

partner, there were found divers printed copies of the Scots' declaration that came but last.

12. Richard Lownes affirmed that John Wells of Moorfields did print *The answer to my lord of Canterbury's book against Fisher* and that he received £80 by those books. And that he likewise printed *The answer to the Commons*.

There was one Wells and Buckley being sent for by the committee refused to come, and they desire that they may be sent for by order of this House.

Clarendon's History on the collapse of controls over press and pulpit

The mass media of the period were the printing press and the pulpit which prior to 1640 had been subjected to theoretically stringent controls. Looking back on events, the moderate royalist and great contemporary historian of the period Edward Hyde (1609–74), who was created first earl of Clarendon after the Restoration, attached considerable importance to the collapse of these controls in creating the circumstances that eventually led to war. Prompt action taken by the senior authorities at the time, he believed, would have averted the conflict.

Source: E. Hyde, earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W. D. Macray, 6 vols (Oxford, 1888), i, 269–70.

And from this time¹⁸ the license of preaching and printing increased to that degree that all pulpits were freely delivered to the schismatical and silenced preachers, who till then had lurked in corners or lived in New England; and the presses [were] at liberty for the publishing of the most invective, seditious, and scurrilous pamphlets that their wit and malice could invent. Whilst the ministers of the state, and judges of the law, like men in an ecstasy, surprised and amazed with several apparitions, had no speech or motion; as if, having committed such an excess of jurisdiction, as men upon great surfeits are enjoined for a time to eat nothing, they had been prescribed to exercise no jurisdiction at all. Whereas, without doubt, if either the privy council, or the judges and the king's learned counsel, had assumed the courage to have questioned the preaching, or the printing, or the seditious riots upon the triumph of these three scandalous men, before the uninterrupted and security had confirmed the people in all three, it had been no hard matter to have destroyed those seeds and pulled up those plants, which, neglected, grew up and prospered to a full harvest of rebellion and treason. . . .

CONTROL OF THE MILITIA

The militia ordinance, 1642

Parliament's militia ordinance of 5 March 1642 broke new ground in that a

measure passed by both Houses that had not received the royal assent was presented as having the force of law. The ordinance took control of the appointment of lord lieutenants, who commanded the militia in England and Wales, out of royal hands and vested it in parliament instead. It was put into effect in a little over half the English counties, and some of the initial local confrontations between rival parties arose from attempts by parliamentarians to implement this ordinance and royalist rival efforts to execute their commission of array.

Source: C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait (eds), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642–60*, 2 vols (London, 1911), i, 1–5.

An ordinance of the Lords and Commons in parliament, for the safety and defence of the kingdom of England, and dominium of Wales.

Whereas there hath been of late a most dangerous and desperate design upon the House of Commons, which we have just cause to believe to be an effect of the bloody counsels of papists and other ill-affected persons, who have already raised a rebellion in the kingdom of Ireland, and, by reason of many discoveries, we cannot but fear they will proceed not only to stir up the like rebellion and insurrections in the kingdom of England, but also to back them with forces from abroad; for the safety, thereof, of his majesty's person, the parliament, and kingdom, in this time of imminent danger, it is ordained by the Lords and Commons now in parliament assembled that Henry earl of Holland shall be lieutenant of the county of Berkshire [the lieutenants for each county and place named] and severally and respectively have power to assemble and call together all and singular his majesty's subjects, within the said several and respective counties and places, as well within liberties as without, that are meet and fit for the wars; and them to train, exercise, and put in readiness; and them, after their abilities and faculties, well and sufficiently, from time to time, to cause to be arrayed and weaponed, and to take the muster of them in places most fit for that purpose. And the aforesaid Henry earl of Holland [and the other named lieutenants] shall severally and respectively have power, within the several and respective counties and places aforesaid, to nominate and appoint such persons of quality as to them shall seem meet, to be their deputy lieutenants, to be approved of by both Houses of Parliament. . . . And the aforesaid Henry earl of Holland [and the others] shall have power to make colonels and captains, and other officers, and to remove them out of their places, and make others from time to time, as they shall think fit for that purpose. And [they], their deputy or deputies, in their absence, or by their command, shall have power to lead, conduct, and employ the persons aforesaid, arrayed and weaponed, for the suppression of all rebellions, insurrections, and invasions, that may happen within the several and respective counties and place; and shall have further power and authority to lead, conduct, and employ the persons aforesaid, arrayed and weaponed, as well within their said several and respective counties and places as within any other part of this realm of England, or dominium of Wales, for the suppression

of all rebellions, insurrections and invasions that may happen, according as they from time to time shall receive directions from the Lords and Commons assembled in parliament. . . .

Thomas Knyvett's dilemma over the ordinance, 1642

The implementation of the militia ordinance put a political moderate like Thomas Knyvett in a quandary. Having reluctantly accepted his former militia command again under the new ordinance, shortly afterwards he was faced with a royal declaration condemning it. He resolved to lie low but was eventually to join the royalist camp.

Source: *The Knyvett Letters, 1620-44*, ed. B. Schofield (London, 1949), pp. 102-3.

Thomas Knyvett to his wife, 18 May 1642.

Oh sweet heart, I am now in a great straight what to do. Walking this other morning at Westminster, Sir John Potts,¹⁹ with Commissary Mutford, saluted me with a commission from the Lord of Warwick,²⁰ to take upon me (by virtue of an ordinance of parliament) my company and command again. I was surprised what to do, whether to take or refuse. 'Twas no place to dispute, so I took it and desired some time to advise upon it. I had not received this many hours, but I met with a declaration point blank against it by the king. This distraction made me to advise with some understanding men what condition I stand in, which is no other than a great many men of quality do. What further commands we shall receive to put this ordinance in execution, if they run in a way that trenches upon my obedience against the king, I shall do according to my conscience, and this is the resolution of all honest men that I can speak with. In the meantime I hold it good wisdom and security to keep my company as close to me as I can in these dangerous times, and to stay out of the way of my new masters till these first musterings be over. . . .

The commission of array in Worcestershire, 1642

The king unwisely sought to raise forces by reviving a medieval instrument, the commission of array. It lacked statutory authority, was open to serious misinterpretation and was generally unpopular. In only a quarter of English counties was the commission put into effect and attempts to execute it elsewhere were thwarted.

Source: J. W. Willis Bund (ed.), 'Diary of Henry Townsend of Elmley Lovett, 1640-1663', *The Worcestershire Historical Society*, 1920, ii, p. 66.

The copy of the commissioners of array to the high constable for to send to the petty constables throughout the county of Worcester.

We his majesty's commissioners of array for the county of Worcester whose names are subscribed send greeting.

Whereas the king's majesty by his commission under the great seal of England bearing date at Beverley the 23rd day of July last past in the eighteenth year of his majesty's reign²¹ have authorised us amongst others in the said commission named to array, train and muster the inhabitants of this county in these times of distraction according to the tenor of the said commission and instructions sent to us from his majesty under his hand. These are therefore to will and require you forthwith upon receipt hereof you issue forth your warrant to all the petty constables within your limits and division thereby requiring them to give warning to all the trained and freehold and clergy bands within their constablewick both horse and foot that are charged with arms to come and appear before us or any three or more of us upon the twelfth day of August next being Friday in the morning by nine of the clock, at and in the great meadow called Pitchcroft near the City of Worcester completely armed and arrayed, and you are to take notice yourself and give warning to the petty constables that neither you nor they nor any of the said trained band horse or foot fail of their appearance upon pain of such penalties as shall fall thereon.

And further we do require you and every of you to signify unto all such as are well affected to this service that so many as will voluntarily come in at the day and place appointed with their arms or otherwise shall be well received and perform an acceptable service to their king and country. Dated at Talbot in Sidbury, the first day of August in the 18th year of the reign of our sovereign lord Charles²² by the grace of God king of England Scotland France and Ireland defender of the faith etc.

NEUTRALS AND SIDE-CHANGERS

A Cheshire neutrality agreement, 1642

Reluctance to be drawn into the war was strong enough in some counties for the local leadership to take the initiative in appealing for an immediate peace or even to conclude formal neutrality agreements between the contending parties. One such agreement reached in Cheshire on 23 December 1642 aimed to prevent any further preparations for war within the county and to reverse those already made. It also hoped to preserve peace by making a united stand against outside belligerents. All these agreements eventually failed but in the short term they helped to slow down the spread of armed conflict.

Source: J. S. Morrill, *The Revolt of the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630-50* (London, 1976), pp. 160-1.

An agreement made the day above at Bunbury, in the county of Chester, for a pacification and settling of the peace of that county by us whose names are subscribed, authorised hereunto by the lords and gentlemen nominated