

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

The Anglo-Scottish Print War: Sermons, Pamphlets, and Polemics 1638-1640

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5bt043nx>

Author

Hudson, Joshua David

Publication Date

2011

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

The Anglo-Scottish Print War:
Sermons, Pamphlets, and Polemics 1638-1640

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

by

Joshua David Hudson

December 2011

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Thomas Cogswell, Chairperson

Dr. Randolph Head

Dr. Alexander Haskell

Copyright by
Joshua David Hudson
2011

The Thesis of Joshua David Hudson is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Thomas Cogswell for giving me the idea to work with this source material and helping me settle on the topic of this thesis. I also thank him for the countless meetings we have had discussing the paper and revising it into its current form. Thank you to Randy Head and Alexander Haskell for being on my thesis committee and giving me helpful advice and knowledge. I want to also thank my fellow history graduate students at the University of California, Riverside who have given me invaluable knowledge inside and outside of the classroom. Any errors found in this thesis are my own. Quotations have been left in their original form, except in instances when they were difficult to read.

Dedication

To my mother, father, and Lauren who have always supported me.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
1. Prologue.....	1
2. Historiography.....	5
Chapter 1 1638: Rebellion, Covenant, and the Beginning of a Print War.....	20
1. Introduction.....	20
2. Proclamations from the King.....	22
3. Printed Sermons.....	25
4. Sermons Against the Scots.....	33
5. Sermons Against Catholicism.....	36
6. Conclusion.....	40
Chapter 2 1639: The Creation of a Protestant-Catholic Print War.....	41
1. Introduction.....	41
2. Discourse Between Scottish Churches.....	43
3. Printed Sermons.....	46
4. Literature Against the Scots.....	53
5. Literature Against Catholicism.....	60
6. Conclusion.....	64

Chapter 3 1640: The Culmination of the Anglo-Scottish Print War	66
1. Introduction.....	66
2. Proclamations from Charles I.....	69
3. The Scottish Army and Parliament.....	73
4. Printed Sermons.....	79
5. On the Scots.....	82
6. On the Roman Church.....	87
7. English Broadsheets.....	88
8. The Impeachment of Archbishop William Laud.....	90
Conclusion	91
Bibliography.....	94

Introduction

1. Prologue

Charles I became King of England, Scotland, and Ireland on March 27, 1625. In 1629, Charles dissolved the English Parliament and began his personal rule, which would last for eleven years. Charles negotiated peace with France in 1629 and Spain in 1630 and ended England's involvement in the Thirty Years' War. England became a peaceful kingdom in the early 1630s, and England's peace became the envy of continental Europe which remained embroiled in war. The early 1630s also saw the rise of William Laud and Arminianism in England. William Laud became the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, implemented religious reforms, and monopolized his power in the Church of England with the complete support of King Charles I.¹ Laudians promoted the beautification of churches, sought to revive old ceremonies, and attempted to produce a balance between Catholic and Reformed doctrine in the Church of England. Laud and his followers were also high ceremonialists. They encouraged bowing, kneeling, and gesturing towards the sign of the cross. Altars and tables were made to stand sideways under the east window of chancels or chapels and were railed for protection from abuse.² The implementation of altars and rails generated religious debate between Calvinists and Laudians in the 1630s.³ Historian Anthony Milton provided the best narrative on the goals of the Laudians in transforming the Church of England. Laudian writers depicted Puritanism and Calvinism

¹ H.R. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud 1573-1645* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1962), 295.

² David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution 1640-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 139 and 151.

³ Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 333.

as improper examples of Christian society and government. Laudian divines viewed the Church of England as the only “properly Reformed Church”, and the view that the Church of England maintained a position between Catholic and Reformed was expressed for the first time during the Laudian period.⁴ Charles’s decision to dissolve the English Parliament and support the rise of Laud and Arminianism caused a breakdown in his relationship with Calvinist parliamentarians.

The significance of the rise of Arminianism during Charles’s early reign was twofold. The Church of England had followed Calvinist doctrine for over half a century prior to the Laudian ascendancy. Nicholas Tyacke convincingly demonstrated that Calvinist doctrine provided an ameliorating bond for English Calvinists, but the rise of Arminianism in England shattered this bond.⁵ Jacob Arminius and John Calvin were sixteenth century reformers who shared many aspects of their theological beliefs. Calvinism and Arminianism agreed on orthodoxy with regard to original sin and justification by faith, but they were in opposition over the doctrine of predestination that taught salvation was for the elect and eternal damnation for the corrupt. Calvinists believed in this strict doctrine on predestination, but Arminians believed salvation could be attained by anyone through free will. According to the Arminians, true believers held the free will to attain salvation, but Calvinists viewed this belief as limiting the

⁴ Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 522, 525, 527-528.

⁵ Nicholas Tyacke, “Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution,” in Conrad Russell, ed., *The Origins of the English Civil War* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 121.

sovereignty of God.⁶ The doctrinal disagreements between Calvinists and Arminians came to a head in England with the Laudian ascendancy.

Religion was a critical issue during Charles's early reign, but it was not the only tension. Other issues of contention between Charles and his subjects in the 1630s were over ship money and fen drainage. Charles implemented the ship money tax without the approval of Parliament. This tax was established during wartime and was placed on coastal towns to offset the costs of defending the coast. Charles's ship money tax affected those inland and ignored all precedence of when and how the tax was levied in the past. English citizens, most famously John Hampden, challenged the ship money demands in court, but the judges gave favorable rulings for Charles. Fen drainage also created disputes between Charles and the English agricultural populace. The practice of draining fens freed the land of excess water and made it available to plant crops. Eric Kerridge discussed in his agricultural history *The Farmers of Old England* how Charles became involved in this agricultural practice. In 1637, Charles took over the business of fen drainage with the intention of making major profits for himself at the expense of commoners. Charles's decision provoked civil disturbances from the country people, and they destroyed the fen drainage projects Charles had taken over.⁷ The challenge of ship money in court and the defacing of fen drainage projects were the beginnings of opposition to Charles's personal rule in 1636 and 1637. Despite the religious tensions and

⁶ Allan I. Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1991), 19-20.

⁷ Eric Kerridge, *The Farmers of Old England* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1973), 116.

resistance to ship money and fen drainage, there were few signs that England was only a few years away from civil war.

Historians C.V. Wedgwood and Kevin Sharpe both reflected that in July 1637, Charles told his nephew the Elector Palatine that he was the happiest king in all Christendom.⁸ That same year, Charles and Laud's plan to establish religious uniformity throughout the British Isles began. It is unclear whether Charles or Laud held more influence over the other in the decision making process, but Richard Cust's theory is convincing. Cust believed Laud succeeded in "nudging and steering" the king towards making certain decisions, and Charles generally knew what he wanted but did not know how to accomplish it. Laud provided Charles with practical solutions to his problems.⁹ Ironically, it was Charles's decision to support Arminianism that disrupted the religious unity, which his father James I had established. Charles wanted complete unity in religion, and to successfully establish uniform worship, he had to enforce it in Scotland.

Charles's mode of enforcing uniform worship on Scotland was through *The Book of Common Prayer*. Archbishop Laud and Scottish bishops created an edition of the Service Book specifically for Scotland, and the book was expected to be read in churches around Edinburgh on Sunday July 23, 1637. That day, the first opposition to the Prayer Book occurred at the St. Giles Kirk in Edinburgh. Scottish citizens rioted in opposition to the Prayer Book when it was read aloud during service. This reaction to Charles and Laud's actions was significant in the breakdown of Charles's government. In 1618,

⁸ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 770-771; and C.V. Wedgwood, *The Great Rebellion: The King's Peace 1637-1641* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1955), 21.

⁹ Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow: Pearson, 2005), 137.

during the rule of Charles's father James I, the General Assembly of Scotland tentatively accepted the Five Articles of Perth, which unified worship in England and Scotland. The articles dealt with kneeling during communion, private baptism, private communion for the sick, confirmation by Bishops, and observance of Holy Days. While James succeeded in his effort to establish integrated religious practices between England and Scotland, Charles failed due to his lack of experience and knowledge regarding Scotland. Conrad Russell explained why Charles's attempt at uniformity was repaid with rebellion. He claimed "the most inflammatory thing about the book was not its contents, but the manner of its imposition. King Charles never showed it to a Scottish Parliament or church assembly, but simply commanded the Scots to use it by proclamation."¹⁰ This offense to Scottish nationhood, combined with religious enthusiasm, turned the initial riots into widespread rebellion. Charles's decision to ignore the General Assembly and Scottish Parliament aroused monarchical fear in Scotland. If Charles could dictate and transform liturgy by his proclamation alone, the Scots feared he could eventually begin enforcing new religion, new taxes, or nearly anything else by proclamation alone and completely usurp Scottish authority.

2. Historiography

The question of what caused the English Civil War has been a much researched and debated issue in British historiography. An early history of the English Civil War was Samuel Rawson Gardiner's massive pioneering works. His ten volume *History of*

¹⁰ Conrad Russell, *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History 1509-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 325.

England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642 and five volume *History of the Great Civil War, 1642-1649* provided an extensive narrative of the first half of seventeenth-century British history. Gardiner is associated with the mono-causal theory of a Puritan Revolution. For him, Puritans rebelled, overthrew the king, and caused the English Civil War. Half a century after Gardiner, C.V. Wedgwood wrote a two volume work, *The Great Rebellion: The King's Peace 1637-1641* and *The Great Rebellion: The King's War 1641-1647*. Her works have a narrower scope and focused specifically on the events preceding the English Civil War and the war itself. Both works are straight forward historical narratives describing the events as they happened. Wedgwood structured her works by examining individuals rather than groups and attempted to "understand how these men felt and why, in their own estimation, they acted as they did."¹¹ Wedgwood artfully reconstructed eleven years of British history and wrote on the civil war as "the defeat of the King [rather] than...the victory of Parliament."¹² These extensive narratives began the historiography of the English Civil War, and the mid-twentieth century would start the exponential growth of studies on this topic.

Between the 1940s and 1960s, the historiography of the English Civil War changed. A driving force in the shift of historiography during these decades came from Marxist historians who viewed the war as a social revolution. Historians began to focus on socio-economic changes and the tensions that arose within English society during the

¹¹ Wedgwood, *The Great Rebellion: The King's Peace*, 17.

¹² C.V. Wedgwood, *The Great Rebellion: The King's War 1641-1647* (London: Collins, 1958), 13.

century prior to the 1640s. R. H. Tawney began the socio-economic debate in his 1940 essay "The Rise of the Gentry." Tawney studied land ownership and argued that a new gentry class rose from 1540 to 1640 and replaced the old landowners. Tawney argued that these social and economic changes persuaded the newly risen gentry to seek political power to match their social and economic power. The gentry rose against the English government, and this was the cause of civil war. In 1953, Hugh Trevor-Roper strongly opposed Tawney's argument in "The gentry, 1540-1640." Trevor-Roper disagreed with Tawney's method of analyzing sources and argued there was actually a decline of the gentry. Trevor-Roper argued lawyers, merchants, and yeomen were responsible for defeating the king, overthrowing the court, and were the radical leaders during the 1640s. Both historians agreed that conflict and change between social classes acted as the conduit for the outbreak of war, and their debate sparked further scholarly interest in the civil war.

In 1972, Lawrence Stone continued to develop the social history surrounding the English Civil War. *The Causes of the English Revolution 1529-1642* opposed Wedgwood's argument that the civil war occurred through political blunders or poor decisions made by men. Stone believed these arguments ignored the social movement that occurred the century before 1642. He analyzed changes in three stages: preconditions from 1529 to 1629, the precipitants during Charles I's personal rule 1629-39, and the triggers 1640-1642. Stone discovered England faced polarization between rich and poor, the countryside and cities, bishops and lower clergy, the clergy and laity, the Puritans and Arminians, the nobles and the gentry, lawyers and court officials, and monopoly

merchants and lesser traders.¹³ English society in the 1630s was full of tension which pushed England towards war. Stone agreed with Trevor-Roper and found a shift of wealth from the church and king to the middle classes of England, and it was the middle classes who gained power and swayed support. Tawney, Trevor-Roper, and Stone focused on long term changes in English society to explain the English Civil War. The Bishops' Wars could be viewed as a precipitant of the war, but according to these three historians, the true causes of the war developed in the century prior to 1639.

These social and economic histories would be challenged in the 1980s and 1990s as new perspectives developed. Conrad Russell began this process a year after Stone's monograph. In the "Introduction" to his edited work *The Origins of the English Civil War*, Russell disputed the arguments of the previous decades. Russell argued the war was not fought between social classes. Instead, Russell discovered the gentry were actually split during the 1640s and "neither 'the rise of the gentry' nor 'the decline of the gentry' ever happened."¹⁴ He did not completely oppose Stone's argument. Russell and Stone agreed that the discontents of the gentry in Parliament unified with other social classes, but for Russell, this further proved his argument that the war was not fought along social lines.¹⁵ The Royalists and Parliamentarians were unified and divided by more than social distinction. The edited work, *The Origins of the English Civil War*, studied political and

¹³ Lawrence Stone, *The Causes of the English Revolution 1529-1642* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), 134.

¹⁴ Conrad Russell, "Introduction," in Conrad Russell, ed., *The Origins of the English Civil War* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 6-7.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 23 and 27.

religious causes, and the decades that followed its publishing saw historians further develop these methods when studying the English Civil War.

The political history of Charles's reign and the English Civil War has been consistently studied since the 1980s. Anthony Fletcher's *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* examined the political process that led to war. The monograph's scope is narrow and only covered British history from November 1640 to 1642. Fletcher recognized religious issues were a cause for the war, but he believed focusing only on the division in the populace that occurred due to the promotion of Arminianism tended to oversimplify the events of 1641 and 1642.¹⁶ Fletcher argued religious division created a political crisis. "Controversy over the church was at the heart of the political debate before the civil war," and the religious issues coalesced with political and constitutional issues to divide the political nation.¹⁷ Fletcher examined propaganda in 1641 and 1642 and studied over 200 petitions between 1640 and 1642 that were presented to Charles or Parliament. Through a study of these petitions, Fletcher found a dynamic relationship between the English Parliament and local communities. Fletcher provided case studies of towns and communities to analyze the breakdown of royalist and parliamentary supporters and found there was not a simple geographical divide in England.¹⁸ Like Russell, Fletcher opposed social history as a cause of war. For Fletcher, the conflict arose from a split in the governing class over religious and political issues. The monograph

¹⁶ Anthony Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London: Edward Arnold, 1981), xxx.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 91.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 368.

examined the events and printed propaganda following the Bishops' Wars in great detail, but Fletcher's scope left the Bishops' Wars out of his narrative.

Caroline Hibbard's political history of Charles's reign provided a new historiographical perspective. *Charles I and the Popish Plot* studied court Catholics and crypto-Catholics in England during the rule of Charles I. Hibbard defined the king's court as "a movable and divisible place surrounding the king and queen made up of people who were frequently in attendance and around the royal family and in position to advise, influence, or obtain favors from them."¹⁹ Although Catholics were a minority in England during the 1630s, they held influence in English politics from 1637 to 1642. Hibbard's monograph is a narrative history of change in the 1630s. It examined how Catholic activities at court developed distrust between Charles and his subjects who opposed him during the civil war. These court Catholics made the fear of a popish plot in England a reality. Hibbard offered the fear of a popish plot as an explanation for the outbreak of war, and she believed this cause had been ignored by historians in the past.²⁰ Caroline Hibbard acknowledged there were propaganda campaigns in England and Scotland during the Bishops' Wars, but a detailed analysis of this propaganda is absent in her work.

In 1990, Conrad Russell expanded on his earlier "Introduction" argument which claimed the causes of the English Civil War were not a result of conflict between classes or a conflict between the government and an opposition. *The Causes of the English Civil*

¹⁹ Caroline Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1983), 10.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 3.

War argued war arose from the division between Charles and his own government.²¹ The English people were divided on “non-institutional lines,” and it was a civil war, not a revolution.²² According to Russell, the conflict did not begin with an uprising in England to overthrow the government; it began with the breakdown of the English government from the center.²³ To understand the causes, Russell first looked at the effects, which were the Bishops’ Wars, England’s defeat in the Bishops’ Wars, the failure to reach a settlement, the failure to dissolve Parliament, the failure to negotiate, the choice of sides, and the problem of the King’s diminished majesty.²⁴ Charles was the only person who could have been a cause for all seven effects. Russell does not view Charles as solely responsible for the English defeat in the Bishops’ Wars, but he was the cause of the wars. Settlement and negotiation were impossible due to the role of Scottish factions in Parliament. According to Russell, Charles I caused the English Civil War, since without the implementation of the Scottish Prayer Book, many events that led to war would have never occurred. Like Hibbard, Russell briefly discussed the printed literature produced during the Bishops’ Wars, but he only devoted minor attention to it.

Kevin Sharpe’s tome, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, provided the fullest account of Charles I’s personal rule since S.R. Gardiner. Sharpe believed “the 1630s offer us the rich opportunity to study Charles I as a king at peace, to understand his values and

²¹ Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 4-6.

²² *Ibid.*, 7.

²³ *Ibid.*, 59.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 24.

ideology of kingship and his priorities for the church.”²⁵ Sharpe argued that the history of Charles I’s personal rule is important to fully comprehend how the English Civil War began. His extensively researched work provided a full account of how the English government broke down. Sharpe’s account of the 1630s and the origins of the civil war portrayed Charles in a more positive light. While Sharpe refrained from becoming an apologist for Charles, he does not explicitly place all of the blame on Charles as other historians have tended to do. One glaring weakness in Sharpe’s work is the lack of printed literature. Sharpe acknowledged that he used very little literature in his source base. While he understood pamphlets provide evidence of what was “read, expected, desired, and idealized” during a time period, he believed “they are far less reliable as a guide to what was going on, or even what was typically thought.”²⁶

John Adamson attempted to completely transform the historiography of the English Civil War in his recent monograph *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I*. Adamson argued that Charles’s government broke down and civil war occurred through the actions of the nobility. Scottish, English, and Puritan nobles all play important roles in Adamson’s narrative. Scottish nobleman controlled the government in Edinburgh and planned to reduce Charles’s authority in Scotland. English nobles brought the Scottish revolt to England in the Second Bishops’ War in an attempt to force Charles to summon another Parliament, which would return power to the English and Puritan

²⁵ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, xvii.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, xxii.

nobility.²⁷ *The Noble Revolt* is written in opposition to Whig and Marxist historiography which placed the nobility on the periphery. The monograph also opposed the view of the civil war occurring from missed opportunities, bad luck, the Bishops' Wars, or the problem Charles had ruling the three Stuart kingdoms, England, Ireland, and Scotland.²⁸ Adamson goes as far as to argue that Charles's defeat in war occurred more to "the interventions of the dissident nobility than to any damage the Scottish army had inflicted on the English, or were ever likely to inflict, on the battlefield."²⁹ Adamson also disputed the social histories that studied the long term political conflict and social change that led to war. His scope focused on 1640 to 1642 and ignored the preconditions before the 1640s that earlier historians, such as Sharpe and Stone, so deeply analyzed. In Adamson's opinion, the nobility drove the revolt and actively forced England into civil war.

Whereas social histories were prevalent from the 1940s to early 1970s and political histories were popular in the 1980s and 1990s, British religious history on the first half of the seventeenth-century, the reign of Charles, and the English Civil War were produced throughout the second half of the twentieth-century. Three historians argued religion was the cause of the English Civil War. Nicholas Tyacke's essay "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution" in *The Origins of the English Civil War* and his monograph *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640* provided detailed studies on Arminianism in England. Tyacke argued religion caused the civil war

²⁷ John Adamson, *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007), 45.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 502-503.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 86.

due to the rise of Arminianism. The rise of the Laudians in the 1620s forced the Puritans into a defensive political position. The Arminian influence over Charles and their doctrinal changes in England forced the Calvinists and Puritans into an alliance against the Crown. John Morrill also argued for religion as the cause of the civil war in his influential article “The Religious Context of the English Civil War.” Morrill’s article viewed the English Civil War from 1642-1645 as the last of the wars of religion, and “it was the force of religion that drove minorities to fight, and forced majorities to make reluctant decisions.”³⁰ Anthony Milton also looked at the role religion played in bringing about the English Civil War in his work *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*. Milton argued:

“religious developments and conflicts which took place during the early Stuart period were prompted in part by a gradual movement by Laudian divines away from an earlier, and perhaps more coherent, view of the Church of England and of its relations with the Churches of Rome and continental Protestantism.”³¹

These changes in the Church of England left irreparable damage when Parliament removed the Laudians from power in 1640. The collapse of the Caroline government left the Church of England partially Laudianized with Puritan and Calvinist influence still prevalent. The British Isles were religiously divided, and this religious discord left the English, Scottish, and Irish incapable of being united again through religion. These three historians used religious literature in their essays and monographs, but works printed on the Bishops’ Wars were not discussed.

³⁰ John Morrill, “The Religious Context of the English Civil War,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, Vol. 34 (1984): 157.

³¹ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 529.

Some historians studied the role of preachers in inciting the civil war. John F. Wilson studied sermons preached to members of the Long Parliament at fast and thanksgiving celebrations in *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars 1640-1648*. It is a narrative on the preaching institution in the 1640s and how printed sermons developed a distinct religious literary tradition.³² Wilson's monograph measured individual interpretations of events in the 1640s, the frame of mind of clerical Puritans, and the framework in which their political experiences developed.³³ The study of these sermons allowed Wilson to analyze how the Puritan social movement changed during the English Civil War. Stephen Baskerville also studied preachers in the 1640s and produced a work on the role of the Puritans in inciting the English Revolution. His work, *Not Peace but a Sword: The political theology of the English revolution*, examined "the language the Puritan ministers used to instigate revolution in seventeenth-century England. It is based largely on sermons and in particular the sermons preached to the Long Parliament and other political assemblies on days of public fasting."³⁴ These works studied preachers and their printed sermons during the English Civil War, but they do not examine sermons produced during the Bishops' Wars.

A recent work that focused on English print culture is David Cressy's *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution 1640-1642*. Like Russell, Cressy did not believe the English

³² John F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars 1640-1648* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), ix.

³³ *Ibid.*, 7, 18, 20-21.

³⁴ Stephen Baskerville, *Not Peace but a Sword: The political theology of the English revolution* (London: Routledge, 1993), 1.

Revolution had a class war with sections of society struggling against one another, nor was there a rearrangement of social status or economic resources that restructured society.³⁵ Cressy argued that “England in 1641 was in the throes of a revolution with political, constitutional, religious, cultural, and social dimensions. The strains of this revolution, reactions against it, and the inability of the political elite to harness or contain it best explains why civil war broke out in the summer of 1642.”³⁶ Cressy used a diverse set of sources in his monograph. Manuscript sources, such as government records, secular and ecclesiastical court records, petitions, diaries, memoranda, and letters were used along with printed sources that became abundant during the time period of Cressy’s monograph. According to Cressy, there were approximately 800 published works in 1640, over 2,000 in 1641, and over 4,000 in 1642.³⁷ This proliferation of published literature led him to examine the print culture of the years 1640 to 1642 with emphasis on 1642 when censorship of the press had ended.

A Scottish perspective on British history comes from two monographs by Scottish historian Allan I. Macinnes. *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641* argued that Charles I was the cause and architect of the Scottish National Covenant, the Bishops’ Wars, and the outbreak of civil war. Macinnes believed that Charles’s pursuit of religious, economic, and administrative uniformity between Scotland and England “fanned the flames of nationalism that was to terminate his personal rule by

³⁵ Cressy, *England on Edge*, 376.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, xi-xii.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, xii-xiii.

1638.”³⁸ Macinnes further explained that unlike his father James I, Charles I never faced Scottish aristocratic rebellions, denunciations from Edinburgh preachers, or angry mobs in the streets of the Scottish capital.³⁹ Charles’s lack of knowledge and understanding of how to rule Scotland can be seen in how he incited rebellion. The Scottish rebellion was not a social movement, but a statement that the Scottish people had no confidence in Charles’s rule.⁴⁰ Macinnes does not argue that the Covenanting movement or Bishops’ Wars caused the conflict between Charles and his political nation, but the presence of the Covenanter army in northern England forced Charles to summon the English Parliament and end his personal rule. The Covenanter army provided security and made it possible for English parliamentarians to make their grievances against Charles known, and “the Covenanting movement provided not just military security but a constitutional model for revolt.”⁴¹ In Macinnes’s more recent *The British Revolution, 1629-1660*, he attempted to broaden the scope of British history. This monograph argued for a more integrated approach to studying British history to provide a wider contextual framework.⁴² Macinnes used the revolution to provide such a framework, since England, Scotland, and Ireland were all involved in the conflict. He hoped future scholars would view the history

³⁸ Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641*, 1.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 198.

⁴² Allan I. Macinnes, *The British Revolution, 1629-1660* (New York: Palgrave, 2005), 2.

of Charles in a transoceanic context by bringing the history of Scotland and Ireland into the civil war narrative.

Mark Charles Fissel's *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's campaigns against Scotland, 1638-1640* is a military and economic history in a political context that provided an analysis of the Bishops' Wars, how they were financed, and how soldiers were recruited for the war. Fissel looked to explain why England was unable to defeat Scotland by force and how the English military failures in 1639 and 1640 were the fault of Charles I. Poor military strategy and tactics hindered England's ability to defeat the Scottish army in battle and prevent them from invading northern England. These were political failures "which demonstrated Charles's inability to manage government."⁴³ During his research of the Bishops' Wars, Fissel found that Charles made the same mistakes in "strategy, officers, soldiers, supply, and tactics" in both wars.⁴⁴ Charles's personal rule left him with financial limitations that kept him from suppressing the Scottish rebellion. Fissel's argument is significant, since it blamed Charles I for the English defeat in the Bishops' Wars and viewed him as "a catalytic agent" for the English Civil War.⁴⁵ His argument opposed Kevin Sharpe's view that under different circumstances, the English could have won the Bishops' Wars.

This collection of literature is not the entire body of historiography, but these works represent a variety of approaches and methods that have been undertaken in an

⁴³ Mark Charles Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's campaigns against Scotland, 1638-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 287.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, xii.

attempt to study the rule of Charles I, the Bishops' Wars, and the English Civil War. Noticeably absent is a study of the print culture produced in England and Scotland during the Bishops' Wars. The work that follows will fill this gap in British historiography from 1638 to 1640. Sermons, pamphlets, polemics, works of prose and poetry, and broadsheets will all be studied in an attempt to explain how various preachers, authors, poets, theologians, and politicians attempted to persuade the populace to support their cause. Through a detailed analysis of these works, it will become clear why the Scots were more persuasive. Scottish print culture argued the Covenanters were maintaining their Reformed religion and opposed the attempts to reintroduce Catholicism into Scotland and England. On the other hand, English literature relied on demonizing the Scots and tried to persuade the Protestant English populace to fight against the Protestant Scottish Covenanters. Scottish propaganda was successful due to its ability to transform the print war between England and Scotland from 1638 to 1640 into a battle of Protestantism against Catholicism.

Chapter 1

1638: Rebellion, Covenant, and the Beginning of a Print War

1. Introduction

In 1638, the Scots quickly responded to the perceived monarchical threat Charles posed when he attempted to enforce the Prayer Book on them. Although the Service Book was what incited rioting, it was not the only aspect of Charles's reign the Scots opposed. Charles sought economic monopolies to provide unity between England and Scotland, and he placed a common fishing policy on Scotland.⁴⁶ This policy was similar to England's ship money tax and hindered the aspirations of Scottish mercantilists. Scottishmen were also excluded from England's growing overseas trade, had no influence over English foreign policy, and resented the Englishmen who profited from their influence over Charles.⁴⁷ These economic policies alone would have never incited rebellion, but they laid the foundation of mistrust between Charles and his Scottish subjects. The rebellion that broke out in July 1637 had underlying factors beyond religious liturgy. Charles challenged Scottish national identity, and Scottish noblemen, gentry, clergy, and burgesses responded with the signing of the Scottish National Covenant on February 28, 1638.

The National Covenant was written to bind the Scottish people together against the absentee English monarch and force the removal of bishops from the Scottish Kirk. The General Assembly of Scotland abolished Episcopalian government and replaced it

⁴⁶ Macinnes, *The British Revolution*, 105.

⁴⁷ Russell, *The Crisis of Parliaments*, 324.

with Presbyterian government. Scottish historian Allan I. Macinnes viewed the document as more than just a revolutionary declaration. He argued the National Covenant “was not a private league of rebellious subjects, nor even an aristocratic reaction against the personal rule of Charles I, but a nationalist manifesto asserting the independence of a sovereign people under God.”⁴⁸ Archibald Johnston, Lord Warriston, a Scottish statesman and judge, and Scottish theologian Alexander Henderson wrote the manifesto. Johnson wanted to revive the Scottish National Covenant of 1581 and remove all religious innovations that had entered the Church of Scotland since that year. Moreover, the Scottish profession of faith bound together their political nation, provided unity of religion, and gave the Covenanters control over Scottish society. The Scottish political nation was not a unified body and the nobility and clergy, especially godly ministers, did not work easily together. The Prayer Book gave the nobility and clergy a common cause, and they worked together in opposition to it. By going around the Scottish government to impose liturgical practices on the nation, Charles had abandoned all pretence of constitutional government in religion. Further, the Service Book enforced on Scotland attacked the established Calvinist orthodoxy, and the Covenanters recognized how the Laudian ascendancy attempted to displace Calvinist doctrine in England. The fear that Calvinist doctrine was being removed from the Church of Scotland influenced the Covenanters to protect their religion and condemn the Prayer Book on three grounds. A constitutional assembly did not introduce the book, it undermined the religious standards and Calvinist doctrine in Scotland, and the contents of the Service Book were closer to

⁴⁸ Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, 173.

Catholicism than the Reformed tradition of the Scottish Kirk.⁴⁹ Charles responded and denounced the Covenanters as rebels and began planning to suppress the Scottish rebellion through force.

Charles's distance from Scotland played a key role in how he responded to the Scottish rebellion. He received poor advice and information on the events taking place in Scotland, which influenced him to suppress the conflict with force and refuse to make any concessions. Scottish Catholics and bishops convinced Charles that the uprising over the Prayer Book was a Calvinist conspiracy to undermine his authority and permanently destroy episcopacy in Scotland. Charles also did not understand why the Scots were against the Service Book. Since an edition of the book was created specifically for Scotland, with the input of Scottish bishops, Charles thought it should be used in their liturgical practices without complaint. Furthermore, he believed the book did not contain popery or religious innovations, so the Scottish Covenanters should accept it. Charles did not realize forcing the Scots to worship from an English style Prayer Book was offensive to them. To make his opinion on the Scots and their rebellion known, Charles gave proclamations in 1638 and had them printed so they would reach the English populace. These printed pamphlets began the attempts in English print culture to influence the English people to support Charles in his conflict against the Scottish Covenanters.

2. Proclamations from the King

On June 28, 1638, a pamphlet curiously attributed to "Scotland Sovereign" and titled *Charles by the grace of God, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland*,

⁴⁹ Ibid., 162.

Defender of the Faith was printed. The pamphlet explained to the English populace that Charles and his government were aware of the disorders occurring in Scotland. The work declared the disturbances were based on the pretence of opposition to the Service Book and Scottish fear of innovation of religion and law. Since the rebellious activities in Scotland were increasing, Charles claimed, “We neither were, are, nor by the Grace of God ever shall be stained with Popish superstition: But by the contrarie, are resolved to maintain the true Protestant Christian Religion already [present] within this our ancient Kingdome.” Further, Charles expected all good and loyal subjects to remain obedient to him.⁵⁰ This pamphlet was also printed in Edinburgh. The Scottish edition announced that the decisions of Scottish commissioners were nullified and any future meetings would be viewed as treason.⁵¹ Charles portrayed the Scots as causing disorder in order to usurp his royal authority. The proclamation also alleged the Scottish were not rebelling over religion, and they would continue to rebel regardless of any religious compromises made by Charles. Rather, the Scots were using religion as an excuse to overthrow the English government.

An anonymous Scot responded to Charles’s June 28th proclamation. In the work, the author claimed the Scottish noblemen, barons, gentlemen, burgesses, ministers, and commoners were all Charles’s true and loyal subjects and were happy to live under a religious and righteous king. The work went on to clarify that the Scots were not

⁵⁰ Scotland Sovereign, *Charles by the grace of God, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith. To our Lovits* (1638).

⁵¹ Scotland Sovereign, *Charles by the grace of God, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith. To our Lovits* (Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Young, printer to the Kings most excellent Majestie, 1638).

rebellling against Charles. They were rebelling against innovations in Scottish religion, law, and liberty. The author explained that it was difficult for the Scots to rebel, but rebellion was necessary to keep them from forsaking their religion and breaking their covenant with God. Their opposition to the Prayer Book ensured there were neither innovations in religion nor popish superstitions in the Church of Scotland.⁵²

Later in the year on February 27, a day before the Scots signed their National Covenant, Charles I issued proclamations at court at Whitehall. Two of these proclamations were produced as pamphlets. In *A Proclamation and Declaration to inform Our loving Subjects of Our Kingdom of England of the seditious practices of some in Scotland, seeking to overthrow Our Regall Power under false pretences of Religion*, Charles explained to his subjects that the disorder in Scotland began under the pretence of religion which was a cloak for their disobedience. “The aim of these men is not Religion (as they [falsely] pretend and publish) but it is to shake off all monarchical government.” Charles reminded his subjects that the power he held over Scotland was justly descended on him from God. Also, he warned readers that Scottish anger over Charles’s authority was far reaching and their cunning ways were attempts to gain power from England. The Scots wanted to seduce the English people to fall into rebellious behavior and poison the hearts of the “good and loyall subjects of this our kingdom.” Charles expected

⁵² Anon, *The Protestation of the Noblemen, Barrons, Gentlemen, Borrowes, Ministers, and Commons, Subscribers of the Confession of Faith and Covenant, lately renewed within the Kingdome of Scotland, made at the Mercate Crosse of Edinburgh, the 4. Of Julij immediatly after the reading of the proclamation, dated 28. June 1638* (Printed in the year of God, 1638), A2, 4, and 5.

Englishmen to continue ignoring these traitors and remain loyal to England.⁵³ In a second pamphlet, *A Proclamation declaring those of Scotland, who have entred, or shall enter this Kingdom in a Warlike manner, and their Adherents, to be Rebels and Traitours to His Majestie*, Charles explained he had shown the rebellious Scots “mildnesse and clementie (beyond that of Sovereign Princes).” Charles’s “Princely Lenity” towards the Scots had no effect in stopping their disloyalty and rebellion. The pamphlet went on to claim the Scots “have now so far proceeded as to take up Arms, to gather forces, and in a hostile manner have entred and invaded this kingdom of England.”⁵⁴ Charles intended to use these printed proclamations to warn his subjects of what was occurring in Scotland and persuade them not to sympathize with the Scottish people.

3. Printed Sermons

Printed sermons were an integral part of seventeenth century print culture in England and Scotland. Preachers spoke directly to the common people, and the literate populace could read their published sermons. Printed sermons also had the ability to influence the people. Lawrence Stone reflected in his monograph *The Causes of the English Revolution 1529-1642* that “the most important propaganda instrument of the day

⁵³ England and Wales Sovereign. By the King, *A Proclamation and Declaration to inform Our loving Subjects of Our Kingdom of England of the seditious practices of some in Scotland, seeking to overthrow Our Regall Power under false pretences of Religion* (London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1638).

⁵⁴ England and Wales. By the King, *A Proclamation declaring those of Scotland, who have entred, or shall enter this Kingdom in a Warlike manner, and their Adherents, to be Rebels and Traitours to His Majestie* (London: Printed by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1638), 1.

was the pulpit.”⁵⁵ Preachers used printed sermons to spread their message, or the message of the person who commissioned the sermon, to the populace. Rather than introducing new themes in sermons which could confuse the reader, ministers would use familiar doctrine to deliver their opinions seamlessly to the reader. This style of sermon was printed in 1638.

With the unrest and rebellion in Scotland over *The Book of Common Prayer*, it became necessary to ensure that the English populace did not support the Covenanters in their cause. The doctrine of obedience was important in both English and Scottish churches. Calvinists believed this doctrine was important in the order of nature, and Michael Walzer claimed the Calvinist belief in obedience to God rather than man was one of “the most significant [platitudes] in the history of political thought.”⁵⁶ In 1638, English and Scottish ministers discussed obedience differently. Englishmen were told to behave obediently, while the Scots argued that their actions were a show of obedience to God.

English preachers did not alter the doctrine of obedience in their attempt to convince the English to obey. Examples of this are found in Laudian conformist William Hardwick and Thomas Bedford’s sermons.⁵⁷ William Hardwick preached God required that “all of us must be obedient,” and Bedford stated “when God calls for obedience by the letter of his word, we must not stand and ask him the ground, and reason of his

⁵⁵ Stone, *The Causes of the English Revolution*, 66.

⁵⁶ Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 57.

⁵⁷ Cressy, *England on Edge*, 135.

Commandement: Duties belong to us: Reasons to God.”⁵⁸ Bedford delivered his lecture at Saint Paul’s Cross outside of Saint Paul’s Cathedral. Often, Charles I approved the sermons delivered at Saint Paul’s or commanded them to be given. Bedford could be preaching on obedience at Charles’s behest. An anonymous author began his sermon as Hardwick and Bedford had. He claimed that men with honest hearts “are all ready to yield cheerfull obedience to [God] for ever.”⁵⁹ These were basic ways ministers preached on the doctrine of obedience, but they would use more influential content in their sermons to be persuasive.

Stories from *The Bible* were referenced in sermons to provide examples of biblical figures living obediently. An anonymous author used the stories of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-Nego from the book of Daniel, and Abraham as he prepared to kill his own son Isaac, as examples of ideal obedience.⁶⁰ Curiously, some of Thomas Hooker’s sermons were reprinted in London in 1638 when Hooker was in America. This shows Hooker’s work remained popular even when he had fled England. Like the anonymous author, Hooker referenced the story of Abraham obeying God’s command to

⁵⁸ William Hardwick, *Conformity with Piety, requisite in Gods Service. Delivered in a Visitation Sermon at Kingston upon Thames September 8. 1638* (London: Printed by I. Okes for Richard Cartwright and are to be sold at his shop in Duck lane next Smithfeld, 1638), 9; and Thomas Bedford, *A Treatise of the Sacraments According to the Doctrin of the Church of England touching that Argument. Collected out of the Articles of Religion, the Publique Catechism, the Liturgie, and the Book of Homilies. With a Sermon preached in publique Lecture, appointed for Saint Pauls Crosse, on the feast of Saint Johns Baptist, June 24. 1638* (London: Printed by Richard Bishop, for Abel Ropen, and are to bee sold at his shop, at the black spred Eagle in Fleet-street, over against S. Dunstans Church, 1638), 40.

⁵⁹ Anon, *The Stay of the Faithfull: Together with the Properties of an honest Heart. In Two Sermons* (London: Printed by M.F. for R. Dawlman, and are to be sold by Thomas Nichols in Popes-head Alley at the sign of the Bible, 1638), 23.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 33 and 70.

kill his son Isaac.⁶¹ These stories were used to convince English readers that no harm would come to them if they lived in obedience like these men from *The Bible*. Laudian Edward Boughen relied on a more persuasive example.⁶² He preached on Jesus' obedience and said, "Neither did our Saviour onely teach this doctrine, but he practiced it in his owne person, giving us an example, how to behave our selves in the like kind. For our Saviour submitted himself freely to the orders of that Church, wherein he lived."⁶³ This work could be viewed two ways. It used Jesus as an example of obedience for the English to follow and pointed out that Jesus obeyed the church. These were biblical figures the English would be acquainted with, and they would want to behave as these men of God had.

While some sermons were devoted to a specific type of obedience, there were also unique sermons printed on the doctrine in England. Minister Samuel Smith used his sermon to argue that Christians must live in obedience, because "God hath a Booke of Life, and hath written downe the very names of every man and woman that shall be saved, and hath withal shewed us the way that leades unto Life."⁶⁴ Smith reminded his

⁶¹ Thomas Hooker, *Foure Learned and Godly Treatises; The Carnall Hypocrite. The Churches Deliverances. The Deceitfulnesse of Sinne. The Benefit of Afflictions* (London: Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Andrew Crooke, and are to be sold at the signe of the Beare in Pauls Churchyard, 1638), 210-211.

⁶² Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 475.

⁶³ Edward Boughen, *A Sermon Concerning Decencie and Order in the Church. Preached at Wood-Church, in the Diocesse of Canterburie, April. 30. 1637* (London: 1638), 14.

⁶⁴ Samuel Smith, *The great assize, or, Day of jubilee. Delivered in foure sermons upon the 20. Chapter of the Revel. Ver. 12. 13. 14. 15. Whereunto are annexed two sermons upon the 1. Chapter of the Canticles, verse 6. 7. The tenth impression, corrected and amended by the author Samuel Smith, minister of the word of God at Prittlewell in Essex* (London: Printed by John Okes, 1638), 122-123.

readers that God was always aware of how they acted, and this should influence how they behaved. William Laud's protégé, Jeremy Taylor, acted as an example to the people.⁶⁵ He proclaimed, "It was obedience to my Superiour that [engaged] me upon this last Anniversary commemoration of the great Goodnesse of God Almighty to our King and Country in the discovery of the most damnable Powder-Treason."⁶⁶ If men like Taylor who had authority showed obedience, the common man should be willing to do the same. These various examples of obedience attempted to persuade the English to behave appropriately towards the church and authority figures. Although difficult to quantify, a segment of the English populace was sympathetic to the Scottish cause. English preachers were determined to maintain obedience in England and hinder disobedience from spreading into society. Scottish theologians also discussed this doctrine, but they argued their rebellion was obedience to God.

Scottish clergy preached on strict obedience to God. In 1638, James Marques explained why the Scottish renewed their Confession of Faith. He claimed:

"We thought fit to reconcile our selves to him again, by renewing the same Covenant. And so, in obedience to his divine Commandement, conforme to the practice of the godly in former times, and according to the laudable example of our religious Progenitours, warranted by acts of Council, we again renewed our confession of Faith of this Kirk and Kingdome, as a reall testimonie of our fidelitie to God, in bearing wisse to the truth of that Religion whereunto we were sworn to adhere in Doctrine and Discipline."⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 491.

⁶⁶ Jeremy Taylor, *A Sermon Preached in Saint Maries Church in Oxford. Upon the Anniversary of the Gunpowder-Treason* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University, 1638), A2-A3.

⁶⁷ James Marques, *An Answer to the Profession and Declaration* (Edinburgh: 1638), 5.

According to Marques, Scotland acted in obedience to God's commandment when they renewed their Confession of Faith. Archibald Johnston Warriston agreed with Marques and professed, "We have declared before God and the world, that this our Covenant, as it now standeth sworne and subscribed, is lawfull and necessary, that it is done in obedience to the commandment of God."⁶⁸ Alexander Henderson also shared this belief, but he reminded his fellow Scots that they needed to continually submit to the commandment of God because the Church of Scotland was not a substitute for their own behavior.⁶⁹ Scottish Calvinist, and former Jesuit, Thomas Abernethie used Acts 5:29, "We ought to obey God rather than man," to preach that a person must never let their obedience to God be usurped.⁷⁰ Scottish theologians strove to show that they would remain obedient to God through their actions and behavior. Although sermons on the doctrine of obedience were delivered in both England and Scotland, the differences in how England and Scotland used this doctrine can be seen. English preachers focused on ensuring that their citizens remained subservient, while the Scots maintained Calvinist thought and argued their actions were obedience to God and no other form of obedience was necessary.

⁶⁸ Archibald Johnston Warriston, *Reasons against the rendering of Our sworne and subscribed Confession of Faith* (Edinburgh: 1638), #4.

⁶⁹ Alexander Henderson, *The Answeres of Some Brethren of the Ministerie, to the Replies of the Ministers and Professours of Divinitie in Aberdene, concerning the late Covenant* (Aberdeen: Printed by Edward Raban, 1638), 17.

⁷⁰ Thomas Abernethie, *Abjuration of Poperie, by Thomas Abernethie: Sometime Jesuite, but now penitent Sinner, and an unworthy Member of the true reformed Church of God in Scotland, at Edinburgh, in the Grayfriar Church, the 24. Of August, 1638* (Edinburgh: Printed in King James his College, by George Anderson, 1638), 27; and *The Holy Bible*, 970.

Due to the dispute over the Service Book, peace and unity became important in English and Scottish sermons. Pastors in each kingdom took distinctly different stances on these issues. In England, the focus was on the disruption of peace and unity throughout the British Isles and what would befall England in a divided society. In contrast, Scotland argued their National Covenant brought peace and unified the Reformed religion in England and Scotland.

English Bishop of Norwich Edward Reynolds and English divine Richard Gardiner published works on peace and unity in 1638. Godly pastor Reynolds believed there were two potential enemies to a divided church, Satan and those against Christianity. He proclaimed, “A Kingdom divided within it self cannot stand at any time, much lesse when it wageth War with a Forreign and Potent Adversary, such as Satan, and all other Enemies of the Church.”⁷¹ Christians splitting weakened the church and made it susceptible to enemies on earth and in the spiritual realm. A unified church provided England safety and protected the people against the tactics of Satan. In Oxford, Richard Gardiner stated peace was the gift of God.⁷² The vagueness of these sermons allowed the reader to develop his own opinion on the issue of peace and unity. Charles’s supporters would view the Scots as disrupting the church’s peace and causing divisions, while those

⁷¹ Edward Reynolds, *A Sermon Touching the Peace and Edification of the Church. Preached at the Second Triennial Visitation of the Right Reverend Father in God, Francis Lord Bishop of Peterborough, at Daventry in Northamptonshire, July 12. 1637* (London: Printed for Robert Bostock, at the signe of the Kings Head in St. Paul’s Church-yard, 1638), 9.

⁷² Richard Gardiner, *A Sermon Preach’d on Easter-Day at Oxford, in Saint Peters Church in the East, the Accustomed place for the Rehearsall Sermon on that Day: Wherein is prov’d the Sonnes Equality with the Father, the Deity of the Holy Ghost, and The Resurrection of the same Numericall Body, Against the old, and Recent Oppugners of these Sacred Verities* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, for Francis Bowman, 1638), 24.

sympathetic to the Scottish cause would view the Scottish Prayer Book as the cause of the breakdown of peace between England and Scotland.

Even with Scotland in open rebellion, Scottish clergy still preached on peace and unity. A work printed in 1638 claimed the Covenanters signed the National Covenant to provide peace and harmony in Scotland and provide an example for other Christian nations to follow.⁷³ John Forbes' sermon, *A Peaceable Warning, to the Subjects in Scotland: Given in the Yeare of God 1638*, thoroughly demonstrated the need for peace. Forbes referred to God as "the Lord God of Trueth and Peace, who hath tolde us by His holie Prophet, That Hee will restore Health unto his Church...His Grace be with thee, that thous mayest [love] Trueth and Peace."⁷⁴ Forbes wanted the Scots to remain united in faith and live in peace. He further preached:

"Let us not judge hardlie, or uncharitable, one of another, nor breake the Bond of Peace, and Christian Brotherhood, for the diversitie of Opinions amongst us, in these economicall and rituall Controversies. But where-to we have already attained, let us walke by the same rule, let us [mind] the same thing; with all lowlinesse & meeknesse, with long-suffering; forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unitie of the Spirit, in the bond of Peace."⁷⁵

According to Forbes, those within the church who did not strive for unity and peace were viewed as opposing Christianity. Archibald Johnston Warriston also preached on those who were against peace. He strongly declared "cursed bee these that doe not wish and

⁷³ T.H., *The Beautie of the Remarkable Yeare of Grace, 1638. The Yeare of the great Covenant of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Printed by George Anderson, 1638).

⁷⁴ John Forbes, *A Peaceable Warning, to the Subjects in Scotland: Given in the Yeare of God 1638* (Aberdeen: Imprinted by Edw. Raban, 1638), 5-6.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.

pray for peace, in the purity and power thereof according to the word of God.”⁷⁶

Although both English and Scottish preachers focused on peace and unity, each side discussed the theme differently. English preachers were vague on who caused the breakdown of peace between England and Scotland, while Scottish preachers wanted those within Scotland to remain united. Both countries produced works on unity due to splits in society. Bishops and Catholics in Scotland opposed the Covenanters, and there were pro-Scot Englishmen in England. Further division in either country was a possibility, and due to this, pastors attempted to maintain unity in their respective country.

4. Sermons Against the Scots

While obedience, peace, and unity were typical themes found in sermons, there were English works in 1638 directly aimed at the Covenanters. These printed attacks focused on condemning the Scots so strongly that Englishmen would have no desire to support them. Laudians William Hardwick and Edward Boughen strongly disparaged the Scots in their sermons. Hardwick explicitly attacked the Scots, Puritans and others who separated from the church by claiming:

“They read the Gospells, and yet are unclean; they heare the Apostles, they frequent Sermons, and yet are Drunkards; they follow Christ, and yet are Theeves; they lead a wicked life, and yet they boast that they have a righteous Law. But now, if ye please, ye shall heare what these Heathen people inferred and conclude upon all this.”⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Archibald Johnston Warriston, *A Short Relation of the State of the Kirk of Scotland since the Reformation of Religion, to the present time for information, and advertisement to our Brethren in the Kirk of England, By an hearty Well wisher to both Kingdomes* (Edinburgh: 1638), 20.

⁷⁷ Hardwick, *Conformity with Piety*, 25.

During this time period, Laudians often linked Calvinist Scots and English Puritans together. Nicolas Tyacke stated in his work, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640*, that “Arminians became increasingly uninhibited in describing Calvinists as Puritans.”⁷⁸ David Cressy agreed with Tyacke and argued, “Laudian conformists branded their opponents ‘with the nicknames of puritan, Brownist, schismatic, and precise fellow’, as if these words were interchangeable. They used the word puritan promiscuously to denigrate or to demonize their opponents.”⁷⁹ Boughen also spoke derisively about the Covenanters when he explained that those who disobey are not men after God’s heart. He preached on Romans 13:2 and stated, “whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation: damnation at least of that which is commanded to obey, and that’s the soule.”⁸⁰ Further, Boughen condemned the Scots to damnation for rebelling and refusing to obey those with power, since those who despise their government walk after the flesh, and those who speak against authority are “undeserving, ignorant, unlearned men; Proud, knowing nothing.”⁸¹ If these statements against the Scots were not enough, Boughen also compared their rebellion and disobedience to “the sin of witchcraft” based

⁷⁸ Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 57.

⁷⁹ Cressy, *England on Edge*, 142.

⁸⁰ Boughen, *A Sermon Concerning Decencie and Order in the Church*, 19 and 25; and *The Holy Bible* 1009.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 24-25.

on 1 Samuel 15:23.⁸² The European witch craze was still fresh in the minds of the English and Scottish people and equating the Scots to practitioners of witchcraft was a strong attack. Scottish witchcraft historian Christina Larner argued that the years 1629 and 1630 saw a witchcraft panic in Scotland, and after this panic, “Scotland shared the decline in prosecutions which followed the peak of 1628 to 1630.”⁸³ Even with a decline in witchcraft, there were still 133 females and 38 males accused of witchcraft in Scotland between 1630 and 1639.⁸⁴ Laudians attacked the Presbyterian Scots as unlearned heathens, drunkards, men who walk after the flesh, and were similar to practitioners of witchcraft. Hardwick and Boughen attempted to make the Covenanters an undesirable group and deter Englishmen from supporting the Scottish cause.

Scottish author David Browne responded to the attacks against the Scottish Covenanters. While Browne does not directly respond to Hardwick and Boughen, he produced a work to remove the negative and vulgar opinions that had been printed against the Scots. He sought to accomplish this by commending the Scottish people. Browne stated that England and Scotland both contained learned men and talented writers, and Scottish men were as educated and talented as men from any other country.⁸⁵

⁸² Ibid.; and *The Holy Bible*, 257.

⁸³ Christina Larner, *Enemies of God: The Witch-hunt in Scotland* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1981), 28.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 91.

⁸⁵ David Browne, *The Introduction to the true understanding of the whole Arte of Expedition in preaching to write, Intermixed with rare discourses of other matters, to shew the possibilitie of skill in teaching, and probabilitie of successe in learning, to write in 6. Hours. Which tending all to one end, doe serve for two uses. 1. If Authors doe excel others in their owne Artes, Why may not this Author excel others in his Arte? 2. For removing a vulgare opinion against his native countrey of Scotland, he sheweth that it hath... excellent Prerogatives than any other Kingdome. Whereby it will rather follow, that a Scottishman is*

Browne pointed to the strength of Scotland by reflecting that even the Ancient Romans were never able to conquer the Scottish.⁸⁶ Moreover, Scottish men were excellent warriors, the best fortifiers of all nations, forced the Romans to construct Hadrian's Wall, and had the strongest buildings and rarest monuments of any country. Scotland also created the "most religious covenant of any nation since the days of the gospel in the happy reign of King James of blessed memory" and refused to yield to any other kingdom.⁸⁷ Browne's work provided Scottish readers with a sense of pride in their country to make them proud to be Scottish and keep them unified.

5. Sermons Against Catholicism

While some English sermons vilified the Covenanters, the Calvinist Scots focused their opposition on Catholicism. While Laudians moved the Church of England to a balance between Catholic and Reformed, the Church of Scotland remained firmly Reformed in faith. This can be seen as far back as the year 1568 when the Scottish gave their *Confession of the Faith*. In this confession, reprinted in 1638, the church stated their view on the Lord's Supper by proclaiming, "Not that we imagine any Transubstantiation of Bread into Christs naturall Body, and of Wine into his naturall Bloud, as the Papists have perniciously taught and damnably believed."⁸⁸ The Church of Scotland went on to

so much the more able to prosecute whatsoever hee undertaketh, and therefore so much the more to be respected, by how much he is more ingenuous than one of another nation (1638), D2.

⁸⁶ Ibid., E1-E2.

⁸⁷ Ibid., F1.

⁸⁸ Church of Scotland, *The Confession of the Faith, and Doctrine Believed and professed by the Protestants of Scotland, exhibited to the Estates of the first Parliament of King James the sixth: Holders at Edinburgh, the 25 day of December, 1568, and authorized there* (Edinburgh: Printed by George Anderson, 1638), 21.

state that papists “delight in vanitie, cruelty, filthinesse, superstition, [and] idolatrie, [and] shall be adjudged to the fire unquenchable, wherein they shall be tormented for ever, as well in their owne bodies, as in their souls, which now they give to serve the divell in all abomination.”⁸⁹ Those within the Reformed Church strongly opposed superstition and idolatry. An example of this belief was found in former Jesuit Thomas Abernethie’s *Abjuration of Poperie*. Abernethie joined the Church of Scotland and delivered a sermon to show how God delivered him from the “monstruous sin of Poperie...[and the liturgy] of Superstitious idolatrie” in Catholicism.⁹⁰ Instead of simply switching denominations, Abernethie felt the need to attack Catholicism. In his sermon, he defined popery as:

“a superstitious masse of policie, under pretext of religion: And examining more narrowlie I found these foure points, philosophie, vaine deceit or sophistrie, traditions of men, and the rudiments of the world, to be the foure pillers whereupon the Babylonish tower of Rome doth stand: or else the foure wheeles whereupon that...cart of superstitious masses and heathenish idolatrie is drawn [through] the world and will be drawn, till it please God, to consume that Man of Sin with the Spirit of his mouth, and destroy him with the brightnesse of his coming.”⁹¹

Andrew Ramsay delivered a sermon when Thomas Abernethie was received into the Church of Scotland. *A Warning to Come Out of Babylon* strongly attacked the Roman Church, which is “branded with three titles and names, of Egypt, Sodome, and [Babylon].”⁹² Some Scottish clergymen produced strong attacks on superstition, idolatry,

⁸⁹ Ibid., 28.

⁹⁰ Abernethie, *Abjuration of Poperie*, 13

⁹¹ Ibid., 22.

⁹² Andrew Ramsay, *A Warning to Come Out of Babylon, In a Sermon preached by Master Andrew Ramsay, Minister at Edinburg; At the receiving of Mr. Thomas Abernethie, sometime Jesuit, into the Societie of the truly reformed Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh: 1638), 6.

and the Catholic Church in 1638, but others expressed strong opposition to *The Book of Common Prayer*.

The Scots would have opposed superstition and idolatry without Charles and Laud's attempt to enforce religious uniformity, but the Prayer Book gave preachers a specific topic to attack in 1638. Scottish theologian George Gillespie stated the Prayer Book "hath all the substance and essentiall parts of the Masse, and so brings in the most abominable idolatry that ever was in the world, in worshiping of a breaden God and makes way to the Antichrist of Rome to bring this Land under his bondage againe."⁹³ Gillespie went on to describe all the Catholic practices found in the Prayer Book. He stated that even if the idolatrous mass was removed, there were still:

"a number of Popish superstitions and idolatrous ceremonies: as, 29 holy days, whereof 22 are dedicated to Saints, two of them to the Virgin Mary, the one whereof is called, The Anuntiation of our Lady...It hath 14 Fasting days, and some weekes. It hath also the humane Sacraments of Crosse in Baptisme, laying on of the Bishops hand in confirmation: a Ring for the outward seal in [Marriage]: a sanctified Font, holie water, holinesse of Churches and Chancels: private Baptisme, private Communion, Ceremonies for Buriall of the dead, and purification of women after Childbirth, the Priest standing, kneeling, turning to the people, and consequentlie from them, speaking with a loud voice, and consequentlie sometimes with a lowe voice."⁹⁴

Gillespie focused his attack on the Catholic elements in *The Book of Common Prayer*, but Archibald Johnston Warriston and Alexander Henderson were more general in their attack on the liturgical work. Johnston stated that bishops were the "chiefe authors of

⁹³ George Gillespie, *Reasons For which the Service Booke, urged upon Scotland ought to bee refused* (Edinburgh: Printed in the year of God, 1638), #2.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, #3.

[the] evils [of the Service Book]” and were responsible for its printing.⁹⁵ Henderson called the work a “superstitious service book” that contained innovations in religion. It was “pestred with Poperie...[and has] the seeds of Romish Heresie, Superstition, Idolatrie, and Papall tyrannie.”⁹⁶ Rather than simply attacking the work, John Forbes explained why the Covenanters opposed it. He claimed, “It is also contrarie to the laws of the Christian Church in all ages. For by the ancient Canons, Pastors are commanded, to contayne themselves within the limites of their owne Charge.”⁹⁷ Lastly, an anonymous Scottish author produced a work to describe how Catholics fled Scotland and went to England.

“The Prelates hereat were so daunted, as their courage began to faile them, & what to doe, they know not; for they perceive that their Kingdome of Darknes, is now falling and out they must. Hereupon some of them secretly fled away into England, and these poore hearts, being full of greefe, used sundry episcopall meanes, or antidotes to expel the venomous defeate, which they brought with them from Scotland.”

Catholic prelates fled Scotland, entered England, and were now influencing affairs in England by making false and grievous complaints against the Scots and persuading Charles to take up arms against them.⁹⁸ These printed sermons against superstition and

⁹⁵ Warriston, *A Short Relation of the State of the Kirk of Scotland*, 9 and 19.

⁹⁶ Henderson, *The Answeres of Some Brethren of the Ministerie*, 12-13, 17, 25, and 29.

⁹⁷ John Forbes, *Generall Demands, Concerning the Late Covenant; Propounded by the Ministers and Professors of Divinitie in Aberdene: To some Reverend Brethren, who came thither to recommend the Late Covenant to Them, and to those who are committed to their Charge: Together With the Answeres of those Reverend Brethren to the sayd Demands: As also the Replies of the foresaid Ministers and Professors to their Answeres* (Aberdeen: Printed by Edward Raban, 1638), 6.

⁹⁸ Anon, *The Beast is Wounded. Or Information from Scotland, concerning their Reformation. Wherein is briefly declared, the true cause and ground of all the late Troubles there; and the reasons why they have rejected the Bishops, with their Courts, Canons, Ceremonies and Service-booke* (Scotland: 1638), 15-16.

idolatry were significant. Multiple Scottish authors opposed the Service Book and produced a unified attack. They also directed the blame for the imposition of the work, and the troubles that arose from it, on Catholicism. Most importantly, this was the beginning of the Anglo-Scottish print war.

6. Conclusion

The literature printed in England and Scotland in 1638 had two distinctly different goals. Charles I gave proclamations accusing the Scots of using religion as pretence for their goal of overthrowing his authority. English sermons focused on maintaining the obedience of the English populace, discussed peace and unity tentatively, and portrayed the Covenanters negatively. Scottish printed works differed. The Scots claimed that they were maintaining strict obedience to God by signing their National Covenant. Moreover, it was clear in their printed sermons that the Covenanters were not against the English people. They attacked superstition, idolatry, and Catholicism. The Scottish ministers even explained that they were not against Charles. They were against the Catholics who were influencing Charles to oppose Scotland. Scottish print culture in 1638 laid the foundation for the print war that would continue to develop during the Bishops' Wars.

Chapter 2

1639: The Creation of a Protestant-Catholic Print War

1. Introduction

In the beginning of 1639, Charles and the Covenanters both began preparing for war. Charles withdrew his Prayer Book demands on Scotland, but it was an empty gesture since no one in Scotland read the work or used it. The king also sent Scottish nobleman James Hamilton, Marquess of Hamilton, to negotiate with the Covenanters and stall them until Charles had time to gather an army.⁹⁹ Charles was driven to stop the Scottish rebellion, and despite managing to only raise a poorly trained army of 20,000 men, he believed a show of force would scatter the rebels. Charles mobilized his army, marched north in April and May, and started the First Bishops' War. The war received its name because it was fought over episcopacy in Scotland.

Since Covenanter print culture strongly stated they were defending their religion, Charles attempted to take advantage of their defensive stance. He did not fear a Scottish offensive attack and planned to establish eastern, western, and southern fronts with the ultimate goal of capturing Edinburgh to establish his authority.¹⁰⁰ The Covenanters were in a problematic position as Charles moved north. Richard Cust described the Scottish frame of mind as the Covenanters prepared for war. He explained “they were...conscious that if public opinion in England – which was deeply divided over the wisdom of fighting the war – was to turn decisively against them they would be in an extremely precarious

⁹⁹ Russell, *The Crisis of Parliaments*, 326.

¹⁰⁰ Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars*, 4 and 22.

position.”¹⁰¹ Luckily for the Scots, Charles’s war plan completely collapsed. General Alexander Leslie led the Covenanter army with his innovative up-to-date warfare tactics that he learned on continental Europe when he fought for the Swedes during the Thirty Years’ War. Leslie quickly moved his forces to Berwick, south of Edinburgh, and established a strong defensive position. The western attack from Ireland never came, and in the east, Aberdeen fell to the Covenanters. Charles’s hope of a Catholic uprising in Scotland never occurred, and his goal of suppressing the rebellion and forcing obedience floundered. The disciplined Scottish army stunned the English, and although the English army was larger, Leslie’s tactics in early June made his army seem much larger than it actually was. The rumors of the large Scottish army unnerved Charles and the First Bishops’ War ended with minor conflict. Leslie’s bluff forced Charles to settle for temporary peace.

Charles and the Covenanters signed the Treaty of Berwick in June 1639 which signified a tentative truce between England and Scotland. As part of the treaty, Charles agreed to withdraw his forces from Scotland and give the power to decide ecclesiastical issues to the Scottish General Assembly and Parliament. In return, the Covenanters also disbanded their army and restored to the Crown all property and castles seized during the war. The peace had no hope of being maintained since the sides were divided over bishops. Charles wanted them to stay in Scotland and the Covenanters wanted to abolish them. In August, this tension was amplified when the Covenanters announced that the

¹⁰¹ Cust, *Charles I*, 245.

Scottish bishops were removed from power in Scotland. This decision incensed Charles, and he began preparing for the resumption of war in November.

Charles's actions in the First Bishops' War left him open to attack in Scottish print culture. According to Caroline Hibbard, crypto-Catholic commanders, Arundel, Cottington, and Windeback led the English army in the First Bishops' War. Charles's army also used Catholic forces in battle, and Charles attempted to raise money for the expedition from English Catholics. Since there was Catholic influence in the First Bishops' War, Scottish authors who discussed a popish plot in England were not creating entirely false rumors.¹⁰² Scottish propaganda continued to oppose Catholicism, and it became more persuasive due to the Catholic involvement in the First Bishops' War. Further, the belief in a popish plot, a Catholic invasion of England, or a Catholic uprising from within England, began to be viewed as a possibility. As Richard Cust discussed, English public opinion on the war was divided. The Covenanters referenced a Catholic plot in England to garner further sympathy from the English people, while English printed works strove to remind their populace that they needed to remain obedient and united in England.

2. Discourse Between Scottish Churches

A debate between theologians in Scotland began in late 1638, but the printing of this discourse did not occur until 1639. A work attributed to the Episcopal Church of Scotland, which represented the protest of the Archbishops and Bishops in the Church of Scotland, opposed the Covenanter rebellion in Scotland. This protest was printed in

¹⁰² Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot*, 99-101 and 108.

London and Aberdeen.¹⁰³ James Hamilton, Charles's High Commissioner in Scotland, stated in the introduction of the document that it was Charles's pleasure to print the protests of the bishops in Scotland. The bishops proclaimed that all clergy in assembly gave an oath which acknowledged and recognized Charles's authority as Scotland's sovereign king.¹⁰⁴ The bishops condemned the Scottish print culture and stated, "For that by their seditious and railing Sermons and Pamphlets, they have wounded the Kings honour and soveraigne authority, and animated his [lieges] to rebellion."¹⁰⁵ Bishops in the Episcopal Church of Scotland argued that the Covenanters were wrong to oppose Charles and broke their oath doing so. Breaking an oath sworn before God was viewed as contrary to respectable Christian behavior.

James Hamilton expanded on the Scottish bishop's stance and published his work "by the Kings speciall command." Hamilton stated "for a man to swear against a thing which is established by the laws of the church and kingdome in which he liveth (unless that thing be repugnant to the law of God) is absolutely unlawfull."¹⁰⁶ The work

¹⁰³ Episcopal Church in Scotland, *The Declinator and Protestation of the Archbishops and Bishops, of the Church of Scotland, and others their adherents within that Kingdome, Against the pretended generall Assembly holden at Glasgow Novemb. 21. 1638* (London: Printed by John Raworth, for George Thomason and Octavian Pullen, and are to be sold at their shop, at the Rose in S. Pauls Churchyard, 1639); and Episcopal Church in Scotland, *The Declinator and Protestation of the Archbishops and Bishops, of the Church of Scotland, and others their adherents within that Kingdome, Against the pretended generall Assembly holden at Glasgow Novemb. 21. 1638* (Aberdeen: Printed by Edward Raban, according to the copie printed at London, 1639).

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 3-4.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁰⁶ Scotland Sovereign, *An Explanation of the Meaning of the Oath and Covenant. Published by the L. Marques, his Majesties High Commissioner in Scotland, By the Kings speciall command* (London: Printed by His Majesties Printer for Scotland, 1639), 4.

questioned why Covenanters viewed Charles negatively for commanding oaths to be given, despite Charles having the authority to do so, but the Covenanter oaths given to the Scottish National Covenant were not viewed in the same manner. Without explicitly stating it, Hamilton was portraying the Scottish stance on oaths as hypocritical.

The Church of Scotland responded to the works the Scottish bishops and Hamilton had printed. The Covenanter's response had to be persuasive, since the Scottish bishops and Hamilton were having their works printed in England. In December 1638 at Edinburgh, the Church of Scotland gave *The Protestation of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland*. Published in 1639, the work argued that the Service Book and Book of Canons were filled with popery and superstition. Further, the Church of Scotland explained that they would do whatever was necessary to maintain their religion, beat down all superstition, and defend their laws and liberty.¹⁰⁷ In direct response to the bishops in Scotland who produced *The Declinator and Protestation of the Archbishops and Bishops*, the Covenanters protested that it was derogatory to have bishops involved in their dispute with England over their religion. A few months later in February 1639, *An Information to all good Christians within the Kingdome of England* responded to the English propaganda that constantly attacked the Scots. The work, attributed to the Church of Scotland, explained that Scottish subjects were being called traitors, rebels, and accused of treason for discovering the wicked plot of the Service Book, which intended

¹⁰⁷ Church of Scotland, *The Protestation of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, and of the Noble-men, Barrons, Gentlemen, Burrowes, Ministers, and Commons. Subscribers of the Covenant lately made at the mercat Crosse of Edinburgh the 18. Of December 1638* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Bryson, 1639), D1-D2.

to bring popish superstition back into their Reformed religion.¹⁰⁸ *The Remonstrance of the Nobility, Barrones, Burgesses, Ministers and Commons Within the Kingdome of Scotland* also responded directly to English print culture. The work stated that in the Scottish Confession of Faith and National Covenant, the Scots declared before God that they had no intention of attempting to do anything “that might turne to the diminution of the Kings greatnesse and authority.”¹⁰⁹ This opposed the English works that accused the Scots of seditious practices seeking to overthrow Charles’s regal power under the false pretence of religion. The Church of Scotland stated they could not understand why their refusal of the superstitious Service Book and rejection of Episcopal government had been interpreted as attempts to overthrow the regal power and authority of Charles. The document went on to claim that it was blasphemy to view the National Covenant as a conspiracy against the king with the intention to do the work of the devil. The Church of Scotland explained that those who wished the National Covenant to be broken up were requesting the Scots to break their covenant with God, and the Scots would rather be incorrectly viewed as rebels and traitors than renounce God.¹¹⁰

3. Printed Sermons

The theme of obedience remained prevalent in sermons during 1639. Public opinion in England was divided over the war, and English ministers wanted the populace

¹⁰⁸ Church of Scotland, *An Information to all good Christians within the Kingdome of England*, 7-8.

¹⁰⁹ Church of Scotland, *The Remonstrance of the Nobility, Barrones, Burgesses, Ministers and Commons Within the Kingdome of Scotland, Vindicating them and their proceedings from the crymes, wherewith they are charged by the late Proclamation in England, Feb. 27 1639* (Edinburgh: Imprinted by James Bryson, 1639), 5-6.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 6,13, 21.

to maintain their obedience. Sermons, such as English clergyman Obadiah Sedgwick's *Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier*, preached that obedience to God was the proper way to behave.¹¹¹ Ensuring English soldiers remained obedient was certainly important when England was mustering an army for war. Other preachers chose to focus on preaching the consequences of disobedience. Bishop of Durham Thomas Morton preached before Charles, "They that obey not the Gospell shall be punished."¹¹² Morton also discussed the ancient Christian thinkers Tertullian and Cyrian who preached against resistance to authority. Christians in the Roman Empire had actual reasons to resist for their faith, but they chose to die rather than rebel. The sermon then moved to a discussion on how John Calvin believed in subjection and obedience, so the Scottish resistance went against Calvinist theology.¹¹³ These references are disjointed, but this could be due to Morton delivering his sermon in front of Charles as he was preparing to invade Scotland. Morton could have preached on these various topics to please the Crown. Readers of the sermon are told they will be punished for disobedience, reminded of ancient Christians who opposed resisting authority, and shown Calvin held these same beliefs. Morton would have lectured on topics Charles agreed with and wanted to hear preached. Thomas Phillips preached a similar message on disobedience and claimed those who do not obey

¹¹¹ Obadiah Sedgwick, *Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier. Drawne out in a Sermon Preached to the Captaines and Souldiers exercising Armes in the Artillery Garden, at their Generall meeting in Saint Andrew's Undershaft, in London, October 18. 1638* (London: Printed by G.M. for Thomas Nicholes, and are to be sold at the signe of the Bible in Popes-head-Alley, 1639), 38.

¹¹² Thomas Morton, *A Sermon Preached Before the Kings most Excellent Majestie, in the Cathedrall Church of Durham. Upon Sunday, being the fifth day of May. 1639* (Newcastle: Upon Tyne, by Robert Barker. Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1639).

¹¹³ Morton, *A Sermon Preached Before the Kings most Excellent Majestie*, 2-4, 20-21, and 35-38.

must fear God's vengeance.¹¹⁴ Punishment and God's vengeance attempted to influence English readers to follow authority. Sedgwick, Morton, and Phillips were relatively brief on the doctrine of obedience in their sermons, but John Gore was not.

John Gore delivered *The Man for Heaven* at the court of Charles in 1637 when the Scottish rebellion began, and the work was published again in 1639. The republishing of Gore's sermon showed it was a work Charles wanted printed to influence his English subjects. The sermon was based on Philippians 2:8, "And being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the cross."¹¹⁵ This verse referred to Jesus, and Gore continued to preach that Jesus "was not only obedient in his death, submitting himself to all the cruelty, all the infamy, all the extremity of pain and shame that God or man could lap upon him; but He was obedient unto death...from the beginning of his Incarnation, to the very end of his dissolution."¹¹⁶ Jesus was obedient while on earth, and every Christian should follow his example. Further, Jesus did not oppose the laws and government of Caesar when he stated in Matthew 22:21, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God

¹¹⁴ Thomas Phillips, *The Booke of Lamentations; or, A Treatise of Hell. Wherein is shewen, the nature of it; the place where it is, so farre as probably may be conjecture; the severall punishments of the damned therein, and aggravations of the same; the justice of God maintained in sending the wicked thither; with divers other things. As also. The Booke of Genesis; or, Christ's Genealogie. Discussed as 'tis set downe by S. Matthew in the 1 ver. Of his Gospel. Being the summe of two Sermons, preached in the Cathedral Church of Lincolne* (London: Printed by I.D. for Peter Cole, and are to be sold at the signe of the Glove in Cornhill neere the Royall-Exchange, 1639), 26.

¹¹⁵ *The Holy Bible*, 1043.

¹¹⁶ John Gore, *The Man for Heaven: A Sermon Preached at the Court to his Majesties Houshold, Anno Domini, 1637* (London: Printed by R. Bishop, for Thomas Alchorn, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the Green Dragon in Pauls Church-yard, 1639), 6.

the things that are Gods.”¹¹⁷ Gore used Jesus’ behavior to convince English subjects that they needed to follow Jesus’ example and obey their king. Two biblical verses justified this obedience to Charles. These were Hebrews 13:17, “Obey them that have the rule over you, and be submissive,” and Romans 13:1, “Let every soul be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God.”¹¹⁸ Based on Jesus’ actions and biblical scripture, Gore’s sermon intended to convince the English to obey Charles. Another printed work discussed Romans 13:1 in much greater detail.

Scottish minister and religious polemicist John Corbet supported the use of Romans 13:1 to dictate that those with authority must be obeyed. Thomas Wentworth, 1st Earl of Strafford and strong supporter of Charles I, patronized Corbet’s work *The Ungirding of the Scottish Armour*. In the work’s dedication to Strafford, Corbet claimed “the Flood of our Scottish Disorders and Uproares have overflowed the banks of divine and humane Authority [due to] a fiery-zealous Faction, [who] have...[proceeded] from evill to evill, and are an assembly of treacherous men.”¹¹⁹ Corbet’s polemic tract was structured with brief descriptions of Covenanter beliefs which Corbet directly responded

¹¹⁷ *The Holy Bible*, 872.

¹¹⁸ *The Holy Bible*, 1071 and 1009.

¹¹⁹ John Corbet, *The Ungirding of the Scottish Armour: or, An Answer to the Information for Defensive Armes against the Kings Majestie, which were drawn up at Edenburgh, by the common help and industrie of the three Tables of the rigid Covenanters of the Nobility, Barons, Ministry, and Burgesses, and ordained to be read out of Pulpit by each Minister, and pressed, upon the people, to draw them to take up armes, to resist the Lords Anointed, throughout the whole Kingdome of Scotland* (Dublin and London: Printed by the Society of Stationers, 1639), A2-A3.

to. One of the beliefs he opposed was on Romans 13:1. He asserted the Covenanters believed:

“It’s objected Rom 13.1. Let every soule be subject unto the higher powers, Answer, Tyranny and unjust violence is not the ordinance of God, and he that resisteth it, resists not the ordinance of God...we must either acknowledge Tyranny to be the ordinance of God, and for our good, or [else] exclude it from the Apostles argument, admitting the resistance therof to be lawfull, at least by the shield for defence, if not by the sword for invasion.”

Corbet depicted this Covenanter stance on biblical scripture as malice and weakness.¹²⁰

The Ungirding of the Scottish Armour also claimed that Covenanters believed Charles’s attack on Scotland was the action of a tyrant king; hence the Scots were justified in defending themselves. Furthermore, according to the Covenanters, if someone in authority “commands contrary to God, and goeth out of his order and line, especially so farr as to invade by armes, if they obey not; the subjects keeping of their own line and order, and defending themselves, is not disobedience...but obedience to God.”¹²¹ Corbet responded by reminding the Covenanters that God forbids resistance to superior powers, and they were perpetuating seditious and treasonable doctrine. English sermons used Jesus’ obedience, biblical scripture, and John Corbet’s strong polemic to impel the people to obey Charles.

With England and Scotland embroiled in war, preachers continued to discuss the importance of peace and unity. Pastors expected Christians to perform two duties, “be of

¹²⁰ Ibid., 24-25.

¹²¹ Ibid., 22.

one minde [and] live in peace.”¹²² George Downname preached that peace was found throughout Christianity. Downname died in 1634, so this work on peace was a reprint rather than a new sermon.¹²³ His work was either popular enough to be printed again or someone wanted it printed in 1639. His work stated, “God is the God of Peace, Christ is the Prince of Peace, the Angels are the Messengers of Peace, the Ministers are Preachers of Peace, the Magistrates are Defenders of Peace...[and] peace, it is the language of Heaven; the Angels speake no other.”¹²⁴ John Jones also felt peace was important in Christianity and declared, “Peace is the Nurse of Piety, the Mother of Prosperity, the Crowne of Christianity, the bond of our Religion, the Glory of our Profession. It will be both pleasant, profitable, and honourable, for us to keepe the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.”¹²⁵ Downname and Jones both argued for the importance of peace and unity in Christianity and exhorted Englishmen to maintain the established peace in their country.

English preachers did not only use peace and unity to describe an ideal Christian society. They also used these themes against the Covenanters. While preaching to English soldiers, Obadiah Sedgwick recounted how Constantine the Great at the Council of Nicea

¹²² George Downname, *An Apostolicall Injunction for Unity and Peace, or, a Sermon Preached by George Downname Master of Arts of Christs Colledge in Cambridge, to the Parishioners of Saint Stephens in Walbrooke, at his departure from them* (London: Printed by J. Okes dwelling in little S. Bartholmews, 1639), 1.

¹²³ For more information on George Downname, consult the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹²⁵ John Jones, *The Conquest of the Saints: or A short Treatise of Concord and Peace: Wherein is shewed the necessity of Unity and Peace, without which neither Church nor Common-wealth can stand* (London: Printed by G.M. for William Jones dwelling in Red-Crosse-streete, 1639), 19.

proclaimed he was more joyful in the unity of the Christian faith than the conquest of pagan enemies. Sedgwick recalled how Constantine stated, “for their swords could onely kill bodies, but Heresies doe destroy soules, the one separates soule and body, but the other separates the soule and Christ.”¹²⁶ *Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier* accused the Scots of sewing dissention in England and dividing Christianity. With such strong opposition to the disruption of peace, it became necessary to rationalize England’s participation in war. Robert Abbot recounted the stories of Josiah and Jonathan from *The Holy Bible* to do so. Since these men were at war with enemies of God, their involvement in war was acceptable.¹²⁷ Likewise, the English were justified in their war against Scotland. In addition to this literature on peace and unity, Thomas Phillips preached that those who separated from the Church of England would join with the devils rather than angels and were bound for hell.¹²⁸ Henry Tozer included that if England was without peace and unity, “[it] shall be altogether empty and hopeless.”¹²⁹ Printed sermons in England provided a strong stance on the necessity of peace. Peace should be found throughout Christianity, and it needed to be maintained in England. Other works

¹²⁶ Sedgwick, *Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier*, 77-78.

¹²⁷ Robert Abbot, *The Young-Mans Warning-peece: or, A Sermon preached at the burial of William Rogers* (London: Printed by R.B. for P. Stephens and C Meredith, and are to be sold at their shop at the signe of the Golden Lion in Pauls Church Yard, 1639), 96.

¹²⁸ Phillips, *The Booke of Lamentations*, 43.

¹²⁹ Henry Tozer, *Christian Wisdome, or The Excellency Fame and Right Meanes of True Wisdome. As it was briefly delivered in a Sermon in St. Maries Church in Oxford. November 11. 1638* (Oxford: Printed by L. Lichfield, 1639), 43.

attempted to convince Englishmen they were justified in participating in war to maintain stability in England.

The Church of Scotland also produced a work to make their feelings known on the peace between them and England. *An Information to all good Christians within the kingdome of England* responded to English sermons. The church announced, “we pray God, to avert the danger, & to grant us peace and puritie, which is the height of our desire.”¹³⁰ The war between England and Scotland saw both sides discuss the need for peace and unity. English works attempted to convince Englishmen to join the army and go to war to protect England’s peaceful kingdom. Scottish Covenanters responded by claiming peace and purity were their desire, and they wanted to avoid of the dangers of war.

4. Literature Against the Scots

The printed assault of the Scottish continued in 1639. Scottish Bishop of Down and Connor Henry Leslie produced scathing literature and led this attack. He recounted that in the beginning of the Church of Scotland’s Psalm books, disobedience to lawful authority went against the word of God.¹³¹ Based on their own confession of faith, the

¹³⁰ Church of Scotland, *An Information to all good Christians within the kingdome of England, from the Nobelmen, Barrons, Borrowes, Ministers, and Commons of the kingdome of Scotland, for vindicating their intentions and actions from the unjust calumnies of their enemies* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Bryson, 1639), 13.

¹³¹ Henry Leslie, *A Treatise of the Authority of the Church. The summe whereof was delivered in a Sermon preached at Belfast, at the Visitation of the Diocese of Downe and Conner. Intended for the satisfaction of them who in those places oppose the Orders of our Church, and now published upon occasion of a Libell sent abroad in writing, wherein this Sermon, and all his proceedings are most falsely traduced. Together with an answer to certain objections made against the Orders of our Church, especially kneeling at the Communion* (Dublin: Printed by the Society of Stationers, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, 1639), 102.

Scots should be obedient subjects to Charles's authority. Leslie also took a strong stance against those who rebelled against unity and peace within the church.

“So wee have tried all manner of faire meanes to reduce you to the unitie of the church, by admonition, exhortation, conference, instruction. Our first coming was in love, and in the spirit of meeknesse; but now I must come unto you with a rod; yea with a sword to cut off all that trouble the Churches peace.”¹³²

Leslie exhorted that the Covenanters should be removed from the Church of Scotland if they refused to live in peace with England. Leslie continued his attack on the Covenanters in *A Full Confutation of the Covenant, Lately Sworne and Subscribed by many in Scotland*. He spoke to the English populace and tried to persuade them away from supporting the Covenanters and their rebellion. He also confirmed that he was aware of some Englishmen living in disobedience. Although these men thought they could force Charles to yield to the demands of the Covenanters, Leslie said, “But deceive not yourselves; for howsoever in Scotland some thinke themselves strong enough to resist their Prince, yet (I thanke God) you are not so many here, but the Kings Laws and authority is well able to overtake you.”¹³³ The work implored its readers to consider their ways before they were also led into rebellion. Next, Leslie accused the Covenanters of having a book called “A Dialogue of White Devils”, which represented the Scots well. It is unclear if there was factuality to this statement or if it was a libel. The strongest attack

¹³² Ibid., 84.

¹³³ Henry Leslie, *A Full Confutation of the Covenant, Lately Sworne and Subscribed by many in Scotland; Delivered in a Speech, at the Visitation of Downe and Conner, Held in Lisnegarvy the 26th or September, 1638. Published by Authority* (London: Printed by John Raworth, for George Thomason, and are to be sold at the Rose in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1639), 4.

against Scotland came when Leslie accused the insurrection in Scotland of being a greater treason than the papist gunpowder plot. He preached:

“the Gun-powder-Treason was but the act of a few 16 discontented Gentlemen, and the thousand Papist in England not guilty of it; but in the present Rebellion of the Puritanes, they have ingaged a great part of that Kingdome, and many who indeed know not what the matter meanes, and so that this may be called the common sinne of that Sect, whereas the other cannot be charged upon the Religion of the Papists.”¹³⁴

Leslie’s portrayal of the Scottish rebellion attempted to strongly persuade the English from continuing to support the Scots, and he influenced other English theologians to produce similar works.

Laudian John Swan and Malachi Harris were also against the Scots.¹³⁵ These two preachers, along with Henry Leslie, focused on a specific type of attack. In 1638, Edward Boughen used 1 Samuel 15:23 and compared the Scottish rebellion to the sin of witchcraft. In 1639, Swan, Harris, and Leslie all used this verse in their sermons to equate the Covenanters with practitioners of witchcraft.¹³⁶ This was significant. Three preachers in 1639, and one in 1638, used the same style attack against the Scots. With multiple preachers claiming that the Scots were linked with witchcraft, it was much more

¹³⁴ Ibid., 10-11 and 15.

¹³⁵ For more information on John Swan being classified as a Laudian, consult the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

¹³⁶ John Swan, *A Sermon Pointing out the Chiefe Causes, and Cures, of such unruly Stirres, as are not seldom found in the Church of God. Preached at Sawston in the countie of Cambridge, at the Arch Beacon of Elie his Visitation held there, upon the nineteenth day of September, 1638* (London: Printed by I.D. and are to be sold by Daniel Pakeman, at the signe of the Raine-bow in Fleet-street neere the Temple gate, 1639), 23; Malachi Harris, *Brittaines Hallelujah or A Sermon of Thanksgiving for the happy Pacification in Brittain Preached in the English Church at Hamburch before his Excellency the Right Honorable Sir Thomas Rowe* (1639), 20; and Leslie, *A Full Confutation of the Covenant*.

believable than if only one preacher made the claim. John Swan also compared the Covenanters to Jezebel from the Book of Kings in *The Bible* and equated the Scots to pagans.¹³⁷ The term “Jezebel” was associated with pagans, false prophets, or anyone pretending to be a follower of God. Leslie, Swan, and Harris’s attacks associated the Scots with witchcraft, pagans, and accused their rebellion of being worse than the infamous Gunpowder Plot in 1605. These were strong attempts to turn the English populace against the Scots, but there was an even stronger literary work produced against Scotland.

An intriguing work of propaganda during 1639 came from Walter Balcanquhall. Balcanquhall was the dean of Rochester, an intelligence gather for Charles I, and sympathetic to the Laudians.¹³⁸ His work *A Large Declaration Concerning the Late Tumults in Scotland, From Their first originals* attacked the Covenanter’s arguments. An important aspect of Balcanquhall’s declaration was that he was a Scottishman who became a staunch supporter of Charles I and his church policies. Balcanquhall’s response to Scottish printed literature was an important piece of English propaganda. He produced his work for Charles and Robert Young, Charles’s official printer in Scotland, printed the work. A Scot attacking his own countrymen in print would be much more persuasive to English readers than a work produced by a biased Englishman.

Balcanquhall began his work by condemning the National Covenant. He called it a wicked covenant, a pretended holy league, and claimed it followed a pattern of sedition

¹³⁷ Swan, *A Sermon Pointing out the Chiefe Causes*, 20.

¹³⁸ More information on Walter Balcanquhall can be found in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

that led the Scots to establish a pretended religion through rebellion. The decision to form this covenant was called “a plot of which they are very fond, being an abortion of their owne braine, but which indeed is such a monstrous birth, as the like hath not yet beene born or bred in any Kingdome Jewish, Christian, or Pagan.”¹³⁹ Their scandal of disobedience and rebellion sought to “blow up the Religion Reformed,” and they used wicked means to alienate English citizens against Charles.¹⁴⁰ According to Balcanquhall, the Covenanters only established their covenant to overthrow the laws of the church, kingdom, and Episcopal government.

Next, Balcanquhall focused on the Scottish opposition to the Service Book. He described the Covenanter’s stance on the book as:

“not onely are sowne the seeds of divers Superstitions, Idolatrie, and false doctrine, contrarie to the true Religion established within this Realme by divers Acts of Parliament; But also the Service Booke of England is abused, especially in the matter of Communion, by additions, subtractions, interchanging of words and sentences, falsifying titles, and misplacing the Collects, to the disadvantage of Reformation, as the Romish Masse is, in the more substantiall points, made up therein, as we offer to instruct in time and place convenient, quite contrarie unto and for reversing and gracious intention of the blessed Reformers of Religion in England.”¹⁴¹

Balcanquhall claimed that the Prayer Book did not contain anything involving idolatry, popery, or superstition. He found their position absurd and reminded his readers that the

¹³⁹ Walter Balcanquhall, *A Large Declaration Concerning the Late Tumults in Scotland, From Their first originals: Together with a Particular Deduction of the seditious Practices of the prime Leaders of the Covenanters: Collected out of their owne foule Acts and Writings: By which it doth plainly appeare, that Religion was onely pretended by those Leaders, but nothing lesse intended by them. By the King* (London: Printed by Robert Young, His Majesties Printer for Scotland, 1639), 2

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 3 and 125-126.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 42.

men who first wrote the Service Book gave their lives in opposition to popery.¹⁴² Further, the religion the Covenanters wanted to maintain was also the religion of the men who first compiled the English Service Book. Balcanquhall wanted to erase any belief that England was involved with popery.

The work concluded with a discussion of some of Charles's goals. According to Balcanquhall, Charles went to Scotland to re-establish peace between the countries and intended to do so without violence. If any death did occur, Balcanquhall reminded the reader that the Scots rebelled and caused the conflict between England and Scotland; hence any causality in war was the Covenanter's fault. The author requested that the good Scottish subjects and ministers be "the messengers of peace, to frame and settle Our subjects minds to the courses and waies of peace, and to lead them on in the way of returning to Our obedience."¹⁴³ English sermons tended to focus on a variety of themes when showing their opposition to the Scots, and Balcanquhall succinctly tied all these arguments together into one large declaration.

Every English author did not take Balcanquhall's approach and produce an extensive work presenting their opinion by refuting the opinions of others. To provide a different style of printed literature, an English author could also write on the conflict between England and Scotland in poetic form. English poet Wye Saltonstall did just this. His poetic work against the Scots had the title *The Complaint of Time Against the tumultuous and Rebellious Scots. Sharpely inveighing against them (as most justly they*

¹⁴² Ibid., 173-174.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 430.

deserve) this yeare, 1639. In the introduction of his work, Saltonstall described England as being blessed by a happy government and gracious king which was being disturbed by:

“Rebellious Scots, who under pretence of Religion would overthrow the Hierarchy of the Church, pulling downe the house of God, and building Babels of their owne invention, and man’d with the furious zeale, they have raised great forces, and stand ready armed in the Field to resist the head of the Church in his Dominions our most gracious King Charles.”

Saltonstall’s prose style introduction went on to state that the rebellion of the Scots was heinous in nature and deserved vindication and revenge before it caused further division.¹⁴⁴ While Balcanquhall produced an extensive literary work against the Scots, the average Englishman might never read such a long work. Shorter literary works would reach a wider audience, and Saltonstall’s introduction was an ideal way to reach more readers.

An anonymous Englishman produced a similar literary work against the Covenanters and exhorted his fellow countrymen to avoid joining their rebellion. His work *Loyalty’s Speech to Englands Subjects; Perswading them, not to suffer Rebellion* provided different instances of rebellion throughout history. The beginning of his work claimed, “so Rebellion (a thing which I quake to heare of) Sedition (a thing which I hope I shall never heare of) are both so capitall in themselves, and so detested of all Ages, as the people must needs be barbarous that live to doe them.”¹⁴⁵ English readers might not

¹⁴⁴ Wye Saltonstall, *The Complaint of Time Against the tumultuous and Rebellious Scots. Sharpely inveighing against them (as most justly they deserve) this yeare, 1639* (London: Printed by B.A. and T. F. for Richard Harpe in Smithfield, at the Bible and Harpe, 1639).

¹⁴⁵ Anon, *Loyalty’s Speech to Englands Subjects; Perswading them, not to suffer Rebellion: Then Band your selves, Honorable Lords, Wife Prelates, Brave Captaines, Worthy Gentlemen, Resolute Souldiers, Trusty Citizens, and Painfull Comminalty; For the Defence of our dread Soveraigne, and native Country:*

have been willing to read the entirety of the lengthy document on the history of rebellion, but if they read the first few pages, they would learn that rebellion had been detested throughout Christian history and anyone who participated in it was barbarous. In 1639, English print culture became more unified and diversified in its opposition to the Covenanters. The addition of Scottish authors producing works against their own countrymen provided the English with a more diverse approach in their print war against Scotland.

5. Literature Against Catholicism

Despite the continuous attacks from England, Scottish preachers remained constant in their opposition to Catholicism and the Roman Church. James Marques continued his attack on Catholicism in 1639 by attacking the denomination doctrinally. He preached on bishops and claimed:

“They have taught points of Poperie and Arminianisme, conditionall election, the power of free-will, resistibility to effectuall grace, the extent of Christs death and merite to the damned in hell as well as to the blessed in heaven, Christ coming into the world...auricular confession, papall absolution, That the Pope is not the Antichrist, That the Kirk of Rome is the true Kirk, That reconciliation with the Kirk or Rome is easie, That the Kirk of Rome erres not in [fundamentals], nor differeth from reformed Kirks in the same.”¹⁴⁶

Marques’s attack focused on Catholic teachings that he felt opposed Reformed doctrine.

He further mocked the Catholic belief that “the Romish religion, and Jesuits learning was

That Rebellion may not take strength in our Time (London: Printed by M. Parsons for W. Sheares, and are to be sold at his Shop in Bedford-street in Coven Garden, neere the New Exchange, 1639), 2

¹⁴⁶ James Marques, *The Declinatour and Protestation of the some some-times pretended Bishops, Presented in Face of the Last Assembly Refuted and Found Futile, but full of Insolent Reproaches, and bold Assertions* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Bryson, 1639), 90.

better then the quintessence of our Religion.”¹⁴⁷ While Marques opposed Catholic doctrine, the Church of Scotland took a direct approach and discussed Arminianism in the Church of England. The work exposed the Church of England for having Catholic practices. The Church of Scotland stated:

“we regrate together with our dear Christian brethren of our neighbor Nation, that we should have so evident and sensible experiences of the dangerous plots set afoot, and intertained by the Church-men of greatest power in England, for introducing novations in Religion, by corrupting the Doctrine, changing the Discipline, daily innovating the externall worship of God, preaching publickly, and maintaining points of *Arminianisme*, and heads of poperie, defending and advancing preachers and professours of that judgement, and allowing books stuffed with that doctrine, fying, confyning, and banishing all such as in conscience of their duetie to God.”¹⁴⁸

The Church of Scotland viewed the influence of Arminianism in the Church of England as a plot to corrupt Christian doctrine and push the church towards Catholicism. Further, the Church of Scotland claimed the Church of England did not only corrupt their own church, but they attempted to also corrupt the Church of Scotland. Again, the Church of Scotland declared:

“And not being content to keep within their own precinct, did induce, assist, and incourage the pretended Arch-bishops, and Bishops of this Kingdome, to presse not only a conformitie of this Church, with that of England, in matter of ceremonie, but also with the church of Rome, in the points most substantially erroneous, as appeareth by these books of common prayer and canons, found to bee a masse of popish superstition, doctrine, and tyrannie, which was confessed to have been first plotted, then corrected and interlined in England.”¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Church of Scotland, *An Information to all good Christians within the kingdome of England*, 6-7.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 7.

Lastly, the Church of Scotland asserted to the English people that some English churchmen intended to bring England and Scotland to war. The war intended to weaken both countries enough to end the Reformed religion and bring popery back into them.¹⁵⁰ The Scots were strategic in blaming the Laudians for causing the Bishops' Wars and attempting to bring popery back into the Church of England. They did not blame the English people or parliamentarians. Their print culture intended to transform the print war into a conflict of Protestantism against Catholicism, and a sign of English support in 1639 came from the reprinting of a popular preacher's sermon.

During his life, godly Church of England preacher Richard Sibbes was a popular preacher. He did not participate in kneeling during communion, wearing the surplice, or signing the cross in baptism. These views led to Archbishop Laud censuring and silencing him.¹⁵¹ He passed away in 1635. In *The Returning Backslider*, reprinted in 1639, he was boisterous in his opposition to the use of imagery in Catholicism. He preached that *The Holy Bible* and history have shown that men are prone to idolatry, as seen by their worshipping of idols, saints and angels. According to Sibbes, these practices occurred in Catholicism and were acts of idolatry.¹⁵² Sibbes further developed why he opposed idolatry within the Catholic Church by preaching:

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 8-9.

¹⁵¹ For more information on Richard Sibbes' life, consult the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

¹⁵² Richard Sibbes, *The Returning Backslider, Or, A Commentarie upon the whole XIII. Chapter of the Prophecy of the Prophet Hosea. Wherein is shewed the large extent of Gods free Mercy, even unto the most miserable forlorne and wretched sinners that may be, upon their Humiliation and Repentance* (London: Printed by G.M. for George Edwards in the Old Baily in Greene Arbour at the signe of the Angell, 1639), 92-93.

“Idolatry is to worship the true God in a false manner, to fixe his presence to that we should not fixe it to, to annexe it to statues, Images, Crucifixes, the picture of the Virgin Mary and the like. Not to run into the common place of Idolatry, but to come home unto ourselves. Whether are the Papists Idolaters or not...I answer, yes.”¹⁵³

His opposition to idolatry forced him to oppose and attack the Catholic Church. Sibbes’s published sermon showed he held similar beliefs with the Scottish Covenanters on opposition to idolatry and superstition in Catholicism. Sibbes also preached God expected Christians to give him obedience.¹⁵⁴ Like the Covenanters, Richard Sibbes believed in strict obedience to God. The godly Sibbes and the Scots were unified in their strong opposition to Catholicism. It would have been dangerous to reprint a sermon given by a godly preacher who Laud had personally censured. The printer might have been desperate to make money off a popular sermon, but more likely, he was sympathetic to the Scottish cause and reprinted the sermon in an attempt to show Sibbes and the Covenanter’s had similar beliefs.

The Covenanter and reprinted godly propaganda against Catholicism seemed to encourage English preachers to also discuss the topic. English minister John Jones’s *The Conquest of the Saints* requested that the Church of England does not “part with any point of our Religion to the Papist” nor “let the Divell disturbe the true Church of God, let Schismaticks arise, let Hereticks rage, let Turke, Papists, Anabaptists, Familists, and the rest of that rout, band themselves against the peace of Sion.”¹⁵⁵ Jones’s opposition to

¹⁵³ Ibid., 94.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 83.

¹⁵⁵ Jones, *The Conquest of the Saints*, 21 and 32.

the papists attempted to prove the Church of England did not want Catholicism in the church, but this did not mean the church agreed with the Covenanters. Thomas Jackson also attacked papists. He claimed that some of the errors of the Pelagians were “communicated to the modern Papists.”¹⁵⁶ Pelagianism was an early Christian movement during the 4th and 5th centuries C.E. that followed the teaching of Pelagius. These Christians believed that original sin did not corrupt human nature, and humans had free will without divine grace. Augustine of Hippo condemned the views of Pelagianism at the Council of Ephesus in 431 C.E. By preaching that modern papists held beliefs similar to Pelagianism, Jackson portrayed the Catholics as believing in condemned Christian doctrine. Jones and Jackson produced their works to dispute the accusations that England was moving towards Catholicism. English ministers responding to Scottish print culture on Catholicism showed the Covenanters were effectively diffusing their printed works. If the English did not have access to the Covenanter’s works, there would not have been a need to respond and attempt to counter the Scottish accusations that Catholicism was entering the Church of England again.

6. Conclusion

England and Scotland both produced influential sermons and literature in 1639. England became more unified in their disapproval of the Scottish rebellion, and Scottishmen who supported Charles published works in England against the Covenanters.

¹⁵⁶ Thomas Jackson, *Wisdom Crying out to Sinners to returne from their evill ways. Contained in three pious and learned Treatises. I. Of Christs fervent love to bloody Jerusalem. II Of Gods just hardning of Pharaoh, when he had filled up the measure of his iniquity. III. Of Mans timely remembring of his Creator* (London: Printed by M.P., 1639), 65.

Covenanter print culture remained united against superstition, idolatry, and Catholic influence in Reformed religion. Propaganda from both countries attempted to influence the populace to support their cause. Scotland seemed to have success in getting their works circulated in England. Charles delivered a proclamation in August 1639 censoring any pamphlets that came from Scotland. It declared Scottish pamphlets were full of falsehood, dishonor, and scandal against Charles. Anyone who was in possession of these pamphlets and refused to hand them over would receive “such pains and penalties as by the Laws and Statutes of realm.”¹⁵⁷ Charles’s condemnation of Scottish propaganda showed these works were successfully entering England. The Scots had success in transforming the print war into a battle of Protestantism and Catholicism. English literature had to respond to Scottish accusations and prove the Church of England did not have forms of popery in it. The Covenanter victory in the First Bishops’ War assisted the Scottish propaganda and enabled its success. The victory ensured there was no settlement, and the conflict would continue to develop in 1640.

¹⁵⁷ England and Wales Sovereign. By the King, *A Proclamation publishing an Act of State, and His Majesties command concerning a scandalous Paper lately dispersed amongst many of His Subjects* (London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1639).

Chapter 3

1640: The Culmination of the Anglo-Scottish Print War

1. Introduction

Following the First Bishops' War, 1640 was a tumultuous year. Charles's military failure the previous year, along with the lack of actual battle, left English citizens feeling that the war was "unsuccessful, fruitless and needless."¹⁵⁸ Plague returned to England in 1640 and added further strain on society. Most significantly, the First Bishops' War brought an end to Charles's personal rule.

In April 1640, Charles summoned Parliament in an attempt to raise money for a second attack on the Covenanters. With Parliament's financial and military backing, Charles could resume his suppression of the rebellion. Instead, Charles provided an opportunity for the English disaffected to discuss their grievances which had accumulated over the previous decade. Ship money taxation, Laudian religious policies, and the military involvement in the north came under heavy attack from English parliamentarians. Charles had undertaken all three issues without Parliament's consultation or approval. David Cressy has argued that some parliamentarians allied themselves with the Presbyterian Scots and intentionally sabotaged Charles's ability to gain the necessary military and financial support to resume war.¹⁵⁹ Kevin Sharpe went even further and argued some members of parliament arrived at Westminster "determined to dismantle the machinery of personal government and to prevent permanent rule by

¹⁵⁸ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, 809.

¹⁵⁹ Cressy, *England on Edge*, 71.

the royal prerogative.”¹⁶⁰ John Adamson pointed to Englishmen, such as John Pym, Viscount Edward Montagu Mandeville, Robert Rich 2nd Earl of Warwick, and Robert Greville, 2nd Lord Brooke, who were known “to be in sympathy, perhaps [even] in treasonous communication, with the leaders of the Covenanter rebellion, and were members of a wider network of godly critics, whose hostility to the king’s policies...had been obvious from within a few years of Charles’s accession.”¹⁶¹ James Fiennes, son of William Fiennes, 1st Viscount of Saye and Sele, went as far as to propose that any money Charles raised through Parliament could not be used against Scotland. If the House of Commons had passed this proposition, it would have been a declaration that parliament sided with the Covenanters against the Crown. The parliamentarian’s grievances and sympathy towards the Scots took precedence, and Charles dissolved the “Short Parliament” on May 5, 1640 without receiving any financial or military support.

The failure of the Short Parliament maintained the pro-Scot sentiment in England. If Charles would have made some concessions to Parliament, the Scottish support would have been weakened. Parliament once again being dissolved led to instability and unrest in England. Iconoclasm aimed at Laudian altars and tables broke out during the summer, and Laud became the target of angry English citizens. Citizens blamed Laud’s influence over Charles for the war with Scotland, and they believed his reforms and innovations in religion caused the instability between England and Scotland. The violence that arose from Parliament being so quickly dissolved posed far-reaching problems for Charles.

¹⁶⁰ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I*, xv.

¹⁶¹ Adamson, *The Noble Revolt*, 13.

The Covenanters recognized an opportunity after the closing of Parliament. They realized there were Englishmen who supported them and only through Parliament could the Covenanter cause be given proper support from England. In the summer of 1640, the Scottish army marched, bypassed Berwick, and invaded northern England. Charles struggled to raise another army, and English soldiers deserted to avoid being involved in a second war with Scotland. This forced Charles to rely on Scottish, English, Welsh and Irish Catholics in the Second Bishops' War, and he placed Thomas Wentworth, the Earl of Strafford, in command of his army. These military decisions only added fuel to the accusations of the invading Scots that there was a Catholic plot in England. The Covenanters defeated Charles's army at Newburn in August 1640. This victory, along with the victory at Newcastle upon Tyne, gave the Covenanters control of northeast England and England's most important coal reserves. The Scottish army now occupied England and received funds from Charles until their demands were met. Charles's second defeat to the Covenanter army dishonored the Stuart regime and exposed his weakness as a monarch. Most importantly, the presence of the Scottish army in England forced Charles to once again call Parliament. Only through Parliament could the Scots be assured Charles would not continue on with the war.

Parliament reconvened in November 1640 with the protection of the Scottish army. Parliamentarians allied with the Scots to allow both sides to receive what they wanted. Ship money was abolished, the ability of Charles to make decisions without approval of Parliament was reversed, and Arminianism, the High Commission and Star Chamber were all ended. The 1640 Parliament, known as the Long Parliament, ended the

Laudian ascendancy. It opened with attacks on Catholics and Catholicism and placed the blame for the ills of the English nation on a popish conspiracy. Parliamentarians impeached and arrested Archbishop William Laud and the Earl of Strafford, condemned the Laudians and their reforms, and had the judges involved in imposing the ship money tax impeached. Parliament also removed the Laudian clergy from their clerical positions and replaced them with Puritan reformers. When the Scots invaded northern England, their propaganda linked the actions of Charles with Catholic aims. Covenanters accused Laud, Strafford, and Catholics of being the instigators of war, and they tried to persuade the English that the war occurred from the English government being infected with popery.

2. Proclamations from Charles I

Prior to defeat in battle, Charles made multiple proclamations in 1640. They were released as pamphlets and thoroughly covered the issues between Charles and the Scots from the previous two years. In early 1640, Charles delivered *A Proclamation against libellous and seditious Pamphlets, and Discourses sent from Scotland* at the Court at Whitehall. His proclamation proclaimed that anyone found with a “[libelous] and seditious discourse pamphlet either in manuscript or print concerning Charles’ proceedings with his subjects in Scotland” would receive punishment and penalties according to the laws of England.¹⁶² The proclamation explained that the printed pamphlets from Scotland contained falsehoods and scandals intending to dishonor

¹⁶² England and Wales Sovereign. By the King, *A Proclamation against libellous and seditious Pamphlets, and Discourses sent from Scotland* (London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640).

Charles. Another proclamation given at Whitehall, *A Proclamation for the repressing and punishing of the late Rebellious and Traiterous assemblies in Lambeth, Southwark, and other places adjoyning*, stated that anyone who helped or knowingly harbored rebellious and tumultuous persons was guilty of high treason. These men planned to assemble in a warlike manner and Englishmen could not give them assistance.¹⁶³ These pamphlets reflected that Scottish propaganda was being circulated in England, and there were enough Englishmen giving support to the Covenanters that Charles was forced to publicly condemn it.

Politician Sir Francis Windebank, who was the Secretary of State under Charles, produced Charles's declaration after the Treaty of Berwick. The declaration explained that Charles sought peace with Scotland even though the Covenanters remained in rebellion and took up arms against England. The Covenanters had also produced libelous pamphlets and purposely dispersed them throughout England, especially in London. According to Windebank, these pamphlets attempted to cause the Scottish "disorders...to be shifted off from the Rebels in Scotland, and most unjustly cast upon [England]."¹⁶⁴ Windebank further stated the Scottish rebellion vilified England's honor and Charles only

¹⁶³ England and Wales Sovereign. By the King, *A Proclamation for the repressing and punishing of the late Rebellious and Traiterous assemblies in Lambeth, Southwark, and other places adjoyning; and particularly for the apprehension of John Archer, George Seares, William Seltrum, and divers other Rebellious persons* (London: Printed by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640).

¹⁶⁴ Francis Windebank, *His Majesties Declaration, Concerning His Proceedings with His Subjects of Scotland, Since the Pacification in the Camp neere Berwick* (London: Printed by R. Young, His Majesties Printer for Scotland, and R. Badger, Printer to the Prince His Highnesse, 1640), 1-2.

reacted against their rebellious and treasonous behavior.¹⁶⁵ The need to condemn these activities further demonstrated propaganda was effectively diffused throughout England, and English were supporting the Scots. To eliminate the spread of Scottish printed works, Charles stated the accusations were false and made it illegal to own them.

Charles produced more proclamations during the Second Bishops' War, and these continued to be directed at the Covenanters. Charles gave *A Proclamation commanding all the Trained Bands and others on this side Trent, to be in readinesse with Horse and Arms, to serve His Majestie for defence of the Kingdome* at court in York. It commanded Englishmen to be ready to defend their homes while Charles was in the north fighting against "those rebels of Scotland, who have [entered] this kingdom with hostility and arms." Lieutenants, justices of peace, mayors, sheriffs, bailiffs and all others were commanded to be obedient.¹⁶⁶ Rather than only preachers discussing obedience, Charles himself now stated it was expected of his English subjects. Charles gave two more proclamations at Court in Whitehall on August 20, 1640. *A Proclamation to summon all such as hold of His Majestie by Grand Sergeanty, Escuage, or Knights Service, to do their Services against the Scots, according to their Tenures* stated Charles had to go to war with the Scots in the north to "represe their Treasons and Rebellion," and he summoned lords, baronets, knights, esquires, gentlemen, and all others to help in this

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 2-3 and 26.

¹⁶⁶ England and Wales Sovereign. By the King, *A Proclamation commanding all the Trained Bands and others on this side Trent, to be in readinesse with Horse and Arms, to serve His Majestie for defence of the Kingdome* (London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640), 1-2.

war.¹⁶⁷ The other pamphlet, *A Proclamation declaring those of Scotland, who have entred, or shall enter this Kingdom in a Warlike manner, and their Adherents, to be Rebels and Traitours to His Majestie*, attacked the Scots with propaganda in an attempt to persuade Englishmen to support Charles and fight for him. The Covenanters were again accused of using pretence of religion as an excuse to usurp Charles's authority and government. The proclamation claimed Charles had been lenient, but despite his leniency in how he handled them, his Scottish subjects remained disloyal and rebellious. They took up arms and invaded England, while Charles had taken care of his kingdom and given it peace. Any Englishman who helped or supplied the invading Scottish with munitions or money was guilty of high treason, a rebel, and a traitor. Charles further professed before God that he never and would never hinder his Scottish subjects from enjoying their own religion and liberty. He would continue to govern Scotland justly as a religious king if they would simply conform and obey. At the end of the proclamation, Charles described how he had pardoned many rebels and traitors who submitted themselves to his authority and these men were allowed to return home and live as free and loyal subjects. Any man who submitted and conformed would likewise receive Charles's grace and pardon.¹⁶⁸ These proclamations prepared the English for the

¹⁶⁷ England and Wales Sovereign. By the King, *A Proclamation to summon all such as hold of His Majestie by Grand Sergeanty, Escuage, or Knights Service, to do their Services against the Scots, according to their Tenures* (London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640).

¹⁶⁸ England and Wales Sovereign. By the King, *A Proclamation declaring those of Scotland, who have entred, or shall enter this Kingdom in a Warlike manner, and their Adherents, to be Rebels and Traitours to His Majestie* (London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640), 1-2

oncoming war. They commanded the English people to obey and support Charles and offered pardon to those who had not done so the previous two years. It was imperative for Charles to receive support during the Second Bishops' War, and these proclamations were his attempt to do so.

In late 1640, a proclamation seemed to be given at the behest of the English Parliament or the Covenanter army in England. At his palace at Westminster, Charles delivered *A Proclamation for putting the Lawes against Jesuites, Seminaries, and Popish Priests, in Execution*. Charles declared any Jesuit or priest from the Church of Rome found in England a traitor.¹⁶⁹ The proclamation rescinded a statute given by Queen Elizabeth which allowed Jesuits and priests to be in England. This was a response to the belief that Catholicism had again entered the Church of England. While it showed Charles did not support Catholicism, and he was attempting to be proactive at removing Catholic influence from the church, it also made it clear Scottish propaganda had been effective. They had so thoroughly convinced the English populace that a popish plot was afoot in England that Charles decided to declare certain Catholics in the country as traitors. The Scottish print culture from 1638 and 1639 had been effective at creating the belief in a Catholic plot in England, and it continued to be persuasive in 1640.

3. The Scottish Army and Parliament

In 1640, the Covenanter army produced extensive printed literature for the purpose of gaining support from the English populace. They invaded England to force the

¹⁶⁹ England and Wales Sovereign. By the King, *A Proclamation for putting the Lawes against Jesuites, Seminaries, and Popish Priests, in Execution* (London: Printed by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640), 1.

recalling of the English Parliament, but they had to explain their invasion was neither against the English people nor with the intention of personal greed or takeover. In one work, *The Intentions of the Army of the Kingdome of Scotland, Declared to their Brethren of England*, the army blamed papists, prelates, and popery for the war with England, not the English people.¹⁷⁰ The author expanded on this belief and claimed:

“but the wrongs done unto us; as the breaking of the late Peace, Crying us down as rebels and traytors. The taking of our ships and goods, the imprisoning of our Commissioners, the acts of hostility done by the English in our Castles: Had they been done by the State or Kingdome of England, they might have beene just causes of a Nationall quarrelling: Yet since the Kindome of England, convened in Parliament, have refused to contribute any supply against us, have shown themselves to be pressed with grievances like unto ours have earnestly pleaded for redresse and remedy.”¹⁷¹

The Scottish army wanted peace between the kingdoms and promised to lay down their arms immediately upon receiving even the “smallest assurance” of being able to continue enjoying their religion and liberty. Misinformation from papists persuaded England to initially use force against Scotland, and the Scottish army entered England to remove this enemy of both kingdoms. The army told the English people to expect proclamations slandering the Scottish cause in an attempt to draw the kingdoms into further war.

According to the document, papists wanted England and Scotland to weaken one another in war and allow the popish plot to take over both countries. Scottish propaganda placed the blame for the war on the influence the papists and Laud had over Charles. The

¹⁷⁰ Scotland Army, *The Intentions of the Army of the Kingdome of Scotland, Declared to their Brethren of England. By the Commissioners of the late Parliament, and by the Generall, Noblemen, Barons, and others, Officers of the Army* (Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Bryson and are to be solde at his Shop at the signe of Jonah, 1640), 5-9.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

declaration went on to describe how the liberties of the Scottish subjects had been taken away.

“Our Commissioners were restrained, and one of the Noblemen imprisoned: Garrisons and strangers set over our heads, in an insolent and barbarous way, exercising their cruelty even against women and children; Our ships and goods taken and sunke, and the Owners stripped naked, and more inhumanely used at the commandement of abused authority by the subjects of our owne King, then by Turkes and infidels. And great Armies prepared against us, with a terrible Commission to subdue and destroy our selves, our Religion, Liberties, Lawes and all.”¹⁷²

The work then questioned whether the Covenanters should remain within their own borders “till our throats be cut, and our Religion, Lawes, and Countrey be destroyed: Or shall wee bestirred our selves, and seeke our Safeguard, Peace, and Liberty in England.”¹⁷³ This was an explanation why the Covenanters invaded England. They refused to receive the superstitious and idolatrous Service Book into their religion. All they wanted was the ability to maintain their true religion and liberty as Parliament had established. The Scots invaded England in a peaceful and orderly manner without any molestation, and they were against papists, popery, and prelates, not their fellow Protestants in England.

The Lawfulness of Our Expedition into England Manifested was another work that came from the Scottish army to justify why their invasion of England was lawful and necessary. Both Scottish and English printers published the work. Scotland needed peace between the kingdoms, or they would be forced to keep a standing army on the border.

¹⁷² Ibid., 11.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 15.

Charles first began the war when he invaded Scotland, but despite this attack, the Scottish army did not intend to hurt others and would lay down their arms once peace was ensured. They reiterated that they were fighting “the Canterburian faction of Papists, Atheists, Arminians, Prelats, the misleaders of the Kings Majesty, & the common enemies of both Kingdomes,” rather than fighting the Kingdom of England itself. A successful expedition would eliminate idolatry and superstition from Scotland, restore peace between both kingdoms, and ensure the popery that had troubled Scotland would be unable to influence England any longer.¹⁷⁴

One final work ascribed to the Scottish army made demands on September 7, 1640 in Newcastle. It stated:

“These are to intimate, and made be knowne to all the Sheriffes, Justices of Peace, Heritors, and Landlords, Maiors and Aldermen of Boroughs, and all others whom it doth concerne: That the Generall, Noblemen, and others of the Scottish Army, shall offer no injury to any person within this Kingdome: And that their desire is, they may have Victuals and Provision for their Army, in a regular and orderly way.”¹⁷⁵

Charles commanded the publishing of the demands of the Scots, but included with it an English pamphlet titled, *A Relation of the behavior of the Rebels in Newcastle, confirmed by the attestation of persons of good quality and credit*. The English pamphlet described how the Scottish rebels asked the citizens of Newcastle for ammunition, artillery, and goods belonging to Charles. If the citizens did not hand over these materials, Scottish

¹⁷⁴ Scotland Army, *The Lawfulnessse of Our Expedition into England Manifested* (Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Bryson, and are to be solde at his Shop at the signe of Jonah, 1640). Margery Mar-Prelat reprinted the work in England in 1640.

¹⁷⁵ Scotland Army, *The Demands and Behaviour of the Rebels of Scotland. Published by Authority* (London: Printed by Robert Young, 1640), 3.

soldiers would break down doors and search homes, mills, bake houses and brew houses for plunder.¹⁷⁶ The Scottish army was accused of making unreasonable demands for provisions, and when these demands could not be met, they stole supplies from innocent English citizens. This pamphlet disputed the Scottish claims that they only wanted provisions for their army and would not use force to attain the goods the Covenanters desired.

This collection of works attributed to the Scotland Army intended to help Scotland gain support from the English people. They reminded the English that the Scots fought only in self-defense, blamed papists and not the English people for the war, and claimed their army would not attack and plunder the English people in retaliation for Charles's actions. English propaganda countered these works and recounted stories of Scottish soldiers using violence and stealing from innocent English citizens to incite fear.

The Scottish Parliament also produced works during 1640 in an attempt to keep the English informed of their activities. Charles's proclamations that responded to the Scottish pamphlets circulating through England proved these types of documents were effective. In *An Information from the States of the Kingdome of Scotland, to the Kingdome of England*, the Scotland Parliament remarked that the troubles Scotland had recently faced were nearing an end as the English and Scottish developed friendship again. Scotland's papist adversaries had plotted against the country to alienate the English against them. Also, papists produced misinformation to create quarrels between the nations with the intention of forcing the nations to weak each other so the papists

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 5.

could invade and take over. England and Scotland needed to unite against the “Whore of Babel” and her supporters.¹⁷⁷ A second pamphlet, *Information from the Scottish Nation, to all the true English, concerning the present Expedition*, pointed out that Scotland did not have the resources to maintain a standing army on their border. If they returned home, Scotland’s enemies would invade again. This forced the Scottish Parliament to make the difficult decision to enter England and fight for their protection. Their invasion was a defensive move. Furthermore, the work exclaimed that the Scottish loved England and both countries shared common grievances. The preservation of religion and liberty in Scotland allowed England to have the same, and these countries would survive or fall together. Scotland and England were brethren, lived in peace for many years, and shared a common desire for the purity of religion in both kingdoms. The document finished with a promise to the English people that the Scottish soldiers would not be allowed to harm them nor steal from them. Any Scottish soldier that committed any crime against an English person would be punished with severity.¹⁷⁸ The Parliament of Scotland’s final printed pamphlet was directed to the Parliament of England. Scottish parliamentarians explained that England and Scotland shared a common enemy that wished to “sacrifice in

¹⁷⁷ Scotland Parliament, *An Information from the States of the Kingdome of Scotland, to the Kingdome of England. Shewing, how they have bin dealt withal by his Majesties Commissioner, in denying to them that which his Majesty granted them by the Articles agreed upon at the Camp, and how they have been dealt with in the Parliament by denying to them the liberty of their own Lawes, and Practise of that Kingdome, all which they are able to make good* (1640), 1, 2-3, 6-7.

¹⁷⁸ Scotland Parliament, *Information from the Scottish Nation, to all the true English, concerning the present Expedition* (Edinburgh: 1640).

a bloudie Warre, the Religion and Liberties of both Nations.”¹⁷⁹ They also accused Archbishop Laud of gaining power from the faction of papists that were close to Charles.¹⁸⁰ The Scottish Army and Parliament’s published polemics blamed Catholicism, papists, and Laud for the troubles between the countries. They provided a compelling case that the Bishops’ Wars occurred over Catholic and Laudian influence over Charles. The Covenanters had worked hard to transform the print war into a conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism, instead of a conflict between England and Scotland. Their 1640 propaganda, along with their successes in the Bishops’ Wars, enabled their plan to come to fruition.

4. Printed Sermons

English and Scottish preachers effectively used sermons in 1638 and 1639, and because of this, preachers only briefly mentioned the doctrine of obedience, peace, and unity in 1640. For example, on the descent of authority from God, John Stoughton stated, “We must looke up unto God therefore as he layes the charge upon the ministry and so we must take our charge from them, and yield obedience answerably.”¹⁸¹ God gave ministers their ability to preach, so they must be obeyed. Like Edward Boughen and John Gore the previous two years, James Eglesfield pointed to Jesus as the perfect example of obedience to God. He recounted how Jesus “lost his life to save his obedience, approving

¹⁷⁹ Scotland Parliament, *A Remonstrance Concerning the Present Troubles from the meeting of the Estates of the Kingdome of Scotland, Aprill 16. Unto the Parliament of England* (1640), 3.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁸¹ John Stoughton, *Seaven Sermons, Preached upon Severall Occasions. 2. One Sermon on 1 Sam. 2.30* (London: Printed by F.D. for John Bellamic, and Ralph Smith, and are to be sold at their Shop, at the three Golden-Lyons in Cornhill neere the Royall-Exchange, 1640), 73-74.

himself the spotless Lambe of God, both in his ingresse to the World, conceived of a Virgin by the power of the holy Ghost.”¹⁸² Between 1638 and 1640, multiple preachers used Jesus to express why the English must be obedient. These brief sermons show previous ones had been effective. English preachers could be brief in their sermons to get their opinions quickly to their readers without needing to provide ample discussion.

Although Scottish preachers did not focus on obedience in 1640, their point of view still reached the English people through the godly. English godly preachers agreed with Scottish Calvinists on obedience to God alone and preached on it in their sermons. Independent minister Jeremiah Burroughs used Matthew 8:27 to preach, “Here learne the Sovereignty and greatnesse of God that hath these creatures at his command. Who is this, said the Mariners concerning Christ, whom the wind and Seas obey.”¹⁸³ Burroughs believed there was complete obedience to God on earth. This is the doctrine of general providence, which is God’s ability to uphold the universe in accordance to his laws. Providence is God’s activity in the world, and Alexandra Walsham argued in *Providence in Early Modern England* this doctrine was a popular part of the religious culture and vocabulary in seventeenth-century England.¹⁸⁴ Jeremiah Dyke also preached on this topic. He stated, “The third benefit is Power & Ability to yield God obedience. In

¹⁸² James Eglesfield, *A Heavenly Hymne to the King of Heaven* (London: Printed by John Dawson, for Francis Eglesfield and are to be sold at the signe of the Marigold in Pauls Churchyard, 1640), 16.

¹⁸³ Jeremiah Burroughs, *The Sea-Mans Direction in Time of Storme. Delivered in a Sermon upon occasion of a strong stormie Wind lately happening* (London: Printed by T. Paine and M. Simons, 1640), 70.

¹⁸⁴ Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 5.

Receiving Christ we doe withal receive Power, & ability to give God obedience.”¹⁸⁵ This is special providence, which is God’s intervention in humanity. God gave man certain abilities when they became a Christian, and this showed God played an active role in the lives of English Christians. Although these examples are brief, they show that godly English ministers shared doctrinal beliefs with the Scots and the Covenanters had a built in group of allies when they took the initiative and invaded England.

English and Scottish preachers both discussed peace and unity the previous two years, but with the Scottish army’s invasion of northern England, sermons on this theme were only printed in England. English clergyman John Preston’s sermon *The Fulnesse of Christ For Us* was reprinted in 1640. Originally, the sermon was given at the court of James I. Preston preached for the soldiers to “let the fulnesse of the mercy of Christ move us to lay downe our armes of rebellion, and to chuse God for our God, and to give [our] selves wholly unto him.”¹⁸⁶ Since it was a reprinted sermon, it does not directly reference the Scottish rebellion, but it may have been used to encourage the Covenanters, or those who supported them in England, to stop their involvement in war and give themselves to God. Nathanael Carpenter’s *Chorazin and Bethsaida’s Woe* was another work reprinted in 1640. The work was originally delivered at St. Mary’s in Oxford, and Carpenter

¹⁸⁵ Jeremiah Dyke, *The Right Receiving of, and Rooting in Christ* (London: Printed by T.P. and M.S. for Henry Overton, and are to be sold at the entrance into Popes head Alley in Lumbard-street, 1640), 38.

¹⁸⁶ John Preston, *The Fulnesse of Christ for Us. A Sermon preached at the Court before King James of Blessed Memory* (London: Printed by J. Okes, for John Stafford, dwelling in Blacke-horse Alley neare Fleetstreet, 1640), 13.

preached that without peace and unity Christians faced the vengeance of God.¹⁸⁷ The reprinting of these sermons complimented two sermons delivered at St. Paul's Church, which Charles would have either approved or commissioned. Augustine Hill preached that England faced the possibility that God would remove himself from those who were not united.¹⁸⁸ Hill delivered this sermon in late 1639, but it remained important for the English to be united in 1640 against the invading Scots. According to Henry King, the Covenanters threatened England's peace and the unity of the Church of England. He preached God gave Charles his authority over England and Scotland. It was God's plan to "make them [into] one Nation," and the Scottish rebellion prevented God's plan.¹⁸⁹ The reprinting of older sermons, and sermons given at St. Paul's Church, showed the English government wanted sermons on peace to be published. Charles would certainly want his subjects to remain unified with him rather than supporting the Covenanters.

5. On the Scots

In 1640, the Scots remained targets in English propaganda, and they were discussed in a variety of works printed in London. Unlike the previous years when attacks came primarily from sermons, English literature used different approaches to introduce propaganda against the Scots to the literate populace. These works did not

¹⁸⁷ Nathanael Carpenter, *Chorazin and Bethsaida's Woe, or warning-peece. A judicious and learned Sermon on Math. 11. V. 21. Preached at St. Maries in Oxford* (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield for Matt. Hunt, 1640), 70.

¹⁸⁸ Augustine Hill, *The Peace of Enmity: A Sermon Preached in Paules Church the 12 day of February, in the yeere of our Lord God, 1639* (London: Printed by E.P. for Nicholas Bourne, and are to be sold at his Shop, at the South Entrance of the Royall Exchange, 1640), 18.

¹⁸⁹ Henry King, *A Sermon Preached at St. Pauls March 27. 1640. Being the Anniversary of his Majesties Happy Inauguration to his Crowne* (London: Printed by Edward Griffin, 1640), 44.

deviate from the previously printed works in 1638 and 1639. Instead, a similar message was produced in a different manner.

Much the same as his work in 1639, Wye Saltonstall produced another work against the Covenanters in 1640. In the introduction to *Englands Complaint: Against Her adjoining neighbours the Scots*, Saltonstall stated, “And so let this Satyre now come forth again in defiance of the Scots, and also let’s arme, arme, arme, against their malicious hearts.”¹⁹⁰ The work was partially written to encourage and motivate the English populace to support Charles and go to war for him. The author further exclaimed:

“But England is confident that the Scots shall be humbled: the English blade cuts deepe, the English heart is full of courage, and the English arme strikes hard. The Irish men too with their Saint Patricke will joyne with the English, & Saint George against the Andrewans or Scottish Covenanters, nay Saint Andrew is sad to see their madnesse and will not protect their rebellious projects shrowded under the vaile of Religion, under which cloake they also hide contempt of the Kings most Excellent Majesty, whose goodnesse and royall mercy being contemned,...he will now expresse his justice, and make their bloud pay for...their boldnesse.”¹⁹¹

Saltonstall reminded his readers that England was blessed with a happy government under Charles until the Scots “who under pretence of Religion would overthrow the Hierarchy of the Church, pulling down the house of God, and building Babels of their own invention” disrupted it.¹⁹² The Covenanters also resisted the King’s sacred Majesty, vilified the English nobility, clergy, and gentry, and aimed to bring about the downfall of

¹⁹⁰ Wye Saltonstall, *Englands Complaint: Against Her adjoining neighbours the Scots. Occasioned by the factious Covenanters, in their disloyalty to his Sacred Majesty, this present yeare, 1640* (London: Printed for Richard Harper, 1640), A6.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., A5.

¹⁹² Ibid., 5.

the Church of England. Saltonstall even accused the Scots of creating a Puritan powder plot which sought to blow up the entire Kingdom of England. The work also attacked Scottish identity and described them as being as “cold as their hills” and their “mental reservations have made them like Sodomites.” The Scots were defective in humility, patience, obedience, discipline and good works, and these shortcomings drove them to rebellion and disobedience “from head to foot.”¹⁹³

The Church of England published a prayer near the beginning of the Second Bishops’ War. *A Prayer for the Kings Majestie in His Expedition against the Rebels of Scotland; To be said in all Churches in time of Divine Service, next after the Prayer for the Queen and Royall Progenie* prayed for Charles to have success in war. The prayer also referenced many elements of the English print culture campaigns during the First Bishops’ War and the conflict over *The Book of Common Prayer*. The prayer went as follows:

“O eternal God and mercifull Father, by whom alone Kings reign, thou Lord of hosts and giver of all victory, we humbly beseech thee both now and ever to guide and preserve our most gracious sovereign Lord King Charles: To blesse him in his person with health and safetie, in his counsels with wisdom and prudence, and in all his actions with honour and good successe; especially against those his trayterous subjects, who having cast off all obedience to their anointed sovereign, do at this time in rebellious manner seek to invade this realm. Grant, blessed Lord, that victory may attend his Majesties designes, that his liege people may rejoice in thee, but that shame may cover the faces of thine and his treacherous enemies. Inable him (blessed Father) so to banquish and subdue them all, that his loyall subjects being setled in peace, and the true fear of thy holy name, he may return with joy and honour, and continue to govern his kingdoms in peace and plenty, and in the happinesse of true religion and piety all his days. These

¹⁹³ Ibid., A3-A4.

blessings, and whatsoever else shall be necessary for him, or for our selves, we humbly beg of thee, O mercifull Father, for Jesus Christ his sake, our onely Mediatour and Redeemer. Amen.”¹⁹⁴

The reader was immediately reminded that Charles reigned by God’s will alone. The prayer labeled the Scots as traitorous and treacherous subjects who disobeyed their sovereign and extended their rebellion to an invasion of England. It also prayed for the return of peace and the continued maintenance of true religion. The prayer was to be read in all English churches and was diffused throughout England.

An anonymous author responded to the continued attacks against the Covenanters. *An English Challenge and Reply From Scotland* was a pro-Scottish work printed in London, but the author’s anonymity makes it unclear if the author was English or Scottish. The work is written in poetry and structured in seven line stanzas. A question derived from English printed works was presented and then answered. For example, the poet answered why the Scots rebelled against Charles by stating:

“May we not justly for our nation
Prevein all dangers may ensue,
Should we not make a separation,
When God commands from Babels crew?
Then with our King [against] Romes off-spring,
And all their trash [we’ll] stoutly fight
And to the death maintaine our right.”

Scotland rebelled against Charles to be separate from Catholicism, which the poet called “Babel’s crew.” The Scots were willing to fight with Charles against “Rome’s offspring,”

¹⁹⁴ Church of England, *A Prayer for the Kings Majestie in His Expedition against the Rebels of Scotland; To be said in all Churches in time of Divine Service, next after the Prayer for the Queen and Royall Progenie* (London: Printed by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640).

but they would not stay united with Charles while he allowed Catholic influence in England. The poet went on to answer why Scotland attempted to separate from England:

“We love all English loyall Subject.
From them we’ll not exempted be,
But of all Bishops popish projects
We stand no fear to make us free
Tho wales we lack to hold you bake
I wish our joyes may still abide
Untill you passé the river Tweid.”

The River Tweed is a Scottish River south of Edinburgh that connects to Berwick where the First Bishops’ War ended. The Covenanters remained peaceful and defensive in their opposition to the popish plots in England until they were invaded in 1639. They still loved their fellow Protestants in England, but they were fighting to be free from popery. The author gave a final response to anyone that believed Scotland participated in a seditious conspiracy plot. The author answered:

“In vain ye boast your English powers
As if your...great horses
Your walled towns and fenced towers
Were able to resist our forces
While as you Blot the valiant Scot,
With treacherous doings, without reason,
You may thinke on the powder treason.”¹⁹⁵

This final response told anyone that believed the Scots were involved in a conspiracy plot to remember the 1605 Gunpowder plot. That was a treacherous conspiracy plot against England, and the Scottish dispute with England was incomparable to it.

¹⁹⁵ Anon, *An English Challenge and a Reply From Scotland* (London: 1640).

6. On the Roman Church

There were two distinctly different works printed in 1640 on the Catholic Church. John Price's extensive *Anti-Mortonus or an Apology In defence of the Church of Rome* was an apologetic work defending Catholicism. The work defended Catholic doctrine, but more importantly, it called the Roman Church the head and mother of all churches.¹⁹⁶ There were still those in England who were fully Catholic and believed Rome was the true head of Christendom. A reprinted work disputed this view. Sermons by Arthur Lake, the Bishop of Bath and Wells who passed away in 1626, were republished in 1640. One of these published sermons attacked the Roman Church. Lake preached:

“And [now the] Church of Rome hath flipt into both these errors. Their superfluous, and superstitious rites have, at least in practice, not only darkned, but even abolished many in heavenly truth; and instead of an ecclesiasticall hierarchie provided for the quiet and decent ordering of the Church, they have forged a terrestriall monarchie to the bane of both Church and Common-wealth. Our lesson therefore must be, that howsoever the things of God are expressed in phrases fitting the capacity of men; yet wee give them no earthly tincture; for so they will ease to be fit matter of the most holy faith of a Christian man.”¹⁹⁷

The errors and superstitious rites found in the Roman Church meant it could not be the head of Christendom. The reprinting of this sermon could have happened for different reasons. A person might have wanted to oppose the Roman Church while remaining anonymous, or it could have been reprinted to show a bishop found fault with the church.

Regardless the reason for its printing, these two works illuminated that there was still

¹⁹⁶ John Price, *Anti-Mortonus or an Apology In defence of the Church of Rome. Against the Grand Imposture of Doctor Thomas Morton, Bishop of Durham* (1640), 61.

¹⁹⁷ Arthur Lake, *Ten Sermons Upon Severall Occasions, Preached at Saint Pauls Crosse, and Elsewhere* (London: Printed by Thomas Badger, for Humphrey Mosley, and are to bee sold at his Shop at the Princes Armes in Saint Pauls Church-Yard, 1640), 29.

division over the importance of the Church of Rome in 1640. Scottish propaganda had striven to transform the print war between England and Scotland into a battle of Protestant against Catholic, and these works show they were having success in creating discourse over Catholicism in England.

7. English Broadsheets

A collection of English broadsheets appeared during the Second Bishops' War. They contained brief snippets of news about the events of the war with pictures and rhyming poetry. These works intended to attract readers in England and influence them to support Charles. *A true Subjects wish* simply hoped “for the happy successe of our Royall Army preparing to resist the factious Rebellion of those insolent Covenanters (against the sacred Maiesty, of our gracious and loving King Charles) in Scotland.”¹⁹⁸ Another broadsheet, *Newes from New-castle with An Advertisement*, attempted to sway opinion on which side to support. Parker wanted the English to “abandon the fond opinion, (which too many doe conceive) of the Scots good meaning to England, which our fore-fathers have ever experienced to the contrary.” This statement was supplemented with a poem:

“Deare Country men then credit not,
The promise of a flattering Scot.
Then let not faire words, make fooles faine,
But let us beate the Scots againe.
The Country must the Army finde,
Such charge the [Scots] have left behind,
With bread, cheese, butter, drink, and smoke,
All this to doe they did provoke;
At their returne they will pay all,
But that I trust they never shall.

¹⁹⁸ M.P., *A true Subjects wish* (London: Printed by E.G. and are to be sold at the Horse-Shoe in Smith-field, 1640.

Our Lord protect King Charles; and send
This war may bring a peacefull end.”¹⁹⁹

This work wanted the English to avoid believing the propaganda that came from Scotland that said they were invading with good intentions. These two broadsheets were likely produced before the war, since they wished Charles and his army luck on their expedition and tried to sway the reader to support Charles rather than the Covenanters. Two other broadsheets were produced during the war, and these recounted events in the war to show England was having success. *Good Newes from the North* was a short poem that told the story of how one hundred Scottish rebels were stopped from plundering a house in Durham in September 1640. English horsemen attacked the rebels and killed over fifty Scottishmen and took thirty-nine more as prisoners.²⁰⁰ *Britaines Honour* also recounted events in the war. It briefly told the story of how “two Valiant Welchmen, who fought against fifteen thousand Scots, at their now coming to England passing over Tynes whereof one was kill’d manfully fighting against his foe, and the other being taken Prisoner, is now upon relaxation come to Yorke to his Majestie.”²⁰¹ These broadsheets were first used to muster support for Charles, but after Charles’s army marched north, they attempted to give confidence to the readers in England that the war was going well.

¹⁹⁹ M.P., *Newes from New-castle with An Advertisement* (London: Printed by E.G. and are to be sold at the Horse-shoee in Smith-field, 1640).

²⁰⁰ M.P., *Good Newes from the North* (London: Printed by E.G. and are to be old at the signe of the Horse-shoee in Smithfield, 1640).

²⁰¹ M.P., *Britaines Honour* (London: Printed by E.G. and are to be sold at the Horse-Shoee in Smith-field, 1640).

They also encouraged their readers to maintain their support for Charles and refuse to believe the lies found in Scottish propaganda.

8. The Impeachment of Archbishop William Laud

The culmination of Covenanter propaganda can be found in the *Articles Exhibited in Parliament Against William Archbishop of Canterbury, 1640*. The House of Commons in the Parliament of England produced the work in 1640. Archbishop Laud was charged with high treason. He was accused of subverting the laws and government of England by giving Charles advice contrary to God's laws. Laud denied Parliament their power, and he gave false judgment in cases of ship money, received bribes, exercised his authority cruelly, and traitorously assumed power over Charles's subjects. The articles against Laud further declared "that by false erroneous Doctrines and other sinister ways and meanes [Laud] went about to subvert the Religion established in this Kingdome, and so set up Papistrie and superstition in the Church."²⁰² He used his power to nominate ministers who were corrupt and against true religion. The English Parliament also accused him of "Trayterously [endeavouring] to reconcile [England] to the Church of Rome, and to that end hath employed a Jesuite and a Papist-Priest, and hath wrought with the Popes Agents in severall points."²⁰³ He became a traitor when he brought division between Charles and his subjects, Charles and Parliament, and convinced Charles to go to war with Scotland. These behaviors were all attempts to destroy the kingdoms of England and Scotland. There are similarities between Scotland's anti-Catholic print culture and

²⁰² England and Wales Parliament, *Articles Exhibited in Parliament Against William Archbishop of Canterbury, 1640* (1640), 3.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*

the English parliamentarian's accusations against Laud, and it is apparent the Scottish works printed between 1638 and 1640 influenced Parliament's impeachment of Laud.

Conclusion

The Covenanters won the Anglo-Scottish print war because their assertions were continually proven true. Scotland turned the print war into a Protestant-Catholic dispute, rather than a conflict between England and Scotland. Scottish Calvinists, along with pro-Scot Englishmen, used propaganda to portray Arminianism as similar to popery and argued that the Laudians would bring Catholicism back into England. Catholic involvement at Charles's court and in the Bishops' Wars aroused fear of a popish plot, which would continue to be used into the early 1640s. The Scottish victory in the Second Bishops' War effectively forced Charles to call Parliament again. Parliamentarians, such as Calvinist John Pym, gave speeches against Catholicism in the House of Commons. John Pym also led the impeachment of Laud at the end of 1640 and the trial against Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford in 1641. Stafford was portrayed in propaganda as leading a Catholic conspiracy in Ireland where he would eventually use the Irish army, along with English and Welsh Catholics, to overthrow Protestantism in England. Covenanters developed this belief in a Catholic plot in England in their print culture between 1638 and 1640. Another significant advantage the Scottish Covenanters had during the print war was support from English Puritans. In Puritanism, it was necessary for the godly to be literate and have the ability to read in the vernacular. The literate English populace could read printed works from England and Scotland, and the

Covenanters had a literate segment of the English populace sympathetic to their cause. Puritans and Calvinists were united in their opposition to the Laudians.

The negotiations between Charles and Scotland were quickened after the impeachment of Charles's top supporters Laud and Strafford. Charles allowed his royal authority to diminish when he permitted Parliament to execute Strafford in May 1641. In August 1641, Charles went to Scotland and signed the Treaty of London to establish peace between England and Scotland. Peace in the British Isles was short lived when rebellion began again. The Irish Rebellion of 1641 occurred in October when the Catholic gentry attempted to overthrow the English administration in Ireland. This event was portrayed as a Catholic attack on Protestantism and the beginning of a larger Catholic uprising against England. After three years of Scottish propaganda, the fear of a Catholic plot removing Protestantism from England was now seen as a reality. English anti-Catholic propaganda built on what the Covenanters began in 1638 and continued to create the perception there was a Protestant-Catholic war on the verge of beginning in the British Isles. Most significantly, the Irish Rebellion hindered Charles's ability to dissolve Parliament. With Parliament unable to be closed again, the tension between Charles and parliamentarians continued to build until the English Civil War broke out in 1642.

Scottish print culture from 1638 to 1640 is a significant part of the history of the breakdown of Charles's personal rule and the outbreak of the English Civil War. Scottish propaganda would not have been influential if Charles defeated the Covenanters in the Bishops' Wars, but their victories allowed their printed works to be diffused. The Covenanter's creation of strife between Protestantism and Catholicism created a volatile

environment that bred conflict in the British Isles into the 1640s. The Catholic accusations in the impeachment of Laud and execution of Strafford were examples of this. This is the lasting legacy of the Anglo-Scottish print war from 1638 to 1640.

This work intends to fill a gap in the historiography of the Bishops' Wars from 1638 to 1640. Historians David Cressy and Anthony Fletcher amply studied the English print culture of the early 1640s, but an analysis of the print culture during the Bishops' Wars was lacking in the body of British historiography. This work provides that analysis of the English and Scottish print cultures. This work did not set out to answer the question of what caused the outbreak of the English Civil War. Instead, it explained how the Covenanters used their print culture to create an environment of anti-Catholic fervor in England between 1638 and 1640 which English parliamentarians continued to use until civil war between Parliament and Charles broke out in 1642. The Covenanters initially produced printed works in 1638 to garner support from English Protestants in the Scottish fight to maintain their religion. They won both Bishops' Wars and were able to maintain their religion and liberty, but in doing so, they further broke down the tenuous relationship between King Charles I and the English Parliament. If Scotland lost the Bishops' Wars, or never used their print culture to create a Protestant-Catholic conflict in England, the English Civil War would not have begun in 1642.

Bibliography

1. Primary Sources

- Abbot, Robert. *The Young-Mans Warning-peece: or, A Sermon preached at the burial of William Rogers*. London: Printed by R.B. for P. Stephens and C Meredith, and are to be sold at their shop at the signe of the Golden Lion in Pauls Church Yard, 1639.
- Abernethie, Thomas. *Abjuration of Poperie, by Thomas Abernethie: Sometime Jesuite, but now penitent Sinner, and an unworthy Member of the true reformed Church of God in Scotland, at Edinburgh, in the Grayfrier Church, the 24. Of August, 1638*. Edinburgh: Printed in King James his College, by George Anderson, 1638.
- Anon. *An English Challenge and a Reply From Scotland*. London: 1640.
- Anon. *Loyalty's Speech to Englands Subjects; Perswading them, not to suffer Rebellion: Then Band your selves, Honorable Lords, Wife Prelates, Brave Captaines, Worthy Gentlemen, Resolute Souldiers, Trusty Citizens, and Painfull Comminalty; For the Defence of our dread Sovereigne, and native Country: That Rebellion may not take strength in our Time*. London: Printed by M. Parsons for W. Sheares, and are to be sold at his Shop in Bedford-street in Coven Garden, neere the New Exchange, 1639.
- Anon. *The Beast is Wounded. Or Information from Scotland, concerning their Reformation. Wherein is briefly declared, the true cause and ground of all the late Troubles there; and the reasons why they have rejected the Bishops, with their Courts, Canons, Ceremonies and Service-booke*. Scotland: 1638.
- Anon. *The Protestation of the Noblemen, Barrons, Gentlemen, Borrowes, Ministers, and Commons, Subscribers of the Confession of Faith and Covenant, lately renewed within the Kingdome of Scotland, made at the Mercate Crosse of Edinburgh, the 4. Of Julij immediatly after the reading of the proclamation, dated 28. June 1638*. Printed in the year of God, 1638.
- Anon. *The Stay of the Faithfull: Together with the Properties of an honest Heart. In Two Sermons*. London: Printed by M.F. for R. Dawlman, and are to be sold by Thomas Nichols in Popes-head Alley at the sign of the Bible, 1638.
- Balcanquhall, Walter. *A Large Declaration Concerning the Late Tumults in Scotland, From Their first originals: Together with a Particular Deduction of the seditious Practices of the prime Leaders of the Covenanters: Collected out of their owned foule Acts and Writings: By which it doth plainly appeare, that Religion was onely*

pretended by those Leaders, but nothing lesse intended by them. By the King.
London: Printed by Robert Young, His Majesties Printer for Scotland, 1639.

Bedford, Thomas. *A Treatise of the Sacraments According to the Doctrin of the Church of England touching that Argument. Collected out of the Articles of Religion, the Publique Catechism, the Liturgie, and the Book of Homilies. With a Sermon preached in publique Lecture, appointed for Saint Pauls Crosse, on the feast of Saint Johns Baptist, June 24. 1638.* London: Printed by Richard Bishop, for Abel Ropen, and are to bee sold at his shop, at the black spred Eagle in Fleet-street, over against S. Dunstans Church, 1638.

Boughen, Edward. *A Sermon Concerning Decencie and Order in the Church. Preached at Wood-Church, in the Diocesse of Canterburie, April. 30. 1637.* London: 1638.

Browne, David. *The Introduction to the true understanding of the whole Arte of Expedition in preaching to write, Intermixed with rare discourses of other matters, to shew the possibilitie of skill in teaching, and probabilitie of successe in learning, to write in 6. Hours. Which tending all to one end, doe serve for two uses. 1. If Authors doe excel others in their owne Artes, Why may not this Author excel others in his Arte? 2. For removing a vulgare opinion against his native cuntry of Scotland, he sheweth that it hath... excellent Prerogatives than any other Kingdome. Whereby it will rather follow, that a Scottishman is so much the more able to prosecute whatsoever hee undertaketh, and therefore so much the more to bee respected, by how much he is more ingenuous than one of another nation.* 1638.

Burroughs, Jeremiah. *The Sea-Mans Direction in Time of Storme. Delivered in a Sermon upon occasion of a strong stormie Wind lately happening.* London: Printed by T. Paine and M. Simons, 1640.

Carpenter, Nathanael. *Chorazin and Bethsaida's Woe, or warning-peece. A judicious and learned Sermon on Math. 11. V. 21. Preached at St. Maries in Oxford.* Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield for Matt. Hunt, 1640.

Church of England. *A Prayer for the Kings Majestie in His Expedition against the Rebels of Scotland; To be said in all Churches in time of Divine Service, next after the Prayer for the Queen and Royall Progenie.* London: Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640.

Church of Scotland. *An Information to all good Christians within the kingdome of England, from the Nobelman, Barrons, Borrowes, Ministers, and Commons of the kingdome of Scotland, for vindicating their intentions and actions from the unjust callumnies of their enemies.* Edinburgh: Printed by James Bryson, 1639.

Church of Scotland. *The Confession of the Faith, and Doctrine Believed and professed by the Protestants of Scotland, exhibited to the Estates of the first Parliament of King James the first: Holden at Edinburgh, the 25 day of December, 1568, and authorized there.* Edinburgh: Printed by George Anderson, 1638.

Church of Scotland. *The Protestation of the Generall Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, and of the Noble-men, Barrons, Gentlemen, Burrowes, Ministers, and Commons. Subscribers of the Covenant lately made at the mercat Crosse of Edinburgh the 18. Of December 1638.* Edinburgh: Printed by James Bryson, 1639.

Church of Scotland. *The Remonstrance of the Nobility, Barrones, Burgesses, Ministers and Commons Within the Kingdome of Scotland, Vindicating them and their proceedings from the crymes, wherewith they are charged by the late Proclamation in England, Feb. 27 1639.* Edinburgh: Imprinted by James Bryson, 1639.

Corbet, John. *The Ungirding of the Scottish Armour: or, An Answer to the Information for Defensive Armes against the Kings Majestie, which were drawn up at Edenburgh, by the common help and industrie of the three Tables of the rigid Covenanters of the Nobility, Barons, Ministry, and Burgesses, and ordained to be read out of Pulpit by each Minister, and pressed, upon the people, to draw them to take up armes, to resist the Lords Anointed, throughout the whole Kingdome of Scotland.* Dublin: Printed by the Society of Stationers, 1639.

Downame, George. *An Apostolicall Injunction for Unity and Peace, or, a Sermon Preached by George Downame Master of Arts of Christs Colledge in Cambridge, to the Parishioners of Saint Stephens in Walbrooke, at his departure from them.* London: Printed by J. Okes dwelling in little S. Bartholmews, 1639.

Dyke, Jeremiah. *The Right Receiving of, and Rooting in Christ.* London: Printed by T.P. and M.S. for Henry Overton, and are to be sold at the entrance into Popes head Alley in Lumbard-street, 1640.

Eglesfield, James. *A Heavenly Hymne to the King of Heaven.* London: Printed by John Dawson, for Francis Eglesfield and are to be sold at the signe of the Marigold in Pauls Churchyard, 1640.

England and Wales Parliament. *Articles Exhibited in Parliament Against William Archbishop of Canterbury, 1640.* 1640.

England and Wales Sovereign. By the King. *A Proclamation against libellous and seditious Pamphlets, and Discourses sent from Scotland.* London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640.

England and Wales Sovereign. By the King. *A Proclamation and Declaration to inform Our loving Subjects of Our Kingdom of England of the seditious practices of some in Scotland, seeking to overthrow Our Regall Power under false pretences of Religion.* London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1638.

England and Wales Sovereign. By the King. *A Proclamation commanding all the Trained Bands and others on this side Trent, to be in readinesse with Horse and Arms, to serve His Majestie for defence of the Kingdome.* London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640.

England and Wales Sovereign. By the King. *A Proclamation declaring those of Scotland, who have entred, or shall enter this Kingdom in a Warlike manner, and their Adherents, to be Rebels and Traitours to His Majestie.* London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640.

England and Wales Sovereign. By the King. *A Proclamation for putting the Lawes against Jesuites, Seminaries, and Popish Priests, in Execution.* London: Printed by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640.

England and Wales Sovereign. By the King. *A Proclamation for the repressing and punishing of the late Rebellious and Traiterous assemblies in Lambeth, Southwark, and other places adjoyning; and particularly for the apprehension of John Archer, George Seares, William Seltrum, and divers other Rebellious persons.* London: Printed by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640.

England and Wales Sovereign. By the King. *A Proclamation publishing an Act of State, and His Majesties command concerning a scandalous Paper lately dispersed amongst many of His Subjects.* London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1639.

England and Wales Sovereign. By the King. *A Proclamation to summon all such as hold of His Majestie by Grand Sergeanty, Escuage, or Knights Service, to do their Services against the Scots, according to their Tenures.* London: Imprinted by Robert Barker, Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majesty: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1640.

England and Wales. By the King. *A Proclamation declaring those of Scotland, who have entred, or shall enter this Kingdom in a Warlike manner, and their Adherents, to be Rebels and Traitours to His Majestie.* London: Printed by Robert Barker,

Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1638.

Episcopal Church in Scotland. *The Declinator and Protestation of the Archbishops and Bishops, of the Church of Scotland, and others their adherents within that Kingdome, Against the pretended generall Assembly holden at Glasgow Novemb. 21. 1638.* London: Printed by John Raworth, for George Thomason and Octavian Pullen, and are to be sold at their shop, at the Rose in S. Pauls Churchyard, 1639.

Forbes, John. *A Peaceable Warning, to the Subjects in Scotland: Given in the Yeare of God 1638.* Aberdeen: Imprinted by Edw. Raban, 1638.

Forbes, John. *Generall Demands, Concerning the Late Covenant; Propounded by the Ministers and Professors of Divinitie in Aberdene: To some Reverend Brethren, who came thither to recommend the Late Covenant to Them, and to those who are committed to their Charge: Together With the Answeres of those Reverend Brethren to the sayd Demands: As also the Replyes of the foresaid Ministers and Professors to their Answeres.* Aberdeen: Printed by Edward Raban, 1638.

Gardiner, Richard. *A Sermon Preach'd on Easter-Day at Oxford, in Saint Peters Church in the East, the Accustomed place for the Rehearsall Sermon on that Day: Wherein is prov'd the Sonnes Equality with the Father, the Deity of the Holy Ghost, and The Resurrection of the same Numericall Body, Against the old, and Recent Oppugners of these Sacred Verities.* Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, Printer to the University, for Francis Bowman, 1638.

Gillespie, George. *Reasons For which the Service Booke, urged upon Scotland ought to bee refused.* Edinburgh: Printed in the year of God, 1638.

Gore, John. *The Man for Heaven: A Sermon Preached at the Court to his Majesties Houshold, Anno Domini, 1637.* London: Printed by R. Bishop, for Thomas Alchorn, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the Green Dragon in Pauls Church-yard, 1639.

Hardwick, William. *Conformity with Piety, requisite in Gods Service. Delivered in a Visitation Sermon at Kingston upon Thames September 8. 1638.* London: Printed by I. Okes for Richard Cartwright and are to be sold at his shop in Duck lane next Smithfeld, 1638.

Harris, Malachi. *Brittaines Hallelujah or A Sermon of Thanksgiving for the happy Pacification in Brittain Preached in the English Church at Hamburch before his Excellency the Right Honorable Sir Thomas Rowe. 1639.*

Henderson, Alexander. *The Answeres of Some Brethren of the Ministerie, to the Replyes of the Ministers and Professours of Divinitie in Aberdene, concerning the late Covenant.* Aberdeen: Printed by Edward Raban, 1638.

Hill, Augustine. *The Peace of Enmity: A Sermon Preached in Paules Church the 12 day of February, in the yeere of our Lord God, 1639.* London: Printed by E.P. for Nicholas Bourne, and are to be sold at his Shop, at the South Entrance of the Royall Exchange, 1640.

Hooker, Thomas. *Foure Learned and Godly Treatises; The Carnall Hypocrite. The Churches Deliverances. The Deceitfulnesse of Sinne. The Benefit of Afflictions.* London: Printed by Tho. Cotes, for Andrew Crooke, and are to be sold at the signe of the Beare in Pauls Churchyard, 1638.

Jackson, Thomas. *Wisdome Crying out to Sinners to returne from their evill ways. Contained in three pious and learned Treatises. I. Of Christs fervent love to bloody Jerusalem. II Of Gods just hardning of Pharaoh, when he had filled up the measure of his iniquity. III. Of Mans timely remembring of his Creator.* London: Printed by M.P., 1639.

Jones, John. *The Conquest of the Saints: or A short Treatise of Concord and Peace: Wherein is shewed the necessity of Unity and Peace, without which neither Church nor Common-wealth can stand.* London: Printed by G.M. for William Jones dwelling in Red-Crosse-streete, 1639.

King, Henry. *A Sermon Preached at St. Pauls March 27. 1640. Being the Anniversary of his Majesties Happy Inauguration to his Crowne.* London: Printed by Edward Griffin, 1640.

Lake, Arthur. *Ten Sermons Upon Severall Occasions, Preached at Saint Pauls Crosse, and Elsewhere.* London: Printed by Thomas Badger, for Humphrey Mosley, and are to be sold at his Shop at the Princes Armes in Saint Pauls Church-Yard, 1640.

Leslie, Henry. *A Full Confutation of the Covenant, Lately Sworne and Subscribed by many in Scotland; Delivered in a Speech, at the Visitation of Downe and Conner, Held in Lisnegarvy the 26th or September, 1638. Published by Authority.* London: Printed by John Raworth, for George Thomason, and are to be sold at the Rose in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1639.

Leslie, Henry. *A Treatise of the Authority of the Church. The summe whereof was delivered in a Sermon preached at Belfast, at the Visitation of the Diocese of Downe and Conner. Intended for the satisfaction of them who in those places oppose the Orders of our Church, and now published upon occasion of a Libell*

sent abroad in writing, wherein this Sermon, and all his proceedings are most falsely traduced. Together with an answer to certain objections made against the Orders of our Church, especially kneeling at the Communion. Dublin: Printed by the Society of Stationers, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, 1639.

M.P. *A true Subjects wish.* London: Printed by E.G. and are to be sold at the Horse-Shoe in Smith-field, 1640.

M.P. *Britaines Honour.* London: Printed by E.G. and are to be sold at the Horse-Shoe in Smith-field, 1640.

M.P. *Good Newes from the North.* London: Printed by E.G. and are to be old at the signe of the Horse-shoee in Smithfield, 1640.

M.P. *Newes from New-castle with An Advertisement.* London: Printed by E.G. and are to be sold at the Horse-shoee in Smith-field, 1640.

Marques, James. *An Answer to the Profession and Declaration.* Edinburgh: 1638.

Marques, James. *The Declinatour and Protestation of the some-times pretended Bishops, Presented in Face of the Last Assembly Refuted and Found Futile, but full of Insolent Reproaches, and bold Assertions.* Edinburgh: Printed by James Bryson, 1639.

Morton, Thomas. *A Sermon Preached Before the Kings most Excellent Majestie, in the Cathedrall Church of Durham. Upon Sunday, being the fifth day of May. 1639.* Newcastle: Upon Tyne, by Robert Barker. Printer to the Kings most Excellent Majestie: And by the Assignes of John Bill, 1639.

Phillips, Thomas. *The Booke of Lamentations; or, A Treatise of Hell. Wherein is shewen, the nature of it; the place where it is, so farre as probably may be conjecture; the severall punishments of the damned therein, and aggravations of the same; the justice of God maintained in sending the wicked thither; with divers other things. As also. The Booke of Genesis; or, Christ's Genealogie. Discussed as 'tis set downe by S. Matthew in the 1 ver. Of his Gospel. Being the summe of two Sermons, preached in the Cathedral Church of Lincolne.* London: Printed by I.D. for Peter Cole, and are to be sold at the signe of the Glove in Cornhill neere the Royall-Exchange, 1639.

Preston, John. *The Fulnesse of Christ for Us. A Sermon preached at the Court before King James of Blessed Memory.* London: Printed by J. Okes, for John Stafford, dwelling in Blacke-horse Alley neare Fleetstreet, 1640.

- Price, John. *Anti-Mortonus or an Apology In defence of the Church of Rome. Against the Grand Imposture of Doctor Thomas Morton, Bishop of Durham.* 1640.
- Ramsay, Andrew. *A Warning to Come Out of Babylon, In a Sermon preached by Master Andrew Ramsay, Minister at Edinburg; At the receiving of Mr. Thomas Abernethie, sometime Jesuit, into the Societie of the truly reformed Church of Scotland.* Edinburgh: 1638.
- Reynolds, Edward. *A Sermon Touching the Peace and Edification of the Church. Preached at the Second Triennial Visitation of the Right Reverend Father in God, Francis Lord Bishop of Peterborough, at Daventry in Northamptonshire, July 12. 1637.* London: Printed for Robert Bostock, at the signe of the Kings Head in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1638.
- Saltonstall, Wye. *Englands Complaint: Against Her adjoining neighbours the Scots. Occasioned by the factious Covenanters, in their disloyalty to his Sacred Majesty, this present yeare, 1640.* London: Printed for Richard Harper, 1640.
- Saltonstall, Wye. *The Complaint of Time Against the tumultuous and Rebellious Scots. Sharpely inveighing against them (as most justly they deserve) this yeare, 1639.* London: Printed by B.A. and T. F. for Richard Harpet in Smithfield, at the Bible and Harpe, 1639.
- Scotland Army. *The Demands and Behaviour of the Rebels of Scotland. Published by Authority.* London: Printed by Robert Young, 1640.
- Scotland Army. *The Intentions of the Army of the Kingdome of Scotland, Declared to Their Brethren of England, By the Commissioners of the late Parliament, and by the Generall, Noblemen, Barons, and others, Officers of the Army.* Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Bryson, and are to be solde at his Shop at the signe of Jonah, 1640.
- Scotland Army. *The Lawfulnessse of Our Expedition into England Manifested.* Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Bryson, and are to be solde at his Shop at the signe of Jonah, 1640.
- Scotland Parliament. *A Remonstrance Concerning the Present Troubles from the meeting of the Estates of the Kingdome of Scotland, Aprill 16. Unto the Parliament of England.* 1640.
- Scotland Parliament. *An Information from the States of the Kingdome of Scotland, to the Kingdome of England. Shewing, how they have bin dealt withal by his Majesties Commissioner, in denying to them that which his Majesty granted them by the Articles agreed upon at the Camp, and how they have been dealt with in the*

Parliament by denying to them the liberty of their own Lawes, and Practise of that Kingdome, all which they are able to make good. 1640.

Scotland Parliament. *Information from the Scottish Nation, to all the true English, concerning the present Expedition.* Edinburgh: 1640.

Scotland Sovereign. *An Explanation of the Meaning of the Oath and Covenant. Published by the L. Marques, his Majesties High Commissioner in Scotland, By the Kings speciall command.* London: Printed by His Majesties Printer for Scotland, 1639.

Scotland Sovereign. *Charles by the grace of God, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith. To our Lovits.* Edinburgh: Printed by Robert Young, printer to the Kings most excellent Majestie, 1638.

Scotland Sovereign. *Charles by the grace of God, King of Scotland, England, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith. To our Lovits.* 1638.

Sedgwick, Obadiah. *Military Discipline for the Christian Souldier. Drawne out in a Sermon Preached to the Captaines and Souldiers exercising Armes in the Artillery Garden, at their Generall meeting in Saint Andrew's Undershaft, in London, October 18.* 1638. London: Printed by G.M. for Thomas Nicholes, and are to be sold at the signe of the Bible in Popes-head-Alley, 1639.

Sibbes, Richard. *The Returning Backslider, Or, A Commentarie upon the whole XIII. Chapter of the Prophecy of the Prophet Hosea. Wherein is shewed the large extent of Gods free Mercy, even unto the most miserable forlorne and wretched sinners that may be, upon their Humiliation and Repentance.* London: Printed by G.M. for George Edwards in the Old Baily in Greene Arbour at the signe of the Angell, 1639.

Smith, Samuel. *The great assize, or, Day of jubilee. Delivered in foure sermons upon the 20. Chapter of the Revel. Ver. 12. 13. 14. 15. Whereunto are annexed two sermons upon the 1. Chapter of the Canticles, verse 6. 7. The tenth impression, corrected and amended by the author Samuel Smith, minister of the word of God at Prittlewell in Essex.* London: Printed by John Okes, 1638.

Stoughton, John. *Seaven Sermons, Preached upon Severall Occasions.* London: Printed by F.D. for John Bellamic, and Ralph Smith, and are to be sold at their Shop, at the three Golden-Lyons in Cornhill neere the Royall-Exchange, 1640.

Swan, John. *A Sermon Pointing out the Chiefe Causes, and Cures, of such unruly Stirres, as are not seldom found in the Church of God. Preached at Sawston in the countie of Cambridge, at the Arch Beacon of Elie his Visitation held there, upon the nineteenth day of September, 1638.* London: Printed by I.D. and are to be sold by

Daniel Pakeman, at the signe of the Raine-bow in Fleet-street neere the Temple gate, 1639.

T.H. *The Beautie of the Remarkable Yeare of Grace, 1638. The Yeare of the great Covenant of Scotland.* Edinburgh: Printed by George Anderson, 1638.

Taylor, Jeremy. *A Sermon Preached in Saint Maries Church in Oxford. Upon the Anniversary of the Gunpowder-Treason.* Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield Printer to the University, 1638.

Tozer, Henry. *Christian Wisdome, or The Excellency Fame and Right Meanes of True Wisdome. As it was briefly delivered in a Sermon in St. Maries Church in Oxford. November 11. 1638.* Oxford: Printed by L. Lichfield, 1639.

Warriston, Archibald Johnston. *A Short Relation of the State of the Kirk of Scotland since the Reformation of Religion, to the present time for information, and advertisement to our Brethren in the Kirk of England, By an hearty Well wisher to both Kingdomes.* Edinburgh: 1638.

Warriston, Archibald Johnston. *Reasons against the rendering of Our sworne and subscribed Confession of Faith.* Edinburgh: 1638.

Windebank, Francis. *His Majesties Declaration, Concerning His Proceedings with His Subjects of Scotland, Since the Pacification in the Camp neere Berwick.* London: Printed by R. Young, His Majesties Printer for Scotland, and R. Badger, Printer to the Prince His Highnesse, 1640.

2. Secondary Sources

Adamson, John. *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007.

Baskerville, Stephen. *Not Peace but a Sword: The political theology of the English revolution.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Cressy, David. *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution 1640-1642.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Cust, Richard. *Charles I: A Political Life.* Harlow: Pearson, 2005.

Fissel, Mark Charles. *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's campaigns against Scotland, 1638-1640.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

- Fletcher, Anthony. *The Outbreak of the English Civil War*. London: Edward Arnold, 1981.
- Hibbard, Caroline. *Charles I and the Popish Plot*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1983.
- Kerridge, Eric. *The Farmers of Old England*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1973.
- Larner, Christina. *Enemies of God: The Witch-hunt in Scotland*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1981.
- Macinnes, Allan I. *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement 1625-1641*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1991.
- Macinnes, Allan I. *The British Revolution, 1629-1660*. New York: Palgrave, 2005.
- Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Morrill, John. "The Religious Context of the English Civil War," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, Vol. 34 (1984): 155-178.
- Russell, Conrad. "Introduction," in Conrad Russell, ed., *The Origins of the English Civil War*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Russell, Conrad. *The Causes of the English Civil War*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Russell, Conrad. *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History 1509-1660*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *The Personal Rule of Charles I*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Causes of the English Revolution 1529-1642*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.
- The Holy Bible: The New King James Version*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1994.
- Trevor-Roper, H.R. *Archbishop Laud 1573-1645*. Hamden: Archon Books, 1962.

Tyacke, Nicholas. "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution," in Conrad Russell, ed., *The Origins of the English Civil War*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Walzer, Michael. *The Revolution of the Saints: A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Wedgwood, C.V. *The Great Rebellion: The King's Peace 1637-1641*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1955.

Wedgwood, C.V. *The Great Rebellion: The King's War 1641-1647*. London: Collins, 1958.

Wilson, John F. *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars 1640-1648*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.