 29.

\textsuperscript{758} Sirluck, 'Introduction', p. 59.

\textsuperscript{759} Michael Mahoney, 'Presbyterianism in the City of London, 1645-1647', \textit{Historical Journal}, 22 (1979), pp. 103-6; Brenner, \textit{Merchants and Revolution}, p. 482.
Apologeticall Narration in January 1644, and continued through this period to publish works by the Brethren Bridge, Burroughs, and Thomas Goodwin. He worked both legally and illegally with Ellis and Grismond, and Flesher, and his interventions played an important role in the construction of a tolerationalist case. Dawlman’s works were, however, separate from what we might call more radical Independents, and there does not seem to be any crossover.

In addition to these publishers, we might also look to the printers Miller, John Field, John Macock and Francis Leach. Miller had a history of helping to produce Presbyterian-sympathetic works, such as Thomas Edward’s Antapologia, Burgess’ Romes Cruelty and Apostacie and Thomas Shephard’s New Englands Lamentation. He also, with Field, helped to print the first edition of Edward’s Gangraena [Appendix 4:1&N2, 17:2]. Miller was a regular printer of parliamentary sermons, and proved willing to print the sermons even when their tone shifted towards accommodation between Presbyterians

760 See Jeremiah Burroughs, An exposition of the prophesie of Hosea begun in divers lectures vpon the first three chapters at Michaels Cornhill, London (Printed by W.E. and J.G. for R. Dawlman, 1643) E.98[1]; William Bridge, A sermon preached before the Honourable House of Commons, at their publique fast, Novemb. 29. 1643 (Printed for R. Dawlman, FD: 29 November 1643) E.79[11]; Thomas Goodwin, A childe of light walking in darkness, or, A treatise shewing the causes by which, the cases wherein, the ends for which God leaves his children to distresse of conscience together with directions how to walke so as to come forth of such a condition (Printed by M. F. for R. Dawlman, FD: 1643) E.57[1]; Thomas Goodwin, The tryall of a Christians growth in mortification, purging out corruption. Or vivification, bringing forth more fruit. A treatise handling this case, how to discern our growth in grace: affording some helps rightly to judge thereof, by resolving some tentations, clearing some mistakes, answering some questions, about spiritual growth (Printed for R. Dawlman, FD: 1643) E.58[1]; Thomas Goodwin, The vanity of thoughts discovered: with their danger and cure (Printed for R. Dawlman, FD: 1643) E.57[4]; Goodwin and others, An apologeticall narration; Thomas Goodwin, Encouragements to faith Drawn from several engagements both of Gods Christs Heart to receive pardon sinners (Printed for R. Dawlman, [28 October] 1645) E.307[18]; Thomas Goodwin, The great interest of states & kingdomes. A sermon preached before the Honorable House of Commons, at their late solemne fast, Feb. 25. 1645 (Printed for R. Dawlman, FD: 25 February 1646) E.325[4]. For the moderate independents, see Coffey, ’The Toleration Controversy During the English Revolution’, pp. 48-52.

761 Thomas Edwards, Antapologia: or, A full answer to the apologetical narration of Mr Goodwin, Mr Nye, Mr Sympson, Mr Burroughs, Mr Bridge, members of the Assembly of Divines (Printed by G.M. for Ralph Smith, [13 July] 1644) E.1[1]; Burgess, Romes cruelty & apostacie. Thomas Shepard, New Englands lamentation for old Englands present errours, and divisions, and their feared future desolations if not timely prevented. Occasioned by the increase of Anabaptists, rigid separatists, antinomians and familists (Printed by George Miller, [22 March] 1645) E.274[18].

762 Thomas Edwards, Gangraena: or a catalogue and discovery of many of the errors, heresies, blasphemies and pernicious practices of the sectaries of this time (Printed for Ralph Smith, [26 February] 1646) E.323[2], sig. A2r, p. 113. Although Hughes does not tell us the printers, she does confirm that it was printed by two different houses in Gangraena, pp. 223-230.
and conservative Independents in 1646. Field also produced works encouraging a Presbyterian settlement, including Steuart’s Second Part of the Duply to M.S [Appendix 17:1], John Brinsley’s Araignment of the Present Schism, Richard Byfield’s Temple-defilers Defiled and the anonymous Anti-Toleration. John Macock mainly worked with the publishing father-and-son duo the Sparks Senior and Junior. His press printed John Vicars’ less-than-generous Picture of Independence and both parts of Bastwick’s Independency not Gods Ordinance. Later in the year, Macock’s press printed several

763 On this, see John Frederick Wilson, Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism During the English Civil Wars, 1640-8 (Princeton, 1969), pp. 86-97; See, for example, Miller’s printing of Joseph Caryl, Englands plus ultra, both of hoped mercies, and of required duties: shewed in a sermon preached to the Honourable Houses of Parliament, the Lord Major, Court of Aldermen, and Common-councell of London; together with the Assembly of Divines, at Christ-Church, April 2 (Printed by G.M. for John Rothwell and Giles Calvert, FD: 02 April 1646) E.330[12]; John Owen, A vision of vnchangeable free mercy, in sending the means of grace to undeserved sinners: wherein gods uncontrollable eternall purpose, in sending, and continuing the gospel unto this nation, in the midst of oppositions and contingencies, is discovered: his distinguishing mercy, in this great work, exalted, asserted, against opposers, repiners: in a sermon preached before the Honourable House of Commons, April. 29. being the day of publike humiliation (Printed by G.M. for Philemon Stephens, FD: 29 April 1646) E.334[15]. For the significance of Owen’s sermon see Tim Cooper, John Owen, Richard Baxter and the Formation of Nonconformity (Farnham, 2011), pp. 34-5.

764 Adam Steuart, The second part of the duply to M.S. alias two brethren wherein are maintained the Kings, Parliaments and all civil magistrates authority about the church, subordination of ecclesiasticall judicatories: are refuted the independency of particular congregations, licentiouseness of wicked conscience and toleration of all sorts of most detestable schisms, heresies and religions, as, idolatry, paganisme, turcisme, Judaisme, arrianisme, brownisme, anabaptisme, &c. (Printed for John Field, [04 December] 1644) E.20[7] sig. A2r; John Brinsley, The araignment of the present schism of new separation in old England. Together with a serious recommendation of church-unity and uniformity. As it was lately presented to the church of God at great Yarmouth (Printed by John Field for Ralph Smith, [04 May] 1646) E.335[10]; Richard Byfield, Temple-defilers defiled, wherein a true visible Church of Christ is described. The evils and pernicious errors, especially appertaining to schisme, anabaptisme, and libertinisme, that infest our Church, are discovered (Printed by John Field for Ralph Smith, [22 April] 1645) E.278[20]; Anti-toleration, or A modest defence of the letter of the London ministers to the reverend Assembly of Divines (Printed by John Field for Ralph Smith, [16 April] 1646) E.333[12].

765 John Vicars, The picture of independency lively (yet lovingly) delineated (Printed by John Macock, [15 March] 1645) E.273[11]; John Bastwick, Independency not Gods ordinance: or A treatise concerning church-government, occasioned by the distractions of these times. Wherein is evidently proved, that the Presbyterian government dependent is Gods ordinance, and not the Presbyterian government independent (Printed by John Macock, for Michael Spark junior, [21 May] 1645) E.285[2]; John Bastwick, The second part of that book call’d Independency not Gods ordinance: or the post-script, discovering the uncharitable dealing of the Independents towards their Christian brethren, with the jugglings of many of their pastors and ministers, to the misleading of the poor people to the detriment of their own souls, and the hurt both of church and state, with the danger of novelties in religion; proving that Indendency, is one of the most dangerous sects, that ever appeared in the world, since mortality inhabited the earth (Printed by John Macock, for Michael Spark junior, [10 June] 1645) E.287[9].
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works by Prynne, including both parts of *A Fresh Discovery of some prodigious new Wandering Blasing-Stars*, encouraging the Parliament to arrest the ‘furious Ringleaders of these Independent Sectaries’, and *A Vindication of Foure Serious Questiones Concerning Ex-communication.*

Macock’s press also produced works that annotated and catechised its longer works, such as John Bernard’s *The Independents Catechisme*, which argued that Christ ordained a church ‘by a Common-Councell of Presbyters’.

The Sparks had previously worked with Leach, who had printed several other works by Prynne, including *Twelve Considerable Serious Questions Touching Church Government and Independecy Examined, Unmasked, Refuted*.

‘Radical Independent’ publishers and printers have received the most attention by historians, especially the printer Overton. However, other printers acting legally and semi-legally are also of importance. As we have seen, Overton laid important groundwork for ideas about Independecy to be spread in his output, which could be built upon by printers. For example, Jane Coe took over her husband’s press between June and July 1644. Andrew Coe had printed the *Perfect Occurrences*, and Jane and their son – also Andrew – continued to print this after his death. Towards the end of his life, Andrew Coe (senior) had printed a number of works that defended Independecy, such

---

766 William Prynne, *A fresh discovery of some prodigious new wandering-blasing-stars, & firebrands, stiling themselves new-lights, firing our church and state into new combustions. Divided into ten sections, comprising several most libellous, scandalous, seditious, insolent, uncharitable, (and some blasphemous) passages; published in late unlicensed printed pamphlets, against the ecclesiasticall jurisdiction and power of parliaments, councels, synods, Christian kings and magistrates, in generall* (Printed by John Macock, for Michael Spark senior, [24 July] 1645) E.261[5], p. [3]; William Prynne, *A vindication of foure serious questions of grand importance, concerning excommunication and suspension from the sacrament of the Lords Supper, from some misprisions and unjust exceptions lately taken against them; both in the pulpit, by a reverend brother of Scotland, in a sermon at Margarets Church in Westminster, before the Honourable House of Commons, at a publike fast there held for Scotland, on the 5th of September last* (Printed by John Macock, for Michael Spark senior, [03 October] 1645) E.265[5].


768 Prynne, *Twelve considerable serious questions*; William Prynne, *Independecy examined, vnmasked, refuted, by twelve new particular interrogatories: detecting both the manifold absurdities, inconveniences that must necessarily attend it, to the great disturbance of church, state, the diminution, subversion of the lawfull undoubted power of all christian magistrates, parliaments, synods: and shaking the chiefe pillars, wherwith its patrons would support it* (Printed by F.L. for Michael Sparke Senior, [26 September] 1644) E.257[3].
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as *The Saints Apologie*, and Jane Coe seems to have continued this trend throughout the later years of the civil war. For example, she printed Lawrence Clarkson’s *Truth Released from Prison*, which emphasised the benefits of lay preaching and condemns denying liberty of conscience. Coe printed multiple works by Hanserd Knollys in February 1646, having previously printed his *Moderate Answer unto Dr. Bastwicks book* the previous year, and Thomas Webb’s *Mr. Edwards pen no slander*, a work that highlighted the errors in *Gangraena*. In January 1646, Coe also seems to have anonymously printed William Walwyn’s *Toleration Justified*, which brings her tantalisingly close to Como’s ‘propaganda collective’ of Overton, Walwyn and Lilburne. A further link might be found with Coe’s copy of *Uniformity examin’d*, printed for Overton, which was also printed by Simmons. Her market, then, was producing works that defended Independency and liberty of conscience, continuing the work of her late husband. Her choice of output was mirrored by a number of increasingly Independent printers, including Simmons (producing works such as Goodwin’s *12 Considerable and Serious Cautions*) and Paine (printing many works by Walwyn, as well as works such as Weld’s *Answer to W.R*). More importantly, their presses did not produce works that encouraged a Presbyterian settlement.

The collaborations of publishers such as Bostock, Meredith and Gellibrand, along with examinations into Overton and Underhill, demonstrate the interconnected web of print relationships. An individual printer might be employed by multiple publishers, each with their own slightly distinct political and religious line, but which all together would make up the printer’s broad identity. Miller, for example, worked for multiple Presbyterian publishers – Meredith, Underhill, Philemon Stephons, John Bellamy – which reflected a

---

769 Hanserd Knollys, *The shining of a flaming-fire in Zion. Or, A clear answer unto 13. exceptions, against the grounds of new baptism; (so called) in Mr. Saltmarsh his book; intituled, The smoke in the temple, p. 15, &c.* (Printed by Jane Coe, [11 February] 1646) E.322[16]; Hanserd Knollys, *Christ exalted: a lost sinner sought, and saved by Christ: Gods people are an holy people* (Printed by Jane Coe, [18 February 1645]) E.322[33]; Thomas Webbe, *Mr. Edwards pen no slander: or, The Gangraena once more searched: which being found very full of corrupt matter, that part of his foul mouth is seringed, and washed with a moderate answer, given by Tho: Web, to that part of his book, wherein Mr. Edwards chargeth him for delivering severall Antinomian doctrines. In which answer is proved, that many things wherewith Mr. Edwards chargeth him, is false* (Printed by Jane Coe for Henry Overton, [21 May] 1646) E.337[34].


771 On the relationship between Simmons and Paine, who collaborated often in the early 1640s, see Achinstein and Burton, ‘Who Printed Milton’s Tetrachordon (1645)?’, pp. 20-22.
wide coalition of Presbyterian thought. His business and his politics were intimately connected, and his paid work was dependent on his willingness to be identified as a Presbyterian printer.

Because printers and publishers were political agents in their own right, and had their own political views which would dictate the works that they would either print or finance, they acted alongside authors in constructing meaning and division. While authors had personal understandings about what the meaning of the conflict was, and could express this in their writing, the output of printers and publishers grouped works by filtering out those opinions that they objected to, creating a wider community of thought that was broadly constitutionally, legally or religiously coherent. By thinking of publishers and printers as political agents, the relationship between them, authors and other political actors might be seen more as a negotiation – a manuscript needed to be steered through the affinities and reluctances of both printers and publishers before it could be purchased at a bookstall. Certain printers would be willing to print certain types of works, while others would refuse them. Some works might be published illegally by one press, while another press would be willing to proudly display their imprint upon the title page. However, printers and publishers could also encourage certain works, as the example of Bishop and White’s press demonstrates, and be integral in actively constructing and disseminating certain views.

IV CONCLUSION

Printers and publishers were fundamental not just in making authors’ ideas available to readers, but also in helping to shape and influence the nature of the pamphlet conversation through which events were understood. This relationship between printers, publishers and authors also had an effect on the way that the reader experienced pamphlets. By relying on a single bookstall, publisher or printer, a reader could find themselves reading only the works that had been curated by partisan members of the production cycle. On the one hand, this might have been something that the reader actively sought out, and Adams has suggested that readers might examine title pages for specific patterns of woodcuts to find the illegally printed works that would confirm their pre-formulated views. On the other hand, readers might find themselves isolated from

access to the arguments that had become the parliamentarian mainstream – such as discussions of the Solemn League and Covenant – and they might find themselves needing to branch out to different bookstalls where they could access the kind of arguments that they wanted to read, or change their preferred publisher as and when their own persuasions differed from them. In this way, at times a reader might have had to actively choose to search for new ideas, rather than passively receiving them. Printers and publishers could construct spaces where certain affinities were marketed to, or were left unchallenged.

By adding barriers to the public, printers and publishers acted as restrictors as well as enablers, meaning that political actions had to be publicised through a divided press as well as a divided kingdom, and the fragmentation of the parliamentarian cause was catalysed by a fragmented press, as well as political disagreements. Because of this, the ability of politicians to get their message across might have been stymied. For example, the reception of the Solemn League and Covenant had to be managed precisely because of the increasingly openly partisan presses, and the reporting of religious and theological debate in the Westminster Assembly was twisted and contorted in the polemical debate by committed advocates.

Thinking bibliographically and typographically also means we can start contextualising some of the episodic pamphlets that have so captivated historians, and understand how readers might have responded to these works. For example, Touching the Fundamentall Lawes and Remonstrans Redivivus, which both argue constitutionally similar points concerning the powers of Parliament, can be connected together with reference to Underhill, and from there to a number of other works that hold the same opinion. Rather than being transient interventions that argued the unthinkable (as historians have often treated them), they can be seen either as part of press ‘campaigns’ that reiterated ideas and understandings, or as part and parcel of the everyday actions of the presses, trying to help their readers comprehend the conflict that had embroiled the nation. Far from detracting from the importance of these pamphlets, bibliographic and typographic contextualisation re-emphasises the importance and potential of these works; rather than being sporadic and fleeting sparks of intellectual creativity, the ideas were part of a wider pool of texts that offered readers coherent ideas and theories in serial. Readers who were well-versed in particular publishers’ outputs would not necessarily be overtly challenged, as is suggested by some historians who have examined
these works, but would rather use them to bolster a more detailed and nuanced partisan view on the nature of the constitution and the law, which may have been more refined that it is often given credit for. Rather than having to deal with excessive contradictions, in other words, the selective reading material offered by certain publishers could offer a curated experience that still offered the justifications that were needed for consciences to be settled but without internal contradictions.

Throughout the early 1640s, the tumultuous events were accompanied by conversations that were shaped and understood through the lens of print, which was collectively influenced by authors, publishers and printers, and readers. Printers and publishers had their own political and religious understandings of the conflict, and could shape their output to match these in order to influence the debate as a whole – either through the production of works that presented the conflict in a particular way, or by refusing to engage with conversations that did not conform to their understanding. Equally, they provided a way for the reader to consistently access a particular method of parsing the conflict, changing the way that the war was understood. Pamphlets could be tools with which readers could justify prejudicial views, and partisan printers and publishers aided this process. Authors, too, could exploit partisan printers and publishers, so that certain works could be published anonymously and with the support of a network of similarly-minded pamphlet producers. Ultimately, partisan printers and publishers could create distinct spaces where the debate was curated, packaged and, to a certain degree, constructed for a prejudiced reader. In these circumstances, with printers and publishers holding religious and political partisan religious views, and readers who could seek out confirmation of views they already held and avoid those they found distasteful, no wonder a settlement could not be found.
CHAPTER 5: THE SEEDS OF FAILURE, JANUARY 1645 TO JULY 1646

The King, it seemes, must keep himself to Lawes, because that splendid dignity of breaking Lawes by force is the Priviledge of both Houses.\textsuperscript{773}

A Letter, in which the Arguments of the Annotator ... are Examined and Answered (August 1645).

... and yet I still side with the Parliament? I confesse I doe, but not as I did before; Before I did it sincerely; now I do it politickly.\textsuperscript{774}

Thomas Swadlin, A letter of an Independent, To his honoured Friend, Mr Glyn (January 1646).

The formation of the New Model Army over the last few months of 1644, and the political machinations that came with it, was a turning point in the parliamentarian war effort. The New Model Army enabled London to pour money into an amalgamation of the three parliamentary armies, and as such was an administrative and financial innovation as much as a military one.\textsuperscript{775} The Battle of Naseby (June 1645) saw the King trounced, helped in part by Prince Rupert’s overenthusiastic cavalry manoeuvres.\textsuperscript{776} Through victory, the hopes of the Presbyterian alliance in Parliament – that the New Model Army might fail, and that a negotiated settlement could be back on the cards – were dashed.\textsuperscript{777} By defeating the King, the New Model Army became the dominant military strength of the kingdom, and their actions were imbued with divine significance.

\textsuperscript{773} A letter, in which the arguments of the Annotator, and three other speeches vpon their Majesties letters published at London, are examined and answered (s.n., [12 August] 1645) E.296[15], p. 11.

\textsuperscript{774} Thomas Swadlin, A letter of an Independent, To his Honoured Friend Mr Glyn, Recorder of London ([Printed by Leonard Lichfield], [08 January] 1646) E.315[1], pp. 6-7.


\textsuperscript{777} Scott, Politics and War, p. 86.
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The increasing possibility of military victory gave a new urgency to the conversation over what settlement could be based upon, and what exactly the purpose of the war was anyway. Parliamentarian printers and publishers were increasingly fractured, mirroring the internal politics of Parliament itself, which was more than ever ‘a body split into rival groups’ rather than a ‘united whole’. The political Independents and the political Presbyterians had developed out of the war and peace parties respectively, and although they had been crystallised by the ongoing debate in the Westminster Assembly over different church settlements, the ‘crucial division’ was the extent to which constitutional settlement was to be imposed on the King – the political Presbyterians favouring a negotiated settlement, and the political Independents arguing for a forced one.8

In May 1646, Charles surrendered to the Scottish Covenanters, having escaped Oxford before it was besieged by the New Model Army. The peace proposals sent to him at Newcastle in July 1646 made demands of him that were broadly similar to the previous attempts to create peace: a time-limited restriction upon control of the militia to restrain the King himself, rather than his office; the taking of the Solemn League and Covenant; and mechanisms to ensure that the church settlement decided by Parliament would be enacted. But it did so in the wake of increasingly contradictory and complex polemical circumstances. Until settlement was made, dissatisfaction with the Parliament could manifest itself in pamphlet works that utilised and exploited the frameworks which justified the parliamentary war effort, and threatened to undermine them.

Before the legal-constitutional framework shift of the summer of 1643, contemporaries had demonstrated the benefit of creating a form of conditional obedience to the Parliament using an implied reader. The Vow and Covenant, and later the Solemn League and Covenant, had made it more difficult, but not impossible, for readers to bring their own meanings to texts. Parliamentary military successes and partisan publishers and printers propelled into the open a discussion about the powers of a civil magistrate in matters of religion, and what form church settlement might take. This was to clash with parliamentarianism and the vocabulary of allegiance that went with it, which remained wedded to an absolute commitment to the parliamentarian cause and

778 On this, see Peacey, ‘John Lilburne’, pp. 265-7,

779 Scott, Politics and War, pp. 89-91.

Parliament’s chosen church settlement. Not to agree absolutely with the Parliament was a slippery slope in parliamentarian thought towards radical consequences, and individuals who were forced to resort to some form of conditional obedience found themselves excluded from the use of justifications which defined the cause they were fighting for. The need for a form of conditional obedience acted as a catalyst for political thinking, leading to periods of intense redefinition and reinterpretation of politics and the constitution, driven by a need for meaning. The shared political languages relied again on a binary – loyal or malignant – that could exclude many from parliamentarianism, and could not adequately describe the increasingly complex and fractious nature of parliamentarian politics.

This chapter examines the several crises, or endgames, which faced the legal and the religious frameworks by the conclusion of the conflict, in part caused by the frameworks themselves, and exacerbated by the polemic. By July 1646, these frameworks, and the shared political languages that operated within them, had become not only problematic in isolation, but increasingly contradictory of each other. The mixture of frameworks and their respective authorities and obligations helped to make the parliamentarian position incoherent and unsustainable.

The first section examines the legal framework, and argues that the political vocabulary of parliamentarian allegiance pushed those who found themselves unable to support Parliament absolutely towards radical consequences. The sovereign power that Parliament wanted to claim clashed with arguments over control of conscience, the application of communal solutions to individual issues around cases, and shifting understandings of the law. The second section examines the religious framework, and looks at the way that religious settlement prevented the Covenant from meaning all things to all people as it had been supposed to do, and transmuted it into being a definitive statement of intent that contradicted the advice of the Westminster Assembly and the Scottish Covenanters.

Internal problems in these two frameworks and compounded dissonance between them meant that the parliamentarian case became fragmented into ever more complex and contradictory polemical positions. The chapter concludes by looking at attempts to abolish episcopacy as indicative of the way in which the two frameworks blurred into each other and exacerbated their internal inconsistencies, and then at an attempt to solve some problems with the parliamentary case using appeals to ’the people’ – a
rhetorical invocation which drew on the mixed constitutionalist arguments of 1642–3. Because the frameworks were entwined and cumulative, contradictions within one also threatened the other. While the polemic of the war years required justifications, no matter the constitutional cost, a successful peace settlement needed certainties – and these proved to be in short supply.

I ENDGAMES

1. THE CREATION OF ‘RADICALISM’

At the beginning of his *Truth Triumphing*, Prynne warned his readers that ‘the Anti-parliamentary Soules’, formerly ‘defunct Prelates’, were revived in a new form:

> New-Generation of men... common[ly] known by the Name of INDEPENDENTS; who, though for the most part really cordiall in their Affections, Actions to Parliament and Church of England, (for which, and for their piety they are to bee highly honoured,) yet some of them are of late become extremely derogatory, and destructive unto both, in their Anarchicall and Anti-Parliamentary Positions.⁷⁸¹

With all their ‘Industry, Policy, Power’ they were setting up New ‘Independent Congregations in every corner’, and arguing in pen and pulpit that they were subject to ‘NO OTHER JURISDICTION, then that of Christ, his word and Spirit’. They wrote:

> That neither KINGS, NOR PARLIAMENTS, NOR SYNODS, have any Authority to prescribe Lawes or Rules for the Churches Government, to order the affaires of Christs Kingdome, or institute the Government of his Churches, or to make coactive Lawes, in any Ecclesiastical matters, to bind the conscience of any Church or Christian to outward conformity.⁷⁸²

For Prynne, this alone was bad enough, but he feared that stripping Parliament’s authority over ecclesiastical power was ‘destructive to the very fundamentall Power and Being of Parliaments’. To his horror, their ‘Anti-Parliamentall, Anti-Synodicall, and Anti-Monarchicall Paradoxes ... have not onely dropped from the Lips, but Pens of sundry

⁷⁸¹ William Prynne, *Truth triumphing over falshood, antiquity over novelty. Or, The first part of a just and seasonable vindication of the undoubted ecclesiasticall iurisdiction, right, legislative, coercive power of Christian emperors, kings, magistrates, parliaments, in all matters of religion, church-government, discipline, ceremonies, manners: summoning of, presiding, moderating in councells, synods; and ratifying their canons, determinations, decrees: as likewise of lay-mens right both to sit and vote in councells* (Printed by John Dawson for Michael Sparke, Senior, [02 January] 1645) E.259[1], sig. A2r.

⁷⁸² Ibid., sig. A3r.
Independents, who have avowed them publiquely in Print, with their Names affixed to their Bookes, even before the face of Your right Honourable Parliamentary Assembly’. 

Prynne’s argument is surprisingly generous to those who were unable to surrender their conscience to the Parliament, even though his judgement was damning, and this reveals the fundamental problem with the parliamentarian religious framework after the Solemn League and Covenant: for Parliament’s justifications to work, obedience had to be absolute. If readers’ obedience became conditional, they became part of a wider problem that parliamentarianism lacked the terminology to categorise. That these arguments could not be made in a moderate space, in other words, meant that attempts to create conditional obedience inevitably became radical.

Because there was no space for anything other than Parliamentary absolutism, those who favoured conditional obedience were pushed to the fringe. This shift was characterised by Thomas Swadlin, a royalist writing as an Independent, as moving from believing in Parliament ‘sincerely’ to believing in them ‘politickly’. The prospect of church settlement had played a crucial role in this shift from sincerity to pragmatism, and indeed, many of the works that immediately responded to Prynne’s Truth Triumphing were keen to stress that they were denying Parliament’s authority over conscience, not over anything else. Walwyn, replying in February 1645, said that ‘all agree, that in all Civill and Military causes and affaires, [Parliament] have absolute supreme power’, but ‘Who can live where he hath not the freedome of his minde, and exercise of his conscience?’ Lilburne had argued the previous month that ‘no Parliament, Councell, Synod, Emperour, King, nor Magistrate hath any spirituall Authority, or jurisdiction over this Kingdome, or the Subjects thereof’. Similarly, Henry Robinson’s reply to Prynne charged him with having ‘done as much as in you liyes to divide the Independents from the Parliament’ by placing the ‘undoubted legislative and coercive power in all matters of

783 Ibid., sig. A2v.
785 Walwyn, A helpe to the right understanding of a discourse concerning independency. Lately published by William Pryn of Lincolnes Inne, Esquire (s.n., [06 February] 1645) E.259[2], p. 6.
786 Lilburne, A copie of a letter, written by John Lilburne Leut. Collonel. To Mr. William Prinne Esq. (Upon the coming out of his last booke, intituled Truth triumphing over falshood, antiquity over novelty) in which he laies down five propositions, which he desires to discusse with the said Mr. Prinne (s.n., [15 January] 1644) E.24[22], pp. 3-4.
Religion’ in Parliament. While Robinson could concede that Parliament was supreme in all other matters, Parliament could not be supreme in religion.\(^787\)

To follow Prynne’s argument to its conclusion, the demand for liberty of conscience had led otherwise potentially loyal parliamentarians to question and undermine the supremacy of Parliament. In a sense, what Prynne is describing can be applied not just to those concerned about the liberty of conscience, but more generally to those who felt the need to attach conditions to their obedience to Parliament, of which the battle for toleration was just the most recent iteration. Positions which could not easily be abandoned were forcibly transformed into radical political consequences by the purist nature of the parliamentary position.

The main way in which this squeeze towards radicalism played out was in discussions around absolutism and conscience. The understandings of the extent of parliamentary sovereignty, and the degree to which Parliament could act as an arbitrary power, continued to be placed under significant scrutiny towards the end of the war. John Taylor, writing as the ‘most oppresed, distressed commons of England’, complained of the ‘Tyranny of the perpetuall Parliament at Westminster’ and reasoned:

we are the body of the Kingdome represented; now as a thing representative is but a derivative from that which is represented, so is your power derived from us, and from us who are but men full of infirmities and errours; though our voyces had power to give you power, to be a house of Commons in Parliament; yet from those voyces and folly of ours, we had not power to infuse infallibl e and inerrable wisedome in you.\(^788\)

According to Taylor, because Parliament’s power derived from the people, Parliament could not claim to be infallible, and therefore there had to be some form of protection against parliamentary fallibility for the ‘distressed commons’. Chapter Three described

\(^787\) Henry Robinson, *The falsehood of Mr. VVilliam Pryn’s Truth triumphing, in the antiquity of popish princes and Parliaments. To which, he attributes a sole, sovereigne, legislative, coercive power in all matters of religion; discovered to be full of absurdities, contradictions, sacriledge, and to make more in favour of Rome and Antichrist, than all the bookes and pamphlets which were ever published, whether by papall or episcopall prelates, or parisites, since the reformation* (s.n., [08 May] 1645) E.282[11], pp. 1-3, 16.

the stirrings of a disagreement around the issue of Parliament’s claim to authority over matters to do with conscience, and the ways in which anxiety around these issues began to show in the polemic. But in January 1645 it became clearer in the polemic that Parliamentary absolutism and personal conscience were seen as incompatible. This was a new explicit awareness of the fundamental contradiction that had lurked, unacknowledged, in foregoing discussions.

Robinson challenged Prynne: ‘Whether have not Parliaments and Synods of England in times past established Popery? And whether they not possibly do so again hereafter?’ Unless the people were able to ‘reserve in our own hands a Prerogative of yielding, or denying obedience thereunto’, the Parliament would be forcing its people to sin – surely a power that no institution could rightfully hold. Thus, the Independents asked for the power to ‘disobey your Councells, Synods, Parliaments when they actually erre, and are apparently repugnant to Scripture’. A similar point was made by the anonymous author of An Antidote Against Foure Dangerous Quaeries, who stated that the proof that Parliament should not have authority over conscience was that popery had previously been advocated by the body. Overton had claimed that ‘Persecution for Consciences is Inconsistent with the Soveraignty of Kingdomes, for it divideth their Powers one against another’ – it took power from Parliament and put it in the hands of a ‘Pontificall Clergie’. Finally, Lilburne argued that the question was not why ‘Kings, Councels, Synods and States have for so many hundred years medled with matters of Religion’, or why they got it wrong, but rather asked ‘by what Right, or by what Authority out of the word of God they have done so?’ This new directness over the matter of conscience can be linked to Prynne’s capitulation in A Full Reply where he had admitted that


790 An antidote against foure dangerous quaeries, pretended to be propounded to the reverend Assemble of Divines, touching suspension from the Sacrament, (Printed for Nathaniell Webb, [02 September] 1645) E.265[3], p. 3.

791 Richard Overton, The araignement of Mr. Persecution: presented to the consideration of the House of Commons, and to all the common people of England wherein he is indicted, araithed, convicted, and condemned of enmity against God, and all goodnesse, of treasons, rebellion, bloodshed, &c. and sent to the place of execution (Printed by Martin Claw Clergie [Richard Overton], [08 April] 1645) E.276[23], p. 4.

792 Lilburne, A copie of a letter, p. 4.
Parliament must have erred rather than relinquishing Parliament’s control of conscience.  

This newly explicit aversion to an arbitrary power might have manifested itself in attempts to redefine the way that parliaments were thought of. For example, the author of A Character of an Antimalignant, or Right Parliamentier argued that he was not ‘so great a soother of the Parliament’ that he would deny that there was ‘some Judassess amongst them’ – it was inevitable as they had been ‘inforc’d to trust so many in all places of the Kingdome’. Parliament, then, contained some untrustworthy members, but could be trusted at this time because their ‘cause is undoubtedly good’. Similarly, William Ball writing in June 1646, argued that he knew ‘not any Nation, State, or Parliament that is infallible’, and although this did not mean that any action by the Parliament whatsoever could be disobeyed, it meant that any action by Parliament could theoretically be wrong.

Parliamentarians who denied a role for individual conscience in the constitution ultimately had to concede that Parliament had erred in advocating episcopacy in the past. Given that Parliament had made a mistake, it therefore followed that Parliament could harm the people, and thus they could not be absolutely representative of the people. The political debate thus forced one of three conclusions: either Parliament was not in charge of conscience, Parliament could not be supported, or the debate could not be engaged with. Many who believed in some form of toleration came to the first conclusion, and came to support Parliament on terms that parliamentarianism stated were impossible – by using conscience in the constitution. In this sense, if their arguments were radical, then this radicalism was also constitutionalist, and their arguments developed from trying to get the constitution to conform to their religious beliefs, rather than trying to overthrow it. Failing this, the second conclusion was that it was impossible to support Parliament. Taking the third alternative, Prynne stopped engaging with the debate, and denied the conclusions of these arguments. Thus the legal


795 William Ball, Constitutio liberi populi. Or, the rule of a free-born people (s.n., [18 June] 1646) E.341[1], p. 4.
framework and the constitutional debate had produced only contradictions, rather than solutions.

II. PRISON WRITING AND PARLIAMENTARY TYRANNY

That theories of parliamentarianism had begun to encounter impossible dead ends, and find the cause logically indefensible without resorting to a conscience-crushing absolutism, was also evidenced in the prison literature of the time. The published writings of imprisoned parliamentarians furnish a microcosmic example of how personal issues were now offering an insurmountable challenge to political resolution. The framework shift of the Solemn League and Covenant in 1643 had stripped authors of the ability to discuss wider constitutional issues, but legal debate could still take place within prison literature, and imprisoned authors could utilise established judicial spaces and tools of redress and petition to present their case outside of the courtroom.\(^{796}\) This interplay between the individual and community experience was crucial in assessing, challenging and refining the political theories by which the polity was understood, leading to tangible effects on the nature of the political debate, and criticisms of Parliament’s constitutional understandings.

Imprisoned writers applied Parliament’s and parliamentarians’ cases in reductio, and could demonstrate the supposed fallacies which had led to the writer’s own imprisonment. Ian Gentles has emphasised a huge expansion in the prison population of London, and de Groot has argued that these prisons – especially the Fleet and Newgate – allowed a burgeoning and complex intellectual atmosphere with which prisoners could interact and exploit in their writings.\(^{797}\) Rather than focus on a wider community issue, prison literature focused on the individual’s struggle. For example, the anonymous authors of An Appeale to Heaven in September 1644 complained that their imprisonment was ‘quite contrary to the Contents of Magna Carta, and the Petition of Right’, and that Magna Carta represented a ‘perpetuall Law’ that was obtained by the ‘bloud of many thousands of our ancestors’.\(^{798}\) The work selectively quoted from Magna Carta that ‘no freeborne Subject shall be detained in prison for Debt’, and emphasised that any attempts

\(^{796}\) On this, see Jerome de Groot, ‘Prison Writing, Writing Prison During the 1640s and 1650s’, Huntington Library Quarterly, 72 (2009).


\(^{798}\) An appeale to heaven, pp. 2–4.
to retract anything whatsoever from Magna Carta was 'voyd by the Statute of the 42 Ed. 3. chap. 1.' 799

The struggles detailed in prison literature took the arguments that were usually reserved for wider community issues, and applied them to individual cases. For example, James Freize, writing in November 1645, argued that his and his companion’s imprisonment was 'contrary to the law of God, the lawes of all other nations, and (as is conceived) against the contents of Magna Charta’. 800 By invoking communal solutions, the individual experience could be compared and discrepancies could be pointed out. The power of statutes or concepts was that they could be offered as steadfast rules, but in practice the polemic had revealed that their use was not quite so simple and universal as sometimes pretended. 801

Perhaps the most famous examples of this are the writings of Lilburne, a prolific prisoner of whatever government he found himself subject to, who detailed his own suffering in self-promotional pamphlets. His struggle was presented as one of martyrdom – one man suffering thanks to successive arbitrary powers who were out to get him. Key to the impact of his work and those that discussed his situation, however, was relating his personal suffering with the communal experience. Works such as England’s Miserie, and Remedie emphasised the particulars of Lilburne’s case, and argued that although some could argue that ‘the Great Charter is but suspended as to [the case of] Lilburne, but not abrogated; and that the duty of the Parliament is to provide for generalities, but it is not at leysure to attend particular grievances; these answeres satisfie none but Ideots, or

799 Ibid., p. 4. The complainants continued with reasons, admittedly less rhetorically striking but still described as 'Infallible', including the abuses of the jailors, the unfairness of the fees being levied by the jailors themselves and the restriction of justice. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

800 James Freize, A declaration and appeale to all the freeborne people of this kingdome in generall and to all the truly noble, pyous and well affected patriots and people of God, within the cities of London and Westminster in particular, humbly craving their assistance and furtherance of this just request unto the high court of Parliament (s.n., [November] 1645) 669.f.10[40].

801 See, for example, John Lilburne, England’s birth-right justified against all arbitrary usurpation, whether regall or parliamentary, or under what vizor soever. With divers queries, observations and grievances of the people, declaring this Parliaments present proceedings to be directly contrary to those fundamentall principles, whereby their actions at first were justifiable against the King, in their present illegall dealings with those that have been their best friends, advancers and preservers (s.n., [10 October] 1645) E.304[17].
those that suck profit under their command’. To this author, to deny Magna Carta to Lilburne was to deny it to everyone, and the author spends the remainder of the pamphlet describing the abuses and loss of liberties that the people have suffered. In another work coming to Lilburne’s defence, Walwyn wrote that ‘this worthy gentle mans case is mine, and every mans’, and that Lilburne ‘hath singly adventured himselfe a Champion for his abused country men’. 803

This process – individual suffering being contrasted with the communal experience – was not limited just to Lilburne. A similar process happened in the case of William Larner, printer of some of Lilburne’s works. Following his arrest in March 1646, a number of pamphlets were produced that emphasised that ‘no breach of any law [was] ever proved against him’, and that ‘hee desired the Liberty of a Free-man, not to answer to Interrogatories, whereby to insnare himself or others’. 804 On the same day as the collection of petitions in defence of Larner was dated by Thomason, another anonymous author produced Every Mans Case, a broadsheet that emphasised the injustice that Larner had faced, and praised his composure. Towards the end of the work, the author argues:

there is the same equity for their trying and Imprisoning mee, and so of every man, as for their trying and imprisoning you ; So that your case in this particular, Is every mans Case, though generally, men are so sottish, as to be sensible of the lash, then, only when it falls upon their own backs, not considering, That they may suffer to morrow that misery and calamity, which to day their Brother groanes under. 805

Freize, campaigning against imprisonment for debt, penned in June 1646 a similarly named work called Every Mans Right, in which he argued that ‘the miseries happening to


804 A true relation of all the remarkable passages, and illegall proceedings of some sathanicall or Doeg-like accusers of their brethren, against William Larner, a free-man of England, and one of the merchant-tailers company of London, for selling eight printed sheets of paper (all of one matter,) intituled, Londons last warning; as also against John Larner, and Jane Hales his servants (s.n., [02 May] 1646) E.335[7], pp. 4. 10; Philip Baker, ‘Larner, William (d. 1672?)’ in ODNB.

805 Every mans case or, A brotherly support to Mr. Larner, prisoner in the new prison in Mayden-lane (s.n., [02 May] 1646) 669.f.10[52].
one man, at one time, may rebound to another man the next.\textsuperscript{806} Printed personal experience, motivated by exceptional cases outside the norm of everyday experience, could be extrapolated to represent communal suffering. Indeed, the mechanisms of these arguments are reminiscent of Charles’s early declarations in 1642, wherein he argued that his own experience under the hands of Parliament was only the beginning, and his subjects could expect to suffer next.\textsuperscript{807} Using the same tactics as Charles had employed at the beginning of the conflict, prison literature acted as a prism through which the injustice and arbitrary nature of the Parliament could be seen, and the reader was encouraged to apply the lessons of the suffering detailed to their own understanding of the intentions of Parliament.

The legal space in which debate could take place had been significantly reduced from the summer of 1643. Because of this, prison literature became an important space in which interaction with law and the constitution could take place. This had several effects on the nature of the political debate. Prison literature was almost invariably written by those with a grievance against the imprisoner and therefore would inevitably be concerned with exceptional cases, which would challenge the commitment of institutions to the law and liberty. The extrapolation from the personal to the communal meant that the claims and declarations of parliamentarians and royalists – who were still broadly professing to want the same end – could be tested in specific cases and experiences. These two factors had a destabilising effect on both the ability to define and protect Parliament’s statements of intent, but also on the way that the constitution was understood. In most parliamentarian theory, authority had come from the extrapolation of the singular natural right of self-protection to the larger representative body. Under this model, it was somewhat inevitable that eventually the individual and the representative would come to blows, and readers would have to decide whether self-protection had been wholly abandoned or just partly, and whether individuals should be made to suffer in order for a common good.

\textsuperscript{806} Freize, *A declaration and appeale*, pp. 8-9.

The fact that prison polemic and constitution could not be reconciled meant that readers needed to make practical concessions. To believe that Parliament could do wrong was to reintroduce the question of whether and how they might be ignored on matters of conscience. The possibility of imperfect and erring political institutions brought with it unanswered questions, especially when considered alongside the natural law. Power was given solely for the benefit of the people, and as they were empowered by their natural laws to protect themselves, authors and readers might have concluded that they must have a way to challenge Parliament if it acted in a tyrannical fashion. In a similar way, statements of Parliament's intent were increasingly challenged by individuals who provided case studies within which general principles could be tested.

Combined with the uneasy position put forth in the Solemn League and Covenant – that the Parliament was acting according to the law even when it was demonstrably not, and no legal investigation could take place on the part of the reader – those who wrote found themselves in need of arguments to justify why they could disagree with the Parliament and hold them to account. This they could find in arguments over the mixed constitution in 1642–3, and the invocation of the implied reader.

III. THE IDEALISED AND INADEQUATE LAW

After several years of pamphleteers on both sides invoking and construing legal details to support their cause, towards the war’s end discussions of the law tended to either elevate it to a utopian ideal, or complain of its unfair judgements (as, for example, in the prison literature). This apparent contradiction was actually perfectly coherent, but it resulted in the determined maintenance of faith in the possibility of a legal solution and also in the impossibility of the same. On the one hand, there was a renewed conviction that the perfect law – whether religious or secular – could be found, and that it would be able to solve the conflict. By discovering the perfect law, and ensuring that it was implemented correctly, the conflict would be resolved and peace restored. On the other hand, at the same time there was renewed dissatisfaction with the understanding in practice of the laws when they were applied to specific situations. It was believed that the failures of the law so far had been down to either misunderstanding or implementation, meaning that faith in the law as a whole remained while simultaneously examples could be pointed to that demonstrated its misapplication. Both these factors meant that the law was still being looked to as a non-subjective ideal, and faith was still put in its potential to solve the conflict.
There was still a belief that truth could be found in the laws and word of God. Lilburne, in early 1645, argued that there were ‘perfect and complete Lawes, which are unalterable and unchangeable’ that could be found in the ‘last Will and Testament’ of Jesus Christ.\footnote{Lilburne, A copie of a letter, p. 3.}

Likewise, in the first few days of 1646, a group of ministers pushing for Presbyterianism proclaimed: ‘Have we not a touchstone of truth, the good word of God?’\footnote{A letter of the ministers of the city of London, p. 1.} Both pamphlets, however, failed to give their own interpretation of what God’s law said, and this was picked up by pamphlet replies, often to score the political point. Lilburne was challenged by the author of A Review of a Certain Pamphlet; ‘when you tell us of compleat and perfect Lawes: Where are they to be found’, and in a strikingly similar objection, Walwyn attacked the Presbyterian ministers by agreeing that there is truth in the word of God, but asking, ‘But now who shall be the examiners, must needs be the question’.\footnote{A review of a certain pamphlet, p. 3; William Walwyn, Tolleration iustified, and persecution condemni’d. In an answer or examination, of the London-ministers letter whereof, many of them are of the synod, and yet framed this letter at Sion-Colledge; to be sent among others, to themselves at the Assembly: in behalf of reformation and church-government, 2 Corinth. II. vers. 14. 15. And no marvail, for Sathan himself is transormed into an angell of light (s.n., [29 January] 1646) E.319[15], p. 8.}

That the laws existed but were seemingly inaccessible created questions from pamphleteers about where, exactly, these perfect laws could be found. Francis Cornwell, a parliamentarian pamphleteer, concluded that these laws could not be taken from the Bible, and in his short publishing career in the 1640s he used a published copy of Foxe’s ‘Book of Martyrs’, to show that there could not be a straightforward relationship between scripture and law. In King Jesus, Cornwell argued that there needed to be a working relationship between the two, rather than the ‘confound[ing] together’ of law and gospel which are ‘in nature so divers and contrary one from another’. By teaching the people that ‘whatsoever the Law saith, the Gospel confirmeth, and whatsoever the Gospel saith, the same is agreeable to Law’, papists failed to distinguish between the two, and implied that both are eternal and perfect which could not possibly be true.\footnote{Francis Cornwell, King Jesvs is the beleevers prince, priest, and law-giver, in things appertaining to the conscience, Isa. 55.4. Heb. 7.17. Jam. 4. 12. Or, The loyall spouse of Christ hath no head, nor husband, but royall King Jesvs (Printed by J. Dawson, [02 April] 1645) E.1179[2], p. 1.} For Cornwell, while the gospel remained the same, the laws must constantly change to reflect new understandings and practices.
For certain issues, it did prove possible to translate a ‘perfect and complete lawe’ from the Bible into an applicable legal statute, but again this could lead to polemical problems when put into practice. In theatrical speeches given at Common Hall, it was emphasised that Charles planned to reduce the penal laws on Catholics, which was seen as demonstrating his infatuation with papists. In response, the royalist author of A Letter reassured its readers that ‘it was One thing to sinne in it selfe, Another to consider [it’s] punishment’. If the King was to ‘passe a Law Popery were no sinne … I might then thinke him sinfull’, but if he is just changing the judicial punishment of the sin, then he is conforming to the precedents of Christian rule. Solomon, the work emphasises, changed God’s ‘Judiciall Law’ by not making a thief pay seven-fold, but rather punishing him ‘either with a wheele or the gallowes’, and Justinian lessened the punishment of adultery, which ‘in the Mosaick Law was punish’t by death’. The King was not trying to make being a papist less of a sin, but rather making the secular punishments less primitive. Such translations of the legal from the scriptural would have maintained the belief that the perfect law to resolve the conflict would be found from God’s word.

Therefore there could be belief in the law as a high concept, but not in the way that it had been executed so far. As such, the legal injustices that were observable were a symptom of an imperfect law, rather than an indication that legal perfection was impossible – the implementation was to blame, not belief in the law itself – an equivocation which enabled the persistence of hope for a perfect reconciliatory legal solution. For example, Walwyn attacked Prynne for concerning himself ‘in matters of Religion’, when really ‘were he truly conscientious for the good of the whole Nation, as he pretendeth, he would have laid open to the Parliament, how improper it is that our Laws should be written in unknowne language, that a plaine man cannot understand so much as a Writ without the helpe of Councell’. The confusing terminology

812 For the printed versions, see John Lisle et al., Three speeches spoken at a common-hall, Thursday the 3. of Iuly, 1645 (Printed for Peter Cole, [14 July] 1645) E.292[29]; For the royalist replies, see A letter, in which the arguments of the Annotator; Some Observations Upon Occasion of the Publishing Their Majesties Letters, (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [08 August] 1645) E.296[2].

813 A letter, in which the arguments of the Annotator, pp. 8-9.

814 Ibid.

surrounding the law led to nothing but ‘vexation of the people, and enriching of Lawyers’.\(^{86}\) It was suggested that if the law was clearer, and lawyers refrained from complicating the law in order to turn a profit, a solution might be found. The anonymous author of *Peace Broken* had argued that ‘It is not ... the nature of positive Lawes to bind where they are not known or publisht’. While the pamphleteer admitted that even though it was Adam who had eaten the apple the sin resonated down the human line, this was the exception, not the rule – it was ‘by a peculiar will’ that God decided ‘to wrap up all men in one Adam’.\(^ {87}\) In normal practice, ‘if Cain had eaten the forbidden fruit, *Enoch* his son had not therefore been borne a sinner’.\(^ {88}\) Later, Lilburne used Husbands’ *Exact Collection* which included the 1642 work *A Question Answered* to state that while ‘all rationall men’ agreed ‘that the *Parliament* hath a power to annul a Law, and to make a new Law, and to declare a Law, but known Laws in force and unrepealed by them, are a rule as long as they so remain’. Therefore, ‘no free man of *England* is to take notice (or can he) of what they intend till they declare it ... For where there is no Law declared, there can be no transgression’.\(^ {89}\) Laws, according to Lilburne and others, needed to be known by the population in order to bind the population.

The same logic could be applied to the issue of parliamentary privilege, and it was often presented as part of the same problem. From August 1645, a key component of Lilburne’s letters was that he had no idea why he was being imprisoned. ‘I have by Authority of the *House of Commons, been three times imprisoned*,’ Lilburne wrote, ‘before ever I knew mine accuser, or mine accusation’, and this, along with the refusal to let him defend himself, ‘is contrary to Magna Carta’.\(^ {90}\) The author of *England’s Miserie* wrote that it was better to

\(^{86}\) Walwyn, *A helpe to the right understanding*, pp. 1-3.

\(^{87}\) *Peace broken, or, Blessings become snares and cursings* (s.n., [05 February] 1645) E.268[3], pp. 5-6.

\(^{88}\) *Ibid*.

\(^{89}\) *Ibid*.


\(^{90a}\) Lilburne, *A copie of a letter*, p. 3; Of course Walwyn later chastises Lilburne for his use of Magna Carta in William Walwyn, *Englands lamentable slaverie, proceeding from the arbitrarie will, severitie, and injustnes of kings, negligence, corruption, and unfaithfulness of parliaments, coveteousnesse, ambition. and variablenesse of priests, and simplicitie, carelesnesse, and cowardliness of people. Which slaverie, with the remedie may be easily observed. By the scope of a modest & smooth letter, written by a true lover of his countrey and a faithfull friend to that worthy*
live under a rigorous and unjust Law, then an Arbitrary government though just, because under the former ‘he is at certainty’, whereas the latter ‘leaves him uncertaine and so in danger’. Lilburne later argued at much greater length in his England’s Birth-Right that ‘it is very requisite, that the Parliament would declare their Privilegeds to the whole Commons of England, that so no man may through ignorance (by the Parliaments default) run causeless into the hazard of the losse of their lives, liberties, or estates’. He continued that ‘unknown Privilegeds are as dangerous, as unlimited Prerogatives, being both of them secret snares, especially for the best people’. While the polemical context of these works – imprisonment, loss of liberty and political Independent and Presbyterian squabbles – is important, they demonstrate an underlying belief that it was possible for these laws to be declared and clear. Crucially for Lilburne, Walwyn and the anonymous author of England’s Miserie, Parliament seem to have been refusing to declare what their privileges were and what the laws were, rather than being simply unable to do so.

The similarities of tone, if not terminology, with royalist propaganda are striking. The language of royalism in 1642 had provided the certainty and fixity that some were calling for in 1645–46. For example, in March 1645 the Clubmen had appealed to the ‘knowne Laws of the Kingdome’ as the antithesis of arbitrary government and innovation, and in September Clubmen in Sussex had argued that they had suffered an arbitrary power ‘contrary to all our ancient known laws, or ordinances of Parliament’. Charles in August 1645 responded to the ‘pretended’ Propositions for Peace in the Clubmen’s petition, and after his familiar protestations for ‘true Reformed Protestant Religion, the just and inseperable right of the Crowne, the just power and priviledges of Parliament, and the lawfull rights and liberties of the Subject’, he argued that his subjects could identify who truly fought for their interests by ‘making the knowne Lawes of the Land (which cannot deceive) the measure of each particular’. For both, the ‘knowne Lawes’


821 England’s miserie, p. 3.

822 Lilburne, England’s birth-right justified, p. 3.

823 Observations concerning the late treaty, p. 2; Ashton, ‘From Cavalier to Roundhead Tyranny’, pp. 200–1.

824 Charles I, The Kings answer to the propositions for peace, as was pretended in the Club-mens petition to his Majestie. With the copie of a letter from Sir Lewis Dives, and another from Colonell 228
could distinguish between innovation and truth, and could provide the stability in the law that was lacking.

Similarly, arguing against the political Independent desire for a forced settlement, another author argued that if ‘by new and unknown Lawes they must maintaine an unknowne, and unheard of Government, the want of the Scepter must be supplied by the Sword, and that which was the Mother of so great a change and innovation of Church and State, must of necessity be the Nurse to violence and Warre, so this will be an alteration, not an end of the Warre’. Writing as Miles Corbet, Taylor argued that the common law had been ‘transform’d and metamorphs’d ... into the Lands common calamity’, and rather than benefitting ‘all men in generall, we have perverted those lawes to the private profit of our selves and some other persons’. Continuing, he argued that by using the ‘Vox Populi’, the Parliament had ‘unlawfully erected martiall law, club-law, Staffords law, and such lawlesse lawes as make most for Treason, Rebellion, Murder, Sacrilege, Ruine, and plunder’. By appealing to the idealised past, some royalists were able to promise the clear and untainted system of law that much of the pamphlet debate aspired towards.

Both parliamentarians and royalists suggested that there were immaculate and hitherto undefined laws, which would distinguish between innovation and truth, and provide the stability that the law currently lacked. These faultless laws were never more than a mirage, but the belief that a perfect set of laws existed meant that authors kept on trying to find them, and were therefore unwilling to compromise when the laws were proven to be imperfect. The high reverence in which the law was held meant that there was a continued conviction that the law could bring order to the political dispute, but if the legal concepts failed to work in all circumstances, they were deemed unsuitable in a particular rather than a general sense, and in need of specific refinement or correction. Because of the belief in the existence of a perfect set of laws, any settlement that was

---


No peace ‘till the King prosper (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [25 August] 1645) E.298[7], p. 2.

John Taylor, A most learned and eloquent speech, spoken (or delivered in the Honourable House of Commons at Westminster,) by the most learned lawyer Miles Corbet Esquire (s.n., [25 August] 1645) E.298[3], p. 4. John Taylor is listed as having ‘revised’ the work on the title page.
based on legal concepts or the law would inevitably be found wanting when it was not sufficient to codify the complex, troubled times.

In order to construct a peace on the foundation of the law, in other words, there would have needed to have been a fundamental shift in the understanding of the law – a regression from the open debate that so far the 1640s had enjoyed, back towards the *arcana imperii* and artificial (and private) legal reasoning – for the only proven way that an appearance of smooth perfection could be obtained was through reticence and impenetrability. The open debate and public airing of legal principles in the polemic had backed the legal system into a corner, where the only two options were to keep making corrections towards the pipe dream of a perfect legal solution, or to draw the shutters and exclude the public from the legal processes they had became accustomed to observing and arbitrating. Neither of these was a viable solution, and so legal settlement remained impossible.

**IV. THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT**

The legal framework was thus incapacitated by the triple issues of radicalisation, constitutional contradiction and restrictive idealism – and in this it had a counterpart in the religious framework that had been established by the Solemn League and Covenant, which was similarly beset with issues of internal contradiction. The Covenant had bound those who had taken it into an ill-defined commitment to unclear religious ends, and so even when isolated from the wider legal-constitutional problems, the religious framework had become contested and incoherent. Inside the religious framework, the Solemn League and Covenant underwent two crucial changes before the end of the war. Firstly, the Covenant’s meaning had shifted from being potentially determined by the Westminster Assembly and (to a certain degree) the reader, towards being determined by Parliament alone. This desacralisation meant that Parliament could claim to control the consciences of those who had sworn to the Covenant, and that their settlement was binding for those who had taken the Covenant. Secondly, the cause of the Parliament and the cause of the Covenant had become synonymous, fragmenting further the parliamentarian coalition. As details of the potential church settlement came to light, and as Charles continued to refuse to consider taking the Covenant, to avoid forswearing the community Parliament needed to balance the consciences of those who had sworn to the Covenant on one hand, and a King who was refusing to abandon episcopacy on the other. These factors combined with partisan presses and publishers helping to force a
wide-ranging debate about church settlement into the public conversation, which made the conversations surrounding the prospect of peace and rebuilding the church ever more frantic. The religious framework that had been established by the Solemn League and Covenant had thus become both a precursor to the peace, and a major hurdle to settlement.

The Solemn League and Covenant was buckling under the issue of church settlement and, as the conflict came to a close, pressure mounted on Parliament to describe the form that they would settle on. The Covenant’s vague promise to examine the best reformed churches meant that diametrically opposed readings could be made. Vallance has argued that the heresiographer Thomas Edwards’s ‘reading of the Covenant as a document committing England to a Presbyterian church was as much a careful literary construct as his depiction of the radical sects’. 827 This meant that, for some, Parliament needed to demonstrate new vigour in pursuit of these (supposed) ends. For example, in August 1645 Prynne argued that the Solemn League and Covenant meant that the ‘Seditious Sectaries’ and those that ignored the Parliament’s religious ordinances were libelling the Parliament, and therefore must be brought to heel. To fail to do so would, according to Prynne, shame all those who had sworn to the Covenant, and ‘so render your selves, with your Proceedings, contemptible to all the world : which God forbid’. 828 A contradictory, but similarly reasonable interpretation might make liberal use of the efforts of Vane to include the provision that the reformation that the Covenant demanded would be according to the ‘Word of God’, not necessarily closer towards the Scots’ Presbyterianism system. 829 For example, Saltmarsh argued in April 1646 that the Covenant did not call for uniformity of belief amongst the kingdoms, but for ‘religious unity’, with each nation ‘free to reform itself according to the word of God’. 830 A Moderate Reply to the Cittie Remonstrance similarly argued that the Covenant does ‘not tie us to a Presbyteriall government and that ‘here is no positive determination of any

828 Prynne, A fresh discovery, sig. A2v-A3r.
829 See for example Woolrych, Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660, p. 271.
thing; but an engagement into an inquisition after the best.\textsuperscript{831} Therefore the Covenant could, in theory, divinely prescribe a wide number of church settlements that could be opposed to each other, the acceptance of which would threaten to make the oath-taker forsworn.

Those who denied that the Covenant could bind consciences – perhaps because of their support of Independency, for example – could question whether the Covenant was lawful at all. For example, Walwyn had dedicated his *Word More* to arguing that the Covenant was against the ‘whole scope of the New Testament’, while Overton in his *Arraignment of Mr. Persecution* corroborated that covenants were only used with ‘Old Man, before the coming of Christ’, and therefore was out of line with Protestantism.\textsuperscript{832} Overton went further and saw the Covenant as part of a much wider conspiracy. In his work *The Arraignment of Mr. Persecution*, ‘Justice Reason’ revealed that there had been a design to ‘settle and establish bloody *Persecution* by *Covenant* over the *Consciences* of honest and faithfull men unto the State, under the spacious and godly pretence of *Reformation*’.\textsuperscript{833} ‘Sir Symon Synod’ had arrogated ‘an *infallability*, and a *supremacy* over Us, and the people, condemning *PERSECUTION*, when they were persecuted, but commending and approving it, if they may persecute.’ ‘The Judge’ continues and states that ‘We blesse God, that hath put it into the hearts of those honest godly people, (though publikely despised and hated) those faithfull friends and lovers of *Parliament* and *Kingdome*, whome you nicke-name *Anabaptists, Brownists, Independents*, &c. to discover and detect unto us the *Jesuisticall* and *Trayterous Designes of the Synod*, for if they had not discovered them, ‘We should have been kept ignorant through their zealous pretences’.\textsuperscript{834} For Overton, then, Symon Synod and the Solemn League and Covenant had claimed infallibility in order to promulgate popish designs which had been dressed

\textsuperscript{831} John Price, *A moderate reply to the citie-remonstrance; presented to the High Court of Parliament the 26 of May, 1646. Containing several reasons why many well affected citizens cannot assent thereunto* (Printed for Matthew Simmons and Henry Overton, [12 June] 1646) E.340[20], sig. A3r-A3v. The same work argued that it was ‘as cleare as the Sunne’ that the Covenant had been made to make ‘more plaine discovery of the Parliaments enemies, and not for a snare to the Parliaments friends’, sig. A3v.


\textsuperscript{833} Overton, *The araignement of Mr. Persecution*, pp. 34-5.

\textsuperscript{834} *Ibid.*, pp. 36-8.
up as Presbyterianism – to deny freedom of conscience, and to tie the people by blind faith to that which they did not understand. While Overton and Walwyn were extreme examples, when the meaning of the Covenant became incompatible with religious preferences logic dictated that it was unlawful. Because there was next-to-no provision for conditional obedience to the Covenant, denying the Covenant even partially could lead to radical consequences.

On 14 March 1646, Parliament made clear that it looked to establish a Presbyterian church under Parliamentary control. While the Westminster Assembly may have preferred orthodox Presbyterianism, the Parliament had overturned this as, according to Baillie, ‘most of the House of Commons [were] downright Erastians’. When the Assembly appealed in April 1646, it was told that its objection was against parliamentary privilege. Parliament’s flexing of Erastian muscles also manifested itself in the polemic, and transformed the way that the Covenant was to be understood. Rather than individuals bringing their own meanings to the document, its meaning was to be confirmed by Parliament, and this was repeated in polemic. For example, in June 1646 the anonymous author of *The Interest of England Maintained* argued that ‘it ever was, and necessarily must be the Priviledge and Prerogative of all States, to be the Interpreters, as of their owne Lawes and Statutes, so much more of their owne Protestations and Covenants’. If people could ‘DISPUTE’ rather than ‘receive the CONSTRUCTION and INTERPRETATION [that] the Parliament shall give thereof’, it threatened to ‘erect a Power within the State, of greater Authority then the Parliament’. The Protestations and Covenants, then, were created by Parliament, not
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838 *The interest of England maintained: the honour of the Parliament vindicated; the malignants plott upon the Presbyters, to make them doe their worke discovered. The designe to destroy common freedome, and all just government, is under the specious pretence of rooting out sectaries, and hereticks, evidenced: in certaine observations upon a dangerous remonstrance lately presented by the Lord Major, and Common Counsell of London, to the Honourable, the Commons of England, in Parliament assembled* (s.n., FD: 08 June 1646) E.340[5], pp. 11-3.
for Parliament by God. Because Parliament had to be supreme, the logic went, only Parliament could judge what the Covenant meant. Similarly, *A Moderate Reply to the Citie Remonstrance* made clear that it was Parliament who had made the Covenant, rather than it having been written by God, and therefore their sole ability to judge it was justified by Parliament’s supremacy. ‘Is it not most absurd’, the work argued, ‘that they shall compose and enjoyn the Covenant, and others shall put their sense upon it’.\footnote{Price, *A moderate reply to the citie-remonstrance*, sig. A3r-A3v.}

Parliament, not the divines gathered in the Assembly, and much less the people, would be the ones to judge what the Covenant bound the subscribers to. In this way, the Covenant as well as the church came to be Erastian.

While the Covenant came to be under the power of Parliament, this did not diminish the role that it played in the definition of the parliamentarian cause. For example, in April 1646, the Houses of Parliament produced *A Declaration to the Commons of England*, in which they declared that some ‘false constructions’ had been put upon them by ‘spirits stirring’ that they were swerving from their first ‘Aims and Principles in the undertaking of this War, and to recede from the solemn League and Covenant’.\footnote{A declaration of the Commons of England assembled in Parliament, of their true intentions concerning the ancient and fundamental government of the kingdom, the government of the church, the present peace; securing the people against all arbitrary government, and maintaining a right understanding between the two kingdoms of England and Scotland, according to the covenant and treaties (Printed for Edward Husband, FD: 18 April 1646) E.333[19], pp. 3-4.}

The Solemn League and Covenant remained central to the negotiations with the King, and in speeches following the Uxbridge negotiations in early 1645, Lord Lowden argued that the Solemn League and Covenant would ensure ‘uniformity of Gods Worship, and Church Government be established in all his Majesties Dominions’, but that his councillors ‘would not so much as advise his Majesty to looke upon it’.\footnote{Lisle et al., *Three Speeches*, p. 3.}

In July 1646 the Newcastle Propositions included several provisions that the King and his followers should take the Covenant, and in letters following the discussions the Duke of Newcastle emphasised that in order for the King to even be able to ‘adhere to the Parliament and settle peace’ he would have to take the Covenant, but ‘He could not’.\footnote{The propositions of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament. For a safe and well grounded peace (Printed for Iohn Wright, FD: 17 July 1646) E.344[25], pp. 2-3, 23; A letter from 234
crucial to settle peace because of the fact that many of Charles’s subjects had taken it, and for Charles to not take it would estrange him from both them and his Parliament. When Charles refused to take the Covenant, he had called Parliament’s bluff.

The strength of the religious framework had been that the public could bring their own meaning to the Solemn League and Covenant, and therefore feel themselves represented and willingly subscribe to the parliamentary cause. However as Parliament brought the Covenant fully under their control in 1646, and clarified the exact terms of the church settlement which they intended, this openness to interpretation was stripped away. Those who had taken the Solemn League and Covenant had subscribed their consciences to a church settlement which was now revealed to be increasingly at odds with the advice of the Westminster Assembly. Those subscribers who found an Erastian form of settlement distasteful were forced either to continue following their own understanding of the Covenant in defiance of Parliament, or to follow the Westminster Assembly’s recommendation against Parliament, or to change their own beliefs to match Parliament’s.

Thus the Covenant, instead of binding the nation together behind Parliament, eventually came to crystallise the differences between the various religious tendencies of the kingdom – dividing them further – and to thin the numbers of those who could subscribe wholeheartedly to the parliamentary cause.

II EPISCOPACY

The legal and the religious frameworks both had internal contradictions and impediments which would have made attempts to reach a peace settlement under either framework difficult. Each had increased the deference that was required to Parliament by the reader, while at the same time the religious and political conversation had become even more fractured. However, as well as sticking points within each framework, the two frameworks had grown to be increasingly incompatible with each other. For the parliamentary case to succeed, both frameworks had to be reconciled for a peace settlement, but this required the correlation of legal, religious and political obligations and languages that were increasingly fragmented and contradictory. Indicative of these

Newcastle, shewing that the Generall Assembly of the Church of Scotland have sent divers ministers to the King, to preach to him, and advise him to take the covenant, which if he shall refuse, to let him know what the church censure is (Printed for Thomas Hewer, [08 July] 1646) E.344[2], pp. 1-2.
problems, and how the two frameworks and the various languages bled into each other, was the struggle over episcopacy towards the end of the conflict.

For many, it was vital that episcopacy was abolished in the peace settlement, because Parliament had declared it against the law, and the Solemn League and Covenant had confirmed that the Church of England needed further reformation. According to the royalist pamphleteer John Gauden in his *Certaine Scruples and Doubts of Conscience* in January 1645, the problem was as follows. While Gauden conceded that the Parliament could decide what the law said, and even go against the explicit church government of episcopacy, it could only do so in exceptional times. When the war ended and the King returned to his Parliament, as would surely happen, the temporary ordinance would be void and the law would revert back to the original legislation (even though this had been deemed unlawful in the interim), until such a point when Charles assented to a bill from the Parliament. This, Gauden argued, went against the Covenant, which he interpreted to be a commitment to oppose episcopacy indefinitely.⁸⁴³ In other words, the reader needed to obey the ordinance, and swear against episcopacy, but equally when the King stopped being ‘absent’ or was in a position where he could sign the bill, the law itself would be superfluous because there had already been a vow to abolish it. Thus, for Gauden, the indefinite Covenant went against the finite Ordinance.

The need to abolish episcopacy also created complex problems for Charles that parliamentarian writers were forced to consider. In May 1645, Constantine described the King’s Coronation Oath, in which the King swore ‘to maintaine the Bishops, and Churches committed to their charge in all Canonical Priviledges’, and ‘at the same time swore to maintaine the Lawes established’.⁸⁴⁴ Charles, and his supporters in the press, had argued that it was impossible for the King to abolish episcopacy, because to do so would be to break his Oath, which would be against both the laws of God and Nature. However, Constantine argued that when a human law (as he understood episcopacy to
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be) was repealed, ‘both his Majesty and his Subjects are disoblige[d] from further observation’, and that ‘Oaths bind then to obey Lawes no longer then they are Lawes’. Ibid. Similarly, John Geree in June 1646 argued that when the Oath to protect the privileges of the clergy was originally made, there was a distinction between the clergy and the laity. Now, however, the ‘Laity and Clergie are now one body Politick, and under the same power and Rule’, and because of this the Oath had ceased to have an effect – they are ‘Both subject to regular alteration’. In addition, Geree had previously argued that because the laws change throughout the King’s reign, the King’s Oath to protect these laws must also change. Because the understanding of the law had changed, the King should be able to sign a bill abolishing episcopacy, and therefore divest himself of the obligation to preserve it.

These arguments, however, relied on the premise that the law had changed, and this remained a contested subject. Certainly, Parliament had used its role as the supreme judicature to declare that the understanding of the law had changed, and thus the church government according to law must change. However, episcopacy was still the church government in law; while ordinances had abolished bishops in the House of Lords, the ordinances remained only acts of expediency until the King was present again. Even though the Houses of Parliament with the assistance of the Westminster Assembly had confirmed that episcopacy was indeed repugnant to scripture, and had therefore declared it unlawful, the act itself still existed, and could only be abolished with the cooperation with the King. In other words, Parliament needed the King to act first, and then he could be disoblige[d] from his Oath later.

The abolition of episcopacy was, as Geree argues, crucial for settlement – there was ‘no hope of the Kings or the Kingdomes safety without a union with Scotland; and that such a union is impossible unless the King condescend in the point of Episcopacy’. Unfortunately for the Parliament, Charles seemed resolutely steadfast in his commitment to episcopacy. Northumberland, after the peace discussions at Uxbridge in
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1645, stated that they had asked for ‘the passing of the Bill abolishing Episcopacy, the Directory for the Worship of God, which are both of them past the two Houses of Parliament’, but ‘those were all denied’.\(^{849}\) Furthermore, in the publication of the *Kings Cabinet Opened* after the capture of the King’s baggage train after the Battle of Naseby in June 1645, it could be seen that Charles had time and time again asserted his support for the bishops. For example, in a letter from January 1644, Charles had begged Henrietta Maria to ‘bee confident, that I will never quit Episcopacy, nor that sword which God hath given into my hands’.\(^{850}\) A year later, he asked her to be ‘confident, that in making peace, I shall ever shew my constancy in adhering to the Bishops’.\(^{851}\) In a series of speeches held at Common Hall following the printing of the *Kings Cabinet Opened*, John Lisle had said that ‘We all did hope, that the end of a Treaty was to settle Church-government according to the Protestation, the Solemn Vow and Covenant which we have all taken; But you see by the Kings Letter, that He avows it to the Queen that He will never quit Episcopacy’.\(^{852}\)

The King’s refusal to consider abolishing episcopacy was when he demonstrated that the power of settlement was in his hands. Parliament’s ordinances were dependent on the idea that they would eventually become laws, and over the course of the conflict the battle against episcopacy had intertwined law, conscience and scripture to make the abolition of episcopacy absolutely necessary. To have taken the Covenant yet to conform to episcopacy once more was to break the oath that they had made with God, and by acting as a roadblock in Parliament’s efforts to abolish episcopacy, Charles demonstrated that he was the only solution to their entwined and contradictory polemic. This, then, was another impossible endgame for parliamentarianism, where the two frameworks had collided and depended on each other, and had created new problems.

### III Revisiting an Appeal to ‘The People’

This chapter has argued that by the end of the conflict, the legal constitution and the religious frameworks had become both internally inconsistent and contradictory when considered together. The realities of discussing the conflict in a marketplace controlled
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by partisan publishers/printers, and of a church settlement that could never please all of those who had to subscribe to it, had played a crucial role in highlighting the increasing ineffectiveness of the two frameworks as a legitimising tool for Parliament. This section will examine the attempts of some of the more radical parliamentarian pamphleteers to reconcile these problems in the frameworks by invoking the rhetorical figure of ‘the people’, and thus returning to the arguments of the mixed constitution of 1642/3, and attempts to make obedience conditional on terms that Parliament found unacceptable.

This thesis has shown that the implied reader had been appealed to as an arbiter early in the conflict in order to empower the Parliament to continue the war effort against the King while resisting full parliamentary sovereignty. It has argued that while some historians have seen this appeal to the community in the form of an implied reader as being destructive to parliamentary power, its use was more predominantly a constructive one, to empower obedience rather than threaten disobedience. These arguments were halted because of the uncovering of the Waller Plot, the Vow and Covenant, and the conflation of royalist plots and arguments of the mixed constitution. However, as Parliamentary absolutism clashed with an eventual church settlement, many of those who were the driving force in emphasising Parliament’s power found themselves increasingly unable to do so.\(^{853}\) Excluded by the current vocabulary of parliamentarianism, these authors turned to reconsideration of the arguments over the mixed constitution, and the ways in which expedient powers could be given to Parliament without the community sacrificing its ability to protect itself.

The author of *England’s Miserie, and Remedie* argued that the reader needed to understand that there were ‘two Bodies of the people’ – ‘the representative and the represented’ – and that the body representative’s power ‘is not lent them for the ruine and destruction of our Lawes and Liberties ... but for the edification and strengthening of the same in particular, as well as generall’.\(^{854}\) ‘The people’ were to play a role in ensuring that the condition of the trust under which they surrendered their power – for the good of the commonwealth – was maintained. If this was not the case, then ‘the multitude’

\(^{853}\) See, for example, William Walwyn’s journey from being involved in the production of *Remonstrans Redivivus*, which argued that there was ‘no appeale’ from the judgements of Parliament, to being open to an appeal to the people: *Remonstrans redivivus*, p. 4; Foxley, *The Levellers*, pp. 56-7; Leng, ’Citizens at the Door’, pp. 13-14.

\(^{854}\) *England’s miserie*, pp. 1-3.
could 'be easily persuaded to shake off all Bonds of obedience, so necessary to the Magistrate; and to cast the blame of their sufferings upon the Authors, either as false to their Trust, or uncapable of the great weight of Authority committed unto them'.

Power could be reassumed if the magistrate was shown to be 'false to their Trust' by being 'regardlesse of their Lawes and Liberties, or negligent of the means of their Subsistance, Livelihood, and Safety'. This, the author argued, was what Lilburne's imprisonment had proved. Although Lilburne was a 'singular' he was 'three times imprisoned without shewing cause by a Parliament professing reformation, and defence of our Lawes and Liberties'.

Similarly, Ball in October 1645 attempted to define the King's prerogative power and the power of Parliament. While some believed the King's power 'vast, and unknowne', and others believed the Parliament's power to be 'like the Great Sea ... enter[ing] into all the creeks and harbors'; he did not 'thinke the Kings Terra Australis Incognita of Prerogative power, or the Parliaments Great Sea of Judiciall power to be so unlimited or boundless', and argued that there must be something that belonged to the people. When writing on the powers of the King and Parliament, he imagined that 'the King and Parliament should make an act that they would & might dispose of all the Subjects estates in England', and asked 'what remedy might the Subject have'. While he conceded to the reader that was 'almost impossible that the King and Parliament should doe such a thing', he thought the 'kind of impossible possibility' worth answering. In such cases, the 'Counties, Cities, and Townes corporate might and ought first to petition', then 'declare and protest', and then 'they might defend themselves by Armes; for if the Representative Body of the Kingdome, may in the behalfe of the Kingdome, raise Arms for the defence of themselves and the Kingdome, may not the essential? For Ball, the point where power could be reassumed was tied explicitly to the laws of Nature, or else 'men will become, or be made slaves, and lose the right of Nature'. There were, he
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argued, certain things that are ‘indisputable, such as is the generall and fundamentall liberty and propriety of the Subject grounded upon the Law of Nature, &c. concerning their lives and estates’. 861

The similarities – both theoretical and rhetorical – to Burroughs’s postscript to the 1642 work *The glorious name of God* are striking. Burroughs had asked, ‘if Parliaments should degenerate and grow tyrannicall, what meanes of safety could there be for a State?’, in answer to which he speculated ‘whether a Law of Nature would not allow a standing up to defend our selves, yea to re-assume the power given to them, to discharge them of that power they had, and set up some other, I leave it to the light of nature to judge’. Although Burroughs argued that it was ‘hard to conceive it possible that a Parliament can so degenerate, as to make our condition more grievous by unjust acts’, there might be ‘power in a Kingdome’ to ‘returne to the law of nature from whence at first it rose’. 862

Like Burroughs, Ball believed that ‘the people’ could be relied upon to temper both extremes of the prerogatives of the King and the privileges of the Parliament. While this remained an extra-constitutional power, it was one that was conceived to be integral to the constitution as a whole – that is to say, the conception of the constitution could not be considered perfect without the ability of the people to protect themselves. In June 1646 in *Constitutio Liberi Populi*, he made this even clearer, when he argued that ‘the English Nation, or People never gave, or voluntarily assented, that their Kings, or Parliaments, or Both, should have an absolute Domineering, or Arbitrary power over them’. The ‘free Nations, or people’ can only reassume power when ‘the fundamental frame of their Efficient Power, and their Liberties, and Properties are destroyed, or violated ... if otherwise they doe it, they are meere Rebels and Anarchists’. 863 These pamphleteers, and others too, suggested once more that ‘the people’ might be legitimated to utilise their power on the occasion that a trust was betrayed.

These pamphleteers found themselves still trying to solve the same problem as had been faced in 1642–3: how to trust Parliament absolutely – although this question had now been further complicated by the events of the intervening years. The inability of parliamentarianism to create categories of obedience that were anything other than
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absolute had created layers of obligation that many found themselves unable to comply with. And so just as in 1642–3, when the polemic had appealed to the implied reader to lend their conditional support to the Parliament in order to legitimate its actions against the King without granting it absolute sovereignty, now at the end of the war the radical fringes of the polemic were once again using the idea of ‘the people’ as a check on Parliament’s potential tyranny.

As has been shown in the preceding sections of this chapter, both frameworks ultimately came under the absolute control of Parliament and had therefore reached argumentative dead ends. It was due to these impasses that those pamphleteers who still wished to resist an absolutist Parliament found themselves turning back again to the rhetoric of the mixed constitution and a safeguarding sovereign people which had been tried at the start of the war, in an attempt to find a solution to the contradictions and dissonances of the combined frameworks.

IV CONCLUSION

The Parliament’s case was reliant on absolute obedience, and as the realities of the reformed church came into focus, dissatisfaction with the direction of reformation threatened to undermine parliamentary sovereignty. Furthermore, application of communal legal solutions to individual cases had demonstrated that the law could be haphazard and context-specific, rather than timeless and perfect, even though belief in an as-yet uncodified ‘perfect law’ perpetuated the search for a legal solution. The Solemn League and Covenant had relied upon ill-defined best practice in order to appeal to as wide a population as possible, but ultimately it transpired that control of religion, and the Covenant, were to remain under the control of Parliament, even when Parliament contradicted the Westminster Assembly – and so the ‘true’ religion as a justification for Parliament’s actions had become an unsustainable and divisive foundation.

Settlement was impossible because there remained a conviction that the problems which these frameworks had come up against, and the issues on which they had faltered, could ultimately be fixed by absolute parliamentarian obedience. By failing to acknowledge that there might not have been perfect laws that could solve the problems, or that one kind of church settlement could settle all consciences, and by refusing to allow space for the implied reader to bring their own subjective meaning to obedience, Parliament had
created a situation where no compromises could be sought and fewer people could wholeheartedly support their cause.

All these endpoints were reached in part because of the impact of print. On the issue of church settlement especially, the polemic was driven by partisan presses and publishers, each with an identity and many with a clear preference. The vicious and sustained debate that took place in the presses had helped to construct clear totems onto which the reader’s church preferences could be marked and differentiated from possible other systems, and could then be extrapolated to demonstrate that certain political or religious settlements were unconscionable. While accounts of the discussions in the Westminster Assembly emphasise the efforts to build consensus, this partisan print helped construct division.

The catastrophic failure of negotiation between the Parliament and King was caused because the official frameworks could no longer contain the polemic. Because the frameworks were cumulative, by 1646 to disagree with an aspect of either framework was to be excluded from both, and in the process, the frameworks that had been used to defend Parliament had created legal, political and religious problems that were more than the sum of their parts. For those who found themselves unable to support Parliament absolutely, the intellectual strain of describing the political system while simultaneously allowing flexibility for increased parliamentary power and personal disobedience had opened constitutional fault lines that were particularly difficult to solve, and would prove to be politically convenient for those wanting to influence Westminster from the outside in coming years.
CONCLUSION

Law with his strength, sting and curse, must needs cease and have an end.  

Francis Cornwell, *King Jesvs is the beleevers prince, priest, and law-giver, in things appertaining to the conscience* (April 1645)

Throughout the first civil war, the law was manipulated and diluted through its publication in the public polemic. Traditional authorities that had acted to protect the law – the Inns of Court, and the court system more generally – had lost their cultural dominance in the judgement of the law, and their control of spaces where arbitration could be obtained. As authors and readers found themselves empowered to discuss legal principles in print, the law had become something that authors and readers could question, negotiate and eventually contest, without the formal training that many deemed was necessary to understand the law.

In October 1642, Richard Ward stated that he would 'not trouble my selfe to search Record, not presume to expound, and interpret Lawes, (being no Lawyer)', but would examine the lawfulnesse of [the Parliament’s] Designe, as farre as the law of Nature, the light of humane Reason, and experience, and my small knowledge in Religion, will dictate unto me.  

Though Ward would not delve into 'Records', he felt qualified to examine the laws of both God and man in order to bring vindication to the Parliament. Parliamentarian pamphleteers consistently struggled to come to terms with the lack of clear legal judgment, and that even with all the legal evidence presented, there were still those who believed that the King’s case was legally correct. This, to Ward, was the fault of either pernicious lawyers, or 'Naturall [or] mischevous, malicious, and affected ignorance'.  

Even though public debate had demonstrated that the legal and constitutional framework was unable to solve the crisis, there persisted the belief that if the 'true' law was discovered, the conflict could be solved. The focus remained on repairing rather than reinventing the law, and protecting it against malicious influence. That the law still remained worthy of respect, and continued to play a dominant role in
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politics and governance, even after it had been publicly debated and contested with such force, is a testament to the enduring belief that the law was perfect, even if the manifestations of legal power might not be.

Throughout the first civil war, the law was used as an enabler, rather than a guide, in the pamphlet debate. Legal and constitutional arguments were appealed to retrospectively, rather than proactively, in an attempt to justify the resistance against the King and measures that had already been taken. However, attempts to legitimise the parliamentarian efforts in such an ephemeral medium as pamphlets were often at the mercy of fast-changing events and circumstances. Positions designed to justify a relatively minor issue in the constitution could be extrapolated to challenge a major issue using the same legal reasoning. In this way, while these legal pamphlets were often written as expediencies, they could be read outside their immediate context, and their conclusions applied to new circumstances. Eventually, this could lead to circumstances of constitutional change which might not be controlled.

The law remained a crucial way to discuss the urgent issues of the time, but through this discussion, its unity and integrity became increasingly contested as its workings were exposed by a contradictory and partisan polemic, and absorbed by an enthusiastic reading public.

These conversations took place in political environments, and the arguments that were made were time- and context-specific. The debate was always moving, either to keep up with events or to keep abreast of retorts and replies, and thus pamphlets needed to answer new problems with each iteration. While approaching these discussions with a focus on the history of ideas can shine new light onto the way that arguments were constructed, it can also distort the conversations in several ways. Firstly, it can gloss over the conversation’s changes of focus, and the way that ideas disappeared and reappeared. Secondly, it can place too much value on the pamphlets’ own claims to be constructed on intellectual foundations, which can mean that parliamentarian thought is overvalued; parliamentarian writers drew their reasoning from a myriad of intellectual languages and combined them to construct haphazard justifications. Great learning can create works that dazzle readers, even if the argument behind them is simply conjecture, and this may have been part of the reason that these works were created. For example, when dealing
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with Prynne’s *Soveraigne Power of Parliaments*, Allen argued that the ‘book is full of confusions and ambiguities, of repetition, digression and empty verbiage’, and exhibits knowledge ‘extensive[ly] to singularly little purpose’.868 Prynne’s *Soveraigne Power* was ‘largely derived not from reasoning but from conviction’, and although at times Prynne’s use of sources is questionable, ‘it is probable that he believed every word he said’.869

Often, pamphlets offered themselves as tools to maintain conviction for prejudiced readers rather than works of persuasion. They offered examples and justifications to defend acts that were already committed, rather than proactively defending actions that were yet to be made. Rather than intellectual works, they should be thought of as political expediencies and tools of mobilisation. This is not to say that they were not dealing with intellectual problems, but rather that these problems came second to the political context – on the most part, events dictated the course of the pamphlet debate, rather than ideas.

Thinking about pamphlets and their ideas as political, and stressing the importance of context, means that we can investigate in greater detail the moments where the debate and conversation changed. For example, the Vow and Covenant and the discovery of the Waller Plot in the summer of 1643 fundamentally shifted the polemical debate in a seismic change that was political, not intellectual, despite the great efforts of writers such as Hunton, whose *Treatise of Monarchie* a few weeks before had extensively and persuasively demonstrated that siding with Parliament was an act of conscience.

Similarly, the need to obtain the military support of the Scots led to the transformation of the parliamentary cause, shifting the framework from one based on the law to one that was based on the pursuit of ‘true religion’. The shifting of the debate following these developments demonstrates that these debates accompanied, rather than dictated, the politics.

By tracing the debate through the civil war, this thesis has pointed to several key moments where the debate was transformed. In the autumn of 1642, when the debate developed from the ‘paper wars’ where the implied reader acted as an observer of the legal discussion, the higher-stakes prospect of conflict and the need to mobilise support led some parliamentarian writers to invoke the implied reader as an arbiter of the legal


discussion. The implied reader was empowered to determine who was acting correctly, and this enabled the reader to support the Parliament while still maintaining that Parliament’s power was not absolute. Disagreements over whether the implied reader could act as an arbiter would divide the parliamentary coalition, but were swept under the carpet by the Vow and Covenant, and later the Solemn League and Covenant. The Solemn League and Covenant rested the parliamentary cause on the pursuit of true religion, which acted to legitimise not only the invocation of extensive religious rhetoric to support Parliament’s claims, but also public discussion of the types of church settlement that might be made. These discussions threatened to undermine the collective Covenant that was intended to bring together the nation, because it became clear that a single fundamental religious truth could not be drawn from the scripture. By July 1646, the parliamentarian position had become visibly rigid and inflexible. Concerns about both church and peace settlements frustrated the debate, and meant that Parliament’s demand for absolute obedience in both conscience and law was crippling demanding on the parliamentarian reader.

The way that these developments affected the evolving patterns of polemic demonstrates the importance of close attention to immediate contexts. By approaching these problems chronologically, we can follow the way that the debate developed more closely, and identify points where the conversation changed. Doing so not only creates a more complete picture of the polemic, but also demonstrates the flexibility that its readers had to maintain in accessing these legitimising languages. Readers were forced to frequently adapt to the new causes and justifications, or else they would lack the ability to justify their own actions, and those of their chosen side.

Throughout the civil war, attempts to invoke the implied reader were explicitly tied to the pressures of mobilisation. The moments when the implied reader was used often occur when the debate was faltering, and polemical problems needed to be solved. For example, the implied reader was invoked to empower Parliament without granting them absolute sovereignty in 1642–3, or when a wide range of religious views needed to be brought together in a collective oath in 1643–4. At key moments in the conflict, politicians attempted to take the initiative and construct shibboleths that would demand allegiance and obedience, and separate the sheep from the goats. In response to this
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effort to confirm clear dichotomies – the lawful versus the unlawful, the righteous versus the corrupt – the implied reader was appealed to by pamphleteers in order to break out of these binaries and develop conditions of conformity. Authors used the implied reader to answer impossible hypotheticals and grant extra-parliamentary validation to the cause without fundamentally changing the constitution. Thus the implied reader was used to get results in particular political circumstances. In this sense, the appeal to the reader was limited to the moment, and occurred in micro-contexts; the implied reader was invoked to enable readers to justify decisions that they had made, and were going to make, at a particular political or religious moment, rather than for posterity – not immaculately reasoned, but immediately expedient.

The work done in this thesis that focuses on attributing religious and political beliefs to printers and publishers is exploratory rather than comprehensive, but it does suggest that there is much more potential hiding within the colophons and ornamental woodcuts. The brief survey demonstrates that printers and publishers could have coherent and partisan identities, and could act as political actors, although a methodical study of the Thomason Tracts would allow us to understand in greater detail how the politics of print works. Printers and publishers could construct debates, manipulating the market of print to present the conflict in certain ways, while using strategies of anonymity to give the appearance of ideas independently conforming with each other or evolving in tandem. This should not act to diminish the importance of ideas – indeed, it suggests that there was a more concerted effort to give these ideas traction than just launching them into the ether. However, it is necessary to be aware of the tactics involved – if comparable or compatible ideas were being perpetuated by a certain press, then it needs to be understood more as a press campaign attempting to manipulate the pamphlet market, than as demonstrative of wider political or religious shifts. By failing to consider the origins of the printed text, the techniques that were employed by printers and publishers who worked anonymously can continue to operate to this day. Indeed, it is testament to the skill of the printers and publishers that their interventions can continue to go unnoticed, despite the best efforts of contemporaries and historians since.

By considering printers and publishers as political actors, we can begin to make more sense of anonymously printed and produced ephemera. Rather than being just white noise, there is the opportunity to group pamphlets into large corpuses, examination of which may suggest more legal and religious consistency than has been previous
suggested. Accounts of cheap print in the period have often portrayed the polemic as being carried by occasional and exceptional radical works, but attending to strategies of anonymity, as this thesis has attempted, suggests instead that these were sustained acts of political thinking. Producers were engaged in active processes of corroboration, reiteration and repackaging, in line with their often consistent political and religious leanings. Thus, political ideas could be read in serial, and presses and publishers could constantly reapply core principles to new circumstances and events.

The political debate in the civil war was based on frameworks that had been introduced to make sense of the conflict, but both the legal and the religious framework proved unable to solve the conflict, and had in fact created new problems that threatened to undermine the cause. Pamphlets that were written for mobilisation had created incoherencies and contradictions within the polemic which eroded the legitimising vocabulary of the frameworks. To disagree with Parliament was to be excluded from both the legal and religious frameworks and thus excluded from a justification of the conflict. Those who found that these shared languages did not correlate with personal expectations or convictions were pushed either to conform to Parliament on its strict terms, or attempt to develop new radical understandings to construct conditional obedience to the parliamentary cause.

Thus, alongside political events and intellectual pressures the political debate was also shaped by the mechanics of making the arguments that constituted the debate. Because the polemic forced authors to produce justifications and defences at pace and in response to rapidly evolving circumstances, the process of arguing itself helped shape the argument, acting as a creative force which could trap individuals within polemical dead ends, or create new problems and contradictions against which individuals had to weigh their principles and beliefs. Because the official frameworks were unable to contain the polemic, the mechanics of print thus propelled ideas into spaces that ultimately could not be controlled.
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Speciall Nevves from the Army at Warwicke since the Fight: Sent from a Minister of Good Note, to an Alderman Here in London: Wherein Is Related the Names of Such That Are Slain and Taken Prisoners of Both Sides (Printed for Henry Overton, FD: 27 October 1642) E.124.[33].

A Speech Made by Alderman Garroway, at a Common-Hall on Tuesday the 17. Of January Upon Occasion of a Speech Delivered There the Friday before, by Mr. Pym, at the Reading of His Majesties Answer to the Late Petition (s.n., FD: 17 January 1643) Wing G280.

A Speech to the People. Or a Briefe and Reall Discovery of the Unhappy Estate of These Most Distracted Times. With a Necessary Caution to All Good Subjects (Printed for H.B., [29 October] 1642) E.200.[66].

A Staffe of Comfort to Beare up the Spirit under the Heaviest Outward Cases: With Some Answer from the Lord, to the Deserted Soule in Hemans Case. Whereunto Is Annexed a Speciall Preservative against the Hurtfull Sword, of Speciall Use in These Hard and Fierce Times, That the Sword May Doe Us No Hurt. (Printed for Tho: Underhill, [04 August] 1643) E.1184.[2].


Thankes to the Parliament (Printed for Thomas Underhill, FD: June 1642) 669.f.6[30].

To the Right Honorable Assembly of Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the House of Commons the Humble Petition of the Inhabitants of the City and Libertie of Westminster (Printed for Thomas Purslow, FD: 15 December 1642) 669.f.6[96].


Touching the Fundamentall Lawes, or Politique Constitution of This Kingdome, the Kings Negative Voice, and the Power of Parliaments. To Which Is Annexed the Priviledge and Power of the Parliament Touching the Militia (Printed for Thomas Underhill, [24 February] 1643) E.90[21].

A Triall of the English Lyturgie. Wherein All the Materiall Objections Raised in Defence Hereof Are Fully Cleared and Answered (Printed for Ben. Allen, [21 April] 1643) E.99[8].

A True and Exact Relation of the Kings Entertainment in the City of Chester. With the Recorders Speech at His Entring the City. Sent from a Citizen of Note in Chester, on Purpose to Be Printed, to Prevent False Copies (Printed for C. M., FD: 23 September 1642) E.119[25].

A True and Full Relation of the Manner of the Taking of the Towne and Castle of Shrewsbury (Printed by J.R. for Christopher Meredith, [04 March] 1644) E.271[2].

A true relation of all the remarkable passages, and illegall proceedings of some sathanicall or Doeg-like accusers of their brethren, against William Larner, a free-man of England, and one of the merchant-tailers company of London, for selling eight printed sheets of paper (all of one matter,) intituled, Londons last warning; as also against John Larner, and Jane Hales his servants (s.n., [02 May] 1646) E.335[7].

A True Relation of Some Remarkable Passages Concerning Nottingham-Shire Petition, and His Majesties Answer. Also the Ill Usage of the Linconshire Gentlemen at York, Who Delivered Their Petition. Written from an Esquire of Nottingham-Shire (Being One of the Gentlemen Who Presented Their Petition at York) and Sent to His Brother, Dwelling in London. Report This from Me to Be a True Copye of Our Answer There, I. W. Whereunto Is Added His Majesties Message, Sent to the Parliament Aprill 8. 1642. Concerning His Resolution to Go into Ireland (Printed for R.H., FD: 08 April 1642) E.143[8].

A True Relation of the Late Battaile before Worcester, Taken on Sunday Last, Sept. 25 by a Gentleman of the Innes of Court (Now in His Excellences Armie) from the Mouthes of Master Nathaniel Fynes, and Many Other Commanders Who Were in the Said Skirmish, and Sent up to Master Pym (Printed for T. Vnderhill, FD: 30 September 1642) 669.f.6[80].


Tryvth and Peace Honestly Pleaded, and Rightly Sought for, or, a Loyall Subjects Advice Vsefull to Confirm, Convince, Calme, Condemne Honest Ignorant Passionate Malicious Men (s.n., [26 November] 1642) E.128[14].
The Vnfaithfulnesse of the Cavaliers and Commissioners of Array in Keeping Their Covenants (Printed for Thomas Vnderhill, FD: 11 January 1643) E.84[37].

What Kinde of Parliament Will Please the King; and How Well He Is Affected to This Present Parliament (s.n., [July] 1642) E.155[12].


II ATTTIBUTED WORKS PRINTED BEFORE 1700

Simeon Ashe, and William Goode, A Particular Relation of the Most Remarkable Occurrences from the United Forces in the North under the Command of Those Three Approved and Faithfull Friends Both Unto the Church and Common-Wealth Generall Lesly, the Lord Fairefax and the Earle of Manchester (Printed for Thomas Vnderhill, [14 June] 1644) E.51[3].

Robert Austin, Allegiance Not Impeached: Viz, by the Parliaments Taking up of Arms (Though against the Kings Personall Commands) for the Just Defence of the Kings Person, Crown and Dignity, the Laws of the Land, Liberties of the Subject: Yea, They Are Bound by the Oath of Their Allegiance, and Trust Reposed in Them, to Doe It (Printed by Rich. Cotes, for Joh. Bellamy, [12 April] 1644) E.42[12].

Robert Baillie, A Dissuasive from the Errours of the Time Wherein the Tenets of the Principall Sects, Especially of the Independents, Are Drawn Together in One Map, for the Most Part in the Words of Their Own Authours, and Their Maine Principles Are Examined by the Touch-Stone of the Holy Scriptures (Printed for Samuel Gellibrand, [22 January] 1646) E.317[5].


William Ball, Constitutio Liberi Populi. Or, the Rule of a Free-Born People (s.n., [18 June] 1646) E.341[1].


———, The Second Part of That Book Call’d Independency Not Gods Ordinance: Or the Post-Script, Discovering the Uncharitable Dealing of the Independents Towards Their Christian Brethren, with the Jugglings of Many of Their Pastors and Ministers, to the Misleading of the Poor People to the Detriment of Their Own Souls, and the Hurt Both of Church and State, with the Danger of Novelties in Religion; Proving That Indepedency, Is One of the Most Dangerous Sects, That Ever Appeared in the World, since Mortality Inhabited the Earth (Printed by John Macock, for Michael Spark junior, [10 June] 1645) E.287[9].

Hans Behr, The Declaration of Commissary Generall Behr, against Divers Slanders and Lies Spread Abroad against Him (s.n., FD: 01 May 1644) 669.f.10[3].

John Bernard, The Independents Catechisme. Or Some Observations Gathered out of Doctor Bastvicke His Religious and Learned Treatise Entituled Independency Not
Gods Ordinance. For the Use of All Poor Ignorant, Wavering, and Seduced Independents (Printed by John Macock, [05 August] 1645) E.186[5].

Peter Bland, The Privilegeds of the House of Commons in Parliament Assembled. Wherein 'Tis Proved Their Power Is Equall with That of the House of Lords, If Not Greater, Though the King Join with the Lords. However It Appears That Both the Houses Have a Power above the King, If He Vot Contrary to Them (Printed for J.R., [31 December] 1642) E.83[39].

———, Resolved Upon the Question: or a Question Resolved concerning the Right Which the King Hath to Hull, or Any Other Fort or Place of Strength for the Defence of the Kingdom. Vhherein Is Likewise Proved, That Neither the Setting of the Militia as Tis Done by the Parliament, nor the Keeping of Hull by Sir John Hotham, nor Any Other Act That the Parliament Have yet Done Is Illegall, but Necessary, Just, and According to That Power Which the Law Hath Given Them (Printed for Matthew Walbancke, [29 September] 1642) E.119[4].

———, A Royall Position, Whereby 'Tis Proved, That 'Tis against the Common Laws of England to Depose a King: Or, an Addition to a Book, Intituled, Resolved Upon the Question: Or, a Question Resolved Concerning the Right Which the King Hath to Hull, or Any Other Fort of Place of Strength for the Defence of the Kingdom (Printed for John Field, 1642) Wing B3163.

Edward Bowles, Plaine English: Or, a Discourse Concerning the Accommodation, the Armie, the Association (s.n., [12 January] 1643) E.84[42].

John Bramhall, The Serpent Salve, or, a Remedie for the Biting of an Aspe Wherein the Observators Grounds Are Discussed and Plainly Discovered to Be Unsound, Seditious, Not Warranted by the Laws of God, of Nature, or of Nations, and Most Repugnant to the Known Laws and Customs of This Realm: For the Reducing of Such of His Majesties Well-Meaning Subjects into the Right Way Who Have Been Mis-Led by That Ignis Fatuus (s.n., 1643) Wing B4236.

John Brandon, The Oxonian Antippodes, or, the Oxford Anty-Parliament (Printed for Richard Lounds, [03 February] 1644) E.31[8].


———, The Wounded Conscience Cured, the Vveak One Strengthened, and the Doubting Satisfied. By Way of Answer to Doctor Fearne: Where the Maine Point Is Rightly Stated, and Objections Throughly Answered, for the Good of Those Who Are Willing Not to Be Deceived (Printed for Benjamin Allen, [11 February] 1643) E.89[8].


Anthony Burgess, The Difficulty of, and the Encouragements to a Reformation. A Sermon Preached before the Honourable House of Commons at the Publicke Fast, Septem. 27. 1643 (Printed by R. Bishop for Thomas Vnderhill, FD: 27 September 1643) E.71[2].

of Their Solemn Seeking of the Lord for His Blessing Upon Their Proceedings
(Printed by M. Simmons for Thomas Underhill, [26 November] 1644) E.18[15].

———, The Magistrates Commission from Heaven Declared in a Sermon Preached in
Laurencejury, London, the 28. Day of Sept., 1644. At the Election of the Lord Major
(Printed by George Miller for Thomas Vnderhill, [30 October] 1644) E.14[18a].

———, Romes Crueltie & Apostacie: Declared in a Sermon Preached on the Fifth of
November, 1644. Before the Honourable House of Commons (Printed by George
Miller for Tho. Vnderhill, FD: 05 November 1645) E.19[16].

Jeremiah Burroughs, An Exposition of the Prophesie of Hosea Begun in Divers Lecture
Vpon the First Three Chapters at Michaels Cornhill, London (Printed by W.E. and
J.G. for R. Dawlman, 1643) E.98[1].

———, The Glorious Name of God, the Lord of Hosts Opened in Two Sermons, at Michaels
Cornhill, London, Vindicating the Commission from This Lord of Hosts, to
Subjects, in some Case, to Take up Arms: With a Post-Script, Briefly Answering a
Late Treatise by Henry Ferne, D.D. (Printed for R. Dawlman, FD: 1642)
Wing 732:12.

Richard Byfield, Temple-Defilers Defiled, Vvherein a True Visible Church of Christ Is
Described. The Evils and Pernicious Errors, Especially Appertaining to Schisme,
Anabaptisme, and Libertinisme, That Infest Our Church, Are Discovered (Printed
by John Field for Ralph Smith, [22 April] 1645) E.278[20].

Edmund Calamy, Englands Antidote, against the Plague of Civil Vvarre. Presented in a
Sermon before the Honorable House of Commons, on Their Late Extraordinary
Solemne Fast, October 22. 1644 (Printed by I.L. for Christopher Meredith, FD: 22
October 1645) E.17[17].

———, The Great Danger of Covenant-Refusing, and Covenant-Breaking. Presented in a
Sermon Preached before the Right Honourable Thomas Adams Lord Mayor, and
the Right Worshipfull the Sheriffes, and the Aldermen His Brethren, and the Rest of
the Common-Council of the Famous City of London, Jan. 14. 1645 (Printed by M.F.
for Christopher Meredith, FD: 14 January 1646) E.327[6].

Joseph Caryl, Englands Plus Ultra, Both of Hoped Mercies, and of Required Duties: Shewed
in a Sermon Preached to the Honourable Houses of Parliament, the Lord Major,
Court of Aldermen, and Common-Council of London; Together with the Assembly
of Divines, at Christ-Church, April 2 (Printed by G.M. for John Rothwell and Giles
Calvert, FD: 02 April 1646) E.330[12].

Thomas Case, The Quarrell of the Covenant, with the Pacification of the Quarrell (Printed

William Cavendish Duke of Newcastle, A Declaration of the Right Honourable the Earle of
Newcastle His Excellency, &C in Answer of Six Groundlesse Aspersions Cast Upon
Him by the Lord Fairefax, in His Late Warrant Bearing Date Feb. 1642 (Printed by
Stephen Bulkley, [02 February] 1643) E.92[17].

Charles I., His Majesties Answer to the Petition of the Lords and Commons in Parliament
Assembled (Printed by Robert Barker, FD: 17 June 1642) E.152[2].

———, His Majesties Answer, by Way of Declaration to a Printed Paper, Entitled a
Declaration of Both Houses of Parliament (Printed by Robert Barker, FD: 23 May
1642) E.150[29].

Charles I, The King’s Majesties Declaration to All His Loving Subjects of His Kingdome of
Scotland with an Act of the Lords and His Majesties Privy Councell for the Printing
and Publishing Thereof: And a Letter of the Lord Chancellour of Scotland and of
Other Lords and Others of His Majesties Privy Councell in That Kingdom to His
Majesty (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [03 June] 1643) Wing C2245A.

Thomas Coleman, *Gods Unusuall Answer to a Solemne Fast. Or, Some Observations Upon the Late Sad Successe in the West, Upon the Day Immediately Following Our Publique Humiliation* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, FD: 12 September 1644) E.16[2].


Thomas Edwards, *Antapologia: Or, a Full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration of Mr Goodwin, Mr Nye, Mr Sympson, Mr Burroughs, Mr Bridge, Members of the Assembly of Divines* (Printed by G.M. for Ralph Smith, [13 July] 1644) E.1[1].

———, *Gangraena: Or a Catalogue and Discovery of Many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of This Time* (Printed for Ralph Smith, [26 February] 1646) E.323[2].

Henry Ferne, *Conscience Satisfied. That There Is No Warrant for the Armes Now Taken up by Subjects. By Way of Reply Unto Severall Answers Made to a Treatise Formerly Published for the Resolving of Conscience Upon the Case* (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [18 April] 1643) E.97[7].

———, *A Reply Unto Severall Treatises Pleading for the Armes Now Taken up by Subjects in the Pretended Defence of Religion and Liberty by Name, Unto the Reverend and Learned Divines Which Pleadde Scripture and Reason for Defensive Arms: The Author of the Treatise of Monarchy: The Author of the Fuller Answer His Reply* (Printed by Leonard Lichfield, [01 November] 1643) E.74[9].

———, *The Resolving of Conscience, Upon This Question Whether Upon Such a Supposition or Case, as Is Now Usually Made (the King Will Not Discharge His Trust but Is Bent or Seduced to Subvert Religion, Laws, and Liberties.), Subjects May Take Arms and Resist? And Whether That Case Be Now?* (s.n., 1642) Wing F803.

Alexander Forbes, *An Anatomy of Independency, or, a Briefe Commentary, and Moderate Discourse Upon the Apologeticall Narration of Mr Thomas Goodwin, and Mr Philip*
Nye, &C. By Argument, Laying Naked the Dangers of Their Positions; and from Experience, Discovering Their Spirits and Wayes (Printed for Robert Bostock, [14 June] 1644) E.50[36].

———, A True Copie of Two Letters Brought by Mr. Peters, This October 11. From My L. Forbes from Ireland (Printed by L. N. for Henry Overton, [12 October] 1642) E.121[44].

James Freize, A Declaration and Appeale to All the Freeborne People of This Kingdome in Generall and to All the Truly Noble, Pyous and Well Affected Patriots and People of God, within the Cities of London and Westminster in Particular, Humbly Craving Their Assistance and Furtherance of This Just Request Unto the High Court of Parliament (s.n., [November] 1645) 669.f.10[40].


John Geree, A Case of Conscience Resolved. Wherein It Is Cleared, That the King May without Impeachment to His Oath, Touching the Clergy at Coronation, Consent to the Abrogation of Episcopacy (Printed by Matthew Simmons for John Bartlet, [19 June] 1646) E.341[4].

George Gillespie, A Late Dialogue Betwixt a Civilian and a Divine, Concerning the Present Condition of the Church of England (Printed for Robert Bostock, [30 October] 1644) E.14[17].

George Gipps, A Sermon Preached (before God, and from Him) to the Honourable House of Commons. At a Publike Fast, Novemb. 27 (Printed for Christopher Meredith, [27 November] 1644) E.23[3].

John Goodwin, Anti-Cavalierisme, or, Truth Pleading as Well the Necessity, as the Lawfulness of This Present Vvar for the Suppressing of That Butcherly Brood of Cavaliering Incendiaries, Who Are Now Hammering England, to make an Ireland of It (Printed by G.B. and R.W. for Henry Overton, [21 October] 1642) E.123[25].

———, The Butchers Blessing, or the Bloody Intentions of Romish Cavaliers against the City of London above Other Places, Demonstrated by 5. Arguments, to the Right Honourable the Lord Major, the Sheriffes, and Other the Religious and Worthy Inhabitants of the Said City (Printed for Henry Overton, [04 November] 1642) E.242[4].


———, M. S. To A. S. With a Plea for Libertie of Conscience in a Church Way against the Cavils of A. S. And Observations on His Considerations and Annotations Upon the Apologetical Narration, Humbly Submitted to the Judgements of All Rationall and Moderate Men in the World (Printed by F. N. for H. Overton, [03 May] 1644) E.45[3].

———, Theomachia, or, The grand imprudence of men running the hazard of fighting against God, in suppressing any way, doctrine, or practice, concerning which they know not certainly whether it be from God or no (Printed for Henry Overton, [07 October] 1644) E.12[1].

Thomas Goodwin, A Childe of Light Vvalking in Darkness, or, a Treatise Shewing the Causes by Which, the Cases Wherein, the Ends for Which God Leaves His Children
to Distresse of Conscience Together with Directions How to Walke So as to Come Forth of Such a Condition (Printed by M. F. for R. Dawlman, FD: 1643) E.57[1].


———, The Vanity of Thoughts Discovered: With Their Danger and Cure (Printed for R. Dawlman, FD: 1643) E.57[4].


Humphrey Hardwick, The Difficulty of Sions Deliverance and Reformation: Together with the Activitty Which Her Friends Should Manifest During the Time That Her Cause Is in Agitation. Delivered in a Sermon at Margarets Westminster, before the Honourable House of Commons on Wednesday Morning, the Twenty-Sixt Day of June. 1644 (Printed by I. L. for Christopher Meredith, FD: 26 June 1644) E.2[9].


Charles Herle, An Answer to Doctor Ferns Reply, Entitled Conscience Satisfied: Especially to as Much of It as Concerned That Answer to His Treatise Which Went under the Name of the Fuller Answer (Printed by Tho. Brudenell for N. A., [17 May] 1643) E.102[3].

———, A Fuller Answer to a Treatise Written by Doctor Ferne, Entituled the Resolving of Conscience Upon This Question, Whether Upon This Supposition, or Case (the King Will Not Defend, but Is Bent to Subvert Religion, Lawes, and Liberties) Subjects May with Good Conscience Make Resistance (Printed for John Bartlet, [29 December] 1642) E.244[27].

———, A Fuller Answer to a Treatise Written by Doctor Ferne, Entituled the Resolving of Conscience Upon This Question, Whether Upon This Supposition, or Case (the King Will Not Defend but Is Bent to Subvert Religion, Lawes and Liberties) Subjects May, with Good Conscience, Make Resistance (Printed for John Bartlet) Wing H1558.
Peter Heylyn, *The Rebells Catechisme Composed in an Easy and Familiar Way: To Let Them See the Hainousnesse of Their Offence, the Weaknesse of Their Strongest Subterfuges, and to Recall Them to Their Duties, Both to God and Man* (s.n., [06 March] 1644) E.35[22].


John Hinton, *The Humble Petition of the Peacefull Obedient and Honest Protestants of This Kingdome, Presented Unto the Honourable House of Commons, by the Gentlemen of the Four Innes of Court* (s.n., [December] 1642) E.181[35].

———, *The Hvmble Petition of the Peacefull, Obedient, Religious, and Honest Protestants of This Kingdome, Presented Unto the Honourable House of Commons in Their Behalfe, by Doctor Hynton, 1642 with an Answer to the Severall Objections Proposed against Him Concerning the Protestants Petition by a Committee Appointed from the Honourable House of Commons.,* [December] 1642) E.181[37].


Richard Hollingworth, *An Answer to a Certain Writing Entituled, Certain Dovbts and Qvaeres Upon Occasion of the Late Oath and Covenant, with Desire of Satisfaction for Tender Conscienced People to Whom It May Be Exhibited* (Printed for Luke Fawne, FD: 11 September 1643) E.67[5].


James Howell, *A Discourse, or Parly, Continued Betwixt Partricius and Peregrine (Upon Their Landing in France) Touching the Civill Wars of England and Ireland* (s.n., [21 July] 1643) E.61[14].


Edward Husbands, (ed.), *An Exact Collection of All Remonstrances, Declarations, Votes, Orders, Ordinances, Proclamations, Petitions, Messages, Answers, and Other Remarkable Passages Betweene the Kings Most Excellent Majesty and His High Court of Parliament Beginning at His Majesties Return from Scotland Being in December 1641 and Continued Untill March the 21, 1643 Which Were Formerly Published Either by the Kings Majesties Command or by Order from One or Both Houses of Parliament: With a Table Wherein Is Most Exactly Digested All the Fore-Mentioned Things According to Their Severall Dates and Dependancies* (Printed for Edward Husbands, T. Warren, R. Best, FD: 21 March 1643) E.241[1] & E.243[1].

Edward Hyde, *A Complaint to the House of Commons, and Resolution Taken up by the Free Protestant Subjects of the Cities of London and Westminster, and the Counties Adjacent* (s.n., FD: 02 January 1643) E.244[31].

Constantin Jessop, *The Angel of the Church of Ephesus No Bishop of Ephesus, Distinguished in Order from, and Superior in Power to a Presbyter. As It Was Lately Delivered in a Collation before the Reverend Assembly of Divines* (Printed by G. M. for Christopher Meredith, [13 April] 1644) E.42[22].
John Jones, *An Examination of the Observations Upon His Majesties Answers. Wherein the Absurdities of the Observators Positions, and Inferences Are Discovered* (s.n., [14 August] 1643) E.65[7].

Hanserd Knollys, *Christ Exalted: A Lost Sinner Sought, and Saved by Christ: Gods People Are Holy People* (Printed by Jane Coe, [18 February 1645]) E.322[33].


George Lawrence, and Christopher Love, *The Debauched Cavalleer: Or the English Midianite. Wherein Are Compared by Way of Parallel, the Carriage, or Rather Miscarriage of the Cavalleeres, in the Present Reign of Our King Charles, with the Midianites of Old* (Printed by L. N. for Henry Overton, [18 October] 1642) E.240[43].


———, *England's Birth-Right Justified against All Arbitrary Usurpation, Whether Regall or Parliamentary, or under What Vizor Soever. With Divers Queries, Observations and Grievances of the People, Declaring This Parliament's Present Proceedings to Be Directly Contrary to Those Fundamentall Principles, Whereby Their Actions at First Were Justifieable against the King, in Their Present Illegall Dealings with Those That Have Been Their Best Friends, Advancers and Preservers* (s.n., [10 October] 1645) E.304[17].


Stephen Marshall, *A Copy of a Letter Written by Mr. Stephen Marshall to a Friend of His in the City, for the Necessary Vindication of Himself and His Ministry, against That Altogether Groundlesse, Most Unjust, and Ungodly Aspersion Cast Upon Him by Certaine Malignants in the City, and Lately Printed at Oxford, in Their Mendacium Aulicum, Otherwise Called Mercurius Aulicus, and Sent Abroad into Other Nations to His Perpetuall Infamy* (Printed for John Rothwell, [18 May] 1643) E.102[10].


William Mewe, *The Robbing and Spoiling of Jacob and Israel: Considered and Bewailed, in a Sermon Preached at Westminster before the Honourable House of Commons, at the Late Solemn Fast, Nov. 29. 1643* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, [26 December] 1643) E.79[10].
Thomas Mocket, *A View of the Solemn League and Covenant, for Reformation, Defence of Religion, the Honour and Happynesse of the King, and the Peace, Safety and Union of the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to Be Taken by All Sorts, in All the Said Kingdoms* (Printed for Christopher Meredith, [01 January] 1644) E.80[2].


Matthew Newcomen, *Jerusalems Vvatch-Men, the Lords Remembrancers: A Sermon Preached at the Abbie at Westminster, before Both Houses of Parliament, and the Assembly of Divines, Upon Their Solemn Fast, July 7. 1643* (Printed by M. F. for Christopher Meredith, [23 August] 1643) E.63[7].

Philip Nye, *The Excellency and Lawfulnesse of the Solemne League and Covenant. Set Forth in a Speech, or Exhortation Made by Mr. Phillip Nye to the Honorable House of Commons and Reverend Assembly of Ministers at Their Taking the Said Solemne League and Covenant* (Printed by W. Wilson, for Tho. Vnderhill, [26 January] 1646) E.318[7].

Richard Overton, *The Araignement of Mr. Persecution: Presente'd to the Consideration of the House of Commons, and to All the Common People of England Wherein He Is Indicted, Araigned, Convicted, and Condemned of Enmity against God, and All Goodnesse, of Treasons, Rebellion, Bloodshed, &C. And Sent to the Place of Execution* (Printed by Martin Claw Clergie [Richard Overton], [08 April] 1645) E.276[23].


———, *Scripture and Reason Pleaded for Defensive Armes: Or the Whole Controversie About Subjects Taking up Armes. Wherein Besides Other Pamphlets, an Answer Is Punctually Directed to Dr. Fernes Booke, Entituled, Resolving of Conscience, &C.* (Printed for Iohn Bellamy and Ralph Smith, [14 April] 1643) E.247[22].


Henry Parker, *The Contra-Replicant, His Complaint to His Maiestie* (s.n., [31 January] 1643) E.87[5].
———, Jus Populi, or, a Discourse Wherein Clear Satisfaction Is Given as Well Concerning the Right of Subjects as the Right of Princes Shewing How Both Are Consistent and Where They Border One Upon the Other: As Also, What There Is Divine and What There Is Humane in Both and Whether Is of More Value and Extent (Printed for Robert Bostock, [16 October] 1644) E.12[25].

———, Observations Upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers (s.n., [02 July] 1642) E.153[26].

———, A Petition or Declaration, Humbly Desired to Be Presented to the View of His Majesties Most Excellent Majestie (s.n., [17 July] 1642) E.107[29].

———, Some Few Observations Upon His Majesties Late Answer to the Declaration, or Remonstrance of the Lords and Commons of the 19. Of May, 1642 (s.n., [May] 1642) E.151[23].

John Paulet, The Latest Remarkable Truths from Worcester, Chester, Salop, Warwick, Stafford, Somerset, Devon, Yorke and Lincoln Counties Most of Which Was Sent up Poste from Judicious Men of Purpose to Be Printed: Among Other Things There Is a Cruell and Bloody Speech of the Lord Paulets Which He Spake to His Fellow Souldiers in Sherbourne the 7 of September Wherein He Gives Them Order to Kill Men, Women and Children without Mercie but to Reserve Such Ministers as They Could Take That Were Well-Wishers to the Parliament for to Be Flead Alive and Such Like Exquisite Torments (Printed for T. Vnderhill, FD: 17 September 1642) E.119[5].

John Ponet, A Short Treatise of Politique Povver; and of the True Obedience Which Subjects Owe to Kings, and Other Civill Governours (s.n., [July] 1642) E.154[36].


———, A Spirituall Snapscacke for the Parliament Souldiers. Containing Cordiall Encouragements, Effectuall Perswasions, and Hopefull Directions, Unto the Successefull Prosecution of This Present Cause (Printed for Henry Overton, [24 May] 1643) E.103[13].


———, The Doome of Cowardize and Treachery or, a Looking-Glasse for Cowardly or Corrupt Governours, and Souldiers, Who through Pusillanimity or Bribery, Betray Their Truths, to the Publick Prejudice. Containing Certaine Domestick Lawes, Heretofore, Lately Made, and Judgements Given against Such Timorous and Treacherous Persons; Fit to Be Known in These Unhappy Times of Warre (Printed for Michael Spark Senior, [03 November] 1643) E.251[6].
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>An ordinance by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament; for the preservation of the vesterne parts of the Kingdom. John Brown Cleric. <em>Parliamentorum</em> (PB RO&amp;GD, FD: 24 December 1642) E.83[29].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>To the King's most Excellent Majesty. The humble petition of the commissioners of the General Assembly of the Kirke of Scotland, met at Edinborough, January, 4th. 1642. And now lately presented to His Majestie, at Oxford (FD: 04 January 1643) E. 246[21].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>A declaration of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, with instructions for the lords lieutenants, committees of Parliament, and other officers and commanders in the counties of Warwick and Stafford, and cities and counties of Coventry and Lichfield ([04 January] 1643) E. 84[11].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td>Two petitions, lately presented by noblemen, barons, gentlemen, burgesses and ministers, of the kingdom of Scotland. To the right honourable the commissioners for the conservation of peace between the two kingdoms (PB RO&amp;GD [Appendix, [24 January] 1643) E. 86[6].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>A confutation of the Earle of Newcastles reasons for taking under his command and conduct divers popish recusants in the northerne parts; wherein is shewed both the unlawfulness, and danger of arming of papists: being a thing of main consequence for all true Protestants to take present and speciall notice of (PB GB&amp;RW [Appendix 1:3], [26 January] 1643) E.86[13].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td>Samuel Turner, <em>A True Relation of a late skirmish at Henley upon Thames, wherein a great defeat was given to the Redding Cavaliers</em>. A letter from Capt. Samuel Turner. Printed for Henry Overton. A true relation of a late skirmish at Henley upon Thames: wherein a great defeat was given to the Redding Cavaliers, lately assaulting the aforesaid towne of Henley. Being the true copy of a letter sent from one Captaine Samuel Turner, then in the said service, to his brother in London (FD: 26 January 1643) E. 86[15].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>New Englands first fruits; in respect, first of the conversion of some, conviction of divers, preparation of sundry of the Indians. 2. Of the progress of learning, in the colledge at Cambridge in Massacusets Bay. With divers other especiall matters concerning the countrey (PB RO&amp;GD, [31 January] 1643) E. 87[2].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>The true character of such as are malignants in the kingdom of Scotland. By way of information and direction to the ministery of that kingdom. Also the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>indication of a publike fast the third Sunday of February next, and the Thursday following. By the commissioners of the generall Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Wherein is shewed their zeale to the glory of God, and the fellow-feeling they have of their brethren, the members of Christs body. Lastly, lamenting the present distraction of the Church, and Kingdome of England (PB RO&amp;GD [Appendix 10:Woodcut 3], [07 February] 1643) E. 246[7].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Speciall nevves from Ireland. Newly received in a letter from a gentleman of good worth in Dublin to a friend in London. Shewing the present condition of that poore kingdome, and the manner of the great victory, which God (most miraculously) hath given to the poore Protestants there (FD: 15 February 1643) E. 91[18].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A true copie of a letter of speciall consequence from Rotetrdam [sic] in Holland subscribed by severall credible hands; and sent to a citizen of good note in London; being very considerable to be taken notice of by all the well-affected throughout the whole kingdom; but especially by the Citie of London (FD: 20 February 1643) 669.f.6.[110].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>A full and true relation of the late great victory, obtained by the Protestants against the rebells in Ireland; in which is declared the manner of the fight, with the number of those that are slaine; and the names of such men of ranke and qualitie, that are either slaine or taken prisoners. All which was sent from Dublin in a letter, dated the 5. of this instant moneth of Aprill, and received the 11. of the same, 1643 (PB TP [Appendix 6:14], FD: 18 March 1643) E.96.[6]. APF Edward Blakemore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The saints travell from Babylon into their owne countrey: or, Considerations touching the reformation of the Church, in the time of this present working Parliament: From those words in the 51. of Jeremiah and the 9. verse. (PB GB&amp;RW [Appendix 13&amp;4], [25 March] 1643) E.94[5].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>John Goodwin, Os ossorianvm, or A bone for a bishop to pick: being a vindication of some passages in a treatise lately published, called Anti-cavalierisme, from the impertinent and importune exceptions of Gr: Williams, the author of the Grand rebellion: calling himselfe by the name of the L. Bishop of OSSory (PB RO&amp;GD [Appendix 10:T1], [11 April] 1643) E.96[1].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>John Price A spirituall snapsacke for the Parliament souldiers. Containing cordiall encouragements, effectuall perswasions, and hopefull directions, unto the succesfull prosecution of this present cause ((24 May] 1643) E.103[13].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>More plots found out, and plotters apprehended. A true relation of the discovery of a most desperate and dangerous plot, for the delivering up, and surprisall of the townes of Hull, and Beverly. With the manner of the apprehension of Sir John Hotham, Sir Edward Rhodes, and Captaine Hotham: who are now bringing up to the Parliament. With the present securing of the thirtie thousand pounds already found out. And other particulars, being sent in a letter from Hull, dated the first of this instant moneth of Iuly, 1643 (PB RO&amp;GD [Appendix 10:Woodcut 3], FD: 01 July 1643) E.59[2].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Samuel Clarke, <em>Englands covenant proved lawfull &amp; necessary also at this time, both by Scripture and reason. Together, with sundry answers to the usall objections made against it</em> (PB RO&amp;GD [Appendix 10:T1&amp;Woodcut 3], [13 July] 1643) E.60[5].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nathaniel Fiennes, <em>A copie of the articles agreed upon at the surrender of the city of Bristol betweene Colonell Nathaniel Fiennes, governour of the said city, on the one party, and Colonell Charles Gerrard, and Captaine William Teringham for and on the behalfe of Prince Rupert, on the other party, the 26. of July, 1643. With a letter hereunto added, in which this copie of articles was inclosed: wherein is manifested how well those perfidious cavaliers have kept the said articles; and may serve as a warning to the whole kingdome, how to trust againe the faith of such cavaliers</em> (PB RO&amp;GD [Appendix 10:T1], FD: 26 July 1643) E.63[15] .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The answer of the Generall Assembly in Scotland, to the letter of some of their reverend brethren of the ministry in England, sent by Mr Marshall, and Mr Nye to the said Assembly (FD: 16 September 1643) E.67[17].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Satisfaction concerning mixt communions unsatisfactory: or, <em>Some short animadversions upon the most materiall passages of a late booke, entituled, Satisfaction concerning mixt communions</em> ([18 October] 1643) E.71[16].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td><em>A True and exact relation of the most sad condition of Ireland, since the cessation, exprest in a letter from Dublin, received the 16th of Novemb. 1643. Worthy to be taken notice of by all who have any true Protestant blood running in their veines</em> (PB GD, FD: 21 October 1643) E.76[4].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Powers to be resisted: or <em>A dialogue arguing the Parliaments lawfull resistance of the powers now in armes against them; and that archbishops, bishops, curates, neuters, all these are to be cut off by the law of God; therefore to be cast out by the law of the land. Very necessary and usefull for the information of the ignorant, confirmation of the weake, stablishing of the strong, convincing of the froward, in the clearing, resolving, and stating the legality of the Covenant, and this present warre</em> (PB GD [Appendix 11:T1], [28 December] 1643) E.79[15].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Peter Murford, <em>Nevves from Southampton, or The copie of a letter to Captain Thomas Harrison in London from Mr. Peter Murford, Serjeant Major to Colonell Norton, discovering a late plot of the cavaleering hoptonians against the said towne of Southampton: but by the mercy of God (and the fidelity of the said major) prevented</em> ([05 February] 1644) E.33[1].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Richard Mather and William Tompson, <em>A modest &amp; brotherly answer to Mr. Charles Herle his book, against the independency of churches. Wherein his foure arguments for the government of synods over particular congregations, are friendly examined, and clearly answered. Together, with Christian and loving animadversions upon sundry other observable passages in the said booke. All tending to declare the true use of synods, and the power of congregational churches in the points of electing and ordaining their owne officers, and censuring their offendors</em> (PB GD [Appendix 11:T1], [15 March] 367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>A discovery of peace: or, The thoughts of the Almighty for the ending of his peoples calamities. Intimated in a sermon at Christ-church London, before the Right Honourable, the Lord Mayor, the right worshipfull the Aldermen; together with the worshipfull companies of the said city, upon the 24th of April, 1644. Being the solemn day of their publick Humiliation and monethly fast. By John Strickland, B.D. pastor of the church at St. Edmunds, in the city of New Sarum; a member of the Assembly of Divines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>M.S. to A.S. with a plea for libertie of conscience in a church way, against the cavils of A.S. and observations on his considerations, and annotations upon the apologetical narration, humbly submitted to the judgements of all rationall, and moderate men in the world; with some modest, and innocent touches on the letter from Zealand, and Mr. Parker's from New-England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>A reply of two of the brethren to A.S. wherein you have observations on his considerations, annotations, &amp;c. Upon the apologetical narration. With a plea for libertie of conscience for the apologists church way; against the cavils of the said A. S. formerly called M. S. to A. S. Humbly submitted to the judgements of all rationall, and moderate men in the world. With a short survey of W. R. his Grave confutation of the separation, and some modest, and innocent touches on the letter from Zeland, and Mr. Parker's from New-England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Honey out of the rock, or, Gods method in giving the sweetest comforts in sharpest combates. Chiefly intended, as spirituall plunder for plundered beleevers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>The keyes of the kingdom of heaven, and power thereof, according to the VVord of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>A more exact relation of the late battell neer York; fought by the English and Scotch forces, against Prince Rupert and the Marquess of Newcastle. Wherein the passages thereof are more particularly set down, presented to the view of those who desire better satisfaction therin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>An answer to W.R. his narration of the opinions and practises of the churches lately erected in New-England. Vindicating those Godly and orthodoxall churches, from more then an hundred imputations fathered on them and their church way, by the said W.R. in his booke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Theomachia; or The grand imprudence of men running the hazard of fighting against God, in suppressing any way, doctrine, or practice, concerning which they know not certainly whether it be from God or no. Being the substance of two sermons, preached in Colemanstreet, upon occasion of the late disaster sustain'd in the west. With some necessary enlargements thereunto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>John Goodwin, Innocencies triumph. Or An answer to the back-part of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>John Strickland, Immanuel, or The church triumphing in God wi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Henry Burton, A vindication of churches, commonly called Independent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Roger Williams, A paraenetick or Humble addresse to the Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Joseph Caryl, An exposition with practical observations upon the five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Samuel Slater, The two covenants from Sinai, and Sion, drawn up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ephraim Huit, The whole prophecie of Daniel explained, by a paraphrase,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Joshua Hoyle, Jehojadahs justice against Mattan, Baals priest: or The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>John Goodwin, Calumny arraign’d and cast. Or A briefe answer to some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>The independants militarie entertainment. Or, Certaine reasons and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>William Dell, <em>Power from on high, or, The power of the Holy Ghost dispersed through the whole body of Christ, and communicated to each member according to its place and use in that body</em> (PB JC [Appendix 21:4], [08 May] 1645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>George Philips, <em>A reply to a confutation of some grounds for infants baptisme: as also, concerning the form of a church, put forth against mee by one Thomas Lamb. Hereunto is added, a discourse of the verity and validity of infants baptisme, wherein I endeavour to clear it in it self: as also in the ministry administrating it, and the manner of administration, by sprinkling, and not dipping; with sundry other particulars handled herein</em> (PB MS, [10 June] 1645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Simonds D’Ewes, <em>The primitive practise for preserving truth. Or An historickall narration, shewing what course the primitive church anciently, and the best reformed churches since have taken to suppressse heresie and schisme. And occasionally also by way of opposition discovering the papall and prelaticall courses to destroy and roote out the same truth; and the judgements of God which have ensued upon persecuting princes and prelates</em> (PB MS, [28 June] 1645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>John Blackwell, <em>A more exact relation of the great defeat given to Gorings army in the west; by the victorious Sr. Thomas Fairfax</em> (FD: 10 July 1645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>The glorious excellencie of the spirit of adoption; or, Of the spirit of the sonne of God, derived to the sonnes of God. Wherein are many precious truths held forth, which are presented to all the children of truth, who are and shall be sanctified through the truth* (PB JC, [21 July] 1645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Independency accused by nine severall arguments written by a godly learned minister, to a member of Mr. John Goodwins congregation, and acquitted by severall replyes to the said arguments by a member of the same church. In both which, sweetnesse of spirit, and soundnesse of arguments have been endeavoured (PB MS [Appendix 7:Y1], [12 August] 1645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>A true and exact Relation of the several Informations, Examinations and Confessions of the late Witches who were arraigned and condemned at the late Sessions, holden at Chelmesford (PB MS, [19 August] 1645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>A true and exact relation of the severall informations, examinations, and confessions of the late witches, arraigned and executed in the county of Essex. Who were arraigned and condemned at the late sessions, holden at Chelmesford before the Right Honorable Robert, Earle of Warwicke, and severall of his Majesties justices of peace, the 29 of July, 1645 (PB MS, FD: 29 October 1645)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>A defence of sundry positions, and Scriptures alleged to justify the Congregational way; charged at first to be weak therein, impertinent, and unsufficient; by R.H. M. A. of Magd. Col. Cambr. in his examination of them; but upon further examination, cleerly manifested to be sufficient, pertinent, and full of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>The spirits conviction of sinne. Opened in a sermon before the Honorable House of Commons, assembled in Parliament upon the solemn e day of their monethly fast, Novemb. 26, 1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Uniformity examined, whether it may be found in the gospel, or, in the practice of the churches of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Twelve considerable Caution very necessary, to be observed in and about a Reformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>The soules own evidence, for its own immortality in a very pleasant and learned discourse, selected out of that excellent treatise entituled, The trunesse of Christian religion, against atheists, epicures, &amp;c. First compiled in French by famous Phillip Mornay, Lord of Plessie Marlie, afterward turned into English by eloquent Sir Phillip Sydney, and his assistant, Master Arthur Golden, anno Domini M D LXXX VII. And now re-published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Cretensis: or A briefe answer to an ulcerous treatise, lately published by Mr Thomas Edwards, intituled Gangraena: calculated for the meridian of such passages in the said treatise, which relate to Mr. John Goodwin; but may without any sensible error indifferently serve for the whole tract. Wherein some of the best means for the cure of the said dangerous ulcer, called gangraena, and to prevent the spreading of it to the danger of the precious soules of men, are clearly opened, and effectually applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Milk for babes. Drawn out of the breasts of both Testaments. Chiefly, for the spiritual nourishment of Boston babes in either England: but may be of like use for any children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>The unveiling of Antichrist. Or, Antichrist stript naked out of all his Scripture-attyre, by which he hath deceived the Christian world; so that we may the more clearly see the very botome-root, from whence he sprang, and the very basis and foundation upon which he hath erected, and set up his kingdome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>The humble acknowledgement, and petition of divers inhabitants, in and about the citie of London. Presented to the Honourable the Commons of England in Parliament assembled the second of June. 1646. Whereunto is added, the answer returned by the said Honorable House of Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>John Price, <em>A moderate reply to the citie-remonstrance; presented to the High Court of Parliament the 26 of May, 1646. Containing severall reasons why many well affected citizens cannot assent thereunto</em> (PB MS [Appendix 7:T3], [12 June] 1646) E.340[20].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Edward Bowles, <em>Manifest truths, or An inversion of truths manifest. Containing a narration of the proceedings of the Scottish army, and a vindication of the Parliament and kingdom of England from the false and injurious aspersions cast on them by the author of the said manifest</em> (PB MS, [04 July] 1646) E.343[1]. APF Giles Calvert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Jeremiah Burroughs, <em>A vindication of Mr Burroughes, against Mr Edwards his foule aspersions, in his spreading Gangraena, and his angry Antiapologia. Concluding with a briefe declaration what the Independents would have</em> ([23 July] 1646) E.345[14].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Samuel Eaton, <em>The defence of sundry positions &amp; scriptures for the Congregational-way justified: or An answer to an epistle written by Mr. Richard Hollingworth, unto S.E. and T.T. wherein he (in many particulars) chargeth them with injurious dealing against God, and against himselfe, in that booke of theirs, called A defence of sundry positions, &amp;c. Containing a vindication from such charges and aspersions so laid upon them. As also a briefe answer to his large (if not unreasonable) demands, to have scripturall, or rationall answ. given to his 112 queries</em> (PB MS, [29 July] 1646) E.346[4].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Antidotes against some infectious passages in a tract, concerning schisme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Denzil Holles, <em>The speech of Denzell Holles Esquire. Delivered at the Lords Barr, Wednesday the 15th. of Iune</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Thankes to the Parliament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Remarkable passages from Nottingham, Lichfield, Leicester, and Cambridge declaring what the Kings standard is, and the time and manner of its setting up. Also how Lichfield and Tamworth are disarmed, and the Lord Gray his house disarmed and pillaged by the traitorous cavaliers. Together with some other remarkable occurrents</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Speciall and Late Passages from the most eminent places in Christendome</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[John Paulet], <em>The latest remarkable truths from Worcester, Chester, Salop, Warwick, Stafford, Somerset, Devon, Yorke, and Lincoln counties</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>A true relation of the late battaile before Worcester, taken on Sunday last, Sept. 25 by a gentleman of the Innes of Court</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>The Latest remarkable truths, (not before printed) from Chester, Worcester, Devon, Somerset, Yorke and Lanchaster counties, as also from Scotland</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>An argument or, debate in law: of the great question concerning the militia; as it is now settled by ordinance of both the Houses of Parliament</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jovis 6. October. 1642. <em>A declaration of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament in commendation of the inhabitants of the towne of Manchester, for their valiant resisting the late Lord Strange, and now Earle of Darbie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Henrietta Maria, <em>The Queens Majesties message and letter from the Hague in Holland, directed to the Kings most excellent Majesty, &amp;c.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>The rider of the vwhite horse and his army, their late good successe in Yorre-shiere, or, A true and faithfull relation of that famous and wonderfull victory at Bradford, obtained by the club-men there, with all the circumstances thereof</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Equitable and necessary considerations and resolutions for association of arms throughout the counties of the kingdom of England, and principality of Wales</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 1642) E.83[20].

16 Brave newes of the taking of the city of Chitchester [sic] by the Parliaments forces, under the command of Sir William Waller, upon Wednesday last, at 5. of the clock, halfe an hour before it began to raine (PB GB&RW [Appendix 1:2] [30 December] 1642) E.83[36].

17 The vnfaithfulness of the cavaliers and commissioners of array in keeping their covenants. By which may be discerned the issue of all future treaties and agreements with them (FD: 11 January 1643) E.84[37].

18 [John Evelyn], A Plain favlt in plain-English. And the same in Doctor Fearne: who (upon different grounds) build one error; but this is the best of it, that their difference destroys the same error, which they would build upon the ruine of Parliaments ([09 February] 1643) E.88[30].

19 The Queens letter from Holland: Directed to the Kings Most Excellent Maiesty ([18 February] 1643) E.90[2].

20 Touching the fundamentall lawes, or politique constitution of this kingdom, the Kings negative voice, and the power of Parliaments (PB WE&JG [Appendix 9:3], [24 February] 1643) E.90[21].

21 Hezekiah Woodward, The [cause use cure] of feare. Or, strong consolations (the consolations of God) cordiall at all times, but most comfortable now in these uncomfortable times, to fixe, quiet, and stablishe the heart, though the earth shake, and make it stand stil, to see the salvation of the Lord (PB WE&JG, FD: 25 February 1643) E.90[23].

22 Hezekiah Woodward, The Kings chronicle: In two sections; Wherein we have the acts of the wicked and good kings of Judah fully declared, with the ordering of their militia, and grave observations thereuponsubiacentes. (i.e.) The sweetest prospect in the world, to looke over other mens errors, so, as to looke into our selves, and correct our owne (PB GM, [08 March] 1643) E.92[16]. APF George Miller.

23 Cheshires succes since their pious and truly valiant collonell Sr. VVilliam Brereton barronet, came to their rescue (PB RO&GD [Appendix 10:T1], [13 March] 1643) E.94[6].

24 Lancasters massacre: or, the nvvv vvay of advancing the Protestant religion, and expressing loyalty to the King and Queene (PB TP&MS [Appendix 5:13], FD:25 March 1643) E.94[27].

25 Prince Ruperts burning love to England: discovered in Birmingham’s flames. Or A more exact and true narration of Birmingham’s calamities, under the barbarous and inhumane cruelties of P. Ruperts forces (PB RO&GD [Appendix 10:T1], [01 May] 1643) E.100[8].
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