A Sociological Analysis of the English Civil War.

Geography and the Civil War in England.

England experienced the growth of capitalism earlier than most European powers, which along with the prevalence of individual freedom, is central for an understanding of the civil war. Luciani Pellicani in his discussion of the history of capitalism, has emphasized the importance of political and military constraints on personal freedom:

> The *consumer's freedom* is as essential for the functioning of capitalism as the *entrepreneur's freedom* ... The emancipation of the urban communities marks the beginning of the genesis of modern capitalism. Its roots are political and military, not economic. Cities were able to inject dynamism and rationality into the stagnant rural world only to the extent to which they succeeded in withdrawing from the effective jurisdiction of their lords and the spiritual control of economic obscurantism centred around the condemnation of profit and trade. They were successful precisely because they were opposed by a crumbling public power, lacking as never before the military and financial means to compel its subjects to obedience.[1]

Max Weber gave several reasons why England differed from continental powers: 'As a result of its insular position [as an island] England was not dependent on a great standing army.' On the continent it was possible for the state to protect its peasantry through its standing army, but in England this was not possible. As a result, England 'became the classical land of peasant eviction. The labour force this threw on the market made possible the development of the domestic small master system ... Thus while in England shop industry arose, so to speak, by itself, on the continent it had to be deliberately cultivated by the state ... This is by no means fortuitous, but is the outcome of continuous development over centuries ... the result of its [England's] insular position.'[2]

The argument that these changes occurred as a result of 'a continuous development over centuries' is consistent with Alan Macfarlane's thesis that 'the majority of ordinary people in England from at least the thirteenth century were rampant individualists, highly mobile both geographically and socially, economically "rational", market-oriented and acquisitive, ego-centred in kinship and social life.'[3] This indicates that English individualism existed well before the late fifteenth century, which is when most historians have dated the emergence of capitalism in England.[4] This suggests that something fundamental in English society – 'its insular position' – was responsible for this cultural development.

England's geographical situation as an island meant that it was relatively free from the wars occurring on the continent, relying mainly on a navy for defence and resulting in periodic recruitment of militias rather than the establishment of a permanent army. France, Germany and most continental powers were vulnerable to military attack because of the threat from other land based societies, and therefore were forced to develop armies in order to survive. According to Jane Whittle

---

[1] L. Pellicani, *The Genisis of Capitalism and the Origins of Modernity*, 1994, pp. 10, 123.
[2] M. Weber, *General Economic History*, 1961, pp. 129, 130; M. Weber, *Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, 1964, p. 277.
[3] A, Macfarlane, *The Origins of English Individualism*, 1978, p. 163.
[4] Ibid, pp. 34-48.

> The lack of prosperity [in France was due to] ... the wars conducted on French soil from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, and the heavy royal taxation to which French peasants were subjected from the late fifteenth century onwards ... That English peasants were not subjected to a similar level of taxation was not a matter of chance. There were rebellions against taxation in 1489, and 1497 and 1525, as well as 1381 ... Yet because of the low level of taxation, English governments could not afford to keep a standing army to put down these rebellions.[5]

Whittle does not explain the relative success of rebellions in England, and why it was so difficult to suppress them. The absence of a permanent national army was the result of England's geographical position as an island, not allowing it as in France, to introduce high taxes. This resulted in a vicious circle: no standing army, low taxation, no standing army.

The exceptions to the vulnerability of continental powers were Holland and Venice, which were protected from attack by their geographical location. In the case of Holland, the canals and marshes allowed them to create flood barriers against enemies, and they established a Water Line in the early seventeenth century which was used to almost transform Holland at times into an island. The Water Line was used for example in 1672, where it prevented the armies of Louis XIV from conquering Holland.[6] Venetian power was derived from its fleet and linked military forces, and its control of its lagoons provided protection from military attacks.[7] It is perhaps no accident that both states became republics with early forms of capitalist development, illustrating Pellicani's thesis about the centrality of military and political factors in creating the freedoms necessary for entrepreneurial growth.

The lack of a permanent national army in England meant that the English crown, as well as the aristocracy, was dependent on the population at large for the creation of military force.[8] This absence of a standing army made it difficult for the government to impose taxes, and eventually resulted in the development of markets relatively free of political and military control. England's reliance on its navy for defence included its merchant fleet – and this partly explains its active involvement in world trade, an important dimension in the growth of English capitalism.

There were also important internal geographical factors associated with the development of capitalism in England. It was a country with plentiful coal and iron deposits, internal rivers and good coastal harbours, and a location between Europe and the Americas. However, there were internal environmental conditions which also facilitated the growth of individual freedoms:

> ... [there was] a growing distinction between working communities in forest and in fielden areas. In the nucleated villages characteristic of the latter ... manorial customs [were] fairly rigid, political habits comparatively orderly, and the labourer's outlook deeply imbued with the prevalent preconceptions of church and manor-house. In these fielden areas labourers often ... more or less freely [accepted] their dependence on squire and parson ... In the isolated hamlets characteristic of forest settlements ... the customs of the manor were sometimes vague or difficult to enforce ... and the authority of church and manor house seemed remote. In these areas [the population was] ... more prone to pick up new ways and ideas. It was primarily in heath and forest areas ... that the vagrant religion of the Independents found a footing in rural communities.'[9]

---

[5] J. Whittle, *The Development of Agrarian Capitalism: Land and Labour in Norfolk 1440-1580*, 2000, pp. 18, 19, 311.
[6] Wikipedia: *Dutch Water Line.*
[7] Wikipedia, *Military History of the Republic of Venice.*
[8] Ibid, pp. xvii-xx, 3-37.
[9] A. Everitt, 'The marketing of agricultural produce' in J. Thirsk, *The Agrarian History of England and Wales, 1500-1640*, 1967, pp. 462, 463. See also the discussion of the contrast between pastoral and arable areas in D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot & Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660*, 1987, p. 5; J. Thirsk, 'The farming regions of England' in Thirsk, *The Agrarian History*, p. 14; K.

The areas outside of manorial control consisted 'mainly of towns, the pasture and woodland areas linked to an expanding market economy, and the industrializing regions devoted to cloth-making, mining, and metal-working ...'[10] Many of these districts were 'perceived as being a lawless ... Few gentry families lived there to supervise the behaviour of the "common" people and ... [they] proved to be one of the areas of considerable religious independence and dissent.'[11]

Given the importance of the cloth industry in England, the support of clothing districts for parliament was a key factor in the civil war.[12] The attempts at political control by Charles I extended to the power of the guilds, which were seen by him, along with monopolies, as 'one of the traditional instruments of industrial control'.[13] However, much economic development took place in rural areas, where the power of the guilds was progressively weakened:

> ... during the thirteenth century there was an increasing shift of industry away from urban areas to the countryside. ... The growth of the rural cloth industry was partly enabled ... by a rural location ... [which] permitted cloth producers to take advantage of cheap labour away from the prohibitive restrictions of the guilds ... the very existence of craft guilds or endeavours to establish them might encourage merchants to transfer their entrepreneurial activities to the countryside. Textile skills were traditional there and rural overpopulation made labour available ... [14]

The Role of Armies on the Political Development of France and England.

In order to fully understand the civil war in England it is necessary to compare it with events in France during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The French 'Wars of Religion' were a period of war between Catholics and Huguenots in France in the latter half of the sixteenth century. This included the destruction of images in Catholic churches, which resulted in Catholics attacking Protestants, including the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre in 1572.

Correlli Barnet contrasted the military developments in England, France and Germany during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as follows:

> An army had indeed been 'standing' in France almost continuously throughout the sixteenth century; an emergency force to meet continuous emergency. Since 1569 there had been permanent regiments of native-born infantry. France's rise to greatness as a modern military power dates, however, from about 1624, during Cardinal Richelieu's administration ... In 1628 the twelve oldest regiments were given a permanent status ... By 1635, when France entered the war [the Thirty Years War], she had five field armies numbering 100,000 men, including 18,000 horsemen ... Men were now to be paid not by their captains but by state commissioners, one per regiment ... In France under Louis XIII and Richelieu royal authority rested on the army – in the 1630s and 1640s taxes

---

Wrightson, *English Society, 1580-1680,* 1982, p. 171; S. B. Jennings, *The Gathering of the Elect: The Development, Nature and Socio-economic Structures of Protestant Religious Dissent in Seventeenth Century Nottinghamshire.* (D.Phil. Thesis, Nottingham Trent University), p. 270.

[10] Underdown, *Revel*, p. 18.

[11] Jennings, *The Gathering,* p. 17.

[12] Underdown, *Revel*, pp. 220, 231-32, 275-78; J. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution,* 1993, p. 235.

[13] R. Ashton, 'Charles I and the City', in F.J. Fisher (ed.), *Essays in the Economic and Social History of Tudor and Stuart England*, 1961, p. 145; L. Stone, *Causes of the English Revolution, 1529-1642*, 1986, p. 126

[14] P.T.H. Unwin, 'Town and trade 1066-1500' in R.A. Dodgson and R.A. Butlin (eds.), *An Historical Geography of England and Wales*, 1978, p. 136.

> were even collected by armed force. In Germany, where some states enjoyed greater formal powers than the English Houses of Parliament, the princes could plead the emergency of the Thirty Years War to make a convincing case for emergency taxation on royal authority and for raising standing armies ... [15]

Fourteen regiments of the French Army were used to persecute the Huguenots, the major Protestant group in France. Louis XIV instituted a campaign of harassment, which included the occupation and looting of Huguenot homes by military troops, attempting to forcibly convert them. In 1685, he issued the Edict of Fontainebleau, revoking the Edict of Nantes and declaring Protestantism illegal. Huguenots made up to as much as ten per cent of the French population; but by 1685 it had reduced to no more than 1,500 people.[16]

The impact of the suppression of the Huguenots and the control of French society by the military has been summarized by Hatton:

> the monarchy followed the policy of state support, regulation and economic control ... To live nobly, in other words in the manner of the nobility, idly without following a trade or craft, was in itself a claim to honour and social esteem. Colbert and his contemporaries did not realise the advantages which would derive from a general system of freedom of labour.[17]

The incidence of taxation was very high in France, but by contrast the level of taxation in England before the civil war resulted in the emergence of an independent group of prosperous yeomen, artisans and traders.[18] The presence of royal troops in France led to the decimation of the rural population, described by Sir John Fortescue in an account written as early as the 1460s, and summarized by Perry Anderson as follows:

> ... Sir John Fortescue, Lord Chancellor to King Henry VI, fled into France with Henry in 1461 and during the next ten years of exile he wrote his *Learned Commendation of the Politique Laws of England* ... Fortescue noted the oppressions of the rural population by royal troops in France ... 'so that there is not the least village there free from this miserable calamity, but that it is once or twice every year beggared by this kind of pilings (pillage).' This and other exactions, such as the salt tax, led to great poverty of the rural inhabitants which Fortescue observed around him ... In England, on the other hand, the position of rural inhabitants was very different. The absence of heavy taxation, of billeted soldiers, and of internal taxes, meant that 'every inhabiter of that realm useth and enjoyeth at his pleasure all the fruits that his land or cattle beareth, with all the profits and commodities which by his own travail, or by the labour of others he gaineth by land or by water ...' Neither are they sued in the law, but only before ordinary judges, whereby the laws of the land they are justly intreated.[19]

A similar account was given by John Aylmer, later Bishop of London, who lived in exile on the continent and in 1559 published a pamphlet entitled *An Harborowe for Faithfull and Trewe Subjects*. He claimed that the impoverishment of the rural French population was due to the frequency of wars – 'as they are never without it' – resulting in the king's soldiers entering 'the poor man's house, eatheth and drinketh up all that he ever hath'.[20]

Correlli Barnett has summarized the role of the army on political developments in England during the outbreak of the civil war:

---

[15] C. Barnett, *Britain and Her Army, 1509-1970*, 1970, pp. 69-73.
[16] Wikipedia Huguenot.
[17] R. Hatton (ed.), *Louis XIV and Absolutism*, 1976, pp. 227, 240.
[18] T.H. Aston and C.H.E. Philpin, *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe*, 1987, p. 89.
[19] P. Anderson, *Lineages of the Absolute State*, 1974, pp. 179-181.
[20] Ibid, p. 178.

> In England ... Charles I endeavoured from 1629 to free himself from the Commons' control over taxation by virtually abandoning any foreign policy, with all its implications in terms of costly armies. However, he could not then plead national emergency to raise an army. The Commons were well aware of the danger to their position which a royal army would represent ... No funds were available to pay an army ... Charles had nothing except the militia system ... [21]

As a result of an absence of a permanent national army, Charles was unable to arrest the rebellious five Members of Parliament, precipitating the civil war. Thomas May's two publications, issued in 1647 and 1650 ... [claimed] 'what the parliamentarians were defending, as they saw it, was the ancient constitution, the common law which had existed (so Coke said) since time immemorial, and the rights and liberties of all free-born Englishmen,'[22] which Levellers and other radicals believed had been subverted by the Norman Conquest. Sir John Strangways writing in the Tower in the 1640s concluded 'that if the gentry were not universally Anglican high-flyers, neither were they supporters of any supposed scheme to establish a despotism on the French model – most of the Cavalier gentry were as attached to the liberties of the ancient constitution as their old enemies had been.'[23] This emphasis on civil liberties rather than religion was confirmed by Cromwell when he said that at the beginning of the civil war 'religion was not the thing first contended for, but God hath brought it to that issue at last.'[24]

The Political History of London.

The City of London was by far the biggest urban area in England, and became one of the largest cities in Europe. It was the capital of a major sea power, and through its trade had grown immensely powerful. This was illustrated by the Venetian ambassador when he 'reckoned that twenty thousand craft, small and great, were to be seen from London in a day.'[25] (p. 30)

It was relatively immune from the control of the monarchy because of the crown's lack of a standing army. Also, its inland geographical location in the Thames gave it a degree of protection from outside invaders. Its population had grown rapidly during the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, reflecting its commercial and financial success and growth.

Table 1: Estimated Population Size of London, 1520-1700.[26]

Approximate Date	Estimated Population of London	Period	Annual Percentage Increase	Estimated Population of England	London's Population as a Proportion of England's Population
1520	55,000			2,600,000	2.1%
1600	200,000	1520-1600	3.3%	4,300,000	4.7%
1650	400,000	1600-1650	2.0%	5,250,000	7.6%

[21] Barnett, *Britain and Her Army*, pp. 69-73.
[22] R. Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution*, 1998, p. 15.
[23] Underdown, *A Freeborn*, p. 115. See also Harold Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880*, 1969, pp. 52, 53.
[24] Morrill, *The Nature*, p. 394.
[25] C.V. Wedgewood, *The King's Peace, 1637-1641*, 2001, p. 30.
[26] P. Razzell and C. Spence, 'The history of infant, child and adult mortality in London, 1550-1850', *London Journal,* Volume 32, p. 25.

1700	575,000	1650-1700	0.9%	5,100,000	11.3%

In 1650 towns with a population of over 10,000 numbered a total of 494,000 people in England, of which about 400,000 – 81% – were living in London.[27] This indicates the overwhelming importance of London in the civil war, dominating the urban landscape and its support for parliament.

Historically, London had formed the centre of opposition to the crown's attempts to control the country through its use of the prerogative. As early as the tenth century the City resisted the invasion of the Danes through its defensive fortifications and its military power:[28] Later in the twelfth century Fitz-Stephen described in some detail the military strength of London:

> ... the city mustered, according to estimation, no less than sixty-thousand foot and twenty thousand horse ... the city was possessed of very considerable military strength, the only efficient source of power in those days ... its wall was strong and lofty, adorned with seven gates, and having all along the north side turrets at equally distances. Within it and its immediate suburbs were ... one hundred and twenty-six parish churches.[29]

London formed alliances with barons and others in conflict with the crown, but also supported the crown on occasions, and because of its financial and military power this formed the basis of the City's relative independence and autonomy.[30]

Under a Royal Charter of 1067 the crown had granted London certain rights and privileges, which were confirmed by Magna Carter. These privileges were given on the basis of loans and taxes that the City granted to the crown. However this charter and later ones were frequently abolished by the crown, often requiring major loans and taxes in order to obtain renewals.[31]

The Role of London in the Civil War

London was seen by contemporaries during the civil war as the chief centre of resistance to the crown. Clarendon called London 'the sink of the ill-humours of this kingdom',[32] and a royalist writer declared: 'If (posterity) should ask who would have pulled the crown from the King's head, taken the government off the hinges, dissolved Monarchy, enslaved the laws, and ruined their country; say, 'twas the proud, unthankful, schismatical, rebellious, bloody City of London.'[33] The Venetian ambassador in one of his summaries of events in the civil war claimed 'London was the chief and most determined hot bed of the war against the King. Countless treasure was poured out of the purses of private individuals for the support of their armies. The goldsmiths alone are creditors for a loan of 800,000 crowns made to Parliament ...'[34]

---

[27] M. Anderson (ed.), *British Population History*, 1996, p. 122.
[28] G. Norton, *Commentaries on the History, Constitution and Chartered Franchises of the City of London*, 1829, p. 29.
[29] Ibid, pp, 76, 83.
[30] Ibid, pp. 75, 156, 158, 204, 211.
[31] Ibid, pp. 70, 96, 97, 115, 156, 157, 282.
[32] V. Pearl, *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution: City Government and National Politics, 1625-43,* 1961, p. xi; see also T. Hobbes, *English Works,* Volume VI, 1839-45, pp. 191-92.
[33] Pearl, *London,* p. xi.
[34] E. and P. Razzell (eds.), *The English Civil War: A Contemporary Account,* Volume 5, 1657-1675*, Relatzione of England by Giovanni Sagredo,* 1656, p. 4.

London was the biggest manufacturing centre of England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, much of it in the suburbs beyond the control of the City authorities:

> From at least the early sixteenth century ... there had been a tendency for domestic industry to establish itself in the suburbs where it was often possible to escape the powers and penalties of the livery Companies. By 1600, nearly all the leatherworkers and makers of felt hats had left the city and were living in Bermondsey, Southwark and Lambeth ... Many of the newer industries of the period were being attracted to the liberties and out-parishes: sugar-refining and glass-making around Stepney and Islington, alum and dye works to the north and east of the city, and copper and brass mills at Isleworth. Large-scale industrial enterprises, such as ship-building at Rotherhithe and Deptford, and brewing in Clerkenwell and Holborn, were also migrating to the suburbs. There were older industries too: brick-and tile-making in the northern outskirts ... clock-making in Holborn and Westminster; bell-founding in Whitechapel; paper-making in Middlesex, while St. Giles, Cripplegate, was crowded with artisans of the weaving, printing and paper-making trades. Thomas Mun, writing in the sixteen-twenties, described the concentration of workers in the silk industry and recalled how in the past thirty-five years, the winding and twisting of imported raw silk, which previously had not more than 300 in the city and suburbs, had now 'set on work above fourteen thousand souls'. The great majority of these would have been workers in the outskirts of London.[35]

These manufacturing areas included Southwark which had long been an area beyond the control of the City – brothels, bear baiting and illegal theatrical productions[36] – but also attracted unregistered artisans and foreigners who brought with them a range of industrial skills:

> The more the city became the commercial centre of England, the more the actual industries moved beyond the walls. The poorer craftsmen who did not have the money to set up shop within the city, and the 'foreigners' or unfree men – often including aliens – who were not qualified to do so, not having served an apprenticeship, tended to settle in the suburbs. Over such recalcitrant workers the [guild] companies found it difficult to assert any control, even when empowered to do so by statute or charter.[37]

This was partly the result of the growth of London's population, which undermined the capacity of the City authorities to regulate industry in the suburbs.[38] The City authorities attempted to exonerate itself from blame for the disorders in the City, writing to the king that 'many of the trouble-makers, they thought, came from the unregulated and disorderly suburbs' which were beyond their control.[39] The radicalism of the suburbs was displayed in 1647 when the inhabitants of Southwark opened the gates of London Bridge to Fairfax's army, resisting the City's attempt to oppose the New Model Army. [40]

Given London's high mortality rate, much of its growth was fuelled by migration from elsewhere in Britain. One of the best sources for data on migration is apprenticeship records. According to Brian Manning, most apprentices were 'of good parentage' whose families 'lived honestly and thriftily in the country.'[41] Only a minority of apprentices came

---

[35] Pearl, *London*, p. 16.
[36] Anonymous, *The City Laws Showing the Customes, Franchises, Liberties, Priviledges, and Immunities of the Famous City of London,* 1658.
[37] D.J. Johnson, *Southwark and the City*, 1969, p. 313.
[38] P. Wallis, 'Controlling commodities: search and reconciliation in the early modern livery companies', in I.A. Gadd and P. Wallis (eds.), *Guilds, Society and Economy in London, 1450-1800*, 2002, p. 87.
[39] Pearl, *London*, p. 129.
[40] Ibid, p. 28.
[41] B. Manning, *Aristocrats, Plebeians and Revolution in England, 1640-1660,* p. 89.

from London and the cosmopolitan nature of the City meant its population came from all areas of the country and with fathers in all occupational groups.[42] The majority of apprentices were from 'middle sort' backgrounds, and it was this group who provided the main support for parliament in London.[43]

Table 2 Numbers of Occupations and Number from London.[44]

Occupation of Father	*Total Number*	*Fathers Residing in London*	*% Fathers Residing in London*
Gentlemen, Esquires & Clerks	33	2	6%
Yeomen	51	0	0%
Artisans. Tradesmen & Merchants	90	38	42%
Husbandmen & Labourers	26	2	8%
Total	200	42	21%

As C.V. Wedgewood observed: 'In all the larger towns, and above all in London, the short-haired apprentices who thronged about the place counted among their number gentlemen's sons, yeomen's sons, the sons of professional men and of citizens ... all were alike apprentices, and common interests, hopes and pleasures broke down the barriers of inheritance.'[45] This illustrates the importance of social structures in unifying disparate individual differences, an important factor in the communities involved in the civil war.

London was both cosmopolitan in the origins of its residents, but also in its high degree of literacy. Evidence produced by David Cressy indicates that seventy per cent of men in England were unable to sign their names in 1641-42, whereas this was true of only twenty-two percent of Londoners, suggesting 'that the capital may have provided a uniquely literate environment.'[46] This high level of literacy was partly associated with the occupational structure of London, as indicated by Table 3.

Table 3 *Social Structure of Illiteracy in the Diocese of London, City and Middlesex, 1580-1700.*[47]

Fathers Occupation	Number Sampled	Proportion Signing With A Mark
Clergy & Professionals	168	0%
Gentry	240	2%
Apprentices	33	18%
Tradesmen & Craftsmen	1,398	28%
Yeomen	121	30%
Servants	134	31%
Labourers	7	78%
Husbandmen	132	79%

[42] For data on migration patterns of apprentices see Razzell and Spence, 'The history', p. 27. For confirmation of the very high levels of in-migration to London in the seventeenth century see V.B. Elliott, *Mobility and Marriage in Pre-Industrial England*, Cambridge University Ph. D thesis, 1978.
[43] B. Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution*, 1991.
[44] Data from Cliff Webb, *London Livery Apprenticeship Registers*, Volumes 2, 33, 43 and 48, tylers & bricklayers, plumbers, vintners, grocers. First 50 cases were selected from each volume, 1640-1660
[45] Wedgewood, *The King's Peace*, p. 52.
[46] D. Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England,* 1980, p. 72; see also P.S. Seaver, *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth Century London*, 1985, p. 5.
[47] Cressy, *Literacy*, p. 121.

Women	1,794	76%

There was a significant difference in the high literacy of the gentry, professionals, tradesmen & craftsmen on the one hand – who were in a majority in the sample – and the low literacy of husbandmen, labourers and women on the other.

London not only provided the bulk of the money, supply of weapons, ammunition, uniforms and other military equipment for parliament,[48] but in the early stages of the war also the majority of its soldiers from its trained bands.[49] As Clarendon wrote of the Battle of Edgehill, 'the London train bands, and auxiliary regiments ... behaved themselves to wonder, and were in truth the preservation of that army that day ...'[50] London not only supplied the bulk of the trained parliamentary troops, but also the City was central to the beginning of the war through its participation in mass demonstrations of parliament, as well as creating petitions for political and religious reform. [51] These demonstrations occurred virtually every day, constantly lobbying parliament in a threatening way.[52] The population also demonstrated through its actions its opposition to the crown and support of parliament:

> In a desperate attempt to redeem his abortive coup, Charles went down to the city on 5 January [1642]. 'the people crying 'Privilege of Parliament' by thousands ... shutting up all their shops and standing at their doors with swords and halberds ... the city was now in mortal fear of the king and his cavaliers. A rumour the next evening that Charles intended to fetch out his victims [five Members of Parliament] by force brought huge crowds into the streets, with whatever arms they could lay their hands on: women provided hot water to throw on the invaders, stools, forms and empty tubs were hurled into the streets 'to intercept the horse' ... the truth was dawning in Whitehall, between 4 and 10 January, that, for all their swashbuckling of the cavaliers and the protestations of young loyalists at the Inns of Court, the king had lost control of his capital.[53] The five members ... together with Viscount Mandeville [who the king attempted to arrest], embarked at the Three Cranes ... there was a fleet of boats, armed with muskets and ordnance ... Trumpets, drums and martial music accompanied the MPs all the way to Westminster ... More than 2000 men in arms and citizens thronged Westminster Hall ... [54]

The Venetian ambassador claimed in July 1643 that 'the support of this war rests upon the city alone ... [It] has already usurped practically absolute power. They have formed a council for the militia, composed of citizens with supreme authority to do what is considered necessary for self defence while, for the equipment of the Army and its despatch, they are raising money and men ...'[55] It was the absence of a standing army which led to the failure of Charles I to force parliament to comply with his demands, leading to his failure to arrest the five members in 1642. He was unable to force Londoners to reveal their whereabouts, and London turned out to be the chief centre of resistance to royal control.

The Venetian ambassador argued that the Puritans owed their success in the Short Parliament elections to their achievements in 'Swaying the Common votes', and Thomas

---

[48] S. Porter and S. Marsh, *The Battle for London*, 2010, p. 41.
[49] J. Morrill (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642-1649,* 1982, p. 19.
[50] E. Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*, Volume 3, 1888, pp. 174, 175.
[51] Fletcher, *The Outbreak*, p. 128; See also R Ashton, *The City and the Court, 1603-1643*, 1979, p. 220.
[52] E. And P. Razzell (eds.), *The English Civil War: A Contemporary Account, Volume 2: 1640-42*, 1996, p. 142.
[53] Fletcher, *The Outbreak*, p. 182.
[54] Ibid, p. 185. See Manning, *Aristocrats*, pp. 34-36 for a discussion of the role of London citizens in support of parliament.
[55] E. And P. Razzell (eds.), *The English Revolution: A Contemporary Study of the English Civil War*, 1999, p. 194.

Hobbes more or less concurred, asserting that 'tradesmen, in the cities and boroughs ... choose as near as they can, such as are most repugnant to the giving of subsidies'.[56]

This illustrates Pellicani's thesis about the role of towns and urban areas in injecting 'dynamism and rationality into a stagnant rural world', and laying the foundation for parliamentarian opposition to the crown. The Venetian Ambassador on the 24th January 1642 gave a further account of the popular support for parliament in London,[57] and on the 7th November described how the Londoners erected barriers to protect the City against the royalist army: 'There is no street, however little frequented, that is not barricaded with heavy chains, and every post is guarded by numerous squadrons. At the approaches to London they are putting up trenches and small forts of earthwork, at which a great number of people are at work, including the women and little children.'[58] On the 15th May the following year, the ambassador described the completion of these fortifications:

> The forts round this city are now completed and admirably designed. They are now beginning the connecting lines. As they wish to complete these speedily and the circuit is most vast, they have gone through the city with drums beating, the flag flying to enlist men and women volunteers for the work. Although they only give them their bare food, without any pay, there has been an enormous rush of people, even of some rank, who believe they are serving God by assisting in this pious work, as they deem it.[59]

This was a revolutionary moment demonstrating fierce and violent opposition to the crown. This moment has been described in detail by Pearl as follows:

> At the order of the Common Council, pulpits were to resound with the call to defend the city. Ministers were to 'stir up the parishioners' to complete the fortifications with the aid of their children and servants ... It is not surprising that Pennington's wife, the Lady Mayoress, was there (armed with an entrenching tool, said a Royalist ballad) – we have already encountered her staunch Puritanism. But ladies of rank were also present, as well as fish wives who had marched from Billingsgate in martial order headed by a symbolic goddess of war ... Columns with drums beating and flags flying were sent through the city to recruit more volunteers until 20,000 persons, it was said, were working without pay, drawing only their rations ... The work was allocated by whole parishes, and different trades and Livery Companies, who marched out with 'roaring drums, flying colours and girded swords': over fifty trades were said to have competed in friendly emulation: one day it was 5,000 Feltmakers and Cappers with their families: the next almost the entire Company of Vintners with their wives, servants and wine-porters; on another, all the 2,000 city porters 'in their white frocks', followed by 4,000 of 5,000 Shoemakers, a like number from St. Giles-the-Fields and thereabouts, and the entire inhabitants of St. Clement Dane. In this astonishing manifestation of unity, even the 'clerks and gentlemen' participated as a profession. Those belonging to Parliament, the Inns of Court, and other public offices, were mustered in the Piazza in Covent Garden at seven o'clock in the morning with 'spades, shovels, pickaxes and other necessaries' Popular enthusiasm for the fortifications could reach no higher pitch. Whatever the military value of the defences, the successful mobilization of a great mass of the ordinary people proved the power of parliamentary puritan organization and leadership ... The city had been united in one desire – London should not become a battlefield.[60]

---

[56] D.. Hirst, *The Representative of the People? Voting in England under the Early Stuarts*, 1975, p. 68. See also Morrill (ed.), *Reactions*, p. 70 for a discussion of the support of trading cities for parliament and the support of cathedral cities for the crown.
[57] Razzell, *The English Civil War,* Volume 2, 1640-42, p. 169.
[58] Razzell, *The English Revolution*, p. 173.
[59] Ibid, p. 188.
[60] Pearl, *London*, pp. 264, 265.

London also had a major influence on provincial towns and urban areas. Clarendon concluded that the chief opposition to the king lay in 'great towns and corporations ... not only the citizens of London ... but also the greatest part of all other cities and market towns of England.'[61] This was mainly through trading links, as described by the Puritan clergyman Richard Baxter in his discussion of the support of tradesmen and artisans for parliament: 'The Reasons which the Party themselves gave was, Because (they say) the Tradesmen have a Correspondency with London, and so are grown to be far more Intelligent sort of Men ... '[62] The role of tradesmen in the civil war was confirmed by Parker, in his *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* published in 1671: 'For 'tis notorious that there is not any sort of people so inclinable to seditious practices as the trading part of a nation ... And, if we reflect upon our late miserable distractions, 'tis easy to observe how the quarrel was chiefly hatched in the shops of tradesmen, and cherished by the zeal of prentice-boys and city gossips.'[63]

There was however internal opposition led by royalists in London to the Puritan takeover of the City.[64] On October 24, 1642 the Venetian ambassador wrote:

> In this city a by no means negligible party is disclosing itself in his [the king's] favour, and a goodly number of men, anxious to make themselves known as such by those who inwardly cherish the same laudable sentiments, have introduced the practice, following His Majesty's soldiers, of wearing a rose coloured band on their hats, as a sign that they are his faithful servants. The Mayor, on the other hand, who is a Puritan, whose duty it is to superintend the government of the City, is endeavouring by vigorous demonstrations to prevent the spread of this custom ... [65]

The conflicts sometimes led to violence and the ambassador reported on an affray which took place in St. Paul's Cathedral on the 30th October 1653:

> Last Sunday ... a riot took place in St. Paul's Cathedral to the consternation of all present. Among the various sects, of which more than fifty may now be counted in England, that of the Anabaptists which at present numbers many proselytes, had a place assigned it there for preaching purposes ... on the day in question, a considerable mob of apprentices appeared there on a sudden to oust the Anabaptists, whose preacher they began to insult, His followers took his part, but though the military were called in and quelled the tumult, some were killed and others maimed.[66]

But that London was the centre of opposition to the crown was reflected in political affiliation in the post-restoration period. In the 1661 election, it returned to parliament four MPs, two Presbyterians and two Independents.[67] Pepys records a conversation with a Mr Hill on 26th July 1661, telling him that 'the King now would be forced to favour the Presbytery, or the City would leave him.'[68] Later in 1663 Pepys claimed that the royalists were afraid of

---

[61] Hyde, *The History,* Volume 2, 1888, pp. 226, 238. Hyde was quoting from Hobbes in this account. The Corporation Act passed in 1661 which prevented non-Anglicans from holding office in towns and corporations, is further confirmation of the role of towns in supporting parliament during the civil war.
[62] R. Baxter, *Reliquiare Baxterianae*, Part 3, 1696, p. 30.
[63] C. Hill and E. Dell (eds.), *The Good Old Cause: The English Revolution of 1640-1660, Its Causes, Course and Consequences,* 1969, p. 238. After the restoration, Bishop Hacket claimed that the 'Conveticles in Corporations were the seminaries out of which the warriors against King and Church came.' Stone, *Causes*, p. 103.
[64] Porter and Marsh, *The Battle*, p. 46.
[65] Razzell, *The English Civil War, Volume 2: 1640-42*, p. 312.
[66] Razzell, *The English Civil War, Volume 4: 1648-1656*, p. 157. For other accounts of opposition to the radicalism of the sects see K. Lindley, 'London and popular freedom in the 1640s' in R.C. Richardson and G.M Ridden (eds.), *Freedom and the English Revolution*, 1986, pp. 127, 132.
[67] R.C. Thatham and W. Matthews (eds.), *The Diary of Samuel Pepys,* Volume 2, 1995, 20 March 1661, p. 57, fn.
[68] Ibid, p. 141.

London and that 'they talk of rebellion, and I perceive they make it their great maxime to be sure to Maister the City of London.'[69] As a result of the fear of the City, in 1683 Charles II suspended the rights and privileges of the corporation, which were only restored by William and Mary in 1689.

Puritanism in the Civil War

Religion played a major role in the civil war, although it was not the first issue to provoke parliament in its opposition to the crown.[70] London had been the centre of separatist Puritan congregations from the fourteenth century onwards,[71] and according to Baxter, 'The remnant of the old Separatists and Anabaptists in London was then very small and inconsiderable but they were enough to stir up the younger and inexperienced sort of religious people.'[72] Contact with London influenced opposition to the religious policies of Laud, which was most vocal 'in great clothing towns, because they see no such thing, as they say, in the churches in London.'[73] London's influence on the spread of puritanism occurred through its trading links:

> The growth of puritanism, wrote a hostile critic, was by meanes of the City of London (the nest and seminary of the seditious faction) and by reason of its universall trade throughout the kingdome, with its commodities conveying and deriving this civil contagion to all our cities and corporations, and thereby poisoning whole counties.[74]

London merchants were also responsible for endowing lectureships in their home towns, encouraging the widespread spread of puritanism.[75] Baxter concluded 'that there was [not] in all the World such a City [as London] for Piety, Sobriety and Temperance.'[76]

Perhaps the essence of puritanism was summarized by Bishop Gardiner in the 1540s: 'They [the puritans] would have all in talking, they speak so much of preaching, so as all the gates of our senses and ways to man's understanding should be shut up, saving the ear alone.'[77] This was the consequence of a 'rational' rejection of all magic and ritual, described so eloquently by Milton and central to Weber's thesis on the protestant ethic. Puritans placed great emphasis on individual conscience often linked to literacy and the reading of the bible.[78]

However, much of puritanism was a reaction to the historical threat from catholicism, and one source noted that John Milton who 'was the oracular poet of the hard-working, godly, mercantile London citizenry, who saw themselves increasingly menaced by papists at court and abroad, and for him and his family and friends, the Gunpowder Plot was both the incarnation of their worst nightmares and solid proof that they were right to be afraid.'[79]

---

[69] Pepys, Volume 4, p. 131.
[70] Baxter, *Reliquiare Baxterianae,* p. 18.
[71] M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism,* 1965, pp. 8, 290; A. Woolrych, 'Puritanism, politics and society', in E.W. Ives (ed.), *The English Revolution, 1600*-60, 1968, p. 53; B. Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution*, 1976, p. 38; H. Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England*, 1964, pp. 21, 22.
[72] Woolrych, 'Puritanism', p. 53.
[73] Underdown, *Revel*, p. 78.
[74] R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, 1936, pp. 203, 204. See also Hyde, *The History*, Volume 2, p. 226; Hirst, *The Representative*, p. 47.
[75] J.E.C. Hill, 'Puritans in the dark corners of the land', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Series, Volume 13, 1963, p. 95.
[76] Baxter, *Reliquiare Baxterianae*, Part 3, 1696, p. 17.
[77] M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism,* 1965, p. 68.
[78] Woolrych, 'Puritanism', p. 87.
[79] D. Purkiss, *The English Civil War: A People's History*, 2007 p. 305.

The Puritan reformation often created a hostile reaction among the general population, described by one apologist as the 'weeping and bewailing of the simple sort and especially of women, who going into the churches, and seeing the bare walls, and lacking their golden images, their costly copes, their pleasant organs, their sweet frankinsense, their gilded chalices, their goodly streamers, they lament in themselves and fetch deep sighs and bewail the spoiling and laying waste of the church, as they think.'[80]

By the 1620s Dorchester was in the grip of an authoritarian Puritan regime 'which regulated the most minute details of the residents' lives with fanatical rigour. Swearing, tippling, sexual irregularities, "night walking" absence from church, feasting and merry making, and general idleness: these were the common targets of reformers everywhere.'[81] The clothing industry was notorious for its puritanism and its support for parliament; for example, one contemporary noted that Colchester 'is a raged, factious Towne, and now Swarming in Sectaries. Their Trading Cloth ... '[82]

The bulk of London Puritans were made up of tradesmen and artisans:

> ... depositions of Francis Johnson's separatist congregation in London, when they were arrested in 1593, show that they included six shipwrights, five tailors, four servants, three ministers, three weavers or cloth-workers, three carpenters, three clerks, and scriveners, two fishmongers, two haberdashers, two shoemakers, two purse-makers, a glover, a cup-maker, a goldsmith, a "scholler", a broad-weaver, an apothecary, a coppersmith, and two schoolmasters. Most were men under thirty-five years old.[83]

This socio-economic group has historically been the core group supporting puritanism, as pointed out by Weber: 'With great regularity we find the most genuine adherents of puritanism among the classes which were rising from a lowly status, the small bourgeois and farmers.'[84] The low status suburbs and some of the liberties very quickly earned a reputation for puritanism and after 1640, for radicalism. In 1642, the inhabitants of the eastern suburbs of London, 'mariners, soldiers, or private persons' petitioned against the removal of their own trained bands from the Tower and the violence which had been used against Puritans.[85] Southwark was another suburb with a radical reputation: 'Here, the tanners, glovers and brewery workers were notorious for lawlessness and sedition. In May 1640 ... they joined with the sailors of Bermondsey in a great demonstration against Laud.'[86]

However, during the civil war period, puritanism appealed to a greater range of socio-economic groups:

> To contemporaries the chosen seat of the Puritan spirit seemed to be those classes in society which combined economic independence, education, and a certain decent pride in their status, revealed at once in a determination to live their own lives, without truckling to earthly superiors, and in a somewhat arrogant contempt for those who, either through weakness of character or through economic helplessness, were less resolute, less vigorous and masterful, than themselves. Such ... were some of the gentry. Such, conspicuously were the yeomen, 'mounted on a high spirit, as being slaves to none,' especially in the free-holding counties of the east. Such, above all, were the trading

[80] Ibid, pp. 435, 436.
[81] Underdown, *Revel*, p. 52.
[82] E.S. De Beer, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, Volume 3, 1955, p. 177.
[83] H. Barbour, *The Quakers in Puritan England*, 1964, pp. 21, 22.
[84] M. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 1930, p. 174.
[85] Pearl, *London*, p.40.
[86] Ibid.

> classes of the towns, and of the rural districts which had been partially industrialized by the decentralization of the textile and iron industries.[87]

The leaders of the Puritan movement in parliament were members of the gentry and aristocracy – John Pym, the Earls of Warwick and Holland, Lords Saye, Lord Brooke and John Hamden – who were shareholders in the Providence Company, a trading company in the Caribbean.[88] In the early period of the civil war parliament attracted great support from the aristocracy and gentry on constitutional and economic grounds.[89]

The influence of puritanism on the support for parliament occurred not only in London, but also elsewhere such as in Lancashire, where the Oliver Heywood noted in his diary:

> Many days of prayer, have I known my father keep among God's people; yea, I remember a whole night wherein he, Dr Bradshaw, Adam Faernside, Thomas Crompton, and several more did pray all night in a parlour at Ralph Whittal's, upon occasion of King Charles demanding the five members of the House of Commons. Such a night of prayers, tears, and groans, I was never present at all in my life.[90]

The parliamentary Puritans captured both the City government and its trained bands, so giving parliament its first soldiers. This preceded the king's early departure from Whitehall in January 1642, which prevented a successful counter-revolution in London.[91] There was however resistance to the imposition of Puritan discipline, as illustrated by events in London where many riots were touched off by attempts to suppress popular amusements. There were sporadic outbreaks in London, including an apprentice riot at Christmas 1645, and another in April 1648 when troops broke up a Sunday tip-cat game in Moorfields.[92]

There were also internal divisions within the Protestant movement, which eventually led to serious political conflicts. Presbyterians began to increasingly oppose the radicalism of the Independents, the Baptists and other religious sects which dominated the New Model Army, leading to differences in support for the monarchy. By June 1651 'many English Presbyterians were beginning to opt for monarchy ... A Presbyterian minister rejoicing in the name of Love was arrested in London during May for conspiring on behalf of the king. He and another minister were executed on Tower Hill at the beginning of August as a warning to all other Presbyterians sympathetic to Charles II.'[93]

These political conflicts were partly the result of differences in socio-economic status:

> The general picture conveyed of Presbyterians in Nottinghamshire is of solid, respectable individuals drawn predominantly from the ranks of the 'middling sort'. Over half of the county's Presbyterians lived in the town of Nottingham. This very much reflects both the national and regional picture of Presbyterianism ... as a faith of the 'urban middle class' ... supporters were predominantly drawn from the upper 'middling sorts', minor or pseudo gentry and their servants. The pseudo-gentry consisted of wealthier merchants, lawyers, civil servants and the younger sons of gentry. Though not part of the landed elite, their status as gentlemen and esquires was increasingly recognized throughout the century and their greater wealth distinguished them from the 'middling sorts'.[94]

---

[87] Tawney, *Religion*, p. 208.
[88] C.V. Wedgwood, *The King's War, 1641-1647*, 2001, p. 28.
[89] Baxter, *Reliquiare Baxterianae*, pp. 30, 31.
[90] W. Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism*, 1957, pp. 297, 298.
[91] Pearl, *London*, p. 132.
[92] Underdown, *Revel,* p. 261.
[93] Ashley, *The English*, p. 173.
[94] Jennings, *The Gathering*, p. 244

The variations in social status between the Presbyterians and the more radical sects was reflected in their appearance: 'While the one party retained the close-cropped and ungainly appearance of the Independents in the days of Cromwell, our Presbyterian clergy developed into full periwigs and flowing luxuriance of band and habit which usually characterized persons of their status after the Restoration.'[95]

Of the Nottingham Presbyterians Lucy Hutchinson wrote

> the Presbyterians were more inveterately bitter against the fanatics than even the Cavaliers themselves ... and prayed seditiously in their pulpits and began openly to desire the king, not for good will to him, but only for the destruction of all the fanatics. In 1660, a confrontation occurred in Nottingham between the young men of the town who were demonstrating for the return of the King, and soldiers of Colonel Hacker's regiment ... Charles II's Declaration at Breda in 1660, which promised to allow a 'measure of religious liberty to tender consciences', encouraged many Presbyterians to actively campaign for his return.[96]

After the restoration settlement, the Puritan aristocracy and gentry abandoned religious dissent, which became dominated by the middle sort.[97] The middle classes were too influential to allow the eclipse of dissent, which eventually became embedded in English society.[98] The Compton Census of 1676 confirmed that dissenters were 'mostly found in towns with a strong puritan tradition, in centres of the cloth industry, and in places where the social and residential structures created conditions favourable to religious individualism.'[99]

Richard Baxter's Account of the Civil War

Richard Baxter, although a Puritan minister who had served in the New Model Army, was nearest to a contemporary with the most sociological understanding of the civil war. He summarized the role of religion as follows:

> ... the generality of the People through the Land (I say not *all* or every *one*) who were then called Puritans, Precisions, Religious Persons ... and speak against Swearing, Cursing, Drunkeness, Prophaness etc. I say, the main body of this sort of Men, both Preachers and People, adhered to Parliament. And on the other side, the Gentry that were not so precise and strict against an Oath, or Gaming, or Plays, or Drinking, nor troubled themselves so much about the Matter of God and the World to come, and the Ministers and People that were for the King's Book, for Dancing and Recreation on the Lord's Days ... the main Body of these were against the Parliament.[100]

Baxter elaborated on this analysis by stating that 'though it must be confessed that the public safety and liberty wrought very much with most, especially the nobility and gentry who adhered to Parliament, yet it was principally the difference about religion that filled up the Parliament's armies and put the resolution and valour into their soldiers, which carried them on in another manner than mercenary soldiers are carried on.'[101] On the other side it was the 'ignorant rabble [who] are everywhere the greatest enemies against Godly ministers and

[95] C.E. Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism* ,1931, p. 44; Jennings, *The Gathering*, p. 244.
[96] Jennings, *The Gathering*, p. 160.
[97] H. Perkin, *The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880*, 1969, pp. 34, 42.
[98] Ibid; Jennings, *The Gathering*, p. 278
[99] Underdown, *A Freeborn*, pp. 120, 121.
[100] Baxter, *Reliquiare Baxterianae* , pp. 30, 31.
[101] Quoted in Woolrych, 'Puritanism', pp. 93, 94.

people ... the Tinkers and Sowgaters and water carriers and beggars and bargemen and all the rabble that cannot reade, nor even use, the bible.'[102]

He described the puritanism of artisans, particularly weavers, who were literate and read the bible and other religious works, and how the occupational structure of Kidderminster aided his evangelism.

> A weaver or a Shoemaker or a Taylor can worke without the wetting or tiring his body, and can thinke and talke of the concerns of his soule without impediment to his labour. I have known many [at Kidderminster] that weave in the Long Loome that can set their sermon notes or a good book before them and read and discourse together for mutual edification while they worke. But the poor husbandman can seldom do ... Another help to my Success was, that my People were not *Rich:* There were among them very few *Beggars*, because their common Trade of Stuff-weaving would find work for all, Men, Women and Children, that were able ... The Magistrates of the Town were few of them worth 40 £ *per* An. ...The generality of the Master Workmen, lived but a little better than their Journey-men, (from hand to mouth) ... [103]

Baxter further elaborated the influence of socio-economic status on religious and political affiliation.

> And, which I speak with griefe, except here and there one (of the richer sort mostly that are not pincht with the necessity of others) there is more ignorance of religion among them than among tradesmen and corporation inhabitants and poore men of manuall artificers. And yet they are not usually guilty of the sins of Gluttony, fornication or adultery, so much as rich citizens and great men's full and idle serving men ... But among merchants, mercers, drapers and other corporation tradesmen, and among weavers, taylors, and such like labourers, yea among poore naylors, and such like, there is usually found more knowledge & religion than among the poor enslaved husbandman. I may well say *enslaved*: for more are so servilely dependent (save household servants and ambitious expectants) as they are on their landlords. They dare not displease them lest they turn them out of their houses; or increase their rents. I believe the Great Landlords have more command of them than the King hath. If a Landlord be but malignant, and enemy to piety or sobriety or peace, his enslaved tenants are at his beck to serve him, in matters of any publike consequence.[104]

He wrote approvingly in 1673 of the presence 'in most places' of 'a sober sort of men of the middle rank, that ... are more equal to religion than the highest or lowest usually are ...'[105] Another Puritan, Nehemiah Wallington, in 1650 anticipated Wesley in his argument about the link between wealth and religious sobriety. He lamented that the 'great change in some men, for ... when they in mean condition, they were humble, and they were for God, but now they be rich ... [they have purchased] brave houses, fine apparel, or belly cheer, when the poor saints have perished in want.'[106]

The authority of a landowner over his employees continued to exist well into the nineteenth century and was illustrated by an account in a local Hertfordshire autobiography as follows:

> Every worshipper had to wait outside [the church] until the squire had walked to the widening of the path and had made that dramatic flourish when he pulled out his gold watch and looked up at the church clock. When he was satisfied that the clock had not dared to contradict the time on his watch

[102] R. Baxter, *The Poor Husbandman's Advocate to Rich Racking Landlords*, 1926, p. 24.
[103] Ibid, p. 26; Baxter, *Reliquiare Baxterianae*, p. 94.
[104] Baxter, *The Poor Husbandman's*, p. 27.
[105] J. Barry and C. Brooks (eds.), *The Middling Sort of People: Culture, Society and Politics in England, 1550-1800*, 1994, p. 48.
[106] Seaver, *Wallington's World*, p. 129.

> he would nod to the clock, smile at the admiring people, and hold out his hand to the vicar standing in the doorway to welcome him. Then the bells would ring merrily and then the other direction the staff of another big house marched to the church: the housekeeper and butler in front, two footmen next then about fourteen girls walking in pairs. They were paraded to church every Sunday, but were only allowed one free evening a month.[107]

By this period deference no longer had such a powerful hold as it did in the seventeenth century:

> We paid three pounds an acre for our land [in Hertfordshire], and looked over fences at land held by big farmers for seventeen and sixpence an acre ... My father once asked a gentlemen farmer to rent him a piece of ground ... He was given a definite refusal: 'Certainly not' ... Some months later the same gentleman stopped my father and said, 'I suppose you have heard that I am standing at the next election. We've been neighbours for some years. Can I could on your vote?' It was not my father's way to avoid the truth. 'Certainly not', he replied; 'my vote is the most valuable thing I have got ...' [108]

The Role of the Navy

Protestantism became embedded in the navy, partly as a result of the historical reaction against the threat from Catholic powers, particularly from Spain. This often took the form of Puritan worship:

> When Drake set sail from Plymouth on November 15, 1577, on the voyage that was to take him around the world, he carried for the instruction of his men Bibles, prayer books, and Foxe's Book of Martyrs, and had, for chaplain, one Francis Fletcher ... Routine religious duties were as rigorously enforced as any other discipline of the ship, and in times of crisis the commander prescribed special religious exercises.[109]

This emphasis on worship also applied to private navies such as those of the East India Company. The Company 'saw to it that ships were amply provided with edifying reading matter. The essentials were a Bible and a Book of Common Prayer, John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*'[110] and on 'the rare occasions when a ship's commander failed in his religious responsibilities, he was subject of complaints, not only from the chaplains but from the seamen themselves.'[111] The religious radicalism of mariners was sometimes found outside London. For example 'a gang of seamen battered down the images and glass of Rochester Cathedral, and destroyed the cherished library accumulated by the poet Dean Henry King.'[112]

This radicalism led to the participation of ordinary seamen in religious and political protests against the crown's attempt to suppress parliament:

> When ... the Five Members returned to Westminster, some 2,000 sailors accompanied them, and their participation was explained in the anonymous *The Seamans Protestation Concerning their Ebbing and Flowing to ... Westminster.* The pamphlet maintained that the sailors had not been summoned but came 'of our own free voluntarie disposition ... as well to protect *White-hall* ... ' This

[107] B. L. Coombes, *These Poor Hands: The Autobiography of a Miner Working in South Wales,* 2012. [First published in 1939], pp. 5, 6.
[108] Ibid, p. 4.
[109] L.B. Wright, *Religion and Empire: The Alliance between Piety and Commerce in English Expansion, 1558-1625*, 1943, p. 1.
[110] Ibid, p. 71.
[111] Ibid, p. 68.
[112] Wedgwood, *The King's War*, p. 124.

publication too, blamed "Papists" as the enemy, and concluded with an oath supposedly sworn by the mariners, closely modelled on Parliament's Protestation oath.[113]

Had the king held the fleet, it would have created major problems for parliament. He would have been able to blockade the Thames, starving London of trade, food and fuel. Such an outcome would probably have led to a major loss of support for parliament, changing the course of the civil war.[114] Mariners lived in communities on both sides of the Thames, along the shipyards in Wapping, Shadwell, Limehouse, Rotherhithe and Southwark. [115] St Dunstans's Stepney, was one of the most staunchly Protestant in London. This was partly because its congregation included a high proportion of Huguenot refugees.[116]

These areas also contained the artisans and tradesmen living in the suburbs, and they formed with the mariners the crowds who had lobbied and petitioned parliament for radical political and religious reform. [117] Much of the political and religious divide which shaped the civil war was based on communities which cut across individual differences of support, providing socially structured action groups.

Parliament's control of the navy was brought about by the Earl of Warwick who seized it in 1642, with only two captains refusing to surrender their ships.[118] The gentlemen commanders who had dominated the navy before the civil war were replaced by men who had been active in popular radical politics. [119] According to Bernard Capp only 20 of the 319 officers appointed by the Commonwealth and Protectorate, came from the gentry, mostly from younger branches which had gone into trade.[120]

Parliament used the navy to land forces and blockade ports held by the royalists, which played an important role in winning the civil war.[121] The navy also ensured that weapons could be imported from abroad – by 4 October 1642 these included 5,580 pikes, 2,690 muskets, 980 pairs of pistols, 246 carbines and 3,788 sets of armour.[122] Warwick's sailors – approximately 3,000 strong – were also organized into two regiments and played an important part in parliament's victory.[123] However, after the polarisation of the opposition into Presbyterian and Independent factions in 1648, there was a significant defection of ships and mariners from the parliamentary cause.[124]

Socio-Economic Status and the Civil War.

An analysis of the socio-economic status of participants in the civil war is fraught with difficulty. Information on the elites is relatively easy to obtain, but data on rank-and-file members of political and religious groups is largely lacking.[125] Although statistical analysis is virtually impossible, literary evidence is abundant but often very partisan given the nature of

[113] R.J. Blakemore and E. Murphy, *The British Civil Wars at Sea, 1638-1653*, 2018, p. 47.
[114] M.J. Lea-O'Mahoney, *The Navy in the English Civil War* (D.Phil. University of Exeter, 2011), p. 8.
[115] Wedgewood, *The King's Peace*, p. 29.
[116] Purkiss, *The English*, pp. 41, 42.
[117] C.V. Wedgewood, *The King's War, 1641-1647*, 1983, p. 61; Purkiss, *The English*, p. 470.
[118] Wedgewood, *The King's War,* p. 105.
[119] Blakemore and Murphy, *The British*, p. 182.
[120] R. Hutton, *The British Republic 1649-1660*, 2000, p. 12.
[121] Blakemore and Murphy, *The British*, p. 74.
[122] Porter and March, *The Battle*, p. 41.
[123] Ibid, p. 80.
[124] Blakemore and Murphy, *The British*, p. 137; Lea-O'Mahoney, *The Navy*, p.199.
[125] Underdown, *Revel*, pp. viii, 183-184; C. Holmes, *The Eastern Association in the English Civil War*, 1974, p. 172.

the civil war. However, by adopting the principle of triangulation which uses sources from both sides of the conflict, it is possible to achieve a degree of consensus.

There is also the difficulty of significant changes in the adherents to parliament and the crown, so that for example more than two-fifths of the Commons and the majority of the Lords left Westminster for the king's cause in 1642.[126] Also there were major changes in the social structure of England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries which affected the social composition of supporters of the crown and parliament:

> ... between 1540 and 1640 ... The number of peers rose from 60 to 160; baronets and knights from 500 to 1400; esquires from perhaps 800 to 3,000; and armigerous gentry from perhaps 5,000 to 15,000 ... This numerical expansion was made possible mainly by the transfer of huge quantities of landed property first from the church to the crown and then from the crown to the laity, mostly gentry, in a series of massive sales to pay for foreign wars.[127]

The House of Commons itself changed during this period, so that it grew from approximately 300 members to about 500, and the gentry component in it rose from about 50 per cent to approximately 75 per cent.[128] Throughout the civil war there were major changes in the numbers of adherents to the parliamentarian and royalist armies, making it difficult to carry our statistical analysis of membership numbers. The alignment of forces of 1640 was different from that of 1642, by which time a large number of former parliamentarians had moved over to royalism. There were changes again in 1648, when conservative elements among parliamentarians, designated as Presbyterians, switched back into support for the king.[129] Many of those who had supported parliament on constitutional grounds in 1640, like Sir Edward Hyde, transferred their allegiance in 1642, whereas those who supported parliament on religious grounds tended to continue to support the parliamentary cause.[130]

The most significant change in parliament occurred in December 1648 when 'under the command of Colonel Thomas Pride, the army purged the House of Commons of any opposition (some 100 MPs were excluded 45 who were actually arrested – others prudently removed themselves). It was the remaining "Rump" of around 70 MPs who would address the matter of bringing the King to trial.'[131]

There were also major changes in demographic and economic conditions during the second half of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries. Population grew by over 30 per cent in the period 1570-1609 and prices more than doubled between 1550 and 1600.[132] Lawrence Stone noted the changes that had taken place in English society during the sixteenth century as a result of population growth: 'the excess supply of labour relative to demand not only increased unemployment, but forced down real wages to an alarming degree ... [there was] a polarisation of society into rich and poor: the upper classes became relatively more numerous and their real incomes rose; the poor also became more numerous and their real incomes fell.'[133]

---

[126] R Richardson, *The Debate On The English Revolution*, 1998, p. 45.
[127] Stone, *Causes*, pp. 72, 73.
[128] Ibid, p. 92.
[129] Ibid, p. 34.
[130] Ibid, p., 143.
[131] D. Flintham, *Civil War London*. 2017, p. 41.
[132] E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield, *The Population History of England & Wales*, 1981; B.R. Mitchell and P. Deane, *Abstracts of British Historical Statistics*, 1971, pp. 484-486; J. Thirsk, 'The farming regions', pp. 857, 858, 1861; E.H. Phelps-Brown and S.V. Hopkins**,** 'Seven centuries of the prices of consumables compared with builders' wage rates' in E.M. Carus-Wilson (ed.), *Essays in Economic History,* Volume 2, 1962, pp. 193-195.
[133] L. Stone, 'Social mobility in England, 1500-1700', *Past and Present*, Volume 33, 1966, pp. 26-29, 49.

Recent research by Alexandra Shepard using church court depositions indicates that wealth inequality increased markedly during the first half of the seventeenth century.

Table 4: Median Wealth in England, Deflated to 1550-1559 Values, by Social Group Over Time.[134]

	1550-74	1575-99	1600-24	1625-49
Gentry (N = 367)	£16.00	£8.00	£59.30	£50.00
Yeomen (N = 1104)	£5.34	£7.27	£23.92	£50.00
Craft/Trade (N = 2185)	£2.40	£1.40	£2.99	£5.00
Husbandmen (N = 2127)	£4.00	£3.37	£5.93	£5.00
Labourers (N = 273)	£1.58	£1.35	£1.36	£1.03

Although the gentry increased their wealth – increasing by about three times – the yeomen's wealth had grown nearly ten times, while labourers' worth decreased slightly. There was little change among husbandmen and a doubling of wealth among craft/tradesmen. This data suggests that this was a period of 'the rise of the yeomanry' during the first half of the seventeenth century. Wrightson has summarized the situation of the yeomen as follows:

> Like the gentry, they benefited from low labour costs as employers, while as large-scale producers they stood to gain from rising prices ... Again like the gentry, they took a thoroughly rational and calculating attitude towards profit ... often ambitious, aggressive, [and] small capitalists ... [they experienced] gradually rising living standards, the rebuilding of farmhouses and their stocking with goods of increasing sophistication and comfort.[135]

These changes had a significant effect on the relationships between different social classes. Village elites composed of local gentry and prosperous yeomen farmers and tradesmen began to attempt to control the impoverished and unruly elements of the poor.[136]

> Long before the civil war, especially in towns and pasture regions where cloth-working or other industrial pursuits were available, the growing gulf between the people 'of credit and reputation' and their less prosperous neighbours was reflected in the emergence of parish elites who saw it as their duty to discipline the poor into godliness and industriousness, and who found in puritan teaching (broadly defined) their guide and inspiration. Along with reformist elements of the gentry and clergy, they mounted a campaign against the traditional culture of the lower orders.[137]

The merging of interests between the gentry and prosperous yeomen and tradesmen makes it difficult to distinguish social statuses in this period.[138] One-hundred-and-two Yorkshiremen obtained coats of arms as gentlemen between 1558 and 1642 and roughly half of them were yeomen farmers. In Lancashire two-hundred-and-two families entered the gentry: ...'the majority were prosperous yeomen.'[139] Gordon Batho has concluded that 'there was no sharp distinction between lesser gentry and the richer yeomen ... In innumerable wills and legal

[134] Data from *Perceptions of Worth and Social Status in Early Modern England* , ESRC Reference Number RES-000-23-1111.
[135] Wrightson, *English Society*, pp. 134, 135.
[136] Manning, *The English People*, p. 46; K. Wrightson, *English Society*, pp. 168-73, 181.
[137] Underdown, *Revel*, pp. 275, 276.
[138] Hirst, *The Representative,* p. 4; see also O'Day, 'Universities', p. fn 19, p. 100; Wedgewood, *The King's War*, p. 205.
[139] Manning, *1649: The Crisis*, p. 58.

documents of the age a man is described in one place as a yeomen and in another as a gentleman ... '[140]

Oliver Cromwell himself illustrates the ambiguity of status in this period. John Morrill has summarized the evidence as follows:

> ... his standing in St Ives was essentially that of a yeoman, a working farmer. He had moved down from the gentry to the 'middling sort' ... Despite his connections with ancient riches, Cromwell's economic status was much closer to that of the 'middling sort' than that to the country gentry and governors. He always lived in towns, not in a country manor house; and he worked for his living. He held no important local offices and had no tenants or others dependent upon him beyond a few household servants. When he pleaded for the selection of 'russet-coated captains who know what they are fighting for', and when he described his troopers as 'honest men, such as feared God', this was not the condescension of a radical member of the elite, but the pleas of a man on the margins of the gentry on behalf of those with whom he had had social discourse and daily communion for twenty years.

A further example of the blurring of statuses is to be found in Shakespeare's social circle in Stratford:

> The Quiney family was one of the most respectable in the town; they bore arms, had been long settled in the community, and were influential members of the corporation. They were well-educated – Richard conducted much of his correspondence with Abraham Sturley, who had been educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, in Latin – and appears from the language of this correspondence, to have been strongly puritan. Nevertheless, along with all other leading townsmen, they frequently engaged in illegal speculative activity, particularly in corn and malt.[141]

Shakespeare's own family illustrates the ambiguities in status at the end of the sixteenth century. His father John, officially a glover, had illegally traded in wool, corn and money-lending, and had yet been granted a coat of arms in 1596, warranting the title and status of 'gentleman', in spite of an earlier bankruptcy.[142] Not only did local tradesmen engage in the hoarding of grain during a period of scarcity, but all four local landed magistrates had arrangements with the townsmen to illegally store large stocks of grain on their behalf.[143] In 1601 the poor of Stratford were 'in number seven hundred and odd, young and old – something like forty per cent of the total population.'[144] As a result, the hoarding of grain resulted in threatened violence and riot by the poor, but they unwittingly appealed to the magistrates without realising that they were some of the leading forestallers of grain.[145]

The conflicting and contradictory position of the townsmen and local gentry, many of whom were of the Puritan persuasion, left them exposed to the charge of hypocrisy. When a dispute over the appointment of the Puritan minister, Thomas Wilson, broke out in 1621, his supporters were satirized in the following verse: 'Stratford is a Town that doth make a great show. But yet is governed but by a few. O Jesus Christ of heaven I think that they are but seven Puritans without doubt? For you may know them. They are so stout. They say 'tis no sin, their neighbour's house to take. But such laws their father the devil did make ... One of the Chiefest hath read far in Perkin's works. The rest are deep dissembling hypocrites.'[146]

---

[140] Ibid.
[141] P. Razzell, *William Shakespeare: The Anatomy of an Enigma*, 1990, p. 26.
[142] Ibid, p. 28.
[143] Ibid, p. 142.
.[144] Ibid, p. 140
[145] Ibid, pp. 141, 142.
[146] Ibid.

There was a great deal of social mobility at this time, with many wealthy yeomen and tradesmen achieving gentry status during the first half of the seventeenth century.[147] Gentlemen and yeomen/tradesmen were educated together in local grammar schools and universities, and so shared similar cultural backgrounds.[148] There was also an increase in the literacy of both the gentry and the middle classes, whereas most husbandmen and labourers remained illiterate during this period.[149] Because of the fear of literacy amongst the 'lower sort', as early as 1543 parliament had stipulated that 'no women, nor artificers, prentices, journeymen, servingmen of the degrees of yeomen or under, husbandmen nor labourers shall read the Bible or New Testament in English to himself or any other, privately or openly.'[150] Hobbes had complained that 'after the Bible was translated into English, every man, nay every boy and wench, that could read English thought they spoke with God Almighty and understood what He said.'[151]

The fear that established authority had of the 'lower sort' obtaining literacy was probably well-founded. As early as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries 'throughout southern and central England groups of Lollards met secretly in towns and villages to read or listen to readings of Scripture and to consider their contemporary application. Most of them came from the class of skilled, literate traders and craftsmen. They were masons, carpenters, wool-merchants and leatherworkers – men and women whose work took them long distances in search of employment and markets.'[152]

This was as we have seen the classic socio-economic group associated with puritanism, but nevertheless there were many adherents of a higher status. When Prynne, Burton and Bastwick, martyrs to the Protestant cause who had been punished and exiled by the king, returned to London on the 28th November 1640, 'some three thousand coaches, and four thousand horsemen' were included in the crowd that welcomed them back to London.[153] During the building of the defensive wall around London, the people helping to build the wall included 'a great company of the common council and diverse other chief men of the city'.[154]

Nevertheless the evidence suggests that wealthy aldermen largely supported the crown: 'strong financial ties bound the wealthy citizens to the crown ... the court contented itself with the belief that the disturbances involved the meaner sort of people and that the affections of the better and main part of the city favoured the king.' [155] As a result of this belief, the king placed a guard to the approaches of the Commons with soldiers 'who disliked or despised the Londoners and officers who, being Westminster men, were friends and dependents of the Court.'[156]

Clarendon summarized his conclusions about the link between status and affiliation to crown or parliament:

---

[147] Wrightson, *English Society*, p.27; see also Manning, *1649 The Crisis*, p. 51.
[148] R. O' Day, 'Universities and professions in the early modern period', *oro.open.ac.uk*, pp. 83, 87, 101; Wrightson, *English Society,* pp. 89; 186, 191-193; Stone, *Causes*, pp. 74;
[149] Wrightson, *English Society,* p. 191.
[150] D. Wilson, *The People and the Book: The Revolutionary Impact of the English Bible 1380-1611*, 1976, p. 87.
[151] Stone, *Causes*, p.101.
[152] Wilson, *The People*, p. 26.
[153] Purkiss, *The English*, p. 99.
[154] Ibid, p. 286.
[155] S. Porter and S. Marsh, *The Battle for London*, 2010, p. 9; see also D. Hirst, *The Representative of the People? Voting in England under the Early Stuarts*, 1975, p. 138; R. Ashton, *The City and the Court, 1603-1643*, 1979, p. 206; Pearl, *London*, p. xi.
[156] Wedgwood, *The King's War*, p. 32.

> ...though the people in general [favoured the king], (except in great towns and corporations, where, besides the natural malignity, the factious lecturers, and emissaries from the parliament, had poisoned the affections,) and especially those of quality, were loyally inclined ... [157]

Most contemporaries believed that the main support for parliament came from London and other corporate towns, with a strong support from the middle sort.[158]

Lilly writing in 1651 described how the terms Cavalier and Roundhead originated:

> They [the Puritans] had their hair of their heads very few of them longer than their ears, whereupon it came to pass that those who usually with their cries attended at Westminster were by a nickname called *Roundheads*, and all that took part or appeared for his Majesty, *Cavaliers* ... However the present hatred of the citizens was such unto gentlemen, especially courtiers, that few durst come into the city; or if they did they were sure to receive affronts and be abused.[159]

Pepys in his diary frequently distinguished between citizens and gentlemen living in London; for example at the end of December 1662 he wrote 'only not so well pleased with the company at the house today, which was full of Citizens, there hardly being a gentleman or woman in the house ... [160]

Baxter concluded that 'though it must be confessed that the public safety and liberty wrought very much with most, especially the nobility and gentry who adhered to Parliament, yet it was principally the difference about religion that filled up the Parliament's armies and put the resolution and valour into their soldiers, which carried them on in another manner than mercenary soldiers are carried on.'[161] There is evidence however of tensions between the aristocracy and gentry on the one hand and the middle classes during the outbreak of the civil war. The burden of ship money fell disproportionately on yeomanry and tradesmen, something which was highlighted by William Prynne in his attacks on the crown.[162] These tensions were exacerbated by the attitudes of the aristocracy and gentry towards the new middle classes.

> The pretensions of yeomen to quality with gentry caused resentment amongst some gentlemen. 'The yeomanry' wrote Edward Chamberlayne ...'grow rich, and thereby so proud, insolent, and carless, that they neither give that humble respect and awful reverence which in other Kingdoms is usually given to nobility, gentry, and clergy' ... which has 'rendered them so distasteful ... even to their own gentry' that the latter sometimes wished that the yeomen's activities were less profitable or they were taxed more heavily.[163]

This is consistent with the patterns of wealth depicted in Shepard's analysis of church court depositions, whereby the yeomanry achieved parity with the gentry by the middle of the seventeenth century.

---

[157] Hyde, *The History*, Volume 2, p. 226.
[158] An indication of where the city's sympathies lay was the return of four members opposed to the court in the election to the Long Parliament in October 1640.
[159] W. Lilly *The True History of King James I and Charles* I, 1715, pp. 55-56 – first published in 1651, p. 246. The association between puritanism and short hair was also found in New England where the rule was 'that none should wear their hair below their ears'. T. Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts* , Vol.1, 1936, pp. 130, 131. Some Baptists continued to prohibit long hair as late as 1689. See A.C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists,* 1947, p. 130.
[160] R. Latham and W. Matthews (eds.), *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, Volume 3, 1995, p. 295.
[161] Baxter, *Reliquiare Baxterianae*, pp. 30, 31.
[162] See Manning, *The English People*, pp. 10, 231.
[163] E. Chamberlayne, *Anglia Notitia*, 1672, pp. 61-63.

A number of scholars have noted the breaking of the alliance between the gentry and the middle classes, as the demands for political and religious reforms began to emerge.[164] However, this reflected some long-term tensions between these socio-economic groups. For example, as early as 1576, a clause was inserted in an Act of Parliament prohibiting West Country clothiers from buying more than 20 acres of land.[165]

In Somerset it was alleged that

> ... a great part of the estate of every farmer or substantial yeoman should be taken from them; alleging that some lords had said that £20 by the year was enough for any peasant to live by ... persuading the substantial yeomen and freeholders that at least two parts of their states would by that commission taken from them ... For though the gentlemen of ancient families estates in that county were for the most part well affected to the King ... yet there were people of inferior degree, who, by good husbandry, clothing, and other thriving arts, had gotten very great fortunes, and, by degrees getting themselves into the gentlemen's estates, were angry that they found not themselves in the same esteem and reputation with those whose estates they had ... These from the beginning were fast friends to the Parliament, and many of them were now entrusted by them as deputy-lieutenants in their new ordinance of the militia ... [166]

Likewise in Yorkshire when the king summoned the gentry of the county to York in May 1642, he omitted to summon the freeholders, who responded by claiming 'ourselves equally interested in the common good of the county', and as a result 'did take boldness to come in person to York ... thereupon the doors of the meeting house were shut, we utterly excluded ...'[167] Elsewhere 'Lord Paulet in opposition to the Militia at a combustion in *Wells* ... declared that it was not fit for any Yeomen to have allowed more than the poor Moitie of ten pounds a year ... when the power should be totally on their [the royalists'] side, they shall be compelled to live at that low allowance ... the people did not take the speech as onely directed to the Yeomen, but to all men under the degree of a Gentleman ... the Tradesmen and Merchants ....'[168]

One Parliamentarian tract published in 1643 claimed

> that this was proof that the royalists intended 'a government at discretion' after the French fashion, because 'the middle sort of people of England, and yeomanry' were the chief obstacles to such a change, and as they composed the main part of the militia, 'then by policy, or even plain force' they must be disarmed ...[169]

This can be seen indirectly as a consequence of 'the rise of the yeomanry', creating increasing demands by yeomen for equal status with their aristocratic and gentry neighbours. This resulted in tension between these groups, leading on occasions to violence. For example, 'the cavaliers in Somersetshire have used violence on the yeomanry, and have turned them out of doors, and take their arms from them, the people seeing it could not suffer it, for if they prevail now they think they shall be slaves forever.'[170]

Fear was a leading component of the civil war. As we have seen, in London the king and many Members of Parliament and the House of Lords had left London in early 1642 as a result of the fear of the population threatening them with violence and intimidation. Many of

---

[164] Manning, *The English People*, p. 46
[165] L. Stone, *The Crisis of the* Aristocracy, 1965, p. 28.
[166] Hyde, *History,* Volume 2, p, 296.
[167] Hill and Dell, *The Good Old*, pp. 244, 245.
[168] *A Memento for Yeomen, Merchants, Citizens and All the Commons in England* (August 23, 1642, B.M. E 113 (13), pp. 4, 5.
[169] Manning, *Aristocrats,*. p. 69.
[170] Manning, *The English People*, p. 328.

these members had originally supported parliament on constitutional grounds, but fear had driven them into the support of the king. Many Protestants feared Catholics, particularly after Spain's attempt to invade England during the late sixteenth century. In the provinces many of the aristocracy and gentry feared the threats from the poor and the increasing radicalism of the middle classes. And at a later stage of the war, the Presbyterians feared the increasing power of the radicals in the New Model Army.

A similar process occurred in France in the eighteenth century when the middle classes were not allowed to access higher social statuses, which according to Eleanor Barber was one of the factors behind the French Revolution.[171] There is ample evidence that the middle classes played a significant role in political developments in the English civil war, although the claim that the middle sort were the main supporters of parliament has been contested by a number of historians.[172] There is plenty of contemporary literary evidence to indicate that the middle classes played an important role in the support of parliament. Keith Wrightson has summarized this evidence**:**

> London demonstrators against episcopacy in 1641 were characterized as being 'men of mean or a middle quality', as distinct from both 'aldermen, merchants or common councilmen' on the one hand, and the 'vulgar' on the other. In Worcester 'the middle sort of people' supported the parliamentarian cause. 'The middle and inferior sort of people' of Birmingham resisted Prince Rupert's advance in 1643 despite the defeatist fears of the 'better sort'. At Bristol 'the King's cause and party were favoured by two extremes in that city; the one the wealthy and powerful men, the other of the basest and lowest sort, but disgusted by the middle rank, the true and best citizens'. Such activism and the terms in which it was described were not confined to urban centres. In Somerset the royalists were said to consist of most of the gentry and their tenants, while parliament had the support of 'yeomen, farmers, petty freeholders, and such as use manufacturers that enrich the country', under the leadership of some gentlemen and others of lesser degree, who 'by good husbandry, clothing and other thriving arts, had gotten very great fortunes' In Gloucestershire the king was supported by both the rich and 'the needy multitude' who depended upon them. Parliament allegedly had the hearts of 'the yeomen, farmers, clothiers, and the whole middle rank of the people'. According to Lucy Hutchinson, 'most of the gentry' of Nottinghamshire 'were disaffected to the parliament', but 'most of the middle sort, the able substantial freeholders , and the other commons, who had not their dependence upon the malignant nobility and gentry, adhered to the parliament'. Again, Richard Baxter saw the king as finding support among most lords, knights and gentlemen of England, together with their tenants and 'most of the poorest people', while parliament had a minority of the gentry 'and the greatest part of the tradesmen and freeholders and the middle sort of men, especially in those corporations and countries which depend on clothing and such manufactures'.[173]

The critique of the thesis that the 'middle sort' were the chief supporters of parliament, has not allowed for the major support for parliament of the middle classes in London, who were the prime movers at the beginning of the civil war and were the mainstay of the New Model Army who shaped its outcome.

The turning point in the support of London for parliament occurred in elections held on December 21 1641 to the Common Council brought in men with active parliamentary

---

[171] E. Barber, *The Bourgeoisie in 18th Century France*, 1957, p. 142.

[172] The main proponent of the middle sort hypothesis is Manning in his *The English People*. The critics of this thesis have pointed out that many of the middle classes supported royalism or remained neutral. See J. Barry and C, Brooks (eds.), *The Middling Sort of People: Culture, Society and Politics in England, 1550-1800*, 1994, p. 22; Morrill (ed.), *Reactions*, p. 71.

[173] K. Wrightson, 'Sorts of people in Tudor and Stuart England' in Barry and Brooks, *The Middling Sort*, p. 46.

Puritan sympathies. These elections transformed the politics of London, and Clarendon attributed to them the king's departure from Whitehall early in January 1642.[174]

The take-over by radical elements of the Common Council in December 1641, 'when that body was effectively captured by the radical party ... Now (wrote one later royalist sympathizer) outgoe all the grave, discreet, well-affected Citizens ... and in their Stead are chosen *Fowke* the Traytor, *Ryley* the Squeeking bodyes-maker, *Perkins* the Taylor, *Norminton* the Cutler, young beardless *Coulson* the Dyer, *Gill* the Wine-Cooper, and *Jupe* the Laten-man in *Crooked-Lane, Beadle* of the Ward ...'[175]

This was a time of revolutionary fervour:

> when Alderman *Pennington* and Captain *Venne* brought down their Myrmidons to assault and terrrifie the Members of both Houses, whose faces or opinion they liked not ... when these rude multitudes published the names of Members of both Houses, as enemies of the Commonwealth, who would not agree to their frantic propositions; when the names of those were given by Members of the House, that they might be proscribed, and torn in pieces by those Multitudes, when many were driven away for fear of their lives from being present at those consultations?[176]

This resulted in 236 MPs leaving parliament in June 1642, mostly to join the King at York.[177] Class hostility grew during the civil war, often associated with religious radicalism: Positions in local and other authorities were increasingly held by wealthy members of the middle classes. The nobility and gentry who had supported parliament against the king found that they were neglected, and people of lower status were preferred for places of authority. Clarendon noted that

> The nobility and gentry who had advance the credit and reputation of the Parliament by concurring with it against the King found themselves totally neglected, and the most inferior people preferred at all places of trust and profit.... most of those persons of condition, who ... had been seduced to do them [parliament] service throughout the kingdom, decline to appear longer in so detestable employment; and now a more inferior sort of the common people succeeded in those employments, who thereby exercised so great an insolence over those were in quality above them, and who always had a power over them, that was very grievous ... all distinction of quality being renounced. And they who were not above the condition of ordinary inferior constables six or seven years before, were now the justices of peace, sequestrators, and commissioners; who executed the commands of Parliament in all the counties of the kingdom with such rigour and tyranny as was natural for such persons to use over and towards those upon whom they had formerly looked at such a distance.[178]

Lucy the wife of Thomas Hutchinson tells 'how her husband, the parliamentary officer, found that his allies in Nottinghamshire distrusted civility, thinking it scarce possible for anyone to continue to be both a gentleman and a supporter of the godly interest.'[179]

In 1646 the Presbyterian Thomas Edwards declared that in the previous two years, and especially since parliament's victory at Naseby, the sectaries had in the most insolent and unheard-of manner abused 'all sorts and ranks of men even to the highest.'[180] Clarenden complained that the sects had 'discountenanced all forms of reverence and respect, as relics and marks of superstition.' In 1663 the Lord Mayor of London issued an order forbidding and repetition of the 'rudeness, affronts, and insolent behaviour' displayed by 'the unruly and

[174] Pearl, *London*, p. 132.
[175] Ashton, *The City*, pp. 205, 206.
[176] Ibid, p. 215. See also Stone, *Causes*, p.145.
[177] Stone, *Causes*, p.141.
[178] Hyde, *The History*, Volume 4, pp. 287, 315.
[179] L. Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel* Hutchinson, 1972, p. 132.
[180] Manning, *1649: The Crisis*, p. 321.

meaner sort of people' during the Interregnum towards noblemen, gentlemen and persons of quality passing in their coaches or walking through the streets of the City. This 'undutifulness and contempt of their superiors', he claimed, had been encouraged by the 'late usurped powers.' In fact, similar orders had been issued in 1621, for hostility to strangers and jeering at the coaches of the aristocracy, and were endemic in pre-civil war London.[181]

However, the civil war increased this hostility:

> ... the fury and license of the common people, who were in all places grown to that barbarity and rage against the nobility and gentry, (under the style of *cavaliers*,) that it was not safe for any to live at their houses who were taken notice of as no votaries to the Parliament.[182]

The City authorities complained to the king that most of the disorders came not from them but 'from the unregulated and disorderly suburbs', located in 'the skirts of the city where the Lord Mayor and magistrates of London have neither power ... [and which were] fuller of the meaner sort of people.'[183] The reaction by wealthy merchants in London after 1643 accounted for the development of political presbyterianism in the City.[184] Presbyterianism attracted both aristocrats and the gentry not only in London but elsewhere in the country, and contemporaries saw the Independents, Baptists and Quakers as the main source of the extreme and radical opposition to the crown.[185] The Quakers turned out to be the most radical of the sects, including a refusal to pay tithes or to doth hats to superiors and recognize titles, which appeared extremely threatening to established authority.[186] They also criticised the aristocracy and gentry, claiming that the latter owed their position to the 'Norman Yoke', seizing land and property by forceful dispossession. [187]

Although the Quakers had relatively humble origins – many of them had come from a Baptist background[188] – they were very literate and established their own libraries with printed books and tracts.[189] Although they eventually espoused pacifism, during the civil war period they were active in the parliamentary army.[190] All Puritan denominations appear to have had high levels of literacy, particularly the Presbyterians, many of whose ministers had university degrees.[191]

Socio-Economic Status and the Royalist and New Model Armies.

There is a difficulty in analyzing the social status of the parliamentary army during the civil war because of its changing composition and numbers. In March 1649, the Commonwealth had in England 44,373 soldiers; in July 1652 it had nearly 70,000, whereas in February 1660, its numbers were fixed at 28,342.[192] This is less of a difficulty with the royalist army as it was in existence for only a relatively short period.

---

[181] K. Thomas, *In Pursuit of Civility: Manners and Civilization in Early Modern England*, 2018, p. 322.
[182] Ibid, p. 318. See also Hill and Dell, *The Good Old*, p. 246.
[183] Pearl, *London*, p. 129.
[184] Ibid, p.204.
[185] Jennings, *The Gathering*, pp. 174, 175, 187; George Yule, *The Independents in the English Civil War*, 1958, p. 57.
[186] Jennings, *The Gathering*, p, 187.
[187] B. Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution*, 1985, p. 39.
[188] Jennings, *The Gathering*, p.269; Reay, *The Quakers*, p. 20.
[189] Jennings, *The Gathering*, pp. 260, 261.
[190] Reay, *The Quakers*, pp. 41, 42, 50
[191] Jennings, *The Gathering,* p. 244*:*
[192] C.H. Firth, *Cromwell's Army,* 1902, pp. 34, 35.

This essay will focus on the New Model Army, for which there is relatively full information. It was also the most radical of all of parliament's armies, playing the major role in the outcome of the war. According to Ian Gentiles, 'while the number of horse [in the New Model] remained fairly stable between roughly 5,000 and 6,500, the foot and the dragoons underwent violent fluctuations in numbers, from 18,000 to 7,000, owing to massive desertions. The men who stamped the New Model with a distinctive character were therefore a tight group numbering about 5,000 horse and 7,000 foot.'[193] It is these fluctuations which make statistical analysis so difficult, and it is therefore necessary to rely mainly on literary evidence.

The origin of the social status of the New Model Army lies in the recruitment of officers to the Eastern Association. One of the officers of the army, Dodson a native of the Isle of Ely, had served with Cromwell from the outbreak of the war, and described how Cromwell had packed the army with officers sympathetic to the sectaries – that in choosing officers for his own regiment, he had dismissed 'honest gentlemen and souldiers that ware stout in the cause', and replaced them 'with common men, pore and of meane parentage, onely – he would give them the title of godly pretious men'.[194] Whitelocke, another contemporary, described Cromwell's men 'as being mostly freeholders and freeholders' sons, who had engaged in this quarrel upon a matter of conscience.'[195]

However there is some evidence that in the early years the aristocracy and gentry played a significant role in the parliamentary army. Baxter claimed that when 'the Earl of *Essex* came to *Worcester*, with many Lords and Knights, and in a flourishing [parliamentary] army, [they were] gallantly cloathed ...'[196] This was confirmed by another source which claimed that in the parliamentary army 'only seven of the new colonels were not gentlemen, and of nine of them were from noble families.'[197] This was in the early stages of the civil war when constitutional concerns were the dominant issues. In June 1647 there was a purge of conservative presbyterian officers from the army, including 'some of the most socially distinguished of the army's founders.'[198]

The discipline for which the New Model was famous for originated in the way Cromwell treated his troops. 'At Huntingdon, two troopers who tried to desert were whipped in the market place ... Colonel Cromwell had 2,000 brave men, well disciplined; no man swears but he pays his twelve pence; if he be drunk he is set in the stocks, or worse, if one call the other "Roundhead" he is cashiered ...'[199] This religious zeal was partly responsible for the discipline that the New Model Army showed in battle, allowing them to defeat royalist armies. However, this was also the result of harsh discipline 'including penalties for drunkenness and fornication; blasphemers [who] had their tongues pierced with a hot iron.'[200] The army also had a reputation for being 'the praying army'[201], and their religious faith along with their discipline 'explained why small handfuls of New Model soldiers were able to put much larger numbers of royalists to flight.'[202] As the Venetian ambassador observed of the New Model, 'This much is certain that the troops live as precisely as if they were a brotherhood of monks ... It was observed in the late wars that when the royal forces gained a

[193] I. Gentiles, *The New Model Army in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1645-1653,* 1992, p. 40.
[194] Holmes, *The Eastern*, p. 199.
[195] A. Fraser, *Cromwell Our Chief of Men,* 1974, p. 100.
[196] Baxter, *Reliquiare Baxterianae*, p. 42.
[197] Purkiss, *The English,* p. 421.
[198] I. Gentiles, 'The New Model Officer Corps in 1647: a collective portrait', *Social History,* 22:2 (1997), p. 130.
[199] Ibid, p. 101.
[200] R. Tombs, *The English and their History,* 2015, p. 230.
[201] Gentles, *The New Model Army, 1645-53*, p. 94.
[202] Ibid, p. 95.

victory they abandoned themselves to wine and debauchery, while those commanded by Cromwell, after their greatest successes were obliged to pray and fast.'[203]

According to Anthony Fletcher, 'the instructions sent to [royalist] commissioners of array made it quite clear ... that the officers were all 'persons of quality' with considerable local estates.'[204] Cromwell largely concurred with this analysis, claiming that he had confronted Hampden about parliamentary soldiers in the early period of the civil war, stating that 'your troopers ... are most of them old decayed serving men and tapsters, and such kind of fellows, and, said I, their troopers are gentlemen's sons, younger sons, persons of quality: do you think that the spirits of such base and mean fellows will ever be able to encounter gentlemen that have honour, courage and resolution in them?'[205]

There is other evidence to confirm this statement. According to one source 'the King's forces in the windy summer morning looked magnificent, with bright fluttering banners of every colour and fantasy, as the light flashed from polished breastplates, glowed on damask banners, taffeta scarves and velvet cloaks.'[206] Cromwell was moved to prayer: 'When I saw the enemy draw up and march in gallant order towards us, and we a company of poor ignorant men ...'[207] According to Gentiles

> All Charles's officers at Oxford from the rank of captain upwards, were of gentry or more exalted status. His regimental commanders early in the war were all noblemen or higher gentry. Throughout the whole royalist army fully 90 per cent of the regimental commanders were gentlemen or peers ... the practice of promoting men from the ranks, which was so common in the New Model, was wholly absent in the Oxford army.[208]

The difficulty in analysing the New Model's composition is that 'of the total officer corps in 1648, half came from backgrounds so obscure that no information can be recovered about them.'[209] However, Gentles who has made the most detailed study of them concluded that of the officers in 1647 'twenty-two – about 9 per cent of the total – are known to have had some form of higher education ... Thirty-seven men or about one-sixth ... are known to have risen from non-commissioned rank ... [and] a high proportion ... even at the rank of colonel, were men of relatively low social status ... it is the strongly urban character of the officer corps that is most striking.' [210]

These conclusions are confirmed by literary accounts by both royalists and parliamentarians. The royalist Denzil Holles, believed that the officers 'from the general ... to the meanest sentinel, are not able to make a thousand a year lands; most of the colonels are tradesmen, brewers, tailors, goldsmiths, shoemakers and the like.'[211] According to another hostile contemporary account it claimed that if you 'Deduct the weavers, tailors, brewers, cobblers, tinkers, carmen, draymen, broom-men, and then give me a list of the gentlemen. Their names may be writ in text, within the compass of a single halfpenny.'[212] The Earl of Manchester wrote in 1645, that Cromwell had chosen for his army 'not such as were soldiers

---

[203] Relatzione of England by Giovanni Sagredo, 1656, Razzell, *The English Revolution*, p. 19.
[204] Fletcher, *The Outbreak,* p. 356.
[205] I. Roots (ed.), *Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, 1989, p 134. See also Ibid, p. 10; Yule, *The Independents*, p. 60.
[206] Wedgwood, *The King's War*, p. 452.
[207] Ibid, p.452.
[208] Gentiles, 'The New Model Officer Corps in 1647', p. 143.
[209] Hutton, *The British Republic*, p. 6.
[210] Gentiles, 'The New Model Officer Corps in 1647', pp. 135, 137, 140, 143,
[211] F. Maseres, 'Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles', *Select Tract Relating to the Civil Wars in England in the Reign of Charles the First*, 1815, p. 277.
[212] *Mercurius Elencticus*, 7-14 June 1648.

or men of estates, but such as were common men, poor and of mean parentage, only he would give them the title of godly, precious men.'[213]' In August 1643 Cromwell justified his mode of selection in a famous speech.

> It may be it provoked some spirits to see such plain men made captains of horse. It had been well that men of honour and birth had entered into these employments, but why do they not appear? Who would have hindered them? But since it was necessary the work must go on, better plain men than none. ... I had rather have a plain russet-coated captain that knows what he fights for and loves what he knows than what you call a gentleman and is nothing else.[214]

In a vindication of the New Model from the charge of intending to sack London, published in the summer of 1647, it is asserted: 'There are verie few of us, but have most of this world's interest in the Citie of London, being chiefly and principally raised thence, and verie many, especially of our officers, being citizens themselves having their wives and children therein.'[215]

Samuel Pepys in his diary for the ninth December 1663 confirmed the role of London artisans and tradesmen in the New Model Army:

> of all the old army now, you cannot see a man begging about the street. But what? You shall have this Captain turned a shoemaker, the lieutenant, a Baker; this, a brewer; that, a haberdasher; this common soldier, a porter; and every man in his apron and frock, etc, as if they had never done anything else – whereas the other [cavaliers] go with their belts and swords, swearing and cursing and stealing – running into people's houses, by force oftentimes, to carry away something. And this is the difference between the temper of one and the other ...[216]

Previously on the 4th July 1663 while watching the royal army parade through London, he had observed that 'all these gay men [royalist horse and foot] are not the soldiers that must do the King's business, it being such as these that lost the old King all he had and were beat by the most ordinary fellows that could be.'[217]

It was the junior officers of the New Model who frequently undertook independent political action, such as Cornet Joyce's seizing of the king at Holdenbury and placing pressure on Cromwell and the senior officers to bring the king to trial and eventual execution.[218] The wealthy Presbyterians who dominated London's government at this time, attempted to block the New Amy's access to parliament in 1647, but this was thwarted by the army sweeping away the resistance of the trained bands.[219] The New Model was reinforced by volunteers raised by Skippon in the suburbs, who were 'predominantly servants and apprentices'.[220] It is no accident that the New Model had been able to gain access to London Bridge through Southwark, which had long been a support of the radicals both in parliament and the army. This culminated in the purging of parliament led by Colonel Pride, leaving a rump of about 70 Independent MPs.[221]

---

[213] C. Hill, *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, 1970, pp. 65, 66.
[214] Ibid, pp. 66, 67.
[215] C.H. Firth, *Cromwell's Army: a History of the English Soldier during the Civil War*, 1912, p. 47.
[216] Latham and Matthews, *The Diary*, Volume 4, 1995, pp. 373, 374.
[217] Ibid, p. 217.
[218] B. Coward, *Cromwell: Profiles in Power,* 1991, p. 50.
[219] J. T. Schroeder, 'London and the New Model Army, 1647', *The Historian*, Volume 19, No. 3, May 1957, p. 249.
[220] L. C. Nagel, *The Militia of London, 1641-1642,* D.Phil. Thesis, Kings College, University of London, p. 303.
[221] Flintham, *Civil War*, p. 41.

In order to confirm the low social status of the New Model, an analysis has been carried out to compare the socio-economic status through university attendance of Royalist and New Model officers during the civil war period. The essence of the analysis is to make a comparison using an identical methodology for both armies. It indicates that the Royalist officers were of significantly higher social status than those of the New Model, confirming the literary evidence reviewed above.

Table 5: Proportions of Royalist and New Model Army Officers Graduating from Oxford and Cambridge Universities.[222]

	Total In Sample	Number Graduating from Oxford	Number Graduating from Cambridge	Total Proportion Graduating
Royalist Officers, 1642-60	100	27	25	52%
New Model Officers, 1645-49	100	9	6	15%
New Model Officers, 1649-63	100	7	10	17%

There are probably too many false positives in all samples, as suggested by Gentles' finding that only nine per cent of New Model Army officers had received a higher education in 1648, including at the Inns of Court. This suggests that most of these officers were from non-gentry backgrounds.

Conclusion

The revolutionary nature of Cromwell's regime is indicated by a speech he made to the army in 1651 when Charles II threatened to invade England with a Scottish army:

> Cromwell announced to the Army that, if he should fall, England would witness a universal crisis and change the numerous colonels, in all their splendour, who were once tailors, goldsmiths and carpenters [and] would have to make way for the nobility and courtiers.[223]

Aristocrats replaced by tradesmen and artisans in the army – indicating the only social revolution ever to occur in England. The New Model Army was a reflection of a social class which had been influenced by the Leveller movement, holding radical ideas about 'the fundamental rights and liberties ... against all arbitrary power, violence and oppression.'[224] This was an extension of the principles that had led parliament originally to object to Charles I's attempt to impose arbitrary government, a reflection of a culture of individualism. This was a culture particularly associated with literate socio-economic groups, a rebellious culture which could not be suppressed because of the absence of a national army in England.

[222] The above figures are based on a hundred cases selecting the first five names in each alphabetical letter in the relevant biographical dictionaries, covering most alphabetical letters. Only names not appearing in C. Webb's *London Bawdy Court, Consistory Court of London,* Volume 1, 1703-13, 1999 were selected for analysis, in order to avoid common names. The royalist figures are taken from P.R. Newman, *Royalist Officers in England and Wales, 1642-1660: A Biographical Dictionary,* 1981; the New Model Army ones are derived from M. Waklyn, *The New Model Army, Volume 1, 1645-49*, 2015 and M. Waklyn, *The New Model Army, Volume 2, 1649-1663,* 2016. The search for university membership was made through the online alumni listings for both universities.
[223] Relatzione of England by Giovanni Sagredo, 1656, Razzell, *The English Revolution*, p. 19.
[224] Morrill (ed.), *Reactions*, p. 183.

It was a culture originating in London and other trading towns of England, as well as the pastoral and woodland areas free of manorial control, which in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was often associated with puritanism. London's role was expressed most eloquently by the poet John Milton, who described in 1641 his fellow Londoners 'sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, revolving new notions and ideas ... reading trying all things, assenting to the force of reason ...'[225] This quote indicates not only the basis of puritanism – the rational scrutiny of all ritual and belief – but also the foundation for the process of rationalisation analysed by Weber in his discussion of the protest ethic.

Religion became more radical over time, with lesser socio-economic groups coming to dominate the religious and political agenda. It ultimately led to a revolution which involved the trial and killing of the king, the abolition of the House of Lords and the establishment of a republic. This never had the support of the majority of the population, which objected to the control of a standing army and a culture of puritanism. Cromwell had attempted to establish a regime of military control through the Major-Generals, which was unsuccessful. He along with the army officers had also attempted to introduce various forms of parliament, including Barebones Parliament with an emphasis on M.Ps sympathetic to the Puritan cause. All these regimes unravelled partly on libertarian grounds – with the soldiers of the New Model insisting on a 'liberty of conscience'. According to Baxter

> many honest men [in the New Model Army] ... made it ... their religion to talk for this Opinion and for that; sometimes for State Democracy, and sometimes for Church Democracy; sometimes against Forms of Prayer, and sometimes against Infant baptism, (which yet some of them did maintain); sometimes against Set-times of Prayer, and against the tying of ourselves to any Duty before the Spirit move us ... and sometimes about Free-grace and free-will, and all the Points of Antinomianism and Arminianism ... But their most frequent and vehement Disputes were for Liberty of Conscience as they called it ... [226]

This range of views anticipated the growth of nearly all the dissenting congregations in England and Wales during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This radical diversity of opinion made it difficult to find a religious and political settlement. The Presbyterians had attempted to impose a Puritan settlement along Scottish lines, but with the overall control of parliament, but this was opposed by the New Model with its insistence on liberty of conscience, again reflecting an individualistic culture.[227]

It was perhaps because of these difficulties that led Crowell to eventually advocate a return to a conservative society. In a speech to parliament in 1654 he claimed that 'a nobleman, a gentleman, and a yeoman ... That is a good interest of the nation and a great one.'[228] It was because of this conservatism that he had suppressed the Leveller movement, including the imprisonment and execution of three soldiers at Burford in 1649.[229] Towards the end of his life Cromwell attempted to purge the army of radicals and introduce aristocrats into his personal circle. According to Lucy Hutchinson

> He weeded, in a few months' time, above a hundred and fifty godly officers out of the army, with whom many of the religious soldiers went off, and in their room abundance of the king's dissolute soldiers were entertained; and the army was almost changed from that godly religious army, whose

[225] Worden, *The English Civil Wars*, p. 79. In 1650 Wallington a London artisan noted in his diary that he had not only written 'above forty books and read over the Bible many times,' but had also read 'above two hundred other books'. P. S. Weaver, *Wallington's World: a Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth Century London*, 1985, p. 5.
[226] Baxter, *Reliquiare Baxterianae*, p. 53.
[227] Razzell, *English Civil War,* Volume 3, p. 287; Underdown, *Revel*, pp. 208, 247.
[228] Coward, *Cromwell*, p. 102.
[229] See also Purkiss, *The English*, p. 499.

> valour God had crowned with triumph, into the dissolute army they had beaten, bearing yet a better name ... Claypole, who married his daughter, and his son Henry, were two debauched cavaliers ... His court was full of sin and vanity, and the more abominable, because they had not yet quite cast away the name of God ... hypocrisy became an epidemical disease ... At last he took upon himself to make lords and knights ... Then the Earl of Warwick's grandchild and the Lord Falconbridge married his two daughters ... [230]

However on the 15th March 1658 the Venetian ambassador reported that

> ... the Army took very badly the cashiering of the officers, reported, and has made a vigorous remonstrance to the Protector, pointing out that officers cannot be dismissed from an army without a Council of War, and so, as they do not know for what reasons he sent away many of their colleagues, they ask him to restore them to their posts and, by order of His Highness, they have been reinstated in them a few days since ...[231]

Cromwell's attempted changes laid the foundation for the restoration of the crown and a traditional parliament, although many of the provincial members of the New Model Army continued to be attached to 'the Good Old Cause' and political radicalism. For example

> Even in Deal, (after the Restoration a great centre of Nonconformity) maypoles were set up on May day 1660, and the people set the King's flag on one of them to the fury of the soldiers in the castle who 'threatened, but durst not oppose.'[232]

Something similar occurred in Nottingham in 1660, when a confrontation occurred 'between the young men of the town who were demonstrating for the return of the king, and soldiers of Colonel Hacker's regiment. The Memoirs [of Lucy Hutchinson] tell us that "the soldiers, provoked to rage, shot again and killed in the scuffle two Presbyterians ..."' [233] By 1660 the general population had turned against the Cromwellian regime and the soldiers in Deal Castle were powerless to prevent this popular revolt.

Cromwell concluded before this period that a new constitutional settlement was necessary, and declared to an audience of army officers deeply opposed to change: 'It is the time to come to a settlement and lay aside arbitrary proceedings, so unacceptable to the nation.'[234] However, puritanism and a culture of individualism did not disappear, but was reflected in the rise of religious dissent and a more extensive development of capitalism. Both individualism and capitalism have come to shape modern England, which has dominated economic, social and political life in the twenty-first century.

---

[230] Hutchinson, *Memoirs*, pp. 294, 295.
[231] Razzell, *English Civil War,* Volume 5, p. 83.
[232] M. V. Jones, *The Political History of the Parliamentary Boroughs of Kent, 1642-1662* (London University Ph. D. Thesis, 1967), pp. 467, 468.
[233] Jennings, *The Gathering*, p. 160.
[234] Coward, *Cromwell*, p. 146.