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HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF History
The origin of political parties in England is usually traced to ecclesiastical differences found in the Long Parliament. In order, however, to understand and appreciate the further development of the parties it is necessary to go back further than 1641. As the coalescing of the parties was due to ecclesiastical discussions, this is in the history of the church, that we must look to find the first shadows of the future division.

During the reign of Henry VIII and especially after the separation from Rome, the balance between the various parties was maintained by the King's firm will and his powerful personality. Although England was now a Protestant country, still the larger portion were Catholics. The change that had taken place being merely a legal and political one. During
Edward and Mary's reign Protestantism grew slowly and continued to do so during Elizabeth's reign. The latter was driven by force of circumstances and necessity to become a champion and defender of Protestantism. As she was the daughter of Anne Boleyn it was impossible for her to have friendly relations with Rome. Soon after she ascended the throne she issued the second Prayer Book of Edward VI, which was declared to be the only form of prayer to be used in churches. "Christian," it was declared, "was to be practically free; but all must go to church and the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion were suffered."

The queen did not intend to be severe to the Catholics. She was unin-terested in theological discussions and failed to see that they were vital questions to the majority of her subjects. The desire for toleration in England.
that had been growing last ground where the consequences of the Pope, Philip of Spain and Mary Queen of Scots became known. As long as the prime mover of the opposition had been so rigidly punished, it was natural that the many who supported the movement should suffer severely. The lines that separated Catholics from Protestants were drawn more sharply. Acts were passed against priests who should attempt to reconcile any subject of the Queen to the See of Rome, or should even be found engaged in the celebration of the mass. Church members were frequently fined and imprisoned. These events were increasing
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Statutes and constitutional documents 1559-1625

23 Eliz. c. 4. To return the Queen's subjects to obedience.
   c. 2. Against seditious words and rumors.

27 Eliz. c. 7. For the safety of the Queen's person.

35 Eliz. c. 17. To return the Queen's subjects to obedience
   c. 2. Against Popish Recusants.
the distance between the two. The old generation who had been born into the Catholic church was passing away. In addition, the question was becoming a national one. The Catholics, backed by the Pope and Philip, would have made a radical change in the government of England.

But while the Catholic and Protestant parties were growing further apart, there was a further division within the Protestant party. Calvinism, as a theory of right living, had gained much ground in England. When it came to a question of church government, however, there was difficulty. The conservatism of the English nation was shown plainly in this matter. The majority, still clinging to the old forms and ceremonies, while a small minority or "non-conformists," as they were called, pleaded for liberty in belief and action.

The spirit of the new Jacobean and Elizabethian attitude is shown in the Venerian controversy. In deciding against the Nonconformists, the Queen said, "She was called following the spirit of the English constitution and the will of the people. The two great changes produced
by the Reformation in England, even the doctrine of the royal supremacy and the power of lay courts over ecclesiastical.

To introduce Presbyterianism meant to set up another Power in England that could not from its very nature acknowledge itself as an inferior one. It might have been expected the result of the Queen's action was not peace but war. The war was carried on by discussions and pamphlets in which Whitgift and Cartwright were prominent. The latter stood for freedom from forms, and the former was the foreman of the extreme High Church party.

In 1571 the House of Commons entered the discussions. Bills had been brought in to amend the Prayer Book, and during this discussion a Bill was passed by which "all ministers were compelled to subscribe only which concerned the Christian faith, and doctrine of the Sacraments." The House evidently intended that the subscribers should be freed

Makower, p. 69
Gardiner Vol. 14, p. 18

13 Eliz. c. 1, for a tax against the using wine and putting wine in casks of pulse (P Letters, p. 84.)
From binding themselves in matters relating to discipline. This is the first breach between the common and the crown and it is significant of what is to follow.

The Queen increased the difficulty by appointing Whitgift as her bishop. He was like Laud, in cherishing uniformity, and the espousing of the English church. Hence a well-meaning and honest man between undue and tactless.

At the beginning of James's reign we find the people in England divided into four parties, using the term in a very broad sense; namely, (1) Catholics, (2) High Church, (3) Puritans, (4) Non-conformists. In speaking of the latter, Gardiner makes the general division that the former desired reform in the church, while the latter were willing to form an independent church.

When James came to the throne the conflict broke out anew. He had been brought up as a Protestant, but had a strong bias towards Episcopacy. The Puritans took no time in sending six a petition wi
favor of certain reforms in the Prayer Book and administration of the church. The result of this was the Hampton Court conference (1604), between Puritans and representatives of the state church. It brought the two parties no nearer to each other. The changes that were made were immaterial and did not concern individual liberty or freedom of worship.

The Canons of 1604 followed, with James' mildness towards the Catholics, increased severity towards more advanced Protestants, caused opposition to spring up in Parliament. The chief man of the opposition was Chief Justice Pilk and in his legal actions there are many references to the church and state and their relations to each other.

James' efforts to establish Episcopacy in Scotland, his attack on the heritable jurisdiction at the opening of Parliament in 1617, the proposed act on ecclesiastical affairs, and Pym's speech at this

*Crottw p. 413
Millenary petition
- Hampton court conference (p.416)
8 Makow, p. 71
Parliament shows the growing opposition between the Puritans on the one hand and the school of Andrews and Sand on the other. A few years back the conflict had been between the Pope and King of Spain and English Protestants. Now it was altogether different. The Catholics were no longer to be feared, and although there were still many who yet dreaded Rome and thought her converts meant advanced power in England, yet unconsciously they had changed their attitude. Now they were fighting sin and immorality. It was a divine set-up against the thoughtless and frivolous spirit of the ages as seen in Buckingham, Lady Rose, Raleigh, and expressed in "The Declaration of Sports," and Selden's "History of the Plotters." Both sides were undoubtedly narrow. The Puritans with his lofty ideal, would do away with much that was good and beautiful because it was connected with what seemed to them wrong. He advocated radical measures. The taming
up of the evil by the roots, while the believers in Decency advanced a more conservative policy. Man should be surrounded by various external forms and ceremonies that would soften the heart and nature, and gradually through this change in his environment he would make a change in his habits. Both sides were in danger of losing political power to carry out their ends. The High Church party was fortunate in having such men as Laud and Andrews to carry out their ideas. So in the Puritan party a two-fold tendency was visible here. Andrews was a mystic and ascetic; Laud a disciplinarian. The one would attract, the other compel men to follow his example.

In the accession of Charles I the nature of the contest changed again. Under James it had been a civil contest, under Charles it became both civil and ecclesiastical. In the first Parliament of Charles I the keynote of what was to follow was struck by Eliot:

"Religion, it is," he says, "that keeps the subject in medicine, as being taught

*Gardiner Vol. 4 p. 244*
by God to honor their sovereigns. And when it is called, as the common obligation among men,—the tie of all friendship and society—the bond of all office and relation. For there is division in religion, so it makes distinction among men. For the unity I wish prosperity might say we had preserved for them that which was left to us."

Soon after, this speech Pym draws up a petition to take measures against the spread of the Roman Catholic church, which was passed.

Two books appeared during these years that aroused intense opposition: one "Puritans' Plea against the Prelate" was written by Alexander Leighton. It was a bitter attack on Prelacy and "unveiled to political persecutionism" to take the sword in hand. He was a Puritan of the narrowest type. Montague's "New Day for an Old Cause" inopportune came at this time.

---

* Gardiner, Vol. IV p. 343
* Gardiner, Vol. III p. 144
National Dictionary Biography (Leighton)
* Gardiner, Vol. IV p. 352
This book is an exposition of the reasons that ever leading men, to reject both the doctrines of Rome and Rome. He objected to the Calvinistic Puritan's belief in predestination. On the other hand, he would not say that the "Roman Catholic church was Antichrist and the Pope a man of sin." Those who remained in the church were of the Church of Christ, except and surrounding in the highest degree, it is true "not wholly apostate." In short, he was a broad-minded critic of the two religious systems and saw plainly the tendency and longing of the Englishman for certain forms similar to what they had been accustomed to in former times. When this book was finally referred to the committee in the House, there was but one result. The members of the Commons were conservative lawyer and country gentlemen and Calvinists, and were naturally opposed to Montague, who represented a reaction against their stern beliefs. Montague, in this respect, stands for the episcopacy or the High Church party, which was but a revival of the foundations away from a religion that was a lifeg
belle to a religion of peace and quiet. This movement originated in the Unitari
and was consequently not a popular one; its followers were the literati, the men of
culture and education. For this reason and because they opposed to great-religious
forces, Rome and Calvinism, not casting off entirely either, they stood in an uncertain
position and with few followers. In the struggle that soon followed this High
Church party united with the King and
the Cavaliers or Calvinists with Parliament. The
Court and the High Commissioners were used
by the former to advance their power.
Many of the persecuted sought refuge in
America. The Metropolitan emigration, by
which Laud hoped to carry out his policy of
"Thorough," his disregard of English conservatism
and customs, produced as general irritation.
Laud's endeavors towards enforced unity only
increased the bitter feeling of the Calvinists
which were bitter enough already.

In Scotland (1638) Charles issued a
book of canons, which recognized royal
supremacy in church and state, and in 1636 a new liturgy based on English book of Common Prayer. The result was a popular outbreak and ultimately a civil war. To obtain a grant of money, the King called a Parliament April 13, 1641. This new Parliament was opened by a speech from the Lord Keeper, Pynch, who set forth at length the troubles in Scotland and the immediate need of money. As soon as this was granted, he said, the grievances might be brought up. To strengthen Charles position an intercepted letter addressed to the King, supposedly to the French King from conspirators, was read. Grinstead records the sentiments of all when he says that "had as a Scottish invasion might be, the invasion made upon the liberties of the subjects at home, no means and more dangerous." Not only sought these grievances to be remedied, but an example ought to be made of the men with whom they had originated. By more followed ma
speech more specifically directed against ecclesiastical grievances. The next day Pym in a long, logical address summed up the grievances under three heads.

   The following words best express his idea and also give the political side of the coming revolution: "The power of Parliament are to the body politic as the rational faculties of the soul to man."

2. Ecclesiastical grievances.
   His chief point here was, that the present system was compulsory—personal liberty was disregarded.

3. Civil grievances.
   Under this head he included the long list of political troubles, enforcement of tonnage and poundage, impositions without Parliamentary grant, monopolies, enlargement of forests, etc.

The remedy was to ask the Lords join in searching out the causes and remedies of these unsupportable grievances and in petitioning the King for redress.

"Pockwood Vol. IV, p. 21"
This speech determined the course of proceedings in the House, and the next few days they buried themselves with their questions. On the 13th they were called to Whitehall and the immediate necessity of raising subsidies was urged by the King. The next day the Commons went into a committee on the message and resolved to demand a conference with the Lords. "Tell the liberties of the House and Kingdom are clear, they know not whether they had anything to give or no." This angered the King and he appealed to the Lords who supported him in his request for subsidies. The Commons considered this a breach of privileges. Their determination not to grant the subsidies until the matter of arbitrary taxation at least was decided, compelled Charles to dissolve the Parliament on May 3rd.

The convocation of the southern and northern provinces had, according to custom, been summoned in addition to the convocation of the southern provinces.
custom, but upon strength of royal permission they continued in conversation and voted a series of canons in which the divine right of the King was recognized, armed resistance to him under all circumstances condemned; and bound themselves by oath, "never to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and canons-deacons, as it now stands established." These canons immediately aroused opposition.

In August, the Scotch marched into England acting in concert with part of English opposition. The King could not depend upon his army, funds could not be raised, and Charles was compelled to summon that historic Parliament of which it has been said—"Many thought it would never have a beginning and afterwards it would never have an end." It at once began an attack on the government of those persons in whom the King had trusted.

Smith p. 399
Dob.
The feeling in the House was that everything had gone wrong. The High church man and Puritan, or the future Cavalier and Roundhead, were of one mind on this matter. At this time there was no thought of opposition to the King. His regime is not mentioned by the Debates. They gave him credit, however, for a much more resolute and consistent policy than he was capable of. They held that all that had taken place was the result of a certain definite policy. To replace law and liberty by despotism, and this political despotism in turn to be subjected to an ecclesiastical despotism of the Pope.

Parliament strength lay first of all in popular support, second in the army. Charles stood in an altogether different relation with the parliament than any previous one. His former dissolutions meant absolute irremiss.

"Gardiner Vol. D, p. 219"

"Ibid"
In the House there was but one mind, and that mind was conservative. All were united in despising innovation, and determined to preserve them. Olym did not take the leading place that he afterwards assumed, but even in the early debates, the strong and powerful personality of the man comes out plainly. His speeches show a thoughtful, practical, conservative statesman; one who has much respect and reverence for the traditions of the English nation, and a desire to attain his ends by constitutional means.

In the long list of grievances that were presented in November and the speeches during the debates of that month and of December, there is unanimity along all lines but one, and that is religious matter. These months are marked by the growing hostility against the King's counsellors, that culminated in arrest, impeachment, and trial of Strafford and Laud. These, together with the dislike of the Catholicks,

* Rushworth Vol. IV, p. 21
* Journals p. 2
* Gardiner Vol. 15, p. 224
intensified by the Queen and supported plots, revelation of her Chapmen victims, found their outlet and expression in the London petition against the new currency, debates on the resolution of the House to do away with Landenius innovations.

The first debates wandered as there was no party organization, no leaders to mark out a definite line of policy. Of the questions discussed, the impeachment of Stafford, ship money, defensive measures against the Catholics, the debates show no division.

Take the question of ship money for instance. It comes up in the early part of the session as one of the grievances. The most influential speech made on this subject was by Falkland. Although again

\textsuperscript*\textsuperscript{For correspondence of plots see Rushworth Vol. I, p. 1816}
\textsuperscript{o} Rushworth Vol. II p. 100-111
Journals p. 47
\textsuperscript{xx}
Rushworth Vol. IV, p. 87-88
Journals p. 46
and again he differs with Pryn on church questions, they are one, together with the House. So strong was the feeling that on Dec. 7 a bill was passed declaring "all receiving of Money, commonly called Ship Money, is against the Law of the Realm, the Subject's right, Property, and contrary to former Resolutions in Parliament, and to the Petition of Rights." This passed "Remorse contradicentis," "in order for the Lords to vacate the Records about Ship-money and pay the Sheriff the Ship-money in their hands" came latter. There was now Royalist party, that is more who wished to defend the Crown policy. Of decision was to come. It is evident it must come from another quarter. Men, it is true, might not agree about the details of the future political institutions but they were agreed as to its general characteristics, namely - the reign of law and authority of Parliament.

The first difference is found in the decision of the committal of the London petition.

Journal 47
Rushworth Vol. IV, 195.
This petition demanded church reforms and the abolition of episcopacy and was signed by 18,000 Londoners. On the question of its commitment to a committee there was "man against man for the same." This division is noteworthy as significant of what is to follow.

In December the 16th, the Canons passed during the summer were abolished. At the time the King's negotiations for foreign aid, his action respecting Goodman's case, Dutch and Scotch difficulties, and the tampering of the Queen with leaders of Parliament, has tended to the matter.

Concerning the strength of the feeling of opposition a Toleration in the London petition is noteworthy. The determination of episcopacy was demanded "root and branch." There was a movement against the Bishops and the Prayer Book also; disturbances in London churches by people who were determined to do away with the new innovations by force. In the

\[ \text{Journal}, p. 293 \]
\[ \text{Rushworth Vol. IX, p. 93} \]
\[ \text{Gardiner Vol. VII, p. 247} \]
\[ \text{Rushworth Vol. IX, p. 99} \]
other side, a body of separatists had been taken into custody.

It was evident that the church question had to be solved in one way or another. There was a large number who determined if bishops continued to exist, they must be brought under subjection of Parliament, their laws, and their authority sustained. There was a large number of dissenters who argued that Episcopacy was anti-christian; a smaller number who believed it was a divine institution. To the mass of the people, it made little difference. They cared not how worship was conducted, when burials were governed. Laud had roused the dislike against the forms of the church into new life. The majority simply wanted the reforms he introduced abandoned; the bowing at the name of Jesus, summun of Communion table to each end, compulsory abstinence of work on Saints' days, etc. There were thousands to whom the words of the Prayer Book were dear. To these Bishop Hall addressed his "Humble Remonstrance for Liturgy and Episcopacy" which appeared in January. The title itself is significant of the times. The
question of the liturgy. The church being fatal importance and taking precedence over theocracy. The main point was that the Book of Common Prayer could be adapted to every mood of Christian devotion. Some few things needed reduce, but the old form and system should remain.

It is not at all strange that Charles liked the book on that those who wished to see Presbyteriannism established in England held it as a must for fire.

Presbyteriannism as well as Episcopal had many enemies in England. This is especially true in the House. Of these Hyde, Hyde, and Walke and Sermont were prominent.

On February the 8th, those momentous debates opened in the House. The question at issue was, whether the Londoner's petition should be committed together with the minister's petition which asked that the Bishops might be restrained by certain definite rules.

* Gardiner Vol. II, p. 275
* Rushworth III, p. 170-188
The first check was given by Pudsey. He argued that the church had too much power, it would soon surpass that of the state and cite the example of the Roman Empire and the Popes. The Church, he declared, should be restrained in its larger power, such as excommunication, etc. Some of the ministry should be joined to them to regulate matters.

Mr. Digby followed with a check that showed his friendly feeling towards the court and his lack of sympathy with the middle and lower classes. The London petition should only be used as an index of grievances, and called it a comet with the tail pointing towards the north. Parliament might regulate and make laws but it was presumptuous for those outside to petition against almonry force. After assailing the petitioners he turns and criticizes the Bishops, declaring that he is willing to cry with the Londoners "down with Them."
There is some good in our institution that has existed so long, and he thinks a triennial Parliament will solve the difficulty of keeping it in order. As for Presbyterianism or limited Episcopacy, he says it cannot exist with a monarchy. They would be sure to claim the right of excommunicating the King. Barkland in the New Church dwelt more upon the intellectual side of the question. He ascribed to him none but a new name for the old priest. Through Land, freedom of speech, consequently in some measure freedom of thought had been suppressed. The church was becoming an English Catholic church. In spite of this gloomy outlook, Barkland would not lose heart with Christianity. He would repeal the persecuting laws, go back to the time of Saint Paul, and trust to the triennial Parliament.

Ferrier replied to Slighly rather than to the idealistic theories of Barkland. He takes up the right of the people to petition.
and declare that the House of Commons is responsible to its constituents and can not act alone. He saw plainly that an ecclesiastical government was not in accordance with the best interests of a Parliamentary government. "Until the ecclesiastical government be framed something of another sort, and be more assimilated to that of the commonwealth, I fear the ecclesiastical will be no good neighbor unto the civil, but will still be casting of its leaven into it, to reduce that also to a sole substance and arbitrary way of proceeding." "A second and greater evil" he adds, "and of dangerous consequence, in the sole and arbitrary power of Bishops over the clergy in this: That they have by that means a power to place and displace the whole clergy of their diocese at their pleasure and this is such a power that for my part I had rather they had the like power over the estates and persons of all within their diocese; for if I held the one but at the will and pleasure of one man, I can have but little or at least no certain joy or comfort in the other." He then goes
on to speak of the real danger, it consisting in the power of the clergy to mould the people as they will through their influence in the pulpit.

Mr. Bagshaw and Plydell followed, arguing that episcopacy was not inseparable from the crown. Mr. Grimston came next, arguing that it was not necessary to do away with episcopacy to reform it. Temporal jurisdiction should be taken away and the High Commission court abolished. Pym, Hampden, Whitt and Stilte were all for the committal of petition. Lyde, Calpepper, Selden and Hopkins followed Sligby and Falkland.

Although the difference of the standpoints taken on this day is slight, yet it marks the separating of the two parties. The previous unity of the house is shown in the debates. Both sides are agreed in desiring restrictions on the monarchy as shown in remarks on triennial bill. In purely church matters they were still united on many points. They wanted
the church to be under restrictions imposed by Parliament; the bishops ought not to have their old un-restrained power, nor did either party think the bishops as having divine origin. The difference lay in the question as to whether the strongest influence and "coercive jurisdiction" should rest. The man in the pulpit with freedom to speak and power to enforce his words would mould the thoughts and lives of men. The Puritans would have the ministry teach and conduct the religious worship and leave to the church as a body all "coercive jurisdiction." On the other hand the High Church party would place "coercive jurisdiction" in the hands of the Bishops.

The present need was as Faverham said to give the institutions another twist, to bring them into some tolerable harmony with the religious feelings of a greater part of the nation, and also to make the system broad enough to permit one to think and believe as he saw fit. There was no one, however, to see this, or strong enough to carry out such a measure, nor was the nation

\* Gardiner Vol. IX p. 252
ready for it. There is one point that it is necessary to emphasize, namely that the
formal bishops had been nominated by the
King, and no mention was made by the
defenders of Episcopacy of any change. This
transfers the question from purely a church
to a political matter.

In the days that followed the breach
between them widened: Hyde, Culpepper, and
Falkland came forward as champions of the
Royal prerogative and decided opponents to a
Scottish alliance. Whether this breach could
be healed or not depended upon the attitude
Cromwell and his party took towards the Rost and
Brach party, and this attitude depended upon
the confidence they would be able to feel in
the King, and the reception with which
the Bishops' exclusion bill would meet in
the House of Lords.

Charles continued to show himself
unstable and unworthy of trust. He
attempted to join the Leaders of Parliament
by favors, he was constantly trying to play
one party against another. To him the
House of Commons was a body of murderers who had voted him of the best and most trusted counsellor. They were noble, and with noble he need not keep his word. The Commons by the act prohibiting the dissolution of the present Parliament had cut themselves away from the crown. Pym stood on uncertain ground. He did not know whom to trust, and advance without revolutionary or unconstitutional measures seemed impossible.

On the 21st, the Bishops succeeded in getting into committee in the Upper House. By the 27th the Peers had agreed to exclude clergyman as a rule, from all civil functions. The bishops, however, were to be excepted, so far as related to their seats in Parliament. The general feeling against seeing clergyman employed in temporal affairs was modified by the strong conservative feeling to resist any change in the constitution of the Upper House. This vote was a defiance to the majority in the House of Commons. Of that majority, a part, how large it is impossible to
determine, decided absolute establishment of Episcopacy. This "Root and Branch Party had been strengthened lately by the discovery that 400,000 were yet needed to pay off the army. To the higher clergy were regarded as instigators of the war. There was a strong feeling that they should be compelled to bear the burden and their estates confiscated if necessary. The defenders of Episcopacy were also a minority in the House and the balance rested, as mentioned before, with Pym and his followers. They were determined to place the King under constitutional restraint and establish Protestant worship in the churches. They felt that the Bishops were merely mouthpieces of the King and for him to have twenty-six votes at his disposal was dangerous. The day on which the decision of the Lords became known, Vane and Cromwell brought with them into the House a bill, said to have been drawn up by Sir John, the effect of which was the absolute extinction of Episcopacy. This was proposed by Henry, passed to second reading.

* Gardiner's Vol. 14, p. 387
by a majority of 185 to 108. One June 4th. the
was a conference on the earlier bill, but on the
7th, it was thrown out on the third reading.
There might be differences of opinion on the
subject of church government; but there was
none on limiting the prerogative. Late the
same day three bills were brought in and
read a third time without division. They
concerned the illegality of ship money, limit-
ing extent of forest, and abolishing of knight-
hood fines.

It was on this same day that
after Bernier produced the report of the
committee, on the army plot, secured that
humiliating scene in the House and the
long exciting debate. This revealed plainly
that the government of Charles and its
reformed government were incompatible.

Pym in his ten propositions makes
a great effort to unite the warring parties
and partially succeeded. It being accepted by
both Houses. The main proposals were the
disbandment of the armies, delay of King's
journey, and removal of evil counsellors.

* Gardiner Vol. IX, p. 401
This act Charles away from his supporters. He did not see his danger any clear, but insisted on following his own plans and going to Scotland.

The spot and branch bill was dropped then was Parliament. It was not the time for division. The armies must be disbanded as soon as possible. So there was no government in England, Parliament ceased ordinances. Practically the House had already taken executive control but not so openly. On the 28th of August it was voted to adjourn on the 7th of September, not to meet again until the 20th of October. This is the last time the two parties cooperated with each other and it marks the beginning of the strife.

The root of the difficulty lay in the proposed ecclesiastical legislation. It was not natural that these matters should rest. To the great mass of the people religious questions were their chief intellectual food; religious books were their only literature. There were many whose constitutional

arguments did not truth, but were vitally
question of a religious question was mooted.
Laud, Williams, and Milton, the most
prominent literary men, were occupied with
these subjects. The old belief that religious
freedom meant anarchy still existed. Laud's
ministerial attempts had simply recoiled on
himself. More extreme Caroline, though attack
on Prayer Book and bishops' Holy work it
was becoming a class question also.
The church was becoming anarchical, guided
by the will of the strongest at that moment.
Some uniform law was needed. Astray
hand was necessary, and Parliament was
the only one. But this body could not do
worthy work. It represented the extreme
both sides and at once took the voice of the
majority for voice of the nation, and neglected
the small but very important minority.
The announcement for adjournment was
followed by a feeling of regret at not doing
anything on the religious question. They
determined to do away with Laudian mis-
actions, to remove the communicant table from
the east end of the church, and have the rails taken down, that all crucifixes, scandalous pictures of one or more persons of the Trinity, and all images of the Virgin Mary should be "taken down;" and all steps and candlesticks and lamps be removed from the communion table; that all corporal bowing at the name of Jesus, or towards the east end of the church, or towards the communion table be henceforth forborne; that all dancing and sports be forborne on the Lord's day; and the preaching of sermons be permitted in the afternoon.

If this had stopped here there would not have been many difficulties raised, but in the proposal to alter the Prayer Book, intense opposition was aroused. There is now a possibility for Charles to find a party not only in Parliament but also in the nation. The Lords' proposed amendments only make antagonism between the Houses.


[x]
appears to be successful, but finds and
his usual double policy soon distend all
friendly feeling and when the "Incident"
becomes known, he is more mistrusted
than ever. When Parliament reassembles
the "shadow of the incident" is there
haunting and preventing a compromise.
The days between the adjournment and
assembly of Parliament were
marked by a growth of fanaticism
and headlong religious zeal, that
produced a rising feeling against the
religious sects. Certain ulterior motives
after the Incidents have become known in
England, the panic has not subverted
the two parties. Gardiner declares that
even at this time if these had been
no question but the political one there
would have been no division. The
history of the next month is
disappointing. There was no man
broad enough to see that the only
solution was in compromise and
tolerance. It is disappointing to find

* Gardiner Vol. X, p. 31
Pryn as narrow and yet his very
pragmatics made him the leader of men
that he was. Falkland, who spoke in
February against Laudian innovations
was now equally offended by the reign
of the Presbytery. Still there were a
few voices raised for toleration. Burton in
a pamphlet entitled the "Protestation
Protist" and Lord Brookes "Discourse
on Episcopacy" have the broader vision.
The keen insight of these men had little
influence.

Events followed each other in
rapid succession, hastening the end. The
Scott rebellion, Grand Remonstrance, Charles
return, and attempt on five members,
struggle for militia, in the midst of which
the Quaker party becomes the Royalists'
party. The immediate cause of this was
a motion by Pryn that "His Majesty
should employ only such councillors and
ministers as should be approved by
Parliament," "If herein," the Commons further
said, "His Majesty shall not vouchsafe
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to condescend to our humble supplication, although we shall always continue with reverence and faithfulness to his person and to the Crown, to perform those duties of service and obedience to which by the laws of God and this Kingdom we are obliged, yet we should be forced, in discharge of the trust which we owe to the State and to those whom we represent, to resolve upon some way of defending Ireland from the rebels, as may concur to the securing of ourselves from such malicious counsels and designs as we have lately seen and still are in practice and agitation against us, as we have just cause to believe; and to command those acts and contributions which this great necessity shall require, for the custody and disposing of such persons of honour and fidelity as we have the cause to confide in.

Thus modified Pyrrhus' mistrusts were startling. It is the most distinctly evolutionary proposal that...
has been adopted by the Commons. This took the executive power in so far as Ireland was concerned. Cromwell move
to entrust Essex with power over Lurien
bands and "this power might continue
till this Parliament shall take further
orders." This was an open attack on the
prerogative of the King.

It is not necessary to decide whether
Prynne's motion was justifiable or not. The
result was the conversion of the Episcopalian
party into a Royalist. That party was
a minority in the Commons but
held the majority in the House of Lords.
To bafffe the Puritans was now its
chief object. To attain this end
they were willing to trust the King and
take the chance of an Irish campaign. On
religious grounds these could be no
compromise. The Commons, fearing to
stand alone, turned to the people and
appealed to them through the
Grand Remonstrance. This was more
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than a political document. It was a
proclamation of battle to the High Church party
of the Royalists. It was a declaration
of religious rights. In that, they took
a stand, for which they afterwards
fought and died.
Bibliography.

The following general histories were consulted to obtain a comprehensive view of the ground covered. The works on the constitutional phase of the question and the Church histories being used for special points. A careful study was made of the sources on the period covered by the Long Parliament. The chief authority followed, however, was Gardiner.

General Works.

Gardiner, S. R.

*History of England. 1603-1642*

10 vol.

Green, John Richard

*History of the English People. Vol. IV*

Puritan England 1603-60

The Revolution 1660-88
Ranke, Leopold von.

Smith, G. Barnett.

Trist, A. D.
Social England.

English Constitution

Bagehot, Walter
The English constitution and other political essays.

Cross, Dr. Randolph.
History of the English constitution

In. by Philip S. Ashworth. 2 vol.

Hallam, Henry.
Constitutional History of England from accession of Henry VII to death of George II.

Taswell-Langmead, Thomas Pitt
English constitutional history.
Taylor, Hannis.
Origins and growth of the English constitution.

Makower, Felix.
Constitutional history and constitution of the Church of England.

Sources:
Buchworth, John.
Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters in Law, Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments, Beginning the Sixteenth Year of King James Anno 1616 and Ending the Fifth Year of King Charles, Anno 1629. 8 vol.

Journals of the House of Commons 1640-44

Gardiner, S. R.
Constitutional Documents of Preliminary Revolution 1628-1660.
Periodicals

American Church Review 11:9
Church, in 17th. century.

Church Quarterly 32:188
Church under Mary I.

Church Review 50:206
Church, Restoration 7.

— 30:16
Church, removal of Bishops 7.

Cornhill 21:161
Church and Puritanism

Church of England.

Edinburgh Review 116:329
Church, from 1660-63

116:377
Revolution of church history.
Edinburgh Review 193:399
Church, Puntaneous and Arnolds

English Historical Review 6:351
Letters

10:417
Condition of morals and religious
belief in reign of Edward V1

7:369
England in 1644-45

7:281
England in 1678

London Quarterly 53:24
Church in 17th Century

41:1
Reformation in England

Nation 25:938
Reformation in England

19th Century 24:764
Church and Queen Elizabeth

26:882
Church under Henry VIII

24:1
Elizabethan settlement
19th Century
England under Charles II

Quarterly
Church, Ritualism in.

Saturday Review
Church History

Scotland Review
Church, Relations with Rome under Charles.