
Theses and Dissertations

Spring 1948

The impact of the Revolution on the social and economic life of the city of London, 1642-1646

Herbert Bonnewell Smith
University of Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [European History Commons](#)

No known copyright restrictions.

This thesis is available at Iowa Research Online: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/6046>

Recommended Citation

Smith, Herbert Bonnewell. "The impact of the Revolution on the social and economic life of the city of London, 1642-1646." MA (Master of Arts) thesis, State University of Iowa, 1948.

<https://doi.org/10.17077/etd.hieptcod>

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [European History Commons](#)

THE IMPACT OF THE REVOLUTION ON THE SOCIAL AND
ECONOMIC LIFE OF THE CITY OF LONDON
1642-1646

by
Herbert B. ^{Connewell} Smith

STATE UNIVERSITY
OF IOWA
LIBRARY

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of History in the
Graduate College of the State
University of Iowa

June, 1948

11948
S649
cop. 2

FOREWORD

It should be noted in the following dissertation that the modern calendar has been used in citing dates.

I should also like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. George L. Mosse for his valuable assistance and advice during the preparation of this thesis.

Herbert B. Smith

Iowa City, Iowa

April 8, 1948

Hein

84608

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
Chapter I - The Period of Tension: Preparation for War During Months of Peace in London	1
II - The Importance of London in the Revolution: Its Financial Role	27
III - The Importance of the Coal Industry to the City of London During the Revolution	45
IV - The Effects of the Revolution on the Commercial Life of London	59
V - Summary: Economic Consequences of the Revolution in London	95
VI - Social Reaction to the Revolution in London	99
VII - Social Standards and Social Life in London During the Revolution	138
VIII - Cultural Progress in Revolutionary London as it was Reflected in Literature, Writing, Science, Learn- ing and the Arts	165
IX - Conclusion	188
Bibliography	194

Chapter I

THE PERIOD OF TENSION; PREPARATION FOR WAR DURING MONTHS OF PEACE IN LONDON

King Charles I of England, the second Stuart monarch of that kingdom, inherited all of his father's views on the sanctity of kingship when he ascended the throne in 1625. To Charles, as to his father, James I, all opposition on the part of his subjects was error on their part. Therefore, when the great mass of grievances which had accumulated from 1625 to 1641 finally culminated in the long indictment of Charles' conduct from the beginning of his reign, known as the Grand Remonstrance of 1641, it is not surprising that Charles proved unequal to the task of handling this criticism with finesse.

Instead of avoiding the issue of the Grand Remonstrance, Charles chose to discover a technical offense in the leaders of the opposition, and the resultant open defiance of the orders of the king by the House of Commons on January third and fourth, 1642, was thus a direct result of Charles' inability to conciliate popular opinion.¹ This defiance, in turn, was a foreboding of things to come within the year in which the City of London was to play a dominant role.

By pointing out that Lord Kimbolton in the Lords, Pym, Hampden, Haselrig, Holles, and Strode in the Commons, had entered into communication with the Scots during recent troubles between England and that kingdom, the king could legally claim that they were guilty of treason for so doing. Therefore, on January third, Charles sent his Attorney-General to impeach the alleged traitors before the House of Lords.² Evasive answers were given to the king's official when he demanded that the specified members be given up, and on January fourth, Charles himself went to the Commons to seize the guilty members, only to discover that the accused had taken refuge in the city. After addressing the Commons as to the purpose of his visit amid confusion and interruption, he left to dine with Sheriff Garrett and then returned to Whitehall with an accompanying mob which voiced the sentiments of the city by their crys of "Privileges of Parliament! Privileges of Parliament!"³

From this event forward there could be little doubt as to where the sentiments of the majority of middle and lower class citizens of London lay. Even before this latest example of Charles' poor judgement had aroused the people to reaction, it had become increasingly evident that Puritanism was strongest among the trading

classes; when Charles went to arrest the ring-leaders of his opposition, London, the city of merchants and craftsmen, instinctively sided with the Parliament.⁴

The whole House quickly followed its leaders to the city and sat daily as a committee at Guildhall, surrounded by a resolute citizenry which, if need be, would protect the Parliamentary group by force of arms.⁵ Even on the day of the king's visit to the Commons, Sir Richard Gurney, the royalist Lord Mayor of London, realized that a most precarious equilibrium existed between peace and order and riot and bloodshed. He immediately sent out new regulations of watch and ward, whereby he commanded his aldermen, in the king's name, to double immediately the watch and ward at the gates, posterns, and landing places, and also to see that fire fighting equipment was in readiness at all times for quenching fire. All householders were ordered to keep their servants and apprentices indoors, and the householders were also warned that they would be held accountable for any disorder or misdemeanor of such persons.⁶ Each alderman was also directed to see that the trained bands, numbering six thousand men, were fully equipped, so that they would not have to borrow arms from the city halls or elsewhere.⁷

On January fifth, 1642, the king demanded of the

Common Council that the persons impeached by his orders should be given up. Instead of obeying his commands, the corporation truly represented its constituents by remonstrating with him on his proceedings against the accused members, and, in their petition, even pointed out the injurious effects which his rupture with Parliament had on the trade of the city; further, they emphasized the fact that his stand was definitely endangering the lives of his subjects.⁸ Before the day ended, the Common Council also voted a sum of £2,000 to provide a stock of arms and ammunition for the defense of the city.⁹

Tension finally broke down into panic on the night of January sixth. The alarm was sounded on the basis of a rumor that the king had raised a force to seize the six "delinquents"¹⁰ but the mayor refused to call out the trained bands, whereupon the bands dispensed with his authority and turned out of their own accord. They were quickly joined by practically every inhabitant as the panic spread, each arming himself as best he could.¹¹ In time the disturbance died down, but the mayor was commanded by the Council on January eighth to inquire into the "disturbance and affright of the inhabitants" on that occasion and to effect speedy punishment on those persons who had taken it upon themselves to call out the trained

bands.¹²

At least even some of the royalists in London, by this time, were convinced that the city was resolved to protect the six members,¹³ and, more particularly, the principles for which they stood. The Committee of Commons, on the other hand, sitting at Guildhall, realized that they were forcing the king to make what might be a dangerous decision, so they requested "strong and sufficient" guards from the City of London and adjacent parts to enable both Houses to sit in safety.¹⁴

On the tenth of January, 1642, a joint agreement for the future defense of Parliament and the city was arrived at by committees from both of those bodies meeting together. Captain Philip Skippon was placed in command of the trained bands at a salary of £300 a year for life; guns and ammunition were stored up at the Leadenhall, and a supply of corn was laid in by the livery companies.¹⁵

In the face of such determined opposition and hostility presented by the all too apparent alliance of the city and Parliament, Charles finally left Whitehall on the same day -- never to return again except as a prisoner.¹⁶

Parliament and the five members of the Commons returned in triumph to Westminster the following day. The seamen and watermen of the city fitted up barges and other

vessels which were filled with armed men who escorted the Parliamentary offenders back in protective celebration. The London multitudes further emphasized their disagreement with certain of the king's principles, however, by assaulting the bishops as they went up the stairs to the Lords' House, tearing their gowns and pushing them through a narrow lane lined by the people. Only those could pass unmolested who were described by the shouts of the crowd as "A good Lord" or "A good man."¹⁷

In the eyes of the city, the gentlemen of the Commons who had been accused of treason were completely vindicated; if there were doubters, the many printed pages which were issued in their defense must surely have altered the skepticism of the few.¹⁸ With the king and his major supporters gone, the Parliament set about to govern the land from London during a period of months which were heavy with tension while the king attempted to reign simultaneously in Oxford.

The impact of any civil war, revolution, national or international war, is felt long before the initial battle starts and long after the concluding peace has been signed. The prelude period is particularly important, for it is during this time, generally, that social and economic crises arise and resultant repercussions are

felt which tend to mold a state of mind that is receptive to conflict as an attempted solution for breaking the deadlock of opposing ideologies.

Conditions in London, in general, during the months after the king's departure from the city and before hostilities actually began, were no exception to the rule, for although there had been much open show on behalf of the Parliamentary cause, the city was hardly prepared to go to war, either mentally or materialistically. Parliament realized the importance of the city's support in either peace or war and was determined to maintain the city's allegiance to its own cause at all costs. Immediately, therefore, the Commons passed a resolution supporting the actions of the citizens of London which tended, at the same time, to assert the authority of the House in the following words:

Resolved upon the Question, that the Actions of the Citizens of London, and others, in the Guarding and Defence of the Parliament or the Privileges or members thereof, either by the Trained Bands, or otherwise, are according to their Duties, and the late Protestation, and the Laws of this Kingdom; and that if any Person shall arrest or trouble any of them for so doing, he doth thereby break the privileges of Parliament, violate the Liberty of the Subject, and is hereby declared an Enemy of the Commonwealth.¹⁹

The initial hope in the city, naturally, was that an amicable solution could be reached, and for months

communications were hurried back and forth between Oxford and London.²⁰ But the outward questions which were being argued in these communications, as to what was constitutional, were merely blinds to the main issue which was embodied in the question, who was to rule England? Gradually, the deadlock solidified, for neither side could accede without abandoning completely everything that it deemed to be right.²¹

In the meantime, London attempted to carry on as usual, but beneath this obviously false front, the alliance between city and Parliamentary governments was pledged to the necessity of preparation for war. The formation of a reserve of manpower was given an early impetus by the arrival from Buckinghamshire of about one thousand mounted men who came to offer their services to Parliament a few days after the king left the city.²² This was merely the beginning of population shifts to and from the city which brought many new social problems and accentuated those already existing.

The lieutenancy of the Tower of London was practically the only emblem of royal authority remaining in the city after the king and his party left, and for a time it seemed as if the Tower might become the Bastille of the English Revolution. The royally appointed lieutenant,

Sir John Byron, refused to present himself before the House when so commanded, and further refused to take the protestation which was sent to him. Food going to the Tower was stopped, and Byron barricaded his fortress. The seamen of London offered to batter it,²⁵ but Parliament wisely chose to settle the matter of the lieutenancy peaceably. Captain Skippon was authorized to keep a guard about the Tower to hinder the importation or exportation of any ammunition except that warranted by Parliament, no excessive amounts of food were allowed to go in, and ships were ordered to lie at Tower wharf to guard the water approaches.²⁴

By January twenty-eighth, however, the jealousies of the city concerning the Tower were reasonably well appeased, and quantities of bullion were once again taken to the mint by the merchants who had petitioned against Byron. The reason, probably, was that there was no longer cause to stand in awe of the Tower, as Byron himself admitted, for almost all of the arms had been issued out for Ireland, powder was decreasing in the same proportion, and nothing was being sent in to replenish the supplies²⁵-- at least as long as Byron was in charge.

A new rebellion in Ireland, which London had first heard about in November of the previous year,²⁶

served both as a blessing and a calamity during the waiting months. It was naturally a calamity, for the early dispatches had been highly colored with atrocity tales wherein the English colonists were reported to have been foully murdered by the Irish Papists, and Parliament, the merchants, and the inhabitants of London all felt duty-bound to come to the aid of the English colony in Ireland, some from a humanitarian point of view, and others because they had economic interests at stake. It was also to Ireland that Charles looked for assistance in his struggle with Parliament, so the latter wished to solve the Irish difficulties as soon as possible.²⁷ But the significant point is that the Irish Rebellion was also an odd sort of blessing in disguise, for it enabled Parliament to prepare for civil war, either intentionally or unintentionally, under the banner of relief for Ireland.²⁸

The Merchant Adventurers were asked to furnish £20,000 on January seventeenth, 1642 to aid in the reduction of Ireland, and the Lord Mayor was requested to give license for the transporting of a thousand barrels of meal from London into Ireland on the same day.²⁹ On the twenty-second of January, the city was asked to loan £100,000 for the Irish war. This loan was refused two days later because the city had, on a previous occasion,

advanced funds with the express understanding that troops would be sent immediately to Ireland, and none had gone. Therefore, the citizens refused to lend additional money until they were assured that relief had actually been sent to Londonderry.³⁰ A second request in June for the loan of the same sum towards "the relief and preservation of the kingdom of Ireland...and the speedy supply of the great and urgent necessities of the kingdom," was freely and quickly voted by the city, however, and was to be raised by the companies according to their corn assessment, for aid to Ireland had become an actuality by that month.³¹

In the meantime, the mayor was directed by the council to contact all the livery companies interested in the Londonderry estate, and urge them to contribute bread and corn for the relief of the plantation.³² The Company of Drapers offered one hundred quarters of wheat, the Company of Fishmongers provided one hundred quarters of wheat and £50, and the Company of Merchant Taylors offered £200 for the relief of Londonderry.³³ The Carpenters' Company also provided sums of money in March, June and August of 1642.³⁴ A group of merchants offered five ships, which the House gratefully accepted in January, 1642,³⁵ and additional aid to Ireland was accepted on February eleventh when a group of citizens offered to aid in putting

down the Irish rebellion at their own expense, provided that they received some satisfaction out of the rebels' estates. A scheme was quickly devised in Parliament for opening a public subscription and the royalist mayor promptly started the action in the city.³⁶

Loans were still being collected, supposedly for Irish relief, as late as July, 1642,³⁷ and on August twenty-second, when the war was finally eminent, Parliament called back £27,000 which it had sent to be put on a ship bound for Ireland.³⁸

Money loans, the collection of provisions, and the amassing of armed forces were not accomplished solely from the incentive of the Irish rebellion, however. Early in February, 1642 Bills were passed for the pressing of both soldiers and marines,³⁹ but there was no indication that their services were desired only for the English colony in Ireland; and it would seem that the allegiances of the soldiers impressed were not unwavering, for a committee was appointed in March to review the new statutes to determine what was to be done with those men who ran away after they had received their press money.⁴⁰ Mariners, too, were reluctant to join the Earl of Warwick who was attempting to arm a naval force of thirty ships. He was further hindered in his efforts by the fact that the city

and merchants refused to supply additional fresh supplies.⁴¹

A crisis of some proportion in the relations between Parliament and its principal urban ally developed late in February, 1642 when a petition criticizing Parliament's appointment of another individual to command the trained bands⁴² in place of the mayor, who had always enjoyed that prerogative, was discovered in the city. Included in the petition was the threat that the protesting citizens would withdraw their trade and residence from London unless the prerogative was restored to its rightful place.⁴³ Upon investigation in the Commons, however, it was discovered that the petition was unsigned, that the persons possessing the petition had not intended to stir sedition,⁴⁴ and that it had certainly not been instigated by the city government. The mayor, the aldermen and the rest of the Common Council of the City of London sent a petition to the House shortly thereafter expressing their respect to Parliament, and the House willingly dropped the matter of the petition.⁴⁵

Other indications of dissent in the population of the city in the early months of 1642 can be found in the several cases of persons against whom information was presented in the Commons for using derogatory and seditious language against the Parliament and its members. Individuals

referred to as Papists were generally the offenders, and Strode, Pym and Hampden bore the brunt of their abuse. One Robert Smyth was reported to have said at an inn: "A company of Asses had sat above a Twelvemonth together for nothing but to set Divisions between his Majesty and his people";⁴⁶ and Colonel Francis Edmonds, in Balcony Tavern in Covent Garden, allegedly said: "If his Majesty would display his banner, he would dispense with Strode, Pym and Hampden."⁴⁷ In all such cases the offenders were brought before the House as delinquents, and were generally given short prison sentences.

Beyond the initial desire to help the English colony in Ireland, there is practically no indication of an incentive or desire for war-like preparations in London during the early part of 1642. On the contrary, numerous minor evidences, such as the two examples cited above, would seem to indicate that there was even open opposition to revolution. It was necessary, therefore, for Parliament to diplomatically mold a state of mind which would, if necessary, be receptive to conflict against the king.

As early as April sixteenth the various livery companies had been made aware of the potential danger to the city by an act of the Common Council which required that each company report the quantities of arms and

ammunition which each would have in readiness for the defense of the city.⁴⁸ In May, a resolution was passed in the House which indicates that the Commons were convinced that the king, "seduced by wicked counsel," intended to make war against the Parliament. The resolution pointed out that if the king did so, it would be a breach of the trust reposed in him by his people, contrary to his oath, and that it would tend to the dissolution of the government. It ended with a note of warning that whosoever assisted him would be considered traitors.⁴⁹ Ways were also discussed that month for obtaining a loan of £50,000 from the Companies of London.⁵⁰ On June tenth, 1642, following the successful request for £100,000 for the preservation of Ireland earlier in the month, the Commons called for the bringing in of money, plate, arms and horses "for the defence of the king and both Houses of Parliament."⁵¹ Within ten days such a vast proportion of plate had been brought in that the treasurers had difficulty accomodating it, and some bringers were kept waiting two days to be relieved of their loads.⁵²

Parliament continued to make a play for public support in the city by publishing statements to the effect that if the king succeeded in humbling Parliament, with it would perish privileges of country, liberty of the people

and the laws of the kingdom. Giustinian, the Venetian Ambassador, acknowledged that such statements sounded very plausible to the people, and that they aroused feelings which were prejudicial to the interests of his majesty, particularly in London, "where more than anywhere else the infection of Calvinism has spread its roots."⁵³ He further reveals the Parliamentary decision to raise an army, the support of which was to be borne by the members themselves for the first six weeks, each contributing £200.⁵⁴ To accomplish this end, Parliament propagandized at great length on what they termed the resolve of the king to destroy Parliament by force and with it the public liberty. They urged the people to prevent such a misfortune by proving their real devotion by contributing money or plate and arms and ammunition in proportion to their respective means, promising them the restoration of their capital investment plus eight per cent interest.⁵⁵ The Calvinist merchants and the lower classes were readily swayed by these demands, and the unanimous support of the city seemed certain.

However, late in June the king, in a message to the magistrates of the city, commanded that no one, under severe punishment, should venture "to contribute money, lend plate or afford any other assistance whatever"⁵⁶

which might facilitate the levy of troops which Parliament proposed to assemble. He also threatened to suspend the privileges of London.⁵⁷ This tended to sober the enthusiastic support of the city, at least insofar as the mayoralty was concerned, and the distinctly royalist mayor, Sir Richard Gurney, intimated to Parliament that the new request for levies would not be paid.⁵⁸ Gurney had consistently been an ominous royalist shadow which hindered Parliamentary propaganda efforts by his very presence.

On July first, 1642, therefore, the Commons seized upon an opportunity to unseat Gurney and ordered the Committee for Impeachment to prepare proceedings against the Lord Mayor.⁵⁹ Mr. Sergeant Wilde delivered by word of mouth the form of impeaching Gurney on the fourth of July as follows:

That Sir Richard Gourney on or about the last day of June, 1642, being then Lord Mayor of the City of London, in several Places of the said City, unlawfully and maliciously caused a Proclamation to be made, for putting in Execution the Commission of Array, tending to the Raising Forces against the Parliament and Subverting the Laws and Peace of the Kingdom.⁶⁰

It was then resolved that he be impeached at the Bar in the Lord's House. He was requested to appoint a Locum tenens in his absence for the calling of a Common Council, and since he pleaded that he desired time for an answer, the most ancient alderman was to appoint the council.

Aldermen Garroway, Rainton and Whitmore all declined in turn, however, saying that they were too aged and infirm.⁶¹

Gurney pleaded "Not Guilty" when he appeared before the House of Lords on July nineteenth,⁶² but a judgement was, nevertheless, handed down against the Lord Mayor on August twelfth,⁶³ causing Giustinian to exclaim in his communique to the Doge that the Judgement was a violation of the privileges of the city, but that never in its history had London patiently borne so conspicuous an injury.⁶⁴ Seemingly, the City of London didn't share his belief, for no violent reaction was reported, and he himself was forced to admit that the merchants who professed Puritanism acclaimed the incident "with thunders of applause."⁶⁵ Gurney was sentenced on August twenty-second, and Sir Isaac Pennington, both an alderman and a member of the House, as well as being a professed Puritan, was selected by the City of London to take his place.⁶⁶

The king, in the meantime, had hoped to win over the sympathy of the city, but his method of threat was hardly conducive to the fulfillment of his aim. He had had the archives of documents sent to York on May twenty-seventh where he proposed to hold the courts of civil justice in place of London. His motive, seemingly, was to strip the hostile city of the honor and advantage

it had enjoyed from the influx of people from all parts of the kingdom who periodically visited London for the settlement of their legal disputes. Too, while threatening and punishing London, it would aid in keeping the allegiance of York.⁶⁷

In his warning to the city in June he expressed his belief that the city, "notwithstanding the barbarous and insolent demeanour of the meaner and baser sort," was to a large degree still loyal to him.⁶⁸ This mass of the people however, or, as Giustinian refers to them, "the lowest classes,"⁶⁹ continued to show evidence of their complete partiality to the Parliamentary cause by contributing not only their work but their meager fortunes as well. Often, too, they would prevent the publication of the king's proclamations by tumult,⁷⁰ and thus aided in cowing that small royalist element to which the king referred.

As July gave way to August, the city intensified its efforts to perfect a fighting force, holding reviews and demonstrations daily to maintain the public interest of the common people of London.⁷¹ Aldermen were required to keep a double watch in the various wards, and the length of the watch was increased to include the hours between nine o'clock at night at the latest to five o'clock

in the morning,⁷² as the inevitability of war became daily more apparent.

Directions for the defense of the City of London were embodied in eleven articles by the House on August tenth, 1642. By these articles, ward committees were formed which were empowered to go from house to house to demand whether each inhabitant was for the king or Parliament, what he had done for Ireland, and to disarm Papists. Strong watches were to be set, fortifications about London were authorized, a good number of horse were to be kept about the city, and four or five thousand men were to be trained and exercised in the city.⁷³

In the face of such determination, Charles could no longer tolerate the deadlock with Parliament, and on the same day that the royalist ex-Lord Mayor of London was sentenced to the Tower, August twenty-second, the king's standard was raised at Nottingham, summoning all loyal subjects to his aid against a stubborn and rebellious Parliament. The conflict of principles had now materialized into open warfare.⁷⁴

From the foregoing, it should be apparent that the spirit of rebellion was not inherent in the citizens of London. Aside from the determinism of the Parliamentary leaders, a state of mind which was receptive to open

rebellion had to be developed by relatively subtle propaganda which would show the necessity for such violent reaction. This development was accomplished by Parliament with the unintentional aid of King Charles himself, who always seemed to antagonize rather than mollify. The fact that London was a Calvinist center, of course, was a matter of prime importance in shaping the rebellion. However, it is not the purpose of this work to handle the religious aspects of the civil war in England which have already been handled exhaustively in many other works. It is sufficient at this point to say that even Calvinist merchants would not have resorted to war, which inevitably disrupts trade, had they not been forcibly persuaded that the attainment of their religious and political principles over an absolute prerogative outweighed the social and economic losses of war.

Notes to Chapter I

1. S. R. Gardiner, The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution, p. 128.
2. Ibid., p. 128.
3. Slyngesbie to Pennington, January 6, 1642, Calendar of State Papers Domestic, (hereinafter referred to as Cal. SP Dom.) 1641-43, pp. 241-43; Wisemen to Pennington, January 6, 1642, ibid., p. 240; Giustinian to the Doge, January 17, 1642, Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, (hereinafter referred to as Cal. SP Ven.) 1640-42, pp. 275-78; Rushworth, Historical Collections, v. iv, pp. 479-80.

Notes to Chapter I (Continued)

4. Margaret James, Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution, p. 8.
5. Gardiner, op. cit., p. 129.
6. Gurney to Adams, January 4, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 238.
7. R. R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, v. ii, p. 159.
8. Ibid., p. 159; E. B. Jupp, An Historical Account of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters of the City of London, p. 93.
9. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 159.
10. Smith to Pennington, January 7, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 245.
11. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 159.
12. Council to Mayor, January 8, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 249.
13. Smith to Pennington, January 7, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 245.
14. Resolution of Committee of Commons, January 8, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 248.
15. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 161.
16. Gardiner, op. cit., p. 129; Sharpe, op. cit., p. 161.
17. Autobiography of Sir John Bramston, ed. Camden Society, p. 82.
18. Slyngesbie to Pennington, January 14, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 254.
19. Journals of the House of Commons (hereinafter referred to as C.J.), v. ii, p. 370.
20. S. R. Gardiner, The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution, p. 130.

Notes to Chapter I (Continued)

21. Ibid., p. 130.
22. Slyngesbie to Pennington, January 14, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 254.
23. Ibid., p. 254.
24. Byron to Nicholas, January 22, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 265.
25. Byron to Nicholas, January 28, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 269.
26. Gardiner, op. cit., p. 124.
27. R. R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, v. ii, p. 162.
28. Edward, Earl of Clarendon, in his History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, v. ii, p. 208, refers to the great exigencies of Ireland as Parliament's two-edged sword used to draw money from the city and to raise soldiers against the king; J. B. Heath, Some Account of the Worshipful Company of Grocers of the City of London, p. lli.
29. C. J., v. ii, p. 384.
30. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 162-63.
31. Ibid., p. 167; C.J., v. ii, p. 601.
32. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 162-63.
33. C.J., v. ii, p. 405.
34. E. B. Jupp, An Historical Account of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters of the City of London, p. 91.
35. C.J., v. ii, p. 398.
36. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 163-64; C.J., v. ii, p. 463.
37. Ibid., p. 660.
38. Giustinian to the Doge, August 22, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, p. 130.

Notes to Chapter I (Continued)

39. C.J., v. ii, pp. 408,411.
40. Ibid., p. 477.
41. Giustinian to the Doge, April 4, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, p. 31.
42. See above, p. 5; Captain Philip Skippon was appointed as sergeant-major-general of the forces of the city on January tenth, 1641-(42) by a joint committee from Parliament and the Common Council; Sharpe, op. cit., p. 161.
43. Giustinian to the Doge, March 7, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, pp. 1-3.
44. C.J., v. ii, p. 452.
45. Ibid., p. 485; the Venetian Ambassador, Giustinian, took the view that the mayor and aldermen preferred to give up for the time being the privileges of their offices rather than "expose their persons to the hazard." Giustinian to the Doge, March 21, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, p. 19.
46. C.J., v. ii, p. 530.
47. Ibid., p. 471.
48. Mayor to Master and Wardens of Co. of Painter Stainers April 16, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 307; W. C. Hazlitt, The Livery Companies of the City of London, p. 272.
49. C.J., v. ii, p. 581.
50. Ibid., p. 568.
51. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 168.
52. Clarendon, op. cit., pp. 226-227.
53. Giustinian to the Doge, June 13, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, p. 73.

Notes to Chapter I (Continued)

54. Giustinian to the Doge, June 20, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, p. 79.
55. Giustinian to the Doge, June 27, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, pp. 82-83; C.J., v. 11, pp. 618-619.
56. Giustinian to the Doge, July 4, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, p. 89.
57. Ibid., p. 89; King to Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs of London, June 14, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 339.
58. Giustinian to the Doge, July 4, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, p. 92.
59. C.J., v. 11, p. 647.
60. Ibid., p. 653.
61. Ibid., p. 665.
62. Ibid., p. 681.
63. Ibid., p. 716.
64. Giustinian to the Doge, July 25, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, p. 107.
65. Ibid., p. 107.
66. C.J., v. 11, p. 723; Giustinian to the Doge, August 29, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, pp. 136-37.
67. Giustinian to the Doge, May 30, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1640-42, p. 65.
68. King to Mayor, June 14, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 339.
69. Giustinian to the Doge, July 4, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1641-43, p. 90.
70. Ibid., p. 90; Giustinian claimed that the loyal faction was overcome by the fear of chastisement and did not have the courage to even refuse to meet the obligations and payments which were demanded of them.

Notes to Chapter I (continued)

71. Giustinian to the Doge, August 1, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1641-43, pp. 112-13.
72. C.J., v. ii, p. 696.
73. Directions for Defence of London, August 10, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1640-42, p. 369; Giustinian to the Doge, August 22, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1641-43, pp. 130-31.
74. Gardiner, op. cit., p. 132.

Chapter II

THE IMPORTANCE OF LONDON IN THE REVOLUTION: ITS FINANCIAL ROLE

In any martial conflict, the role of dominant cities in the affected areas is, and always has been, of vital importance. This truth is accentuated by an evaluation of the part which the City of London played in the civil wars in England, for such an evaluation points up the almost undeniable fact that the allegiance of this city to the Parliamentary cause enabled the forces of Parliament to ultimately triumph over those of the king.

The importance of the City of London was appreciated by both sides from the very start of the conflict. Command of the city meant access to great wealth, the trained bands formed a nucleus for a formidable fighting force, and the city mob, though often an uncertain and occasionally compromising ally, was always a dreaded enemy. London was vital, too, as a source of effective propaganda which served as a mold for the shaping of public opinion. Sermons, pamphlets, and the topics of conversation in the city could almost be depended upon to reach important leaders in other parts of the kingdom.¹

London's decision to side with Parliament undoubtedly stems from a correlated religious, economic and political motivation which found an increasingly dominant Calvinist merchant class in the city desiring freedom from royalist absolutism which previously had restricted their activities in all three of the aforementioned fields.

Thomas Hobbes, a strong proponent of absolutism and a stern critic of the forces of rebellion, stressed this point in his written rationalization of Charles' defeat, which he entitled, Behemoth: or, The Epitome of the Civil Wars of England. He points out that the power of the Presbyterians had drawn practically all of the citizens of London to its devotion, who, in turn, admired the prosperity of the people of the Low Countries after they had revolted against their monarch, Philip II of Spain, and hoped that a like change in government would produce similar prosperity in England.² This was, of course, only one small aspect of the Londoners' thinking, and it may even have been a figment of Hobbes' mind, but it tends to stress the economic aspects of the city's decision to aid Parliament. The removal of absolute prerogative and privilege would logically facilitate the trade and commerce of independent businessmen, and freer

trade was therefore advocated by this group particularly. It should be noted, of course, that the situation in the Netherlands was really quite different from that in England, in that Philip II had been a foreign ruler who had drained off much of the wealth of the Netherlands to his own native Spain. Naturally, by successfully resisting this foreign influence, the Dutch were able to retain their wealth to the great benefit of the country's prosperity.

Hobbes further emphasizes this economic motive by stating:

Those great capital Cities, when Rebellion is entered-into upon Pretence of Grievances, must needs be of the Rebel Party, because the Grievances are but Taxes, to which Citizens, that is Merchants, (whose Profession is their private Gain,) are naturally mortal Enemies; their only glory being to grow excessively rich by the Wisdom of buying and selling.³

Hobbes also appreciated the financial importance of London, for he attributed the king's failure to raise a sufficient army to the fact that the king's treasure was low while his enemies could draw on the resources of London and other cities. He believed that there were few of the common people who cared much for either of the causes and that they would have taken either side for pay and plunder.⁴ London, therefore, with its power of the purse, spelled the difference.

The methods used by Parliament to raise funds to finance its war effort were many and varied. Regardless of the method used, however, the City of London and its inhabitants were always the principal contributors-- either by choice or by force, and the economic consequences of the war must have prompted many of the Calvinist merchant backers of Parliament to wonder if the advantages they hoped to gain were worth the disruption in trade.

The principal way by which a Parliamentary loan was floated was by means of a request or demand to the Lord Mayor, aldermen and the Common Council of London for a specified sum. These representatives, in turn, requested the sum to be raised from the livery companies of the city, each company being asked for an equitable share in accordance with its size and relative importance. Each Company attempted to raise its proportion either directly from the organization's assets or from contributions from individual members. Thus, eventually and inevitably, the burden fell upon the individual inhabitants of the city, and both Parliament and the city government attempted to keep account of each person's contributions in relation to his ability to pay.

Experience in collecting funds for Ireland had already necessitated the establishment of some sort of

administrative machinery to handle contributions. Therefore, on the twenty-sixth of August, 1642, the treasurers were able to examine a tabular form listing certain wards and parishes within the city which specified the names of citizens who had already been asked for a loan, the amounts in money and plate already lent, and the names of non-subscribers, together with their reasons for not lending.⁵

By the same token, however, the campaign to collect funds for Irish relief had already imposed an extremely heavy burden on the people. This was particularly true in the case of the livery companies, some of whom had already been forced to sell part of their plate.⁶

The Saddlers' Guild is a case in point; when they were assessed £200 in August, 1642, over and above Irish contributions, they initially were reticent to comply, due to the sums of money they had already borrowed. In an attempt to economize, all feasts and dinners were discontinued. Their arms were borrowed by Parliament on September third, and the Company then decided that the need was great enough, so they lent the desired £200 on the thirteenth of September. These continual demands told heavily upon the Company, however, and the whole of the Company's plate was finally ordered out of the treasury and sold.⁷

Parliament became increasingly concerned over finance when the treasurers estimated that they would be spending £15,000 sterling a day.⁸ Also, their efforts to raise money were intensified during November and December, 1642, by the news that royal forces were approaching the city. Therefore, application for funds was made to everyone, without distinction, and it was reported by the Venetian Ambassador that those who did not promptly consent had their plate taken by force, together with the best of their goods, and often those who failed to cooperate were imprisoned as enemies of the state and adherents to the contrary party. This same report stated that seventy of the most substantial merchants of the mart were thus treated.⁹

In the days of panic of late 1642 it was also necessary to commandeer wagons for the sutlers who were to feed thirteen regiments. Of the twenty-six wagons needed, the Wagon-Master General had only fourteen serviceable wagons belonging to the state. The order was therefore given that country wagons in and about London were to be seized to make up the deficit, the owners being paid what appointed commissioners deemed them to be worth.¹⁰

An apparent state of emergency thus proved to

Parliament that the spasmodic nature of voluntary contributions was inadequate. Regular taxation and the commandeering of necessary equipment had then been resorted to in an attempt to equalize the burden not only in the city but in the kingdom at large. Assessments were made according to ability to pay, but in no case was a person to be assessed above a twentieth part of his estate under the new system.¹¹ It was under the guise of taxation that the seizure of goods, to which the Venetian Ambassador referred, was made possible.

A demand for £30,000 was met¹² by individual payments, but the returns indicated that many persons were not paying in proper proportion, and some of the wealthier citizens absolutely refused to pay. Some refused to comply with the assessment on principle, preferring imprisonment to paying what they considered to be an illegal tax, and others from sheer inability, for the war had already ruined many.¹³

In late January, 1643, Essex, Lord General of the Parliamentary army, sent in an account of debts owed by Parliament which exceeded £400,000 sterling.¹⁴ This amount could not possibly be raised under conditions then existing, so Parliament resolved to impose a weekly assessment upon every county throughout the kingdom.¹⁵

London's imposition was £10,000, but the city was also asked for £60,000 to keep the army from disbanding.¹⁶ This seems, at first glance, to be a double burden, as indeed it was, except that the latter figure was a requested loan instead of an imposed tax. Too, London was allowed a monthly rebate of £3,000, though the Common Council complained that even then the city was over-assessed and suggested that the monthly allowance be raised to £4,000.¹⁷

In March, Pym, in the name of both Houses, asked the Common Council to hasten the payment of the residue of the £60,000. Lenders, however, were discouraged, because debts were not being repaid. There was no way of forcing men to lend, and many rich citizens had left the city, taking what possessions they could with them. The Commons, however, was persistent, and requested an additional advance of £40,000 from the city for the support of the army on the sixth of April.¹⁸

The threat to Gloucester by the king's forces prompted the Common Council to put pressure once again on the livery companies, this time for £50,000, for which the city issued bonds at eight per cent interest. The companies were to contribute in accordance with their corn assessment.¹⁹ Although the Carpenters had already sold their plate,²⁰ and the Grocers had sold part of theirs,²¹ both companies

managed to contribute their quotas.²² The saddlers expressed themselves unwilling to borrow the sum of £600 which was requested of them, because of the great sums they already owed, but they were willing to borrow £500, according to the company's old proportion of one hundred quarters of wheat.²³ The Girdlers were asked for £700, and in their attempt to meet the emergency, they "ordered that such plate as belonged to the company remaining unsold should be sold." This was done, but only £150 was realized and they were no longer able to borrow on the common seal of the company.²⁴ In addition, every inhabitant of the city, citizen or stranger, was asked to contribute a sum equal to fifty times the amount of subsidy he had been accustomed to paying. Again, the city allowed eight per cent interest. Parliament guaranteed the repayment of the loan.²⁵

As the press for money became greater and greater, taxes were laid on almost all articles of food and clothing,²⁶ and it was found necessary to cut down the pay of both officers and men.²⁷ The inhabitants of the city were even called upon to set apart the price of one meal every week to raise money in January, 1645.²⁸

The collection of funds was based upon parish rolls to a large extent, and upon prepared ward lists.²⁹ Contributions and loans were naturally expected to be

voluntarily made, and were to be turned in to centrally located governmental treasurers who were appointed by Parliament. When it became necessary to resort to taxation, however, assessors were appointed in each ward to assess all persons having any real or personal estate.³⁰ Again, the desire was expressed for all persons to pay freely. However, collectors within the various parishes and wards were appointed who were even authorized to be armed and to collect by force if necessary.³¹ The funds collected were then turned over to the Parliamentary treasurers.

A monthly tax was assessed on all persons having any real or personal estate on the fifteenth of February, 1645, and persons refusing to cooperate in the collection of the tax were to be fined.³² The city further advanced £80,000 on March fourth, 1645 to aid in the formation of the New Model Army,³³ and on May twenty-seventh, an ordinance was passed in the Commons which provided for the raising and assessing of £20,000 within the cities of London and Westminster towards the reduction of Oxford.³⁴ The siege of Chester in November also called for a loan of £6,000 from the city, and it was agreed to advance the sum, but the city was becoming distressed about the repayment of the monies in arrear and appointed a committee to review the matter and to address Parliament to learn

precisely how the city stood with respect to loans already made.³⁵

Revenue was, of course, obtained by means other than direct taxation and by the floating of loans. Again, however, the inhabitants of the City of London were those who were most affected, though it was generally those elements of the population which were deemed to be made up of royalist sympathizers which suffered most.

Any person who showed sympathy or favor to the royalist cause was generally punished by having his goods confiscated and his estate sequestered. Even those persons who failed to take the oath of association, declaring their support of Parliamentary principles, fell into the category of "royalist," and were thus punished. Confiscated goods were sold, and the revenues realized from such sales were added to the public exchequer.³⁶

The seizure of plate which was used "superstitiously" upon cathedral altars was used to raise money,³⁷ and an interesting ordinance of July fifth, 1643, compelled people to advance "so much Monies for the reducing of Newcastle, as their yearly Expence in Coals comes to."³⁸ This was an example of Parliament's appeal to a genuinely felt necessity as a basis for collecting funds.³⁹ If the people wanted coal badly enough, they could contribute to

the military expedition necessary to regain the source of the fuel! Items of value were taken out of Saint Paul's Cathedral and were sold to aid in the equipping of an artillery train,⁴⁰ and horses were seized indiscriminately from any person within the liberties of the City of London, with such persons receiving satisfaction by having the value of the horses subtracted from the money the individuals were due to pay in taxation.⁴¹ Legacies which were given for the repair of Saint Paul's Cathedral were borrowed for the service of Parliament, and additional funds were obtained by converting all of the plate in the Tower which belonged to the king into coin;⁴² all superstitious plate which could be found in the Regalia at Westminster was also to be so used.⁴³

The Grocers' Company was the victim in an interesting case wherein the Master of the Company received a message from the Parliamentary Party to the effect that one Richard Greenough was a delinquent to the Parliament, and that that body had learned that Greenough was a creditor of the Grocers' Company to the sum of £500. They, therefore, demanded that the sum be paid in to Parliament. To make payment for this bizarre demand, the company was forced to borrow the amount on their company's seal.⁴⁴ Innocent citizens were also inconvenienced by the

sequestration of rents from royalist properties which occasionally were reserved by the occupants for payment of debts owed to them by the owners.⁴⁵

The last great financial effort during the years 1642-1646 was towards the payment of funds to the armies of Parliament's Scottish ally. In June, 1645, £31,000 had been cheerfully advanced by the city to pay the Scottish army,⁴⁶ but by the nineteenth of May, 1646, the Commons decided that they had no further use for the Scots' army within the Kingdom of England.⁴⁷ The dominant problem then was to determine how to get rid of their ally. The Scots demanded full payment of all expenses incurred,⁴⁸ and it was only after considerable argument that the Scots agreed on the sum of £400,000 as a payment for all claims, part of which was to be paid before they left England, and the remainder in installments on specified dates.⁴⁹ The initial sum of £200,000 was desired by the Commons on August twenty-first to start the Scots on their way. The first £100,000 was to be paid when the armies marched out of England, and the second £100,000 was due on the eighteenth of September following.⁵⁰

Again the city was destined to bear the brunt of the burden. A committee was organized in the House to go to the city or "to any other persons," to borrow the money

"for the Service of the State," with the revenues of suppressed bishoprics being assigned as security.⁵¹

Additional funds for this purpose were raised by fines paid by Papists or delinquents or by the sale of their estates.⁵²

If there had been no City of London to support the Parliamentary cause financially, it would have been practically impossible for Parliament to have made any sort of successful stand. The cost of this support to the city, its livery companies and inhabitants was much greater, however, than the actual worth of the pounds sterling deposited in the treasury, for this steady drain of money contributed greatly to the general economic stagnation which settled like a cloud over the entire kingdom during the war years. Though the increase in taxation caused the loudest complaints, it was the large scale borrowing from the city and its companies which caused trade to suffer most from London's financial obligations to the war effort.⁵³

Notes to Chapter II

1. Helen Douglas-Irvine, History of London, p. 226.
2. Thomas Hobbes, Behemoth: or, The Epitome of the Civil wars of England, as recorded in Baron F. Maseres' book, Select Tracts Relating to the Civil Wars in England in the Reign of King Charles the First, pp. 459-477.
3. Ibid., p. 576.

Notes to Chapter II (Continued)

4. Ibid., p. 458.
5. Returns from Wards and Parishes, August 26, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 378.
6. J. W. Sherwell, A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Guild of Saddlers of the City of London, p. 91.
7. Ibid., pp. 91-92.
8. Giustinian to the Doge, October 3, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 166.
9. Ibid., p. 198.
10. Order of Committee of Lords and Commons for Safety of Kingdom, November 22, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 408.
11. R. R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, v. ii, pp. 176-77.
12. Giustinian to the Doge, December 12, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 211.
13. Returns furnished by Parishes of London, November 26-December 2, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, pp. 409-10; Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 181-82.
14. Agostini to the Doge, January 30, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 237.
15. Ibid., p. 237; Sharpe, op. cit., p. 182; Clarendon, In his History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, v. ii, p. 547, refers to this assessment as the first general tax to be levied upon the people by Parliament, thus discounting the assessment of November, 1642, probably because of its failure as a general tax; E. B. Jupp, An Historical Account of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters of the City of London, p. 96; C.J., v. ii, p. 950.
16. Jupp, op. cit., p. 96; Sharpe, op. cit., p. 182; C.J., v. ii, p. 984.
17. Ibid., p. 985; Sharpe, op. cit., p. 182.

Notes to Chapter II (Continued)

18. Ibid., p. 185.
19. Ibid., p. 194; the City of London, from an earlier period, had adopted the custom of maintaining a store of wheat for providing food for the inhabitants and preventing extortion and "corners" in times of scarcity. The companies determined to keep their own stores, beginning in 1578, and, in time, they moved their stocks to their own halls, according to Sherwell, op. cit., p. 94.
20. Jupp, op. cit., p. 96.
21. J. B. Heath, Some Account of the Worshipful Company of Grocers of the City of London, p. 112.
22. Ibid., pp. 113-14; Sharpe, op. cit., p. 194; Jupp, op. cit., pp. 98-99.
23. Sherwell, op. cit., pp. 93-94.
24. W. D. Smythe, An Historical Account of the Worshipful Company of Girdlers, London, p. 186.
25. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 194.
26. Agostini to the Doge, August 7, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 3.
27. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 199.
28. Ibid., p. 199.
29. Returns of Wards and Parishes, August 26, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 378; Returns of Parishes, November 26-December 2, 1642, ibid., pp. 409-10.
30. Ordinance of Lords and Commons, February 15, 1644-45, Cal. SP Dom., 1644-45, p. 305.
31. Agostini to the Doge, January 30, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 247.
32. Ordinance of Lords and Commons, February 15, 1644-(45), Cal. SP Dom., 1644-45, p. 305.

Notes to Chapter II (Continued)

33. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 214.
34. C.J., v. iv., p. 155.
35. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 224-25.
36. Agostini to the Doge, April 24, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 265.
37. C.J., v. iii, p. 106.
38. Ibid., p. 157.
39. See p. 46.
40. C.J., v. iii, p. 462.
41. Pennington to Sub-Committee of Militia Appointed to Seize Horses, August 12, 1643, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 476.
42. C.J., v. iii, p. 651; H. B. Wheatley, London, Past and Present, p. 396.
43. C.J., v. iii, p. 657.
44. Thomas Arundell, Historical Reminiscences of the City of London and its Livery Companies, p. 52; Heath, op. cit., p. 115.
45. Petition of Francis Bickley to Committee of Lords and Commons for Sequestrations, April 16, 1645, Cal. SP Dom., 1644-45, p. 411; C.J., v. ii, p. 898.
46. Proceedings at Committee for both Kingdoms, June 14, 1645, Cal., SP Dom., 1644-45, p. 591; Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 219-20.
47. C.J., v. iv., p. 551.
48. Journals of the House of Lords (hereinafter referred to as L.J.), v. viii, p. 461.
49. Ibid., p. 487; C.J., v. iv, pp. 644, 649, 654-56, 659.

Notes to Chapter II (Continued)

50. C.J., v. iv, p. 650.
51. Ibid., p. 663; Nani to the Doge, October 11, 1646,
Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 285.
52. January 13, 1646-(47), Cal. SP Dom., 1645-47, p. 514.
53. Margaret James, Social Problems and Policy During the
Puritan Revolution, p. 38.

Chapter III

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE COAL INDUSTRY TO THE
CITY OF LONDON DURING THE REVOLUTION

One of the most difficult problems which both national and city governments had to face throughout the war period was that of providing London with fuel. The king had obtained control over the coal supply in the Newcastle area practically at the outbreak of the war, and he wished to use this control as a means of raising revenue from his enemies, and of supplying his troops with arms and ammunition from Holland. He reimposed all duties on coal of which Parliament had recently deprived him, and he placed an additional levy of £30 to £50 on every ship leaving the harbor with coal for London. If this trade had continued without restraint, the king would have been able to realize an annual revenue of nearly £100,000 which would have enabled him to purchase the supplies he needed from Holland. Parliamentarians were, therefore, faced with the grave decision of either contributing to the enemy's war chest or of depriving the citizens of London of vitally needed fuel. They finally chose the latter course, for not only did they object to

financing the king's war effort, but they also feared that the price of fuel would be forced up, causing riots and other internal disturbance in London.¹

A joint resolution was accordingly passed by the Lords and Commons on January ninth, 1643, forbidding all trade with Newcastle, Sunderland and Blyth until those districts were liberated from the king's forces.² The Lords, however, when the ordinance forbidding the Newcastle trade was being prepared, began to feel that such a step might have the undesired effect of diverting permanently the coal trade from Newcastle and that it might also cause an immediate rise of prices in London -- one of the things they wished to avoid. Also, they doubted whether the city would have a sufficient store of coal on hand to enable it to bear the strain.³ The Lord Mayor announced that there was enough coal within the city to last five months, and the Commons were willing to add a clause forbidding coals to be sold at prices exceeding twenty-two shillings a chaldron at the wharf or twenty-four shillings if delivered, so the Lords agreed on the passage of the ordinance on January fourteenth, 1643.⁴ However, any mention of coal rates was actually omitted.

The Lords' fears seemingly were realized almost immediately, for Agostini, in his message to the Doge in

Venice on January thirteenth, remarked that in London the people experienced great discomfort due to the fact that coal had risen to intolerable prices.⁵ This fact was further substantiated by the Perfect diurnall which reported that since the stoppage of trade with Newcastle the price of coal had risen from twenty-two shillings to thirty-four shillings a chaldron, according to a complaint made to the Commons.⁶

It had thus become clear that some definite policy of regulation or price-fixing was necessary. On January twenty-eighth the Lord Mayor was asked by the Commons to consider what rate was fit to be put upon Newcastle coals, and in the meantime, woodmongers, and all other retailers of coal were ordered not to sell coal at above twenty-two shillings per chaldron at the wharf. Wharfingers were not to exceed the usual rate for carrying coals, and an order was also issued forbidding the export of coal to foreign lands.⁷ The price ceiling by ordinance was established in the Commons upon the Lord Mayor's recommendations on February fourth, 1643, at twenty-three shillings a chaldron at the wharf until the approaching Easter, after which time it was to be twenty shillings per chaldron.⁸ The Marshal of the Admiralty was authorized shortly thereafter to seize ships which had recently come

from Newcastle with coal in order to take over receipts which were in excess of those allowed by ordinance. Such money was to be turned over to the Committee of the Navy.⁹ This action appears to have had the dual purpose of raising money for the navy while, at the same time, enforcing the new price regulations. In March all wharfingers, woodmongers and other sellers of Newcastle coal were warned that they would be committed by the Committee for Examinations if they sold their coal at rates in excess of those authorized by Parliament.¹⁰

This attempt to regulate the price of coals seems to have met with little success, for only one month later it was reported in the Commons that the coal sellers were still exacting unreasonable prices. The Lord Mayor was urged to enforce the ordinance, and he was further empowered to seize the coals of those who didn't conform, for distribution among the poor, paying the prescribed rates to the dealers from whom it was taken.¹¹ Further evidence of the failure of the ordinance appears in a report of the House of Commons dated June eighth, 1643, in which it is revealed that ship owners were taking advantage of the times and were illegally obtaining coal at Newcastle which they were selling at extremely high prices. The Lord Mayor was therefore directed to appoint officers of trust to go

on board the ships to see that coal was sold at the prescribed rates. No coal was to be sold to woodmongers, chandlers, or others who ordinarily peddled fuel; instead, only the poor and housekeepers "and those of the meaner sort," were allowed to buy, no one being allowed more than one chaldron per person.¹² This was the first indication of war-time rationing during the English Civil War.

While price control was an acknowledged necessity, Parliament failed to implement the control ordinances which it passed with effective administrative machinery for enforcement. The responsibility for enforced compliance fell mainly upon the Lord Mayor of London who, in turn, delegated the task of control to the sheriffs of the city. The aforementioned Committee for Examinations was appointed by Parliament for investigative and commitment purposes, but it could only be utilized after alleged offenders had been apprehended. The control of unauthorized shipment of coals on the sea fell under the jurisdiction of the Marshal of the Admiralty. As has been noted above, however, practically all attempts at price control failed because of the ineffectual enforcement of legislation, thus indicating the inadequacy of the scheme of control used.

The Committee of the Navy ominously reported in May that the supplies of coal which were obtainable from

Scotland and Wales would prove insufficient to carry London through another winter,¹³ so on July fifth, 1643, Parliament resorted to a forced loan to raise an army for the capture of Newcastle. Ship owners trading for coal, salt or glass in Newcastle, Sunderland or Blyth had to subscribe a sum equal to at least half of the capital they had invested in shipping or else pay extra sums above the price charged to subscribers on shipments of salt, glass or coal after trade was reopened with the besieged town. As has been mentioned previously,¹⁴ the ordinance also required everyone living in London or its immediate environment to subscribe a sum equal to the value of coal annually used, or else to pay in the future ten shillings more per chaldron than those persons would pay who subscribed when asked.¹⁵ Only about £6,000 was raised by this method, so Parliament was obliged again to invite the Scots to invade the north of England.¹⁶

As the winter of 1643-44 approached, the inhabitants of London were forced to look for wood supplies for heating and cooking purposes. This was particularly true in the case of the poor who were unable to pay the black-market prices which were being demanded for the meagre coal supplies. Therefore, in response to the agitation of the people, it was enacted that fellable wood might be cut within three score miles of London, a committee of the

Lords and Commons being formed to appoint overseers and generally to superintend the work. The wood was to be taken from the parks and estates of malignants, delinquents and the king, and the greatest proportion was to go to the poor. The remainder could be sold to ordinary citizens after the poor had been provided for, but no woodmonger was to be allowed to engross any of this fuel. When the ordinance was first enacted, it was also necessary to provide the guards of the outlying areas with fuel, in order to keep them from wantonly destroying the parks and woods near London. The guards were also instructed to prevent other persons from spoiling and wasting the timber lands. In December, 1643, sixscore loads of wood were furnished for the use of sick and maimed soldiers of the Parliamentary forces.¹⁷

During the year 1644 the coal situation became even more critical, with rich and poor alike bemoaning the scarcity of the vital commodity.¹⁸ Though there had been a certain amount of illegal trade with the north, the blockade had been so effective that only about 50,000 tons of coal left Newcastle in the year ending Michaelmas, 1643, and less than 3,000 tons in 1644.¹⁹ The emergency prompted the House of Commons to consider the reversal of the ordinances forbidding trade with the Lower Tyne

Valley, and in March it ordered that an ordinance be brought in for the reopening of that trade. Shipments of arms and provisions to the Scots near Sunderland were authorized in the hope that the ships would be able to bring back coal.²⁰ On June tenth the Venetian Ambassador wrote that the lack of coal would be unbearable in the winter to come, for most of the trees in the neighborhood had been felled the previous winter.²¹ Later in the summer he predicted that without coal there would be riots in the city during the cold months.²²

With the Scots apparently close to victory in the north, Parliament was kept busy planning how the coal industry could be resumed effectively, for much damage had been done to equipment by the royalists; impediments to shipping had been erected on the river, and it was difficult to find experienced personnel who were friendly to the Parliamentary cause to operate the collieries.²³ In the meantime, an ordinance was passed for providing fuel for the city by cutting peat and turf on sequestered lands,²⁴ and a committee was appointed in the Commons to meet with the Common Council to consider the advisability of obtaining turf and peat from Egham, the Fens of Wisbeche, the Isle of Ely and other places, for the service of the city.²⁵ An additional attempt was also made to fix the

price of coal during the summer of 1644, this time at fourteen shillings for superior grades and twelve shillings for coal of lesser quality.²⁶

Newcastle surrendered to the Scottish forces on October nineteenth, 1644,²⁷ and its seizure was naturally greeted with much rejoicing in the city, but the problems of paying the Scots, who now had a firm footing in England and a great advantage over London, and of keeping the coal fields in operation, continued to make the situation critical.²⁸ Much abuse continued in the engrossing and sale of coal to the great prejudice of the poor,²⁹ and the citizens were forced to pay a high legal price for the commodity owing to a heavy impost set upon it by Parliament who wished to use this means of paying off the Scots. An earnest request of the municipal authorities finally brought some reduction in this tax.³⁰

The ordinance of January fourteenth, 1642, prohibiting trade with Newcastle, Sunderland and Blyth was repealed on November thirteenth, 1644,³¹ and at the end of the month, plans were made for a shipment of coal which was to be distributed to the poor of London and Westminster by the Lord Mayor of the former.³² Again in March, 1645 attempts were made to get 4,000 chaldrons of coal to be sold for the use of the poor.³³ To facilitate shipments,

an extra five shilling tax, which had been imposed by the Commissioners of Both Kingdoms, at Newcastle and Sunderland, was declared illegal by Parliament since it was without authority or power, and was ordered to be removed.³⁴

The shipments from Newcastle during the year ending Michaelmas, 1645, amounted to about 126,000 chaldrons, which was considerably less than normal. Although Parliament could hardly hope to pay off the whole Scottish debt out of revenue from the coal, it is worthy of note that approximately £75,000 was collected in coal taxes between October, 1644, and February, 1647, when the Scottish occupation ended, which is more than one-third of the amount said to have been paid over to the Scottish Commissioners before the Scots returned to their own lands. With the Scots gone, the excuse for these taxes vanished, and the duty was finally removed in April, 1647.³⁵

It is apparent that the scarcity and need of a single vital commodity -- coal -- actually was a dominant influence in the shaping of the Parliamentary war effort, the social environment of London, and the important political relationships with the Scots. The very need itself accentuated the social problem of providing for the poor and of maintaining an amiable relationship between Parliament and its important ally, the population

of London. Industry which was not important to the war effort was practically halted, and there is practically no evidence whatsoever of building in London, with the exception of fortifications, due partially to the lack of coal for the important brick-making industry.³⁶ However, it is worthy of mention at this point that new building in the city had been openly opposed from 1570 onward, and the gradual development of the suburbs had been a constant anxiety to the Court and to the city authorities as well, who feared plague, famine, fire, plots and disorder in these unregulated areas.³⁷ Elizabeth, James I, and finally Charles I all issued building proclamations with stringent regulations to stop all new buildings in and around London,³⁸ but it is interesting to note that violations were numerous during the years of peace, much building actually did go on, and that no Act of Parliament since the time of Elizabeth had ever forbidden building development.³⁹ The war, however, with the coal scarcity as one of its elements, accomplished what the monarchs had been unable to do, and what Parliament had previously failed to do, for house-building was brought to a standstill.⁴⁰

The inaccessibility of the vital fuel literally brought the Scots into the conflict in the north, and the

necessity for coal in London also enabled the Scots to exact a high price from the Parliamentarians for their aid after the war was won. It is worthy of note, too, that selfish desires for individual gain at the expense of the rest of mankind accelerated illegal trade and supported a fairly successful black market in coal sales.

Notes to Chapter III

1. J. U. Nef, Rise of the British Coal Industry, v. ii, pp. 285-86.
2. Ibid., p. 286.
3. L.J., v. v, p. 546.
4. Ibid., p. 554; C.J., v. ii, p. 927.
5. Agostini to the Doge, January 30, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 235.
6. Perfect Diurnall, January 30-February 6, 1642-3, as reported by Margaret James, Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution, p. 260.
7. C.J., v. ii, p. 946.
8. Ibid., p. 957.
9. Ibid., p. 965.
10. C.J., v. iii, p. 22.
11. Ibid., p. 47.
12. Ibid., p. 121.
13. Nef, op. cit., p. 286; C.J., v. iii, p. 68.
14. See p. 37 above.

Notes to Chapter III (Continued)

15. Nef, op. cit., pp. 286-87.
16. Ibid., p. 287.
17. C.J., v. iii, pp. 231, 249, 261, 288, 345-46; Agostini to the Doge, October 16, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 30; James, op. cit., p. 262.
18. "In 1644 men recalled a time when 'some fine Nosed City Dames used to tell their husbands; O Husband! We shall never bee well, we nor our Children, whilst wee live in the smell of this cities Seacole smoke; Pray, a country house for our health, that we may get out of this stinking Seacole smell'. But, the blockade of Newcastle having deprived them of the fuel they had hitherto despised, 'how many of these fine Nosed Dames now cry, Would to God we had Seacole fire we used to have, how we want them now, no fire to your Seacole!'" Nef, op. cit., p. 198, quoting from Artificiall Fire, or Coale for Riche and Poore, 1644.
19. Nef, op. cit., p. 287.
20. C.J., v. iii, pp. 425-26; Agostini to the Doge, April 8, 1644, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 87.
21. Agostini to the Doge, June 10, 1644, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 106.
22. Agostini to the Doge, July 15, 1644, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 116.
23. Armyne and Barwis to Vane, June 20, 1644, Cal. SP Dom., 1644, p. 255; C.J., v. iii, p. 561.
24. Ibid., p. 546; James op. cit., p. 262.
25. C.J., v. iii, p. 551.
26. Ibid., p. 561.
27. R. R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, v. 11, p. 212; Agostini to the Doge, November 11, 1644, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 152.

Notes to Chapter III (Continued)

28. Ibid., p. 152; Nef, op. cit., pp. 288-93.
29. C.J., v. 111, p. 668.
30. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 212; Nef, op. cit., p. 294; C.J., v. 111, p. 709.
31. C.J., v. 111, p. 694.
32. Ibid., p. 715.
33. C.J., v. iv, p. 75.
34. Ibid., p. 85.
35. Nef, op. cit., p. 294.
36. N. G. Brett-James, The Growth of Stuart England, p. 111.
37. Ibid., p. 67.
38. Ibid., p. 105.
39. Ibid., p. 117.
40. Ibid., p. 119.

Chapter IV

THE EFFECTS OF THE REVOLUTION ON
THE COMMERCIAL LIFE OF LONDON

It should be remembered initially, in evaluating the effects of the revolution on commerce and trade in London, that seeds of economic depression had been planted by King Charles himself during the years immediately prior to the war. In 1640, for example, he had seized bullion from the mint to the value of £130,000 after he had been unable to borrow either from London or abroad in the midst of his Scottish troubles, and this action shook a national credit which was already in a precarious condition. Merchants were unable to meet their bills of exchange and the importation of bullion stopped altogether, causing a financial dislocation which was inevitably reflected in commerce, trade and industry.¹

After open hostilities had started in August, 1642, the already existing economic problems were complicated by the necessity for providing the Parliamentary army with clothing and provisions. Since there were no governmental manufacturing establishments, supplies had to be purchased either in the open market or by contract.²

The exactions of the army and the burdens of taxation and loans, by themselves, would have been enough to impair normal trade seriously, but in addition there must be taken into account both the internal and external breakdown of means of communication.³ This was an inevitable result of the always present correlation of economics to war efforts. Due to the over-all importance of the City of London, its defeat immediately became one of Charles' prime objectives when war began, and the economic weapon of blockade was early used by him with the dual view of crippling the city's war effort and of aiding his own, by attempting to control resources and provisions outside of the city.

The Parliamentarians, too, had attempted to regulate internal trade as early as June, 1642, when a committee was appointed which was empowered to halt all shipments of ammunition, monies, or other warlike provisions which were going to York,⁴ then the center of royalist activity, but it was not until December twenty-first that they ordered that no intercourse would be allowed thereafter "either by Land or Water, by Horse or Waggon, between Oxford and London,"⁵ Oxford having become the king's headquarters. Carriers to other parts of the kingdom were halted momentarily in January, 1643, but on

the twenty-third of that month they were allowed to proceed, provided that they carried no wine, sugars, strong waters, brimstone, or any other warlike provisions with them. A search of all carriers was instituted in an attempt to insure compliance with this intent.⁶

Ordinary trade and commerce were forced to surrender completely to the exigencies of defense in London on October twenty-fourth, 1642 when all persons were required to shut up their shops, trades and other regular employments so that the entire population could concentrate on the defense of the city.⁷ This type of directive was not carried out without ultimate objections being raised, and the citizens of London raised their voices on several occasions.⁸ In December, 1642, petitions to Parliament from the city strongly stated the citizen's complaints against the ruin which had overtaken their trade and industry and the resultant increase in unemployment.⁹ After this date, however, the citizens seemingly became more stoical, for the vehemence and frequency of this type of petition decreased.¹⁰

In January, 1643, Agostini, who had replaced Giustinian as the official Venetian representative in England, reported that the king hoped to have forty thousand soldiers by March to blockade London in the hope

that he could so restrict food supply from the outside that the people would revolt against the government.¹¹

On the other hand, Parliament, during the same month, was taking additional steps to see that no food, arms, powder or ammunition got out of the city by vessels on the Thames which might be bound for Reading, Oxford, and other places on the river.¹² Finally, on July twenty-fourth, 1643, Parliament issued a proclamation which prohibited all trade between the City of London and other parts of the kingdom.¹³

All shops were closed and businesses were suspended again in August, 1643, when the Committee of the Militia of the City resolved to send a force under Essex to aid in raising the siege of Gloucester. This action again meant loss to the merchants and inconveniences to the inhabitants.¹⁴ Goods, which ordinarily sold readily, deteriorated in the shops, and Parliament received requests for permission to export such goods, either for the purpose of rejuvenation or for foreign sale.¹⁵ Since the trained bands included many merchants and shop-keepers, it was inevitable that continued absences from their places of business should result in bankruptcy for many.

Other losses resulted when Parliament sequestered the estates of those supporting the royalist cause, many

of whom had received credit from the city's merchants, and the merchants, tradesmen or craftsmen were thus left to recover their debts as best they could. An attempt was at length made to remedy this situation when, on the second of August, 1644, the Common Council agreed to petition Parliament to have delinquents brought to judgment and to have provision made for the payment of all just debts out of delinquent's estates in cases of sequestration. London merchants also complained against the large circulation of farthing tokens which they were not able to get re-changed.¹⁶ Hard money was naturally extremely scarce in the city, due to the increasing poverty of the merchants¹⁷ and due to the steady drain by taxation and loans.

Almost without exception, the livery companies of London were dealt staggering blows by the economic impact of the war. Even the companies who supplied stores for the Parliamentary army suffered from the financial burden, but the Saddlers, for example, were partially able to counterbalance the claims made upon them by filling the army's saddle needs.¹⁸ It has already been mentioned above that many of the companies were forced to sell their plate to raise funds, and to this group can be added the Stationers, who, though they received much business from Parliament itself, were forced to sell their plate in

1643 to meet liabilities.¹⁹ The civil war was one of the blows which almost caused the collapse of the Mercers' Company, with the Great Fire of 1666 bringing disaster to a climax. It took the organization a century and a half to recover.²⁰ Among others who suffered most were the Drapers, the Silkmen, the Grocers, the Haberdashers, and the Vintners, and in all cases their troubles reacted on many handicraftsmen and artificers.²¹ Parliament's failure to repay loans and to pay for services rendered when the amounts were due also worked a hardship upon many, especially the smaller businessmen and artificers.²²

The break-down of communications boded ill to the inhabitants of London not only because of the decrease in commerce and trade, but also because of the restrictions on the necessities of life which resulted. Food, clothing and fuel were all ordinarily furnished to the city from areas throughout the kingdom, and at one time or another, these areas were either directly controlled by, or were threatened by, the king's forces.

The necessity for maintaining an adequate food supply for the city was early realized by Parliament when, on June thirteenth, 1642, it resolved to postpone all plans for the transportation of corn into Ireland.²³ In January, 1643, when trade was generally at a stand-still, the

Committee for the Affairs of Ireland saw fit to grant licenses to a Mr. Whitcombe enabling him to transport corn out of France,²⁴ and on May nineteenth, 1643, it was ordered that no sort of corn whatsoever was to be exported, except to Ireland and from port to port within the kingdom.²⁵ In spite of the difficulty in obtaining food, the government began to tax items which fell into the fringe of the food classification, such as wine and beer, which many Englishmen considered necessities. The fund to be thus raised was to be used for the support of the fleet,²⁶ but the result could only add the difficulty of higher prices to that of scarcity.

King Charles made the most of his economic weapon of blockade, using utmost severity against the peasants who attempted to take food to the city and who were captured in the act. The scarcity was telling in London, and again Parliament made capital of the situation by sending commissioners to address a great crowd in the city who urged the citizens to contribute money to provide food for the city before the scarcity became greater; at the same time, however, they attempted to minimize the danger and called upon them to be courageous in the time of need.²⁷ Royalist fortifications at Newport, on the edge of Bedfordshire, caused great inconvenience to the

city since it cut off food supply which ordinarily came from five important counties. This part of the blockade was especially troublesome during the winter of 1643.²⁸

The obvious solution in times of great need was to prevent exports and to facilitate imports. Parliament finally gave in to the wisdom of this conclusion, and in October, 1643, it was ordered that recently imported corn was to be transported custom free in accordance with a contract made by the Committee of the Navy with the buyers of the commodity.²⁹ A committee was appointed on January sixth, 1644 to prepare an order to prevent the transportation of corn, butter, cheese, wool and fullers' earth. The group was also to determine how magazines of corn might be provided for the needy.³⁰ An exception to the rule against corn export was made in July, 1644 when permission was granted for the transport of four thousand quarters of grain, but this was qualified, in that the entire proceeds were to be used to procure arms and ammunition only.³¹

Parliament also logically tended to encourage industries which would help to alleviate the problem of food scarcity. An ordinance of February fifth, 1644, had a joint purpose of encouraging the breeding of cattle and of furthering the fishing industry.³² Subsequent ordinances

continued to encourage the latter industry by prohibiting the import of fish products other than those brought in from Greenland by Englishmen in English ships,³³ provision of a convoy to protect the herring fishing fleet,³⁴ and by exempting fishermen from paying the salt tax on salt used specifically for the industry.³⁵

The city authorities attempted to keep a close check on corn supply and market regulations at all times. The Lord Mayor often requested the Master and Wardens of the various companies to let him know in writing "what quantitye of good and wholesome corne your sayd Companye hath at present in stoare towards the cittye's provision and in what Granary or place ye same lyeth."³⁶ There was a growing feeling in the city, however, that the companies' provisions, by themselves were inadequate to meet the needs of the time,³⁷ and in 1644 the aldermen stated that the Committee of Both Kingdoms advised the city to furnish itself with a greater stock of corn and victual than ever before.³⁸ Therefore, the Recorder was told to bring in an ordinance to enable citizens to lay in supplies of corn, always provided that existing legislation was not disregarded.³⁹ However, even existing legislation proved unduly burdensome, and in March, 1644, an ordinance was introduced for bringing corn and grain into the City of

London by citizens or others for the use of the city, "Notwithstanding any former Act against Engrossers of Corn."⁴⁰ Civil war, therefore, offered unprecedented scope to the forestallers and engrossers whose previous machinations had been curtailed by the Council and the justices.⁴¹ This could only result in higher prices at a time when unemployment, due to the decline of trade, meant less money in the hands of the majority of the population.

By the close of the year, 1644, the trade and commerce of the city was in a deplorable condition, and the blockade of the eastern coast of England by the royalist navy deprived the city of a great amount of corn, fish, butter, cheese and other provisions.⁴²

Probably the clothing industry suffered more than any other during the war years, because it was so completely dependent upon means of transport, both within and without the country, which were practically non-existent while the war was in progress.⁴³ Too, the years leading up to the war had been hard on this industry, for religious intolerance under the bishops' rule had driven many of the kingdom's most profitable subjects, especially clothiers and merchants, out of the country in search of religious freedom. They transplanted their

industries to Holland and other lands, and as a consequence, the woollen trade had appreciably deteriorated, workmen were thrown out of employment, and the whole country was impoverished.⁴⁴

During the interim months from January to August, 1642, both the king and the Parliament were keenly cognizant of the problem of the clothing industry. In a message which the king sent to Parliament in February, 1642, he concluded by saying:

...And lastly, his Majesty taking notice, by several Petitions, of the great and general Decay of Trade in this Kingdom, and more particularly of that of Cloathing and New Draperies... of which Decay of Trade His Majesty hath a deep Sense, both in respect of the extreme Want and Poverty it hath brought, and must bring, upon many Thousands of His loving Subjects, and of the influence it must have, in a very short time, Upon the very Subsistence of this Nation, doth earnestly recommend consideration of that great and weighty Business to Both Houses.⁴⁵

The same day that the king's message was received, a committee was appointed in Parliament to see how the clothing trade could be furthered in Europe, and to see how the trade of clothing and the vent of wools could be advanced and set free.⁴⁶

The clothing trade was also extremely liable to plunder after the war had started, and both merchants and carriers complained about the seizure of their cloth. Royalists made frequent depredations on wagon-loads of

cloth and other merchandise which made attempts to reach London; therefore, the City of Worcester, in 1644, tried to obtain legal permission from the king to trade with London, for they had no sale for their goods. This permission was granted, but the royalist troops continued to seize the clothiers' pack-horses and wagons.⁴⁷

Parliament, in the meantime, attempted to conserve what clothing industry supplies it could by passing ordinances against the export of wool and fullers' earth,⁴⁸ for by the end of the year 1644 commercial intercourse with the woolen and linen manufacturers of the west of England had been almost entirely cut off. Though the citizens of London were opposed to the allowance of free trade with those ports and towns which were in the hands of royalists, they were extremely anxious to have their trade kept open with the west of England, and they petitioned Parliament with that end in view.⁴⁹ In a petition of June fourth, 1645, they also asked that adequate convoys be provided for merchants.⁵⁰

Salt-petre, a necessary ingredient for the manufacture of gunpowder, was another resource which Parliament desired to conserve and protect. Even in June, 1642, before the war began, the Commons was negotiating for supplies of this material, and salt-petre merchants

were asked not to transport or dispose of their supplies.⁵¹ By April, 1644, however, the difficulty in obtaining enough salt-petre to meet military demands was acute enough to force Parliament to grant concessions to the salt-petre men. Foreign salt-petre was not only considered inferior, but it was impossible to obtain, since many foreign countries had recently prohibited its export. Therefore, certain persons were authorized to dig for salt-petre in all stables, cellars, vaults, empty warehouses, and other outhouses, yards and areas likely to afford that earth. To ease the burden on those persons who would be directly affected by the salt-petre men's activities, the men were only allowed to work from one-half hour after sunrise to one hour before sunset, and they had to level the ground and repair all damage done in the process at their own expense. However, their carriages were exempt from all taxes and tolls.⁵²

Illegal trade, in many commodities as well as in coal, was a constant problem to Parliament and the city authorities. Powder, money, ammunition and provisions were often taken out of the city to be sold to the king's forces, and often, too, dissolute Parliamentary soldiers of indifferent allegiance would sell their arms to the opposing armies.⁵³ Even as late as December tenth, 1645,

illegal trade proved troublesome to Parliamentary leaders, and the complaint was expressed that the connivance at trade between London and Worcester, Hereford, and other of the king's garrisons enabled the people of those areas to pay the levies placed upon them for the support of the king's forces. Therefore, all trade between London and royalist towns was to be halted and traders were to be ordered to return with their goods to the city; due to the factor of connivance, no seizure of goods was to be made unless a second attempt was made to smuggle goods through the lines after warning had been given.⁵⁴

Excessive prices were also not characteristic solely of the coal trade, for many purveyors of items or commodities which were both scarce and in demand saw opportunities to reap abnormally high profits; inevitably, too, with Mercantilism as the dominant economic system of the time, attempts were made by the government to establish set rates when prices seemed to be getting out of hand. It was sometimes difficult to strike an equitable balance, however, as is exemplified by the case of the alehouse-keepers who were forced to pay an excise on beer and ale and yet who had to sell their wares at a set rate.⁵⁵

Underneath the surface of compliance with the necessities of war and its resultant favor and protection

granted by Parliament to important industries, there was a significant and growing reaction against the monopolist.

In 1641 a writer who enumerated important commodities which had come under the sway of monopolists listed coals, soap, starch, leather, wine, hops, tobacco, gold wire, war horns, butter and rags. This same writer pointed out that it was not the shop-keeper who was to blame for higher prices, but the monopolist, "whose machinations forced the tradesmen to raise their prices."⁵⁶ Another complaint was that men were made monopolists, not because of their fitness for the task, but because they happened to be personae gratae at the court.⁵⁷

Though monopolists had been a product of royal rule, their privileges continued under Parliamentary domination and it was only gradually that their powers were reduced; for Parliament in many cases preferred to collect the cost of privilege which had previously gone to the king from the monopolists rather than abolish their restrictive rights. Therefore, the fight against monopoly was led, for the most part, by independent tradesmen who exerted enough pressure from the outside to make Parliament aware of at least the most outstanding abuses of the system.

Rivalry between two soap companies, the Westminster

Soapmakers and the London Soapboilers, was one of the conflicts which brought the question of monopoly to the surface. The Westminster Company had been declared a monopoly in 1641, but it continued to fight its rival. The London Company was almost condemned in 1642, but its promise to collect the governmental excise on soap may have been the reason it was able to survive the criticism of the Long Parliament. However, the independent soapmakers were hostile to both companies, claiming that as freemen of London they had an equally good right to practice the art of soapboiling, and they added that the fact that they were able to dispose of their goods indicated that their product was not inferior.⁵⁸ An Act of Restitution from the Soapboilers of Westminster, and their share-holders, of moneys extorted from individuals by high soap prices, was also passed in 1642.⁵⁹

A similar Act of Restitution was passed against the Vintners and retailers of wine who apparently had also exacted and extorted great sums of money,⁶⁰ for the wine monopoly, though probably not so serious a grievance as that of soap, raised almost as great a storm.⁶¹ The Wine Project, as the monopoly existing during the civil war was called, arose from a patent or monopoly procured from the king by several important persons who farmed the wine

business, paying to the government forty shillings per tun; excessive prices to pay this rate caused an early breakdown of the system, and two of the participants, who belonged to Parliament, were expelled from that body.⁶²

Another group which was severely criticized and attacked by pamphleteers and Parliamentary committees was the Merchant Adventurers' Company, primarily because many of the ills of the woolen trade were laid at their door. However, the necessity for funds caused Parliament to be lenient with the Adventurers who readily contributed funds in exchange for privileges. They were rewarded by an ordinance of October twelfth, 1643, which was passed for the encouragement and support of the Fellowship of Merchant Adventurers of England which had been found very serviceable and profitable to the State; the ordinance also included a confirmation of all former privileges and the fine for admission was doubled.⁶³

Though the privileges of monopoly were largely upheld by the Parliament from 1642 to 1646, it is significant that the monopolists were fiercely challenged by the independents during this period when the king's prerogative was giving way to a less absolute type of government. The population as a whole was made fully aware of the disadvantages of monopoly due to adverse economic conditions which

allowed the many to be exploited at the hands of the few, and opposition by general public opinion was building a concrete case against the economically privileged. Thus it is not surprising that monopolies were virtually abolished by the time of the Restoration, particularly insofar as they were connected with the prerogative power of the crown which was too often characterized by favoritism at the expense of ability.

With domestic trade completely disrupted on land and along the coastal routes of England, it was natural that Parliament and the City of London should desire successful trade with foreign countries. However, there were many obstacles to amicable relationships with lands apart from England, not the least of which was the fact that many of the countries with whom Parliament wished to trade were sympathetic with the royal cause, though they were generally willing to trade wherever they could gain a profit. Also, it was difficult to attract foreign trade when communications with England were full of risks and when economic stagnation in the country made investment hazardous.

The reaction of the Protestant London citizens towards the Catholic merchants from Catholic countries, such as France and Spain, was occasionally a source of

some embarrassment to the Parliamentary government, particularly during the early stages of the disagreement between the king and Parliament. Catholicism had long been a target for suspicion and dislike in England, and when differences arose between King Charles and many of his subjects, the new target of absolutism was allied with the old in the minds of the king's opponents, who then considered Catholics and royalists alike as enemies. French merchants in London during January, 1642 complained bitterly to their associates in France of the treatment they had received at the hands of the common people of London; some of the merchants had been injured as they were dragged along the streets to the justices of the peace, and others had had their houses broken open in the middle of the night by commoners who claimed to be searching for arms and gunpowder. The disturbances were reported to Mr. Browne, the English Agent in Paris, by the French associates of the merchants concerned, and he attempted to smooth over the situation by explaining that the acts had been committed by the meaner sort of people, neither commanded nor avowed by any magistracy, and that in the distemper of the times it was difficult to prevent such disorders. However, in his dispatch to Secretary Nicholas in England he expressed the fear: "Our Protestant English

merchants here in Paris may run hazard of the like or worse usage."⁶⁴

An incident of July and August, 1642 momentarily upset friendly relations with the Dutch. Admiral Tromp of the Dutch fleet had seized twelve English ships bound for Dunkirk on the twenty-third of July and had sent them to Zeeland on the grounds that they were taking money to the Spanish. Vice Admiral the Earl of Warwick then retaliated by stopping five Dutch ships. Parliament wisely ordered their release on July twenty-sixth and attempted to recover as much of the English capital as possible by negotiation, but English merchants were annoyed at the incident not only because of their loss but because of the effect it would have on the trade of London with the Low Countries. The Spanish Ambassador in England secretly rejoiced, however, for he was doing all in his power to prejudice the English against the Flanders trade.⁶⁵

The decline of English trade with foreign parts in January, 1643, is indicated by Agostini who reported that merchants, not desiring to leave their ships idle during the cessation of trade, were seeking all sorts of employment. Among other things, they had requested and had received permission from Parliament to plant colonies in Madagascar.⁶⁶ In August of the same year Parliament

attempted to take at least token action on behalf of foreign trade. The Merchant Strangers had warned in 1642 that unless some method were taken to settle the disturbances in the country, strangers would fear to bring in their bullion,⁶⁷ but it was not until August twenty-fifth, 1643, after the warning had been repeated, that Parliament declared "that all Bullion and coin that shall be brought into this kingdom in any English shipping, shall have free and safe passage and protection both by sea and land into the ports of Dover and London and in and out of his Majesty's Mint in the Tower of London without any Interruption."⁶⁸ On the twenty-ninth of that same month a petition of the Merchant Strangers was granted which exempted them from all public subsidies and taxes, for Parliament desired "to avoid engaging this nation in any disputes about privileges in these time."⁶⁹ These aids were insufficient for some as is evidenced by a committee which was appointed in September to obtain certification from the Dutch and French churches as proof of the condition of certain poor strangers, who were allegedly unable to stay in England without begging due to the decay of trade, so that they might be granted warrants to return to their homelands.⁷⁰

In spite of these conditions, Parliament was

driven by the press for money to seize all ships which entered English ports, including foreign ones, for the purpose of taxing the cargos carried.⁷¹ This naturally was a hindrance to trade, as were the activities of armed merchant ships whose owners were given permission by Parliament in April, 1644, to privateer against the ships of the king and of Bristol and who occasionally pursued and captured their prey right in the harbors and ports of the Dutch States.⁷² The French Resident in England also voiced complaints in 1644 and demanded restitution and reparation of the losses sustained by the French King's subjects.⁷³ Many of the individual complaints of French merchants and ship captains were referred to the Committee of the Navy so that just redress could be given and to enable favorable commerce and trade between the nations to continue.⁷⁴

Depression in foreign trade continued, however, and a London merchant in 1644 stated by pamphlet that the means of communication had been so badly thrown out of gear by the war that it was more than possible that trade with foreign countries would be completely lost.⁷⁵ Another pamphleteer in the same year described how the vultures of Europe were hovering over England's carcass. The Hollander alone seemed to pity the troubled country, and yet he too

did not object to filling his shops with her plundered goods, seeing her gold brought to Holland in quantity, and her trade almost wholly in his hands. The writer further stated that the only reason the London merchant went to the Exchange was to hear the latest news.⁷⁶

A message to the Committee for the Admiralty and the Cinque Ports from the Commons in March, 1646, indicated that body's desire to attempt once again to better foreign trade regulations, for it was recommended that the merchants from the United Provinces be given every consideration in the quick dispatch of justice, in order to testify Parliament's desire to continue and improve "the mutual correspondency" between the two countries.⁷⁷

An earnest attempt was also made to further trade with Russia, a country about which little was known, in June, 1646. The Parliamentarians were so anxious to create a proper impression on the Emperor of Russia that they were even concerned with the color of the sealing wax which was to be used to seal their letter to that potentate.⁷⁸

An extremely elaborate ceremony was arranged for the reception of the Russian Ambassador in Parliament, and when the Speaker delivered the letter into the Ambassador's hands, he eloquently took notice of the greatness of the Russian Emperor and of that ruler's favors to the merchants

of England.⁷⁹

The Russian merchant class, however, which was becoming increasingly influential, definitely opposed the large number of English merchants in their country. Also, Tsar Alexis' sympathies were almost solely with King Charles, in spite of the Parliamentary explanation of the acts of that body which was sent to Alexis when Dokhtourov, the Russian Ambassador, returned to his native land. Therefore, almost immediately after Dokhtourov's arrival in Russia in July, 1646, an ordinance was published against the English merchants, taking away their right to impost exemptions and causing them, instead, to complain bitterly that they were now forced to pay twice as much as other foreigners in Russia. Thus the Parliamentary efforts to improve trade relations with the tsar actually back-fired, to the great disadvantage of the English merchants trading in Moseovy and its vicinity.⁸⁰

A study of the trade in currants which the Venetians sold from the Islands of Zante and Cephalonia to England provides an interesting example of the difficulties which foreign merchants faced in maintaining trade with England. In 1642 the directors of the Levant Company asked that the further import of currants be prohibited due to the fact that they had been unable to dispose of the

previous year's supply under the restricted economic conditions of the times. The directors pointed out to Parliament that the trade was conducted solely on cash payments and not by an exchange of goods, which resulted in a drain of £40,000 yearly from England. They believed that the embargo would force the Venetians to lower their prices, and if it didn't, they told Parliament that they would be able to fill the demand from the Morea.⁸¹ The first reading of the Bill prohibiting the import of currants, to go into effect the following August, was passed on March nineteenth.⁸² The large supply of the commodity on hand, and the scanty sale of currants due to the fact that they constituted a luxury item in a time of depression, caused the price to fall in July from forty-two shillings to twenty-eight.⁸³ This fact helped the ordinance to become law on August twenty-sixth, 1642, though the king failed to sanction the action at any time.⁸⁴

The Levant Company discovered that there were disadvantages as well as advantages in halting the currant trade, for they desired to export cloth and other merchandise to Constantinople but they had to postpone shipment in September, 1642, because they lacked a commodity for the return shipment to make the voyage profitable.⁸⁵ The fruit was also occasionally unloaded secretly in the city to the disadvantage of the company, but when this occurred

its governor was in prison for non-payment of taxes so its members dared not complain.⁸⁶

Since the king supported the currant trade, the plan was made by the royalists and Venetians to shift the trade from London to Bristol merchants.⁸⁷ This change, together with the fact that the Venetians did reduce the rates on currants, prompted the Commons to grant the petition of one Jordan Fairfax for permission to unload the ship, Rainbow's cargo of four hundred tons of the fruit on January twenty-ninth, 1644, providing that a payment of six shillings above the usual duties was paid.⁸⁸ On March nineteenth, 1644, Parliament, by ordinance, made it lawful for all merchants of the Levant Company to import currants once again in English bottoms to London provided that a duty of six shillings per hundred was paid over and above the customs and excise due. This action was actually forced by the royalists, who imported currants consistently, for Parliament felt compelled to protect the trading interests of London.⁸⁹

While foreign representatives had occasion to voice their complaints about Parliamentary trade tactics, London merchants had corresponding complaints to make against the obstacles to their overseas trade which were either instigated by foreign powers or were the result of

royalist activities.

A group of merchants' ships bound for London were forced into Falmouth Harbor by contrary winds early in January, 1643, and were seized by the Cavalier commanders of the king's castles there. The thirty-six merchants concerned immediately petitioned Parliament to prevent ships from going into Falmouth and desired that steps be taken to obtain the release of the ships. They suggested that ships be placed at the harbor entrance to warn off unsuspecting vessels, for the merchants were daily expecting £200,000 in silver from Spain which, if lost to the royalists, would mean their undoing.⁹⁰

Another source of annoyance was the group of Spanish ships which was commissioned by King Charles to prey upon Parliamentary shipping. In April, 1645, the Committee for Foreign Affairs from the Lords and Commons was requested to treat with the Spanish Ambassador to call a halt to the seizure of ships and goods belonging to the subjects of the kingdom. They were also to press for restitution of the ships and goods which had been taken and which might be taken in the future.⁹¹

The French king was also guilty of molestation of English merchants trading in his dominions, so it was ordered by the Commons on December fifteenth, 1645 that

the Company of Merchants of London trading in France were empowered to collect taxes of five shillings for every £100 value of goods being shipped to or from the Dominions of France, and six pence on every tun of French wine imported; this money was to be used for the defraying of expenses of suits and other charges which had arisen from the French king's arrests of London merchants and the seizure of their goods.⁹²

Piracy was another source of worry, and the Committee of Foreign Affairs was instructed to send letters to the King of Denmark, the States of Emden, and to other Princes and States deemed necessary, to ask that they take action against "the Mischief that arises to the Subjects of this Kingdom, by permitting Pirates, and Robbers at Sea, to sell their Ships and Goods of the English Subjects in their Dominions."⁹³ Much of this piracy was actually committed by Englishmen who were probably in the king's pay.⁹⁴

Although there seems to have been initial opposition to the influx of foreign tradesmen in London, as is evidenced by a petition of a number of poor tradesmen and artificers on January thirty-first, 1642, against the great number of aliens trading in the city and its suburbs,⁹⁵ it later became apparent that they could at least be of great aid to some of the wealthier English merchants. In

March, 1643, when new taxes were forcibly being collected, many English merchants were afraid to export for fear that their wealth would become known and they would be called upon to contribute large sums. Therefore, they adopted the expedient of bringing over Jews from Amsterdam who provided the money and then carried away the goods in installments.⁹⁶

It was a natural policy for the Parliamentary government to encourage Protestant immigration, and although there was no wholesale influx, the churches of the new merchant strangers were granted the same liberty in the exercise of their religion that they enjoyed at home.⁹⁷

The admission of the Jews, however, was less obvious after their exile from England since the time of Edward I, but it was probably a more important action than the welcome extended to Protestants.⁹⁸ The abolition of the Court of High Commission in 1640 took away the political means of punishment for heresy, and although the principle of toleration of nonconformity could only be officially accepted with the later victory of Puritanism and the growth of innumerable Protestant sects with doctrines equally as different as Judaism, there was a sizable secret Jewish immigration in 1643 due to the financial exigencies mentioned above.⁹⁹

The newcomers from Amsterdam undoubtedly joined the Sephardi colony, made up of Jews of Spanish or Portuguese origin, who were already settled in the capital. One of the important congregating spots was the house of Antonio de Souza, Portuguese Ambassador in London who was himself a Marrano or Crypto-Jew, where the settlers secretly joined for Jewish rites under the pretence of hearing mass.¹⁰⁰

The social condition of this Jewish group appears to have been excellent, for many were respected merchants and some were exceedingly wealthy. Considerable shipping was owned by the Jewish community, and they dealt in bullion, cloth, wool, wine, hides, sugar, corn, timber and other important commodities, in transactions which extended to the Netherlands, France, Spain, Portugal, the Canary Islands, Italy, Syria, Brazil and the Indies.¹⁰¹

The repute in which these merchants were held is well illustrated by the case of Antonio Fernandez Carvajal, one of the most important figures in the community, who was denounced for transgressing the Act of Conformity in 1645. All of his competitors and many other prominent merchants petitioned Parliament to protect him, and the informer was summoned before the House of Lords where the proceedings were stopped.¹⁰²

Notes to Chapter IV

1. W. R. Scott, Joint Stock Companies, v. i, p. 199.
2. Margaret James, Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution, p. 36.
3. Ibid., p. 40.
4. C.J., v. ii, p. 630.
5. Ibid., p. 898; Agostini to the Doge, January 30, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 234.
6. C.J., v. ii, p. 940.
7. Ibid., p. 821; Boswell to Rowe, January 20-30, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, pp. 262-63.
8. L.J., v. v, pp. 501-7.
9. Ibid., p. 512.
10. James, op. cit., p. 49.
11. Agostini to the Doge, January 23, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 230.
12. Committee for Safety of the Kingdom to the Lord Mayor, January 26, 1643, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 440.
13. C.J., v. iii, p. 180.
14. R. R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, v. ii, p. 194; Agostini to the Doge, September 4, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 14.
15. Petition of Deuxvilles to Committee for Navy and Customs, 1644, Cal. SP Dom., 1644-45, p. 208.
16. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 208.
17. Nani to the Doge, January 16, 1646, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 235.
18. W. C. Hazlitt, The Livery Companies of the City of London, p. 60; it is interesting to note that the Saddlers,

Notes To Chapter IV (Continued)

in the midst of many types of complaints, found occasion to look upon the production of the coach in its several forms with misgiving and dislike, since it seemed to foreshadow a gradual decline in the call for saddle-horses; ibid., p. 60.

19. Ibid., p. 628.
20. Ibid., p. 184.
21. The Merchant's Remonstrance, 1644, as quoted by James, op. cit., p. 45.
22. C.J., v. iv, p. 681.
23. C.J., v. ii, p. 621.
24. Ibid., p. 915.
25. C.J., v. iii, p. 93.
26. Agostini to the Doge, May 29, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 277.
27. Agostini to the Doge, August 13, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 6.
28. Agostini to the Doge, November 6, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 36.
29. C.J., v. iii, p. 264.
30. Ibid., p. 359.
31. Ibid., p. 547.
32. C.J., v. iv, p. 42.
33. Ibid., p. 129.
34. Ibid., p. 239.
35. Ibid., p. 638.

Notes to Chapter IV (Continued)

36. Books of Common Hall, e.q. i, flb, and if.79b, as quoted by James, op. cit., p. 269.
37. Ibid., p. 269.
38. Ibid., pp. 269-70.
39. C.J., v. iii, p. 400.
40. Ibid., p. 439.
41. James, op. cit., p. 264.
42. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 213.
43. James, op. cit., pp. 56-57.
44. Ibid., pp. 9-10.
45. C.J., v. ii, p. 430.
46. Ibid., p. 429.
47. James, op. cit., pp. 36-37, 41.
48. C.J., v. iii, pp. 311, 411.
49. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 213.
50. Ibid., p. 218.
51. C.J., v. ii, p. 621.
52. C.J., v. iii, pp. 446-47.
53. C.J., v. ii, pp. 871-72.
54. Committee of Both Kingdoms to Committees and Governors of certain towns, December 10, 1645, Cal. SP Dom., 1645-47, p. 258.
55. C.J., v. iii, p. 304.
56. James, op. cit., p. 133, quoting from A Pact of Patentees, 1641.

Notes to Chapter IV (Continued)

57. George Unwin, Gilds and Companies of London, p. 293.
58. C.J., v. ii, p. 515; James, op. cit., p. 137, quoting from A Looking Glass for Soap Patentees, 1646.
59. C.J., v. ii, p. 523.
60. Ibid., p. 520.
61. William Herbert, History of the Twelve Great Livery Companies of London, v. ii, p. 631.
62. Hazlitt, op. cit., p. 322; C.J., v. ii, p. 567.
63. James, op. cit., p. 150.
64. Browne to Nicholas, January 21-31, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, pp. 264-65.
65. Agostini to the Doge, August 8, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 120.
66. Agostini to the Doge, January 16, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 230.
67. L.J., v. iv, p. 576.
68. C.J., v. iii, p. 218.
69. Petition of Merchant Strangers to Commons, August 29, 1643, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, pp. 479-80.
70. C.J., v. iii, p. 238.
71. Agostini to the Doge, November 13, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 39.
72. Agostini to the Doge, April 15, 1644, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 90.
73. C.J. v. iii, p. 682.
74. Ibid., p. 624.
75. James, op. cit., pp. 44-45, quoting from The Merchant's Remonstrance, 1644.

Notes to Chapter IV (Continued)

76. Ibid., p. 49, quoting from England's Tears for the Present Wars, 1644.
77. C.J., v. iv, p. 491.
78. Ibid., p. 574.
79. Ibid., p. 575; Irma Lubimenko, Les Relations Commerciales et Politiques de l'Angleterre Avec la Russie Avant Pierre le Grand, pp. 206-207.
80. Ibid., pp. 207-208.
81. Giustinian to the Doge, March 21, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, pp. 14-15.
82. Ibid., p. 15; C.J., v. vii, p. 471.
83. Giustinian to the Doge, July 4, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, pp. 87-88.
84. Ordinance of Lords and Commons Concerning Currants, March 19, 1643-(44), Cal. SP Dom., 1644, p. 59; Giustinian to the Doge, August 8, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 121; L.J., v. vi, p. 474.
85. Giustinian to the Doge, September 26, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 163.
86. Agostini to the Doge, March 20, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 254.
87. Agostini to the Doge, December 11, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47.
88. Ibid., p. 50; C.J., v. iii, pp. 351, 361, 368; Agostini to the Doge, January 29, 1644, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 67 states that the Levant Company petitioned Parliament for permission to unload the ship, Rainbow; the sources in the Common Journals, however, indicate that the Venetian Ambassador was in error, for the Company in reality opposed the unloading of the ship.
89. C.J., v. iii, p. 432; Ordinance of Lords and Commons Concerning Currants, March 19, 1643-(44), Cal. SP Dom., 1644, p. 59; Agostini to the Doge, March 18, 1644, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 82; L.J., v. vi, p. 474.

Notes to Chapter IV (Continued)

90. Petition of Merchants to Commons, January 6, 1643, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 437.
91. C.J., v. iv, p. 108.
92. Ibid., p. 376.
93. Ibid., p. 509.
94. Ibid., p. 509.
95. C.J., v. ii, p. 404.
96. Agostini to the Doge, March 13, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 252.
97. L.J., v. v, p. 566.
98. James, op. cit., p. 188.
99. A. M. Hyamson, A History of the Jews in England, pp. 128-29, 135.
100. Ibid., p. 135.
101. Ibid., pp. 136, 138; James, op. cit., p. 188.
102. Ibid., pp. 188-89; Hyamson, op. cit., pp. 135-36; Lucien Wolf, The First English Jew, in Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society in England, v. ii, 1894-95, p. 16.

Chapter V

SUMMARY: ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE REVOLUTION IN LONDON

Any general summation of the impact of the English Revolution on the economic life of the City of London must stress the fact that war definitely accentuated existing economic problems and added many new ones. Some of the burdens which the citizens of London had to bear from 1642 to 1646 are characteristic of the trials which face any large urban community in a war area, and others were peculiar to that situation alone. The request for contributions, and even the levying of taxes, to support a war effort are expected, but seldom to the extremes to which Parliament carried its demands. The expense of the war alone ruined many prominent citizens, and the complete disruption of commerce and trade, both foreign and domestic, tended to complete the havoc in London economic circles. This fact may have even more far-reaching implications than appear on the surface. It is surely true that internal strife was much more devastating to commerce and trade than were England's foreign wars where the homeland was not under the direct fire of the enemy. Thus,

it is quite plausible to correlate the peaceful evolution of changing ideologies following the period of English Revolution up to the present time to the lessons learned in those years of conflict. Once the economically minded middle classes had obtained a foothold in the government, it was only natural that every attempt should be made to establish peace and order, both of which were essential for the development of economic prosperity, and the maintenance of peace and order by the provision for evolutionary change may well have been a considered choice over further internal disruption which could only cause economic paralysis and decline. In November, 1688, when William of Orange and his wife Mary landed in England in response to the invitation of Parliamentary leaders to replace Catholic James II and his infant Catholic heir, people of all classes joyously and spontaneously rallied around him. Even some of James' important officers joined the new claimant to the throne, and when the whole army wavered in its allegiance, James was left without a means to put up a fight. The inciting cause of the Glorious Revolution had been on the basis of religion, but the fact that it was "Glorious" -- without bloodshed and the disruption of war -- may well be attributed to the fact that a century of internal war and turmoil had considerably lessened the

English enthusiasm for conflict.

Illegal trade practices flourished to a greater extent during the Revolution because the war was internal and demanded divided allegiances among citizens of the same country, whereas a national conflict would have provided a unity of purpose that would have made illegal trade far more odious. In addition to black markets, modern attempts at price-fixing and rationing can find their earlier counter-parts during 1642-46 in England. It is significant, however, that the general tenor of the conflict, with its anti-privilege implications, was reflected in the movement against monopolies, the ultimate defeat of which was one of the few triumphs, in the economic field, to come out of the Revolution.

Dependence on certain commodities, particularly coal which had theretofore been unappreciated, was suddenly brought into sharp focus by the conflict, for the use of coal had been looked upon with disdain in the years immediately preceding the war due to the belief that the smoke was unhealthy. Brick kilns were considered a nuisance,¹ and as late as 1641 brewers who dwelt near the palace might be sentenced if they made free use of coal during the residence of the royal family at Whitehall.² Its use, and the dependence on its use, had evolved

gradually, and its advantages were only fully appreciated when the item was suddenly almost unobtainable.

The economic crisis inevitably led to the magnification of existing social problems, and the social environment of the city definitely reflected the concept of upheaval and change which resulted from the war. It is to this changing social picture that we must now turn.

Notes to Chapter V

1. N. G. Brett-James, The Growth of Stuart London, p. 111.
2. J. U. Nef, The Rise of the British Coal Industry, v. ii, p. 157.

Chapter VI

SOCIAL REACTION TO THE REVOLUTION IN LONDON

Although the totality of the era in English history known as the Stuart Period reveals few sweeping social changes on the surface, the imprint of Puritanism and the impact of war half way through the period were nonetheless indelible on the lives of Englishmen who lived during the century of revolution. Particularly was this true insofar as most of the citizens of London were concerned who dwelt at the hub of Puritanism where they either contributed directly to its dogma of oppression, passively reflected its sobriety, or suffered as a suppressed minority. There were a few, of course, whose sympathies were with the royalist cause, who were relatively unaffected by Puritanism in their daily living and who attempted to carry on an extremely social existence in spite of the war, but these persons were the exception to the rule.

The years of stiff and unbending Puritanical rule are comparable to a dark valley lying between two peaks of flourishing Stuart social activity. The climax of the controversy between Charles I and Parliament was

reached during the tremendously significant war years of 1642 to 1646, and it was during these years that necessity and distress gave the Puritans occasion to firmly implant their moralistic doctrines of stern sobriety. It is quite plausible to presume, however, that many of the acts of suppression which have been attributed to Puritanism alone were quite possibly merely wartime expedients when they were initially carried out.

It would be incorrect to imagine that the people of London entered into the war against their monarch jubilantly; and quite naturally, as both the war and their leaders continued to narrow any pleasurable activities, the inhabitants of the city displayed varying reactions and attitudes. It is perhaps to their credit that they supported the war effort by active participation as individuals as well as they did.

The traveling merchants of London were understandably Puritan in sympathy, for their connections with the Low Countries had brought them into contact with a militant Calvinism, and their journeys through Germany and down the Mediterranean had made them acquainted with the activities of the Counter-Reformation. They sided entirely with the Puritan ministers and often endowed the lectureships of these divines, for they loved their Bibles

as much as they hated the church of Rome.¹

At the opening of the conflict in August, 1642, there were many other citizens of lesser standing than the merchants who supported the Parliamentary cause either because of a firm conviction in its righteousness, by the way of mob psychology, or by necessity. The outward unanimity of purpose displayed by the citizens prompted one writer in September, 1642, to speak of the "Courageousness and constancy of the City of London," whose inhabitants were all "either real or constrained Roundheads."² The writer had failed to make a thorough examination of city attitudes, however, for within the boundaries of the capital there were royalists, who, though passive from necessity, would never actively support the Long Parliament's rule. These exceptions were to be found chiefly among the wealthier and more aristocratic class of citizens. When the attitudes of these persons were found out, they were marked as delinquents or malignants and, as such, were committed to prison, while their estates were seized to help finance the Puritan war effort. Out of a group of thirty-seven of these delinquents who were imprisoned in November, 1642, three at least, Sir William Acton, Sir George Whitmore, and Sir John Cordell, were aldermen of the city.³

Certain elements of the city mob, and the newly formed army with its inexperienced leadership and lack of discipline, tended to prejudice conservative public opinion further by excesses in behavior that paraded under the banner of patriotism. The Commons finally felt it necessary to call upon the Lord General of the Armies to punish soldiers who pillaged houses of the king's subjects in and about London, and the request was made for an order to restrain the disorders of soldiers when marching.⁴ A later order placed the responsibility for the prevention of disorder on the officers of the army who were personally to be in attendance with their troops in billets and while marching.⁵ One William Browne and his wife, Rebecca, petitioned in complaint after their house had been plundered, and the Commons ordered that if the outrage had been due to officer negligence, the officer concerned was to be cashiered.⁶

Much of this apparent law-breaking was due, of course, to the panicky reaction to the realization that war was finally a reality. Even Parliament supported the attack on those persons known to be followers of the king, but such support gave ample opportunity for the venting of private grudges, and many well-meaning citizens were left exposed to the capricious authority of undisciplined

soldiers.⁷ It had naturally been necessary to billet the new soldiers in and about the city, and their licentiousness and robberies played havoc with the public peace and private security of sober citizens who inevitably expressed their resentment.⁸ In the search by the soldiers for money and arms, not the least of their mistakes was their forced entrance into the homes of foreign diplomats, such as that of Salvetti, the Resident of Florence, who fortunately made light of the search,⁹ but such action could not help but prejudice foreign opinion against the Parliamentary cause.

The seriousness of the war began to be felt by October, 1642, however, and London began to openly fear an attack by the king. This occasioned jubilation in the ranks of the opposite faction which had theretofore remained as inconspicuous as possible. Many of this party even introduced the obviously dangerous practice of wearing a rose colored band on their hats as a sign that they were faithful servants of the king, following the example of the royalist soldiers.¹⁰ Though the city authorities violently opposed the wearing of these countersigns because of the unfavorable psychological effect created, there were undoubtedly some citizens who were affected as the royalists wished and who regretted having committed themselves

so completely for Parliament; it was this group who wished to find an aid for their troubled consciences in an early peace.¹¹ To many, the state of affairs had become disastrous due to the shutting up of shops, the stoppage of trade and the frequent disturbances between party factions. New Parliamentary taxation also increased the general dissatisfaction, and the desire for peace was openly shown,¹² though open warfare had barely started.

Independent Protestant factions, as opposed to the Puritans, were those who most keenly desired peace, and when the former group drew up a petition for the cessation of hostilities they were prevented from presenting it because Parliament had ordered that no paper from the City of London could be admitted without the approval of the Common Council, which was completely Puritan. Both parties had participated in a riot at the Council meeting when the Independents tried to push through their peace proposals; the lives of the Lord Mayor and the unpopular aldermen had been threatened, and it had been necessary to call out the trained bands to restore order. The Puritans, however, had won out, and shortly thereafter they formed their own petition in which they asked for peace, but only if a safe one could be obtained. They further requested Parliament not to grant, under any circumstance, the

demands of the Independent Protestant group.¹³

The tumultuous behavior of the two factions over the peace petition prompted the Commons to remind the sheriffs of the City of London that they were empowered to suppress tumultuous meetings and assemblies, and should do so.¹⁴ They further ordered the Lord Mayor, sheriffs, and justices of the peace to investigate particular offences committed during the riots at Haberdashers Hall and Guildhall over the desire for the ending of the war.¹⁵

In the meantime, every effort was made to keep Parliamentary losses secret by vigorous demonstrations designed to keep the morale of the people high. To counterbalance the true rumors of royalist success which often leaked out in spite of precaution, Parliament had manifestos printed and published which were written to malign the current and past actions of the king and his ministers, and which predicted the dire fate of the people if the royal armies should achieve and maintain success.¹⁶ The influx of strangers into the city occasioned much suspicion, and the Lord Mayor was authorized to make periodic searches to learn where the allegiance of these persons lay. They were also to be asked to subscribe money, horse or plate, and the names were to be taken of those who failed to give a good reason for coming to London or who failed to

subscribe.¹⁷

The news of the Parliamentary victory at Winchester, as the year 1642 yielded to 1643, gave London occasion for both joy and apprehension. Though the victory was not a major one, the Puritans lighted bonfires and had the bells in all the parishes rung in celebration.¹⁸ The rumor got out, however, that the royalists were going to compensate for their loss by setting all the prisoners in London free to create confusion; some were even supposed to seize the Tower; so a group of timid citizens requested that all suspected persons be arrested.¹⁹ The city put up a brave front, in spite of the uneasiness, and reported to the Commons that at the meeting of the Common Hall on January thirteenth, all men wore livery gowns, "...that his Majesty might see Tumults did not carry the Sway in the Government of the City."²⁰

Agostini seemingly looked behind this facade of confidence with skepticism, for in one of his reports to the Doge during the same month he noted that among many of London's inhabitants the zeal for liberty was giving way before growing discomforts, obligations, and dangers. To indicate the fluctuation in the support of the Parliamentary cause, he mentioned that two thousand apprentices, "who in the past were among the most seditious in the

country," had recently pressed for a speedy settlement of the war.²¹

Undoubtedly, the year 1643 was the most crucial of the war years for Parliament and the City of London. As reversals and apprehensions were felt, the attitudes of the citizens tended to reflect more and more their desire for peace. The internal dissention between Protestants and Puritans furthered this desire, for riots between the two factions continued to make London the center of a smaller conflict within the larger war effort, to the detriment, naturally, of the latter.²² There was a noticeable exodus from the city of both its normal inhabitants and foreigners during the year, some joining the king's forces in hopes of being on the winning side, and some crossing the sea to escape the general turmoil.²³ The daughter of the Earl of Leicester was one of those hurrying to Oxford in January, 1643, but she failed to get through without serious difficulty. Parliamentary officials met her on the way and searched her baggage in which was found a catalogue of the names of the king's partisans in London. She escaped arrest by claiming that it had been put in her baggage without her knowledge by servants, but it naturally hurt the king's cause and imperiled the lives of many royalists in London.²⁴ It is noticeable, however, that when the tide of fortune once

again turned in favor of Parliament, there was a similar movement of peoples back to the city, many returning from the king's camp with changing allegiances which fluctuated to match their personal safety and welfare.²⁵

Throughout the spring and summer of 1643 there was unrest and rumor, and some of the talk of the time intimated that the council of London would take control of the military machine if Parliament wouldn't make peace or prosecute the war with more effective vigor. The city's desire to equip and command its own army was disapproved by a suspicious Parliament whose members possibly believed that the city aimed at usurping the chief power in the war effort.²⁶

In June, Pym felt the necessity of making certain suggestions for the better concentration of effort following the revelation of a plot to seize the city. Among nine observations which he made, he suggested that a vow be utilized to distinguish the "good Party" from the "bad" and to further unite the former, that this vow be taken by all officers and soldiers of the army, and that all participants in a recent plot, who revealed themselves as such, be pardoned.²⁷

August brought another concentrated quest for peace, this time from the women of the city who appeared

at the doors of Parliament with white ribbons in their hats. On the eighth day of that month they merely shouted loudly for peace, but on the following day they appeared in greater numbers and presented a petition for the cessation of the war. Though they received a courteous reply from the Commons, they refused to go home and demanded that the traitors who were against peace be handed over to them. The assembly soon degenerated into a general melee with flying stones and brickbats, and it was necessary for troops to appear to restore order.²⁸

Agostini reported that many of the women, as well as their husbands, were imprisoned, and that the riot occasioned a fresh general search of houses to take away weapons of every sort, even swords, from those not actually serving Parliament.²⁹ It should be considered, however, that Agostini was not himself in sympathy with Parliament, and his generalities on searches and imprisonments were often exaggerated, sometimes being based only on rumor. In another of his reports, this time in April, 1644, he reveals that for several nights there had been serious fires in the heart of the city. He states positively that these had been accidental and then adds, "...it is announced that they have been caused by the royalists to render that party more hateful...."³⁰ Quite obviously, Agostini had no way

of substantiating his statement that the fires were accidental.

The Committee of the Militia of the City of London possibly best summed up the condition and the position of the metropolis during the dismal year of 1643 when they reported on November twentieth, 1643 to the Commons on the "Great Wants" of the city. Though emphasizing that they were not discouraged in the service of Parliament, they pointed out that great sums had been advanced, security had been given, but benefit had not been received. The city's forces in the field needed money and provisions, but there was no way for the citizens to aid them. Therefore, the Committee further stated the city's position and attitude as follows:

Our City Forces were raised for the Guard of the City, and are Tradesmen; and when they are abroad, their Plough lieth still at home; and besides, they lose their Employment; and you cannot be ignorant, that, if the Course of recruiting be continued, it will be a great Wasting of Men: For the preventing whereof this Remedy is offered; That my Lord General's Army be speedily recruited; and that the City of London may be considered of, as a Place that hath much advanced, and is drawn dry; Our rich Men are gone, because the City is the Place of Taxes and Burdens; Trade is decayed, and Shops shut up in a great measure; Our Poor do much increase: We desire you, for future Taxes, that they may bear but their Proportion and not be over-burdened.³¹

With the diminution of the city's obstinacy for war, the king made a concentrated effort to approach London

with an army, more for the sake of intimidation than for hope of success, for he wished to create further divisions in public opinion to prejudice the Parliamentary cause. To further this move, in January, 1644, he sent letters to the Lord Mayor and the aldermen which were intercepted by the Parliament and were declared seditious. In apprehension and alarm, the city hurriedly invited both Houses of Parliament to a banquet at the great hall of the city where they announced their determination "...to live and die with Parliament for this cause."³²

As success turned from the king to Parliament in the years 1644 and 1645, the attitudes of the citizens improved, from a Parliamentary point of view, and that body received fairly consistent support from the city during those years.³³ As an example, in March, 1644, the Saddlers Company ordered all its members to bring in their certificates that they had taken the vow of support of the cause, and they also subscribed to the Solemn League and Covenant which vowed to preserve the Reformed Church in Scotland, to promote the reformation in England, and to abolish popery, prelacy and schism.³⁴ The return of dissatisfied royalists from Oxford to London, in response to an offer for pardon to all who would return to their duty and take the covenant made by Essex in January, 1644,

made it necessary for Parliament to take steps to see that only genuine converts returned. Thus it was ordered that the mayor could expel all suspicious persons from the city, such as those who had recently come from Oxford or other of the king's cities, all recusants, their wives, and the wives of those who were in arms against the Parliament.³⁵

On one occasion when Parliament grew apprehensive over the thought of the possibility of plot, an attempt was made to arrest all of the officers and soldiers in London in one night. To prevent any of them finding an asylum, they set guards at the houses of all the foreign ministers. These were removed in the morning when an apology for the affront was sent jointly from the Lords and Commons.³⁶

The growth of the city prompted the Council late in 1644 to propose to the Commons that the citizens of London should be allowed to send two additional burgesses to Parliament since the city's population had increased so greatly.³⁷

With the imminence of peace in 1646 there were once again indications of dissention in the city. Reviews of well disciplined and equipped men were held as a prevention of possible riots, and the rumor was that the Council of London was disgusted by the governmental squandering of money.³⁸ In July, the city was curtly informed

by Parliament that the City of London was included in the propositions which were being sent to the king, and that under no circumstance was the city to send a separate petition. A committee was formed in Parliament to seek out the principal framers of the city's remonstrance who they believed were attempting to "disaffect the People and the City from Parliament."³⁹

It is undoubtedly true that this dissention in the city was exactly what King Charles desired, and an expressed wish to visit London earlier in the year had not been to make peace but rather to touch the hearts of his people and to sow discord among his enemies.⁴⁰ Parliament had suspected and feared this motive, and resolved that if the king should come to the city against the advice of the two Houses, the Committee of the Militia of London should be granted power to raise necessary forces to prevent any tumults which might be occasioned by his coming. The Committee was further to apprehend and secure those who accompanied the king to the city, to prevent resort unto him, and to secure the king's person. He was to be taken to Saint James House with a guard, supposedly to guard him from danger, but in reality to prevent him from arousing the populace in his own behalf.⁴¹ Charles, however, didn't risk an entrance into the city and finally, in desperation,

surrendered to the Scots in May, 1646.⁴² Shortly thereafter, in June, the king's garrison at Oxford surrendered,⁴³ and the resultant influx of royalists from that city and other of the king's garrisons gave London and Parliament much concern.⁴⁴ It was ordered that all such persons could not go about armed in London, could not keep arms in lodgings or houses, and after nine o'clock at night could not go out of their lodgings. Also, they were required to report to Guildhall to produce their passes and to promise not to bear arms against Parliament.⁴⁵

The division between the Protestants, or Independents, instead of healing as war with the king abated, continued to grow and was becoming increasingly discernible.⁴⁶ The year ended with Parliament openly acknowledging its awareness of the fact that numerous citizens opposed its policies.⁴⁷ Its answer to the complaints, however, was grim, but it was in accordance with the iron-handed rule of its members. On December eighth, it was resolved that "if any Person or Persons whatsoever shall, from henceforth raise arms or maintain arms against both or either Houses of Parliament or their forces, such persons shall die without mercy."⁴⁸

In addition to the study of general attitudes of the city towards the war as reflected by mob actions

and agitations for peace which have been described above, one should also note several other gauges of the social reaction of the citizens of London to the revolution which may be drawn from their voluntary or forced participation either in the armed forces of Parliament or in activities directly associated with the war effort. The role of the trained bands, conscription, with its successes and failures, and the efforts put in on the fortifications of the city, all reveal varying degrees of support or lack of support to the Parliamentary cause.

The London trained bands, essentially organized for the prevention of riots internally and for the general protection of the city, constituted an important core for the formation of the Parliamentary army. The members of the bands were made up of the citizens of London from all walks of life and from varying trades and occupations. The more influential citizens filled the officer ranks, while the apprentices and commoner folk constituted the large body of foot soldiers.

When the war came, the bands were given definite training by the city who used experienced soldiers to train them in the Artillery Garden at Bishopsgate and the Military Garden in Saint Martin's Fields.⁴⁹ Parliament naturally increased their numbers, and henceforth they were

composed of nine regiments, the Red, the White, the Yellow, the Blue, the Green, the Orange, and the contingents of Westminster and Southwark, to which seven other regiments called Auxiliaries, were subsequently added. The gilds of the principal men who were appointed as colonels to command some of the bands reveal the diversity of occupations represented in these troops. Thomas Adams, of the Drapers' Gild, commanded the Blue regiment; Isaac Pennington, Fishmonger, commanded the White; John Towse, Grocer, commanded the Orange; John Wollaston, Goldsmith, commanded the Yellow; John Warner, Grocer, commanded the Green; and Thomas Atkins, Mercer, commanded the Red regiment.⁵⁰

Following the news of the king's victory at Brentford late in 1642, Parliament sent a committee into the city to take measures for the preparation of the trained bands to join the Earl of Essex.⁵¹ From that time onward the city's troops were destined to play important roles in the war against the king.

In August and September of 1643 the Committee of the Militia of the City sent two regiments of the trained bands, two of the auxiliaries, and a regiment of horse, together with eleven pieces of cannon to aid Essex in raising the siege of Gloucester, and the successful relief of this city might well be considered the turning

point of the war.⁵² Concerning this event, in retrospect, Hobbes was prompted to write: "It seems, not only by this, but also by many Examples in History, that there can hardly arise a long or dangerous Rebellion, that has not some such overgrown City, with an Army or two in its Belly, to foment it."⁵³

Hobbes further pays a back-handed tribute to the valor of the London soldiers while excusing the soldiers of the king who, he states, were as stout as those of Parliament,

...Yet, because their Valour was not sharpened so with Malice, as theirs was of the other Side, they fought not so keenly as their Enemies did; Amongst whom there were a great many London Apprentices, who, for want of Experience in the War, would have been fearful enough of Death and Wounds approaching visibly in glistering Swords; but, for want of Judgement, scarce thought of such Death as comes invisibly in a Bullet, and therefore were very hardly to be driven out of the Field.⁵⁴

Another supporter of the royalist cause, the Earl of Clarendon, also paid tribute to the effectiveness of the trained bands for the stand they made against Prince Rupert's famous cavalry on September twentieth, 1643 at Newbury, by stating in his History of the Rebellion:

The London trained bands, and auxiliary regiments ...behaved themselves to wonder; and were, in truth, the preservation of the army that day. For they stood as a bulwark and rampire to defend the rest; and when their wings of horse were scattered and dispersed, kept their ground so

steadily, that, though Prince Rupert himself led up the choice horse to charge them, and endured their storm of small shot, he could make no impression upon their stand of pikes, but was forced to wheel about.⁵⁵

However, the trained bands under Waller's command were less successful. They were dissatisfied at their lack of pay, and in the midst of an attack on Basing House, the mansion of the Marquis of Winchester, where Waller lost approximately one thousand men, many of whom were Londoners, the bands mutinied. Many returned to London and some deserted to the king. Parliament desired to send new regiments but Sir John Wollaston, who had succeeded Pennington as mayor on November twenty-eighth, 1643, persuaded the Common Council to send the Aldermen to point out to Parliament the disturbance that would result if the city lost so many workmen, and that their own safety rested upon the defense of these men.⁵⁶

Thus it became apparent that the London trained bands, though they had on occasion done good service, could not be relied upon in the field. Therefore, on July twelfth, 1644 Parliament resolved to establish a permanent force of men who were willing to devote themselves to the military life as a profession.⁵⁷ London, together with the County of Middlesex, was called upon to furnish two hundred horse for this army,⁵⁸ but the use of the regular

trained bands continued, particularly in times of emergency, in spite of the fact that they were not always dependable.⁵⁹

Throughout the course of the war, Parliament had as much difficulty raising men as it did to raise money. Before the war actually started, the Council of the city offered to maintain five thousand infantry at the public expense, and the apprentices offered to serve on condition that they be granted many exemptions.⁶⁰ Accordingly, an ordinance was passed in 1642 which stated that all those apprentices who enlisted should be secured against their masters from loss and inconvenience occasioned by forfeiture of their bonds and covenants. When the apprentices returned to their jobs following service, they were not to be punished or made to suffer loss for their absence in defense of the Commonwealth, and Masters who suffered considerable loss by the absence of their apprentices were to be recompensed out of public funds.⁶¹

Initially, almost total reliance was placed upon volunteers to fill the army's ranks, but Parliament was hard pressed to make this scheme of recruiting successful. In November, 1642, a deputation of Londoners appeared in the House of Commons who placed their persons, purses and estates at the command of the House to do with them as it pleased.⁶² But it was not always that easy to get

volunteers. Certain privileges were provided as enticements, such as lodging for only a penny a night, a quart of beer for three half-pence,⁶³ and occasional postponements of minor debts,⁶⁴ but such offers still did not provide enough men to meet the demand.

At the same time, it was difficult to keep those who had already enlisted. In November, 1642 it was ordered that all train band deserters were to be arrested and imprisoned, all soldiers were ordered to their colors, and the city watches were to apprehend all those who disobeyed. In December, the responsibility for the punishment of desertion was placed upon the Lord General of the Army who was furnished a list of deserters who were to be sent for by him. The Lord Mayor and sheriffs were almost constantly enjoined to make diligent search for deserters, and in April, 1643, an ordinance was read enabling city captains to force their common soldiers to do and perform their duties by laying mulcts upon them and to imprison them if necessary. Where possible, deserters were to be returned to their commands.⁶⁵

In March, 1643, the Masters and Wardens of all livery companies, particularly those of the Armorers and Gunners, were ordered to inform their members that they were forbidden to leave the city, and the city's sheriffs

were forbidden to publish a proclamation which had been received from the king offering to pardon all officers, gunners, armorers, gunsmiths, carpenters, wheelwrights and other artificers belonging to the office of ordnance if they would attend him at Oxford.⁶⁶ Obviously, since Parliament was experiencing difficulty in raising forces, it would do anything to make the king experience the same hardship.

On sea as well as on land men were needed, so a committee was appointed in February, 1643 to prepare an ordinance for the pressing of seamen, watermen, and other artificers and officers necessary for sea service, and for the advancing of the wages of common seamen. Mariners were to be encouraged further by offering them a third part of the prizes taken by them. However, in April, 1643, Parliament found it necessary to take action against ale-house-keepers and innkeepers who were harboring and protecting the mariners who had been pressed to serve in the summer fleet.⁶⁷ Warrants were also issued to individuals "for the raising of volunteer marines by beat of the drum in London and its suburbs," for specific missions of private individuals on behalf of Parliament.⁶⁸

A further attempt to appeal to apprentices of the city was embodied in an ordinance of September

fifteenth, 1643, which pointed out that since "in Time of Common Danger and Necessity the Interest of Private Persons ought to give way to the Publick," apprentice watermen were to be secured against "all loss and inconveniency" from their masters if they entered the Parliamentary forces. At the end of service their jobs were guaranteed, and once again, if the masters suffered loss, Parliament promised to make reasonable redress.⁶⁹

Parliament was finally forced to resort to the impressment of soldiers, since dependance on volunteers proved to be inadequate. An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament on August fourth, 1643 provided for the speedy raising and impressing of men for the defense of the kingdom, particularly soldiers, gunners and "chirurgeons." If persons refused, they were liable for imprisonment until they either yielded or paid £10 to be used to supply the service the persons should have furnished. It is particularly interesting to note the types of persons who were exempt from this draft:

Provided always, That this Ordinance shall not extend to the pressing of any Clergyman, Scholar, or Student, in any of the Universities, Inns of Court, or Chancery, or Houses of Law; or any of the Trained Bands, or any person rated in the last Subsidies granted by this Parliament; or the Son of any Person rated at Five Pounds Goods, or Three Pounds Lands, in the Subsidy Books; or of any Person of the Rank or Degree of an Esquire, or

upwards, or the Son of any such person, or the Son of the Widow of any such person; or to the pressing of any Person under the Age of Eighteen, or above the Age of Fifty Years; or of the Members or Officers of either House of Parliament; or of the menial servants of the members or officers of either House....⁷⁰

Two thousand men were ordered to be raised under this new impressment ordinance on August eighteenth, 1643, and five thousand were authorized to be raised under its provisions in September. Five hundred were called for on the tenth of July, 1644, and on the seventeenth of the same month, one thousand more were ordered to be impressed immediately.⁷¹

However, it should be stressed that the numbers called for were not always obtained.

If one is to heed the words of the Venetian Ambassador once again, one discovers that the new impressment ordinance was exceedingly unpopular, for he states that during the last week of August, 1643, the City Council for the Militia had been pressing men with so much inhumanity that many of the objectors were injured and five were killed in serious riots throughout the city. He further related that to raise morale, Parliament sent citizens out at night to fill up the trained bands which had been greatly decimated in battle, and in the busiest part of the day the soldiers would enter all crowned with laurel to hearten other citizens when they were called upon

to go forth.⁷²

Seemingly, apothecaries and surgeons were extremely difficult to obtain as volunteers for military duty, for the Master and Wardens of the Apothecaries and Surgeons Company were instructed to arbitrarily choose the most able and fit men of their group to accompany the army. If they refused, they were to be pressed into service. An allowance of £5 apiece was to be made to those who went with Waller's forces, and special medicament chests were to be made up for their use.⁷³ Surgeons were also included in an ordinance impressing men for service in the 1645 summer fleet.⁷⁴

A special ordinance was passed on August fifth, 1645, enabling Major General Browne, the Committee of the Three Counties, and the Committees of the Militia of London and Middlesex to press men and to beat up their drums for volunteers to obtain two thousand soldiers, and when Sir Thomas Fairfax's army was being raised in October, London's proportion was set at 1,465 men, even though the Committee of the Two Kingdoms protested to Parliament when plans were being laid that the number was too great.⁷⁵ Another list of counties with the number of recruits to be supplied by each, which was made up in January, 1646, listed London's proportion at four hundred and that of Westminster and

Middlesex combined at three hundred.⁷⁶

Women, as well as men, participated in activities closely associated with the war, and those who aided the cause did it more willingly than those members of the opposite sex who were forced into service, for the female assistance was largely voluntary. Some served as spies and messengers, and women of the middle classes formed committees in London to collect plate and jewels for the mint, and shoes and stockings for the army.⁷⁷ Others served as nurses in the hospitals,⁷⁸ and widows and aged persons who were rich, "but not able to bear Arms in their own Persons," were called upon to furnish funds to pay poor men to bear their arms for them.⁷⁹

Probably the one project which called for and received the greatest support from all classes of women in London, from fine ladies down to wenches who sold fish, was the preparation of the fortifications around the city, particularly during the latter part of the year 1642 when attack on the city by the king's forces seemed eminent. During this period of time the principal highways were blockaded with timber and thick chains of iron, and at the approaches to London great numbers of people, including women and children, toiled to dig trenches and to erect small forts of earthwork.⁸⁰ All persons with able bodies

were even allowed to dispense with the observance of a Fast Day on October twenty-sixth, 1642, so that they might better apply themselves to the defense of the Parliament and the city.⁸¹ Also for the safety and security of London, it was ordered on October twenty-eighth that all sheds adjoining the outside of the walls of the city be speedily pulled down and demolished.⁸²

It was not until 1643, however, that the truly elaborate system of fortifications and defenses was erected about London and its suburbs. The cost was supposed to be borne by subscriptions within London and the outlying districts, but the city had to advance a total of £12,000 between the months of March and July, 1643 to keep the work going. As a result, Parliament allowed the city to deduct £3,000 monthly from the weekly assessments owed to the government of the nation.⁸³ Later it was ordained that the cost of upkeep of the fortifications and guards in certain parishes was to be borne by those parishes by weekly assessment.⁸⁴

The city authorities were so anxious to get the work completed that the workers even toiled on Sunday, and recruiters were sent through the city with drums beating and flags flying to enlist men and women volunteers for the task. Although they were given only bare food and

no additional pay, Agostini reports that there was a tremendous rush of people, even of some rank, to aid the cause, believing that they were serving God by so doing. On May twenty-second, the Venetian Ambassador estimated that more than twenty thousand persons were working voluntarily daily on the project.⁸⁵

The fortification work was solely a city enterprise, and it was the duty of the militia of London to guard the defenses eight days and eight nights consecutively in two watches.⁸⁶ Too, the burden of upkeep proved to be extremely heavy to the city, and it was finally necessary for Parliament to pass ordinances to raise money for the "Preservation and Defence of the Cities of London and Westminster, Parliament, and Places adjacent."⁸⁷ An ordinance of December third, 1644, levied a monthly assessment of £5,482, 10, d3 upon the city and liberties to pay the charge of fortifications and guards and to satisfy the many debts already incurred. A Committee of Arrears was also appointed to examine the claims of gunners, "matrosses," timber merchants, carpenters, bricklayers and others who had been regularly employed about the fortifications, and of the innholders who had fed horses used in the work.⁸⁸

The general Committee for Fortifications was

faced with the problem of examining suits of landlords against tenants for rents when these tenants had been prejudiced in their interests by the fortifications, and to order the stay of such suits of law if they found just cause for so doing.⁸⁹ Also, this committee sent certificates to the Committee of Arrears verifying claims of workmen. Included in certificates sent on March twentieth, 1646, which reveal the types of work being done, were those authorizing payment to one John Young, a freemason, who was the overseer of stonework construction at two important breaches; to Bevis Piggot, a carpenter, who furnished timber and workmanship; to John Freeman, a merchant, who sold fir timber for palisades which were used in the city's fortifications; and to Edward Byworth, a waggoner, who was to be paid for carrying ninety-four pieces of ordnance to the various forts about London.⁹⁰

The fortifications were maintained even some months after King Charles had surrendered to the Scots, but finally on October first, 1646, the Common Council asked the House if it were necessary to continue guards about the city, for if it were necessary, the Council would need a grant of £12,000 for their maintenance. It was therefore resolved by Parliament that the guards need only be continued for an additional six months' period and

that ordnance could be drawn off the forts. The total number of guards to be used for this period was reduced to a regiment of twelve hundred common soldiers divided into twelve companies.⁹¹

From the foregoing statements concerning the general attitudes of the citizens of London toward the war and their participation in activities directly associated with the war effort, it would seem that the unanimity of purpose in the capital city during the years 1642 to 1646 was actually much less complete than is sometimes supposed or assumed by some students who occasionally fail to investigate the period thoroughly.

It is apparent that support tended to fluctuate upwards in times of success and downwards in times of failure, and large temporary shifts in population were regulated by the same scale. The concept of individual freedom and interest tended to become a paradox in the minds of many who wished the royal prerogative limited but who failed to understand why stern discipline and regulation were necessary for the achievement of the goal. Others worked and fought faithfully and well for what they believed to be the common good. The effects of the revolution were all-encompassing, and the war effort itself included all types of individuals in the city regardless

of sex, age, occupation or station.

When the framework of Stuart administration was shaken by the war, it is interesting to note the impact on the gild system, where the ideas concerning apprenticeship were among the first to change. The ordinances granting privileges to apprentices in return for their military services opened the door to still further violations of apprenticeship. Possibly preferring, in their innocence, the excitement and dangers of war to the dull routine of the shop, many apprentices ran away with no idea of returning. The law requiring all boys of sixteen or seventeen years of age, who were not sons of husbandmen or gentlemen, to be apprenticed, with their fathers paying a fee for their admission, was successfully evaded by parents, in the general disorganization, who taught their boys their trade at home to escape the cost of premiums. Fewer boys, therefore, entered the gilds.⁹² Admissions into the freedom of gilds also were far below average for the war years.⁹³

The partial freedoms granted to the lower orders of the London companies during the war provided an opportunity for expression against the system of oligarchical government which controlled the companies, and many apprentices and other young men pointed to the fact that

they had risked their lives for their country and had a right to be heard in the government of their crafts.⁹⁴ Though this form of agitation brought no immediate gains during or even following the war, it might be classed as one of the truly significant early democratic movements fomented by the laboring class in England.

It was during the years 1642 to 1646, too, that the government of England realized the need for a permanent standing army when the trained bands of London proved to be erratic in their support in the field. However, it is important to note that the man-power furnished by the City of London was as vital an aid as its financial power to the Parliamentary cause. Even when the New Model Army was formed, there were numerous Londoners in its ranks.

Though there were riots and agitations for peace in the City of London during the revolution, it is worth noting that at no time did the city mobs gain a controlling hand as they later did in Paris during the French Revolution. Though there were internal disputes between factions in the city, the Parliamentary government was relatively successful in preventing radical excesses and in obtaining both voluntary and controlled allegiance from its city ally.

Notes to Chapter VI

1. Mary Coate, Social Life in Stuart England, p. 90.

Notes to Chapter VI (Continued)

2. Wharton to Willingham, September 26, 1642, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 391; Helen Douglas-Irvine, History of London, p. 227.
3. R. R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, v. 11, p. 173.
4. C. J., v. 11, pp. 725, 841-42.
5. Ibid., p. 727.
6. Ibid., p. 727.
7. Giustinian to the Doge, August 22, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, pp. 130-31.
8. Giustinian to the Doge, August 29, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 135.
9. Giustinian to the Doge, September 5, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, pp. 140-41.
10. Giustinian to the Doge, October 24, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 181.
11. Giustinian to the Doge, October 31, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 188; Douglas-Irvine, op. cit., p. 226.
12. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 177.
13. Agostini to the Doge, December 26, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 218; Sharpe, op. cit., p. 178; Agostini to the Doge, January 2, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 222; Douglas-Irvine, op. cit., p. 228.
14. C.J., v. 11, p. 885.
15. Ibid., p. 889.
16. Giustinian to the Doge, October 10, 1642, October 31, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, pp. 170, 186-87.
17. C.J., v. 11, p. 839.
18. Agostini to the Doge, January 2, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 222.

Notes to Chapter VI (Continued)

19. C.J., v. ii, p. 894.
20. Ibid., p. 927.
21. Agostini to the Doge, January 16, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 228.
22. Agostini to the Doge, March 6, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 249.
23. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 202-203; Agostini to the Doge, June 5, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 280.
24. Agostini to the Doge, January 30, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 237.
25. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 202-203.
26. Agostini to the Doge, April 17, 1643, July 24, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, pp. 264, 301.
27. C.J., v. iii, p. 117; mention of this plot to seize the city, and other similar plots, are mentioned often in the Commons Journals, particularly for the year 1643. Because of the dissatisfaction with existing conditions, it seems logical to attribute some of these "plots" to supposedly perfectly legal agitation for either peace or for changes in the methods of carrying on the war. The iron hand of Parliament, however, was suspicious of criticism, especially that which got down to the level of the common citizens, and it might well be supposed that any such agitation was looked upon as "plots" by their eyes. Some agitation was, of course, the result of royalist instigation.
28. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 192-93; Agostini to the Doge, August 21, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 8, gives a more colorful account in which he states that ten persons were killed and more than a hundred were injured, mostly women.
29. Agostini to the Doge, August 28, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 11
30. Agostini to the Doge, April 22, 1644, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 92.

Notes to Chapter VI (Continued)

31. C.J., v. iii, pp. 315-16.
32. Ibid., p. 365; Agostini to the Doge, December 25, 1643, January 22, 1644, January 29, 1644, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, pp. 53, 64, 67.
33. Douglas-Irvine, op. cit., p. 229.
34. J. W. Sherwell, A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Guild of Saddlers of the City of London, p. 96.
35. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 202-203.
36. Nani to the Doge, January 2, 1646, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 231.
37. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 209.
38. Nani to the Doge, June 12, 1646, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 263.
39. C.J., v. iv, pp. 615-16.
40. Letters, Charles to Henrietta Maria, January 14, 1646, January 18, 1646, Camden Society, ed. John Bruce, Charles I in 1646, pp. 9, 11.
41. C.J., v. iv, pp. 397-98, 490, 495, 498-99, 531; Nani to the Doge, April 24, 1646, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 254.
42. C.J., v. iv, p. 537.
43. Ibid., p. 585.
44. Ibid., p. 592.
45. Ibid., p. 597.
46. Nani to the Doge, April 26, 1646, September 25, 1646, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, pp. 257-280.
47. C.J., v. v, pp. 2, 5.
48. Ibid., p. 6.
49. Coats, op. cit., p. 101.

Notes to Chapter VI (Continued)

50. A. H. Johnson, History of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London, p. 416.
51. E. B. Jupp, Historical Account of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters of the City of London, p. 94; S. R. Gardiner, The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution, p. 133.
52. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 194-95.
53. Thomas Hobbes, Behemoth; or, The Epitome of the Civil Wars of England, as recorded in Baron F. Maseres' book, Select Tracts Relating to the Civil Wars in England in the Reign of King Charles the First, p. 576.
54. Ibid., p. 565.
55. Edward Earl of Clarendon, History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, v. iii, p. 181.
56. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 196-97; Agostini to the Doge, December 4, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 46.
57. C.J., v. iii, p. 559; L.J., v. vi, pp. 629-630.
58. Sharpe, op. cit., pp. 208-209.
59. Ibid., p. 211.
60. Giustinian to the Doge, August 8, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 110.
61. C.J., v. ii, p. 830; Margaret James, Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution, pp. 172-73.
62. C.J., v. ii, p. 847.
63. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 176.
64. C.J. v. ii, p. 788.
65. Ibid., pp. 830, 837, 874, 882; C.J., v. iii, pp. 49, 63, 107.
66. C.J., v. ii, p. 999; C.J., v. iii, p. 9.

Notes to Chapter VI (Continued)

67. C.J., v. ii, pp. 951, 1000; C.J., v. iii, p. 29.
68. Warrant of Robert, Earl of Warwick, January 18, 1643-44, Cal. SP Dom., 1644, p. 5.
69. C.J., v. iii, pp. 238, 241, 243.
70. Ibid., p. 194.
71. Ibid., pp. 210, 238, 558, 564.
72. Agostini to the Doge, September 4, 1643, October 13, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, pp. 13, 29.
73. C.J., v. iii, p. 661; C.J., v. iv, pp. 37, 50.
74. Ibid., p. 57.
75. C.J. v. iv, pp. 231, 307; Proceedings at Committee of Both Kingdoms, September 22, 1645, Cal. SP Dom., 1645-47, pp. 150-51.
76. List of Counties with number of recruits to be supplied by each, January 22, 1645-46, Cal. SP Dom., 1645-47, p. 319.
77. Coate, op. cit., p. 31.
78. Ibid., pp. 159-60, 29.
79. C.J., v. iv, pp. 397-98.
80. C.J., v. ii, p. 809; Giustinian to the Doge, October 17, 1642, November 7, 1642, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, pp. 175-76, 192; H. B. Wheatley, London Past and Present, p. 501; N. G. Brett-James, Growth of Stuart London, pp. 269-70.
81. C.J., v. ii, p. 823.
82. Ibid., p. 826.
83. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 184.
84. C.J., v. iii, p. 95.

Notes to Chapter VI (Continued)

85. Agostini to the Doge, March 20, 1643, May 15, 1643, May 22, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, pp. 256, 273, 274.
86. Agostini to the Doge, December 25, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 54.
87. C.J., v. iii, pp. 602, 616; Order of Common Council, April 15, 1645, Cal. SP Dom., 1644-45, p. 408.
88. Ibid., p. 408.
89. C.J., v. iv, p. 123.
90. Certificates by Committee of Fortifications to Committee of Arrears, March 20, 1645-46, Cal. SP Dom., 1645-47, pp. 380-81.
91. C.J., v. iv, pp. 679, 710; Nani to the Doge, December 4, 1646, Cal. SP Ven., 1643-47, p. 291.
92. Coate, op. cit., p. 88.
93. Johnson, op. cit., p. 253.
94. James, op. cit., p. 196.

Chapter VII

SOCIAL STANDARDS AND SOCIAL LIFE
IN LONDON DURING THE REVOLUTION

Social standards in England up to the time of the Stuarts had been patterned almost solely from Continental examples which had largely been the product of Italian Renaissance thinking. Indeed, even seventeenth century courtesy literature in England continues to reveal the Italian influence of stoicism as it applied to theories of nobility and gentility, but during the century there was a definite trend toward a distinctively English pattern which combined humanist ideas obtained from the new study of Seneca with the Maxims of the Stoic philosophers.¹

This change in trend might well be attributed to the changing tenor of the times which was marked by an increasing Puritanical influence in the middle class of citizens where the worth of the individual and industriousness were receiving new emphasis. Also, the seventeenth century in England was assuming a new cloak of morality, again reflecting Puritanism and its ideals, which tended to de-emphasize the concept of the Magnanimous Man with

its basis of self-perfection to the benefit of humanitarian and romantic notions which could be used to corroborate the teachings of religion.² The age of individual heroics and self-sacrifice for honor was thus being diluted with a sense of responsibility on the part of the privileged few towards those who were less advantageously situated in life.

Society was, of course, stratified in England, but it was at least characterized by a greater flexibility than that of its Continental neighbors. Standards of behavior, however, were set up only for the higher class of citizens, and adherence to the pattern was an identifying mark of position. Many persons in this class felt qualified to be arbiters of correct and incorrect behavior, and a great amount of courtesy literature, much of it written in a condescending fashion, was the result of their efforts. It is from this type of source that the social picture of the upper classes in London may be drawn most easily.

During the revolutionary years of 1642 to 1646 in London it is notable that courtesy writing, together with all forms of scholarly literary endeavor, decreased considerably. However, by comparing examples of the output of the year 1642 with those published in the years immediately

following 1646, Ustick discovered that there is little change, for the shift in emphasis from Stoicism alone, to the combination of Stoicism and Humanitarianism, had occurred largely during the early years of King Charles' reign.³ Probably the most discernible influence during the war years was the growing sobriety and admonition of Puritanism.

The true gentleman of London or elsewhere, according to Thomas Fuller, writing in 1642, was he who was extracted from "ancient and worshipful" parentage. At the university and at the Inns of Court he applied himself diligently, and had to learn the laws of the kingdom; he was always courteous and affable to his neighbors, and he delighted in seeing himself and his servants well mounted. He furnished and prepared himself in times of peace for times of war, and if he were called upon for public office he would accept and faithfully discharge his duties. There could be no connivance at the smothering of punishable faults by a true gentleman, and if he were chosen as a member of Parliament, he would be always willing to do his country service.⁴

On the other hand, there were those who were in a position to be gentlemen but who failed to conform and were characterized by degeneracy. It was he who "...goes to

school to learn in jest and play in earnest,"⁵ and who, "coming to the university, his chief study is to study nothing." At the Innes of Court to learn law, "...he learns only to be lawless," and since he has probably been admitted into the society of his father's servingmen, he has been taught to drink.⁶ He borrows heavily, going quickly through his father's fortune, and his drinking becomes "...one of the principall Liberal Sciences he professeth."⁷ Gaming is another art he studies much, and after having undone himself, he sets out to undo others. "His death is as miserable as his life has been vicious."⁸

Francis Hawkins took it upon himself to translate a book of etiquette from the French shortly after the war which he entitled, Youths Behaviour, or Decency in Conversation Amongst Men. To the original text, he added many of the ideas which were prevalent among the more gentle folk of London. In his volume, he warned that it was not decent to spit upon the fire, and "If there bee any meate on the fire, thou ought'st not to set thy foot thereon, to heat it...."⁹ When sitting, it was improper to cross ones legs, for they were to be kept firm and settled with the feet joined evenly. It was definitely bad taste to kill fleas or other unclean vermin in the presence of others, and, when spitting, one should: "Spet not farre off thee,

nor behinde thee, but aside, a little distant, and not right before thy companion."¹⁰

When visiting sick friends, one was never supposed to be cheerful. Rather, one was supposed to sympathize with the ill person's infirmities, "...for that will afford a gratefull easement, by a seeming participation."¹¹

In wearing clothes, the gentlemen of the time were warned not to wear perfume, and hats were to be worn neither too high on the head nor too close to the eyes. Bad smelling, unsewed, dusty or old clothes were not to be worn, and all persons were urged to accomodate themselves to the fashion of their equals in choosing their apparel.¹² When walking, Hawkins admonished his readers: "Runne not in the streets, also goe not too slowly, nor with thy mouth open: Move not to and fro in walking, go not like a ninnie....Goe not with thy head too high, nor too low, nor hanging to the right, or left, and look not giddily here and there."¹³

Ones demeanor at the table was particularly important, where it was judged most unsuitable by Hawkins for a person to scratch himself. Further, one should not throw bones, parings, wine or similar things beneath the table, and it was considered indecent "...to clean ones face or wipe away ones sweat with the napkin, or with

the same cleane ones nose, ones trencher, or the dish." While eating or drinking, it was important not to make noise with ones teeth, either in sipping or grinding too hard, and cleaning the teeth with the table-cloth, napkin, ones finger, fork or knife, was also frowned upon.¹⁴

The City of London was deemed to be a veritable den of iniquity by the writers during the war years, and much advice is given to youth and to strangers from the country who were inexperienced in city living. A pessimistic author in 1641, while indirectly attacking the privilege of the wine monopoly, derided many of the professions which were reputedly almost above reproach in the city. He advised against sending sons to the university which he claimed was "much polluted and contaminated with Popish superstitions."¹⁵ Lawyers were judged to be dishonest because their fees were so high, and soldiers were swearing braggarts who could perform nothing.¹⁶

Henry Peacham, whom Ustick regards as the last of the strict Stoicists among the arbiters of social behavior,¹⁷ wrote a tract in 1642 which was full of warnings against the ways of the city entitled, The Art of Living in London; or a caution how Gentlemen, Countrey-men, and Strangers, drawn by occasion of Businesse, should dispose of Themselves in the Thriftiest Way, as also, a Direction

to the poorer Sort, that come thither to seeke their Fortunes. Particularly did he warn against those persons who would get money away from the new-comer, such as useless acquaintances, needy persons who constantly borrowed, those who urged one to get new clothes and to attend new plays, tavern feasts and meetings, those who had horses and coaches for hire, and those who rented boats to neighboring places on the river.¹⁸ "And above all things," he states, "beware of beastly drunkenness.... Drinking begets challenges and quarrels, and occasioneth the death of many, as is known by almost daily experience."¹⁹

Play and gaming were two pit-falls to be avoided, and he pointed out that one should look after ones own horse, for the help in London was not to be trusted. It was further necessary to be careful of the company one kept, to keep out of debt, and to avoid throngs and public places where ones pocket might be picked. Monied men and gentlemen were told to "especially beware" of the "over-hot and crafty daughters of the sun, your silken and gold-laced harlots," which were to be found everywhere, but particularly in the suburbs. He pointed out that "these have been and are daily the ruin of thousands."²⁰

The growing influence of Puritanism in the City of London, and the pessimism of the year, 1643, is reflected

in William Tipping's, The Father's Counsell, written during that dark year, in which he states:

My Son, God hath given thee thy being in a doleful age; thou livest in times streaming in blood, abounding in sin...; Life is now, to them that can judge of it, a sad and melancholy thing; death uncertain yet at our doors; friends prove flaggy, and foes merciless; the world deceitful; distractions rage within us, and dangers without us, God's judgements round about us; And this is the temper of the times! To rest upon friends is a fading shelter.²¹

Therefore, according to Tipping, God was the only one in whom trust might be put, for to him, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."²² He looked upon life as a valley of tears which was nothing but a dying condition or continual progress towards death. Therefore, he deemed trust in the Lord to be imperative.²³

Gentlemen were constantly enjoined, in characteristically Puritan tradition, to avoid idleness. Peachham urged those persons who came to London not to waste time lying in bed; instead, he suggested that time might be better spent studying the Bible and other books of piety.²⁴ Fuller called a sleeping a recreation, but agreed that the morning should not thus be wasted. "Pastime," he said, "like wine, is poyson [poison] in the morning."²⁵

Yet Fuller recognized the need for recreation, and his advice on the subject, for the most part, seems

quite sound, even by modern standards. Since there was much controversy over the legality of some forms of entertainment in 1642, such as cock-fighting and bull and bear-baiting, he took no specific stand on these forms of amusement, suggesting only that a person should be well satisfied in his conscience as to the "lawfulness" of his recreation, which should be ingenious and suitable to ones age. Boisterous and over-violent exercises were to be avoided, though "the ruder sort of people scarce count anything a sport which is not loud and violent."²⁶ He also counsels the people of the time to refresh that part of their bodies which was most wearied. "If thy life be sedentary, exercise thy body; if stirring and active, recreate thy mind...."²⁷

In an age when morality and religion were so closely identified with every-day life, one might well expect radical changes in the fashion of apparel during the war years in London, when the example of elaborate and extravagant clothing, set by the court, was gone from the city. However, it was not until after the Restoration that costliness in dress was associated with the royalists and sobriety with the Puritans.²⁸

It was during the period, 1642 to 1646, nevertheless, that the transition was being made, for the idea of severity and plainness in dress was gradually gaining

ground among the middle classes during those years,²⁹ and the strict Puritans were already dressing without ornamentation. Fashion-plates were not unknown for the period, and reveal this trend towards simplicity.

A collection of such plates in 1640 indicates that styles were often set by Queen Henrietta Maria. Skirts were elaborately trimmed, and large lace collars, brooches, ear-rings and pearl necklaces were almost always worn by ladies of quality. Deep frills of lace were worn at the cuffs, and gloves were long and loose. Those of the ladies were often unembroidered, but men's gloves were elaborately decorated. The fans of the time were made of feathers, and there seem to have been few of the folding type. Elaborate hats with wide brims and cords and tassels were often worn in the summer.³⁰

In picture fashion-plates published in 1643 the apparel for the noble lady has not changed particularly from that of 1640. However, a merchant's wife was pictured in the new series, and the fashions displayed for her were already much more simple. The merchant of the war years in London wore a plain long open gown with hanging sleeves, and completed his attire with a scull-cap.³¹ The showy garters decorated by large bows which had been worn by men were also greatly simplified in the light of Puritanical

objections.³² It is interesting to note, however, that the use of rouge had already become common among the women of the lower orders, but women of better class and good taste didn't resort to its use until after the revolution.³³

The serious issues at stake during the civil war undoubtedly sobered all classes, and outward dress seemingly followed a trend which indicated inward convictions; the contrast between the dull looking, neat, plainly cut garments of the Puritan and the silk and lace and fine plumed hat of the cavalier was the ultimate result, which prompted Ben Jonson to write that Puritans had "Religion in their garments and their hair cut shorter than their eyebrows."³⁴ In gild meetings, the laws became particularly strict regarding correct apparel, and those who appeared in 1644 in light colored suits at the meetings of the Saddlers were fined two shillings and sixpence.³⁵

Undoubtedly, the initial abolition of public entertainments in London from 1642 to 1646 was due to the exigencies of war. Parliament desired to prevent public distractions from the war effort, and to prevent large congregations of people which might lead to tumults. Too, the need for money to finance the war effort was too great to allow for frivolous spending.

Plays had been popular in the years before the

war, but the drama was rapidly declining, particularly during the time of Charles I.³⁶ Vice was no longer denounced and punished on the stage, but was instead indicated and even recommended.³⁷ According to Fuller, "Wanton speeches on stages are the devils ordinance to beget badnesse."³⁸ Therefore, not only the Puritans but even many of the royalists welcomed the forcible closure of the theatre shortly after the start of the war.³⁹

The actors themselves naturally fought this enforced restriction on their means of livelihood, both by action and through the medium of the printed page. In January, 1643, a group of them published a printed satirical defense of their profession entitled, The Actors Remonstrance or Complaint, in which they claimed that they had corrected all the bad habits which had previously been attributed to them. They assured their readers that they had purged from their stages all obscene and scurrilous jests, that they now were attempting to teach each other how to act, that they had repressed bawling and railing, and that they had quit "...inveighing young gentlemen, merchants factors and Prentices to spend their patrimonies and Masters estates..." upon themselves and their harlots in taverns. As a matter of fact, they even stated that they had given up their mistresses and had returned to their wives;⁴⁰

They further took occasion to complain that "recreations of more harmly consequences" were permitted to continue while actors were prevented from performing. Particularly, they objected to the Bear Garden, "where pick-pockets abound," and puppet-plays, which they considered to be even inferior to the music which the regular theatres had used between acts.⁴¹

The actors were faced with many problems because of the restriction; they had been forced to poverty from lack of work, their hired men were dispersed, the musicians wandered about with their instruments under their cloaks, their poets were reduced to writing pamphlets, and it was feared that their boys, who took women's parts, would be grown up with changed voices and old faces by the time the restriction was lifted.⁴²

Therefore, in desperation, many tried to continue their play-acting in spite of the ban, but the law generally caught up with them. In 1643 one of the newspapers of the time reported on the misfortune suffered by players at the Fortune Theatre in Golding Lane where all of the costumes were seized by authority from Parliament while the play was in session.⁴³ Disuse caused the Globe Theatre to be torn down in 1644 by Sir Matthew Brand,⁴⁴ but secretly the actors struggled on.

Finally, on February eleventh, 1647, Parliament was forced to pass another ordinance, "for the utter suppression and abolishing of all Stage-Playes and Interludes." The penalties to be inflicted upon the actors and spectators were included and directed that all money collected was to be confiscated and turned over to church parishes, while all those present were to be fined five shillings which was to be used for the poor in the parishes. The Lord Mayor, justices of the peace and sheriffs were also authorized to pull down stage galleries, seats and boxes.⁴⁵

The Puritans' attacks on all forms of amusements were thus especially bitter insofar as the theatre was concerned. In addition to the stock charges of its leading to immorality, they maintained that fiction and poetry were lies and were therefore to be condemned.⁴⁶ With the Restoration and after, the theatre revenged itself by perpetuating a caricature whenever it dealt with Puritanism, and this might well be one of the main reasons why Puritanism has often been associated in the popular mind with the extravagances of extremists.⁴⁷

The bear-baiting at the Paris Garden Theatre in Southwark which had been erected for the purpose of bull and bear-baiting and to which the actors expressed opposition after their theatres had been closed, was also destined

for suppression. In December of 1642, the Commons ordered that the Masters of the Bear Garden and all other persons who had interest there be enjoined to abolish bear-baiting temporarily because of the distracting conditions of the time.⁴⁸ On November thirtieth, 1643, however, the Subcommittee of the Commons which sat in Southwark was ordered to totally suppress the game of bear-baiting, to allow no people to go to the Garden, and to apprehend "such loose and suspicious Persons as come thither."⁴⁹

The levity and expense of feasts were thought inappropriate during the "miserable distractions and calamities" of the kingdom which had been brought about by the "unnatural and bloody warre,"⁵⁰ so many of the public entertainments in the gilds and companies of London were omitted while war raged. Election dinners and the feasts which generally followed funerals of members were all temporarily abandoned.⁵¹

Victory on the field of battle or the necessity of strengthening morale were the only valid excuses which were accepted for public entertainments, and generally in these cases the city authorities and the members of Parliament were the only ones who benefited directly. On May tenth, 1642, a grand review of all the trained bands with Skippon at the head was held at Finsbury Fields in the

presence of members of both the Commons and the Lords who were afterwards hospitably entertained on the grounds at the city's expense.⁵² When the plot to divide the city from Parliament was uncovered in January, 1644, the city again hastened to invite the Commons to dinner to assure them of their support in the cause.⁵³ A sermon preached by Stephen Marshall at Christ Church, Newgate, preceded the entertainment which was held at the Merchant Taylors' Hall.⁵⁴

Waller's success at Cheriton was celebrated by a public thanksgiving service on April ninth, 1644,⁵⁵ and a similar service was ordered on July eighth, 1644, to be held in Westminster Abbey to celebrate the Parliamentary victory over Prince Rupert in Yorkeshire.⁵⁶ The biggest of these celebrations, however, followed the victory over the king's forces at the Battle of Naseby which was reported in Parliament on June sixteenth, 1645 where the messengers who brought the news were rewarded with sums of money. On the nineteenth, both Houses attended thanksgiving services at Christ Church and afterwards dined with the citizens of London at the Grocers' Hall in the Poultry. Since that hall was not large enough, the members of the Common Council dined by themselves at the hall of the Mercers Company.⁵⁷ Another such celebration was held on April second, 1646,

at Grocers' Hall to celebrate Fairfax' victory over Hepton's royalist army in the west of England and Astley's defeat at Stow-on-the-Wold.⁵⁸ The final important victory at Oxford was celebrated in like manner on July fourteenth, 1646.⁵⁹

Together with the steady trend to eliminate what were believed to be frivolous types of entertainment, there was an increase in the number of moral restraints, which served more and more to spread the influence of Puritanism over the lives of Londoners. The Bible was the written code of moral law to all true Puritans, and its interpretation by the Puritan divines was a necessary part of the few public gatherings which were allowed, as has been evidenced above.

The proper observance of Fast Days was an early great concern of the Puritanical leaders in both Parliamentary and city governments, and on the twenty-sixth of April, 1642, the Lord Mayor of London was ordered by the Commons to take special care to see that normal trade was halted on the following day when a Fast was to be observed. He was also to see to it that there was no resort to taverns, inns, or similar places.⁶⁰ On the day following this particular Fast, it was ordered that three members of the House, Mr. Kinge, Mr. Whittacre and Mr. Davies, give an

account to the House explaining why they had ridden on the previous day when they should have been more piously employed.⁶¹ During August, 1642, an Act was passed for the due observation of all days of public fasting,⁶² and in December, 1643, it was again necessary to investigate information concerning certain members of the House who were reported to have been dining in a tavern during the time that the House was solemnizing a Fast.⁶³

Objections to the Book of Sports, which had been published during the reign of James I, grew out of the fact that it tolerated sports on the Sabbath Day. Gradually, the activities described therein themselves became associated with wrong and immorality, and finally the book, in November, 1642, was ordered to be burned by the common hangman.⁶⁴ Similar orders were made from time to time as copies of the book were rediscovered in the possession of Londoners.⁶⁵

In December, 1644, a committee was appointed to prepare an ordinance which provided for the registering of the time of children's baptisms, together with their parents' names, and for the registering of burials. This committee was also to prepare an ordinance which prevented the marriage of children without their parents' consent. Parents were not to force or deny the marriage of their children

unjustly, but ministers were prevented by this law from joining in marriage any persons who failed to receive this consent.⁶⁶

The Puritans had no thought of suppressing the ordinary use of liquor, for even children were given the staple drink which was beer, but they did oppose feasts and frolics which ordinarily accompanied weddings and funerals alike, where drunkenness and greater excesses were the end result. Therefore, it was drunkenness and licentiousness which received their special attention.⁶⁷

In London, public houses were carefully inspected in order to suppress excessive drinking, and in 1644, the aldermen of the city were specifically ordered to take note of all cases of swearing and drunkenness committed by those who perpetually haunted taverns, inns, and alehouses. Westminster justices were asked to report the number of alehouses which they deemed to be necessary for each parish and disorderly taverns were to be suppressed. When any keeper died, the licence was not to be renewed until the number of taverns had been reduced.⁶⁸

The diary of Sir Humphrey Mildmay, a royalist gentleman who lived in and about London during the time of the revolution, would indicate, however, that the Puritanical efforts to suppress excesses in drinking were

often unsuccessful. Sir Humphrey spoke often of merry dinners at taverns or private homes with both male and female friends, particularly Sir John Curzon whom he often accompanied to their favorite tavern, the Trumpet, "...for dinner and a protracted debauch."⁶⁹

Mildmay's pleasures seemingly were largely untrammled even in 1643, for he illegally continued to attend the theatre, visited acquaintances constantly in an extremely social manner, and "'played the bad fellow at taverns' returning home late, 'well smitten with wine,' and 'with a rattle of canary'" in his belly.⁷⁰ All and all, he seemed to fit Fuller's description of the "De-generous Gentleman." He occasionally kept Fast Days, but more often failed to, and he objected strenuously to the new Puritan divines who had replaced the old royalist ministers.⁷¹

It was probably this type of gentleman which drove the Puritans to even greater extremes in their legislative regulation of morals. In July, 1644, it was ordered that an ordinance be brought in "punishing the grievous and frequent sin of Blasphemy,"⁷² and in December of the same year ordinances were requested by Parliament which would repress incest, adultery, whoredom, drunkenness, swearing, blaspheming the name of God and other vices. A

committee was also to bring in an ordinance preventing Sabbath-breaking and "profanation" of the Lord's Day.⁷³

When the Puritans realized that their attempts to legislate the citizens of London onto the straight and narrow path by prohibition were insufficient, they determined to appeal to the spiritual consciences of erring individuals by threatening to prevent them from taking the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Incestuous persons, adulterers, fornicators, drunkards, profane swearers, blasphemers and murderers were all prohibited from enjoying this privilege by a resolution of April seventeenth, 1645.⁷⁴ To this list were later added those persons who were proven renouncers of the "true" Protestant religion,⁷⁵ and in May, 1646, a special committee was appointed to further enumerate scandalous offences for which additional persons could be suspended from taking this sacrament.⁷⁶ Ordinances for the prevention of the growth and spreading of heresy were also increasing in 1646.⁷⁷

In the turmoil accompanying war, the crime of child stealing got out of hand to the extent that Parliament itself became alarmed in May, 1645. Although some children were possibly kidnapped for immoral purposes, the greater number was undoubtedly seized by unscrupulous persons who sent them to the colonies as indentured servants. When

Parliament was informed that "divers lewd Persons" had stolen many little children in a "most barbarous and wicked manner," it ordered that officers and ministers of justice were to be diligent in apprehending these criminals who were guilty of stealing, buying, selling, inveighing, purloining, conveying or receiving stolen children. Ships and vessels on the river were to be searched for such children, and the ordinance was to be given wide publicity in the churches, "that it may appear to the world, how far careful the Parliament is to prevent such mischiefs, and how much they do detest and abhor a crime of so much Villainy."⁷⁸

It is, of course, obvious that if one over-all influence on the social lives of the citizens of London during the civil war were to be singled out, it would be the force of Puritanism, with its emphasis on strict morality. It should not be assumed that the impact was immediate, however, nor that the force was complete in its effectiveness; for during the years 1642 to 1646 it was the war with its inevitable emergencies and distractions which initially necessitated certain restrictions. These later pointed the way for the development of the more overwhelming aspects of Puritanical suppression, but at no time did Puritanism completely dominate the lives of all

classes of Londoners.

The influence of the war which brought governmental control by the Puritans could not help but bring about at least some changes in the lives of all persons in the city, and these changes were reflected in their social standards, dress and amusements.

Suppression, however, can only be temporary, for it tends to create tensions which, when released, are apt to be explosive; this was indeed to be the case in London and England when the Restoration was to bring Charles II and moral relaxation to the throne in the wake of militant Puritanism. Extreme reaction to the sobriety of war and fanatical morality was to seriously retard rational and constructive social development in England for a number of years.

Notes to Chapter VII

1. W. L. Ustick, Changing Ideals of Aristocratic Character and Conduct in Seventeenth Century England, in Modern Philology, xxx, (1932-33), p. 166.
2. Ibid., p. 166.
3. Ibid., p. 166.
4. Thomas Fuller, The Holy State, 1642, pp. 149-152.
5. Ibid., p. 410.
6. Ibid., p. 411.

Notes to Chapter VII (Continued)

7. Ibid., p. 413.
8. Ibid., pp. 414-16.
9. Francis Hawkins, Youths Behaviour, 1651, p. 5.
10. Ibid., pp. 6-7.
11. Ibid., p. 15.
12. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
13. Ibid., pp. 20-21.
14. Ibid., pp. 32-37.
15. Old Book Collectors Miscellany, v. iiii, no. x, The Country-mans Care, 1641, p. 2.
16. Ibid., pp. 5-6.
17. Ustick, op. cit., p. 166.
18. Harleian Miscellany, v. ix, pp. 86-87.
19. Ibid., p. 87.
20. Ibid., pp. 87-89.
21. Ibid., p. 193.
22. Ibid., p. 193.
23. Ibid., p. 198.
24. Ibid., p. 87.
25. Fuller, op. cit., p. 183.
26. Ibid., pp. 183-84.
27. Ibid., p. 184.
28. Elizabeth Godfrey, Home Life Under the Stuarts, 1603-1649, p. 268.

Notes to Chapter VII (Continued)

29. Ibid., p. 268.
30. Ibid., pp. 265-66.
31. Ibid., p. 267.
32. W. D. Smythe, Historical Account of Worshipful Company of Girdlers, London, pp. 60-61.
33. Godfrey, op. cit., p. 274.
34. Arthur Compton-Ricket, London Life of Yesterday, p. 240, quoting Ben Jonson, source unknown.
35. J. W. Sherwell, A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Guild of Saddlers of the City of London, p. 172.
36. F. D. DeSoet, Puritan and Royalist Literature During the Seventeenth Century, p. 88; Compton-Ricket, op. cit., p. 217.
37. DeSoet, op. cit., p. 88.
38. Fuller, op. cit., p. 186.
39. De Soet, op. cit., p. 88.
40. Old Book Collectors Miscellany, v. iii, no. xix, The Actors Remonstrance or Complaint, 1643, pp. 1-3.
41. Ibid., pp. 4-5.
42. Ibid., pp. 6-8.
43. Newspapers of 1643, Weekly Account No. 5, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, p. 564.
44. Godfrey, op. cit., p. 43.
45. Old Book Collectors Miscellany, v. iii, no. xx, Ordinance Of Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, for Suppression of Stage-Playes and Interludes, 1647, pp. 1-5.
46. Godfrey, op. cit., p. 47.

Notes to Chapter VII (Continued)

47. Compton-Rickett, op. cit., p. 214.
48. C.J., v. 11, p. 885; Wheatley, London Past and Present, p. 32.
49. C.J., v. 111, p. 325.
50. J. B. Heath, Some Account of the Worshipful Company of Grocers of the City of London, p. 113.
51. Ibid., p. 113; Sherwell, op. cit., p. 175; E. B. Jupp, An Historical Account of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters of the City of London, p. 100.
52. R. R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, v. 11, p. 166.
53. C.J., v. 111, p. 365.
54. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 198.
55. Ibid., p. 200.
56. C.J., v. 111, pp. 554, 555.
57. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 219; W. J. Loftie, A History of London, p. 348.
58. Sharpe, op. cit., p. 234; C.J. v. iv, p. 492.
59. Ibid., p. 600.
60. C.J., v. 11, p. 542.
61. Ibid., p. 545.
62. Ibid., p. 702.
63. C.J., v. 111, p. 353.
64. C.J., v. 11, p. 847.
65. Compton-Rickett, op. cit., p. 217.
66. C.J., v. 111, p. 715.

Notes to Chapter VII (Continued)

67. Compton-Ricket, op. cit., p. 217.
68. Margaret James, Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution, pp. 13-14.
69. P. L. Ralph, Sir Humphrey Mildmay, Royalist Gentleman, p. 186.
70. Ibid., p. 167.
71. Ibid., pp. 168-171.
72. C.J., v. 111, p. 555.
73. Ibid., p. 721.
74. C.J., v. iv, p. 113.
75. Ibid., p. 412.
76. Ibid., p. 549.
77. Ibid., p. 526.
78. Ibid., p. 136.

Chapter VIII

CULTURAL PROGRESS IN REVOLUTIONARY LONDON AS IT
WAS REFLECTED IN LITERATURE, WRITING, SCIENCE,
LEARNING AND THE ARTS

Though the first half of the seventeenth century in England was tremendously important insofar as history is concerned, the same cannot be said for literature; for the violent struggle between the king and many of his subjects left little time or opportunity for literary pursuits.¹ In addition to this basic fact, the very strict censorship of all means of expression by both of the opposing factions was an attempt to prevent literary creative endeavor which might, in any way, be in opposition to the policies or beliefs of either side. The authors of the time, therefore, were often reduced to writing propaganda in support of one of the two causes.

In London, quite logically, the dominant influence on all writing which could be legally published was Puritanism, which, in turn, was based on the Bible. Thus it is not surprising to find direct references to the "Holy Word" in practically all of the accepted works of the time, and often the arguments and rationalizations for action are based on the Calvinist interpretation of

the Bible.

The prohibition of literary individualism in expression was the result of a long tradition of censorship in England. Under Queen Mary, a Company of Stationers limited the liberty of the press, and the Court of Star Chamber under Elizabeth only allowed printing in London and the two universities; it also forbade the publication of any book or pamphlet without a license from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, or their substitutes. These restrictions were continued under James and Charles, for freedom of the press was obviously incompatible with the political and religious principles of Stuart government; after the abolition of the Star Chamber, the Long Parliament placed the responsibility for censorship upon the Stationers Company which tried to stop the printing of not only Catholic and Anglican, but also of Independent works.²

Naturally, there were those who attempted to circumvent the regulations, particularly in London, which was the center of printing activities in England. Parliament, therefore, was kept busy throughout the war years suppressing those publications which were derogatory to its cause and to the religious principles for which it stood.

Even before the war started in 1642 action was being taken against authors, publishers and printers who participated in the dissemination of "scandalous" papers against the members of both Houses of Parliament.³ The Committee for Printing and the Bill on printing were revived on January twenty-ninth, 1642, and it was ordered that the Master and Wardens of the Company of Stationers be required to see that printers neither print or reprint anything without the name and consent of the author.⁴ Thereafter, the printers of the city were harassed almost constantly by Parliamentary officials who were attempting to seek out anonymous publishers and authors who, if they were located and were found guilty, were punished by imprisonment.⁵

The Master and Wardens of the Stationers' Company were also empowered to search houses where derogatory and seditious works might be found,⁶ and persons possessing such works were to be taken into custody.⁷ Often the Parliamentary agents were ordered to seize all available copies of undesirable works which, after they had been collected, were burned by the common hangman.⁸

Parliament was particularly diligent in its suppression of writing which it deemed to be harmful to the Puritan religion or to the strict moral code of the

time. In August, 1644, the Stationers were asked to discover the authors, printers and publishers of a pamphlet written against the immortality of the soul and which also concerned divorce.⁹ A book entitled, Comfort for Believers About their Sins and Troubles, was branded as "scandalous, blasphemous heresy" in July, 1645, and it was asked by some members of Parliament that the work receive some public reprimand to vindicate the purity of the doctrine of the Puritan Church.¹⁰ No foreign impressions of English Bibles which had been imported were allowed to go on sale until they had been passed by an Assembly of Divines,¹¹ and all books which were judged to be lewdly written and which, therefore, might corrupt youth, were ordered to be suppressed.¹²

Interestingly enough, the greatest protagonist for freedom of the press during this time was John Milton, himself a Puritan. The printing ordinance of June fourteenth, 1643, enacting that no book, pamphlet or paper should thenceforth be printed unless it had previously been approved and licensed by official censors,¹³ caused the production of Milton's finest prose work, a speech for the liberty of unlicensed printing entitled, Areopagitica, which was published in 1644.¹⁴ In this treatise Milton attacked the restraints of a few "...illiterate and

illiberal individuals, who refused their sanction to any work which contained views or sentiments at all above the level of the vulgar superstition."¹⁵

There is no doubt but what Milton was the greatest literary figure living in London during the revolutionary years. It is the period during which he devoted himself almost entirely to politics, however, and for that reason it is the least interesting part of Milton's life to the literary student. Nonetheless, his works supply an important commentary on those forces which animated contemporary life in London.¹⁶ Other books published by Milton during the war years include his four arguments in support of divorce entitled, The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, (1643), The Judgment of Martin Bucer, (1644), Tetrachordon, (1645), and Colasterion, (1645); and his outstanding tractate of education addressed to Master Samuel Hartlib which was published in June, 1644.¹⁷

Though there were many lyric poets living and writing in England during the civil war, practically all of them were royalists and were therefore not writing in London. Of these, Thomas Carew, Richard Lovelace, Robert Herrick, Sir John Suckling, Edmund Waller, Sir John Denham, Abraham Cowley and John Cleveland are all worthy of mention.¹⁸

One of the more interesting books published from

1642 to 1646 in London was the third edition of Gervase Markham's, The Souldiers Exercise, which was corrected and amended for use by the Parliamentary army in 1643. According to its title page, it was; "A work fit to be studied and meete for the knowledge of Captaines, Muster-Masters, and all young Souldiers, and generous spirits that love the honorable practice of armes."¹⁹ As a veritable soldiers' handbook, it included information on fire orders, commands, formations, use of weapons, duties of the common soldier and of officers, battle motions, and marching orders and discipline.

Since theatres were so effectively suppressed in London, it is not surprising that little dramatic literature was produced from 1642 to 1646. In a check-list of all English plays published from 1641 to 1700, compiled by Gertrude Woodward and James McManaway in 1945, there are only thirteen plays from the pens of nine writers for the war years. Again, several of these playwrights were royalists, such as Carew, Denham, and Suckling, who included plays with their poems in published collections, but whose efforts took place outside of the capital city. Those that were written in London dealt largely with the political problems of the time, and would have had little dramatic appeal had they been produced. An example is

George Buchanan's, Tyrannicall-government anatomized; or
A discourse concerning evil-counsellors, which was published
in 1642.²⁰

The most prolific writing of the period was done by those persons who used the press for propaganda purposes by publishing countless tracts, broadsides and pamphlets in support of, or in opposition to, the many controversial subjects of the day. Many ordinances of Parliament were also published in the form of tracts or pamphlets for public consumption. Practically none of this output, however, qualifies as literature of any quality.

News-books of the most ephemeral character sprang into existence following the abolition of the Star Chamber in 1641, and they were published in great numbers by both sides during the war. Little capital was needed to start news-books, with the result that many men of questionable ability entered the field of journalism. Seemingly, all that was needed was "...the pen of a ready writer and a complete lack of scruple."²¹ The rival papers were full of attacks on each other, and a steady day-by-day campaign on both sides was designed to keep up public spirit by concealing details of defeats and by magnifying victories. At Oxford, the most important of the royalist publications was Mercurius Aulicus, which flourished from 1643 to 1645.

Perhaps the most reliable of the Parliamentary papers in London were the Diurnall Occurrences and the Perfect Diurnall.²²

The large number of Diurnals and Correntes did not supplant the private newsletter, however, because, whereas the news-books were subject to censorship, the newsletters were private matters. Gentlemen in the country, either individually or collectively, would arrange to have news supplied regularly by one of the many "professional" writers in London, who sent several copies to several patrons at a certain fixed rate. Ciphers were generally agreed upon to convey dangerous matter in the event the letters were opened enroute. Impartiality was neither expected nor desired, for the writer generally knew what views were expected and wrote accordingly.²³

In the years immediately preceeding the war, an alert curiosity was probing into natural phenomena, and an interest in science was becoming paramount in many intellectual circles in London. The first pendulum clock in Europe, for example, was invented by Richard Harris of London in 1641 and was placed in Saint Paul's Church in Covent Garden.²⁴ The war, however, tended to retard inventive genius, for there were few who had leisure for the peaceful arrangement of a society for research.²⁵

In spite of the distractions of conflict, the

foundations of the now famous Royal Society were laid during the war years even though the organization of such a society was not possible at that time. John Wallis, an able mathematician of the time, describes the intellectual meetings which took place in London in 1645, and that later resulted in the formation of the Society, in his account of some of the memorable events of his own life.

Due to the partial interruption of "academical studies" in the universities because of the war, a number of persons, "...inquisitive into natural philosophy, and other parts of human learning; and particularly of what hath been called the 'New Philosophy' or 'Experimental Philosophy,'"²⁶ met weekly by agreement to discuss scientific matters. Among those early scholars were Dr. John Wilkins, later Bishop of Chester, Dr. Jonathon Goddard, Dr. George Ent, a Dr. Glisson and a Dr. Merret, who were described as physicists, Mr. Samuel Foster, then Professor of Astronomy at Gresham College, and Mr. Theodore Hank, a German from the Palatinate. Because Dr. Goddard kept an operator in his house for grinding glasses for telescopes and microscopes, the group often met at his lodgings in Wood Street; at other times they met at the Bull Head Tavern in Cheapside or at Gresham College.²⁷ Wallis describes the vast variety of scientific matters

which were discussed as follows:

Our business was (precluding matters of Theology and state affairs) to discourse and consider of Philosophical Enquiries, and such as related thereunto; as physick, anatomy, geometry, astronomy, navigation, staticks, magneticks, chymicks, mechanicks, and natural experiments; with the state of these studies, as then cultivated at home and abroad. We then discoursed of the circulation of the blood, the valves in the veins, the vence lacteae, the lymphatick vessels, the Copernican hypothesis, the nature of comets and new stars, the satellites of Jupiter, the oval shape (as it then appeared) of Saturn, the spots in the Sun and its turning on its own axis, the inequalities and selenography of the moon, the several phases of Venus and Mercury, the improvement of telescopes, and grinding of glasses for that purpose, the weight of air, the possibility or impossibility of Vacuities, and nature's abhorrence thereof, the Torricellian experiment in quicksilver, the descent of heavenly bodies, and the degrees of acceleration therein; and divers other things of life nature.²⁸

Thomas Fuller in his Holy State, was, among many other things, vitally concerned about learning and education. His evaluation of the curriculum which he believed the general scholar should follow to attain academic proficiency reveals the types of subjects often studied during the middle years of the seventeenth century in London.

Language, according to Fuller and in agreement with the leading scholars of the day, was the key to all knowledge. Therefore, Latin and Greek were to be studied first, followed by Hebrew, "...the mother-tongue of the

world." Logic and ethics were next on the schedule, together with rhetoric, poetry and music. Fuller believed that mathematics should be moderately studied for personal contentment, but astrology was merely to hear, not believe. History was an absolute essential, together with chronology, "...without which History is but an heap of tales." The true student should also be acquainted with cosmography, chorography and topography.²⁹

With this basis of general education as a setting, the scholar could then insert the diamond of some one of the predominant professions such as law, physics, divinity or state policies.³⁰

The curriculum advocated by Milton in his essay, Of Education, written for his friend, Samuel Hartlib, in 1644, reveals the strong Puritanical influence of the time. To Milton, the end of education was not a knowledge of classical languages but rather; "To know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love Him, to imitate Him and to be like Him."³¹ However, he believed that God revealed himself in the visible world as well as in the Bible and that His Spirit was also present in science, art, literature and beauty. Therefore, his curriculum contained most of the subjects advocated by Fuller and included Biblical study, theology, and character building as well.

Since in his academy pupils were to be brought up so that they could reach maturity of mind simultaneously with maturity of body to be prepared for "...all of the offices both private and public of peace and war," he also included studies in fortifications, architecture, navigation and physical training.³²

There was a great need for good schoolmasters on the secondary level, according to Fuller, and he listed a number of reasons to account for the scarcity of talent. Inadequate young scholars tended to use the profession as a refuge instead of going on to university, and others used it merely as a temporary stop-gap to "patch the rents in their fortunes." Some were disheartened from doing their best because of the miserable rewards they received, being masters to children and slaves to parents, and those who gained a fortune tended to grow negligent.³³ The truly good schoolmaster was he who studied his scholars as carefully as they did their books, who was able, diligent and methodical in his teaching, and who was, and was known to be, an absolute monarch in his school.³⁴

Scholarly research was limited primarily to church history in which Fuller warned that "...a little skill in antiquity inclines a man to Popery; but depth in that study brings him about again to our religion."³⁵ He

also emphasized that the true church antiquary should not "...so adore the Ancients as to despise the Modern."³⁶

The value of books and historical records was definitely recognized by learned men both in Parliament and in the academic world. In November, 1643, a specific ordinance was passed in the Commons for the preservation and the keeping together of all books, parchments, manuscripts, records and other writings which had been sequestered or taken by distress.³⁷ Fuller suggested that a few books well selected could add much to individual learning, and further, that an hour's meditation should accompany each hour's reading of a reputable author. However, the mere accumulation of books to present the appearance of learning through a large library was only vanity. He lamented the fact that printers could make more money by printing "foolish" pamphlets instead of books which contributed to learning, for he felt that these tracts would spoil readers' tastes for solid and wholesome writers. He objected to them also because they were often so vicious and biased and because he feared that the pamphlets of his age might pass for records with the succeeding generations.³⁸

The war and Puritanism held several advantages for scholars in the colleges in London and environment from 1642 to 1646, for they were exempt from subscriptions,³⁹

they were able to discard the bulky and uncomfortable surplices which they had previously been forced to wear, because they reminded the Puritan leaders too much of popery,⁴⁰ and they were also able to escape the draft because of their scholarly pursuits.⁴¹

Artistic endeavor and achievement suffered immeasurably in England from 1642 to 1646 due both to the revolution and to Puritanism. The attacks by the Puritans on all art objects which revealed the influence of Catholicism were strikingly reminiscent of the impact of the Protestant Reformation on German art, for some of the most beautiful art treasures of London were destroyed by the extremists of the Puritan faction during these years.⁴²

Immediately after open conflict began in 1642, destructive attacks on religious art became general. Pictures seized from a French painter by the Parliamentary Committee for Informations which included representations of the Christ, the Virgin Mary, or other "superstitious" subject matter, were ordered to be demolished in September, 1642,⁴³ and in April, 1643, a specific committee was appointed to deal with "superstitious monuments." This group was empowered to demolish all such art works in "...public or open Places," as well as in churches and chapels.⁴⁴ The pictures and monuments of Somerset House,

which had been used by a group of Capuchins in the city,⁴⁵ were thus destroyed, and when York House was dismantled for Parliamentary use in 1645, superstitious works were destroyed, while other pictures and statues were sold.⁴⁶ Some of the best paintings from York House, however, were reported to have been successfully smuggled over to Holland where they were purchased by the Archduke Leopold.⁴⁷

Brass statues which were destroyed were generally sold, with the revenue going to the state. The remnants could even be sent over-seas, provided that care was taken to see that they were adequately defaced so that they could not be used in any superstitious manner.⁴⁸ Even the elaborately embroidered and decorated hearse cloths, which the gilds and companies of London used for the funerals of their members, were ordered to be destroyed by an ordinance of Parliament in 1646, primarily because most of them had crosses and other religious symbols on them.⁴⁹

In May, 1643, the Puritan party ordered the wholesale destruction of monuments deemed to be superstitious or idolatrous in Westminster Abbey and elsewhere, and during the same month the city received permission from Parliament to destroy the Cheapside Cross, which was one of the most conspicuous ornaments on one of the principal streets of London, because it was decorated with religious

figures. Sir Robert Harlow was in charge of the destruction, accompanied by a troop of horse and two companies of foot soldiers. The act was met with enthusiastic rejoicing on the part of the majority of those present, who later lent their support to other destructive occurrences at Westminster, Saint Pauls, Lambeth Cathedral, and Christ's Hospital.⁵⁰ In 1646 the Cavaliers gained partial revenge for Puritan action by destroying the hearse and effigy of Essex, the Parliamentary general that had been placed in Westminster Abbey.⁵¹

As early as 1643 many of the city's halls, which had been so rich in works of art were stripped of relics which, to many members of the guilds, were invaluable. Among the items lost were the choice and rare tapestry hangings in the Merchant Taylor's Hall which contained incidents in the life of Saint John the Baptist, the Company's patron saint.⁵²

Few creative artistic works were produced in London during the war years because artists of the time were generally more closely associated with the court than they were with the common people. Thus many, such as Inigo Jones, left the city and were classed as delinquents by Parliament.⁵³ In addition, many of the truly great artists in England during the years right

before the war, such as Van Dyck, were foreigners, and when the war was in progress there was little incentive for alien painters and artisans to come to London. Immediately following the war years, however, portraiture was revived, and there are numerous paintings of Cromwell by Cooper, Walker, Lely, and Faithorne who painted the general from life.⁵⁴

Though the Puritans were less vehement towards music than they were towards art, it nevertheless suffered from neglect and from occasional acts of destruction and suppression from 1642 to 1646, particularly insofar as religious music was concerned. As early as 1642 the Puritans were attempting to destroy the organs in cathedrals, but they often met with resistance on the part of the Independent Protestants.⁵⁵

In 1644, however, the Puritans forbade the use of instrumental music in the churches, and organs were taken down, broken up, and were in many cases totally destroyed. Too, many music books were burned, whereby many unpublished gems which existed only in manuscript form were entirely lost to posterity, and "...the injury done to music by the complete break of the traditions of

the old English style of contrapuntal writing is beyond all estimation."⁵⁶ It was ordained that only metrical versions of the Psalms should be sung, and the manner used was completely devoid of all musical effect, for the preacher read out the verses line by line with the congregation following.⁵⁷ It is not surprising that true musicians were, almost to a man, loyal to the king!⁵⁸

On a less intellectual plane, there were numerous popular songs and ballads which often revealed the prevailing sentiments of the more common people of the city and nation. They were meant primarily for the vulgar and uneducated and were often sung in places of popular resort, such as taverns and markets.⁵⁹

Puritanism, together with the civil war and its military, political and economic preoccupations, contributed directly to a state of cultural stagnation and even retrogression in London from 1642 to 1646. It is true that the extremists of the Puritan faction were responsible for the open acts of destruction which affected literature, art and music adversely, but the deep underlying religious philosophy of Puritanism provided the incentive, and the less fanatical members of the sect provided no effective restraints to limit these losses.

Learning suffered primarily from neglect, as did all cultural aspects of life in the city during the war, but it is worthy of note that religious and moral emphasis became increasingly apparent in suggested curriculums. Scientific development was merely retarded during the period, and the intense curiosity and interest in science on the part of a few even managed to prepare the ground-work informally for later significant scientific organization and progress.

It is notable that many of the leading figures in literature, art, music and the drama were royalists, for court subsidation and support were important to the success of endeavor in these fields in seventeenth century England. This fact by itself is one of the dominant reasons for the lack of cultural development in the Puritanical city of London during the war.

The profit motive in writing, together with the stress on biased propoganda, tended to render worthless, as literature, the vast quantity of pamphlet material which was published. Milton's work is the sole exception to the rule, and he stands alone as the figure of literary importance in London during the war.

It has been previously noted that Puritanical

suppression was to give way to extreme reaction in social behavior which would tend to further retard its constructive development in London following the Restoration. The same was to be true in the case of the cultural arts and literature, for the void left by the war years and Puritanical government was to provide a situation where almost anything that was to be produced would be acceptable during the reign of Charles II; the end result was to be much which was in reality insignificant and often worthless.

Notes to Chapter VIII

1. F. D. DeSoet, Puritan and Royalist Literature in the Seventeenth Century, p. 88.
2. Ibid., p. 29.
3. C.J., v. 11, pp. 367, 396.
4. Ibid., p. 402.
5. Ibid., pp. 404, 408, 414, 472, 501; C.J., v. 111, p. 606; C.J., v. iv, p. 206.
6. C.J., v. 11, pp. 414, 911.
7. Ibid., p. 911.
8. Ibid., pp. 411, 613; C.J. v. iv, p. 516.
9. C.J., v. 111, p. 606.
10. C.J., v. iv, p. 206.
11. Ibid., p. 248.

Notes to Chapter VIII (Continued)

12. W. C. Hazlitt, The Livery Companies of the City of London, p. 636.
13. Arthur Compton-Ricket, London Life of Yesterday, pp. 227-28.
14. DeSoet, op. cit., p. 29.
15. J. W. Hales, Introduction and Notes to John Milton, Areopagitica, pp. vi-vii.
16. Compton-Ricket, op. cit., pp. 224-25.
17. Hales, op. cit., pp. vii-viii; DeSoet, op. cit., pp. 23-25.
18. DeSoet, op. cit., pp. 92-152, passim.
19. Gervase Markham, The Souldiers Exercise, p. 1.
20. G. L. Woodward and J. G. McManaway, A Check List of English Plays, 1641-1700, pp. 19-127, passim; DeSoet, op. cit., pp. 100-101, 121.
21. Mary Coate, Social Life in Stuart England, pp. 145-46.
22. Ibid., pp. 145-46; Newspapers for 1643, Cal. SP Dom., 1641-43, pp. 563-67.
23. Elizabeth Godfrey, Social Life Under the Stuarts, pp. 145-46.
24. H. B. Wheatley, London, Past and Present, v. iii, p. 57.
25. Godfrey, op. cit., pp. 83, 89.
26. R. B. Morgan, ed., Readings in English Social History from Contemporary Literature, 1603-1683, v. iv, p. 58.
27. Ibid., p. 57; Wheatley, op. cit., pp. 186, 530.
28. Morgan, op. cit., p. 57.
29. Thomas Fuller, The Holy State, pp. 72-75.
30. Ibid., p. 75.

Notes to Chapter VIII (Continued)

31. DeSoet, op. cit., p. 33, quoting from John Milton, of Education, 1644.
32. Ibid., p. 33.
33. Fuller, op. cit., p. 109.
34. Ibid., pp. 110-111.
35. Ibid., p. 69.
36. Ibid., p. 72.
37. C.J., v. 111, p. 306.
38. Fuller, op. cit., pp. 199-201.
39. C.J., v. 11, p. 922.
40. Ibid., pp. 969, 972.
41. C.J., v. 111, p. 194.
42. Compton-Ricket, op. cit., p. 215.
43. C.J., v. 11, p. 757.
44. C.J., v. 111, pp. 57, 63.
45. C.J., v. 11, p. 885; Agostini to the Doge, April 10, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, p. 262.
46. C.J., v. 1v, p. 216; Thomas Arundell, Historical Reminiscences of the City of London and its Livery Companies, p. 147.
47. Wheatley, op. cit., p. 539.
48. C.J., v. 1v, pp. 350, 505.
49. Hazlitt, op. cit., p. 395.
50. C.J., v. 111, p. 110; Agostini to the Doge, May 15, 1643, May 29, 1643, Cal. SP Ven., 1642-43, pp. 272, 277; R. R. Sharpe, London and the Kingdom, v. 11, p. 187; Wheatley, op. cit., pp. 59, 62; Arundell, op. cit., p. 147.

Notes to Chapter VIII (Continued)

51. Wheatley, op. cit., p. 477.
52. Arundell, op. cit., p. 158.
53. C.J., v. iv, p. 557.
54. Compton-Rickett, op. cit., p. 243.
55. Giustinian to the Doge, October 24, 1642, Cal. SP. Ven., 1642-43, p. 182.
56. Godfrey, op. cit., pp. 55-56.
57. Ibid., p. 56.
58. Ibid., p. 64.
59. DeSoet, op. cit., p. 150.

Chapter IX

CONCLUSION

The mass of disrupting forces which made themselves felt in the City of London from 1642 to 1646, as a result of the civil war, were essentially similar in many ways to the general problems facing any large city which is, has been, or will be in a war area, for certain characteristics of warfare never change. There will always be financial problems, the personal element in the support of the war effort, shortages of essential commodities, propaganda, and general social and economic interruptions which touch all elements of an urban population. Inside of this general pattern of similarities, however, one finds a secondary design of many variances such as in the degree of the severity of impacts, differences in causal factors and motivating influences, and in the dissimilarity of under-lying ideologies.

London definitely conformed to the general pattern, for the inevitability of certain wartime problems was accentuated by the fact that the English capital was made the bulwark of the Parliamentary cause by the enemies of the king. Its inhabitants were forced either by

necessity or by desire to share in both the support and the consequences of the strife which swept the land.

It is the pattern of effect within the general framework, however, that tends to differentiate the situation in London from those in other cities during other periods of war, and it is, therefore, the impacts that make up this internal pattern which interest us most.

Whereas in most of England's foreign wars only external communication ran the risk of disruption, in the civil war, which divided the population within the country, both internal and external transport and contact systems broke down; this resulted in closer correlation between economic and social effects, for economic necessity led to more intensified social reactions. Blockades within the country ruined London's domestic trade, and the fact that many countries were in sympathy with the royalist cause made it difficult for London merchants to pursue foreign commerce successfully.

Shortages of food, clothing and fuel, therefore, not only revealed a stagnation of trade, but they also emphasized a state of emergency which necessitated the restriction, modification, and suppression of many vital elements in what might be called the London way of life. Peculiar to the case of the civil war in England alone,

was the fact that there was a desire among the leaders of the Parliamentary cause to perpetuate many of these changes in tune with Puritanism, and the citizens of London, at the center of the Parliamentary area of influence, naturally felt the force of the social Puritanism of Parliament and the city authorities to the greatest extent.

Thus by capitalizing on the exigencies of war, the leaders of Puritanism in London were able to profoundly alter the city's social pattern. The religious ideology of Puritanical Calvinism, with its moral and somber tone, was able to penetrate and influence almost all aspects of social and cultural life during the years, 1642 to 1646. It should be noted, however, that its influence was not complete during those years, and there were many attempts to circumvent the authority of the Puritan leaders; in reality, therefore, the war era constituted a transitional period in which Puritanism entrenched itself for its ultimate short triumph after the death of Charles I and before the Restoration of Charles II.

The war itself, while creating a static condition in the economic life of the capital, also retarded the development of science, learning, and the cultural arts due to the fact that the concentration on, and the cost of, the war effort made pure neglect of these areas

inevitable.

Though London was undoubtedly vitally important to Parliament as its chief source of money, materiel, and man-power, the occasionally prevalent idea today that the city was unanimously loyal to that body is in error, for there were many within its limits who totally opposed the Parliamentary cause. Too, many of the royalist citizens of London left the city, and there were others whose allegiances fluctuated with the tide of battle in an attempt to be identified with the winning side. Still others tried to capitalize on the difficulties of living which existed by selling commodities at exorbitant prices for personal gain.

Concepts of individualism and democracy received a direct impetus from the war against royal sovereignty, with the result that agitation on the part of labor and independent artisans sternly attacked the monopoly system and the oligarchical government of industry and commerce which existed in the gild system. It should be noted, however, that this democratic movement was only a prelude to achievement in the distant future, for few tangible gains were made during, and even immediately following, the war years.

It is an interesting fact that one of the

outstanding dreads of seventeenth century London, the plague, failed to reach serious epidemic proportions at any time during the war years, when one might well expect it to have been a devastating force. Only during the late summer of 1646 was its influence felt to any extent, and preventative measures kept the disease under reasonable control at that time. Thus disease, one of the usual fellow-travellers of war, was fortunately not a great problem to Londoners during the civil war.

Poverty and unemployment, however, increased with great rapidity during the war years due to the general stagnation of commerce and trade, the heavy financial drain on the pockets of the citizenry, and the large number of wounded soldiers who were unable to support themselves and their families. Though constant collections were taken up in churches for the benefit of the soldiers, the policy of suppressing those believed to be rogues and vagrants continued, for a wandering beggar was both a political and economic danger during times of war. It was nevertheless apparent that the need for a vigorous poor law policy had been greatly accelerated by the war, and establishment of more centralized control over the hospitals of the city in 1647 led ultimately to a Parliamentary ordinance that same year which established the

London Corporation for the Poor; this, however, was more concerned with the reform of administration than with that of policy, but it at least denotes a recognition of the need for social action by the city government in behalf of the poorer elements of the population.

In the total picture of the City of London from 1642 to 1646, one sees the dual influence of the war and Puritanism forming a cloud over the citizens of the metropolis which was destined to ultimately shadow the lives of all persons to at least some degree. It was, in reality, an unhappy alliance to the majority of Londoners, for their expressions of relief, when the Restoration brought an end to oppression, tended to submerge anything that might have been worthy in Puritanism in a rollicking reaction which often proved to be more superficial than it was productive. Thus in the long range view, even when oppression was gone, the dominant influences of the war era were destined to be felt in London for many additional years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SourcesA. Government Documents

Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, G. H. Firth and R. S. Rait, eds., London, 1911, vol. 1.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1625-49, London, 1858-97, 23 vols.

Calendar of State Papers, Venice and Northern Italy, 1625-47, London, 1913-26, 9 vols.

Journals of the House of Commons, London, 1803, vols. 1-v.

Journals of the House of Lords, London, no date, vols. ix-ix.

B. Primary Sources

Ascham, Antony, A Discourse; Wherein is Examined, What is Particularly Lawfull During the Confusions and Revolutions of Government, etc., London, 1648.

Autobiography of Sir John Bramston, Camden Society, eds., London, 1845.

Bird, William, The Magazine of Honour, etc., London, 1642.

Brathwaite, Richard, The English Gentlemen, etc., 3rd Edition, London, 1641.

Brathwaite, Richard, The English Gentlewoman, London 1631.

Brathwaite, Richard, Times Treasury, etc., London, 1652.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Browne, Humphrey, A Map of the Microcosme; or, A Morall Description of Man. Newly Compiled into Essayes, etc., London, 1642.

Charles I In 1646: Letters of King Charles The First To Queen Henrietta Maria, John Bruce, ed., Camden Society, London, 1856.

Clarendon, Edward, Earl of, The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, Together With an Historical View of the Affairs of Ireland, Oxford, 1849, 7 vols.

Cotton, John, The Bloody Tenent, etc., London, 1647.

Fuller, Thomas, The Holy State, etc., Cambridge, 1642.

Goodwin, John, The Butchers Blessing, London, 1642.

Harleian Miscellany, London, 1812, 12 vols.

Hawkins, Francis, Youths Behavior, London, 1651.

Markham, Gervase, The Souldiers Exercise, 3rd Edition, London, 1643.

Maseres, Baron Francis, Select Tracts Relating to the Civil Wars in England in the Reign of King Charles the First, London, 1815, 2 vols.

Milton, John, Areopagitica, 1928 Impression, Oxford, 1875.

Nicholas Papers, George F. Warner, ed., Camden Society, London, 1886.

Old Book Collectors Miscellany, London, 1872, vol. iii.

Quarles, Francis, Enchyridion, London, 1641.

Quarles, Francis, Observations Concerning Princes and States Upon Peace and Warre, etc., London, 1642.

Readings in English Social History From Contemporary Literature (1603-1643), R. B. Morgan, ed., Cambridge, 1922, vol. iv.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Rushworth, John, Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, London, 1721, 7 vols.

Verney, Sir Ralph, Verney Papers, John Bruce, ed., Camden Society, London, 1845.

Whitelock, Sir Bulstrode, Memorials of the English Affair, new edition, J. Tonson, London, 1732.

Secondary Works

Arundell, Thomas, Historical Reminiscences of the City of London and its Livery Companies, London, Richard Bentley, 1869.

Brett-James, Norman G., The Growth of Stuart London, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1935.

Boynton, Percy H., London In English Literature, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1913.

Clode, Charles M., London During the Great Rebellion, London, Harrison and Sons, 1892.

Coate, Mary, Social Life in Stuart England, New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1924.

Compton-Rickett, Arthur, The London Life of Yesterday, London, Constable and Co., Ltd., 1909.

Davies, Godfrey, The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937.

DeSoet, Frans D., Puritan and Royalist Literature in the Seventeenth Century, Delft, 1932.

Douglas-Irvine, Helen, History of London, New York, James Pott and Co., 1912.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution, 1603-1660, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

- Godfrey, Elizabeth, Home Life Under the Stuarts, 1603-1649, New York, E. P. Dutton and Co., 1903.
- Godfrey, Elizabeth, Social Life Under the Stuarts, London, Grant Richards, 1904.
- Hazlitt, W. Carew, The Livery Companies of the City of London, etc., London, Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1892.
- Heath, John Benjamin, some Account of the Worshipful Company of Grocers of the City of London, Second Edition, London, 1854.
- Herbert, William, The History of the Twelve Great Livery Companies of London, London, 1836, 2 vols.
- Hyamson, Albert M., A History of the Jews in England, Second Edition, London, Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1928.
- James, Margaret, Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution, London, George Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1930.
- Johnson, A. H., The History of the Worshipful Company of Drapers of London, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922, 2 vols.
- Jupp, Edward Basil, An Historical Account of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters of the City of London, London, Pickering and Chatto, 1887.
- Loftie, W. J., A History of London, London, Edward Stanford, 1883, 2 vols.
- Lubimenko, Inna, Les Relations Commerciales et Politiques de l'Angleterre Avec la Russie Avant Pierre le Grand, Paris, Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion, 1933.
- Nef, John U., The Rise of the British Coal Industry, London, George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1932, 2 vols.
- O'Donoghue, Edward G., Bridewell Hospital, Palace, Prison, Schools from the Death of Elizabeth to Modern Times, London, John Lane, The Bodley Head Limited, 1928, 2 vols.
- Powell, Chilton Latham, English Domestic Relations, 1487-1653, New York, 1917.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

- Ralph, Philip Lee, Sir Humphrey Mildmay, Royalist Gentleman; Glimpses of the English Scene, 1633-1652, New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1947.
- Scott, W. R., Joint Stock Companies, Cambridge, 1912, vol. 1.
- Sharpe, Reginald R., London and the Kingdom, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1894, 3 vols.
- Sherwell, John W., A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Guild of Saddlers of the City of London, London, Harrison and Sons, 1889.
- Smythe, W. Dumville, An Historical Account of the Worshipful Company of Girdlers, London, London, Chiswick Press, 1905.
- Unwin, George, The Gilds and Companies of London, London, Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1908.
- Victoria History of London, William Page, ed., London, Constable and Co., Ltd., 1909.
- Watson, Foster, The English Grammar Schools to 1660: Their Curriculum and Practice, Cambridge, 1908.
- Wheatley, Henry B., London, Past and Present, its History, Associations and Traditions, London, John Murray, Publisher, 1891.
- Woodward, Gertrude L., and McManaway, James G., A Check List of English Plays, 1641-1700, Chicago, Newberry Library, 1945.

Articles

- Ustick, W. Lee, "Changing Ideals of Aristocratic Character and Conduct in Seventeenth Century England," Modern Philology, XXX (1932), 147-66.
- Wolf, Lucien, "The First English Jew," Publications of the Jewish Historical Society, vol. 2, 1894-95.