

# Drafting the Nineteen Propositions, January–July 1642

Colin Tyler

## Abstract

This article analyses the drafting of the document eventually printed as the Nineteen Propositions. Section two addresses certain issues regarding the methods and concepts employed in the subsequent analysis, focusing on consensus-building, constitutional leanings and the drafting of parliamentary declarations in early 1642. Section three examines the origins of the Nineteen Propositions in the draft Declaration of Ways and Means (January 1642) (hereafter cited as the Ways). Section four traces the emergence of the Declaration Concerning Grievances and Remedies (hereafter cited as the Grievances) from the Ways (January–February). Section five examines the junta's efforts to overcome the Lords' prevarication over passing the Grievances (February–May). Section six examines the emergence of the initial draft of the Nineteen Propositions from the Grievances (24–7 May). Section seven analyses the 28 May draft, while section eight explores the amendment of that draft (31 May and 1 June). Section nine examines parliament's abortive attempts to revise the Nineteen Propositions in light of *His Majesty's Answer to the XIX Propositions* (21 June–2 July). It is concluded that, contrary to the received view, the text of the Nineteen Propositions began to emerge in January rather than May 1642, and that the junta in the Commons rather than the Lords drove this process. The three appendices identify, respectively, the constitutional leanings of the relevant parliamentarians, the parts of the text of the Ways that were repeated in the Grievances, and dates on which the various parts of the final text of the Nineteen Propositions were written.

I wish to thank the following for their comments and assistance: the British Library, Glenn Burgess, Steve Cinderby, Clyve Jones, Jemma Lee, Philip Norton, Jon Parkin, the Parliamentary Archives at the houses of parliament, Paul Seaward, Tim Stanton, Pip Tyler the Brynmor Jones Library at the University of Hull, Erik Willis and the anonymous referees. The usual disclaimer applies.

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: TYLER, C. (2012), **Drafting the Nineteen Propositions, January–July 1642**. *Parliamentary History*, 31: 263–312, which has been published in final form at [doi:10.1111/j.1750-0206.2012.00345.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-0206.2012.00345.x). This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance With Wiley Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

## 1. Introduction

The Nineteen Propositions contained few, if any, new demands. Almost all of its ‘humble . . . advice’<sup>1</sup> had appeared in previous parliamentary petitions, speeches and declarations, not least John Pym's speech of 17 April 1640 to the Short Parliament, the Ten Propositions (June 1641) and the Grand Remonstrance (November 1641).<sup>2</sup> Even moderates such as Culpeper and Falkland had actively supported many of its individual elements. Indeed, it is established below that they were involved in its earliest drafting. Yet, the Nineteen Propositions has come to be seen as a significant turning point, partly because of the apparent concession of parity between parliament and the king found by many in *His Majesty's Answer to the XIX Propositions*.

The Nineteen Propositions is seen as significant also because of the juncture at which most historians believe it to have been written: late May 1642.<sup>3</sup> Despite the scholarly consensus regarding this date, surprisingly little detailed research has been conducted into the origins of the text. Anthony Fletcher is one of the few historians to have considered the precursor documents, among which he places particular emphasis on the Declaration of Both Houses about Fears and Jealousies, of March 1642.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, even Fletcher's interesting account contains important errors and misinterpretations. He confuses the Fears and Jealousies with two other declarations drafted, but not completed, between January and April 1642. The Fears and Jealousies was approved by the Commons on 5 March, entered into the *Lords Journal* on 7 March, and presented to the king two days later, before parliament ordered its printing on 12 March.<sup>5</sup> The two documents that Fletcher conflates with the Fears and Jealousies went by various names, including the ‘Declaration of Ways and Means’ (hereafter cited as the Ways) (drafted by a joint committee between 14 and 19 January) and the ‘Declaration Concerning Grievances [or “Causes” or “Distempers”], and Remedies’ (hereafter cited as the Grievances) (passed by the Commons on 19 February), and was reported, but not passed, by the Lords. It is established below that the Nineteen Propositions grew out of the Grievances, which itself grew out of the Ways.

This article traces the stages through which, between January and June 1642, the text of the Nineteen Propositions came to be written, and analyses the role of junta members and others in this process. Section two considers certain preliminaries regarding consensus-building, alliances and declarations in early 1642. Section three examines the aborted Declaration of Ways and Means (14–19 January). Section four shows how that text formed the basis of the Grievances (26 January–25 February). Section five examines the attempts of the junta in the Commons to get the Lords to approve the Grievances (25 February–23 May). Section six examines the drafting of a recognizable version of the Nineteen Propositions (24–7 May), while section seven examines the Lords' amendments to the initial draft (28 May). Section eight reconstructs the process by which final amendments were made (31 May–1 June). Section nine considers parliament's proposals to revise the Nineteen Propositions in light of Charles's response to the published declaration (21 June–2 July). It is concluded that the text of the Nineteen Propositions began life five months earlier than is normally thought. Moreover, contrary to an influential assessment of the relative positions of the upper and lower Houses immediately prior to the first civil war,<sup>6</sup> in this instance, at least primarily, it was the junta in the Commons who drove the drafting process, although it did so within constraints created by the need to retain a workable consensus among the mixed group of parliamentarians of both Houses who remained at Westminster in the late spring and early summer of 1642. This article draws no conclusions regarding the power of the junta in the Commons apart from during the passage of the Nineteen Propositions.

## 2. Consensus-Building, Constitutional Leanings and Parliamentary Declarations

There are some preliminary matters to consider before reconstructing and analysing the series of events leading from Charles's attempt on the five members to parliament's abandoned redrafting of the Nineteen Propositions. First, this article is concerned with the period immediately prior to the first civil war.<sup>7</sup> Arguably, in this context it is more helpful to analyse the relevant events using the idea of the constitutional leanings of the individuals involved, rather than that of political or military allegiances. An allegiance suggests a relatively-fixed adherence to a relatively-defined programme of beliefs and measures that are shared between members of a relatively-defined and stable group. Adopting the language of 'leanings', on the other hand, helps to convey the greater fluidity and lack of definition in the participants' respective, often unsystematic, commitments and the often amorphous groups through which they pursued those commitments at various times. The ambiguity that this must introduce into any analysis is mitigated to some extent below by the fact that our topic concerns, primarily, the constitutional distribution of authority and roles between the crown and parliament. It is on this basis that members have been classified loosely below and in Appendix 1 as 'radicals' or 'republicans' (those seeking significant diminution, if not abolition, of royal authority), 'junta members' (those pushing strongly to protect parliamentary privilege),<sup>8</sup> 'junta sympathisers' (those usually supporting junta's efforts), 'moderates' (those who prioritised reconciliation between Charles and parliament), and 'loyal to Charles' (those who deferred to Charles's understanding of royal prerogative). These labels are intended as points on a spectrum rather than what the nature of the situation precluded them from being: clearly-defined, stable categories with a fixed and undisputable membership. This language of 'leanings' helps to establish that the junta's actions made sense in the context of a constitutional culture that prioritised deference, consensus-building and unanimity.<sup>9</sup>

In fact, the lack of defined and disciplined positions was central to the events described below. The junta had to persuade other members to support efforts to give practical effect to a number of broadly-stated demands which, as noted above, had been endorsed by a wide range of individuals for several years previously. Indeed, as becomes clear below, one striking characteristic of this consensus is that its first parliamentary committee (sitting in January 1642) included both of the individuals who drafted *His Majesty's Answer to the XIX Propositions*: Culpeper and Falkland. Whether by accident or design, the concession of broad parity between the crown and parliament that they introduced into *His Majesty's Answer* accorded well with the central point of the consensus which the junta was attempting to build in the first half of 1642.

Next, it is important to emphasize that by issuing a declaration, parliament gave an authoritative public statement of its complaints, demands and intentions to the monarch and wider public, thereby enabling it to counter the royalists' views, false reports and propaganda.<sup>10</sup> Hence, the Lords stated formally that it wished to use these propositions ('or demands') 'to let all the World see, that the Parliament seeks nothing but the Good and Peace of the King and Kingdom'.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, declarations enjoyed parliamentary authority without requiring royal assent and could form the basis for dialogues with Charles and his supporters as well as being propaganda against them.<sup>12</sup> Yet, the need for consensus helps explain why the junta prioritised the issuing of declarations, rather than bills, orders or some other form of document. Its less 'demanding' constitutional status tended to make it easier to secure parliamentary agreement regarding a declaration. Finally, declarations tended to be less confrontational than bills or ordinances, both of which relied on non-parliamentary groups and officeholders to endorse actively parliamentary authority by performing definite actions.

In each of these ways and as Pym himself noted when recommending the Grievances to the Lords in April 1642, issuing declarations was the most effective method for ‘the settling of the Minds of Men’.<sup>13</sup> Raymond captures this nicely: ‘Parliament's Nineteen Propositions, the King's Answer, Henry Parker's *Observations* . . . were the communications that articulated ideological fracture and led to the outbreak of civil war. Each was published in cheap pamphlet form, encouraging the reader to read, criticise, respond, choose sides.’<sup>14</sup>

### 3. The Draft Declaration of Ways and Means, 14–19 January 1642

On 7 January 1642, the Commons created a committee to prepare the official response to Charles's attempt three days earlier to detain Nathaniel Fiennes, Sir Arthur Hesilrige, Denzil Holles, John Pym and William Strode from the Commons, with Mandeville from the Lords. This committee, which was to hear evidence from any member who wished to appear before it, mixed moderates (Culpeper, Whitelocke, Falkland, Hopton and Hotham) with members and supporters of the junta (Glynn, Stapleton, Fiennes, Erle, Pierrepont, Long and Grimston).<sup>15</sup> It continued to sit on 8 January, amid ongoing protests from the mob against Charles's recent violation of parliamentary privilege. On Monday 10 January, the third and final day that the committee sat at Grocer's Hall, Charles fled London.<sup>16</sup>

Defended by ships on the Thames and the City of London's forces on land, parliament set a guard on the Tower of London and ordered Hotham and Goring not to surrender Hull and Portsmouth respectively, to Charles, while news arrived of Lunsford and Digby raising arms for Charles at Kingston.<sup>17</sup> Yet, the ‘distressed Estate [at which] stood Affairs of these miserable Kingdoms’ at this time was not reflected within parliament itself.<sup>18</sup> Indeed, some even feared that this harmony would endanger the ‘liberty of the press’ and favour ‘ill-affected ministers’ at Westminster,<sup>19</sup> while others anticipated a reconciliation between parliament and Charles.<sup>20</sup> It was in this context that parliament decided to address the problems of national stability and security by issuing a collective declaration regarding Charles's attempt on the five members.

On Friday 14, Tuesday 18, and Wednesday 19 January, the Commons reinstated the committee that had sat at Grocer's Hall. Bulstrode Whitelocke chaired the committee, which was tasked with identifying the causes of the conflict and on deciding ‘the best Ways and Means to remove them to the Honour, Peace, Safety, and Happiness of the King and Kingdom; and to frame, or perfect, any Declaration for that Purpose’.<sup>21</sup> On 17 January, the Commons invited Lords' participation, although implying that it would proceed irrespective of the latter's attendance. The Commons was clearly in a confrontational mood, also ordering the prosecution of anyone who had ‘given any Counsel, or endeavoured to set or maintain Division or Dislike between the King and Parliament’, or aided those who had, as ‘publick Enemies of the State and Peace of this Kingdom’.<sup>22</sup> The Commons sat on neither 18 nor 19 January, to allow members to attend the final two days of committee, while the Lords sent its committee of Irish affairs to consider this and other matters at the conference.<sup>23</sup> While the figures are very uncertain, the joint Ways drafting committee appears to have had 75 members (47 from the Commons, and 28 from the Lords), including four radicals, 38 junta members or sympathisers, 17 moderates and 16 loyalists.<sup>24</sup>

It was Verney, rather than the parliamentary recorders, who detailed the committee's eventual 15 draft resolutions. The purpose of the Ways was to give formal expression to parliament's claims that, despite the whisperings of his ‘ill counsellors’, Charles had no reason to leave Westminster in the aftermath of the five members' debacle, and that while the queen was not

threatened with arrest for high treason, it was essential, for both the stability and safety of the English people and their protestant religion, to destroy the 'power [of] the recusants, preests, and other malignant persons' over the queen, and for the queen herself to retire from political life.<sup>25</sup> On the first day that the committee sat, the causes of the problems of the realm were identified as: Charles's promotion of those whom parliament had declared 'delinquents' and his removal from office of the delinquents' enemies, and, indeed, the promotion of anyone without parliamentary approval; the practising of catholicism at court and throughout England; the holding of temporal offices and the making of temporal decisions by catholics, Arminian bishops and the clergy more generally; the recent 'violent and frequent' attacks on parliamentary privilege; and the secrecy with which Charles conducted public business through the use of 'unknown councillors' and clandestine 'informers' against parliamentarians.<sup>26</sup> (The most obvious informer was Sir Edward Herbert, the attorney-general, whom the Commons was impeaching at this time for his role in the five members' controversy.)

Various solutions to these problems were proposed: executing the bishops recently condemned as traitors; banning all catholic services; removing from the Lords 'delinquents' such as Digby, whom Charles had ennobled so as to remove from the Commons' power; requiring the assent of both Houses for the creation of new peers, except where established hereditary procedures applied; and, until and unless both Houses agreed to their reactivation, suspending the votes of former Commons' members ennobled in that parliament.<sup>27</sup>

The standing of the Ways is unclear. The surviving articles are brief and possibly incomplete, with Verney's manuscript ending in midsentence. Nevertheless, the first three paragraphs form the brief preamble one would expect of a draft declaration: indeed, its own opening paragraph refers to it explicitly as 'a declaration'. Whatever was intended, the text of the Ways survives only in Verney's personal notes, and apparently even these records were made day-by-day, rather than being read out as a single document at the end of the committee's sitting. Ultimately, it seems significant that while Verney entered a heading for 'The declaration to the king from both houses of parliament' on 24 January, the title was deleted and no formal articles recorded.<sup>28</sup> Nevertheless, the Ways was the basis of a far longer document. This link is indicated by William Montagu's reference, in late May, to the '14 or 15 votes which were framed at Christmas [that is, the Ways], when they sate in Grossers' Hall, and have gone ever since, and do still, by the name of the diseases [or Grievances] and remedies'.<sup>29</sup> The link is established, however, by the fact that the second declaration (the Grievances) included much of the text of the Ways, something that should become clear in the following section (and Appendix 2).

#### **4. Declaration Concerning Grievances, and Remedies, 26 January–25 February**

On 20 January, the day after the final sitting of the Ways' committee, Littleton, the lord keeper, read to the Lords a message from Charles, wherein the king noted that: 'He might justly expect (as most proper for the Duty of Subjects) that Propositions for the Remedies of . . . [the] Evils [then afflicting the realm] ought rather to come to Him than from Him'.<sup>30</sup> As such propositions had not been forthcoming thus far, Charles ordered both houses of parliament to consider urgently:

all those Particulars which they shall hold necessary, as well for the upholding and maintaining of His Majesty's just and Regal Authority, and for the settling of His Revenue, as for the present and future Establishment of their Privileges, the free and quiet Enjoying of

their Estates and Fortunes, the Liberty of their Persons, and Security of the true Religion now professed in the Church of *England*, and the settling of the Ceremonies in such a Manner as may take away all just Offence; which when they shall have digested and composed into One entire Body, that so His Majesty and themselves may be able to make the more clear Judgement of them, it shall then appear, by what His Majesty shall do.<sup>31</sup>

Charles was explicit that such a declaration would allow him to absolve himself of blame. Ultimately, he concluded, it would be parliament's fault if the nation was unprepared to face the current 'Fears and Jealousies'.

Charles's message is interesting in at least two ways. First, his admonishment of parliament for failing to produce 'Propositions' setting out 'Remedies' for the present unrest was a striking anticipation of the language of both the Grievances and the Nineteen Propositions. Second, Charles's message reinforced the fact that both Houses had a constitutional 'Duty' to produce such documents without being asked to do so by the monarch. On this view, the subsequent moves of some within parliament to draft such declarations and advice could be seen as acknowledging Charles's authority rather than challenging it. Indeed, the Lords seemed to have taken something like this view. Hence, immediately on receiving the message, they began to draft a short, but effusive, message of thanks to Charles, forwarded his message to the Commons expressing 'a great Deal of Joy and Comfort' at receiving it, and requested the Commons to confer with them. Having sent Pym, Holles, Hampden and Falkland to receive the Lords' invitation, the Commons agreed immediately to send members to form a joint committee (as they 'find a quicker Dispatch of Affairs by Committees').<sup>32</sup> In spite of this apparent initial excitement, significant differences soon began to arise however, with the junta-dominated Commons' group asking to add a paragraph calling on Charles to bolster the militia and forts, a proposal that divided the Lords and allegedly angered some MPs.<sup>33</sup>

Such concerns regarding England's military preparedness would bear fruit most obviously in the Militia Bill and the Militia Ordinance, and reference to 'Fears and Jealousies' brings to mind the 'Declaration of Both Houses about Fears and Jealousies' which was emphasized, as noted above, in Fletcher's work on the Nineteen Propositions. Nevertheless, in mid January these issues had not been disaggregated from other constitutional matters. This was especially true of the control of appointments to the most significant public offices, issues that formed the foci of the Grievances and the Nineteen Propositions. Hence, on 26 January, merely two days after the joint conference regarding the message of thanks to Charles, Littleton reported to peers the results of a related joint conference which had been held on the previous night at the Commons' request.<sup>34</sup> His report was actually a verbatim record of a lengthy speech by Pym regarding petitions from the City of London, Middlesex, Essex and Hertfordshire. Even here one finds anticipations of the later documents, with point 11 of the City's petition reading like a summary of parts of the Grievances as recorded in the *Commons Journal* a month later (and the Lords' record six weeks after that).<sup>35</sup>

Four general problems can be discerned among the specific complaints in Pym's speech. First were concerns for England's security, especially regarding Spain, France and their allies: 'the Papists and ill-affected Party at Home' and the '*Irish Friars*' who were the 'chief Incendiaries to this Rebellion'.<sup>36</sup> Second were economic concerns, not least the growing disorderliness of 'the meaner Sort of People'.<sup>37</sup> Pym urged parliament to remove taxes and other restrictions on the 'Freedom of Trade' that gave 'Life, Strength, and Beauty, to the whole Body of the Commonwealth'.<sup>38</sup> Third were the impediments to parliament's capacity to act, especially the

power of ‘the Bishops and the corrupt Part of the Clergy’.<sup>39</sup> Fourth was the use of royal authority to allow papists to travel to and within Ireland, and to join together militarily there. Pym complained that ‘His Majesty's own Hand hath been obtained’ to prevent the carrying out of sentences against ‘delinquents’, and ‘the great and frequent Breaches of [Parliamentary] Privilege’, including – no doubt with the army plot, the incident, the papist plot discovered by Beale and the five members' debacle in mind – ‘those manifold Designs of Violence (which, through GOD's Mercy, we have escaped)’.<sup>40</sup> Throughout, Pym stuck to the line endorsed by many parliamentarians: the ultimate responsibility for these problems lay with the evil counsellors surrounding Charles.<sup>41</sup> (Adamson has described this trope as ‘the stock-in-trade argument of parliamentary propaganda’.)<sup>42</sup> Charles's advisors prevented the promotion of good men at court, hindering laws and policies that would serve the interests of English, Irish and Scottish protestants. The Lords fell into a heated, and ultimately fruitless, debate following Pym's speech.

Parliament did not return to the matter for another three weeks. On 14 February, the Commons ordered Pym to present his report on the ‘Declaration Concerning the Grievances and Remedies’.<sup>43</sup> The following morning, without entering the text of Pym's report into the official record, the House appointed Pym, Vane jr, Wilde, Prideaux, Hampden, Fiennes and Barrington (all junta members or sympathisers) ‘to make an Addition unto it, according to the present Condition of the Times’.<sup>44</sup> (These changes were incorporated into the Grievances on 19 February.)<sup>45</sup> On 17 February, Glynn's committee was ordered to add any appropriate grievances from petitions recently received from the counties. Moreover, Pym was ordered to draft an article against the trade in ‘judicial places’, ‘Serjeantships at Law’ and ‘Offices of Trust belonging to Courts of Justice, and the Commands of Forts, Castles, and Places of Trust’, which was reported by Pym and accepted by the Commons on the following day, becoming cause 11 of the Grievances.<sup>46</sup> The Commons retained remedy five which, in the final version, required the queen to take an oath in front of both Houses not to advise Charles on affairs of state. No doubt the narrowness of this vote (117 for and 113 against) reflected the humiliation such a public oath would bring to the queen and, by extension, Charles.<sup>47</sup>

On 19 February, the Grievances was read into the Commons' record. A little over half of the Ways was repeated verbatim in the Grievances (312 words out of 612), with the remaining demands being represented in more precise and polished terms (see Appendix 2). However, although the Grievances raised familiar points, its tone was far more urgent and forthright than that of the Ways. The preamble to the Grievances portrayed an England on the verge of ruin, undermined by Henrietta Maria, her advisors and the ‘Popish Lords’.<sup>48</sup> The Grievances emphasized parliament's self-restraint in the face of the frustration of its conciliar role by this papist fifth column. Charles should consider urgently the causes and remedies needed ‘to maintain God's true Religion, the Honour and Rights of Your Crown, the Peace and Safety of Your Royal Person and Your Kingdoms, [and] the just Liberties of Your Peace’.<sup>49</sup>

The Grievances called for the restoration of parliament's ability to fulfil its conciliar function, the enforcement of its judgments on delinquents and public offices, and the protection of the English Church from creeping Laudianism. It sought a parliamentary veto of appointments, especially to the privy council, and the regaining of influence at court.<sup>50</sup> The queen should no longer advise Charles, leaving parliament as his sole conciliar body, even exercising a veto over the marriages of the royal children as well as over their foreign journeys. Catholic practices were to be banned and all existing laws against catholics should be enacted fully and catholic peers should lose their voting rights. Those whom parliament declared delinquents were to be removed from office and prosecuted, and parliamentary consent was

to be required for recent and future appointments to the Lords and leading public offices. Appointments were to be made purely on the basis of 'Ability, Merit, Experience, and other publick Respects', rather than being sold as at present.<sup>51</sup> Moreover, 'the Proceedings of Justice [should be] made more easy, certain and indifferent'.<sup>52</sup> Those responsible for turning Charles against the five members should be 'discovered' and prosecuted, and the king was not to comment on proceedings within parliament, instead restricting his remarks to their final decisions and authorised public pronouncements. The Grievances concluded with the prediction – and, effectively, the promise – that, by accepting these requests, Charles would be assured of adequate funds and a peaceful kingdom.

The next working day, Monday 21 February, Charles accompanied his wife and Princess Mary to a ship that was to take the women to relative safety in Holland.<sup>53</sup> At the same time, the Lords agreed to a Commons' request (carried by Irby) for a joint conference to discuss the Grievances, to be managed by Pym.<sup>54</sup> The Lords ordered the outcome of this conference to be reported on 25 February.<sup>55</sup> In fact, a month later, the Grievances had not been passed by the Lords.

### **5. The Prevaricating Lords, 25 February–23 May**

On 23 March, Vane jr carried a strongly-worded Commons' request that the Lords pass the Grievances, and then attend a joint conference on the document. The Lords agreed to consider the text of the declaration the following morning, although in fact they did not discuss it then.<sup>56</sup> Three days later, the Commons sent another strongly-worded message, making clear that it was particularly concerned to finalise the Grievances the following Thursday, 'because there is something contained in it that concerns the Matter of Religion, which this House desires should be settled and established'.<sup>57</sup> Once again, the Lords agreed to discuss the Grievances either that day (Saturday) or on Monday 28 March, the business having been scheduled already for Tuesday 29 March.

The Lords failed to discuss the Grievances on any of these days. Undoubtedly frustrated by the Lords' prevarication, Pym took the unusual step of addressing its House on this day through the junta peer, Robartes. Having read out the Grievances in full, Robartes reported Pym's answers to a series of possible objections.<sup>58</sup> These acknowledged that the Grievances stated the 'Mischiefs . . . with more Danger and Violence than in any Age heretofore', but claimed that the Commons 'have kept themselves within the Bounds of their Duty and Modesty'.<sup>59</sup> The first substantive objection answered by Pym was to the 'Naming of ill Counsellors, which might seem as an Ineroachment upon the [King's] Prerogative'.<sup>60</sup> Pym responded by styling Charles as the innovator, in that he (Charles) was violating the ancient, legal privilege of parliamentary consent for appointment of the 'Great Officers of the Realm'.<sup>61</sup> (Pym conceded that, formally, parliament's function would be merely advisory, not determining.) The second projected objection concerned the proposal to dismiss all postholders *en masse*, before reappointing those acceptable to parliament. Pym responded that this apparently overly-complex method aimed to save the honour of rejected officers by obscuring their departure. It was also more likely to create public confidence in the purging of great officers.

Pym countered the possible objection that the Grievances denied the queen free practice of her religion by emphasizing the priority of the 'Law of the Land' and especially God's law, over the queen's honour.<sup>62</sup> The fourth and fifth projected objections concerned the requirement that the queen took a 'solemn oath' before both Houses not to 'intermeddle in



any of the Affairs of State, or Government of the Kingdom',<sup>63</sup> and parliamentary control of royal marriages, respectively. Pym's responses emphasized the 'unusual' nature of the times and, in the latter regard, the public nature of the superficially-private transaction: 'The Children of the King . . . are the Children of the Kingdom also.'<sup>64</sup> Clearly the monarch's children, like the king and queen themselves, each had 'Two Bodies', the physical and the constitutional.<sup>65</sup>

Pym closed by justifying the need to proceed with these measures in the form of a declaration rather than pursuing the more usual route of passing new laws. Again, he appealed to the 'Necessity of the Times': matters needed to be resolved quickly, and it was faster to issue a declaration rather than to draft, debate and pass new laws. A declaration would help to secure Charles's agreement to the measures, prior even to the preparation of the initial bills, as well as helping to reconcile the wider public ('settling of the Minds of Men') to that necessity, prior to passing such laws.<sup>66</sup> Issuing a declaration would prepare the way for a series of related bills, thereby tending to speed the passage of the legislation and bring a more lasting and widespread agreement to it from Charles and the remainder of the population.

Even having heard Pym's answers however, the Lords failed to approve the Grievances. In fact, the Lords was in turmoil at this time. The day after the reporting of Pym's speech, 67 absent peers were recorded, 14 without a stated reason.<sup>67</sup> On 15 April, 82 peers were absent, 19 without a stated reason, with Goring being 'excused, having Leave to go with the Queen'.<sup>68</sup> Such absences caused much consternation in both Houses, and continued to do so for many months.<sup>69</sup> The Lords resolved against peers who had joined Charles and condemned the latter's order for peers to attend his parliament at York against the Westminster parliament's wishes. (On 25 March, the Commons itself had created a committee to consider the growing problem of its own deserting members.<sup>70</sup>)

When, eventually, the Lords did begin to debate the remedies set out in the Grievances on 5 April, it gave up having approved only remedy one of the 25 (plus preamble and conclusion), even this decision having provoked 18 peers to take the unusual step of dissenting formally from the vote.<sup>71</sup> The Lords did agree to the Commons' next request of 11 April, carried by Holles, that it discuss the Grievances the following day, but once again, there is no record that actually it did so.<sup>72</sup> Pressure even came from outside parliament on 22 April, when the Lords received a Cornish petition, thanking it for its work with the Commons on the Grievances and urging it to greater efforts.<sup>73</sup>

There was some movement the next day however, when the Lords approved topics for a joint conference with the Commons.<sup>74</sup> The official record is interesting here: first, the list of topics was prepared by junta members (St John, Brooke and Robartes); second, it appears to invoke the first article of the Grievances; third, it stated that 'the Lords have assented to' the list (it is ambiguous whether the Grievances as a whole is meant, or simply its first article); and fourth, the Lords did actually approve the list. Three days later, the Lords decided that it would consider the Grievances the following Thursday (5 May).<sup>75</sup> Again, it appears that it did not do so, and on 9 May, Holles carried another message from the Commons urging peers to 'hasten the Declaration, concerning the Evils, and the Remedies'.<sup>76</sup> The Lords refused to give an immediate response.

## **6. The Nineteen Propositions, 24–7 May**

A fortnight later, during the afternoon of Monday 23 May, the Lords appointed 16 peers to sit from 3 pm the next day, in order ‘to consider some Propositions, which are fit to be presented to the King’.<sup>77</sup> William Montagu noted on that day that: ‘It is not yet known whether the Lords will send to the Commons to join or not with them in it.’<sup>78</sup> He characterised their primary intention as being ‘to draw up articles to offer to the King, by way of accommodation; which articles they [the Lords] intend shall be so reasonable and necessary that if the King denied them, all the world should see where the fault lay: this was accordingly ordered’.<sup>79</sup> Ten of the 16 peers were either junta members or more radical than the junta (Northumberland, Essex, Say and Seale, St John, Mandeville, Feilding, Brooke, Grey, Robartes and Wharton), while the remaining six were more moderate than the junta (Manchester, Pembroke, Leicester, Holland, North and Spencer).

The following day, the *Commons Journal* recorded its order: ‘That the House do meddle with no Business then, but what requires a present Dispatch for the Safety of the Kingdom.’<sup>80</sup> Sir Edward Hungerford took a formal proposal for the creation of ‘a Committee of both Houses . . . to consider of some Means for the present Defence of the Kingdom’, and upon receiving the Lords’ agreement from the Earl of Manchester, the Commons decided formally that at this conference it would present ‘some Propositions for the present Defence of the Kingdom’.<sup>81</sup> The conference ran from 6 pm to 7 pm, with Holles and Pym appointed to manage it.<sup>82</sup>

On the morning of 27 May, Mandeville reported back to the Lords.<sup>83</sup> Almost immediately, following a motion tabled by Northumberland,<sup>84</sup> and presumably in response to Mandeville’s report, the Lords appointed 12 members to form a joint committee with the Commons ‘to consider some fit Means for the present Defence of the Kingdom’.<sup>85</sup> All except Peterborough and Hunsdon had served at the recent joint conference. Eight were junta members (Warwick, Essex, Mandeville, Northumberland, Feilding, Wharton, Brooke and St John), with the remaining four being more moderate (Lords Holland, Pembroke, Peterborough and Hunsdon). This conference, at which at least five of the 12 named peers had to be present, was scheduled for 27 May. The Commons appointed 24 representatives for the conference. Once again, these were mostly junta members and sympathisers (Holles, Pym, Evelyn, Fiennes, Erle, Hesilrige, Wentworth, Sir John Holland, Reynolds, Rolle, Marten, Sir John Coke jr, Vane jr, Bodvel, Harley, Glynn, Montfort, Strode and Sir Robert Coke), with a rather inactive parliamentarian (Pye) and four of Charles’s sympathisers (Waller, Sutton, Crane and Smyth).<sup>86</sup>

The Commons’ discussion ranged more widely than the administrative task of appointing members to the committee. Lenthall, the Speaker, formally proposed a revision of the latter’s terms of reference, and eventually Waller was sent ‘to the Lords, to desire, that the Power of the Committee may be enlarged so far as to consider of all Means for continuing and preserving the Peace of the Kingdom, and the preventing of Civil War’.<sup>87</sup> The Lords agreed immediately on reassembling that afternoon and adjourned to allow its representatives to attend the conference.<sup>88</sup> During the conference, there was some discussion of Waller’s suggestion to moderate the ‘orders concerning Hull’ ‘as a means tending to accommodation’ with Charles.<sup>89</sup> However, the proposal was dropped following opposition by reformers including Strode.<sup>90</sup>

## **7. The 28 May Draft**

The resulting draft of what became the Nineteen Propositions was presented on 28 May. It lacked a preamble and conclusion, the final five propositions, and other qualifications and clauses that were added over the coming days.<sup>91</sup> Some passages were taken verbatim from the remedies set out in the second half of the Grievances, while other propositions bore close resemblances to other remedies set out there (see Appendix 3). Nevertheless, the two documents differed markedly in both tone and strategy. Where, generally, the Grievances was very aggressive, rambling and repetitious, the Nineteen Propositions was comparatively businesslike and as concise as was consistent with precision. Where the Grievances launched direct and, in many key instances, explicitly-personal assaults on the queen and her evil counsellors, the Nineteen Propositions sought impersonal, blanket procedural powers. The more measured approach of the new draft was reflected most strikingly in the absence of anything like the list of accusatory 'causes' that had occupied much of the respective first halves of the Ways and the Grievances. This sheds light on Feilding's remark that the propositions 'have bene brought downe to the lowest degree of moderation and respect', and that they were 'the only meanes which is left' to secure a reconciliation.<sup>92</sup> The content was as uncompromising, however.

The first draft of proposition one created a parliamentary veto over Charles's appointments to the Lords, privy council and all other 'Great Offices of State', and retained the requirement that privy councillors took a public oath of good service. It was transplanted verbatim from remedy one of the Grievances, although with one crucial difference. Proposition one did not respect existing hereditary rights to occupy certain positions, even though remedy one had done so.<sup>93</sup> Parliament was now to have absolute power to remove and exclude anyone from such offices. The first half of proposition two was a slightly restructured, and very slightly rephrased, version of remedy seven.<sup>94</sup> Another crucial change had been made however: whereas remedy seven specified that privy councillors were to be 'recommended' by parliament, proposition two held that they were to be 'chosen' by it. Moreover, privy councillors appointed during parliamentary recess could only retain their office if parliament consented subsequently. Proposition two went further however, stating that decisions of the privy council would possess authority only if they were ratified by parliament. Hence, proposition two would give parliament control over a crucial source of advice to the king and ensured that public decisions could be made only by holders of offices that were explicitly authorised to do so. It also established parliament as the supreme political institution except for that of the monarch.

Parliament still had reason to insist on this sort of publicity and authority of decision makers. For example, in the six weeks since Pym's speech to the Lords in defence of the Grievances, Mandeville's correspondents had recorded two instances where Charles and his supporters had attempted to conduct public business in secret, using private men, in order to circumvent parliamentary authority.<sup>95</sup> Parliament's anger at such clandestine dealings was probably heightened by the continuing desertion of parliamentarians to Charles at York, and the planned betrayals of the parliamentary forces at Hull by Beckwith and Carnarvan, of which it became aware immediately prior to considering the Nineteen Propositions.<sup>96</sup>

Proposition three of the Nineteen Propositions required the king to gain parliamentary consent for appointments of certain public officers. Morrill has expressed a certain mystification at the offices named, some of which were either very minor or even defunct in the summer of 1642.<sup>97</sup> Yet, the first seven offices were simply the 'Great Officers of the State', and the remaining eight were very significant given parliament's recent troubles. In fact, the very reasons Morrill gives for his puzzlement seem to imply something highly

significant about parliament's concerns for the future.<sup>98</sup> As Morrill notes, where king and parliament could not be reconciled, the lord high steward, lord high constable and earl marshall could institute a commission of estates to decide the matter, and, under certain circumstances, the lord high constable could arrest the king. It is not puzzling then that the junta wanted to control these potentially very powerful offices during a period of such tension. The lord high steward also had a pivotal role constitutionally during impeachment trials of the type that Pym's group had recently instigated against Strafford. Control of the named offices would bolster parliament's authority to dismiss such delinquents.

Proposition four gave parliament a veto over the monarch's appointment of tutors and governors to the king's children, as proposition five did for each of their marriages.<sup>99</sup> Again, the influence of the Grievances on the Nineteen Propositions was clear, with proposition four being a restricted version of remedy 21 of the Grievances, and proposition five including text taken verbatim from remedy eight. The propositions made no mention of parliamentary control of foreign journeys by the royal children. This had been sought by remedy nine of the Grievances, an omission probably reflecting a desire to draft demands that would be acceptable to Charles's remaining parliamentary sympathisers and would be judged reasonable beyond parliament.

In line with remedy ten, proposition six sought the enforcement of the laws 'against Jesuits, Priests, and Popish Recusants'. It repeated almost verbatim the demand made in remedy 12: 'That some effectual Course may be enacted, by Authority of Parliament', of 'disabling them from making any Disturbance in the State.'

The first draft of proposition seven was an extended version of remedy 13, precluding 'Popish Lords in the House of Peers' (a phrase taken from remedy 13) from voting 'in such Matters as do conduce to the Suppression of Popery and Advancement of the Protestant Religion'.<sup>100</sup> It also incorporated the new requirement that Charles was to allow the drafting of a bill 'for the Education of the Children of Popish Recusants, by Protestants, in the Protestant Religion'.<sup>101</sup> Proposition eight required: 'That a due Reformation may be made of the Church Government and Liturgy' (another phrase taken from remedy 13) on lines set by parliament and in light of the advice of the Divines.

At this stage, proposition nine read simply: 'That a Bill shall be passed, for settling the Militia, as shall be advised by both Houses of Parliament',<sup>102</sup> something that had become more pressing over recent weeks, especially in light of Charles's rejection of the Militia Ordinance of 5 March, whereby parliament had sought to assume control of the armed forces.<sup>103</sup> (The matter had not been covered in the Grievances.) Proposition ten allowed parliament to reinstate any of its former members who had 'been put out of any Place and Office' during that parliament, or for those individuals to be compensated for their removal. This was a very slightly rephrased version of the second part of remedy 22 but was given added significance, in April, by Charles's dismissal from court of Holland and Essex. At the time of their dismissals, parliament had attributed their removal to 'the effects of evil counsels to discourage good men in their duties, and tend to increase division between the king and his people, and to disturb the peace of his kingdom'.<sup>104</sup>

Proposition 11 required 'all Privy Counsellors and Judges' to swear to uphold 'the Petition of Right, and . . . certain Statutes made [during] this Parliament'.<sup>105</sup> In this way, parliament sought to dispel the confusion regarding the legal status of the 1628 Petition of Right that had been caused, apparently deliberately, by Charles's ambiguous modes of authorising the

petition. Proposition 12 allowed judges and all other officeholders appointed with parliamentary consent to retain their positions as long as they behaved appropriately. Proposition 13 allowed parliament to punish 'all Delinquents' even when the latter had fled abroad, thereby covering the same ground as remedy 16. Finally, proposition 14 brought into effect the 'General Pardon offered by Your Majesty', subject to parliament's veto in the case of certain individuals. This was probably an allusion to the 'free and general Pardon' offered by Charles (in the aftermath of the five members' controversy) on 6 February and entered into the Lords' record the following day.<sup>106</sup>

When, on 28 May, Hampden returned from his inspection of the Buckinghamshire militia, he was surprised by the Commons' self-assurance. Writing to Hotham, he observed that: 'I know not what hath passed the House in my absence, having been here but about an hour. But I may tell you they seem confident and secure above what I could expect, considering how great a noise the withdrawing of the Lords made in the Country.'<sup>107</sup> Indeed, the Commons' enthusiasm for reform remained much greater than that of the Lords. Frustrated by their failure to pass the 14 propositions of the existing draft straightaway, late in its Friday sitting the Commons had resolved to send an urgent message the next day: 'to desire their Lordships to expedite the Declaration concerning the Causes and Remedies' (once again making explicit the link between the Grievances and the Nineteen Propositions).<sup>108</sup> That day, the Lords passed all the then-extant propositions without alteration, except for the fifth which was rewritten during the sitting itself by Northumberland, Holland and Mandeville (the very first version was not recorded).

## **8. Amendments of 31 May and 1 June**

On Monday 30 May, the Lords requested a joint conference with the Commons to discuss the 28 May draft. The wording of the subsequent official record was itself interesting, in that it highlighted their moderate and symbolic intensions: 'to let all the World see, that the Parliament seeks nothing but the Good and Peace of the King and Kingdom'.<sup>109</sup> Pym's role in this conference is unclear, for while D'Ewes named him as one of its 'reporters', the *Commons Journal* named Holles, Glynn, Lisle and the more moderate Widdrington.<sup>110</sup> D'Ewes also recorded that Wharton was appointed to manage the conference, which happened very soon after the Commons granted the Lords' request for the meeting, and that the reporters 'went with the greatest part of the house to the Painted Chamber'.<sup>111</sup>

Even at this stage, some Commons' members saw a chance of avoiding open civil war with Charles, who even then was far from being the 'man of blood' of the late 1640s.<sup>112</sup> Rev. John Shaw recorded that, soon after his arrival in York on 19 March, Charles had received 'many petitions . . . from almost all the countys of England . . . presented to the king by some persons of quality (magistrates and ministers), . . . humbly entreating the king to return to his parliament'.<sup>113</sup> In the same vein, Grimston now (31 May) proposed that parliament added a request to the draft propositions, asking Charles to return to Westminster so as to negotiate the granting of funds from him, something that would also allow parliament to send forces to Ireland. It is revealing that this was even worth the Commons discussing at this time (immediately prior to the formal receipt of Holles's report on the 30 May joint conference). Certainly, D'Ewes and others spoke against Grimston's motion, because it 'would rather make the breach [with the king] wider than repair it'.<sup>114</sup> Yet, the fact that D'Ewes shared some of Grimston's optimism was evident in his claim that: 'I did conceive the present differences between us and his majesty do rather proceed from fancy and misunderstanding than from any real difference that is between us, whereby things appear in a prospect and at a distance

otherwise than indeed they are.’<sup>115</sup> Similarly, even on 2 June, the day when the Nineteen Propositions was printed, William Montagu ‘wonder[ed] at the confidence which possesseth most men here, that we shall have no blows’.<sup>116</sup>

It was decided to continue the Grimston debate once Holles had given the formal report of the previous day's conference. The 28 May draft seems to have been passed to the Commons without alteration at the 30 May joint conference.<sup>117</sup> During the Commons' debate on the 14 propositions the next day, Goodwin proposed the total omission of proposition one, which called for the removal of those privy councillors to whom parliament objected and their replacement with individuals acceptable to both Houses.<sup>118</sup> While Goodwin's motion failed, the Commons did make certain amendments: to proposition six was added ‘or otherwise’; to proposition eight were added the final two clauses (from ‘and that Your Majesty’ to the end of the proposition), drawing on remedy 14; and proposition nine (concerning parliamentary control of the militia) was redrafted completely, making unequivocal the requirement for Charles's acceptance of the Militia Ordinance.

A revealing change occurred during the Commons' debate on proposition six, where the clause was widened to refer to ‘Papists’ rather than the more restricted ‘Popish Recusants’.<sup>119</sup> This amendment exposed a difference between the two Houses. The Lords had been willing to allow professed catholics readmittance as long as they continued to affirm that their allegiance to the king and parliament took precedence over their allegiance to the pope. The Commons, on the other hand, required such peers to renounce their catholicism completely, presumably because as Pym had claimed in his Short Parliament speech of 17 April 1640, the pope could absolve any catholic of oaths to the state and even require them to act directly against those oaths.<sup>120</sup> As the Lords' reporter of the Commons' amendments noted during the discussion of these amendments at the first joint conference of 1 June, the ‘reason’ for the change to proposition seven was that: ‘The principles of popery contrary to liberty of kingdom’.<sup>121</sup>

No doubt feeling that the draft still neglected many significant issues, the Commons immediately appointed eight junta members and sympathisers (Pym, Holles, Nathaniel Fiennis, Hampden, Sir Robert Coke, Crue, Pierrepoint and St John), ‘or any Three of them’, to make whatever changes they thought necessary ‘according to the Debate of the House’, and add a preamble and conclusion.<sup>122</sup> Pym reported the results of the junta subcommittee's deliberations that afternoon, after which they were presented again, this time formally by the clerk. The subcommittee proposed to add what became propositions 15 to 18, as well as the preamble and conclusion, all of which the Commons accepted after two readings, following some debate and amendments.<sup>123</sup> (It may also have been at this point that the final clause of the original version of proposition seven was deleted.)<sup>124</sup> The clerk was ordered to organise a fair copy in time for a conference with the Lords which the Commons requested be held the following day.

The additions drafted by this junta subcommittee were remarkable for their uniformly-respectful tone. This was especially true of the preamble and conclusion, which stood in stark contrast to the aggression evident in the equivalent parts of the Grievances. No mention was made of the queen, unlike in the Grievances which had devoted a great deal of space and bile to attacking her; none of the queen's advisors were named; and the requirement that parliament control the movement of the royal children was also dropped.<sup>125</sup> Given the queen's absence from England and especially the other powers sought in the Nineteen Propositions, however, these concessions seem largely matters of style and tone. It might be thought that

this moderation was possible because Henrietta Maria was then resident in Holland, and so presumably was felt to be less of an influence over Charles. Against this, parliament knew that she and Charles were in regular contact. Moreover, given that the queen went to Holland before Pym addressed the Lords on 1 April, the change was probably made to secure agreement from the Lords and the wider country, rather than as a response to any perceived reduction in her influence.

Nevertheless, the subcommittee's willingness to appear humble was undermined seriously by the substance of some of their new propositions. Proposition 15, for example, created a parliamentary veto over Charles's appointment of commanders of the 'Forts and Castles of the Kingdom', while proposition 16 required Charles to disband his army. Substantial accommodation was attempted elsewhere in the document. While proposition 17 was undoubtedly a partial infringement of the king's right to determine English foreign policy, its call for 'a more strict Alliance' with protestant powers against the pope accorded with the king and queen's long-standing wish to restore Charles's sister, Elisabeth, and nephews, to the crown of Bohemia. Understandably, the subcommittee emphasized this benefit. Furthermore, although Pym's subcommittee added a clause to proposition 11 requiring regular monitoring of the actions of privy councillors and judges, when it came to proposition 18, whereby Charles would absolve the five members, it dropped the long-standing call for the king to 'discover' those who spread the offending rumours, a call that had also been present in remedy 24. This was all the more remarkable given that three of the five members (Holles, Pym and Hampden) served on the small subcommittee. The new conclusion promised a significant increase in Charles's revenues, the release of Hull and its magazine (although to an army controlled effectively by parliament), and a revival of parliament's prior 'most dutiful and loyal Affections' and obedience to the king.

On the morning of 1 June, the Commons added proposition 19 (giving parliament the power to control the rights of new peers to vote in the Lords) prior to meeting with the Lords in the Painted Chamber.<sup>126</sup> This meeting had three parts, and yet again, Pym chaired the part of the meeting dealing with the Nineteen Propositions.<sup>127</sup> The record of this meeting reveals some attempt by the Commons to smooth the passage of the propositions in the Lords: for example, of the redrafted proposition nine: 'this agrees with your desires nott to admit of any weakness in the [Militia] ordinance'; and the addition to proposition 11 was characterised as according with the desire 'of our ancestors [?] for preservation of the g[rea]t charter' (presumably the Magna Carta).<sup>128</sup> During its consideration of the report of this conference, it seems that the Lords added the final two clauses to proposition one, again drawing heavily on the Grievances (paraphrasing part of remedy 22, and quoting directly from remedy one).<sup>129</sup> It then requested the second joint conference of the day, which was managed by Pym, Crue and Coke.<sup>130</sup> Even though the Lords' request interrupted an important Commons' debate on a treaty with the Scots for the latter to send 10,000 troops to Ireland, the Commons left immediately to meet the Lords.

Next, the Lords sought to amend proposition seven, which its 'scribble book' recorded as 'a clause of dispute',<sup>131</sup> by adding the subclause 'so long as they continue papists' to the existing text ('That the Votes of Popish Lords in the House of Peers may be taken away').<sup>132</sup> After this second joint meeting (with the Commons being represented by the junta in the persons of Pym, Crue and Robert Coke), the members returned to their respective Houses.<sup>133</sup> Pym reported the Commons' agreement to the Lords, and then, following a Commons' proposal to do so, both Houses ordered a parliamentary delegation of well-respected members to carry the Nineteen Propositions to the king immediately.<sup>134</sup> (*The Commons*

*Journal* named Herbert first whereas the *Lords Journal* named Howard of Escrick. The journals agreed on the remaining members: Fairfax, Sir Hugh Cholmeley, Stapleton and Sir Henry Cholmley.) This 'humble petition and advice' was also sent immediately to parliament's own committees at York.

The following day (2 June), the Lords ordered its printing.<sup>135</sup> That it did so is interesting in itself. The normal parliamentary practice on such matters had changed in the preceding months in reaction to a burgeoning of newspapers, pirated publications and Charles's habit of attaching the text of such messages when printing his replies, not to mention covertly sponsoring pro-monarchy pamphlets and newspapers.<sup>136</sup> (Parliament was not above such tactics, of course.) In March, the Lords had explicitly prohibited the distribution of the 'Fears and Jealousies'.<sup>137</sup> A few days later however, in response to what they saw as Charles's inflammatory reply to the declaration, the Commons complained that Charles's use of the phrase 'strange and unexpected' to describe the declaration: 'reflect[ed] much upon both Houses of Parliament; therefore they desire that their Lordships would join with the House of Commons, that the Declaration last presented to His Majesty, with the additional Reasons, be forthwith printed and published, for the Satisfaction of the Kingdom'.<sup>138</sup>

Viewed in this light, the Nineteen Propositions was one product of the 'first mass propaganda machine of modern times' and a contribution to the 'paper war' that preceded the first civil war.<sup>139</sup> Nevertheless, there were other, more conciliatory reasons for the printing of the Nineteen Propositions. As noted above, on 1 April, in the closing remarks regarding possible objections to the draft Grievances, Pym had argued that, ultimately, issuing a single declaration would bring lasting agreement much more quickly and surely than would simply introducing a series of bills: 'the Necessity of the Times will not wait for the passing of sundry Bills, which must take up some Time', and 'it will be a great Comfort to the Kingdom to have the King's Assent before-hand, and it will much conduce to the settling of the Minds of Men'.<sup>140</sup>

## **9. Parliamentary Reactions to His Majesty's Answer, 21 June–2 July**

Kenyon is emphatic that parliament was insincere in its profession that, even at this time, compromise with Charles was possible: the Nineteen Propositions was 'effectively terms of unconditional surrender', 'terms which no man of honour could accept'.<sup>141</sup> As evidence of parliament's duplicity, Kenyon notes that: 'Taking his refusal for granted, on 6 June it issued a proclamation claiming to exercise sovereign power in view of the King's demonstrable incapacity'.<sup>142</sup> The situation does not appear to have been this straightforward, however.

Charles entrusted the drafting of his response to Falkland and Culpeper, two of his moderate supporters, both of whom had sat on the joint committee that drafted the Ways five months earlier. Charles sent *His Majesty's Answer* to the Lords on 18 June. The Lords received it, together with Charles's covering letter, on Tuesday 21 June, immediately passing copies of both to the Commons, in line with the king's command, where immediately they were read into the official record in front of a sparsely-attended chamber.<sup>143</sup> The Commons began to debate the *Answer* two days later.

After not endorsing what may well have seemed the rather precipitous proposal of two moderate members (Tomkins and Rudyerd) that the House 'should embrace [such] an accommodation of peace',<sup>144</sup> the Commons' first decision was to create another subcommittee to examine its preamble in detail, and report back that afternoon. (The



subcommittee contained 11 junta members (Holles, Crue, Pierrepont, Fiennis, Stapleton, Pym, Hampden, Barrington, John Coke, Vane jr and Glynn), two moderates (Whitelocke and Selden) and four others with stronger royalist leanings (Strangwayes, Waller, Crane and Palmer).<sup>145</sup> Next, the Commons resolved itself into a committee of the whole House, chaired by Whitelocke, to consider the king's responses to each of the Nineteen Propositions. Discussion of the *Answer* was divided in this way due to the fact that, in Gawdy's words: 'The beginning of the message was in high language, but when he came to answer the articles, he used moderate language'; indeed, the preamble's tone caused consternation.<sup>146</sup>

A long debate ensued regarding proposition one (the veto over the appointment of privy councillors and all other grand officers of state). Hill's diary recorded that customary and legal precedent was a particular bone of contention, with moderate members such as Selden arguing that no such precedent remained in force, and junta members such as Glynn, St John and Pym arguing that it did.<sup>147</sup> Possibly, Glynn gave the most honest reason for retaining the article: 'We demand it not as a right but as a security for time to come.'<sup>148</sup> This thought appears to have underpinned Pym's position as well, in that he argued Charles's concession of requiring officeholders to take an oath would have no effect as it would be '[a] great obligation to tender conscience, but men without conscience will break over that', or as Verney had it: 'An oath bindes honest men but not knaves.'<sup>149</sup> Ultimately however, Glynn, Pym and junta members including St John, Holles and Strode lost the day, it being decided not to insist upon proposition one.<sup>150</sup>

The Commons resumed its consideration of Charles's *Answer* the following afternoon, reaffirming the bulk of proposition two.<sup>151</sup> Although moderate members including Selden and D'Ewes spoke against its retention, the House reaffirmed the first clause (requiring Charles to take advice only from individuals who had been sworn publicly to fulfil that task).<sup>152</sup> However, it withdrew some of proposition two's other clauses, including that which gave parliament the right to exert 'Censure and Judgment' over secret and unsworn counsellors, that which made the appointment of privy councillors subject to 'Approbation of both Houses of Parliament', and that which required parliamentary consent for the continuance of privy councillors appointed during recesses. The Commons also modified proposition two so as to allow councillors appointed in this way to be authorised temporarily by 'Six or more' of their prospective colleagues, rather than insisting on the original, more exacting, standard of the agreement of at least half of the existing members of privy council.

The Commons revised proposition three during the afternoon of the following Monday (27 June), dropping the veto over the offices of lord high steward of England, lord high constable, lord privy seal, earl marshal, warden of the Cinque Ports, chancellor of the exchequer, and secretaries of state.<sup>153</sup> They did continue to insist upon a veto, however, over appointment of the lord chancellor, lord keeper of the great seal, lord treasurer, lord admiral, chief governor of Ireland, master of the wards, two chief justices and chief baron.<sup>154</sup> They also inserted a limit of 30 days from the commencement of parliament's sitting for the approval of any appointments made to these offices during a recess. They retained proposition four (giving a veto over the appointment of royal tutors), although the latter no longer required privy council's temporary consent during recesses. Proposition five was amended with the effect of restricting the proposed parliamentary veto to royal marriages to foreign catholics (rather than to foreigners generally). The Commons expressed its satisfaction with Charles's response to proposition six, presumably meaning that it withdrew it as being already redundant. Hence, the next day the Commons reaffirmed proposition seven (regarding the voting rights of catholic peers), but, following a lengthy debate regarding the next proposition, Vane jr

proposed the creation of a subcommittee to draft any remaining revisions, ready for their presentation to the House two days later (30 June).<sup>155</sup> Vane was appointed, together with the junta members, Pym, Hampden, Pierrepont and Fiennes, and Waller and Selden who felt greater loyalty to Charles.

Events started to overtake the process of revision, and gradually the debates lost their momentum. The Commons did not return to the Nineteen Propositions until 2 July, when proposition nine was considered and, 'after a long debate',<sup>156</sup> reaffirmed.<sup>157</sup> It is interesting to note that, late on 30 June, it was Robert Goodwin who moved that the Commons should not delay further discussion of the remainder, and that it was Pym who, the following morning, insisted that the Commons consider the growing unrest in Leicestershire and Lancashire.<sup>158</sup> Vane's subcommittee never reported back. With events around the country making it increasingly urgent to settle a parliamentary militia and Hull becoming increasingly insecure and quickly adopting a war-footing, the momentum behind the revisions of the Nineteen Propositions dissipated. The junta moved on to more pressing matters, leaving the constitutional case underpinning the Nineteen Propositions to be made through pamphlets such as Henry Parker's *Observations*, a work which Charles claimed could be traced to the junta.<sup>159</sup>

## **10. Conclusion**

Many lessons can be drawn from the preceding analysis of the Nineteen Propositions. First, this is one example of parliament working to agree a declaration that it could print and distribute so as to state its own position authoritatively and without distortion.<sup>160</sup> Second, it has been established that not only did the demands made in the Grievances owe much to the Ways, but much of the text of the Ways was incorporated almost verbatim into the Grievances (Appendix 2). It has been shown that Pym himself wrote the first draft of the Grievances and some of its additional articles, with the remainder being written by a subcommittee dominated by junta members. With the Lords prevaricating, the junta pushed hard for the adoption of a document that encapsulated the demand for the control of the offices of the state, while still garnering enough support to be carried in the upper House. The printed version of the Nineteen Propositions was the closest they got to achieving that end, and itself drew heavily on the Grievances (Appendix 3). Third, contrary to the widespread understanding of the relative power of the Lords and Commons at this time, it was the Lords which prevaricated over the Grievances to be sent to Charles, and it was the junta in the Commons which, in effect, insisted on its drafting and printing. Yet, the Lords' prevarication over the Grievances showed that it could not be simply forced to endorse the reformers' pronouncements. Another indication that the reformers did not have a free hand was their (grudging) willingness to wait over three months for the Lords to endorse their position (from mid February to late May). Moreover, the junta moderated the strident tone of the Grievances very significantly in order to secure the Lords' endorsement.

Nevertheless, affirming the Nineteen Propositions on 1 June was merely a temporary victory for the junta, as the wider Commons rejected the junta's aims during the process of responding to Charles's *Answer*. Discarding certain propositions and significantly revising others – especially the rejection of proposition one – left the project in ruins. Even then, however, the Lords seemed unable to act, apparently failing to consider *His Majesty's Answer* in any real depth.

## **Footnotes**

1

*The Humble Petition and Advice of Both Houses of Parliament, With, XIX Propositions, and the Conclusion. Sent unto his Maiestie, the second of June, 1642. H. Elsinge, Cler. Parl. D. Com. (1642).*

2

For older allusions, see John Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (1993), 299–300.

3

Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1647* (Oxford, 1991), 514–16.

4

Anthony Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (1981), 262–3; Norah Carlin, *Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1999), 28.

5

*CJ*, ii, 467a–b: 5 Mar.; *LJ*, iv, 629b–31b: 7 Mar.; *CJ*, v, 477a: 12 Mar. All dates are in 1642 (new calendar), except where indicated.

6

Paul Christianson, 'The Peers, the People, and Parliamentary Management in the First Six Months of the Long Parliament', *Journal of Modern History*, xlix (1977), 575. Christianson blurs his claim to discussing a 'network' of people (effectively, the junta) including both peers and members of the Commons. See also Fletcher, *Outbreak*, ch. 4; William G. Palmer, 'Oliver St. John and the Middle Group in the Long Parliament, 1643–1645: A Reappraisal', *Albion*, xiv (1982), 20–6; Sheila Lambert, 'Opening of the Long Parliament', *HJ*, xxvii (1984), 265–87; Lotte Glow, 'Pym and Parliament: The Methods of Moderation', *Journal of Modern History*, xxxvi (1964), 373–97; John Adamson, *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I* (2007), 104–6.

7

Scholarship on this later period includes Glow, 'Pym and Parliament', 373–97; Conrad Russell, 'Issues in the House of Commons 1621–1629: Predictors of Civil War Allegiance', *Albion*, xxiii (1991), 23–39.

8

See Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, 138–9.

9

Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603–1714* (1996), 62–4.

10

David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton, 2000), 199–206; Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004), 176–8.

11

*LJ*, v, 92a: 30 May.

12

Zaret, *Origins*, 176–84.

13

*LJ*, iv, 693a: 1 Apr.; see further, Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 52–4.

14

Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2003), 208.

15

Sir Ralph Verney, *Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament, Temp. Charles I* (1845), 139, citing *CJ*, ii, 369; see also Verney, *Notes of Proceedings*, 140.

16

Verney, *Notes of Proceedings*, 139–41.

17

Verney, *Notes of Proceedings*, 144.

18

John Nalson, *An Impartial Collection of Great Affairs of State from the Beginning of the Scotch Rebellion until the Murder of King Charles I* (2 vols, 1682), ii, 920.

19

*CSPD, Charles I, 1641–3*, p. 254: letter from Captain Robert Slyngesbie to Sir John Pennington, 14 Jan.; pp. 254–5: letter from Thomas Wiseman to Sir John Pennington, 14 Jan.

20

E.g., *CSPD, Charles I, 1641–3*, pp. 256–7: letter from Elizabeth, queen of Bohemia to Sir Thomas Rowe, 17 Jan.; p. 257: letter from Thomas Smith to Sir John Pennington, 17 Jan.; p. 253: letter from Sidney Bere to Sir John Pennington, 3 Jan.

21

*CJ*, ii, 385b: 17 Jan.

22

*CJ*, ii, 383b: 17 Jan.

23

*CJ*, ii, 385a–b: 17 Jan; *LJ*, iv, 520b: 17 Jan.

24

The leanings of the Commons' members were as follows: four republicans or radicals (Arthur Goodwyn, Martin, Mildmay and Rigby); 25 junta members or sympathisers (Pym, Holles, Stapleton, Robert Coke, Wilde, Erle, Barrington, St John, Rolle, Fiennis, Hampden, Cage, Rous, Sir John Evelyn, Grey, Whitaker, Long, Whitehead, Strode, Glynn, Browne, Vane jr, Prideaux, Reynolds and Patheriche); 12 moderates (Grimston, Potts, Vane sr, Sir Hugh Cholmeley, Whitelock, Rudyard, Wenman, Selden, Bowyer, Hotham, Sir John Holland and Palmes); six loyalists (Culpeper, Falkland, Rogers, Palmer, Kirton and Hopton) (*CJ*, ii, 384a: 17 Jan.). The Lords' committee for Irish affairs had been constituted on 1 November with three new members being added three days later (*LJ*, iv, 416b, 421a). When proceedings opened on 17 January, the Lords' committee appears to have included 12 junta members or sympathisers (Northumberland, Essex, Warwick, Newport, Say and Seale, Conway, Wharton, Mandeville, Brooke, Robartes, Pierrepont and Paget), three moderates (Manchester, Leicester and Holland) and 11 loyalists (Bath, Southampton, Bristol, Wentworth, Cromwell, Howard de Charleton, Paulet, Seymour, Mowbray, Walter Curll, the bishop of Winchester and Godfrey, the bishop of Gloucester). During the day, one junta sympathiser (Howard of Escrick) and two moderates (Pembroke and Salisbury) were added to the committee, and the Lords began proceedings against the 12 bishops, thereby necessitating the withdrawal of the bishop of Gloucester, the most prominent loyalist (*LJ*, iv, 521a, 522a: 17 Jan.). The committee should have included the bishops of Lincoln, Exeter and Bristol; however, these bishoprics were vacant on 17 January. See also Adamson, *Noble Revolt*, 454 n.

25

Verney, *Notes of Proceedings*, 145–6.

26

Verney, *Notes of Proceedings*, 146–7.

27

Verney, *Notes of Proceedings*, 147–8.

28

Verney, *Notes of Proceedings*, 148.

29

HMC, *Buccleuch MSS*, i, 302: William Montagu to Lord Montagu, 29 May–1 June.

30

*LJ*, iv, 523b: 20 Jan.

31

*LJ*, iv, 523b: 20 Jan.

32

*LJ*, iv, 524a, 526a–b: 20 Jan.; *CJ*, ii, 388a: 20 Jan.

33

The Commons' group combined junta members and sympathisers (Pym, Fiennes, Holles, Vane jr, Maynard, St John, Hampden, Stapleton and Glynn), and others who were more ready to defer to Charles (Bridgeman, Culpeper, Hopton and Hyde) (*CJ*, ii, 388a: 20 Jan.). See also *Private Journals of the Long Parliament*, ed. Willson H. Coates, Anne Steele Young and Vernon F. Snow (3 vols, New Haven, 1982–92), i, 114–15: D'Ewes, 20 Jan.; 123–5: Moore, 20 Jan. For the grumbling MPs and the divided Lords, see *LJ*, iv, 530b–3a: 24 Jan.

34

*LJ*, iv, 537b–43a: 26 Jan.; see *LJ*, iv, 537a: 25 Jan.

35

*LJ*, iv, 538b: 26 Jan.; *CJ*, ii, 443b–6a: 19 Feb.; *LJ*, iv, 689a–92a: 1 Apr.

36

*LJ*, iv, 541a: 26 Jan.

37

*LJ*, iv, 541a: 26 Jan.

38

*LJ*, iv, 541b: 26 Jan.

39

*LJ*, iv, 541b: 26 Jan.

40

*LJ*, iv, 542a: 26 Jan.

41

*LJ*, iv, 542b: 26 Jan.

42

*J.S.A. Adamson, 'Pym as Draftsman: An Unpublished Declaration of March 1643', Parliamentary History, vi (1987), 135.*

43

*CJ*, ii, 431b: 14 Feb.

44

*CJ*, ii, 432b: 15 Feb.; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, i, 384: D'Ewes, 15 Feb.

45

*CJ*, ii, 443b–6a: 19 Feb.

46

*CJ*, ii, 438a–b: 17 Feb.; ii, 440a: 18 Feb.

47

*CJ*, ii, 438b: 17 Feb.

48

*CJ*, ii, 443b: 19 Feb.

49

*CJ*, ii, 443b: 19 Feb.

50

The first article, dealing with appointments, harked back to the treaty of union Charles signed with the Scottish covenanters in Aug. 1641. Russell overstates the connection between this article and the Nineteen Propositions however (Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, 515).

51

*CJ*, ii, 445b: 19 Feb.

52

*CJ*, ii, 445b: 19 Feb.

53

Alison Plowman, *Henrietta Maria: Charles I's Indomitable Queen* (Stroud, 2001), ch. 7; Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (2007), 327–34.

54

*CJ*, ii, 447a: 21 Feb.; *LJ*, iv, 602a: 21 Feb.

55

*LJ*, iv, 609b: 24 Feb.

56

*LJ*, iv, 665b–6b: 23–4 Mar.; compare *CJ*, ii, 493b: 23 Mar.

57

*CJ*, ii, 498a: 26 Mar.; compare *LJ*, iv, 672a–b: 26 Mar.

58

The closest to a notable change between the texts appearing in the *Commons Journal* and the *Lords Journal* occurred in remedy 13, where the original phrase: ‘Votes of the Popish Lords’ became: ‘Votes of the Papist Lords’, but even that difference seems merely stylistic (*CJ*, ii, 445a: 19 Feb.; *LJ*, iv, 691a: 1 Apr.).

59

*LJ*, iv, 692a: 1 Apr.

60

*LJ*, iv, 692a: 1 Apr.



61

*LJ*, iv, 692a: 1 Apr.

62

*LJ*, iv, 692b: 1 Apr.

63

*LJ*, iv, 692b: 1 Apr.

64

*LJ*, iv, 692b: 1 Apr.

65

Adamson, 'Pym as Draftsman', 135.

66

*LJ*, iv, 693a: 2 Apr.

67

*LJ*, iv, 718b–19a: 15 Apr.

68

*LJ*, iv, 718b–19a: 15 Apr.

69

*The Papers of the Hothams, Governors of Hull during the Civil War*, ed. Andrew Hopper (Cambridge, 2011), 54–5: letter from John Hampden to Sir John Hotham, 7 June.

70

*CJ*, ii, 496b: 25 Mar.

71

*LJ*, iv, 700a: 5 Apr. The dissenting peers were Hertford, Bath, Devon, Monmouth, Berkshire, Westmoreland, Cleveland, Dover, Portland, Mowbray, Strange, de Grey, Wentworth, de Charleton, Savill, Coventry, Capell and Seymour.

72

*LJ*, iv, 712a: 11 Apr.; *CJ*, ii, 522a: 11 Apr.

73

*LJ*, v, 10b: 22 Apr.

74

*LJ*, v, 11a: 23 Apr.

75

*LJ*, v, 21b: 26 Apr.

76

*CJ*, ii, 564b: 9 May; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 296, 298: D'Ewes, Gawdy (respectively), 9 May.

77

*LJ*, v, 80b: 23 May. Montagu gave the number as 12, possibly confusing this first group with the Lords' appointments made by the Lords on 27 May to the joint parliamentary committee: HMC, *Bucleuch MSS*, i, 301: William Montagu to Lord Montagu, 22–6 May.

78

HMC, *Bucleuch MSS*, i, 301: William Montagu to Lord Montagu, 22–6 May.

79

HMC, *Bucleuch MSS*, i, 301: William Montagu to Lord Montagu, 22–6 May.

80

*CJ*, ii, 585b: 24 May; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 367: D'Ewes, 24 May.

81

*CJ*, ii, 586a: 24 May.

82

D'Ewes records that Pym managed the portion that he (D'Ewes) attended. *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 368: D'Ewes, 24 May.

83

*LJ*, v, 85b: 27 May.

84

HMC, *Buccheuch MSS*, i, 301: William Montagu to Lord Montagu, 22–6 May. Montagu gave the date of the motion as 23 May.

85

*LJ*, v, 85b: 27 May.

86

*CJ*, ii, 589a: 27 May; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 376: D'Ewes, 27 May; 381: Gawdy, 27 May.

87

*CJ*, ii, 589b: 27 May; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 376–7: D'Ewes, 24 May.

88

*CJ*, ii, 589b: 27 May; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 376–7: D'Ewes, 24 May.

89

Chief Justice Bankes, of parliament's York committee, wrote to Saye, a member of the junta, emphasizing, in Russell's words, 'that the King required satisfaction in point of honour about Hull, and asked again for a mutual exchange of propositions': Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, 513–14.

90

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 378: D'Ewes, 27 May. On Pym's own moderation, see Glow, 'Pym and Parliament', 373–97.

91

Proposition one lacked the final two clauses (from 'and that the Persons' to the end of the proposition). Proposition six lacked the final two words ('or otherwise') and proposition seven began: 'That the Votes of Popish Lords in the House of Peers may be taken away, in such Matters as do conduce to the Suppression of Popery and Advancement of the Protestant religion' and so on as in the final version, rather than the ultimate wording of: 'That the Votes of Popish Lords in the House of Peers may be taken away, so long as they continue Papists'. Proposition eight lacked the final two clauses (from 'and that Your Majesty' to the end of the proposition), and proposition nine read simply: 'That a Bill shall be passed, for settling the Militia, as shall be advised by both Houses of Parliament'. Proposition 11 lacked the final clause (from 'and that an Enquiry' to the end), and propositions 15 to 19, inclusive, were absent (*LJ*, v, 90b–1a: 28 May).

Presumably, some, if not all, of them were the ‘Propositions for the present Defence of the Kingdom’ mentioned in the Commons’ second message to the Lords three days earlier, on Tuesday, 24 May.

92

National Records of Scotland, GD 406/1, Hamilton MS 1655, quoted in Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, 515.

93

Remedy one read: ‘excepting such as Offices by Inheritance’, whereas proposition one read: ‘excepting such as shall be approved of by both Houses of Parliament’ (see Appendix 3 for the final version).

94

Specifically, proposition two’s clause running from: ‘And such other Matters of State’ to: ‘Place of Parliament’ had appeared in the middle of remedy seven.

95

HMC, *Bucleuch MSS*, i, 296: William Montagu to Lord Montagu, 31 Mar.–6 Apr.; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 131: D’Ewes, 5 Apr. See *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 45–6: D’Ewes, 16 Mar.; 84: D’Ewes, 25 Mar.; 91: D’Ewes, 26 Mar.; 99: D’Ewes, 28 Mar.; 104: D’Ewes, 29 Mar.; HMC, *Bucleuch MSS*, i, 300: William Montagu to Lord Montagu, 19 May.

96

*LJ*, v, 80a: 23 May; *CJ*, ii, 588a: 27 May; HMC, *Bucleuch MSS*, i, 302: William Montagu to Lord Montagu, 22–6 May; 294–302 *passim*: various correspondents; HMC, *Salisbury MSS*, xxii, 370: letter from the earl of Salisbury, 31 May; see also 370–1: letters to and from the earl of Salisbury, 7, 14, 15, 20 June.

97

Morrill, *Nature*, 299–300.

98

Morrill himself observes that ‘The connection remains elusive and was never spelled out, perhaps deliberately so’: Morrill, *Nature*, 300.

99

The recorded version (referred to here) is a redraft of the original produced at the first sitting of the drafting committee of both Houses (27 May). The original version was not recorded in the *Lords Journal*. The process of redrafting was undertaken by Northumberland, Holland and Mandeville on 28 May (*LJ*, v, 89a–

90a: 28 May). My text assumes the original draft of proposition five dealt with the same issue as the new version drafted quickly during this Lords' debate.

100

*LJ*, v, 91a: 28 May.

101

*LJ*, v, 91a: 28 May.

102

*LJ*, v, 91a: 28 May.

103

'Militia Ordinance', in *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625–1660*, ed. S.R. Gardiner (3rd edn, Oxford, 1906), 245–7; see Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, 469–84 *passim*, 505–13 *passim*.

104

HMC, *Buckleuch MSS*, i, 298: letter from George Montagu to Lord Montagu, 14 Apr.

105

*LJ*, v, 91a: 28 May.

106

*LJ*, iv, 566b: 7 Feb.

107

*Papers of the Hothams*, ed. Hopper, 54: letter from John Hampden to Sir John Hotham, 28 May.

108

*CJ*, ii, 590a: 27 May.

109

*LJ*, v, 92a: 30 May.

110

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 387: D'Ewes, 30 May; *CJ*, ii, 594a: 30 May.

111

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 387: D'Ewes, 30 May; see also *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 387–8: D'Ewes, 30 May, for his record of the then 14 propositions.

112

Patricia Crawford, 'Charles Stuart, That Man of Blood', *Journal of British Studies*, xvi (1977), 41–61.

113

John Shaw, 'Life of Master John Shaw', in *Yorkshire Diaries and Autobiographies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Surtees Society, 1875), 134–5. Shaw noted immediately that these requests 'prevailed not'.

114

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 392: D'Ewes, 31 May.

115

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 392: D'Ewes, 31 May.

116

HMC, *Buccleuch MSS*, i, 303: Montagu to Lord Montagu, 2 June.

117

*CJ*, ii, 594a: 30 May.

118

*CJ*, ii, 595b–6a: 31 May; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 393: D'Ewes, 31 May.

119

*CJ*, ii, 596a: 31 May; cf. *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 400: D'Ewes, 1 June.

120

John Pym, *Declaration of the Grievances of the Kingdome, delivered in Parliament, by John Pym, ESQUIER* (1641), 5, 6.

121

Parliamentary Archives [hereafter cited as PA], HL/PO/JO/10/1/123, Lords' scribble book, p. 51: 1 June.

122

*CJ*, ii, 596a: 31 May.

123

*CJ*, ii, 597a: 31 May; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 395: D'Ewes, 31 May.

124

Before this deletion, proposition seven read: 'That the Votes of Popish Lords in the House of Peers may be taken away, *in such Matters as do conduce to the Suppression of Popery and Advancement of the Protestant religion*' (emphasis added to the clause deleted subsequently).

125

However, the preambles to the Grievances and the Nineteen Propositions began with almost the same words (see Appendix 3).

126

*CJ*, ii, 597b: 1 June; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 402: Gawdy, 1 June.

127

The first part discussed the addition of the preamble and conclusion as well as propositions 15 to 19; the second, discussing Hammond's refusal 'to be one of the divines of the synod', was managed by Sir Robert Coke; while the third considered Charles's imprisonment of Hotham's ensign at York, and was managed by Holles (*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 398: D'Ewes, 1 June).

128

PA, HL/PO/JO/10/1/123, Lords' scribble book, p. 51: 1 June. The word transcribed here as 'ancestors' might be 'ministers'.

129

These final two clauses appear in the authorised version (*CJ*, ii, 599b; *LJ*, v, 98a: 1 June). Neither the *Commons Journal* nor the *Lords Journal* specifies explicitly the point at which this passage was added to the first proposition, nor by whom. It may well have been the Lords' sponsored amendment referred to also on 1 June (*LJ*, v, 96b; *CJ*, ii, 598b).

130

*CJ*, ii, 598b, 1 June; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 399: D'Ewes, 1 June.

131

PA, HL/PO/JO/10/1/123, Lords' scribble book, p. 51: 1 June. As implied above, the entry in the 'scribble book' seems to be notes for the report to the Lords by its representative at the first joint conference held this day.

132

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, ii, 399–400: D'Ewes, 1 June.

133

*CJ*, ii, 598b–9a: 1 June.

134

*CJ*, ii, 598b, 599a; *LJ*, v, 97b: 1 June.

135

*LJ*, v, 100b: 2 June. The *Lords Journal* contains no information regarding the number of copies to be printed, although Lambert suggests 1,500 copies as being usual for such documents (*Printing for Parliament*, ed. Sheila Lambert (1984), p. viii).

136

*Printing*, ed. Lambert, p. iii. See Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, esp. ch. 7; Zaret, *Origins*, ch. 7; Raymond, *Pamphlets*, 202–10.

137

*LJ*, iv, 631b: 7 Mar.

138

*LJ*, iv, 643a: 12 Mar.

139

*Printing*, ed. Lambert, p. i.

140

*LJ*, iv, 693a: 1 Apr.

141



John Kenyon, *Civil Wars of England* (1988), 31.

142

Kenyon, *Civil Wars*, 31.

143

*LJ*, v, 153b: 21 June; *CJ*, ii, 635a: 21 June. On the ‘thin[ness]’ of the house, see *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 112: Gawdy, 21 June.

144

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 120: D'Ewes, 23 June.

145

*CJ*, ii, 637a: 23 June.

146

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 113: Gawdy, 21 June. On the consternation, see *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 120–1: D'Ewes, 23 June.

147

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 122–5: Hill, 23 June.

148

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 122: Hill, 23 June.

149

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 124: Hill, 23 June; Verney, *Notes of Proceedings*, 182.

150

*CJ*, ii, 637a: 23 June. *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 121–2, including 121 n. 15: Gawdy, 23 June.

151

*CJ*, ii, 639a: 24 June.

152

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 128–9: D'Ewes, 24 June.

153

*CJ*, ii, 642a: 27 June.

154

It seems that this clause did not excite much interest. When, after it had been read, 'the house remained a pretty while silent', then D'Ewes and two or three others spoke before the vote was taken (*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 138, 140: D'Ewes, 27 June). The House sat as the Commons, rather than as the committee of the whole House (of Commons) 'because of the delay in the committee' (*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 143: Gawdy, 27 June; Hill, 27 June).

155

*CJ*, ii, 643a: 28 June; 645a: 30 June; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 145–7: D'Ewes, 28 June; 147: D'Ewes, 28 June.

156

*Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 163: Gawdy, 2 July.

157

*CJ*, ii, 648b: 2 July; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 161–3 *passim*: D'Ewes, 2 July; 164: Hill, 2 July.

158

*CJ*, ii, 645b: 30 June; *Private Journals*, ed. Coates *et al.*, iii, 156: D'Ewes, 1 July; 159: Gawdy, 1 July.

159

Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, 79.

160

Zaret, *Origins*, 199–201.

161

Numbers in parenthesis in this column refer to the relevant pages in Verney, *Notes of Proceedings*.

162

*CJ*, ii, 599a–600b, collated to *LJ*, v, 97b–9a: 1 June.

163

*LJ*, v, 90b-1a: 28 May.

164

*CJ*, ii, 443b-6a: 19 Feb.; *LJ*, iv, 689a-92a: 1 Apr.

165

*CJ*, ii, 596a: 31 May.

166

*CJ*, ii, 596a, 597a: 31 May.

167

*CJ*, ii, 597b: 1 June.

168

*CJ*, ii, 598b; *LJ*, v, 96b: 1 June.

169

Same (conventional?) opening as the Grievances (*CJ*, ii, 443b: 19 Feb.; *LJ*, iv, 689a: 1 Apr.).

170

*LJ*, v, 98a, omits 'First,'.

171

Almost verbatim from remedy 1 (*CJ*, ii, 444a; *LJ*, iv, 690b).

172

*LJ*, v, 98a: 'High'.

173

Almost verbatim from remedy 7 (*CJ*, ii, 444b; *LJ*, iv, 690b).

174

Almost verbatim from remedy 8 (*CJ*, ii, 444b; *LJ*, iv, 691a).

175

Almost verbatim from remedy 12 (*CJ*, ii, 445a; *LJ*, iv, 691a).

176

Almost verbatim from remedy 13 (*CJ*, ii, 445a; *LJ*, iv, 691a).

177

*LJ*, v, 98b: ‘your’.

178

Almost verbatim from remedy 14 (*CJ*, ii, 445a; *LJ*, iv, 691a).

179

Compare remedy 14 (*CJ*, ii, 445a; *LJ*, iv, 691a).

180

*LJ*, v, 98b: ‘Declarations’.

181

Almost verbatim from remedy 7 (*CJ*, ii, 444b; *LJ*, iv, 691b).

182

*LJ*, v, 99a: ‘*quamdiu*’.

183

*LJ*, v, 99a: ‘this’.

184

*LJ*, v, 99a: ‘You’.

185

*LJ*, v, 99a: ‘Your’.

186

*LJ*, v, 99a: ‘your’.

187

*LJ*, v, 99a: ‘Predecessors; We’.

## Appendices

### APPENDIX 1: Leanings of Relevant Parliamentarians, January–July 1642

Key to columns 2–5:

\* = named member

\*? = possible member

W = joint ‘Ways’ committee, 14–19 January

G C15 Feb. = members of the Commons given the task of revising the ‘Ways’, 15 February

NP J28 May = members of the joint committee that produced 28 May draft of the Nineteen Propositions

NP C31 May = members of the Commons' committee that amended 28 May draft of the Nineteen Proposition, 31 May

R = drafted Commons' response to the preamble to *His Majesty's Answer* on 23 June

Key to the sources (excluding standard abbreviations):

A = John Adamson, *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I* (2007).

C = Edward, earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*, ed. W. Dunn MacRay (6 vols, Oxford, 1888).

H = J.H. Hexter, *The Reign of King Pym* (Cambridge, 1961).

M = Michael Mendle, *Dangerous Positions: Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Answer to the XIX Propositions* (University, AL, 1985).

ODNB = *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. L. Goldman (Oxford, 2004–11).

PJ = *Private Journals of the Long Parliament*, ed. Willson H. Coates, Anne Steele Young and Vernon F. Snow (3 vols, New Haven, 1982–92).

All dates are in 1642 (new calendar), unless stated otherwise.

For the different ‘leanings’, see section one of the article.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of ‘leaning’	Sources
Bankes, Sir John						Ultimately, loyal to Charles, who had made him chief justice (Jan. 1641). Given government of	C, iii, 82; v, 209, 346.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						Purbeck militia by Commons (Feb.). Joined Charles at York (spring), signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	<i>ODNB.</i> <i>PJ</i> , i, 361.
Barrington, Sir Thomas	*	*			*	Junta. Served on militia committee (Jan.). Personally and politically close to Pym and Warwick.	A, 455. H, 44–5, 88. <i>ODNB.</i>
Bath (or 'Bathon'), Henry Bouchier, 5th earl of	*?					Loyal to Charles (if unenthusiastically so). Resisted Militia Ordinance (Mar.), joined Charles at York (May). Signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	A, 454. C, v, 346. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a. <i>ODNB.</i>
Berkshire, Charles Howard, 2nd earl of						Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	C, v, 346. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 700a.
Bodvel, John			*			Junta sympathiser. Served on junta-dominated committee drafting letter proclaiming parliamentary fears for national safety (Jan.). Served on junta-dominated committee to consider response to Charles's comments on the passage of Irish catholics across English borders (Feb.). Parliament trusted him to transport arms to countryside (May).	<i>PJ</i> , i, 47, 319; ii, 382.
Bowyer, Sir Thomas	*					Moderate. Appointed to many Commons' committees until summer 1642. Subsequently, attempted to gain Sussex militia for Charles (Aug.), declared delinquent (Nov.).	<i>CJ</i> , ii, 711a, 860b.
Bridgeman, Orlando						Loyal to Charles. Laudian. Described by Clarendon as being 'of very good reputation' a loyal supporter of Charles.	C, iv, 204 n; vi, 270; viii, 211. <i>PJ</i> , i, 123–5.
	*?						A, 454.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
Bristol, John Digby, 1st earl of						Loyal to Charles. Accused of being an evil councillor (Dec. 1641). Signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June). Father of George Digby (below).	C, v, 346.  ODNB.
Brooke, Robert Greville, 2nd Lord	*?		*			Junta. Supported 'Root and Branch', given military command under Militia Ordinance (Mar.). Judged treasonous by Charles.	A, 451, 454 n, 472, 491. C, vi, 441 n. 4. H, 58 n, 88. ODNB.
Browne, Samuel	*					Junta sympathiser. Politically, 'Royal Independent', religiously Erastian. Served on committees to disarm recusants (Jan.), to prepare articles of impeachment against archbishop of Canterbury (Mar.) and to suppress those obeying Charles's commission of array (Aug.). Associate of Pierrepoint, cousin of St John (solicitor general).	CJ, ii, 387a-b, 499a, 729b. H, 98. ODNB.  PJ, i, 90.
Cage, William	*					Junta sympathiser. Served on numerous committees including those investigating preparation of domestic and foreign forces (June, Aug.) and finance committees, including that raising funds for parliamentary forces (May). 'An old parliament man' (D'Ewes)	CJ, ii, 266a, 571a, 586, 619a.  PJ, iii, 246.
Capell, Lord Arthur						Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles in York as soon as Charles ordered. Signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	A, 119 n. C, v, 346; vi, 59. LJ, iv, 627a, 700a. ODNB.
Cholmeley, Sir Hugh	*					Moderate. Well-disposed to Charles I but respected in parliament in opening months of 1642. Parliamentary commissioner	C, iii, 35; v, 106; vi, 268. H, 8 n.





Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
Coventry, Sir Thomas, 2nd Lord						Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June). Sent by Charles to help raise support in western England (Aug.).	C, v, 346, 443.  LJ, iv, 627a, 700a.
Crane, Sir Robert			*		*	Well-disposed to Charles but respected in parliament in opening months of 1642. Joined royalists (Sept. 1643).	C, vi, 62.  H, 8 n.
Crew (or Crue), John				*	*	Junta sympathiser. Chaired parliamentary committee for finance of defence of realm (May). Parliament objected formally to Charles's brief imprisonment of Crew in Tower two years previously (May). Sent to execute Militia Ordinance in Northamptonshire. Pledged resources for parliamentary defence (June).	A, 119 n. C, v, 162 n.  PJ, ii, 367 n, 371; iii, 41 n, 85–6, 467.
Cromwell, Thomas (subsequently 1st lord of Ardglass, Ireland)	*?					Loyal to Charles. Subsequently, royalist military commander.	ODNB.
Culpeper, Sir John	*					Reformist but loyal to Charles, although questioned his political acumen. King's privy councillor and chancellor of the exchequer.	A, 486. C, iv, 158, 167.
Devonshire, William Cavendish, 3rd earl of						Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June). Became commander in Charles's army.	C, iv, 627a, 700a; v, 346; vi, 269.
Digby, George (subsequently 2nd earl of Bristol)						Loyal to Charles. Advised arrest of five members, after failure of which he left parliament to raise	A, 482–3. C, iv, 127–8, 146,

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						military force loyal to Charles. Commons accused him of treason (Jan.). Son of earl of Bristol (John Digby, above).	154–5, 205. <i>ODNB.</i>
Dover, Henry Carey, 1st earl of						Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	C, iv, 627a, 700a; v, 346. <i>ODNB.</i>
Erle, or Earle, Sir Walter	*		*			Junta. Close associate of Strode and Pym.  Helped draft Grand Remonstrance.	A, 138–9, 469. C, iv, 204 n. <i>ODNB.</i> <i>PJ</i> , i, 11.
Essex, Robert Devereux, 3rd earl of	*?		*			Junta. Pym's close friend. Supported Scottish covenanters. Warned five members. Refused Charles's order to attend him. A 'military earl' for junta. Obeyed Militia Ordinance.	A, 421, 454 n, 485, 488, 498, 491, 499. H, 90–3. <i>ODNB.</i>
Evelyn, Sir John (MP for Wiltshire)	*		*			Junta. Active on many pro-parliamentarian committees. Subsequently, a leading 'Royal Independent' and judged a traitor by Charles (Nov.). (Probable identification based on committee composition and other events on these days. This Evelyn was nephew of parliamentarian of same name, latter being more moderate parliamentarian with leanings towards Charles.)	C, vi, 128– 9. <i>ODNB.</i>
Fairfax, Ferdinando, 2nd Lord Fairfax of Cameron						Junta sympathiser. Helped impeach Strafford (Apr. 1641), presented Charles with Grand Remonstrance (Dec. 1641), monitored Charles's activities in York (May).	A, 251. C, v, 446; vi, 257– 64. <i>ODNB.</i>

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
Falkland, Lucius Cary, 2nd Viscount	*					Reformist but ultimately loyal to Charles. Made king's privy councillor and secretary of state (Jan.). Joined king's party against parliament.	A, 138–9, 312, 419, 486, 488, 492–3. C, iv, 122, 167; vi, 128, 204 n. H, 174. ODNB.
Feilding, Basil, 2nd earl of Denbigh			*			Junta. For example, given military command under Militia Ordinance.	A, 411, 451. ODNB.
Fiennes, Nathaniel	*				*	Junta leader.	A, 138–9. C, iii, 55 n; iv, 204 n. M, 178–9. ODNB.
Glynn, Sir John	*	*	*		*	Junta but shifted position.	A, 450, 484. H, 38–43, 47. ODNB.
Goodwyn, Arthur	*					Parliamentary radical, unimpeachably respectable. Hampden's ally, Wharton's father-in-law.	A, 424. H, 138, 184. M, 158.
Goodwin, or Goodwyn, Robert						Supported junta. Served on parliamentary mission to Ireland (Oct. 1643).	A, 418, 448 n. C, vi, 315.
Goring, George						Loyal to Charles but trusted by parliament, even following discovery of involvement in army plot (early 1641). Joined royalist army (Aug.).	A, 278–9. C, v, 439–41. ODNB.
Grey, Thomas, Baron Grey of Groby	*					Junta. Supported Grand Remonstrance. Eventually, parliamentary army officer and regicide.	C, vi, 274–5. ODNB.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
Grimston, Sir Harbottle	*					Moderate. Supported junta following five members' controversy.	A, 11–12, 413. H, 83. <i>ODNB.</i>
Hampden, John	*	*		*	*	Junta. One of the five members.	A, 138–9. C, iv, 204 n; v, 441 n. 4. H, 88, 93–4. <i>ODNB.</i>
Harley, Sir Robert			*			Fervent junta supporter, active in many ways. Anti-Laudian, attacked Council of Wales and Marshes (1640).	A, 174–5 n, 386. H, 199. <i>ODNB.</i>
Haselrig, or Hesilrige, Sir Arthur			*			Junta. One of the five members. Introduced bill of attainder against Strafford and sponsored Militia Bill (Dec. 1641).	A, 459–60, 466. H, 5 n, 51, 57–8. <i>ODNB.</i>
Herbert, Sir Edward						Loyal to Charles. Accused five members of treason, for which he was impeached by Commons.	C, iv, 148, 204, 208; v, 46–9.
Hertford, William Seymour, earl of						Loyal to Charles. Although viewed with some suspicion at court, conveyed prince to Charles against parliamentary orders (Feb.). Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	A, 447, 466. C, iv, 314; v, 346. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a, 700a.
Holland, Henry Rich, 1st earl of	*?		*			Junta sympathiser at this time. A 'military earl' in Lords for junta. Censured duke of Richmond (Jan.).	A, 421, 447, 451, 491, 499. C, iv, 256. <i>ODNB.</i>
Holland, Sir John	*		*				A, 479.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						Moderate. Supported parliament but actively sought reconciliation with Charles. Called for replacement of Charles's current counsellors with parliamentary appointees (Dec. 1641). Led parliamentary delegation to Charles, asking him to respond to peace overtures (Jan.). Pledged resources to defend both royal and parliamentary authorities (10 June). Introduced a bill to settle militia (July).	<i>PJ</i> , i, 214, 218; iii, 182, 265, 472.
Holles, Denzil	*		*	*	*	Ambiguous junta member. One of the five members, Pym's pall-bearer. Joined 'peace party' on outbreak of first civil war. Ennobled at Restoration.	A, 138–9. C, iii, 35; v, 441 n. 4. H, 5 n, 9. <i>ODNB</i> .
Hopton, Sir Ralph	*					Loyal to Charles. Presented Grand Remonstrance (Dec. 1641), but supported attempted arrest of five members. Committed to Tower for fortnight for opposing parliamentary censure of Charles (Mar.). Allied himself with Charles following Militia Ordinance (May). Stripped of Commons' seat for raising royalist force in Shepton Mallet, shortly before being prosecuted for high treason (Aug.).	A, 183. C, iv, 338; v, 385; vi, 6. <i>CJ</i> , ii, 703, 475. <i>ODNB</i> .
Hotham, Sir John	*					Moderate. Sided with parliament but actively sought to avoid civil war. Governor of Hull, refused Charles entry. Well-disposed to Charles but respected in parliament (early 1642).	A, 138–9, 479. C, v, 434 n; vi, 261. H, 8 n. <i>ODNB</i> .
Howard of Charleton, 1st earl of Berkshire	*?					Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Having joined Charles at	C, v, 346; vi, 390. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a, 700a.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June). Temporarily imprisoned by parliament under suspicion of attempt to raise army for Charles (Aug.).	
Howard, Edward, 1st baron of Escrick	*?					Junta sympathiser. Supported impeachments of Strafford (spring 1641) and Laud (late 1644). Delivered parliamentary message regarding Hull, to Charles (May).	C, iii, 28.  ODNB.
Hungerford, Sir Edward						Junta sympathiser. Helped implement Militia Ordinance in Wiltshire (July).	A, 234.  ODNB.
Hunsdon, John Carey, Lord			*			Moderate? Endorsed parliamentary request for Charles to settle militia (Feb.). Subsequently, Commonwealth commissioner (lord chancellor appointed by parliament).	ODNB.  PJ, i, 288.
Hyde, Edward, 1st earl of Clarendon						Loyal to Charles. Drafted many of Charles's official statements. Joined Charles at York (June). Subsequently, wrote many works defending Charles.	C, <i>passim</i> .  ODNB.
Irby, or Ireby, Sir Anthony						Junta sympathiser. Led parliamentary negotiations with Charles and others to resource Irish campaign (spring 1642). Pledged resources to defend parliament (Sept.).	PJ, iii, 476.
Kirton, Edward	*					Loyal to Charles. Earl of Hertford's steward, opponent of junta.	A, 119 n, 255, 471.  M, 136.
Leicester, Robert Sidney, 2nd earl of	*?					Moderate, although leant towards parliament. Hesitated to implement Militia Ordinance. Lord lieutenant of Ireland.	A, 421, 454 n.  C, iv, 78 n, 149; vi, 304–6, 387.  ODNB.
Lenthall, William						Moderate. Defended parliamentary privilege as	A, 331.  C, iii, 1 n.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						Commons' Speaker. Sought Charles's reconciliation with parliament.	<i>ODNB</i> .
Lisle, John						Junta sympathiser. Prepared bill against recusants (Mar.). Sided with Pym over suppression of Irish rebels. Subsequently, regicide.	C, xi, 249 n. <i>ODNB</i> . <i>PJ</i> , ii, 5, 345, 362, 366.
Long, Walter	*					Junta sympathiser. Long-standing critic of Charles. Sought impeachment of two counsellors (Dec. 1641). Subsequently, parliamentary military officer.	A, 479. <i>ODNB</i> .
Longueville, Charles, 12th Baron Grey de Ruthyn						Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against: Militia Ordinance, urging Charles to recognize parliament's military authority at Hull (Mar.), parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices, Warwick's appointment as lord admiral (Apr.), and parliament's recall of Littleton from Charles at York (May).	<i>LJ</i> , iv, 152b, 589a, 622b, 627a, 656a, 697a, 700a; v, 80b, 92b.
Lunsford, Sir Thomas						Loyal to Charles, who made him lieutenant of Tower of London (Dec. 1641). Parliament removed him two days later. Accompanied Charles in attempt to arrest five members. Subsequently fled Westminster with Charles before raising monarchist force with Digby (Jan.).	A, 474–6. C, iv, 101, 147, 154–5, 205, 210 n; v, 173. <i>ODNB</i> .
Lyttleton, or Littleton, Sir Edward, 1st Lord						Moderate with leanings towards Charles. Made lord keeper (Dec. 1640). Refused to put seal on arrest of five members and voted for Militia Ordinance. Charles frustrated by his failure to counter parliament's activities as Speaker. Joined Charles at York (May).	A, 461. C, iii, 15; v, 203–14. <i>ODNB</i> .

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
Manchester, Sir Henry Montagu, 1st earl of	*?					Moderate, seeking reconciliation with Charles. Lord privy seal. Disagreed with son's support for junta (Mandeville, below).	C, i, 116–17; vi, 105. <i>ODNB.</i>
Mandeville, Lord, Edward Montagu, 2nd earl of Manchester; Lord Kimbolton	*?		*			Junta. Sixth of five members. Leaked details of army plot. Active against Charles in numerous ways (early 1642).	A, 454 n, 491. H, 58 n, 88. <i>ODNB.</i>
Marten, Henry	*		*			Leading republican.	C, v, 280, 441 n. 4. H, 9, 56–8. <i>ODNB.</i>
Maynard, John						Junta. A leading lawyer in impeachments of Strafford (spring 1641) and Laud (late 1644). Advocated parliamentary oversight of privy council appointments during Grand Remonstrance debates (Nov. 1641).	A, 226, 309, 434. <i>ODNB.</i>
Mildmay, Sir Henry	*					Radical. Part of Warwick's circle. Enthusiastic advocate of parliamentary cause. Later, regicide.	A, 455. C, iii, 13; xi, 237. H, 57 n, 59 n. <i>ODNB.</i>
Mondeford, or Montfort, Sir Edmund			*			Junta sympathiser. Sought established legal means of restricting movement of recusants (Mar.). Parliament sought appointment as deputy lieutenant (Mar.). Pledged two horses for parliamentary defence (June).	<i>PJ</i> , ii, 6, 54; iii, 468.
Monmouth, Henry Carey, 2nd earl of						Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	C, v, 346. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a, 700a. <i>ODNB.</i>
	*?						A, 359.



Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
Mowbray and Maltravers, Henry Frederick Howard, Baron						Loyal to Charles (staunchly, early 1642). Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles in York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	C, v, 346. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a, 700a. <i>ODNB</i> .
Newport, Mountjoy Blount, 1st earl of	*?					A 'military earl' for junta (Oct. 1641), but attempted to retain Charles's confidence (early 1642), for example, by helping Charles's attempt to arrest five members (Dec. 1641). Urged Charles to regain Hull through negotiation. Joined Charles at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	A, 421, 454. C, v, 346. <i>ODNB</i> .
North, Dudley, 3rd Baron						Moderate. Supported parliamentary authority, serving on many committees (early 1642). Sought reconciliation between parliament and Charles. Royalist, after regicide.	<i>ODNB</i> .
Northumberland, Algernon Percy, 7th earl of	*?		*			Junta. A 'military earl' for junta. Supported Militia Bill. Active for parliament in numerous ways (early 1642).	A, 421–2, 430, 454 n, 498. C, iv, 149, 271; v, 215. <i>ODNB</i> .
Paget, William, 6th Baron	*?					Junta sympathiser (Jan.). Central to impeachments of Strafford (spring 1641) and Laud (late 1644). Implemented Militia Ordinance in Buckinghamshire (May). Joined Charles in York (June).	C, iii, 28, 55; v, 339. <i>ODNB</i> .
Palmer, Sir Geoffrey	*				*	Loyal to Charles. Imprisoned in Tower (4 Nov.–8 Dec. 1641) vehement protest against parliamentary attacks on royal prerogative. Member of royalist parliament (Jan. 1644).	C, iv, 52–8. <i>ODNB</i> .

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
Palmes, Sir Guy	*					Moderate. Well-disposed towards Charles but respected in parliament. Royalist subsequently.	H, 8 n. <i>ODNB.</i>
Patheriche, or Partridge, Sir Edward	*					Junta sympathiser. Sent with others to press Charles to respond to parliamentary petition regarding defence of realm (Jan.). Pledged resources for parliamentary defence (Sept.).	<i>PJ</i> , i, 210.
Paulet, John, 5th marquess of Winchester	*?					Loyal to Charles. Joined Charles in York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	C, v, 346.
Pembroke, Philip Herbert, 4th earl of	*?		*			Moderate. Disaffected from Charles in 1641 but parliamentary negotiator with king in 1642. Secretly professed loyalty to Charles.	A, 448–51. C, vi, 128–9, 230, 400. H, 58 n. <i>ODNB.</i>
Peterborough, John Mordaunt, 1st earl of			*			Moderate parliamentarian. Protested against Lords' refusal to grant parliament control of militia (Jan.).	H, 58 n. <i>ODNB.</i>
Pierrepoint, William	*?			*	*	Junta sympathiser. Vigorously resisted ship money. Subsequently, sought redress for tax. Leading reformer in Lords, to secure parliamentary control of Tower and for settling militia. Member of committee of safety (July).	C, vi, 369. <i>ODNB.</i>
Portland, Jerome Weston, Lord						Loyal to Charles. Parliament suspected him of catholicism, and removed him from governorship of Isle of Wight (Nov. 1641). Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Subsequently imprisoned for nearly a year (from Aug.).	C, v, 136, 440 n; vi, 401. A, 434. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a, 700a. <i>ODNB.</i>
Potts, Sir John	*					Moderate. Served on parliamentary gunpowder	<i>PJ</i> , ii, 31, 54; iii,

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						committee, made a deputy lieutenant (Mar.). Pledged resources for parliamentary defence (June). Sought reconciliation with Charles (July). Fearful of catholic resurgence (Aug.).	264, 274–5, 476.
Prideaux, Edmund	*	*				Junta sympathiser. Informed parliament of shipwreck containing men and arms for Ireland, from France (Feb.). Managed impeachments of Sir George Strode and Spencer (May). Member of committee to prevent unauthorised transportation of arms to Charles (May). Pledged money for parliamentary defence (June).	<i>ODNB</i> .  <i>PJ</i> , i, 374–5; ii, 300, 377; iii, 471.
Pye, Sir Robert			*			Moderate (rather inactive?). Pledged resources for parliamentary defence (June).	<i>ODNB</i> . <i>PJ</i> , i, 137; ii, 224, 323; iii, 467.
Pym, John	*	*	*	*	*	Junta leader. One of the five members.	<i>A</i> , <i>passim</i> . <i>C</i> , iii, 55 n; iv, 244–52; v, 441 n. 4. <i>H</i> , ch. X, <i>passim</i> .
Reynolds, Sir Robert	*		*			Junta sympathiser. Served on parliamentary committees regarding recusants and Ireland, including mission to Ireland (Oct. 1643).	<i>C</i> , vi, 315; vii, 363. <i>ODNB</i> . <i>PJ</i> , i, 286.
Rigby, Alexander	*					Radical. Subsequently, 'war party'.	<i>ODNB</i> . <i>H</i> , 9, 49, 59, 60.
Robartes, John, 2nd baron Robertes of Truro	*?					Junta. Lord lieutenant of Cornwall (Feb.). Remained with parliament after outbreak of civil war. Fought under Essex at Newbury.	<i>A</i> , 454 n. <i>C</i> , vi, 79; vii, 369 n. 5. <i>H</i> , 86.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
							<i>ODNB.</i>
Rogers, Richard	*					Loyal to Charles. Lionised by Clarendon. Attended Charles at York (June). Disabled by parliament (Sept.).	<i>C</i> , vii, 95. <i>PJ</i> , iii, 252, 311.
Rolle, Sir Samuel	*		*			Junta. Served on committee for disarming recusants (Jan.). Supported Dering's exclusion (Feb.). Sat on Ireland committee with Pym and others (Feb.). Pledged resources for parliamentary defence (June).	<i>PJ</i> , i, 121.
Rous, or Rowse, Francis	*					Junta. Close ally of stepbrother Pym. Committed presbyterian. Sat on various committees, including that charged with the suppression of delinquents (May). Subsequently, led the installation of parliamentary deputy lieutenants in Cornwall (July) and sat on committee on absent MPs (Sept.).	<i>C</i> , xiv, 18. <i>CJ</i> , ii, 556b, 694b, 772a. <i>H</i> , 197–8. <i>M</i> , 157. <i>ODNB.</i>
Rudyerd, or Rudyard, Sir Benjamin	*					Moderate. Client of Pembroke. Supported parliament, but actively sought accommodation with Charles.	<i>A</i> , 11–12. <i>H</i> , 8, 20. <i>ODNB.</i>
St John, Oliver, 1st earl of Bolingbroke			*			Junta sympathiser. Consistently voted against Charles in Lords. Eventually, a military commander for parliament.	<i>C</i> , vi, 93. <i>H</i> , 58 n.
St John, Oliver (solicitor general)	*			*		Junta leader.	<i>A</i> , 138–9. <i>C</i> , iii, 55 n, 85, 191; iv, 75–6, 204, 209. <i>H</i> , 5, 34, 78, 166–70. <i>M</i> , 166–7. <i>ODNB.</i>
Salisbury, William Cecil, 2nd earl of	*?					Moderate. Non-aligned. Signed testimony of Charles's desire for	<i>C</i> , v, 346; vi, 403. <i>ODNB.</i>

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						peace (June). Subsequently, endorsed parliamentary positions.	
Savile, Thomas, earl of Sussex						Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	C, v, 346, 360, 364 n. 5. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a, 700a.
Saye and Seale, William Fiennes, 1st Viscount	*?	*	*	*		Junta. Obeyed Militia Ordinance. Not as fervent as some junta members, may have retained links to Charles via earl of Dorset.	A, 422, 451, 454 n, 462, 487–91. C, vi, 409–10. H, 58 n, 85, 88. <i>ODNB</i> .
Selden, John	*				*	Moderate. Jurist and scholar. Advocated mixed monarchy. Sought accommodation between king and parliament.	C, v, 204. H, 182, 186–7. <i>ODNB</i> .
Seymour, Francis, 1st Baron	*?					Loyal to Charles, whom he advised. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles at York (Apr.), signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June). Eventually, royalist commander.	C, v, 346. A, 454 n. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a, 700a. <i>ODNB</i> .
Smyth, Sir Thomas			*			Loyal to Charles. Stripped of Commons' seat for raising royalist force in Shepton Mallet, shortly before being prosecuted for high treason (Aug.).	<i>CJ</i> , ii, 703, 475. <i>ODNB</i> .
Southampton, Thomas Wriothesley, 4th earl of	*?					Loyal to Charles. Refused to sign protestation against catholicism (May 1641). Converted Lord Spencer to Charles's side (Feb.). Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.). Joined Charles	A, 454. C, iii, 187, 231; v, 339, 346. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	<i>ODNB</i> .
Spencer, Henry, 1st earl of Sunderland						Junta sympathiser initially. Lord lieutenant of Northamptonshire (Mar.). Switched allegiance to Charles (Aug.), but always favoured reconciliation.	C, v, 339. <i>ODNB</i> .
Stapleton, Sir Philip	*				*	Junta. Respectable, Pym's friend.	A, 479. C, iv, 19; v, 106. H, 22, 71, 184. M, 163. <i>ODNB</i> .
Strange, James Stanley, 7th earl of Derby, Lord						Loyal to Charles. Anti-Laudian, but always protective of royal prerogative. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles's forces before outbreak of civil war. Impeached by parliament (Sept.).	C, vi, 67. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a, 700a. <i>ODNB</i> .
Strangways, Sir John					*	Loyal to Charles. Endorsed royal prerogative <i>contra</i> junta, condemned by mob for supporting Charles (late 1641). Subsequently, imprisoned by parliament.	A, 119 n, 419. C, iii, 90; iv, 129 n. <i>ODNB</i> .
Strode, William	*		*			Junta. One of the five members. Associate of Martin and radicals.	A, 138–9. C, ii, 86; iv, 148–9, 192, 204; v, 441 n. 4. H, 51, 57–8. <i>ODNB</i> .
Sutton, Robert			*			Loyal to Charles. Resisted 'Root and Branch' (Dec. 1641). Denied parliament's authority to legislate without royal assent. Rejected	<i>ODNB</i> .

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						Militia Ordinance (July). Excluded from Commons (Sept.).	
Tomkins, Thomas						Loyal to Charles but stayed at Westminster. Waller's brother-in-law. Involved in 'Waller Plot'. Pledged two horses to parliamentary defence (June). Sought accommodation with Charles (June–July).	C, vi, 54–68.  <i>PJ</i> , iii, 120, 220, 466.
Vane sr, Sir Henry	*					Moderate, but dismissed by Charles for disloyalty (Dec. 1641).	A, 447. C, iv, 75. <i>ODNB</i> .
Vane jr, Sir Henry	*	*	*		*	Junta. Dismissed by Charles (Dec. 1641), like his father (above). Subsequently, 'war party'. Executed during Restoration.	A, 138–9, 177–8, 447. C, iii, 34, 147. H, 5 n, 6 n, 56. <i>ODNB</i> .
Waller, Edmund			*		*	Well-disposed to Charles but respected in parliament (early 1642). Subsequently, plotted against parliament, before joining royalists.	C, vi, 54–68. H, 8–10. A, 419. <i>ODNB</i> .
Warwick, Robert Rich, 2nd earl of	*?		*			Junta leader. Lord admiral.	A, 454. <i>ODNB</i> .
Wenman, Thomas, 2nd Viscount	*					Moderate. Subsequently, 'peace party'.	<i>ODNB</i> .
Wentworth, Sir Peter			*			Radical. On committee regarding Hull (May). Pledged resources to parliamentary defence, and organising parliamentary conferences implementing the Militia Ordinance in various southern counties (June).	C, v, 289. <i>CJ</i> , ii, 621–2, 629a. H, 56, 57 n. <i>ODNB</i> .
Wentworth, Thomas, 5th Baron	*?					Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against Militia Ordinance (Mar.) and parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices	C, vi, 32 n. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 627a, 700a.

Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
						(Apr.). Served under Goring at Portsmouth.	<i>ODNB</i> .
Westmoreland, Mildmay Fane, 2nd earl of						Loyal to Charles. Protested formally against parliamentary veto of appointments to great offices (Apr.). Joined Charles at York, signed testimony of Charles's desire for peace (June).	<i>C</i> , v, 346. <i>LJ</i> , iv, 700a.
Wharton, Philip, 4th Lord	*?		*			Junta. Sympathetic to Scottish covenanters. Parliament made lord lieutenant of Lancashire (Feb.) and Buckinghamshire (June).	<i>A</i> , 444, 454 n, 491. <i>C</i> , iii, 56 n. <i>H</i> , 58 n. <i>ODNB</i> .
Whitaker, Laurence	*					Junta sympathiser. Condemned by Charles for alleged intrigues. Puritan, serving on various committees. Helped found New Model Army (1645).	<i>C</i> , iii, 13. <i>ODNB</i> .
Whitehead, Richard	*					Junta sympathiser. Volunteered intelligence regarding plotters against five members (Jan.). Pledged two horses for parliamentary defence (June). Implemented Militia Ordinance in Hampshire (July).	<i>PJ</i> , i, 208; iii, 158, 476.
Whitelock, Bulstrode	*				*	Moderate.	<i>H</i> , 7–8, 40–1. <i>ODNB</i> .
Widdrington, Sir Thomas						Moderate with inclination towards junta. Petitioned Charles to compromise, and monitored letters from Ireland (Mar.). Subsequently, Speaker and helped secure Cromwell's inauguration as protector.	<i>C</i> , xv, 29, 43, 47. <i>ODNB</i> . <i>PJ</i> , ii, 34.
Wilde, John	*	*				Junta sympathiser. Sergeant-at-law, championed parliamentary privilege against Charles's encroachments. Prevented royalist muster in Worcestershire (July).	<i>C</i> , iv, 231. <i>ODNB</i> .



Parliamentarian	W	G C15 Feb.	NP J28 May	NP C31 May	R	Nature and evidence of 'leaning'	Sources
Winchester, Walter Curl, bishop of	*?					Loyal to Charles.	<i>ODNB.</i>

## APPENDIX 2: Comparison of the Ways and the Grievances

<b>The Ways</b> <b>(14, 18, 19 Jan.)</b>	<b>The Grievances</b> <b>(CJ, 19 Feb.; LJ, 1 Apr.)</b>
'ever hath been, careful of the honour and saifty due to her majesties person' (146) <sup>161</sup>	'have ever been careful of the Honour and Safety due to her Majesty's Person' (preamble: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 443b; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 689b)
'the evil counsellours about the king and queen have been a cause of all our distractions and troubles' (146)	'The evil Council about Your Majesty and the Queen' (cause 1: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 443b; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 689b)
'delinquents, and preferment of such as adhere to them' (146)	'Delinquents; the Preferment of such as have adhered to them' (cause 7: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 444a; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 690a)
'the public exercise of the popish religeon at Whitehall, Somerset house, and other places, and the encouragement thereof' (146)	'The great Encouragement of Popery; the publick exercise of that Religion in <i>Whitehall, Somersett-house</i> , and other Places' (cause 3: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 443b; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 689b)
'the preferring some men, and displacing others, in time of parliament, without consent of parliament' (147)	'The preferring Men to Degrees of Honour, to Offices, and other Employments of Trust, and Displacing other, in time of Parliament, without the Consent of that great and faithful Council' (cause 10: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 444a; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 690a)
'transacting of great affaires by unknown counsellours' (147)	'Transacting the great Affairs of the Realm in private Cabinet Councils, by Men unknown' (cause 9: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 444a; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 690a)
'the violent and frequent breaches of the priviledges of parliment' (147)	'The violent and frequent Breaches of the Priviledges of Parliament' (cause 8: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 444a; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 690a)
'falce information and accusations received against divers members of parliment' (147)	'false Informations and Accusations received against divers Members of the Parliament' (cause 12: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 444a; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 690a)
'THAT such popish priests as have [been] condemned lately may bee executed forthwith, and that such as shall heerafter bee condemned may be executed acording to law.' (147)	'That such Popish Priests as are already condemned, may be forthwith executed; and such as shall hereafter be condemned, may likewise be executed, according to Law.' (remedy 10: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 445a; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 691a)
'THAT noe mass, or other popish servise, bee sung or said in the chappells of the king, queen, prince, or any other houses of any of the kings subjects, and that non of the kings subjects resort to, or be present at, masse, or any servise of the church of Roome.' (147)	'That no Mass, or Popish service, be sung or said in the Courts of the King, Queen, Prince, or in the House of any Subject in this Kingdom, and that none of Your Majesty's Subjects, or other Servants to Your Majesty, the Queen, or any of Your Children, be present at Mass, or any Service of the Church of <i>Rome</i> ' (remedy 11: <i>CJ</i> , ii, 445a; <i>LJ</i> , iv, 691a)
'THAT such members of the house of commons which the parliment have bee accused of delinquency, and pending that	'That every Person, which, being a Member of the House of Commons in this present Parliament, hath there been accused of any

**The Ways**  
(14, 18, 19 Jan.)

accusation have been preferred to the lords house, may bee removed.’ (147–8)

‘THAT hereafter noe member of the house of comons, except in case of decente, may be called upp to the lords house as peeres without consent of the house of comons.’ (148)

‘THAT noe person that shall heerafter bee made a peere of this realme, shall bee admitted to have vote in the lords house, without consent of both houses of parliment.’ (148)

‘THAT those members of the house of commons that have this parliment been cald to the lords house, except in case of decente, shall bee excluded from giveing there votes there, till it hath been consented to by both houses of parliment.’ (148)

**The Grievances**  
(*CJ*, 19 Feb.; *LJ*, 1 Apr.)

Offence against that House; and, That Accusation depending, hath been called up to the House of Lords, in the Quality of a Peer; shall, by Act of Parliament, be put out of the House’ (remedy 18: *CJ*, ii, 445a; *LJ*, iv, 691a)

‘that hereafter no Member of the House of Commons, except in case of Descent, may, without their Consent, be called up to be a Peer in the Lords House.’ (remedy 18: *CJ*, ii, 445a; *LJ*, iv, 691a)

‘That no Person which shall hereafter be made a Peer of this Realm, shall be admitted to have his Seat, or Vote, in the House of Peers, without the Consent of both Houses of Parliament.’ (remedy 19: *CJ*, ii, 445a; *LJ*, iv, 691b)

‘That those Members of the House of Commons who have this Parliament been called to the House of Peers, except in case of Descent, may be excluded from giving their Votes in the House of Peers, unless both Houses of Parliament shall assent thereunto.’ (remedy 20: *CJ*, ii, 445a; *LJ*, iv, 691b)

### **APPENDIX 3: The Nineteen Propositions<sup>162</sup>**

Key to the annotation:

unmarked = remained unaltered from the first draft accepted by the Lords on 28 May<sup>163</sup>

bold = text taken either verbatim or almost verbatim from the ‘Grievances’<sup>164</sup>

<< >> = added by Commons on the morning of 31 May<sup>165</sup>

underlined = added by Commons *ad hoc* drafting committee on the afternoon of 31 May<sup>166</sup>

<<< >>> = added by Commons on 1 June (proposition 19 only)<sup>167</sup>

<<<< >>>> = added on 1 June (proposition 1 only)<sup>168</sup>

#### **TEXT**

**Your Majesty's most humble and faithful Subjects, the Lords and Commons** <sup>169</sup> in Parliament, having nothing in their Thoughts and Desires more precious, and of higher Esteem, (next to the Honour and immediate Service of God) than the just and faithful Performance of their Duty to Your Majesty, and this Kingdom; and being very sensible of the great Distractions and Distempers, and of the imminent Dangers and Calamities of those Distractions and Distempers, are like to bring upon Your Majesty, and Your Subjects; all which have proceeded from the subtle Insinuations, mischievous Practices, and evil Counsels, of Men disaffected to God's true Religion, Your Majesty's Honour and Safety, and the publick Peace and Prosperity of Your People; after a serious Observation of the Causes of those Mischiefs, do, in all Humility and Sincerity, present to Your Majesty, their most dutiful Petition and Advice, that out of Your Princely Wisdom, for the Establishing Your own Honour and Safety, and gracious Tenderness of the Welfare and Security of Your Subjects and Dominions, You will be pleased to grant, and accept these their humble Desires and Propositions, as the most necessary effectual Means (through God's Blessing) of removing those Jealousies and Differences which have unhappily fallen betwixt You and Your People; and procuring both Your Majesty and them, a constant Course of Honour, Peace, and Happiness.

1. First,<sup>170</sup> **That the Lords, and others of Your Majesty's Privy Council, and such great Officers and Ministers of State, either at Home, or beyond the Seas, may be put from Your Privy Council, and from those Offices and Employments, excepting such as shall be approved of by both Houses of Parliament; <<<<And that the Persons put into the Places and Employments of those that are removed, may be approved of by both Houses of Parliament: And that all Privy Counsellors shall take an Oath for the due Executions of their Places, in such Form as shall be agreed upon by both Houses of Parliament.**<sup>171</sup>>>>>

2. **That the great Affairs of the Kingdom may not be concluded, or transacted, by the Advice of private Men, or by any unknown or unsworn Counsellors; but that such Matters as concern the Publick, and are proper for the high<sup>172</sup>Court of Parliament, which is Your Majesty's great and supreme Council, may be debated, resolved, and transacted, only in Parliament, and not elsewhere: And such as shall presume to do any**

**thing to the contrary, shall be reserved to the Censure and Judgment of Parliament:**<sup>173</sup>

And such other Matters of State as are proper for Your Majesty's Privy Council shall be debated and concluded, by such of the Nobility, and others, as shall from time to time, be chosen for that Place, by Approbation of both Houses of Parliament: And that no public Act, concerning the Affairs of the Kingdom, which are proper for Your Privy Council, may be esteemed of any Validity, as proceeding from the Royal Authority, unless it be done by the Advice and Consent of the major Part of Your Council, attested under their Hands; and that Your Council may be limited to a certain Number, not exceeding Twenty-five, nor under Fifteen: And if any Counsellors Place happen to be void, in the Intervals of Parliament, it shall not be supplied without the Assent of the major Part of the Council; which Choice shall be confirmed at the next Sitting of Parliament, or else to be void.

3. That the Lord High Steward of *England*, Lord High Constable, Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, Lord Treasurer, Lord Privy Seal, Earl Marshal, Lord Admiral, Warden of the Cinque Ports, Chief Governor of *Ireland*, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Master of the Wards, Secretaries of State, Two Chief Justices, and Chief Baron, may always be chosen, with the Approbation of both Houses of Parliament; and, in the Intervals of Parliament, by Assent of the major Part of the Council, in such Manner as is before expressed in the Choice of Counsellors.

4. That he or they unto whom the Government and Education of the King's Children shall be committed, shall be approved of by both Houses of Parliament; and, in the Intervals of Parliament, by Assent of the major Part of the Council, in such Manner as is before expressed in the Choice of Counsellors: And that all such Servants as are now about them, against whom both Houses shall have any just Exception, shall be removed.

5. **That no Marriage shall be concluded or treated for any of the King's Children, with any foreign Prince, or other Person whatsoever, abroad, or at home, without the Consent of Parliament,**<sup>174</sup> under the Penalty of a Praemunire, unto such as shall conclude or treat any Marriage as aforesaid: And that the said Penalty shall not be pardoned, or dispensed with, but by Consent of both Houses of Parliament.

6. That the Laws in Force against Jesuits, Priests, and Popish Recusants, be strictly put in Execution, without any Toleration, or Dispensation to the contrary: And **that some more effectual Course may be enacted, by Authority of Parliament, to disable them from making any Disturbance in the State,**<sup>175</sup> or eluding the Law, by Trusts <<or otherwise.>>

7. **That the Votes of Popish Lords in the House of Peers may be taken away,**<sup>176</sup> so long as they continue Papists: And that his<sup>177</sup> Majesty would consent to such a Bill as shall be drawn for the Education of the Children of Papists, by Protestants, in the Protestant Religion.

8. That Your Majesty would be pleased to consent, that such a **Reformation be made of the Church Government and Liturgy,**<sup>178</sup> as both Houses of Parliament shall advise; wherein they intend to have Consultations with Divines, as is expressed in their Declaration to that Purpose: <<And that Your Majesty will contribute Your best Assistance to them, for the Raising of a sufficient Maintenance for **Preaching Ministers throughout the Kingdom:**<sup>179</sup> And that Your Majesty will be pleased to give Your Consent to Laws for the Taking away Innovations and Superstitions; and of Pluralities; and against scandalous Ministers.>>

9. <<That Your Majesty will be pleased to rest satisfied with the Course that the Lords and Commons have appointed for ordering of the Militia, until the same shall be further settled by a Bill: And that Your Majesty will recall your Declaration<sup>180</sup> and Proclamations against the Ordinance made by the Lords and Commons concerning it.>>

**10. That such Members of either House of Parliament as have, during this present Parliament, been put out of any Place and Office, may either be restored to that Place and Office, or otherwise have Satisfaction for the same, upon the Petition of that House whereof he or they are Members.**<sup>181</sup>

11. That all Privy Councillors and Judges may take an Oath, the Form whereof to be agreed on, and settled by Act of Parliament, for the Maintaining of the Petition of Right; and of certain Statutes made by the Parliament, which shall be mentioned by both Houses of Parliament: And that an Inquiry of all the Breaches and Violations of those Laws may be given in Charge, by the Justices of the King's Bench, every Term, and by the Judges of Assize, in their Circuits; and Justices of the Peace, at the Sessions; to be presented and punished according to Law.

12. That all the Judges, and all the Officers placed by Approbation of both Houses of Parliament, may hold their Places *quam diu*<sup>182</sup>*bene se gesserint*['during good behaviour'].

13. That the Justice of Parliament may pass upon all Delinquents, whether they be within the Kingdom, or fled out of it: And that all Persons cited by either House of Parliament, may appear, and abide the Censure of Parliament.

14. That the general Pardon offered by Your Majesty may be granted, with such Exceptions as shall be advised by both Houses of Parliament.

15. That the Forts and Castles of the<sup>183</sup> Kingdom may be put under the Command and Custody of such Persons as Your Majesty shall appoint, with the Approbation of Your Parliament; and in the Intervals of Parliament, with Approbation of the major Part of the Council, in such manner as is before expressed, in the Choice of Counsellors.

16. That the extraordinary Guards, and military Forces now attending Your Majesty may be removed and discharged; and that, for the future, you<sup>184</sup> will raise no such Guards or extraordinary Forces, but according to the Law, in case of actual Rebellion or Invasion.

17. That Your Majesty will be pleased to enter into a more strict Alliance with *The States of the United Provinces*, and other neighbour Princes and States of the Protestant Religion, for the Defence and Maintenance thereof, against all Designs and Attempts of the Pope, and his Adherents, to subvert and suppress it: Whereby Your Majesty will obtain a great Access of Strength and Reputation, and Your Subjects be much encouraged and enabled, in a Parliamentary Way, for your<sup>185</sup> Aid and Assistance in restoring Your Royal Sister and her Princely Issue, to those Dignities and Dominions, which belong unto them; and relieving the other Protestant Princes who have suffered in the same Cause.

18. That Your Majesty will be pleased, by Act of Parliament, to clear the Lord *Kymbolton*, and the Five Members of the House of Commons, in such Manner that future Parliaments may be secured from the Consequence of that evil Precedent.

<<<19. That Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to pass a Bill for restraining Peers made hereafter, from sitting or voting in Parliament, unless they be admitted thereunto with the Consent of both Houses of Parliament.>>>

And, these our humble Desires being granted by Your Majesty, we shall forthwith apply ourselves to regulate Your present Revenue, in such Sort as may be for Your best Advantage; and likewise to settle such an ordinary and constant Increase of it, as shall be sufficient to support Your <sup>186</sup> Royal Dignity in Honour and Plenty, beyond the Proportion of any former Grants of the Subjects of this Kingdom to Your Majesty's Royal Predecessors.

We<sup>187</sup> shall likewise put the Town of *Hull* into such Hands as Your Majesty shall appoint, with the Consent and Approbation of Parliament; and deliver up a just Account of all the Magazine; and chearfully employ the uttermost of our Power and Endeavour, to the real Expression and Performance of our most dutiful and loyal Affections, to the Preserving and Maintaining the Royal Honour, Greatness, and Safety of Your Majesty, and Your Posterity.