FAST DAY SERMONS TO THE LONG PARLIAMENT

by

Louis J. Sparks

History 195H

Professor J. Sears McGee

Senior Honors Thesis, 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

On November 6, 1640, representatives met in London to begin a new Parliament, the first, excluding the abortive Short Parliament earlier that year, since 1629. Their first order of business was to call for a day of fasting and prayer. Three days later a fast day was set for the seventeenth of November. Accompanying this day of fasting and prayer were to be two sermons addressed to the members by preachers the Commons had appointed the same day the fast was approved. Cornelius Burges and Stephen Marshall both gave sermons on the seventeenth of November and both would go on to become "pillars of the puritan preaching to the Long Parliament," delivering many sermons to the House in the following years of turmoil.[1]

From these first sermons in 1640 to the dissolution of the Long Parliament in 1660, the Commons held fast days and heard preachers encourage them to godly deeds. From February, 1642 until December, 1648, by order of the Commons, the last Wednesday of every month was set aside as a special day of prayer and preaching. While their representatives in London were to hear God's word and seek his guidance, the rest of the nation was to fast and pray also for God's wisdom for their leaders and blessing upon their land.

The members of the Long Parliament met in 1640 virtually

---

[1] John F. Wilson, Pulpit in Parliament (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), 37.

unanimous in their belief that things had gone wrong in their nation, politically and religiously, and that something had to be done. By January, 1642 the king had left London and within months civil war would break out over differing plans to correct these wrongs. Hugh Trevor-Roper, former Regius Professor of Modern History in Oxford University, argues that the Fast Sermons were political propaganda for the more radical faction within the Parliament, used to set forth its plans for the nation, announce switches in policy and to inform members of its agenda.[2] It must have been a very insightful and ingenious plan, devised over many months and with careful thought.

"After all," Trevor-Roper writes, "this great meeting of Parliament had been planned long ago. For three years 'the great contrivers,'... had been planning their tactics, preparing their program."[3] John Pym, the leader of this conspiracy within the House of Commons, is pictured as a man grasping for greatness, who would lead the radical faction, and the nation, to civil war. It was Pym who "would learn to 'tune the pulpits' as effectively as his heroine Queen Elizabeth had done."[4] Quite deceptively, this group of radicals worked to convert the "perfectly natural" tradition of fast days and their sermons into means, a "system," of manipulation and control "in order to sustain the unity of the

---

[2] Hugh R. Trevor-Roper, Religion, the Reformation and Social Change (London: Macmillan Press, 1972), 294.

[3] Ibid., p. 297.

[4] Ibid., p. 296.

Parliament and the fulfillment of an ever more radical program over several years." The most hideous corruption of the fast day sermons, which Trevor-Roper presents as the strongest evidence for the conspiracy, was the leaders' success in preparing the members of the House for those "dramatic episodes...." What the ministers seemed to preach about came to pass: the demand for Strafford's execution, the call for radical church reform, and the appeals to the mob in late 1641, to name only a few.[5] What a grand conspiracy it must have been!

There is, however, a much more plausible thesis about the role of the fast sermons in the early 1640s. While John Pym, the leader of Charles I's opponents in Parliament, was undoubtedly a shrewd politician and managed the House well, he acquired neither complete control nor the ability to dictate policy. Pym, consumed as apparently is Trevor-Roper by concerns of a conspiracy, feared the threat to England from the papal conspirators at court and in the Church. The Puritans, too, had been preaching to their followers all over the country, not just to members of Parliament, about the popish threat. Pym, his political associates, and the preachers are best seen as a natural alliance of like-minded men, not a group of conspirators. Pym and the Puritan ministers had a common goal. They sought to keep the members of Parliament (MPs) aware of the real reason for their work: to repair the damage of government abuses caused by

---

[5] Ibid., p. 296.

the infiltration in church and council of a papal influence and prevent the like from reoccurring.

In presenting this thesis we will examine several questions raised by earlier work. To which kinds of actions did the preachers seek to move their listeners? Is there evidence that the House of Commons' actions did follow the program set forth in the sermons? If so, can it be shown that the sermons moved men to this course? Did these sermons inaugurate new policy, or announce shifts in existing policy, as Trevor-Roper has claimed? The answers to these questions help demonstrate the true relationship between the preacher's sermons and the political goals and victories of the radicals within Parliament.

First, a word on the sermons themselves may be useful at this point. The House of Commons declared official days for fasting and prayer at irregular intervals until February, 1642. The sermons given on these days are the "official" fast sermons. But there were numerous other occasions for members to hear the word and be encouraged to godly deeds. There are many sermons extant, preached to "sundry" members of the House at St. Margaret's, Westminster, considered within the fast sermon tradition and included in this, as well as earlier research.

CHAPTER ONE

THE ROAD TO 1640

In 1640 England was in great turmoil. There was a fragile peace with the Scots, a constitutional crisis caused by distrust between King and Parliament, and rising religious dissension due to conflict between factions vying for control of the Church of England. The factions involved, the goals they sought to achieve and the methods they used to achieve them, evolved over a long period and would continue to be shaped by the events of the later 1640s, especially those within Parliament. Understanding what these groups were and how they reached their 1640 form will help explain their role and interests in the Long Parliament.

I. Fast Sermon Tradition.

The concept of fast days and their sermons was not new to the 1640s. In 1580, during the reign of Elizabeth I (1558-1603), a "Motion [was] made for a public Fast, with Prayer and Preaching to be exercised by this House for the Assistance of God's Holy Spirit."[6] The queen saw this as an "innovation" and did not want Puritan ministers establishing a parliamentary fast that could be used to interfere with her plans for a church dominated by royal wishes. She put a quick stop to Parliament's plans by simply ordering them not to discuss the issue. The Puritans were forced

---

[6] Wilson, p. 22. Chapter II of Wilson's work is a good history of the Fast Sermon tradition in England from which this brief overview is derived.

to wait for more advantageous circumstances.

Under the rule of James I(1603-1625) efforts to call a fast day were begun again. In the second Parliament of James's reign, which had a short life in the spring of 1614, a motion that all members receive communion before a certain day was offered to the House. While this was more an effort to prove one's Protestant loyalties to the king following the failed attempt to blow up the members of Parliament and king by radical Catholics, known as the Gunpowder plot, the motion was approved and began the practice of "preaching services in St. Margaret's, Westminster, directly sponsored by the House of Commons."[7] This is where all the fast sermons of the 1640s would be preached to members of the House.

In 1624 Sir Edward Cecil offered a motion for a "general" fast, to include the entire kingdom, that passed without difficulty. As John Wilson points out, this fast went beyond the earlier "test communion" fast days of James's reign, designed to exclude closet Catholics from the House, and was seen as bringing "the whole body under the discipline of preaching."[8] Isaac Bargrave, chaplain to Prince Charles, preached to the House and admonished them as representatives of the whole land to repent for the entire nation.[9] Bargrave earned disfavor from the court for setting the Commons up as the representation of England,

---

[7] Wilson, p. 24.

[8] Wilson, p. 26.

[9] Isaac Bargrave, A Sermon Preached...1623 (London, 1624), 1-2.

while the House gained prestige from being depicted as such.

In the first years of Charles I's reign (1625-1649) there were fasts to accompany the meeting of Parliament. The most notable was that of his first Parliament in 1625. John Preston, the most illustrious and eminent of the Puritans, addressed the House during a time of plague and described it as a result of God's anger.[10] He also pointed out that zeal, "if aroused and properly directed, could turn it away." This sermon proved to be the model for those given before the Long Parliament in the 1640s. It equated catastrophe with God's wrath and called for the whole nation to repent and to turn to the Lord. The Commons held fasts in all the subsequent Parliaments of the 1620s. In March, 1629, Charles dissolved Parliament and it was not to sit again until 1640.

When Parliament met again it had precedents firmly in place to continue the fast sermon tradition. The fast sermon began in England from the tradition of calling fast days for thanksgiving, which Elizabeth did allow in 1588 to mark the defeat of the Armada. It developed from test communions to times set aside for godly preaching during the rule of James I. Charles I saw the fast sermon firmly established as a function of Parliament with that body appointing the preachers and having the sermon printed afterwards. How in the early 1640s the Puritans used this captive audience to propagate their plans for England, to

---

[10] Wilson, p. 34, 139.

persuade others to follow these plans, and whether they succeeded in their goals will be discussed in the pages to follow.

II. The Rise of Religious Dissension

There have always been, and will continue to be, Puritans. Puritanism is more a mind set, or zealousness for pure religion, than a particular religious doctrine. However, this paper is concerned with the rise of "historic Puritanism," the movement that sought reform of the Church of England to a degree beyond which the authorities of the Church were willing to allow.[11] Since its beginning in the reign of Elizabeth I, the Puritans struggled to bring about their design of reform. How they fared in this effort during the years 1558 to 1640 sheds some light on their militancy in the Long Parliament.

With the death of the Catholic Queen, Mary I (1553-1558), and the accession of the Protestant Elizabeth, reform-minded men saw cause for great hope. While Mary had reversed all the reforms of her brother Edward VI (1547-1553), and her persecution of Protestants had earned her the infamous title Bloody Mary, exiled reformers returned to England planning to implement even more radical ideas they had learned in Geneva and Frankfurt. But reform was not to be. Elizabeth sought above all to prevent the religious conflict that had characterized her siblings' reigns; she implemented the "Elizabethan Settlement." She tried to keep

---

[11] William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938), 5.

all her subjects, Catholic and Protestant, happy within the Church of England. She returned to the policies of her brother Edward VI but did not favor the extensive reforms sought by the Puritans, such as eliminating surplices and other ceremonial garments of the clergy. Though unhappy with the settlement, Puritans remained within the Church and devised means to reach their goals, means that would have long lasting consequences.[12]

Those seeking to purify the Church, Puritans, did not want to leave the Church. Instead they turned to preaching and to the press in order to further their beliefs, in an effort to cleanse the Church from within. Most exhibited outward signs of conformity, usually staying within the letter of the law, but continued to spread Puritan ideas of doctrine and liturgy. They created lecturships to provide for their own preaching and gained a large following among the laity. Puritans came to control several of the colleges at Cambridge and educated large numbers of clergy who then propagated their brand of Protestantism. Also, they began printing their doctrines for dispersion among the populace, a practice which had a far-reaching impact. Theirs was a participatory, literate faith. It had great appeal and spread throughout the realm during reign of Elizabeth, though predominantly in the south and south-east of England.

In 1603 the great Queen died and James VI of Scotland

---

[12] see Patrick Collinson, The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559-1625 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) and Peter Lake, Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

traveled south to become James I of England. New hope swept the Puritan community. James was a strong Calvinist and had ruled with a presbyterian church in Scotland. The extent of coming reform was decided at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. But James too disappointed the Puritans. He agreed with their plans for a better educated clergy and for the elimination of pluralism but not for lower clergy participation (quasi-presbyterianism) in authoritative bodies. Yet, like Elizabeth, James made no effort to oust the Puritans from the Church. Many of his bishops were sympathetic to their point of view and only mildly enforced the conformity laws on the Puritan preachers. The effect was to allow Puritanism to grow and gain many followers among the gentry as well as the common people, most notably in the towns and cities.[13]

After the turn of the century, Puritanism began to mean more than just "purifier." For decades Puritans had sought to bring what they saw as true reform to the Church. Year upon year of frustration convinced some of the inability of the Church of England to reform itself from within; these believers became separatists. They no longer wanted to belong to the corrupt Church of England but opted for building their true church beyond royal and ecclesiastical rule. This caused difficulty for those Puritans, still a majority, who worked to convert the people and bring about change from within. With this shift from outward

---

[13] Haller, p.20.

conformity on the part of some believers the term "Puritan" became a derogatory label for those separating from the Church of England. Those who remained within the Church, while having common doctrinal views with many, but definitely not all, of the separatists, felt insulted if called a "Puritan."[14] Some in the hierarchy of the Church used it to mark a person as radical and unfit for position in the church (much as the "L" word was used in American politics in 1988).[15] However, as it concerns this work, the name Puritan should be understood to represent not separatists but those seeking reform of the Church. Although seemingly only a question of degree, what stance a person took on the reform question, how much of a Puritan he or she was, came to have serious consequences in the reign of James's son.[16]

The intermittent enforcement of conformity and the freedom to preach their views enjoyed by the Puritans under Elizabeth and James ceased when, in 1625, the king died. The new monarch, Charles I, wanted unity and control in his Church and had just the man for the job. William Laud had moved slowly through the ranks of the Church and was made Archbishop of Canterbury in

---

[14] OED, p. 1621.

[15] N. Tyacke, "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution" in Conrad Russell, The Origins of the English Civil War (London, 1973) 119-143.

[16] Collinson provides an excellent overview of religious concerns during James' reign. See also Haller, chapter 1.

1633.[17] He favored the Arminian form of Protestantism, which to Puritans was nothing less than a disguised form of Catholicism. Laud saw the Puritans as the cause of the conflict and disorder in the Church and as behind the rise in radical notions in religion. He worked hard at returning many of the ceremonial practices, viewed by Puritans as Catholic, to the Church. Laud wanted to return some power and authority to the Church. He worked hard, and succeeded to a fair degree, at silencing the Puritan preachers and presses.[18]

Late in the 1630s Laud was at the height of his influence with the king, and together they sought to bring the Church in Scotland under tighter royal control. In 1636 the king ordered a prayer book, modeled on that of England, imposed on the Scottish church. The Scots, long accustomed to their presbyterian practices, revolted against the king and his churchmen in the first Bishop's War. Puritan hopes of being rid of this Archbishop increased as animosity towards him and his rule of the Church appeared from all segments of society. While many Englishmen were not Puritan, they did not want to return to popish practices and resented the high-handed authority Laud had come to represent. When Charles was forced to call his second Parliament of 1640 to get funds for the war with Scotland, there

---

[17] J. Sears McGee, "William Laud and the Outward Face of Religion," in Leaders of the Reformation, ed. Richard L. DeMolen, p. 322.

[18] Haller, p. 324.

was virtual unanimity in the call for reform in the Church.

III. Constitutional Crisis in 1640

The call for religious reform was accompanied by one for rectification of what many saw as constitutional abuses committed by the king and his advisors. Charles had ruled without Parliament since 1629. Many felt he was ignoring ancient precedents by not seeking the advice of the people's representatives. Convocation, the law-making body for the Church, was legislating changes in doctrine and liturgy without the consent of Parliament, a power the Parliament had firmly wielded since Elizabeth's reign. The king's actions and a growing fear of Catholic conspiracy, due in part to the open Catholicism of the queen, caused heightened tensions as the new Parliament met in 1640.

Charles had provoked animosity and distrust by his actions and policies during the years without Parliaments. The revival of old forms of revenue devices imposed without the traditional consent of Parliament, such as distraint of knighthood and forest laws, added to the abuse of Ship Money writs, lost Charles many supporters among the landowners.[19] The "thoroughness" of Charles's advisors, Laud and the Earl of Strafford, caused resentment (these two were the first to go when Parliament met).

---

[19] Thomas G. Barnes, Somerset 1625-1640: A County's Government During the "Personal Rule" (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961).

In religious policy Charles and Laud had alienated not just Puritans but others who feared a growing Catholic influence over the king and sought to retain the Protestant character of the English Church. Politically, Charles had angered the majority of the gentry because of taxation and patronage. John Pym, the leader in the House, painted a clear picture for the members. In his first speech of the session he claimed "there was a design 'to alter law and religion.'"[20] Charles had few friends willing to stand up for him in Parliament, as the first weeks were to demonstrate.

The Puritans' opportunity came when Parliament met in November, 1640. Members decried the abuses of law, government and Church. Well-known opponents of the King and Laud were freed from prison or called to London by Parliament.[21] A new wave of printed material flooded from London printers to sway the public mind. One man, George Thomason, collected over a thousand pieces of printed material, books, pamphlets and broadsides, in the first year following the opening of Parliament.[22] Cornelius Burges and Stephen Marshall "resolved to close [their] eyes against all clouds of discouragement" and addressed the members

---

[20] Notestein, Wallace ed., The Journals of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the Beginning of the Long Parliament to the opening of the Trial of the Earl of Strafford (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922), 7-11. Hereafter cited as D'Ewes (N).

[21] John Rushworth, Historical Collections vol. 3:1 (London, 1691), 20-21.

[22] Haller, p. 326.

in St. Margaret's Church at Westminster.[23]

[23] Cornelius Burges, The First Sermon (London, 1641), A2*. And Stephen Marshall, A Sermon Preached (London, 1641), A1*. The "*" denotes those sermons available in facsimile in Fast Sermons to Parliament, edited by Robin Jeffs (London: Cornmarket Press, 1970).

CHAPTER TWO

SETTING THE AGENDA: NOVEMBER, 1640 TO JUNE, 1641

The sermons given during the first months of the Long Parliament served both preacher and politician. For the minister they contained an outline of the goals he hoped to see the members of Parliament accomplish. For the Puritan MP they offered, in unguarded terms, a religious justification for the political actions necessary to reach those goals. The overriding political issue of these first months was the correction of abuses, and more pointedly, the search for the cause of the nation's troubles. The king's advisors, the Earl of Strafford and Archbishop Laud, were found to be that cause. From indirect references in early sermons to open, aggressive attacks by April, 1641, the Puritan ministers contributed their encouragement for the destruction of the king's most efficient and powerful counselors. But were the aims of preacher and MP, inseparable to some observers, derived from a single design or source? And did the House of Commons act on the advice of their "divines?" In these sermons from November, 1640 to June, 1641 can be seen the role Puritan ministers and their political allies sought to play in the contest between king and parliament. And, reaction to the sermons illustrates the degree of influence their message held.

I. Themes Announced

To the modern reader such concepts as reformation, liberties and anti-Popery may appear straightforward and simple, but our

perception of these terms is rather different from that of the Puritan preacher in 1640. These concepts were themes outlined by the preachers and the parliamentary leadership alike. Knowledge of the minister's and politician's definitions of these terms is imperative to seeing how their views complemented each other and to grasping the political significance of these views.

The ministers who addressed the members had several common themes they expressed in their sermons. On the first Fast Day, two well established Puritans within the Church of England, Stephen Marshall and Cornelius Burges, expressed as their "joint and earnest suit in preaching" the desire for "the perfecting of the Reformation" of true religion.[24] Burges went on in his sermon to admonish the Commons to reflect upon themselves and the "progress of Reformation" in their own church.[25] In the following June, Henry Burton preached to members of Parliament concerning "England's bondage and hope of deliverance." He encouraged them to do God's work, for "the Lord strengthen them to work a Reformation."[26] Reformation was the most important of all the causes the preachers came to espouse. But this term meant much more to the Puritans than just the break from the Roman faith (Anti-Popery had long been a topic in itself). The preachers would also lay out specific measures to be implemented

---

[24] Burges, The First Sermon, p. A3 .

[25] Ibid., p. 52.

[26] Henry Burton, England's Bondage and Hope for Deliverance (London, 1641), 29.

for the furthering of the Reformation.[27]

The parliamentary leadership, too, fought for reformation. John Pym was the acknowledged leader in the House of Commons.[28] In his opening speech to the Long Parliament, on November 7, before the first Fast Day, Pym described the abuses of the previous eleven years, among those the "prejudice of religion," and recommended the remedies. As to religion, Pym decried the many "innovations" introduced and the "discouragement of preaching." His remedies were "declaring the Law" and providing for the "execution of the Law."[29] For Pym the task of reformation and a return to the true Church of pre-Laudian years lay in the hands of Parliament.

Other members spoke of religious concerns and reformation. Sir Benjamin Rudyard spoke of Englishmen's need to secure religion. He argued that those innovators "who would introduce another religion into the Church must first trouble and disorder the government of the State," and he let it be known he was "zealous for a thorough Reformation."[30] Sir Edward Dering asked the House to select a committee to discover the "numbers of oppressed ministers under the bishop's tyranny."[31] There were

---

[27] see section II below.

[28] Anthony Fletcher, The Outbreak of the English Civil War (New York: New York University Press, 1981), xx.

[29] Rushworth, p. 21-22.

[30] Rushworth, p. 24.

[31] Ibid., p. 56.

many such calls for the protection of preaching and for stronger adherence to the true religion. These politicians articulated, first, what would be echoed in the weeks and months ahead by the preachers-- the call for reformation.

The ministers and MPs worked together for the same goal. Through their speeches and their immediate attention to religious problems, the leadership presented its plans in the first days of the Parliament. The preachers very clearly articulated the goals they sought and made Parliament responsible for enacting them. In doing so, the Puritan preachers gave the leadership the moral and religious foundation for its course of action in furthering the reformation.

Many cries in defense of "Liberties," were heard in the first year of the Long Parliament. In his first sermon Burges described as an act of justice the pulling down "of the Nimrods who have invaded [our] Laws and Liberties" and spoke of making wholesome laws to prevent the like in the future.[32] Gauden preached that the "safety of... liberties, lives and all that is dear in this world" depended on the "mind of the Law."[33] At the end of Parliament's first year in session, Marshall thanked God that "we have seen broken the yokes which lay upon our Estates,

---

[32] Burges, The First Sermon, p. 42.

[33] John Gauden, The Love of Truth and Peace (London, 1641), 15.*

Liberties, Religion and Consciences."[34] Most often the ministers did not elaborate specifically about "liberties." This was undoubtedly because they were confident others had done so for them.

Again, John Pym led. In his opening speech he listed the many grievances against the king. Among these were those "against the Liberty of the subject," the most numerous of all grievances. Pym cataloged those concerning taxes and royal abuse of Parliamentary rights but saved the "greatest" for last. It was that which "leads us a step higher, even as high as Heaven," the "ambitious and corrupt clergy." These bishops, too, had taken the law into their hands, "pretending divine authority ...to do what they will with us."[35] This was the basis of Englishmens' complaints concerning the loss of "Liberties;" the king, and his Arminian archbishop, had tampered with the accepted form of rule. It was not a desire for equal rights or civil liberties as we know them, but rather an objection to the fact that Charles had tried to rule without Parliament, and indeed had succeeded until 1640. Politicians, Puritan and non-Puritan, as well as the preachers decried the abuses of this rule and saw them as the loss of their liberties.

The cause of all the evils in the land was "Popery." The crusade against it touched every institution and person (the

---

[34] Stephen Marshall, A Peace Offering to God (London, 1641), 45.*

[35] Rushworth, p. 21-23.

McCarthyism of the 1950s pales in comparison). Most problems were linked to the conniving plans of the Pope and his army of Jesuits. The English Church had been delivered out of the mouth of the beast, the Roman Church, and now worked to rebuild the Temple, the true Church.[36] Yet, as Marshall pointed out the same afternoon, it had been eighty-two years since "the Lord set the gospel among us" and little progress had been made.[37] The preacher Thomas Wilson, on April 4, 1641, described the reason for England's lack of progress. It was the "substance of worship" that was false, the external form which included "superstition" and "additions, gestures... mutations" and provoked God to "be gone from the sanctuary."[38] Gauden complained the problem was the "Jesuistic spirit...which deceives the nation with the cup of errors" and the "superstition, formality and back-sliding" of men. He complained of established doctrines being refuted by new "ridiculous Heads" of the Church, those men of "alters, sacrifices, priests, penance, auricular confession."[39] Preachers were by no means the only segment of society worried about popery and innovation in religion.

The fear of papal conspiracy was very real to political leaders in England. Pym revealed to the House that two Kings of

---

[36] Burges, The First Sermon, p. 3-8.

[37] Marshall, A Sermon, p. 37.

[38] Thomas Wilson, David's Zeal for Zion (London, 1641), 7.

[39] Gauden, p. 18.

France had been murdered for merely tolerating Protestantism. Worst of all were the innovations of religion. There was maintaining of popish tenets, popish ceremonies and the preferment of popish persons.[40] Sir John Holland, a newcomer to politics in 1640, spoke to the House concerning "public sufferances of priests and Jesuits." He warned "the number of Roman Catholics is dangerously high, idolatry multiplied, and God's judgement highly provoked."[41] Sir John Culpeper, shire knight from Kent, gave as his first two grievances the great increase of papists and new ceremonies in the Church.[42] For preacher and parliamentarian the threat of a popish conspiracy, including anything that minutely resembled popery, was cause for attack.

The threat of a papal plot to overthrow Protestantism in England may seem farfetched but to most good Englishmen it was very real. More important than the number of Jesuits or Catholics was their positions in very high places. When Gauden pointed out that men of a popish tint were the new "Heads" in the Church he was referring to Laud and other Arminians. Pym complained that papists were being allowed places of trust and honor in the Commonwealth and set differences between the King

---

[40] Rushworth, p. 22.

[41] Ibid., p. 28.

[42] Rushworth, p. 33.

and his subjects.[43] It was these people in high places, counselors to the king, who had implemented the changes in both Church and State government during the years without Parliament. The preachers and political leaders made good compatriots in the fight against the Anti-Christ of Rome and popery.

The first sermons and speeches of the Long Parliament outlined and presented to listeners a conflict with the enemies of England. The goal of preacher and politician in this conflict was Reformation, building a strong preaching ministry and enforcing the Puritan way of life. All had suffered the loss of liberties, those freedoms from arbitrary rule to which they were accustomed, at the hands of king and archbishop. And each recognized the cause of theirs, and the nation's, troubles: "Popery." With these themes explicated, the next step was deciding upon the best way to correct the problems, to define the proper strategy.

II. The Strategy and Tactics of Change

Preacher and MP alike had ideas for the needed reforms. The preachers who admonished Parliament to correct the abuses of the previous decade were quite clear in specifying the course to follow and in their attacks on what they believed to be the cause of the nation's problems. Pym and others in the House also set things in motion to accomplish their goals. Though religious and

---

[43] D'Ewes (N), p. 8.

political goals were often very similar, the latter were rarely strictly determined by the former.

Burges and Marshall preached on November 17 articulating the Puritan plan for repairing the nation's ills and for setting it on the "true" course. Burges, acknowledging that all members agreed "upon the necessity of a great reformation," pointed out to the House that Old Testament reforms began with the tearing down of idols and the destruction of idolatry. Parliament was to "purge out and cast away (as a menstruous cloth) all" these abominations.[44] Additionally, they were to "take care of" the great multitudes that went to mass as confidently as others go to and from churches by ridding the nation of papists.[45] Marshall reiterated these goals in the afternoon, advising England to be a truly holy people and practice "purity in worship," doing away with idols. The members of Parliament were told to be "purgers and preservers of true religion," and to stand by Him (God), being His people, "so that He may be with us."[46]

Burges and Marshal proclaimed the need for a "covenant" with God to bring renewed blessing upon their country. Marshall harkened back to Old Testament rulers and showed the members it was "princes, the Officers, the Magistrates of the Kingdom, the

---

[44] Burges, The First Sermon, p. 70.

[45] Ibid., p. 84.

[46] Marshall, A Sermon Preached, p. 126-129.

parliament men" who were to enter into a covenant with God.[47] Burges stressed "there must be a thorough joining of themselves to God by covenant." Both, as Trevor-Roper rightly points out, patriotically recalled the days of Elizabeth when a covenant had been used to protect and defend religion.[48] Here the ministers set out their strategy for combating popery, destroying idolatry and returning God's blessing to England.

The ministers were not without tactics in the war to save Protestantism in England. All the ministers speaking to the House in the first months, excluding G. Morley whose sermon was not printed, described preaching as the means to achieving a godly nation, without which they forecast doom for the future of the Church.[49] Burges explained that a preaching ministry was "one of the best advantages to a secure State" and that it was "not only a hedge, but walls and bulwarks unto any Kingdom."[50] Marshall advanced as a "Catholic" remedy for all their evils (his pun not mine), the "promoting, establishing, and maintaining [of]

---

[47] Ibid., p. 16.

[48] Marshall, A Sermon Preaches, p. 53.

[49] Gauden and G. Morley preached on November 29, 1640. Contrary to Trevor-Roper, who strongly implies that Morley was not asked to print his sermon because the House leaders found it lacking in value, on December 1, it was ordered "thanks to be given to Gauden and Morley, at request of this House, and to be moved, if they please, that their sermons may be printed." See Commons Journal, vol. II p. 40 and p. 48. Hereafter cited as CJ.

[50] Burges, The First Sermon, p. 75.

a faithful, learned, painful preaching ministry."[51] John Gauden, though later a royalist, taught on November 29 that the problems of the Church were due to bishops' failure to preach and study the truth.[52] Thus, the restoration of puritan preaching was the means to repairing and reestablishing the state on solid ground. While the surest way to guarantee happiness for England, godly preaching was to be accompanied by other actions. The cause of all the troubles, the evil, papist councilors to the king, had to be removed from the centers of power. Within the Church it was Laud and his fellow Arminians, "those Step-Fathers and hardhearted wretches," who caused the people "to run headlong by droves to Popery, Anabaptism, Familism, Atheism and what not."[53] In the civil realm, Burges encouraged, as "an act of justice," the pulling down of "some of the Nimrods who have invaded ... laws and liberties" and told the members to "make examples of [these] villains."[54] Even the royal family was not immune to charges of papal conspiracy. Burges pointed out as an example Asa, "that good and religious King of Judah," who spared not the queen mother for her idolatry. Indeed, Burges was brave enough to note not even Asa's wife, the Queen, was to be spared if she

---

[51] Marshall, A Sermon Preached, p. 48.

[52] Gauden, The Love of Peace and Truth, p. 35.

[53] Burges, The First Sermon, p. 77.

[54] Ibid., p. 42.

were an idolater.[55] Popery, the real danger to king and country, was to be eradicated from every corner of church and state.

The members of the House heard the calls to action but few needed prodding from the preachers to move against the papal conspiracy or to safeguard the nation from pseudo-Catholic advisors. In the early months of the Parliament there was a short-lived unanimity. As Samuel Gardiner wrote, "future Cavalier and Roundhead were united in" believing everything had gone wrong.[56] Members heard the advice from the preachers, but reaction, while generally favorable, was not adherence to the ministers' plan. The evidence, sparse as it is at times, shows the beginning weeks were both successful and disappointing relative to the goals presented by the puritan ministers.

The attack on popery and the papal conspiracy began in the first days of the Parliament. On the first day of business the House formed the Committee for Religion, a committee of the whole House-- in which normal rules of order did not constrain debate-- whose first task was to recommend action on the new canons approved by the Laudian bishops earlier in the year.[57] These debates on the new canons were said to be very lively and had to be continued for several days. It was decided, on December 15, and ordered by the House, that the canons were "not binding on

---

[55] Ibid., p. 10-12.

[56] Samuel Gardiner, History of England (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1899), vol 9 p. 218.

[57] CJ, p. 25.

clergy or laity of the land." More importantly, the committee was to investigate Laud and "his role and design of the subversion of the laws of the realm and of religion."[58] Finally, on December 18 Pym moved for the impeachment of Archbishop Laud on charges of treason. The House sent the motion to the House of Lords where it was approved; Laud was impeached and was denied any visitors without prior approval of the Commons.[59] Thus, the leader of the popish faction within the Church of England was put under parliamentary control.

The "Nimrods" who had abused the laws and liberties of the land were handled with more speed and determination than was Laud. The Earl of Strafford had very few friends by the fall of 1640. He was the "evil councilor" to blame for all the nation's ills in a time when the king was beyond incrimination. On November 11, four days after beginning the session, the House asked the Lords to impeach Strafford for high treason and he was sent to the Tower.[60] On 24 November Pym formally accused Strafford of trying to cause a separation between the king and his subjects, embezzling funds, and of planning to bring a "popish" army from Ireland to suppress England, to name only a few.[61] After Strafford was safely away, for the moment at least,

---

[58] CJ, p. 51.

[59] CJ, p. 52. Rushworth, p. 123.

[60] Rushworth p. 43.

[61] D'Ewes (N), note page 60-62.

leaders in the House began investigating Secretary of State Sir Francis Windebank, reputed to be a papist. By December 4 it was rumored that Windebank had fled the country, as indeed he had.[62] The attack on popish prelates and councilors would continue but these were the suspected leaders against whom immediate action was necessary.

The House had moved quickly against the feared papal conspiracy, as the preachers had asked, but the members were busy with other pressing concerns. When Parliament met, the Scottish army was encamped in the north waiting for a proper settlement before they would disperse and return home. Much time was spent, in House debate and corridor politicking, deciding how to settle the army problems. The army of Scots was seen as insurance for the continuance of the Parliament, as the king would not dissolve the meeting until money had been granted to pay the soldiers wages. Robert Baillie, one of the Scottish Commissioners sent to negotiate a settlement, said some MPs viewed the Scottish army as "a most happy mean for all their desires... the dissolving it their utter ruin."[63] Thus, the very delicate task of keeping the Scottish army in the field while working to pay the wages of both English and Scottish soldiers and trying to settle the mess of royal finances on some sound basis, in order eventually to pay the armies, proved very time consuming for the leadership.

---

[62] Ibid., p. 103.

[63] Robert Baillie, Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie, (Edinburgh, 1841), vol I, quoted in Fletcher, p. 18.

An equally important concern to most MPs was the need to correct constitutional abuses. As in the case of religion, a committee, the Committee for Privileges and Elections, was established by the House.[64] The first week's business was crowded with the House's attempt to hear many petitions seeking redress of abuses against the rights of citizens and members. Bastwick, Burton and Prynne, sufferers at the hands of Laud and the Court of High Commission during the 1630s, were all granted a hearing and quickly had their charges dropped by the House in the first weeks of the session.[65] Committees were named to recommend action against abuses suffered during the previous decade of "personal rule." The House was bombarded with petitions from counties, individuals, groups of various nature and from numerous cities, all seeking protection from and assistance against the interference of royal administration, religious and civil.[66] The tangle of committees and sub-committees became so unmanageable the leaders had to reshuffle the organization in January, cutting down on the number and stream lining the flow of committee recommendations.[67] The leaders of the House had much more on their minds, and on their agendas, then what the ministers had outlined in their sermons

---

[64] Rushworth, p. 19.

[65] Rushworth, p. 20.

[66] see CJ, p. 20-40 for only those brought to the attention of the whole House. Many more were dealt with by committees.

[67] CJ, p. 62.

preached in November.

That is not to say the preachers were without success. The House did begin its attack on the papal conspiracy and removed several councilors believed supporters of a return to the Roman sphere. However, all the preacher's demands were not met. There was a communion for all members on November 29, but this did not constitute a new "covenant" between members to establish a truly godly kingdom, though few may have objected to this in principle. Nor was any action taken against the queen mother or the queen because of their "idolatry," as Burges suggested on November 17. The House did take action against many individuals and their specific abuses but little was settled by legislation to prevent future occurrences of the same. The service these sermons provided for the parliamentary leadership was to keep members reminded, through the busy days of committees and debates, of the grander picture. They served to make members aware of the threat the papists were to England. Through the spring of 1641, as thoughts turned more intently to the fate of the Earl of Strafford, this threat was on everyone's mind.

III. Strafford's Trial and Church Reform

In the spring of 1641 came a heightening of tensions and the loss of the earlier unanimity in political goals. The fate of the Earl of Strafford occupied many people's minds and was seen as the decisive factor in reaching a settlement between king and Parliament. A series of events, proving very detrimental to the

king's fortunes, unfolded to move the House leadership towards more radical measures. Before the beginning of summer the fate of Strafford was settled and the episcopal form of church government was under more direct attack by the House. In this heated atmosphere there were several sermons addressed to members of the House between April and June which, while seen by some as outlines of the radicals' policies, in fact revealed little that was not previously understood by those in and out of the House.

Strafford was the center of attention as proceedings against him evolved into a trial beginning 22 March, 1641.[68] The king wanted desperately to save his councilor, having given his word to prevent his death. From the Parliament's view, Pym, and his allies among the peers, Bedford and Essex, did not seek to destroy the monarchy or even its prerogatives to choose advisors, but they did favor a plan of "bridge appointments" of loyal, protestant men to help restore the proper relations between king and country the previous councilors had destroyed.[69] A live Strafford threatened this hope of rebuilding. From the start of the trial the outcome sought by House leaders, and the weakness of the case against the Earl, were known to all. Witnesses were bullied, some charges proved to be merely malicious gossip, and the Lords began to waver, for a dislike of the House methods, in the effort for Strafford's head. Early in the trial the House

---

[68] CJ, p. 111.

[69] Derek Hirst, Authority and Conflict (London: Edward Arnold Press, 1986), p. 199.

moved to speed things up before the Lords lost heart. On March 25 a motion was read stating the House sought a speedy trial for Strafford and stressing their hope that all delays would be prevented.[70] Sir Simonds D'Ewes, annoyed at Strafford's delaying tactics, proposed a conference with the Lords on March 26 to persuade them to shorten the Earl's speeches to facilitate a speedy trial.[71] With tensions high, members took time for spiritual nourishment.

Samuel Fairclough, a minister from Suffolk whose patron was Pym's ally, Sir Nathaniel Barnardiston, preached a very blunt message to the Commons on April 4, 1641. Fairclough admonished the members to quickly administer justice to those guilty of crimes against God and Israel, to "trouble those troubling the church and commonwealth." Because, as Fairclough preached, "a whole nation may be guilty of the sin, and punishment committed by one Achan" (troubler).[72] He stressed the need for swift and thorough execution of the sentence against the convicted, as the biblical example in Joshua demanded. The preacher summed it up best in clearly defining the needed policy: the way to recover a Commonwealth and Church, disturbed by Achans, was for those in

---

[70] CJ, p. 112.

[71] Fletcher, p. 9.

[72] Samuel Fairclough, The Troublers Troubled or Achan Condemned and Executed, (London, 1641) p. 16. Trevor-Roper presents this sermon as an official Fast sermon, but it was not.

authority completely to abolish and extirpate all Achans.[73] Clearly Fairclough felt the only fate for Strafford was death and advised members to proceed speedily.

Fairclough's sermon should not "force upon us," as Trevor-Roper insists, the conclusion that Fairclough was the means of declaring a new party line.[74] He did preach for the speedy demise of Strafford but, this was hardly a "new" policy. Few had to be told of the leadership's desire to be rid of Strafford, or that a speedy solution was sought. By the nature of the system Fairclough owed much to his patron, Sir N. Barnardiston, but this did not make him a pawn in the hands of the House leadership. Fairclough would, only a few months later, be opposed to the House's religious reform and avoid all active participation in setting up a presbyterian system. If it was their goal, the leadership could have "hand-picked" a more dependable supporter in a London teeming with radical preachers.[75] Also, the weeks of intense debate, which culminated in the passage of the Bill of Attainder proclaiming Strafford guilty of treason, on April 21, demonstrate the small effect Fairclough had in swaying men's minds to the leadership's plan. Ultimately, it was the disclosure of the king's plan to use the army to free Strafford from the Tower, the first "Army Plot," which moved the Lords to

---

[73] Ibid., p. 24.

[74] Trevor-Roper, p. 303.

[75] DNB, p. 993.

pass their own Bill of Attainder, leading to the Earl's execution on May 12.[76]

While the battle raged over the fate of Strafford, efforts at deciding how to reform the church had been progressing. The preachers had much to say on the subject, and perhaps did help prepare the ground for the bill's final passage, but, as in the issue of Strafford, there were other forces involved which had a greater influence. Again, the sermons addressed to the Commons served more to reinforce stated policy and remind members of the papal threat than to announce new policy.

As Strafford had represented the abuses in civil government, Laud and the Arminians stood for those of the episcopacy. From the first days of the Parliament citizens had sent petitions to the House demanding the abolition of the current system of bishops in "root and branch." The city of London's, instigated by the puritan clergy, was first on December 11. Within six weeks of the London petition the House received thirteen county petitions demanding root and branch reform of the episcopacy.[77] Throughout the ensuing months members were constantly reminded of the abuses and shortcomings of the church under corrupt bishops by literally hundreds of petitions from parishes attacking their ministers as scandalous in life, liturgy

---

[76] Hirst, Authority and Conflict, p. 201.

[77] Fletcher, p. 91-92.

or doctrine.[78] Those who had suffered at the hands of episcopal justice during the 1630s, in ecclesiastical and civil courts, clamored to be heard when Parliament offered the opportunity.

The Commons had been looking into church reform. As stated earlier, in the first days of the Parliament committees investigated the "new" canons and corrupt ministers. On the day the articles for Laud's impeachment were read, December 19, the House informed the Lords they had "received informations of a very high nature against" Matthew Wren, Bishop of Ely. It was requested, and then ordered, that Wren, suspected of an attempt to flee the country, be made to put up a bond (a whopping ten thousand pounds, no less) to guarantee his "forthcoming" and his acquiescence to the "judgement of Parliament."[79] On February 9 the House added new members to the committee on church government and reserved the right to decide "the main point of Episcopacy" to the whole House.[80] The Bishop of Norwich, Richard Montague, was investigated by committee to revive charges against him from the previous Parliament and, if needed, to reverse the pardon granted him.[81] The leaders were moving ever closer to breaching

---

[78] W. A. Shaw, A History of the Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth, 2 vols, quoted in John Morrill, "The Attack on the Church of England in the Long Parliament, 1640-1642" in History, Society and Churches edited by D. Beales and G. Best, p. 107.

[79] Rushworth, p. 123.

[80] CJ, p. 81.

[81] CJ, p. 91.

the subject of what to do with the bishops.

The answer materialized in the weeks from March 1 to May 27. On March 1 a committee was formed to discuss with the Lords the exclusion of clergy from the Commissions of the Peace, the county-level civil authority.[82] By March 10 the House had proposed a bill to exclude the bishops from the House of Lords. It was resolved "that lay and judicial power of bishops, in the House of Peers, is a great hinderance to the discharge of their spiritual functions, prejudicial to the Commonwealth, and fit to be taken away, by bill."[83] Events culminated on May 27 when, because of dissatisfaction with the Lords for opposing the exclusion of bishops from their body, the leadership offered the Root and Branch Bill abolishing episcopacy.[84]

It should be stressed that this was not accomplished without heated debate. The unanimity the Commons began with, already stressed by the questionable methods of the House leadership in the Strafford trial, began to fall apart when radicals and conservatives reached an impasse concerning the bishops. Indeed, as one scholar has pointed out, before there was a "royalist" party in Parliament there was an "Anglican" party trying to

---

[82] CJ, p. 95

[83] CJ, p. 101.

[84] Fletcher, p. 100.

defend the bishops.[85] The signs of future conflict were clearly evident during the spring of 1641. Again, into the arena entered the preachers with their words of encouragement.

The first sermons preached to members that spring, missing from earlier scholarship on the sermons' influence, were those of Joseph Symonds and Nathaniel Holmes, on May 30, after the Root and Branch bill had been forwarded.[86] Symonds admonished members to not be spectators and partners in the "calamities" in the church, where "oppression is in power, superstition in credit, luxury and idleness in favor..." Members were to "build a house (church) after God's model," not their fancy.[87] Holmes reiterated these themes in the afternoon, preaching on the "reformed church" members were to think upon when building God's house.[88] Later that spring, Henry Burton preached that "whatever man hath set up in the church of God since the Apostles ... is Popish innovation" and that every minister who preaches anything he is not "able to prove out of scripture" be punished by

---

[85] Morrill, "The Religious Context of the English Civil War" Transactions of the Royal Historical Society series 5, vol. 34 (1984), p. 168.

[86] Joseph Symonds, A Sermon Lately Preached, (London, 1641) and Nathaniel Holmes, The New World, or the New Reformed Church, (London, 1641). Many thanks to J. Wilson for discovering these sermons and showing their importance in his work Pulpit in Parliament, p. 276.

[87] Symonds, p. 3.

[88] Holmes, The New World.... (London, 1641)

Parliament.[89] The preachers made it clear only a church based on the apostolic model could return blessing to the nation.

Again the preachers reinforced the leadership's message. After the months of edging to root and branch reform, granted many members may not have seen it coming until March, 1641, Pym and the radicals were convinced the bishops had to go and took steps to pass the necessary legislation. By March the House was openly working to eject the "Lords Spiritual" from the upper House. The puritan ministers, avowedly presbyterian minded since the 1570s, could be depended on to support and legitimize the move to abolish episcopacy. They did so beginning in late May, 1641 and again offered the religious justification for Parliament's actions.

Throughout the spring of 1641 puritan ministers were called on to preach before members of the Commons. After the leaders had revealed their policies before the House, either openly or by implication, as in the obvious moves to speed up Strafford's trial and to bring about root and branch reform, the ministers reiterated these goals and helped keep the excitement and tension levels high. They kept the papal threat alive in depicting Strafford as the threat to the church and Commonwealth as Achan had troubled Israel. In May they added their support for a biblical church government after Parliament had moved to abolish

---

[89] Henry Burton, England's Bondage and Hope of Deliverance, (London, 1641). Preached June 20, 1641. Fletcher does notice this sermon on page 103.

episcopacy in the Root and Branch Bill.[90] They did not reveal policy but helped keep it in the forefront of members' minds during hectic times of debate.

In the first months of the Long Parliament, November, 1640 to June, 1641, the sermons given before members of the House of Commons furthered the cause of preacher and MP alike. Pym and his allies in the House used the sermons to show the religious justification for their legislative agenda. Also, the sermons were used to keep emotions heated and keep Parliament, and the public, reminded of the greater threat of the papists. For the preacher the fast days were an opportunity for presenting to politicians the method of correcting previous, and preventing future, abuses of evil conspirators and establishing a true, godly church for the nation. By the summer of 1641 the evil councilors had been removed, Strafford was dead and Laud safely away in the Tower. Reform of the church, if only as correction of the Laudian innovations and a proposed root and branch bill, was seen on its way. Unfortunately, for king and country, things were just heating up.

---

[90] Fletcher, too, on page 103, mistakenly writes that the "ground was well laid" by the preachers, when in fact the leadership had done the preparing throughout the first months of 1641.

CHAPTER THREE

THE STUMBLE TO WAR

Following a relatively quiet summer, the last five months of 1641 brought both "euphoria" and "disillusion."[91] Throughout the period from August through October the public's distrust of the king appeared to be declining, a settlement had been reached with the Scots leading to the disbandment of the armies, and Pym and the Parliament had made progress in obtaining more influence in government for the House. On November 1, word reached London and Parliament of a rebellion in Ireland. The news reignited the political arena and re-emphasized the popish threat. Opposing sides calcified into determined foes, and by January 1642 Charles would abandon an anti-royalist city to the Parliament. During these months Pym and his allies fought to retain control over the legislative agenda in the House against the gestures of an appeasing monarch. The preachers, too, were enmeshed in the struggle. For them it was an effort to bring about true religious reform, the expulsion of the popish threat and the rebuilding of God's House according to Puritan design. Again, the preachers and MPs worked towards the same goals and reinforced each other in their public addresses, be they sermon or speech.

I. A Glorious Autumn?

---

[91] Trevor-Roper, p. 304.

In several ways, as Trevor-Roper suggests, it had been a successful summer for Pym. The previous May Charles had announced his plans to travel north to Scotland, raising fears that he might return with the armies to gain control of his unruly Parliament.[92] This fear, present within both Houses, facilitated the passage of the Ten Propositions. In late June, during what was perhaps "Pym's finest hour," the propositions passed, setting forth demands for the removal of "evil councilors" (with parliamentary approval of new advisors), attacks on "popery," and steps for the defense of the realm.[93] These legislative victories, and a general apprehensiveness towards the king, showed Pym in control of the political arena.

In the early autumn the preachers, too, seemed pleased at the progress their reform agenda had made through the previous months. On September 7, the nation observed a day of thanksgiving for the peace with Scotland and members of Parliament heard two sermons in St. Margaret's. In the morning Stephen Marshall addressed the members. He set a tone of thankfulness and wonder for what the Lord had done for England, recalling the deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot and "this great mercy which we have now received." In case the "wise men" of the House needed clarification, Marshall explained: "you all know our estates, our liberties, our religion,... were in a manner

---

[92] Hirst, p. 206.

[93] Fletcher, p. 43-44.

irrecoverably lost through malice and practice of wicked instruments, and a dreadful cloud hath these two or three years been gathering and hanging over our heads, continually ready to dissolve into showers of blood the two nations [England and Scotland]."[94] Fortunately, God had delivered them from their enemies in "this one year, this wonderful year."

In Marshall's eyes Parliament, more than the nation as a whole, had cause to praise God. In the previous year, as Marshall told the MPs, God had "prevented and discovered great designs against you, quelled great adversaries before you, [and] restored great privileges unto you." Marshall reminded them that they "found their sovereign granting (I think) all [their] suits," and that their "rights and liberties are [now] established." In return, they should "surpass the very angels in thanksgiving."[95] To drive the point home Marshall begged them to "consider the wonders (I almost said miracles) of this last year," the foremost being that Scotland and the king were reunited in peace and the two kingdoms were united in a league of love, "oh wonderful."[96] It had been a momentous year for the reformers, and they had much for which to offer praise to God.

For those who, however unlikely, may have been less than attentive in the morning, Jeremiah Burroughs mounted the pulpit

---

[94] Marshall, A Peace Offering to God, p. 17.

[95] Ibid., p. 42.

[96] Ibid., p. 45.

for the afternoon sermon to reiterate the message of thanksgiving and praise to God. Burroughs congratulated the members, "the anointed of the Lord," for their role in reform, both past and future.[97] He reviewed the horrors of previous years, "when our brethren cast us out," but now proclaimed "rejoice with Jerusalem, let the name be changed, rejoice ye with England, not long since called to mourning and weeping."[98] If one wondered why he should rejoice with England, Burroughs was quick to describe the "mercies of God" in the previous year. The list was similar yet distinct from Marshall's: "God so honored the nation in the cause of religion against the Anti-Christian party-- not against king; religion is maintained, superstitious vanities removed, prelatical tyranny banished-- all in a peaceable way."[99] The preacher summed it up by declaring that the world had not seen greater oppression then "was practiced in England," but God "hath appeared for the honor of those who would not sacrifice or compromise."[100] In the eyes of Marshall and Burroughs it had indeed been a successful summer and fall for the movers of reform.

---

[97] Jeremiah Burroughs, Zion's Joy (London, 1641), p. 2.

[98] Ibid., p. 3.

[99] Ibid., p. 24-25.

[100] Ibid., p. 27.

And yet, as extensive scholarship has shown, all was not to the opposition's advantage.[101] While during June, and perhaps July, Pym was at his best, the late summer and early fall proved troublesome. The summer had been spent trying to get legislation through before the king's departure for Scotland. As Fletcher points out, by mid-July "everything depended on a quick national response to the poll tax."[102] It was this tax which would allow Parliament to pay off the remaining troops in the north, just in case Charles had plans to bring them to London on his return trip. While the treaty was agreed to and the majority of Scottish troops disbanded, the English army did not disperse until September 18.[103] Pym was caught in a dilemma: the armies in the north served to justify the continuance of the Parliament, as only Parliament could raise the money to pay them off, but the soldiers threatened the session's existence if the king used the troops against the House. Pym, and other opposition members, could hardly have been encouraged by the news of the very warm reception the king received upon his arrival in Edinburgh.[104] Events were beyond Pym's direct influence; the ball was in the king's court in Scotland.

---

[101] See Fletcher's Outbreak of the English Civil War, p. 86.

[102] Fletcher, p. 50.

[103] Ibid., p. 54.

[104] Ibid., p. 159.

In London there was more cause for concern. Pym realized "the sense of impending national crisis" which he "sought to maintain in London was missing in the localities."[105] While the first months of the Parliament could be seen as successful in removing evil councilors, undoing religious innovations of the 1630s, and finally in August disbanding the armies, there were still no measures taken to prevent a recurrence of the same abuses. Pym and the opposition did not trust Charles. Work was begun on the Grand Remonstrance, a restating of the opposition case against the crown, listing again the abuses of misgovernment from 1625 to 1638. It was an effort to swing national support behind Parliament. Indeed, men were voicing doubts about Pym's constant cries of alarm. One MP wrote a friend "he could find no grounds for the 'great jealousies and suspicions.'"[106] In this atmosphere of uncertainty, of declining influence for himself and rising appeal for the king, Pym and the House celebrated the national day of thanksgiving for the peace with Scotland.

As we have seen, the sermons given on 7 September hardly reflected the "alarm and fear for the future" Pym felt at the time.[107] Marshall and Burroughs concentrated on the glories and wonders of the previous year, though still encouraging members to

---

[105] Ibid., p. 81.

[106] Ibid., p. 88.

[107] Ibid., p. 86.

continue the reform. Theirs were "ecstatic sermons," celebrating the previous year, a year "greater than 1588, the year of the Armada," as Trevor-Roper correctly describes them. But Pym had reason to fear close ties between Scotland and the king, while both Marshall and Burroughs made a clear point of the wonder of God's mercy in this fact.[108] The heart of the sermons, praise to God for his mercies and wonders, failed to represent the insecurity and apprehension among the leaders in the House as fall began.

But what of Marshall, "the spiritual oracle" of John Pym, the "true amplifier of his master's voice," as Trevor-Roper describes the preacher?[109] Had he failed in his sermon to grasp the difficulty his master was struggling with in September, 1641? This was possible but, more to the point, the "tuning of the pulpits" ascribed to Pym was beyond his power.[110] This is not to say the preachers and MPs now held different goals, or even favored separate means; on the contrary, the leaders in the House and the preachers were allies in the cause of "godly reform" and the sermons still reflected the general program the preachers and MPs spelled out ten months earlier. The sermons in September are an example of the preachers reflecting the national feeling of relief concerning the peace with Scotland, even though leaders in

---

[108] see page 41 above.

[109] Trevor-Roper, p. 306.

[110] Ibid., p. 294.

the House might have reason to despair.

If the early fall brought alarm and fear, the weeks from 7 September to word of the Irish Rebellion compounded problems to make for a dark season indeed. The breech between factions in Parliament widened and weariness from the long session brought "apathy and disillusion."[111] When a recess was finally called, beginning September 9, Pym chaired the committee overseeing the running of government but enthusiasm and attendance quickly dwindled in this group also.[112] Disdain for Parliament ran so high in these months that Pym became the victim of an assassination attempt by way of a plague-infested rag sent to him through the mail.[113] Pym and the preachers seemed to need a divine act or intervention to save their cause.

II. The Papists Are Coming!

The Scottish uprising in 1638 ended Charles' personal rule and forced him to call Parliament. Equally frustrating for the king, the outbreak of rebellion in Ireland would abort his short-lived hope of regaining control over Parliament and force him to keep the unruly representatives in session. The measures the parliamentary leaders sought to implement for combating the rising forced a decision upon those hoping to avoid taking a

---

[111] Hirst, p. 207.

[112] Fletcher, p. 126.

[113] Ibid., p. 128.

stand against king or Parliament, "the middle group." It was the members' reactions to the rebellion and the subsequent legislation which can be seen as the catalyst to the formation of the royalist party.[114] The preachers, called to minister to the members on three occasions, reacted to the new conflict with words about the opportunities lost, the responsibilities neglected, and the steps necessary to regain God's blessing. Overriding this outline was the predominant theme repeatedly presented to members: a strong and clear call for reformation now. Once the rebellion erupted the preachers let the members know, as they had from the first fast sermon, the Puritan view of events and what the godly expected of them.

It was shortly after business began on November 1, when "the intelligence of a great rebellion in Ireland" and word of Spanish assistance to the effort was reported to the House.[115] The rising was everything Pym feared and that about which he had warned the nation repeatedly. The news launched Pym and the opposition into swift action against the feared papal conspiracy. On the day the news arrived Catholics were ordered "kept safe in the counties where they reside," and a motion passed demanding the replacement of the Earl of Portland as governor of the Isle

---

[114] Gardiner, vol. 10 p. 59.

[115] Coates , Willson Havelock ed., The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes from the First Recess of the Long Parliament to the Withdrawal of King Charles form London (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970) p. 61. Hereafter cited as D'Ewes (C).

of Wight because of his Catholic beliefs.[116] Also, Committees for Irish Affairs were formed in both houses, and motions were began for the raising of monies for "some speedy course" to repress the rebellion.[117] The hurried pace continued for weeks as tales of Catholic atrocities in Ireland reached England and word of more plots demanded action.

For John Pym the Irish rebellion, beyond confirming his worst fears, reconfirmed his position as the leader of the House and forced him to take a more radical stance towards the king's authority. Pym had been warning of the evils of papal influence at court since the opening of Parliament. When word reached London that the rebels were fighting with the royal blessing, though it later proved false, Pym launched his attack on the king's evil councilors. On November 5 he presented his plan requesting that the king, having given his "ear to those evil councilors about him," be asked to remove the said councilors and appoint only those "as might be approved by parliament." If the king failed to dismiss the councilors, the Parliament "should account [themselves] absolved" from the problem of suppressing the Irish rebels.[118] When Pym addressed the Lords, delivering instructions to a committee which was to communicate with the parliamentary representatives at Edinburgh with the king, he

---

[116] Ibid., p. 62.

[117] Ibid., p. 63-65.

[118] Ibid., p. 94.

expressed his view on the real problems confronting the nation. It was, in Pym's eyes, the "ill councils [proceeding] from a spirit and inclination to popery" which held evil designs on all three kingdoms (England, Scotland, and Ireland) and have caused the war between them in order to maintain popery in Ireland "and would do the like here [England] if they were able."[119] These were the words of a man sincerely and completely convinced of the papal threat to England, forced to take perhaps drastic steps to secure the nation's safety.

Just four days after the discovery of the rebellion, November 5, members celebrated the anniversary of the failed Gunpowder Plot and heard a sermon from Cornelius Burges.[120] That Friday morning "the Speaker and the greater part of the members" heard a sermon at St. Margaret's church.[121] Burges preached to members and expounded upon the causes for England's current turmoil. Fundamentally, the problem was the "rages" of men, or papists, which were ceaseless and became more vile as new conspiracies were hatched: "As it is with foul stomachs, the best that comes up into the basin is but the filthy stuff, but that which is behind, and comes up last, is far more loathsome

---

[119] Lords Journal vol. 4, p. 431-432 in Fletcher, p. 138.

[120] Cornelius Burges, Another Sermon (London, 1641).* For some reason Trevor-Roper excludes this sermon from his essay. It is, however, the first sermon preached following word of the outbreak of rebellion, and as such, is essential to understanding the parliamentary response to the conflict.

[121] D'Ewes (C), p. 87.

and bitter through the abundance of choler and gall."[122] The Irish uprising was merely the latest attempt by the papists to return England to the Roman fold. There was fault to be found with England also. Burges pointed out, mincing no words, the shortcomings of Parliament that brought the current troubles to England. He asked members to recall the first days of this Parliament, "when your beginnings promised much," when members expressed many "brave and noble resolutions of giving God's business precedence over your own affairs." Now, from parliamentary neglect, and to England's peril, "matters of religion lie bleeding, all government and discipline of the Church is laid in her grave, and all putridness vermin... glory in her ashes."[123] Burges acknowledged the great quantities of business demanding the House's attention but, if members called upon God to answer their prayers, as they did in the earlier issue of disbanding the northern armies, then they must settle God's business or suffer the consequences: new rages of men. It was because Parliament, and thus the nation, had failed to settle the issue of religion and rebuild God's house that "God hath now laid upon [them] a business of more difficulty, by kindling a fire in Ireland to the unspeakable persecutions and butcheries of poor Protestants."[124]

---

[122] Burges, Another Sermon, p. 8.

[123] Ibid., p. 60.

[124] Ibid., p. 62.

There were means to avoid further judgement from God. Burges beseeched members to consider what God expected of them and to look at the example of David, who seriously resolved to build the House of God. The practical thing, the very necessary course to follow, was for the Parliament to call to their assistance "a free synod of grave ministers of the nation."[125] This synod would help the members find the best path to curing the "ulcers of [the] time" and put all men into a course of "order and uniformity in God's way."[126] The course to follow was clear. All Parliament need do was adhere to the advice given and thus spare England from experiencing God's wrath.

The tensions and excitement continued at a fever pitch through December. The king had returned to his capital at the end of November to a very warm welcome. Though this rapprochement with the people, and thus their support, would be short lived, he set about regaining control over the legislative initiative. Pym and his opponents had succeeded in gaining parliamentary approval for the printing of the Grand Remonstrance just prior to the king's return to London, though this action nearly caused fighting in the House and ultimately destroyed the little remaining unanimity within the Commons.[127] Charles, finally seeming to grasp political reality, issued a conciliatory

---

[125] Ibid., p. 63.

[126] Ibid., p. 64.

[127] D'Ewes (C), p. 186.

proclamation on religion on December 10 and rather politely rejected the Grand Remonstrance on December 23.[128] Riding the crest of his new-found popularity Charles, as Derek Hirst points out, completely misread the situation, and "seeing only the insubordination of his enemies" and deciding further concessions "anathema and unnecessary," let word out that he would personally command the armies to Ireland.[129] Nothing could have sparked fear into the hearts of the parliamentary opposition more than the thought of the king in control of a standing army.

Into this continuing milieu of rumor and insecurity two familiar ministers entered to remind members of how best to deal with the religious and political crisis. On December 13 the House voted to set aside a fast day for the concerns of Ireland.[130] Edmund Calamy, in the morning, and Stephen Marshall, in the afternoon, preached similar sermons before the members on December 22. Calamy, apologizing for taking up members' time from their "more serious affairs," spoke of Jeremiah 18:7-10 as a "looking glass" for England.[131] The preacher made clear the turmoil of the day was a sign that God was very displeased with England; it was a warning for the nation to avoid God's wrath by repenting. Indeed, God had given eight warnings of impending

---

[128] Hirst, p. 213 and Rushworth, p. 452.

[129] Hirst, p. 213.

[130] D'Ewes (C), p. 281.

[131] Edmund Calamy, England's Looking Glass (London, 1641), p. 1.*

doom: the voices of godly ministers, divisions in church and state, rebellion in Ireland, and, most disturbing of all, the "great demur and delay of Reformation," to name only a few.[132] And how much worse were their sins for all the mercy God had shown England in the previous year. Calamy made clear his purpose: "I am not come hither this day to feast your ears but to wound your hearts."[133] England was in turmoil because the nation, or Parliament, being its representative, had not turned to God and his ways, as the preachers had been admonishing for some time.

Calamy laid out the path for dissolving God's anger and returning England to His blessing. Repentance, through "humiliation and Reformation," was the only means to ward off the wrath certainly on its way. Humilation, for sins past, was reached by dipping into the "well of atonement" with seven buckets to draw up humility.[134] After contemplating the sins of the past, and God's mercy in forgiving them, the way to return to favor with God was reformation, "personal and national."[135] The preacher hoped to move members to "be reformed" personally so the nation itself might be reformed, so there might be "a Court-reformation, a country-reformation, a city-reformation, a

---

[132] Ibid., p. 31-37.

[133] Ibid., p. 23.

[134] Ibid., p. 26.

[135] Ibid., p. 39.

general-reformation."[136] But this was to be reformation "beyond [the] first reformation in King Edward's day, ... reform of the reformation itself," including the calling of "faithful, learned ministers of the kingdom to meet in a free national synod," to advise members on reform of the church.[137] Only these steps towards repentance, humiliation and reformation, would appease God's anger and make His wrath pass by their land. Calamy summed-up the message best: "Turn or Burn...."[138]

Marshall did his best to turn up the heat in his sermon in the afternoon. Though he spoke on the wrath of God also, Marshall went a step further and declared "that the sins of a nation may come to that height, and God's wrath may be kindled to that heat, notwithstanding their reformation, God will inexorably go on to a desolation" of the country.[139] Marshall, too, reviewed the sins of the nation and listed all the warning signs of its imminent destruction, but he wanted it to be much clearer that, regardless of earlier blessings, England might well be beyond that point at which reform and repentance would appease the Lord's justice. "Oh that it might not fit England" resounded Marshall.[140] But were there not children of Belial, "those whose

---

[136] Ibid., p. 45.

[137] Ibid., p. 46-48.

[138] Ibid., p. 59.

[139] Stephen Marshall, Reformation and Desolation (London, 1641), p. 8.*

[140] Ibid., p. 43.

lives are contrary to God's ways and to the gospels," amongst the members of Parliament? To these, the real problem in England Marshall seemed to say, was given a loud curse: "Oh thou miserable and wretched worm, great is the wrath of God that is kindled against you."[141]

Again, the only answer, if it were at all possible at the stage of corruption and depth of sin to which England had fallen, was fear of divine wrath and more reformation. Marshall showed the way to resanctification as "mourning under" the wrath, always being aware of its threat, "emptying the vessel" full of the nation's sins, and action by Parliament.[142] Parliament, the physicians and repairers, were to think constantly of England, Scotland, and Ireland and to consider turning away God's wrath as the top priority. Specifically, Marshall asked that Parliament call for continued fasts "until the fierce wrath of God be turned away." Echoing Calamy, Marshall prayed that "the God of all wisdom direct" the members to call a "grave synod of divines" to advise members and that they would do "all according to God's law."[143] Through these measures perhaps, only perhaps, could England be spared the desolation warranted by its wretched sins.

In all the sermons given after November 1 the preachers repeatedly drove home to members the already well-known Puritan

---

[141] Ibid., p. 19.

[142] Ibid., p. 49-51.

[143] Ibid., p. 50-52.

message. The calamities which threatened the nation were but consequences of Parliament, and thus the nation, not heeding the ministers' advice to reform. All the preachers pushed for a national synod of divines to advise Parliament on settling the so far debilitating question of how build God's House, of how to reform the church. And they all warned of impending, even imminent, doom for the nation if members continued to ignore their warnings. While it is true, as Trevor-Roper points out, that the preachers thought Christians should drive out sin and sinners, he offers no evidence that the ministers sought to "draw on the radical spirit of the City mobs" and to "exalt their radicalism by ideological gestures.[144] Indeed, in these sermons of December, and that of November 5 ignored by Trevor-Roper, it is clear the preachers sought to reinforce their earlier calls for reform of church and society.

The members of Parliament heard these sermons in an excited and tense environment intensified by the rebellion in Ireland. The king's popularity was rising and declining dependent upon the city's perception of his actions. On December 21, before the fast sermons could have ignited the mob's radical tendencies, tendencies which Trevor-Roper notes and acknowledges were present even in November, 1640,[145] the city elected more radical aldermen to a majority control. Charles reacted by appointing Colonel

---

[144] Trevor-Roper, p. 305.

[145] Trevor-Roper, p. 304.

Lunsford, a convicted felon and experienced army veteran, to command the Tower of London, convincing members of his ill will towards Parliament[146] and that the papist conspiracy "was now growing to maturity.[147] As the king exhibited more menacing gestures Pym and the opposition became determined to keep the army needed in Ireland out of the king's control. By the end of December the opposing parties, convinced of each others' evil motives and objectives, stumbled toward confrontation.

III. The Confrontation.

In the last days of December new forces entered the struggle between king and Parliament adding new pressures to an already heated contest. The citizens of London, angered at the appointment of Lunsford to command the Tower, demonstrated for three days at Westminster, much maligning the bishops as the cause of all the nation's ills. These demonstrators were met by soldiers, those waiting for back pay and loyal to the king, the dismissed Lunsford among them, who would enjoy a fight for the protection of the king and bishops.[148] The bishops, kept from the House of Lords by the crowds around Westminster, petitioned the king to declare all orders of the House from December 27 to 30 null and void. These bishops were subsequently impeached by the

---

[146] Hirst, p. 215.

[147] D'Ewes (C), p. 346.

[148] Ibid., p. 172

House for treason and put in the Tower.[149] By the end of December the opposing sides were at the proverbial breech.

Charles stepped first. On January 3 the king ordered the Lords to impeach five members of the House of Commons for treason and sent orders to the Commons for the five members to be handed over to the king's men.[150] It was the breaking point of the fragile relations between king and Parliament. The Lords, disgruntled by the bishop's action for nullifying Parliament's orders, failed to follow the king's orders for impeachment. "About 3 of the clock we noticed that his majesty was coming from Whitehall to Westminster with a great company of armed men," noted Sir Simonds D'Ewes. However, the accused five members, Pym being top on the list, "did withdraw" out of the House into the safety of the city.[151] The attempt on the five members failed. On January 10, fearing the mobs of a city against him, Charles left London, not to return until 1648 for his own trial and execution.

Thus, what began as perhaps a promising autumn deteriorated by the end of the year into open division between king and Parliament. During these months the preachers continued to articulate the Puritan goals set forth on previous occasions before the House. The preachers, as did Pym and the opposition

---

[149] Ibid., p. 176-177.

[150] Ibid., p. 377-379.

[151] Ibid., p. 381.

leaders, reacted to new information concerning plots and rebellion with more heated warnings of popish conspiracy. As the threat continued month after month and came to be linked closer to the king himself, the opposition demanded more assurances in the form of constraints on royal power and increases in that of Parliament. The distrust between king and Parliament resulted in the show-down on January 3. Who to trust, as far as Puritan preachers were concerned, was clear. The sermons never ceased to admonish the House to godliness.

CONCLUSION

From the beginning of the Long Parliament until the king's departure from London was only fourteen months. In this period, what began as a unanimous effort by Parliament to set the nation back on the right course ended in estrangement between king and people, formation of royalist and parliamentary parties, and preparation for civil war. But the move to civil war was a stumble, not a deliberate, brisk walk to confrontation with the king. The puritan preachers, called by the House to address members on special days of fasting and prayer, candidly presented their view on the cause of the nation's ills and how to go about repairing them. Parliamentary critics of royal policy also had their ideas concerning the problems needing attention and the answers to those problems. Most often these MPs and preachers presented identical goals and supported each other through speeches and sermons, perhaps correctly described as propaganda, to achieve those goals. That there was a mutually beneficial relationship between these two groups is clear, but what has been misrepresented or ignored, and what this paper has explored, is the nature of this relationship and its causes.

For their part, the preachers stuck to their plan. They began in November, 1640 with a clear course to further reformation, guarantee liberties, and attack popery; this was the Puritan program of reform. Through the first half of 1641, during the Strafford trial and the efforts at root and branch reform, the preachers reiterated their goals, the eradication of

popish councilors and reform of the church, sticking to the prescribed plan to save the nation. Their sermons a year later, following the uprising in Ireland, illustrate the same reform agenda being articulated before members of the House. The Irish rebellion was, the preachers thought, partly caused by the Parliament's failure to build the "godly" society envisioned in the program. The same attacks on the sins of the nation were heard beginning with the first fast sermon on November 17, 1640. Such a program, publicly disclosed in a crowded St. Margaret's church, before members of the House and interested citizens, is not the stuff of conspiracy.

Members of the parliamentary opposition were not merely responding to the preachers' calls for reform; it was the members who initiated the measures. In the first months of the Parliament, when unanimity prevailed and virtually all members strived to correct the abuses of the previous decade, the Parliament acted to effect reform, reform which had been proposed before the first sermons were given. In spring 1641, fearing failure of the plan to impeach the Earl of Strafford, Pym and his allies took other measures to gain the same results and urged members to speed the process, well before Samuel Fairclough preached on the "troublers troubled." That same spring the House took up the debate on root and branch reform and proposed a bill to bring about the changes needed. This was before the fast sermons called for the end of episcopacy. At the end of the year, when the Irish rebellion broke out, the preachers were

called on to reaffirm the justification of reform and even to chastise members for not proceeding further in the cause. There was common cause between members and the preachers.

The relationship of minister and MP was one of support and justification, not conspiracy. Each had similar views on the causes of the nation's ills and how to reform those ills. The preachers offered members of the House religious justification for their program while MPs supplied the means to implement the ministers' reform agenda. Pym and his allies most often presented the plans before the House and then called on the ministers to show the biblical support for these plans through the sermons on fast days. That the ministers had to chastise members, and that a few of the preachers would end up in the royalist camp, demonstrates it was not a perfectly harmonious relationship, certainly not one of a finely tuned pulpit and hand picked preachers.

So what of Trevor-Roper? He correctly demonstrates a relationship between the preachers and the parliamentary opposition to the king, but he supports his conspiracy theory with nothing more than superbly written conjecture and the words of the Earl of Clarendon, hardly an unbiased source. On a number of occasions he misuses the sermons: Samuel Fairclough's sermon he treats as an official fast sermon while it was not, and the sermon on November 5, 1641 he completely ignores. One is forced to seek elsewhere the unarticulated, but nonetheless implicit, presuppositions underlying the thesis Trevor-Roper makes

concerning the events of the early 1640s.

These biases can be found in Trevor-Roper's earlier work on the seventeenth century and the contemporary English gentry. As Trevor-Roper depicts things, Pym and his allies in both Houses of Parliament were among those members of the landed class unable to gain patronage from the "Renaissance state" the Tudors had built. These disgruntled men, the "mere gentry," returned to their estates, formed the "country" faction, and would later risk, indeed cause, civil war because of their exclusion from the spoils.[152] The struggle of the seventeenth century became, as J. H. Hexter expertly describes Trevor-Roper's thesis, "a lack of empathy between the little piggies that went to court and had roast beef and the little piggies that stayed home and had none."[153] It is his inability to see any explanation other than self-interest that clouds Trevor-Roper's judgement on the events of the early 1640s and undermines his work on the fast sermons to Parliament. Self-interest certainly played a part in motivating people, but the ideas of religious and social reform, such as those forwarded by the MPs and preachers addressing the Long Parliament, must be seen as important factors. These ideas, the goal of Puritans in and out of Parliament, moved men to resist royal policies and contributed to the coming of civil war.

---

[152] H. G. Trevor-Roper, "The Gentry, 1540-1640," in Economic History Review Supplement I (1953).

[153] J. H. Hexter, Reappraisals in History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. 142.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

To perhaps save future senior honors seminarians heartache and frustration, I will discuss some of the more important and useful sources he or she might be tempted to investigate. Many primary sources, printed and on microfilm, and several secondary sources played a major role in helping this thesis take form.

As for primary sources, the fast sermons in facsimile published by the Cornmarket Press, though out of print in June 1989, were extremely valuable for gathering most of the fast sermons in several manageable volumes. Be aware, however, there are several sermons not included in the Cornmarket series for which the researcher must resort to microfilm (those sermons available in the Cornmarket volumes included in this work were so noted in the thesis with a "*"). For the proceedings of Parliament there is nothing better than the Commons Journals, though these can be difficult to obtain for extended research. The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, with different volumes edited by Wallace Notestein, Willson Coates, and Helen Barber proved very useful when the Commons Journals were beyond reach. Rushworth's Historical Collections provided the full texts of many speeches, ordinances, propositions, and acts of Parliament for which the diaries of D'Ewes, or the Journals, only noted occurrence. These works constitute the primary documents on which this study is based.

Excellent secondary sources were abundant for the majority of subject matter. The seminal work of William Haller, The Rise

of Puritanism, though now somewhat outdated, is a great way to begin, let me stress begin, an understanding of the Puritans and Puritanism. The work replacing Haller's, at least considering Elizabethan Puritans, is that of Patrick Collinson, The Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society 1559-1625. Also, Peter Lake's Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church helps brings the scholarship up to date on Puritans. For an understanding of Puritans and the struggle between religious factions in Stuart England, Sears McGee's The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans, and the Two Tables, 1620-1670 elucidates what can often be a confusing theological nightmare. The elusive definition of "Puritan" and "Puritanism" may seem more within reach, though still just beyond your fingertips, after careful perusal of these works.

To better grasp the fluidity and complexity of politics in the Long Parliament during its first two years there is little scholarship more useful than Anthony Fletcher's The Outbreak of the English Civil War. Though not flawless (see above page 38), Fletcher's work makes clear the myriad forces, constantly pushing at each other to gain advantage, which made the outcome of these years' events so unpredictable. Derek Hirst's Authority and Conflict also brings organization and clarity but to the broader scope of the first decades of the seventeenth century, including the events through the civil wars in 1642 and 1648.

If one searches for the "causes" of the civil war, one would do well to read, and re-read, J. H. Hexter's Reappraisals in

History, especially "The Myth of the Middle Class in Tudor England" and "Storm Over the Gentry," included therein, to learn where not to begin exploring. Then, John Morrill's article "The Religious Context of the English Civil War" shines much light on the power of religious conviction to move men to revolutionary acts. For the constitutional developments and possible causes for the war several works by Conrad Russell would be imperative, The Crisis of Parliaments being only one. These, as well as the works by Fletcher and Hirst listed above, should sufficiently launch a student into a lifetime of investigation.

A word must be said concerning the work of Hugh Trevor-Roper. While it has been one purpose of this work to show that this scholar has thoroughly bumbled the job of explaining relations between fast sermons and the Long Parliament, it is with sincerity that I urge recommended reading be made of Trevor-Roper's work. He is a very good writer and can weave a good tale based on the slightest evidence. However, he also generates the intellectual curiosity, and at times, the anguish, necessary for pushing people to further questioning. Also, his work, or at least the number of articles discussed here, demonstrates the peril of doing history set on defending one's preconceptions rather than formulating ideas based on all the evidence available. Good luck!