A Comparative Study of the Impact of Civil War on Local Political Society in Medieval and Early Modern Hampshire

Lucy Lynch, BA Joint Honours, MA (Research)

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham

MPhil in History - 2016

Abstract

This thesis of 65,903 words offers a comparative study examining the impact of civil war on local political society in medieval and early modern Hampshire, namely the Wars of the Roses (1450-85) and the English Civil Wars (1640-1660). The comparative methodology employed here seeks to detect both contrasts and comparisons between the two periods with the intention of furthering our understanding of how civil war affected local society in pre-industrial England. In so doing, this thesis will explore the makeup of local society within Hampshire, discussing both the offices and the personnel who filled them; the relationships that existed between the local officers themselves and with central government, by examining concepts such as loyalty and allegiance (both to the locality and to central government), political and religious ideology and local independence.

Primarily this thesis has drawn upon a large corpus of primary sources, much of which is drawn from the National Archives, including records of the King's Bench, the Patent, Close and Fine Rolls, Pipe Rolls and the State Papers, as well as secondary literature for both the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries, thereby drawing upon various debates and historiographical ideas surrounding these two periods.

This thesis is divided into three sections: the first examines Hampshire's local society during the fifteenth century; the second focuses on the seventeenth century; with the third drawing together their conclusions to explore where similarities and divergences are apparent between the two periods.

Acknowledgements

I would like to dedicate this work to my father, James, who is sadly no longer around to read it. I know he would have been proud.

There are so many people whose support has helped me keep focus and made this thesis possible and I would like to thank all of my friends who have provided constant help and positivity along the way. A special thanks to Dr. Alan Kissane, Dr. Matthew Phillips, Dr. Matthew Ward and Dr. Faye Taylor who have provided endless aid, proofing, advice and suggestions, all of which have been invaluable.

I would also like to thank the staff at The National Archives. Many hours were spent there whilst undertaking research and they were unfailingly helpful, making my time there pleasant and enjoyable.

My mother and brother, Francesca and Alexander, deserve special thanks. They have always encouraged, advised and taken interest in my work and without them I would not be where I am today. They are my greatest inspiration.

My final and most important thank you is to my supervisors, Dr. Gwilym Dodd and Dr. David Appleby. Without them this thesis would not have been possible. Their unfaltering encouragements, motivation, praise and continuous support is the reason I have enjoyed writing this and I will be forever grateful.

Abbreviations

CCR	*Calendar of the Close Rolls*
CFR	*Calendar of the Fine Rolls*
CPR	*Calendar of the Patent Rolls*
C	*Chancery*
Hist. MSS. Comm.	*Historical Manuscripts Commission.*
VCH	*Victoria County History*
HRO	Hampshire Record Office

Map of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight

Table of Contents

Introduction

This thesis offers a comparative study of Hampshire in the periods of civil conflict commonly known as 'The Wars of the Roses' (1450-1485) and the 'English Civil Wars and the Interregnum' (1640-1660). These two conflicts, pivotal in English history, have only been studied as isolated phenomena: to date no historian has considered them together, comparing and contrasting how England and its population fared during these most turbulent of times. Hampshire was an important county, for it contained Winchester, once the capital of England and the location of the oldest and most important English diocese, finding its origins in the pre-conquest era in 676. In the medieval period the Bishop of Winchester was a wealthy and powerful landowner in the county, listed on many local commissions. For the earlier period, William Waynflete was bishop for the entirety of the period in question. The Long Parliament did away with episcopal church government in the 1640s, and confiscated episcopal estates. Many of these estates came into the hands of acquisitive local landowners, further enhancing the new owners' local status. As well as this, Hampshire also encompassed the strategically important Solent which included the Isle of Wight, Portsmouth and Southampton. The county's proximity to London meant that it was never far from central turmoil, especially during the wars of the seventeenth century when the county experienced considerable military activity on its soil.[1]

Comparative history can be a useful tool in order to further our understanding of human behaviour and historical phenomena. Raymond Grew's analysis of the comparative approach suggests a number of advantages, including identifying historical problems, designing appropriate research and reaching and testing significant conclusions.[2] The fifteenth and seventeenth centuries are particularly suited to comparative study because there has been a wealth of county studies focusing on both centuries.[3] This provides a framework for exploring

[1] These points will be explored at further relevant points throughout this thesis. See Appendix 1 for a full chronology and further detail of military activity in the county.

[2] R. Grew, 'The case for comparing histories', *The American Historical Review,* vol. 85, no. 4 (1980), p. 769.

[3] These include; E. Acheson, *A Gentry Community: Leicestershire in the Fifteenth Century, c.1422-c.1485* (Cambridge, 1992), M. J. Bennett, 'A county community: social cohesion amongst the Cheshire gentry, 1400-1425*', Northern History,* 8 (1973), pp. 24-44, C. Carpenter, *Locality and Polity: A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society, 1401-1499* (Cambridge, 1992), J. Eales, *Community and Disunity: Kent and the English Civil*

the inner workings, structure and resilience of pre-industrial local political society by investigating whether the changing position of the gentry and central government had a different social and political impact on the localities. Investigating how local gentry communities coped with the turmoil and upheaval of civil war invites some consideration of key concepts, including loyalty and allegiance (both between the locality and central government and within the local community itself), the factious religious and political ideologies that were emerging, royal authority and local independence. Whilst it is certain that there will be contrasts between periods, especially regarding political and religious ideology, this thesis seeks to identify whether any continuities existed in how the respective local elites responded to domestic turmoil.

In her work on the theory and conceptual understanding of comparative history, Victoria Bonnell writes that frequently historians do not easily accept a comparative framework that extends beyond a single historical period, nation or culture due to their conceptions of theory and its relation to history.[4] What she means here is that, for historians, generalisation of a phenomena or statement tends to apply only to a single case, which stands in contrast to the position of sociologists who look for theories that conform to a more universal applicability.[5] This thesis, therefore, addresses this apprehension by bridging the gap between historical and sociological methodology through the comparative method as it provides a better understanding of certain phenomena reoccurring through history, in this case civil war.

During the Enlightenment, the comparative history of societies emerged as an important specialism amongst intellectuals such as Voltaire, which opened the way for further use by sociologists and economists of the nineteenth century, such as Tocqueville and Webber,

Wars, 1640-1649 (Faversham, 2001), A. Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-60* (Leicester, 1966), A. Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex, 1600- 1660* (London, 1975), C. Holmes, *Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1980), A. Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, 1987), J. S. Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-1660: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (Oxford, 1974), S. J. Payling, *Political Society in Lancastrian England: The Greater Gentry of Nottinghamshire* (Oxford, 1991), A. J. Pollard, 'The Richmondshire community of gentry during the Wars of the Roses', in C. Ross (ed.), *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England* (Gloucestershire, 1979), pp. 37-59, S. Wright, *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century*, Derbyshire Record Society (Chesterfield, 1983), A. R. Warmington, *Civil War, Interregnum and Restoration in Gloucestershire, 1640-72* (London, 1997), D. Underdown, *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum* (Newton Abbot, 1973).

[4] V. Bonnell, 'The use of theory, concepts and comparison in historical sociology', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 22, no. 2 (1980), p. 159.

[5] Bonnell, 'The use of theory, concepts and comparison in historical sociology', p. 159.

followed by Tilly, Toynbee and Bendix in the twentieth century.[6] The mid-twentieth century saw a revival in historical sociology and call for closer cooperation between the two disciplines. In the opening of his paper 'Concepts and generalisations in comparative sociological studies', when discussing the idea of social organisation in different societies, Bendix comments that 'a whole series of mutually related concepts can be elaborated deductively in an effort to construct a framework of concepts applicable to all societies.'[7] What he meant was that it was possible to formulate an overarching model which historians and social scientists could then apply when researching each and any society. Whilst this can help in detecting consistency between historical circumstance and human nature, it also risks leading to anachronistic historiography. Although there are limitations with the comparative method, as with any methodology, this thesis will explore the opportunities that a comparative approach offers. Whilst reviving the older tradition of the local study, but with a new approach and different questions, this method will help in determining how the breakdown of political consensus at the centre of government affected the localities and whether the responses of, and impact on, the gentry changed in different periods.

In terms of the limitations related to comparative methodology, Marc Bloch concluded that a 'comparison of societies far removed from each other in space and time is not without value for some purposes, but it is too imprecise to be of much use from the scientific point of view.'[8] A further danger in using this type of methodology relates to the availability of comparative sources. In particular, this study has drawn on a wealth of primary material, despite some sources existing in only one of the two periods. For example, the King's Bench records provide important information regarding the inner workings of fifteenth-century local society through the minutae of legal administrative practices, yet these do not exist in the same form for the seventeenth century. Whilst this does not altogether hinder the investigation, it is important to be aware of such problems as it is not always possible to approach the primary source material

[6] For various works using the approach, see for example; C. Tilly, L. Tilly and R. Tilly, *The Rebellious Century 1830-1930* (Cambridge, 1975), R. Bendix, *Work and Authority in Industry. Ideologies of Management in the Course of Industrialisation* (New York, 1956), N. Smelser, *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution; An Application of Theory to the British Cotton Industry* (Chicago, 1959). Both Tilly and Bendix have made significant contributions to the field of historical sociology – for further works see R. Bendix, 'Concepts and generalisations in comparative sociological studies'. *American Sociological Review,* vol. 8, no. 4 (1963), pp. 532-39 and C. Tilly, *The Vendee* (Cambridge, 1964). See also Bonnell, 'The use of theory, concepts and comparison in historical sociology', for further discussion of the method and works surrounding it.

[7] Bendix, 'Concepts and generalisations in comparative sociological studies', p. 532.

[8] M. Bloch, "Toward a Comparative History of European Societies" in F. C. Lane and J. C. Riemersma (eds.), *Enterprise and Secular Change* (Homewood, 1953), pp. 496-498.

in the same way. That said, William Sewell has argued against excessive pessimism towards a comparative methodology suggesting that,

> we should use for comparison whatever social systems will be useful in determining the validity of our hypotheses. In short, it is more appropriate to warn historians of potential pitfalls of comparisons between remote societies rather than trying to limit their comparisons to chronological and geographical neighbours.[9]

Sewell highlights also how it is important to remember that with any type of study, regardless of methodology, there are limitations. However, this does not imply that the methodology is flawed, only that circumspection and care are needed in its application.

Whilst this thesis examines two periods two hundred years apart, it is important to draw attention to similarities between fifteenth- and seventeenth-century local society in Hampshire. These include the nature of local office-holding, attitudes towards social hierarchy, the power of central government and the growing independence of the localities, which, along with the timelessness of human nature, transcends the distance of space and time that Bloch refers to. Perhaps the most important issue connected with the comparative method is the risk of generalisation. Many historians are unwilling to sacrifice specialism for the broader, more complicated comparative method. Use of the comparative method is challenging and it leaves the scholar open to making large generalisations – an action that every historian attempts to avoid or receives rebuke for doing so. Even so, the comparative approach to civil war in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries is especially well-served by the fact that there is an extensive body of historical literature focusing on local society in the both centuries, and there has been a clear cross-fertilisation of ideas applied in both periods, with an obvious overlap and a similar sense of uncertainty and confusion regarding the nature of local society.[10] This includes the county community debate, which, taking root within studies of early modern England soon permeated late medieval scholarship, producing both adherents and opponents

[9] W. H. Sewell, 'Marc Bloch and the Logic of Comparative History', *History and Theory*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1967), p. 215.
[10] See fn. 3 for evidence of such literature.

and directly connecting the two periods with a shared historiography.[11] Examining the same county in two separate periods also implies the existence of a common heritage (and as this thesis will show, some medieval families did manage to survive and retain local power into the early modern period), and whilst certain factors (such as religion) do present a contrast, overall applying the comparative methodology to these societies is both possible and worthwhile.

Historical studies of politics and government by nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars tended to focus upon the crown and nobility. During the second half of the twentieth century, Sir Lewis Namier pioneered the local study approach, using prosopography or collective biography in order to facilitate an analysis of the parliamentary system in the eighteenth century. Throughout his work Namier sought to demonstrate wider historical trends through the lens of local studies, thereby providing a different approach to the generally accepted Whig method of narrative history.[12] K. B. McFarlane drew upon this new approach, applying it to a medieval context, all the while stressing the importance of networks tying king, nobility and gentry together. In turn, historians began to realise that through a closer examination of the localities in England it was possible to gain a deeper understanding of how society functioned at all levels.[13] The impact of this was that in the latter part of the twentieth century there was an abundance of county studies, many of which drew the same general conclusion which suggested that the group known as 'the gentry' were keen to remain neutral at times of national political crisis in order to protect their growing estates and status. It was therefore apparent that their role in society was changing as they were slowly drawn into the national political arena as their position of rulers of the localities grew.

Defining who 'the gentry' actually were has been problematic for historians for many years, with G. E. Mingay commenting that in its broadest sense the term 'gentry' is more vague than helpful.[14] For the purpose of this thesis, it is important to understand how this term relates to local society in Hampshire because these were the people who held most of the important local offices, and who are therefore the basis of this thesis. The main problem with the term is that

[11] The county community debate and its historiography will be addressed fully in the following sections, for example see p. 29. It began with Alan Everitt who saw England as a collection of insular, partially independent states with a mistrust of central government. This theory was refuted by many historians, such as Ann Hughes and Clive Holmes which in turn led to other contributions from different scholars.

[12] http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/historians/namier_lewis.html - accessed 20th May 2015.

[13] See, for example, K. B. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England: The Ford Lectures 1953 and Related Studies* (Oxford, 1973), for discussion relating to this topic.

[14] G. E. Mingay, *The Gentry: The Rise and Fall of a Ruling Class* (London, 1976), p. 1.

people in the Middle Ages did not refer to themselves as the gentry and the term was not used prior to the sixteenth century: it is, in other words, an early modern construct that remains without firm definition.[15] There is a large amount of historiography for both periods relating to the definition and emergence of this group. Peter Coss, for example, defines the gentry as a type of lesser nobility whose identity began within the county.[16] Devoting more sustained attention to the definition of the gentry, some historians have also spent time dividing them into sub groups, for example, Chris Given-Wilson has defined three types of gentry - the greater, the lesser and the county. He classed the 'greater gentry' as families with an income in excess of £1000 per annum, holding between them about 15% of the land in England; the 'lesser gentry' with an income ranging from £250 and £1000 per annum, holding about 12.5% of land; and the 'country gentlemen' with an income of about £250, holding around one quarter of the land in the country.[17] Similarly, J. Lander dismissed a vague and ambiguous definition stating that the gentry 'in spite of extensive kinship networks, were far from being a homogenous, countrywide group. Their thickness on the ground varied from area to area as did their wealth.'[18] Lander's point relates directly to the county community debate in that he demonstrated how important it is not to make generalisations about the provinces as regional differences were significant. On the other hand, turning to the seventeenth century, Alan Everitt, in his investigations of the local officers and the general political and administrative structure of the locality, suggested that 'in general the Kentish gentry began to emerge in the thirteenth or early fourteenth century, as small freeholders, often taking their name from the land they held.'[19] Anthony Fletcher also wrote that the 'Stuart gentry as a social class are hard to define….men who had acquired some of the accepted marks of gentility….were constantly claiming to be gentlemen'.[20] Keith Wrightson offers interesting and informative discussion in his *English Society* on how seventeenth-century contemporaries defined local society -

[15] R. Radulescu and A. Truelove (eds.), *Gentry Culture in Late Medieval England* (Manchester, 2005), p. 2.

[16] P. Coss, *The Origins of the Gentry* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 248. For further discussion of the origins of the gentry see for example, G. Harriss. 'Society and the Growth of Government in Late Medieval England', *Past and Present*, no 138 (1993), p.138; P. Coss, 'The Formation of the English Gentry', *Past and Present*, no. 147 (1995), pp. 38-64; M. Mercer, *The Medieval Gentry: Power, Leadership and Choice during the Wars of the Roses* (London, 2010); C. Carpenter, 'Gentry and Community in Medieval England', *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 33, no. 4, Vill, Guild, and Gentry: Forces of Community in Later Medieval England (1994), pp. 340-380.

[17] C. Given-Wilson, *English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages* (London, 1996), p. 69.

[18] J. Lander, 'The significance of the county in English government', in P. Fleming, A. Gross and J. R. Lander (eds.), *Regionalism and Revision: The Crown and its Provinces in England, 1200-1650* (London, 1998), p. 20.

[19] Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion*, p. 37.

[20] Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War*, pp. 22-23.

highlighting that whilst 'gentility was broadly defined in terms of birth and blood' it could also be achieved as well as inherited and that as a status it was 'dependent upon a compound of occupation, wealth and life-style in addition to, and sometimes independent of, birth'.[21] As well as disagreement between scholars regarding a definition, so too were there disagreements between contemporaries with many stressing different aspects for qualification.

It is almost impossible to avoid generalisations when discussing a group as a whole; however, what can be said is that the gentry formed the group below the aristocracy – they were local officials and large local landowners. In the thirteenth century the territorial elite was enhanced during the second half of the century as judicial and other commissions fell to a more restricted sector of the community.[22] Coss states that by the mid-fourteenth century all of the major ingredients which constituted the English gentry were in place 'with a central forum for the articulation of its interests, allowing opinion to take shape in the localities and to be effectively communicated.'[23] From this slow emergence and growth in the power of the local elite there began to develop clearly codified ranks, typically termed as knights, esquires, or gentlemen, thus supporting Coss's view that the gentry emerged as 'a part society'.[24] Everitt essentially suggested something similar for his study of Kent, which sparked much opposition from other local historians, both in medieval and early modern scholarship.[25] However, the structure of local society can be envisaged as a pyramid shape with the top elite holding large amounts of land and the top offices within local administration and politics. It was these landowners and growing office-holders who can be defined as 'the gentry'.

In many of the counties in England in both periods there was often a dominant noble, although someone who was not necessarily based there permanently. This prompts the question: who ruled the shire, gentry or nobility? Carpenter has suggested that during the fifteenth century the gentry elites governed rather than the nobles, because 'noble power was not exercised at county

[21] K. Wrightson, *English Society, 1580-1680* (London, 1982), p. 28. Wrightson draws upon the ideas of contemporaries William Harrison, Sir Thomas Wilson and Gregory King, providing invaluable insight into contemporary interpretation of local society. See pp. 25-31 especially.
[22] Coss, *The Origins of the Gentry*, p. 248.
[23] Coss, *The Origins of the Gentry*, p. 251.
[24] Coss, *The Origins of the Gentry*, p. 251.
[25] See Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion*. For further discussion and works relating to this subject see pp. 28-9, 35, 44, 68-70.

level'.[26] Fletcher echoes these sentiments in his discussion of the gentry during the seventeenth century, stating that by the 1620s the nobility no longer controlled the county and the gentry were the unchallenged rulers of the countryside.[27] Although local men grew in importance both locally and nationally, this was a gradual process, and in the fifteenth century the civil strife resulted in some localities essentially running themselves without central interference. This also awakened central government to the reality that the local officers were not simply at their disposal but were a powerful group in their own right, controlling the majority, if not all, of the political and administrative workings within the localities. Such developments remain central to this thesis.

Both periods experienced political upheaval and constitutional chaos at the centre of government. The Wars of the Roses were dynastic struggles between rival claimants to the throne descended from the House of Plantagenet and intermittent warfare with a total of six changes in regime and five usurpations in a forty-year period.[28] The English Civil Wars, however, were far less clear-cut in their nature, involving a mixture of constitutional and religious factions resulting in unprecedented situations, including the public beheading of the king and the inception of the English Commonwealth followed by Cromwell's Protectorate. Whilst the English Civil Wars were far more cataclysmic for both local and national society than the Wars of the Roses, the strain placed on the localities was similar in that it threatened the position and fortune of the local elite. Perhaps the main difference was that due to the different nature of the two conflicts the seventeenth-century gentry (certainly royalists and moderate parliamentarians) were not just worried about the threat to the fortunes of their individual families, but of the perceived threat to the whole social order, attitudes which will be scrutinized to see not only how they coped but also what type of survival strategies they employed in order to protect their positions as local leaders.

Both conflicts have generated a wealth of literature encompassing various theories and debates regarding their origins, events and legacy. Whilst it is impossible to address all of these issues here it is nevertheless worth highlighting that both periods share adherents of the idea that the

[26] Carpenter, 'Gentry and Community in Medieval England', p. 356.
[27] Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War*, pp. 23, 57.
[28] For a comprehensive chronology of both periods, see Appendix 1.

gentry were in some way responsible for the wars. For example, K. B. McFarlane believed that the wars of the fifteenth century originated at the very centre of the English polity, with the inadequacy of the monarch: 'Henry VI's head', he wrote, 'was too small for his father's crown'.[29] R. L. Storey, on the other hand, believed that their origins were to be found not at the centre of the English state, but in the localities, as the cumulative outcome of escalating private feuds, bastard feudalism and violence between aristocrats. [30] Storey's theory received little support, with the majority of historians adopting McFarlane's view because the reality was that had Henry VI been an able ruler there would have been less of a reason for the country to descend into civil war.[31] Similarly for the seventeenth century R. H. Tawney, Lawrence Stone and Christopher Hill all argue that the gentry were the major cause of chaos as they were rising economically and their desire for this economic success to be reflected in enhanced political power led to civil war. Their theory came under attack by Hugh Trevor-Roper who suggested that whilst the office-holders and lawyers were prospering, the lesser gentry were actually in decline.[32] Again, like Storey, the arguments of the 'rising gentry' school were disputed and dismissed. The problem surrounding this historiography is that the theories are overly simplistic and do not consider the complexity of local society and its interaction with central government. This thesis will not only address in detail the structure and inner workings of the provinces, but it will also investigate the relations between central and local government in order to obtain a deeper understanding of the complex and diverse nature of local society in pre-industrial England.

This thesis is divided into three sections. The first two detail the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries, with the third providing the comparative framework previously discussed. More specifically, the first two sections are divided into sub-chapters, firstly examining the general

[29] K. B. McFarlane, 'The Wars of the Roses', *Proceedings of the British Academy,* 50 (1964), p. 239.
[30] R. L. Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster* (New York, 1967), pp. 27-8. For further discussion on 'bastard feudalism' see p. 98. See also P. Coss, 'Bastard Feudalism Revised', *Past and Present,* no. 125 (1989), pp. 27-64 for useful discussion surrounding the topic. See also K. B. McFarlane, 'Bastard Feudalism', *Bulletin for the Institute of Historical Research,* xx (1945), pp. 161-80.
[31] For example see A. J. Pollard, *The Wars of the Roses* (New York, 1988), p. 66 and K. Dockray, 'The Origins of the Wars of the Roses', in A. J. Pollard (ed.), *The Wars of the Roses* (New York, 1995), p. 88. Both historians agree that Storey's argument is not as convincing as McFarlane's.
[32] See R. H. Tawney, 'The Rise of the Gentry, 1558-1640', *Economic History Review,* vol. 11, no. 1 (1941), pp. 1-38; L. Stone, 'The Anatomy of the Elizabethan Aristocracy', *Economic History Review,* vol. 18. no. 1 (1948), pp. 1-53; C. Hill, *The English Revolution, 1640* (1940), H. Trevor-Roper, 'The social origins of the Great Rebellion' *History Today,* vol. 5 (1955), pp. 376-382.

composition of local political society in Hampshire and the available offices, along with the office-holding personnel in each period, followed by a detailed investigation into the relationships that existed between the gentry at a local county level on the one hand, then between central government and the localities on the other. The point of this investigation is to gain an enhanced understanding of the nature of pre-industrial local society and how it responded to national tensions and domestic turmoil at the centre which then filtered down into the provinces. The concepts of loyalty and allegiance will be considered throughout and whilst they are extremely complex in both periods this thesis seeks to investigate the wider principle of loyalty between the localities and central government, as well as on a local level amongst the office-holding elite. The comparative element of the thesis will then explore if and how loyalties changed between periods amongst the county elite. Royal authority and local independence will also be discussed, along with the political and religious ideologies that existed in each period, in order to draw conclusions about how the relationship between national and local society operated in similar contexts but different historical periods. Whilst there have been many county studies over the last century for both the fifteenth and the seventeenth centuries, there has not been a comparative study exploring both periods together. This thesis will therefore provide new and important contributions to our understanding of conflict, government and society in pre-industrial England and whether the two hundred years between the two periods made a large difference in how local society coped with the strain of civil war.

The Fifteenth Century

This chapter focuses on the period of civil unrest in fifteenth-century Hampshire and explores the lives and the relationships of the local gentry both at a local and a national level. It specifically covers the period from 1455 to 1485.[1] Following the end of Richard, duke of York's Protectorate the wars began with the first battle of St Albans (1455) followed by sporadic episodes of fighting throughout the 1450s, 60s, 70s and 80s. Richard was killed (1460) and his son Edward took the crown and became Edward IV of England (1461). Following Edward's secret marriage to Elizabeth Woodville (1464) the earl of Warwick formed an alliance with Edward's treacherous brother George and invaded the country forcing Edward to flee to Burgundy (1470). Henry VI took the throne, however a year later Edward landed and after defeating the Lancastrians was restored to the throne (1471) where he remained until his death (1483). His death was sudden and his brother Richard of Gloucester was made Protector, shortly after placing Edward's children in the Tower. Following Buckingham's rebellion in opposition to Richard's rule (1483) Richard failed to gain full support from the country and was finally defeated by Henry Tudor at Bosworth (1485). Whilst it appears that most of the struggles seem to be at the centre, a Victorian historian, William Denton, still believed that the lower levels of society were affected by this period of unrest, by ruined land and disease.[2] However, it has also been suggested that the Wars of the Roses were no more than a baronial war, with Kenneth Vickers commenting that 'the struggle of York and Lancaster was a "baron's war" and did not concern the commonalty.'[3] Whilst it is true that the majority of the disputes were between the crown and nobility, it would be incorrect to assume that the majority of the English population was completely unaffected.

Domestic turmoil was a strain on the country, regardless of how directly affected one might be. During the fifteenth century the gentry were eagerly attempting to enhance their position within both the local and national arenas, but civil war could hamper this process, even ruin it.

[1] See Appendix 1 for full chronology of events.

[2] W. Denton, *England in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1888), pp. 115, 118-9.

[3] K. H. Vickers, *England in the Later Middle Ages* (Methuen, 1913), pp. 439, 494; See also A. Makinson, 'The Wars of the Roses: who fought and why?', *History Today*, 9 (1959), p. 599; A few examples of those who believed that the wars had little impact on the everyday life of the masses include C. L. Kingsford, *Prejudice and Promise in Fifteenth-Century England* (London, 1962), p. 62; T. Rogers, *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, vol. 4 (Oxford, 1866-1902), pp. 3, 5, 23.

That said, this is open to debate and many historians, such as Peter Coss and Christine Carpenter, have concluded that the position of the gentry actually became stronger as a result of noble power weakening.[4] Both the crown and magnates became preoccupied with civil unrest, which, in turn, led to a lack of authority within the locality and the neglect of local grievances. This suggests that whilst conflict manifested itself mostly amongst the aristocracy its effects were felt at all levels of society. Once government became paralysed at the centre the result was lawlessness, with much of the population living in fear not just for their livelihoods but also for their lives.

Evidence of disorder throughout the country can be seen, for example, in the documents and letters relating to the Pastons of Norfolk, arguably a typical fifteenth-century gentry family. The Paston family have provided important evidence regarding the impact and struggles that plagued the fifteenth century, thanks to the survival of their extensive letters. This volume of family letters is unique, with over a thousand letters and documents surviving, and they remain vital in understanding local affairs of this time as well as the reactions of the gentry to the unrest experienced in the country. Margaret Paston, for example, wrote 'God for Hys holy mersy geve grace that ther may be set a good rewyll and a sad in this contre in hast, for I herd nevyr sey of so myche robry and manslawter in thys contre as is now within a lytyll time.[5] One of the Pastons' correspondents warned his master that 'the word [world] is right wilde…'[6] Yet during this wild period, the gentry discovered that they could run the localities without the nobility and report directly to the Crown, due to magnates becoming unavailable to manage county affairs. The impact on the gentry varied, as did their level of involvement in local and national affairs; however, there is a general consensus amongst scholars that the majority were keen to remain as detached from the domestic turmoil as possible.[7] For them, the acquisition and maintenance of their estates was the key to maintaining and heightening their position. Although generalisation is problematical, however, it has been argued that familial loyalty,

[4] C. Carpenter, *Locality and Polity; A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 640: P. Coss, 'The formation of the English Gentry', *Past and Present*, no. 147 (1995), p. 61.

[5] J. Gairdner (ed.), *The Paston Letters 1422-1509*, vol. II (Edinburgh, 1910), no. 435.

[6] Gairdner, *The Paston Letters*, no. 399.

[7] For example, Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, p. 621; M. Mercer, *Medieval Gentry: Power, Leaderships and Choice during the Wars of the Roses* (London, 2010), pp. 128-130. Mercer also agrees that loyalty was a concept which had many different meanings and that it 'was a malleable concept that could be, and was, moulded according to circumstance.' p. 77.

maintenance of lands and properties and, arguably most importantly, the strengthening of the family's position were the most important things to the fifteenth-century gentry.[8]

The late fifteenth century saw immense political upheaval and so perhaps it is to be expected, therefore, that local office-holders would also change depending on who sat on the throne at any one time because they were Crown nominees and if there was turmoil at the centre this would inevitably filter down into the localities. This assumption has been disputed and as the county community debate has already shown, every county and locality produced different results depending on numerous factors. [9] This chapter seeks to address these ideas and debates as well as to explore the impact of this period of political turmoil on those leading land and office-holders.

Before this, however, it is important to note the problems of sources during this period. The difficulty facing any late medieval historian focussing on the fifteenth century, in particular from *c*.1450 onwards, is that there is a lack of surviving records. The National Archives (TNA) holds numerous different record series, many of which remain in excellent condition; however, there is a scarcity during this period and it seems that in general Hampshire is particularly ill-served compared to other counties. For example, the records relating to the Justices of Gaol Delivery (JUST 3) completely disappear by 1476 and those that have survived prior to this date do not relate to the county of Hampshire. The index associated with this series held in TNA states that the assize clerks of the fifteenth century ceased to prepare enrolments from the separate files that they kept for gaol deliveries and assizes respectively and ceased to return either files or rolls to the Exchequer.[10] Similarly the Parliamentary Election Writs and Returns (C 219) appear to have suffered the same fate, with no relevant records relating to Hampshire postdating 1450. Whilst other series do shed light on the county during this period, they are not abundant. Dr Lander has blamed the thinness of some of these series on contemporary administrative inefficiency and suggested that the information available to the Chancery was in some degree defective as the clerks found difficulty in keeping their information about

[8] See previous footnote.
[9] This will be discussed later in this chapter with relation to Hampshire. See for example J. R. Lander, *English Justices of the Peace, 1461-1509* (Gloucester, 1989), p. 163; S. Wright, *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century*, Derbyshire Record Society (Chesterfield, 1983), p. 93, and A. E. Acheson, *Gentry Community: Leicestershire in the Fifteenth Century, c.1422 - c.1485* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 132.
[10] Carpenter supports this finding in her discussion of the use of legal records in *Locality and Polity*, p. 706.

families and individuals up to date.[11]

That said, some series have survived and are more or less complete, yet they are not without limitations. Carpenter provides a useful discussion on the use and problems of legal records, such as the King's Bench series, in her local study of Warwickshire.[12] She has suggested that whilst it is vital to utilise these records as far and away the best source for events in the localities, there is a need for caution as historians can place too much reliance on them and misinterpret their meaning.[13] Similarly Bertha Putnam has discussed the issues scholars are faced with when approaching studies of a local nature, especially relating to the justices of the peace, suggesting the main problem is that the information tends to be scattered among all classes of Chancery and Exchequer records.[14] That said, the fifteenth century is at least blessed with a fairly complete series of King's Bench records, and whilst their sheer size and composition presents an arduous task for the historian, they do nevertheless provide useful insight into fifteenth-century political society at a local level. Nonetheless, it is important to be aware of the limitations surrounding these types of records. They do shed light on certain elements of the locality, showing, for example, which individuals were causing trouble in the localities, who was sitting on the Bench presiding over such cases and even at times suggesting who was allied with whom. However, the records do not in general indicate the outcome of each case and they are often illegible, leaving the historian with limited scope to draw their conclusions.

(i)

The Local Office and Landowners

In contrast to counties such as Warwickshire, Norfolk or Suffolk, Hampshire did not have a dominant resident noble family during the fifteenth century, nor was it part of the Duchy of Lancaster lands where crown control was far stronger. Local gentry officers therefore tended

[11] Lander, *English Justices of the Peace,* p. 19. This idea was taken from H. Miller, *Henry VIII and the English Nobility* (Oxford, 1986), p. 10. Miller suggests that news tended to travel slowly and the clerks were infrequently left in ignorance or doubt.

[12] Carpenter, *Locality and Polity,* Appendix 4.

[13] Carpenter, *Locality and Polity,* pp. 705-709. She also highlights many other studies that relate to the problems of sources in the fifteenth century, p. 705.

[14] B. Putnam, *Proceedings before the Justices of the Peace: in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, Edward III to Richard III,* edited for the Ames Foundation by Bertha Haven Putnam. With a commentary by Theodore F. T. Plucknett (London, 1938), p. cxxxix; see also the introduction.

to take the lead in the administration of county affairs. Three main offices drew the attention of the gentry class: the shrievalty, the commission of the peace and those who represented the shire in parliament, the MPs. The office of the sheriff had declined in power in comparison to its prominence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but it still retained a key position, which was to administer locally all the writs issued by the royal government as well as acting as a figurehead for the county during times of political crisis. In his examination of the fourteenth-century sheriff, Richard Gorski concludes that to the question of why particular men were appointed as sheriffs there is no adequate single answer.[15] However, what can be deduced is that sheriffs were an elite within the office-holding community. In the 1258 Provisions of Oxford, a clause relating to the shreivalty stated that the sheriff had to be a substantial freeholder, a vavasour of the county and should serve for only one year.[16] By the turn of the fourteenth century the sheriffs received their commissions from the Exchequer under the authority of its own seal. The potential for abuse by the Treasurer, however, led to the adoption of a new method of appointment in 1311.[17] The Ordinances of that year established that sheriffs should be appointed collectively and under the great seal, by the Chancellor, the Treasurer and Privy Council, or if the chancellor was absent, by the Treasurer, Barons of the Exchequer and the justices of the bench.[18] Gorski believes that affiliations of a personal or political nature were essential in determining the composition of the medieval office-holding community.[19] Patronage and lordship operated alongside more formal criteria, like wealth and locality and most importantly land-holding. This assumption is in fact supported by the statute of April 1328 which confirmed the Statute of Sheriffs, made at Lincoln in 1315 under Edward II, specifying that 'sheriffs, hundreders and bailiffs shall be of such people as have lands in the same shires or bailiwicks'.[20] This evidence suggests that there was an expectation on the part of local communities that their principal office-holders should be 'local men'. This rule may

[15] R. Gorski, *The Fourteenth-Century Sheriff: English Local Administration in the Late Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2003), p. 160.
[16] H. Rothwell (ed.), *English Historical Documents, 1189-1327* (London, 1975), p. 365. See also N. Saul *Knights and Esquires: The Gloucestershire Gentry in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1981), p. 108.
[17] J. C. Davies, *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (Cambridge, 1918), p. 522.
[18] Gorski, *The Fourteenth-Century Sheriff*, p. 12. See also Saul, *Knights and Esquires*, p. 106; A. Luders, T. Edlyn Tomlins, J. France, W. E. Tauton and J. Raithby (eds.), *The Statues of the Realm, 1101-1713* (London, 1810-28), vol. I, p. 160.
[19] Gorski, *The Fourteenth-Century Sheriff*, p. 15. Gorski also relates his discussion to the works of K. B. Macfarlane, especially that of 'bastard feudalism'. For a good overview of this topic see K. B. Macfarlane, 'Bastard Feudalism' in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays* (London, 1981), pp. 23-45.
[20] Statute Rolls, vol. I, p. 258. For the Statute of Lincoln see 9 Edw II.

not always have been completely adhered to,[21] however the point is that the crown could not appoint somebody who had absolutely no connection whatsoever with the county where his office was. Gorski determined that it is near to impossible to account for every individual appointment of sheriffs, yet this conclusion applies to the other offices within local administration. It must be noted that the king had a voice in the process and locally generated information about prospective officials, whether in the form of magnate canvassing or gentry co-opting, was refracted through the Chancery, council and Exchequer. These bodies appointed officials both centrally and locally, with differing views on eligibility and suitability for the role and with access to different information.[22] As with most examinations regarding local society, this process would also vary from county to county, depending on the make-up of the county elite amongst other factors.[23]

As opposed to the declining authority of the sheriff, the Justices of the Peace (JP) experienced an increase in their power during the second half of the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries and so by this period were occupying some of the most desirable positions within local society. It was this increase in influence that saw them gain ground as administrators, with greater powers, especially economic, granted under new statutes and through supplementary mandates.[24] Walker writes that originally the wide-ranging military and police powers were 'committed on an emergency basis to a small group of royal officials, acting as keepers of the peace' and by the reign of Edward III they had evolved into a permanent commission of the peace in each county.[25] This then united magnates, royal justices and local gentry in fulfilling a range of judicial and administrative duties. The final office, that of MP, carried immense prestige due to the direct connection to the crown and central government. The office of MP had little influence upon the day-to-day activity of county affairs, however, it could represent the locality in parliament and present petitions to the king, which in turn made them a very important group within the locality. John Maddicott, for example, vigorously argued his case for treating the fourteenth-century shire as an active and politically-minded

[21] This can be seen with the Berkeleys, see p. 23. Whilst they did have land ties to Hampshire, they were originally from Gloucestershire and yet they held significant offices throughout the period. What was considered as 'local' clearly proved problematic for contemporaries too.
[22] Gorski, *The Fourteenth-Century Sheriff*, pp. 11-20.
[23] Christine Carpenter touches on this point in her study of Warwickshire (p. 277) stating that the appointment of officers within the locality would have varied according to the power structure within each county, to the capacities of the local nobility and to the situation in which they found themselves.
[24] Putnam, *Proceedings before the Justices of the Peace*, p. cxxx.
[25] S. Walker, 'Yorkshire Justices of the Peace, 1389-1413', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 108, no. 427 (1983), p. 281.

community.[26] From the early fourteenth century the writs for election were regularly sent to each sheriff to find two knights from his shire and two citizens from each borough and send them to parliament as representatives for the county. It was in the interest of the shire to have an experienced representative in parliament and it was the desire of local knights and esquires to speak for their shire leading to a relationship of mutual interest.[27] Simon Payling has established that the electoral process of parliamentary election underwent changes following the statute of 1406.[28] Prior to this, the choice of MPs was the concern of the very restricted elite.[29] However, by the early fifteenth century, Payling concludes that whilst the representatives of baronial interests still continued to play a part in elections, theirs was no longer the dominant role. When consensus broke down amongst the elite during election days, it tended to be those lower down the political spectrum, such as the 'mere 40s freeholders', who would provide the decisive vote.[30]

In Derbyshire during the fifteenth century, Susan Wright pointed out that in the absence for most of the period of a dominant magnate it is difficult to ascertain the identities of those who advised the crown on whom to appoint to the Bench. [31] The advice of regional magnates and ecclesiastics would inevitably reflect the present realities of the local gentry power structure. Hampshire, like Derbyshire, did not have a dominant magnate associated with the county; however, there is plenty of evidence to show that a number of men associated with the crown played a prominent part in local affairs. Though Hampshire did not have dominant local magnate – meaning there was not a noble family based permanently within the county – it did contain the richest see in medieval England. This was occupied by William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester, who remained in office throughout the whole of the second half of the fifteenth century, from 1447 to 1486, and sat on many of the peace commissions in the county during the period.[32] He was close to the famously pious Henry VI and whilst it was thought that he

[26] J. R. Maddicott, 'The county community and the making of public opinion in fourteenth-century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 28 (1978), pp. 27-43.
[27] Saul, *Knights and Esquires*, p. 127. See also S. Payling, 'County parliamentary elections in fifteenth-century England', *Parliamentary History*, vol 18 (1999), pp. 237-259.
[28] Payling,'County parliamentary elections in fifteenth-century England', p. 237.
[29] Payling provides examples of this in his article, one dating from 1318, whereby Matthew Crawthorne had complained that he had chosen one of the county knights but that the sheriff had returned another in his place 'against the will of the said community', p. 238.
[30] Payling, 'County parliamentary elections in fifteenth-century England', p. 257. See Appendix 3 for a full list of the MPs for Hampshire in this period
[31] Wright, *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 97.
[32] *CPR, 1452-61*, p. 677; *1461-67*, p. 571*; 1467-77*, p. 629; *1476-85*, p. 572. Waynflete also sat on the peace commissions in other counties; Berkshire, *CPR, 1452-61*, p. 660; *1461-67*, p. 559; *1467-77*, p. 608; *1477-85*, p. 554; Buckinghamshire, *CPR, 1452-61*, p. 661; *1461-67*, p. 560; Somerset, *CPR, 1452-61*, p. 676; *1467-77*, p.

had limited political interests, it was impossible for him to remain aloof from affairs during this period of political strife. Chandler's biography of the bishop highlights that he remained in his position throughout the regime changes of 1461, 1470-1 and 1483-5, drawing attention to the fact that despite his close friendship with Henry and the Lancastrians, Edward IV immediately favoured him. That he did not suffer setbacks may well be an example of the Church remaining separate from domestic turmoil; however, it may also be a tribute to his personal merit and high reputation.[33] Of the eight bishops who had all been originally appointed under Henry VI and who had supported the Readeption, six of these were pardoned by Edward IV, with Waynflete being one of them.[34] This may also be a sign that Edward IV wanted to build bridges with moderate Lancastrians. Waynflete may not have been hugely active in the running of local county affairs, however due to his large land-holding within the county and important position as bishop of Winchester it is unsurprising that he was appointed to the peace commissions.

Alongside Waynflete there were also other members of the aristocracy who were listed as sitting on the peace commissions, although their physical presence, like Waynflete, is dubious. Thomas, bishop of Bath and Wells and William, earl of Arundel are both listed as having been appointed to the commissions for Hampshire with Waynflete on nearly all of the commissions between 1452 and 1485; and there is also evidence of both Richard, duke of Gloucester and George, duke of Clarence being appointed to Hampshire commissions during the 1460s and 1470s.[35] In his article examining the justices of the peace in Yorkshire in the later fourteenth century, Simon Walker addressed the idea that the crown began to place its men on various commissions within the localities in order to increase its control and influence. However, he concluded that within Yorkshire those who were appointed to the office were either men who came from the social elite within the county 'for whom a seat on the bench was only one rung on the *cursus honorum* of county government', or men who were not necessarily positioned within the ranks of the greater gentry but whose position was due to their administrative or

628; Surrey, *CPR, 1452-61*, p. 678; *1461-67*, p. 571; *1467-77*, p. 631; *1477-85*, p. 574; Wiltshire, *CPR, 1452-61*, p. 681; *1461-67*, p. 575; *1467-77*. p. 635; *1476-85*, p. 577. He also sporadically sat on commissions in Middlesex, Oxford and Sussex.

[33] R. Chandler, *The Life of William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester* (1911), p. 110. Whilst clearly identifying closely with the Lancastrians, Waynflete is shown to have acted as a mediator almost between the two sides as certain times. He was a member of the protectorate council alongside the duke of York during Henry's period of insanity and he was instrumental in the organisation of 'love day' in March 1458.

[34] *CPR, 1467-77*, p. 259.

[35] *CPR, 1467-77*, p. 629; 1477-85, p. 572.

legal experience.[36] In order to avoid faction and disorder, those appointed to the county bench needed to have some form of acquaintance with local fora. The idea that any man appointed by the crown was perceived as an agent of a distant and intrusive power underestimates the sophistication of later medieval England.[37] Walker deduced, within Yorkshire at least, that Henry IV, rather than placing his men in certain counties and offices, strove to befriend and elevate leading county families in order to command loyalty.[38] It appears that this process met with success and continued under the kings of the late fifteenth century, for evidence shows that there was little change in the county elite during the second half of the fifteenth century. This suggests that the crown chose to reward local officers in return for loyalty as opposed to replacing them and risk disorder with local society.

The existing evidence showing who the main people were in the local offices in Hampshire is surprisingly good for the period, with an unbroken list of the sheriffs in the second half of the fifteenth century, as well as the JPs and MPs.[39] The office of sheriff was controlled more by the 'native' gentry, or residents (those whose main estate and family was based in Hampshire), throughout the period, with the majority being of either knightly or esquire status. Those who had knightly status were not native to the county, as shown in Table 1. With regards to the JPs, the resident gentry dominated slightly, however in terms of knights, as with the office of sheriff, there seems to have been more non-residents sitting on the commissions than residents, especially later on in the period, as shown in Table 2. Table 3 is shown in the same format, with the Berkeleys included as the only non-residents. Those listed as MPs are to be expected and are the main office and land holders native to the county during this time.[40]

[36] Walker, 'Yorkshire Justices of the Peace', p. 298.
[37] Walker, 'Yorkshire Justices of the Peace', 1389-1413', p. 310.
[38] Walker, 'Yorkshire Justices of the Peace, 1389-1413', p. 308.
[39] For the sheriffs of Hampshire see A. Hughes (ed.), *List of Sheriffs for England and Wales, from the Earliest Times to A.D. 1831,* Public Record Office Lists & Indexes, 9 (New York, 1963), p. 55; For JPs see *CPR, 1452-61*, p. 677; *1461-67*, p. 571; *1467-77*, p. 629; *1476-86*, p. 572; For MPs see *Lists of Members' Returns. Members of Parliament, Part 1, Parliaments of England, 1213-1702* (London, 1878), pp. 351, 358, 361, 364.
[40] For a full list of all MPs and sheriffs during this period see Appendix 3 and for full lists of JPs, see Appendix 4.

Table 1: Analysis of Sheriffs.

	1455 – 1461 (Lancastrian)	1461 – 1485 (Yorkist)
Resident Knights	-	-
Resident Esquires	7	13
Non-Resident Knights	-	3
Non-Resident Esquires	2	3*
Other	-	8
Total	**9**	**30**

**These three were the Berkeleys; Edward, Maurice and William. They held office between them 10 times throughout the Yorkist period.*

Table 2: Analysis of Commissions

	1450 – 1461 (Lancastrian)	1461 – 1485 (Yorkist)
Resident Knights	1	5
Resident Esquires	12	21
Non-Resident Knights	2	12
Non-Resident Esquires	2	2
Other	2	15
Total	**19**	**65**

Table 3: MPs of Hampshire

	1450 – 1461 (Lancastrian)	1461 – 1485 (Yorkist)
Resident	5	4+
Non-Resident	1	3*
Total	**6**	**7**

+ This includes John Hammond who was MP for Winchester and Thomas Pounde who was MP for Portsmouth.

** These three are the Berkeleys, Maurice, Edward and William.*

Sources: *The information within these tables has been collected from sources such as The History of Parliament: Biographies of the Members of the Commons House, 1439-1509; Calendar of the Patent Rolls, 1452 – 1485; Calendar of the Close Rolls, 1454 – 1485; Calendar of the Fine Rolls, 1454 – 1485 and the Victoria County History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight. Each member has only been counted once and so does not take into account men holding the office multiple times. The names remain fairly constant throughout the period, with the majority holding their various offices many times.*

The tables suggest that the majority of office-holders were resident gentry. However, there were non-residents who were established as office and land holders within the county, such as the Berkeley family. The same names and families appear all the way through the period, with very few changes even during times of significant political upheaval, notably 1461, 1470-71 and 1483-85. This suggests both the residents and non-residents combined were a uniform and consistent social group, unaffected in the main by civil strife at the centre. These findings appear consistent with other counties. For example, Susan Wright found that 'national politics did not have the immediacy in Derbyshire in the mid-fifteenth century that they had, for example, in Devon or the North'.[41] It seems that continuity was a strong theme in Derbyshire

[41] Wright, *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 145.

and the same gentry there managed to dominate the shire, unshaken by political change at the centre and factional influences. This was also the case in Hampshire. This may have been due to the absence of a dominant resident noble, for in Warwickshire there is evidence of national politics impacting on local political society, with Christine Carpenter commenting that 'at times of acute national crisis the impact of politics can be seen yet again, not just in the rather unexpected names that crop up among all the officers, but also in the sudden fall in the size of the peace commissions'.[42] She attributes this factor to the government's uncertainty about many of its more prominent subjects, such as the earl of Warwick, who dominated local power structures in Warwickshire. Without a resident nobleman, Hampshire's circumstances appear to have been very different to Warwickshire's.

Whilst the tables suggest that the resident gentry dominated county affairs, there were in fact a number of non-residents who appear on the peace commissions, and also as sheriff and MP. The fact that those who do appear as office-holders remain fairly constant throughout the period suggests that both resident and non-resident gentry managed to work together when running the county, regardless of who dominated the higher offices within political society. There were of course a number of local men who appeared sporadically on the peace commissions, however the principal resident office-holders in Hampshire during the second half of the fifteenth century were Thomas Uvedale, William Uvedale, John Wallop, John Lisle, John Paulet, Michael Skyllyng, Thomas Welles, William Sandes, John Paulet, John Whitehead, John Rogers, Thomas Troys, John Coke, Richard Darell, John Pounde, Thomas Pounde, John Brocas, William Brocas, John Hammond, Thomas Danvers, William Warbelton, Henry Bruyn, Richard Dalingrigge and John Tichebourne. Again, there were a number of non-resident knights and esquires who appear a few times as having tenuous ties to the county, but there were also a number who are listed as having sat on the commissions regularly (see Appendix 4 for a full list of JPs). The Berkeley family dominated all offices within Hampshire and could be classed as semi-resident, because their principal residence was located in Gloucestershire. Maurice, Edward and William all held numerous offices within the county including sheriff, JP and MP. Further non-residents who were regularly involved were Geoffrey Gate, Walter Moyle, Nicholas Assheton, John Audeley of Audeley, William Fienes, Henry Moore, John Blount of Mountjoy, Richard Chokke, William Stourton of Stourton, Thomas Arundel of Matravers and Anthony Wooville. The lack of turnover in terms of who was running the county

[42] Carpenter, *Locality and Polity,* p. 276.

would suggest that both resident and non-resident gentry worked together in order to maintain the status quo. This is not to say that they all got on in perfect harmony, however the evidence would suggest that no factions existed, whether this was between resident and non-resident or factions within the resident gentry themselves. Thus, in general, the cohesiveness of the locality was strong and local administration was overall unaffected by the domestic turmoil experienced at the centre.

Whilst sections two and three of this chapter will be exploring in further detail those involved in political society and the kind of relationships that emerged both at local and national level, it is worth briefly examining who the main officials were who ran the county. The Berkeley family of Beverstone in Gloucestershire and the Uvedale family of Wickham in Hampshire were perhaps the most prominent landowning and office-holding-families in the county at this time.[43] The Berkeleys were not strictly native to Hampshire, with their powerbase situated in Gloucestershire. That said, they held much land within Hampshire and might be considered semi-resident. In fact the History of Parliament biographies list Edward Berkeley as coming from Avon in Hampshire and his brother Maurice being connected to both Beverstone in Gloucestershire and Bisteren in Hampshire.[44] Maurice Berkeley, aside from holding numerous titles in other counties, was not only sheriff of Hampshire three times, but also sat on a large number of commissions during the 1450s, 60s and 70s, represented Hampshire in parliament and acquired the title of squire and then Knight of the Body between 1467-74.[45] Similarly, his brother Edward also filled a long list of positions spanning the entire second half of the fifteenth century: he was sheriff six times, listed in the returns of 1467 as MP for the county, he sat on all of the peace commissions during the period and was named Bailiff of Burley in the New Forest, as well as holding the Lieutenancy there.[46] In addition to these brothers, Maurice's son William, like his father and uncle, held the offices of sheriff and MP as well as sitting on the commissions. He also, amongst other positions, was made governor of the Isle of Wight and of Carisbrooke castle. William was in fact one of the few men connected with the county to have been attainted during Richard III's reign for high treason. He joined the Buckingham

[43] In Tables 1, 2 and 3 the Berkeleys have been counted as foreigners, despite the fact that they held just as much land in the county, if not more, as some of the native esquires and knights.
[44] J. C. Wedgwood (ed.), *History of Parliament. Biographies of the Members of the Commons House, 1439-1509* (1936), pp. 67-8.
[45] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, pp. 67-68; E 403/839. A more detailed discussion of Maurice's (and the rest of the Berkeleys') titles, relationships and which commissions he sat on will be included in the sections addressing horizontal and vertical relationships.
[46] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 67.

rebellion in 1483 (a rebellion against Richard III led by Henry Stafford, duke of Buckingham, in response to Richard's seizure of the throne and the disappearance of the two princes, Edward IV's sons) and then escaped to join Henry Tudor in Brittany, where he died. [47]

The second family to dominate Hampshire's political sphere were the Uvedales, who were resident in Hampshire, from Wickham. Thomas Uvedale, for example, sat on almost every commission between 1441 and 1473 and was appointed 56 times both on Lancastrian and Yorkist ones.[48] As well as holding many other offices in Sussex and Surrey, Thomas was also an elector for Hampshire and a sheriff. His son, William, held similar positions, although mainly during the 1480s and 90s. Alongside William Berkeley, he too rebelled with the duke of Buckingham and was attainted in 1484. Whilst he lost his estates in Wickham, he did receive a pardon in 1485.[49] He then prospered during the government of Henry VII, gaining the offices of sheriff and JP in Hampshire as well as being made a Squire of the Body in 1485.

These two families clearly took the lead in local affairs in Hampshire, monopolising the majority of the desirable offices and acquiring much land within the county. A third family, however, also stands out as having made a name for itself: the Pounde family of Drayton. In terms of office and land-holding, their portfolio was not as impressive as the Berkeleys', or the Uvedales'; nevertheless, they remained prominent as office-holders in the county during the period. Thomas Pounde was an elector for Hampshire in 1472 and acted as JP from 1461 until his death in 1476, as well as being an MP for the county in 1450-1. He was also collector of customs and subsidies at Southampton throughout the 1460s and 70s, having held this title for London in the 1440s. He also managed to retain the title of Teller of the Exchequer from 1437 until his death in 1476.[50] His son, John, followed in his fathers' footsteps as an elector for

[47] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 70*; CPR, 1476-85*, p. 423; C 81/1392/17. See also H. Ellis (ed.), *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III.* from an early translation, preserved among the mss. of the old royal library in the British museum (London, 1844), p. 200. For evidence of being attainted see C. Given-Wilson (ed.), *Parliamentary Rolls of Medieval England, 1275-1504* (Leicester, 2005), vi, p. 246. William's father Maurice was a great supporter of Edward IV, joining him in exile during the Readeption. It is likely that had he lived to see Richard's usurpation he too would have experienced the same fate as his son. Further discussion of such loyalties will be addressed in the subsequent sections.

[48] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament,* p. 900. As with the Berkeleys, a more detailed discussion of the Uvedales will take place in the subsequent sections.

[49] A. H. Doubleday and W. Page (eds.), *Victoria County History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, vol. 3 (1908), p. 234. His lands were later reclaimed by his step-mother, Elizabeth Uvedale (*CPR, 1476-85*, p. 523).

[50] *CFR, 1461-71*, pp. 4, 5, 7, 95-7, 178-9, 248, 250, 5-6, 9; Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 695; *CFR, 1452-61*, pp. 105, 107. There is also evidence showing that he was in the king's household in 1433, C 1/12/10.

Hampshire in 1467 and 1472 and as MP for Portsmouth between 1472 and 1475.[51] He sat on the commissions from 1469 onwards – not, however, during the Readeption or the reign of Richard III.

There were also a number of individuals who were active in the running of county affairs and who were just as significant in their influence and authority as these three families. John Wallop for example, a resident esquire in the county, as well as holding much land in Hampshire also held the office of sheriff, represented the county in parliament and acted as JP throughout the 1450s, 60s and 70s. He graced many of the other commissions during this period, along with the members of the Berkeley and Uvedale families and was named as an elector in the late 1440s.[52] There were also men such as John Rogers and John Lisle, both of whom were residents and conspicuous within local county affairs. John Rogers, as well as claiming the position of sheriff throughout all three decades also sat on many of the Hampshire commissions and in 1477 was appointed as constable of Winchester.[53] John Lisle was in fact one of the few resident knights involved in local politics. Having ties in both Thruxton in Hampshire and Wootton on the Isle of Wight, Lisle acted as elector in 1427, 1435, and 1437, as well as MP and sheriff during the 1440s. He was a JP from 1441 until his death in 1471, as well as an assessor of the tax in the county in 1463.[54]

There were a number of other individuals whose role in local affairs is unmistakable and they will be examined in detail, along with those already mentioned, in the following two sections. But what is important about the collective group of local officers during this period in Hampshire is that it is clear that there was very little change among the county's rulers during this period of political uncertainty. Focusing specifically on the key years of political upheaval (1460-1, 1470-1 and 1483) there are a number of examples of men being issued with pardons following acts of disloyalty. Thomas Danvers was pardoned in 1462 along with other

[51] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 695.
[52] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 916. Wallop is listed as having a large amount of land within Hampshire by the Victoria County History, including the manor of Farleigh Wallop in the Bermondspit Hundred, Wallop's manor in the parish of Soberton in the Meonstoke Hundred, the manor of Cliddesden in the Basingstoke Hundred, lands in the Andover Hundred and Kingsclere Hundred and a further man called Over Wallop. His lands appear to be predominantly in Hampshire, unlike other gentry who tended to have lands in multiple counties. See *VCH*, vol 3, pp. 261, 364; vol. 4, pp. 146, 358, 368, 258, 532.
[53] *CCR, 1476-85*, p. 51.
[54] CFR 1461-71, pp. 100, 104. Like John Wallop, Lisle is shown in the Victoria County History to have held much land in the county of Hampshire.

Lancastrian supporters and then again in 1471, John Wallop received a pardon in 1462[55] and William Stourton was pardoned by the Lancastrians in 1470 and then again by Edward IV in 1472.[56] Geoffrey Gate, a non-resident knight, who held many offices in Hampshire including sheriff and Lieutenant of the Isle of Wight, joined Warwick's rebellion in 1470 and led a band of Lancastrians to London to release political prisoners following Edward IV's flight. He too was pardoned in 1471.[57] John Lisle served with the Duke of Somerset in France in 1443, which suggests that he had Lancastrian sympathies. However, he received a pardon from Edward IV in 1462, went on to sit on the Yorkist commissions and then fought on the side of the Yorkists at Barnet in 1471. Thus despite showing hostility toward the crown during this period, these men managed to maintain their position within local political society, further emphasising the idea that there was a strong, unwavering group of men permanently occupying offices within the county. There is also evidence of a *cursus honorum*, especially amongst the Berkeleys and the Uvedales. For example, Maurice, Edward and William were all appointed as JPs and then closely followed by sheriff and MP. Thomas Uvedale was listed as a JP in the 1450s onwards but also a sheriff in this decade (and subsequent ones) and then as an MP in the returns of the 1477-8 parliament. This is almost the same for John Wallop who was listed as an MP in the returns of the 1472 parliament. The office of MP was the last to be acquired by these men, possibly because it was the most prestigious of the offices because one was expected to represent their shire – a position only bestowed on those who could be trusted by their county to act as fair and loyal representative.

Examining the lists of sheriffs, MPs and JPs is one of the most comprehensive ways of establishing who the county elite were, however there are other sources that complement this process.[58] The National Archives holds the Exchequer pipe rolls, which are the written record of the audit process of the king's accounts for one financial year, which ran from Michaelmas (29 September) to the next Michaelmas. These are arranged by county and offer a wide range of information relating the accounts of each locality, including local expenditure, records of taxation and lists of those who had received penalties. As well as providing a wealth of information about the running of the county, they also tend to list payment of wages to the leading justices within the county, which for the purpose of ascertaining who they were is very

[55]Wedgwood, *History of Parliament,* p. 916.
[56]Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 819.
[57]*CPR, 1467-77*, pp. 218, 209, 270.
[58] See Appendices 3 and 4 for detailed lists of the sheriffs, MPs and JPs for the county during this period.

useful because it shows those who were actually active as JPs. Whilst they are not listed in every year, there is enough evidence to draw conclusions as to who was in charge. The 1450s produced five records listing Hampshire men, the 1460s produced four and the 1470s only two.[59] Unsurprisingly they include Maurice Berkeley in every one. Thomas Uvedale and John Wallop are included in six and John Lisle in four. Thomas Pounde is recorded in three and William Brocas and Edward Berkeley in one. John Paulet, a resident esquire who acted as both sheriff and JP for the county, appears in three and John Philpot who acted as sheriff for the county in the 1450s in one. Thomas Welles, a resident lawyer, was also listed in five of the records. Welles was one of four lawyers to sit on the Hampshire commissions during the second half of the fifteenth century.[60] He was named as a justice of the peace from 1468 through to 1492 and he was also an assessor of the tax for the county in 1463.[61] A fellow resident lawyer, John Hammond appears in two of the records, as does William Warbelton, a resident esquire. Warbelton had ties to Hampshire, Sussex and Berkshire and acted as MP for both Hampshire and Berkshire, although he was only prolific within county affairs during the 1450s. He served as sheriff in the early 1400s and again in 1450.[62] The final member of the county elite to appear within these records is Michael Skyllyng who is recorded in four of them. Skyllyng appears regularly, in fact more so than any other, in various records as sitting on the bench during court cases, suggesting he did genuinely take part in many county affairs.[63] Like William Berkeley and William Uvedale, Skyllyng was attainted in 1484 and lost his lands following participation in Buckingham's rebellion. He is listed as being a leader of the rising in Wiltshire.[64]

Whilst later sections will examine in detail patterns of loyalty and allegiance, the evidence suggests that for the crown the most important consideration during this time of political

[59] For the years 1455 – 1460; E 372/301 m.66, E 372/302 m.68, E 372/303 m.67, E 372/304 m.68, E 372/305 m.61. For the years 1460-70; E 372/306 m.54, E 372/307 m.50, E 372/312 m.53, E 372/313 m.48. For the years 1470-80; E 372/322 m.46, E 372/325 m.42.

[60] Michael Skyllyng, John Hammond and Thomas Danvers were the others. Skyllyng resided in both Wiltshire and Hampshire and was appointed as a JP between 1439 and 1461. Hammond came from Winchester and commanded a number of titles within the county including JP, gaol deliverer, elector and apportioner of the subsidy. See Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, pp. 412-3. Danvers was from Oxon, however he was appointed as JP for Hampshire during the 1470s and 80s, as well as a controller of customs at Southampton in 1477. See Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 275.

[61] *CFR, 1461-71*, pp. 100, 104. He was also a justice of the gaol delivery and on the commissions of *oyer and terminer.* See Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 928.

[62] Wedwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 919.

[63] Skyllyng is recorded very often in the King's Bench records (KB9s and KB27s). He was often the official in front of whom cases were read; this will be discussed in subsequent chapters.

[64] For evidence of Skyllyng being attainted see Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 771 and *Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous, Chancery*, preserved in the Public Record Office, vol. 8 1422-85, p. 216. He had his attainder reversed in 1485.

uncertainty was to maintain the status quo by keeping those who had influence in the localities on their side, rather than punishing them for supporting the opposition. If another power struggle ensued, the king needed to secure the loyalty of the politically weighty elements of the community, these being the nobility and gentry. Richard III, however, ignored this principle and changed the status quo by focusing his patronage on those in the North.[65] This resulted in an inability to establish loyal support amongst those counties below the Thames and the Severn. This leads to further questions about the nature of political power that fifteenth-century kings held and the importance of achieving consensus amongst the lower levels of political society. It is evident that the crown needed the support of the localities, but that the gentry looked to the crown to enhance their status and security, so a strong relationship of interdependence developed. The instability of the position of the crown meant that it needed to secure loyalties throughout the country and it was the local landowners and office-holders who could provide this. This worked both ways and the evidence detailed so far supports Pollard's statement that 'loyalty was rarely taken to the point of risking patrimony and place'.[66] Malcolm Mercer has also stressed that loyalties only lasted as long as benefit was present.[67] The lack of turnover of local offices can indeed be attributed to the positive developing relationship between crown and locality, however it also suggests that there was a fairly homogenous group of men in Hampshire who remained in power throughout the period.

(ii)

Horizontal Relationships

Having considered office-holding and the personnel who occupied such positions,[68] this section will now focus on the relationships that existed between these men at a local level. It is from local studies that the 'county community' debate emerged. It was the pioneering work of Alan Everitt, who explored the local community of Kent during the seventeenth century, which led to many other historians producing local and county studies for this period of history.[69] This

[65] C. Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses: Politics and the Constitution of England, 1437-1509* (Cambridge, 1997), see chapter 10.

[66] A. J. Pollard, *North Eastern England during the Wars of the Roses: Lay Society, War and Politics, 1450-1500* (Oxford, 1990).

[67] Mercer, *Medieval Gentry*, pp. 96, 107, 127-130; see also S. Payling, *Political Society in Lancastrian England: the Greater Gentry of Nottinghamshire* (Oxford, 1991), p. 105.

[68] Appendix 2 details all of the office-holders in Hampshire during this period.

[69] For example see A. Everitt, *The County Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion* (Leicester, 1966); A. J. Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660* (London, 1975); J. Morrill, *Cheshire,*

new phenomena was not just confined to the seventeenth century, and whilst the technique of local study in the fifteenth century was essentially borrowed from Tudor and Stuart historiography, interest in the localities was far from new.[70] The work of K. B. McFarlane had already drawn attention to the importance of the nobility and their relationship with the localities, and the emergence of 'bastard feudalism' and local order called for a local approach.[71] It is has already been noted that there has been a clear cross-fertilisation of ideas applied both in the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries.[72] Everitt saw England as a union of partially independent county 'states', each with their own separate ethos and loyalties. He continued to stress throughout his study the insularity of the county, especially for the gentry in terms of their marriage alliances as well as their social network. He believed that 'the dominant desire of the community of Kent, in 1660 as much as in 1640, had been to live a life of its own apart from the mainstream of national development'.[73] Many disputed this view, the main protagonists being Clive Holmes and Ann Hughes, who believed that the gentry's horizons were much wider than those suggested in Everitt's model of an England composed of isolated provinces.[74] Hughes believed that 'local governors did not automatically oppose central "interference", and indeed social policy is an instructive example of creative co-operation between centre and localities'.[75] Similarly, in fifteenth-century scholarship Everitt's findings also met with disapproval. Susan Wright concluded that in fifteenth-century Derbyshire there was as yet 'no coherent county social group or "community"', indicating that her findings did not agree with Everitt's theory of insularity of the county. By the 1990s

1630-60: County Government and Society during the English Revolution (London, 1974); D. Underdown, *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum* (Newton Abbot, 1973).

[70] Many local studies of the fifteenth century emerged around the same time as Everitt's work including M. J. Bennett, 'A county community: social cohesion amongst the Cheshire gentry, 1400-1425*', Northern History*, 8 (1973), pp. 24-44*;* N. Saul, 'The Gloucestershire gentry in the fourteenth century', unpublished D. Phil thesis, Oxford University (1978); S. Wright 'A gentry society of the fifteenth century: Derbyshire c. 1430-1509', unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, Birmingham University (1978). Both Saul and Wright developed their theses and published full local studies during the 1980s.

[71] See K. B. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England* (Oxford, 1973) and the 'Introduction' by G. L. Harriss; R. L. Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster* (London, 1966), chs. 5, 7-8, 10-11, 13.

[72] See p. 4.

[73] Everitt, *The County Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion,* p. 326.

[74] C. Holmes, 'The county community in Stuart historiography', *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 19, no. 2 (1980), pp. 54-73. See also C. Holmes, *Seventeenth Century Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1980). Hughes also argues against Everitt's findings in A. Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, 1987).

[75] Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire*, p. 45. As well as her disagreement with Everitt's theory, Hughes also suggested that it was actually the cooperation and support between Parliament and the localities that resulted in Parliaments' success over the Royalist cause in her article, 'The King, the Parliament and the localities during the English Civil War', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 24, no. 2, Politics and Religion in the Early Seventeenth Century: New Voices (1985), pp. 236-263.

widespread reaction against the idea of a 'county community' set in, with Peter Coss warning against overemphasising the county as a factor for social cohesion and Carpenter denying the existence of a social community altogether.[76] The debate itself has long since ended in fifteenth century scholarship.[77] However, aside from the general debate and opinions that have formed since, one of the main benefits of the county study has been an increased awareness and interest in the localities themselves. Prior to this, most scholars tended to focus heavily on the crown and nobility, in the main ignoring local officers and their relationships. Whilst the relationship between the crown and the localities is of immense importance, and will be discussed in the next section, relations between land and office-holders at a local level are also important as they directly affected the running of the county.

It has already been concluded that between 1450 and 1485 there was little change in the personnel who ruled the county; there were around 40 men whose names graced the many commissions and offices of the period, with the majority of them remaining in these offices uninterrupted by national crisis (see Appendix 2). Moreover, it appears that many were in some way connected with each other, whether through marriage or business or purely friendship, suggesting an extensive network of ties and affiliations within the locality. For example, taking the group as a whole there were six inter-familial marriage alliances. Edward Berkeley married his daughter to John Blount of Mountjoy, a JP and escheator for Hampshire during the 1470s.[78] His nephew, William, married Katherine Stourton who was the daughter of William. William Stourton, a non-resident knight, mainly resided in Wiltshire and Dorset where he had lands; however, he acted as JP for Hampshire throughout the 1470s and was also appointed to the commissions of *oyer* and *terminer* in 1468 and the commissions of array during the later 1450s, the 1460s and 1470s.[79] William Berkeley's father, Maurice, married Anne West, daughter of Sir Reginald West de la Warre, who although a non-resident knight, acted as JP for the county in the 1460s. The Uvedales also unsurprisingly made marriage alliances within the county. Thomas Uvedale married Agnes Paulet, sister to John Paulet. His son, William, married

[76] Wright, *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 58; P. Coss, *Lordship, Knighthood and Locality: A Study in English Society 1180-1280* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 3; Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, chp. 9.
[77] Whilst this is the case for the fifteenth century, the debate has since been revised in seventeenth-century century scholarship, see J. Eales and A. Hopper (eds.), *The County Community in Seventeenth-century England and Wales* (Hertford, 2012).
[78] For escheator see *CFR, 1471-85*, p. 81; For JP see *CPR, 1467-77*, p. 629. John was a knight and his father, Walter, was given Courtney lands in Devon and Hampshire – C. Ross, *Edward IV* (London, 1975), p. 81.
[79] For JP see *CPR, 1467-77*, p. 629 and *1476-85*, p. 572. For commissions of *oyer* and *terminer* see *CPR, 1467-77,* p. 128. For commissions of array see *CPR, 1452-61*, p. 495, *1467-77*, pp. 196, 219, 220, 284 and 350.

Dorothy Troys, daughter of Thomas. Thomas was a resident esquire from Owslebury and commanded the offices of JP, sheriff and MP throughout the 1470s and 1480s. He was also an escheator for both Hampshire and Wiltshire and acted on other commissions such as the gaol delivery for Hampshire.[80]

Aside from these two powerful families there were further marriage ties within the county elite. John Lisle ensured he remained in close connection with his fellow gentry. He married one of his daughters to John Philpot, a resident member of the county elite and sheriff. Lisle married a second daughter to John Rogers who was another resident esquire. Rogers was sheriff during the 1460s, 1470s and 1480s and acted as JP for the county, as well as being appointed to the commissions of array in all three decades, including those raised against Warwick and the duke of Clarence in 1470.[81] He was also appointed as constable of Winchester in 1471.[82] As well as having kinship ties through marriage to John Lisle, Rogers married his daughter to John Brocas, a member of another resident family in Hampshire, from Beaurepaire, whose presence remained constant within local office during this period. John Brocas acted as sheriff in the 1480s and as a JP in the 1470s and 1480s. His father, William was also appointed to a number of commissions for the county during the 1460s.[83]

Whilst marriage was one way, and indeed often a fruitful way, in which the gentry formed identifiable alliances with one another, other evidence relating to friendship ties and affiliations appears in the form of a number of men acting as witnesses in land-holdings or as executors of wills. There is also evidence of men acting as trustees or feoffees holding lands for others, occasionally for when their children came of age, or more often than not when they were shown to be seised of it when they died. An example of witnesses in land granting is shown when William Warbelton granted lands to Hugh Pakenham in 1457. The witnesses were Thomas Uvedale, William Brocas, John Pounde, William Uvedale, Bernard Brocas and John Wallop, suggesting that they had connections of friendship.[84] A similar example involving witnesses related to the estates of John Roger which were presented as a gift with warranty to his son, a second John Roger, in 1455. The witnesses that he chose for this were John Lisle, William

[80] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 878.
[81] *CPR, 1452-61*, pp. 170, 311; *1467-77*, pp. 196, 220, 496; *1476-85*, p. 399.
[82] *CCR, 1476-85*, p. 51.
[83] Commissions of array, see *CPR, 1452-61*, pp. 401, 495; *1467-77*, pp. 56, 196, 1220.
[84] *CCR, 1454-61*, p. 217.

Warbelton, Thomas Uvedale, Thomas Welles and John Wallop, amongst a few others.[85] The assumption that the local elite of Hampshire were closely connected is also supported by wills. For example, Thomas Pounde was named as executor of the will of Thomas Uvedae and John Philpott is named as the executor of the will of John Lisle.[86]

Further evidence supporting these connections is in the form of land-holding. For example, William Sandes, a resident knight who came from a family who had acquired much land in the early fifteenth century, died seised of the manor of Sherborne after it had been given to him by Bernard Brocas who had died childless.[87] Similarly, John Whitehead, a resident esquire who acted as both sheriff and JP in the 1460s, benefited from the manor of Eastrop, which was released to Maurice Berkeley in 1472 for the use of Whitehead and his wife Katherine.[88] A final example of land-holding connections involves William Fiennes (or Fenys) of Say and Sele. Although a non-resident knight, Fiennes was heavily involved in the local affairs of the county. He sat on the peace commissions throughout the 1460s and 1470s and in 1461 he was appointed to the office of keepers and warden and the custody of the New Forest, the manor and park of Lyndhurst and a rent of 40s yearly.[89] Despite being granted the manor of Lyndhurst for life by Edward IV on accession, it was in fact revoked in 1467 in favour of a staunch Yorkist, William FitzAlan, earl of Arundel.[90] In 1488, Fiennes sold the manor of Otterbourne to William Waynflete, bishop of Winchester.[91]

Land-holding, marriage and evidence of witnesses are all useful ways to determine the types of local connections that existed within local society; however, there are also series of records that provide evidence of relationships in a different light. The King's Bench records indicate who was causing problems in the county and which local men sat on the bench to try such cases.[92] Interestingly, the men identified as being at the top of the political spectrum do not

[85] *CCR, 1454-61*, p. 445.
[86] For Thomas Uvedale's will see Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 900; For John Lisle's will, Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 546.
[87] *VCH*, vol. 4, p, 160. William Sandes will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter for he had a strong connection to the crown.
[88] *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 498.
[89] *CPR, 1461-67*, p. 125.
[90] *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 632.
[91] *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 545. This suggests that Waynflete did play a certain role in local affairs and was involved in as far as land-holding went.
[92] For the later part of the fifteenth century almost all of the series for these dates have been examined, give or take a number of records that prove impossible to examine. The KB 9s run from KB 9/278/1 to KB 9/367/2, plus a few that have been organised into KB 9/947- 952. The KB 27s run from KB 27/753/2 to KB 27/816/47.

appear in the records as defendants. It appears that those accused of the various felonies, such as trespassing, debt, robbery, violence, ambushing, kidnap and stealing were men of the lower social status. Many list those accused as yeomen, husbandmen and labourers. Not one record suggests that those in charge of county affairs acted wrongly within the county. There are a few examples of these men bringing cases against their accusers. John Wallop appears in a number of records as being a victim. In 1470 a case was brought against a group of men by the names of John Elys, John Dunne, Thomas Kame, John Kame, Reginald Dyer and Thomas Spyre who were accused of coming with force and arms and weapons and entering the property at Hokefold.[93] Interestingly, one of the men presiding over this case was Thomas Welles, a fellow member of the county elite alongside John Wallop. Wallop was also included in another in 1477, where again he is listed as the victim. The crime was similar to the previous case, involving different men and yet again those presiding as justices included Edward Berkeley and Henry Moore.[94] Moore was a non-resident knight who sat on commissions throughout the 1460s, 1470s and 1480s, including the commission of array as well as assessing subsidies for the county. Wallop also appears within the plea rolls, again as a victim. In this case Robert Dyker and Thomas Polwyn were charged with assault and breaking and entering Wallop's manor at Basingstoke in 1477. The accused denied the charge.[95] A further case involved that of John Brocas. He brought a case against a man named Thomas Potynger, husbandman, who was accused of using force and arms and weapons in an attempt to kidnap his wife, Anne.[96] The men listed as presiding were Henry Moore and John Roger, who was in fact John Brocas's father-in-law and more importantly, father to Anne.

These records inadvertently support the idea that the county elite were not only closely connected to one another but that they also had positive working relationships with each other, as well as ensuring that peace was kept within the county. The KB9s especially provide extensive evidence to suggest that those listed as sitting on the commissions and partaking in county affairs did actually honour their duties. For example, Michael Skyllyng is listed in almost all of the cases throughout the 1450s.[97] Initially he appears to have presided over cases by himself, but was then joined by others in the following two decades. These included the

[93] KB 9/326/1.
[94] KB 9/343/2.
[95] KB 27/811/44.
[96] KB 9/343/3.
[97] Skyllyng appears in nearly all of the records spanning from KB9/278 to KB9/298. Sometimes he appears alone and other times he is one of many.

Berkeleys and Uvedales, John Lisle, William Sandes, Walter Moyle, Thomas Welles, Henry Moore, John Wallop, John Rogers, John Whitehead and a number of others. Non-residents such as William Stourton and John Audely, who both held numerous titles within the county also, are listed.[98]

As well as the King's Bench records, there are a number of other series that are able to shed light upon county affairs. The Court of Chancery (Early Proceedings) (C1) for example provide further insight into the day-to-day workings of the county.[99] There are various cases within Hampshire during the period and, as expected following investigation of the King's Bench records, there is little evidence of troubles and strife caused by the local officers within the county. That said, one case was recorded between John and Bernard Brocas.[100] This is recorded as taking place in the late 1460s when Bernard brought a case against John over rent from the manor of Stevengton of the late Sir Stephen Popham, which was in the possession of John. As well as this case, the Brocases were involved in another dispute, this time involving William and Bernard Brocas, who were brothers. William stated that on the 20 May 1459 he and his brother accounted together in London for various labours and expenses in the trades of grocery and apothecary, and it was agreed that Bernard owed William £4 15s 4d. However, Bernard had not paid, to his damage of 5 marks.[101] There is also a case between John Wallop and John Whitehead over the manor of Watching Well and land in Shallfleet, Whatynwell and Calbourne in the Isle of Wight of the late Thomas Cambreleyn.[102] Wallop and his wife brought the suit against Whitehead, his wife and a number of others. This appears to be a rare example of evidence showing relations were not completely harmonious between the main office-holders.

Aside from the above indictments, there is little evidence within the Chancery bills of those men ruling Hampshire causing disturbances. However, these records do show who was and they could not be any clearer in their evidence. John Payn, mayor of Southampton, is recorded in numerous records as corrupt and often involved in wrongdoing. The majority of his misdemeanours involved seizure of goods in the port of Southampton, quite often involving Italian merchants. Interestingly, Pamela Nightingale describes Payn's election as mayor of

[98] Stourton and Audely will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter. Both had ties to the crown.

[99] These records detail pleadings, interrogatories, depositions and exhibits relating to equity causes initiated in the court of Chancery up to 1558, and consist solely of bills of complaint until the mid-fifteenth century, but subsequently there are also answers, interrogatories and depositions.

[100] C1/34/36.

[101] This case is listed in the Court of Common Pleas – C P40/800/032d.

[102] C 1/32/40.

Southampton, and notes that he was one of several guild members to insist upon regulations barring foreigners (mainly Italians) from selling their goods.[103] In the late 1450s, for example, a case is bought against Payn by Nicholas De Vege, merchant of Venice, over a suit of debt on a bond.[104] Similarly, there are two further cases bought by Anthony Moresyn and Phillip Sene, both merchants of Venice, regarding seizure of wine on false pretence as well as seizure and sale of the petitioners' goods.[105] However, Payn, despite his obvious corruption and dishonesty, was elected MP for Southampton in 1435 and 1447, as well elector and he received a number of pardons, one for taking a Breton ship in 1435.[106]

Overall, these records show that the county elite were not only loyal, in the main, to one another but that they took their roles as leaders of local society seriously. This is not to suggest that they were all perfect law-abiding citizens; however, relying on existing evidence it would seem that the relationships that were manifested within the upper echelons of county society were positive and most appeared keen to align themselves with one another in order to remain, in and indeed further their positions as, leaders of local society. These findings appear fairly typical to other counties where there was no regional magnate. Dr Acheson found similar results in his study of the Leicestershire community. He concluded that Leicestershire provided its own political cohesion. The community 'stood at the hub of a series of interlocking social and political circles, some of which were parochial and narrow, some extended beyond the county border into neighbouring shires'.[107] He describes them as sufficiently resourceful in themselves to meet the economic and political changes of the day. This could also be said for the gentry in Hampshire. Interestingly Acheson also discusses disputes between family members and how they tended to centre upon conflicting claims to property, an example of which has already been discussed in Hampshire.[108] It suggests that self-interest rather than family interest was the main determinant of attitudes to kin. Further to this, Dr Payling found that in Nottinghamshire although the group were not perhaps as cohesive as in Leicestershire

[103] P. Nightingale, *Medieval Mercantile Community: The Grovers' Company and the Politics and Trade of London, 1000-1485* (New Haven, 1995), pp. 510-11, 531-2.
[104] C 1/26/117.
[105] C 1/27/416 and C 1/29/50. There a numerous other recorded cases against John Payn. See also C 1/29/403 and C 1/31/80 – both brought by Italians.
[106] He received three pardons, in 1446, 1455 and 1458, see Wedgwood, *History of Parliament,* pp. 669-70.
[107] Acheson, *Leicestershire in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 202. Acheson also comments that decades of responsibility for the government of their shire had strengthened their idea of community, an idea which also found expression in their more important social interactions. See p. 201.
[108] See p. 34 for the Brocas' dispute.

or Hampshire, he determined that there was no doubt that even if the leading men of Nottinghamshire did not strongly identify with each other, they certainly did feel corporately responsible for the administration of the county.[109] Similarly, Susan Wright stated that whilst the gentry had 'little cause, as yet, to have a sense of "county community" the gentry did have what might be described as a county attitude towards law and order.'[110] It appears, therefore, that the local officers of Hampshire during the later fifteenth century were similar to those in other counties in that they desired the maintenance of order and harmony within the county.

(iii)

Vertical Relationships

Whilst relations amongst the gentry at a local level were important because they determined how office-holders operated as a group when running county affairs, relations with the centre were also significant. It has already been established that the civil strife affecting central government had a limited effect in Hampshire, with the main local officers remaining in power, largely unaffected by the situation. The horizons of the gentry were expanding and a growing contact with London broadened their prospects beyond their locality.[111] A realisation that contact with the crown could enhance a man's position within local, and possibly even national, society had developed. As already discussed, it appears from surviving evidence that in general those sitting on the various commissions and holding the most offices within Hampshire were not the main instigators of disruption and petty crime within the county.[112] It can also be concluded that in general the same names appear within all of the main offices throughout the period, suggesting a strong relationship of interdependence.[113] This would suggest that whilst there was an element of loyalty to the crown from the localities, the evidence from Hampshire supports the premise that there was loyalty to the *crown*, not the king. Most local men were unaffected by the usurpations that took place between 1455 and 1485.[114] This suggests the

[109] Payling, *Political Society in Lancastrian England*, p. 218.
[110] Wright, *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century*, p. 119.
[111] Holmes, 'The county community in Stuart historiography', p. 64. Holmes discusses this idea with regards to the seventeenth century however, as noted on p. 1, the gentry were becoming more independent as rulers of the county.
[112] See previous section, especially pp. 32-4.
[113] See pp. 22-24.
[114] This can be seen in the limited movement within local office-holding; see Appendices 3 and 4 for further evidence.

crown rewarded those who supported it, as opposed to punishing those who switched allegiance. Evidence to support this assumption can be found in the form of pardons which have already been noted earlier in this chapter.[115]

That said, betrayal was not infrequent and there is some evidence of members of the gentry actively rebelling during this period. The Berkeley and the Uvedale families were perhaps the most prominent, both in their treachery, but also in their loyalty. William Berkeley, who was made governor of the Isle of Wight by Richard III in 1483,[116] and William Uvedale, both joined the rebellion of the earl of Buckingham later that year. Both men were attainted in 1484. William Berkeley fled to Brittany to join Henry Tudor but died in 1485. His entire estate was given away but eventually recovered by his sister. William Uvedale received a pardon in 1485; however, his estates were not returned to him due to his hostility to the government of Richard III.[117] In his biography of Richard III, Kendall writes 'When… Sire William Berkeley… got word that Buckingham was a fugitive and the king was rapidly approaching, he instantly abandoned all thought of resistance'.[118] This suggests that many men were willing to actively support a cause, but only to the point where there was benefit. Despite evidence showing the switching of sides, along with a number of pardons, there were men who did identify with one side or the other, although these men were rare. One such rarity was Maurice Berkeley, who held many offices including MP, sheriff, escheator, Squire and Knight of the Body, constable of Southampton – and sat on all the peace commissions. He held lands in Hampshire, as well as Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Devon, Dorset and Somerset. He went into exile with Edward IV during the Readeption and he was a retainer of Lord Hastings, possibly one of the first according to Dunham.[119] Mercer comments that the fact that Berkeley was appointed as sheriff in 1471 suggests Edward IV's desire to have a loyal supporter on the south coast who enjoyed connections with the county in advance of Queen Margaret's anticipated landing in that region.[120] The tradition of service within the Berkeley family was maintained by William Berkeley when he rebelled against Richard III in 1483. As soon as Richard abandoned his role as protector and took the throne, he alienated the Yorkist affinity, including the Berkeleys.

[115] See pp. 25-6.
[116] C. Ross, *Richard III* (London, 1981), p. 112.
[117] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 324.
[118] P. Kendall, *Richard the Third* (New York, London 1975), p. 328.
[119] W. H. Dunham, *Lord Hasting's Indentured Retainers 1461-1483: the Lawfulness of Livery and Retaining under the Yorkists and Tudors* (Hamden, 1970), p. 99.
[120] Mercer, *Medieval Gentry*, p. 81.

Leading members of Edward's household formed a nexus around which the rebellion shaped.[121] Kleineke describes Maurice as Edward's household man and on the 9 July 1469 he was dispatched with letters to Clarence and Warwick and the Archbishop of York, summoning them into Edward IV's presence.[122]

Local landowners during this period certainly realised the dangers in choosing sides because times were uncertain and unstable. Many county studies of this period have shown that the gentry were keen to avoid the local repercussions of the national crisis resulting from usurpations of the throne. Carpenter concluded in her study of Warwickshire that the gentry needed stability and their main priority was maintaining internal peace.[123] In Hampshire, disregarding men such as Maurice Berkeley, the majority continued with their administrative duties regardless of who was king. John Tuchet, Lord Audely, a non-resident member of Hampshire's office-holding network, is a perfect example of a man whose main priority was to survive and advance. He defected to the Yorkist earls after being taken prisoner at Calais in 1461 by the earl of Warwick, despite his father's death at Warwick's hands at Blore Heath in 1460.[124] He then became one of Edward IV's most active supporters, mainly in Hampshire and Wiltshire where his lands were situated, sitting on commissions in many counties. Following his return in 1471 Edward made him Privy Councillor and Master of the King's dogs. He then went on to enjoy similar treatment under Richard III, becoming one of his trusted advisors and Treasurer in 1484.[125] He was on Richard's side at Bosworth and whilst he lost his title of Treasurer under Henry VII, he received a pardon. A further example of this is shown by John Lisle, a prominent landowner based mainly in the Isle of Wight but with lands in other counties. He served with the Duke of Somerset in France in 1443, suggesting he had Lancastrian sympathies. However, he received a pardon from Edward IV in 1462, went on to sit on Yorkist commissions and then fought on the side of the Yorkists at Barnet in 1471. The abundance of rewards and pardons throughout this period of domestic turmoil suggests that both Yorkist and Lancastrian kings were aware that support of the local officers was key in securing loyalties amongst the provinces. In fact, it appears that the king needed the support of the local elite more than the local elite needed the king and it is clear that these men realised this, with many

[121] P. Flemming and M. Wood, *Gloucestershire's Forgotten Battle, Nibley Green 1470* (Stroud, 2003), p. 82.
[122] H. Kleineke, *Edward IV* (London, 2009), p. 96.
[123] See Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, conclusion, especially p. 612.
[124] Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 131.
[125] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 30.

using it to their advantage.

The allegiance of most of these men was limited, yet many were still rewarded generously. The Berkeley family held a plethora of titles and lands, with Edward Berkeley holding the Lieutenancy of the New Forest, as well as being a Bailiff of Burley. Edward remained in possession of all of his titles throughout the period, suggesting he pledged allegiance to whoever rewarded him. He benefitted well from his position within the New Forest and an example of this is shown in 1472 by order of the king 'For so much as our squire Edward Berkeley mindeth to build beside the forest, we have granted him twenty oaks.'[126] Similarly William Feinnes of Say and Sele, who also went into exile with Edward,[127] was given the office of Keeper and Warden and the custody of the New Forest, as well as being given much land including the royal hundred of Redbridge in 1461.

As noted, there were a number of lawyers who took part in the management of county affairs, the most prominent being Thomas Danvers, Thomas Welles and John Hammond. Thomas Danvers, although resident to Oxfordshire, acted as JP for Hampshire during the 1470s and 1480s and was appointed as controller of customs at Southampton in 1477.[128] It has already been noted that he received a pardon in 1462 and was in fact listed by Dunham as being part of Hastings' retainers, alongside Maurice Berkeley.[129] Thomas Welles was a resident member of the gentry who acted as JP and MP and was listed on the commissions of array as well as other commissions whereby he was called upon by the king.[130] John Hammond, MP for Winchester and resident JP was also listed in many county commissions like Thomas Welles, and was appointed as an assessor of the tax in Hampshire and as approver of the subsidy and alnage of cloths for sale in Southampton, Winchester and the Isle of Wight.[131] He also held further impressive titles, elevating him in the ranks of the local gentry. By 1467 he was town

[126] D. J. Stagg, (ed.), *A Calendar of New Forest Documents: The Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries*, Hants Record Series, vol. 5 (Winchester, 1983), p. 29. This was signed at Southampton in December 1472.
[127] Ross, *Edward IV*, p. 155.
[128] *CPR, 1476-85*, p. 38.
[129] Dunham, *Lord Hasting's Indentured Retainers*, p. 32.
[130] Michael Skyllyng tended to be involved in the same positions, however he was only prominent in county affairs in the 1450s. For evidence of commissions of array/general commissions whereby men are called upon by the king see *CPR, 1452-61*, pp. 311, 558, 614; *CPR, 1461-67*, p. 37; *CPR, 1467-77*, pp. 56, 196, 246, 351, 405; *CPR, 1476-85*, p. 263. Alongside Thomas Welles there were a number of other men who also were listed on the same commissions, these included the obvious – Uvedales, Berkeleys, Lisle, Wallop, Audely, Brocas, Sandes, Rogers, Poundes and Paulet. The office-holding community was genuinely very constant and those who appear on the various commissions tended to appear on all of them.
[131] *CPR, 1461-71*, pp. 100, 104, 200.

clerk and then auditor of the Chamberlain's account in 1484 until 1492.[132] He was also an elector of Winchester and an officer in the New Forest in the late 1480s.[133]

Further evidence of good relations between gentry and the crown is shown by Geoffrey Gate, a non-resident knight from Essex, who was prominent within Hampshire's local society. As already noted when discussing the subject of pardons, Gate joined Warwick's rebellion, leading political prisoners to freedom following Edward IV's flight, but was pardoned.[134] Gate clearly had strong connections to Hampshire as he was appointed sheriff in 1465 and Lieutenant of the Isle of Wight. He was also given Carisbrooke castle for life, although he surrendered this a year later to Anthony Woodville in 1465.[135] Despite joining a rebellion, Gate still managed to maintain positive connections with the crown and commanded important positions and titles within the county as his reappointment as Lieutenant in 1460, 1461 and 1465 demonstrates.[136] Another gentleman, resident to Hampshire, was William Sandes who was among the men that Maurice Berkely raised in support of the Yorkist cause.[137] The Sandys family, who at the beginning of the fifteenth century acquired much land in this part of Hampshire, held a manor in Andover, called Sandys manor.[138] William died in 1496 holding Sandys manor of the freemen of Andover. He became much more actively involved in Hampshire's county affairs after Edward IV's restoration in 1471, sitting on the peace commissions as well as being listed on various other commissions, suggesting that those at the centre trusted him.[139]

The various commissions, for example, of array and *oyer* and *terminer*, also provide solid evidence of who the king relied upon in the counties to suppress disorder and manage affairs. It is unsurprising that throughout the second half of the fifteenth century the same names appear on the commissions of array, commissions designed to protect and keep the peace, including Lisle, Uvedale, Berkeley, Skyllyng, Wallop, Welles, Rogers, Brocas, Ponde, Paulet, Stourton, Whitehead and Hammond.[140] Similarly, the commissions of *oyer* and *terminer*, which were commissions to inquire into all treasons, felonies and misdemeanours committed within the

[132] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 413.
[133] *A Calendar of New Forest Documents*, p. 281.
[134] See p. 26.
[135] *VCH*. vol. 5, p. 223.
[136] *CPR, 1452-61*, pp. 637-8; *1461-67*, p. 168.
[137] Mercer, *Medieval Gentry*, p. 81.
[138] *VCH.* vol. 4, p. 353.
[139] *CPR 1461-67*, pp. 202, 230, 550; *1467-77*, pp. 56, 351, 405, 429, 524, 629.
[140] *CPR*, 1452-61, pp. 311, 400, 495, 556, 558, 564; 1467-77, pp. 56, 196, 220.

county, show those listed to be the same men who held the offices of sheriff, JP and MP and again with very little fluctuation in terms of who was called throughout the period. In the 1460s Lisle, Berkely, Uvedale, Danvers, Skyllyng and Paulet were listed, as was Walter Moyle who was a non-resident knight but who held plenty of titles in Hampshire. Others included Nicholas Assheton of Callingtonin, Cornwall who sat on various Hampshire commissions as well as being a justice of the peace for the county and a justice of the bench.[141] He was joined by John Audley, William Stourton, Walter Moyle and William Sandes.[142] The Patent Rolls also list 'general commissions whereby men were called upon by the king' or 'commissions to suppress disorder'. Again, those prolific individuals such as the Bekeleys, Uvedales, Lisle, Welles, Skyllyng, Stourton, Wallop, Whitehead, Hammond, Danvers, Tichebourne and Moore were all listed. The bishop of Winchester was included in the 1461 commissions as were a few other nobles such as Henry, duke of Somerset in 1460 and George, duke of Clarence in 1478.[143] These records support the evidence gathered from the King's Bench records that those in control of the localities took their responsibilities seriously. The fact that they were called upon by the king to act in this role on behalf of the county shows that they fulfilled their roles as protectors of the peace. Whilst the crown had little choice but to trust these men so that some semblance of order could be kept, the same names appearing on many of the commissions indicates that there must have been some form of trust between the two parties.

What has been discussed so far would suggest that there appeared to be a relatively positive relationship between the crown and the gentry of Hampshire. However, occasionally, problems did arise. Take, for example, an interesting piece of surviving information, and evidence of negative relations, which relates to John Hammond and Richard of Gloucester. Much surviving evidence during Richard's time as duke relates to his litigation over, and acquisition of, land and one such instance concerned the manor of South Wells in Romsey. Most of his land in Hampshire was the inheritance of his wife, however, South Wells actually belonged to Thomas Greenfield who was in the duke's service on the Scottish borders.[144] The manor had been in the Greenfield family for a few generations and John, clerk to the counting-house of Henry VI, was MP for Melcombe Regis in 1455-6, steward of Odiham and other places within

[141] Wegwood, *History of Parliament,* p. 25.
[142] For *oyer* and *terminer* records see CPR, 1452-62, p. 613; 1461-67, pp. 38, 67, 202, 304; 1467-77, p. 128.
[143] *CPR,* 1452-61, pp. 604, 614; 1461-67, p. 37; 1467-77, pp. 246, 405; 1476-85, pp. 109, 110, 263, 424. Interestingly, in 1463 John Payne, the troublesome mayor of Southampton, is also listed on the commissions alongside Geoffrey Gate, despite his proven unruly behaviour in Southampton, see *CPR,* 1461-67, p. 230.
[144] D. Macphearson and others (eds.), *Rotuli Scotiae,* Record Commision, vol. 2, (London, 1814-19), p. 451.

Hampshire.[145] The Greenfield family's Winchester connections explain the marriage of his daughter, Agnes, to Hammond. Michael Hicks, who outlines this dispute, comments that whilst the Greenfield family were of no great importance in Hampshire society, John the elder appointed two county magnates as his trustees, these being Maurice Berkeley and Thomas Uvedale.[146] South Wells was given to Hammond who by 1474 had then passed it on to a panel of trustees, including John Eatsby as well as Thomas Welles and John Tichebourne, fellow Hampshire office-holders.[147] Richard, who was interested in this land, in a bill to the chancellor alleged that those trustees held the South Wells in trust for Greenfield.[148] Hammond disputed this, but he was let down by his trustees, with Tichebourne pleading ignorance and accepting the court's decision.[149] Hammond, clearly annoyed, threatened Eatsby with a subpoena over sealing the deed, which unfortunately gave Richard a counter-argument accusing Hammond of dishonesty. Richard also argued that South Wells had been leased, not sold, to Hammond who held it subject to annuities to Greenfield.[150] Hammond lost his case and whilst the verdicts do not survive, Hicks suggests that there is evidence to suppose Richard triumphed.[151]

This informative case is a rarity as most existing evidence does suggest fairly positive relations between Hampshire and central government. Whilst this chapter has shown that the relationships and networks that existed at a local level were important when it involved running the county and maintaining law and order, relations between the county and the centre were also important because, ultimately, most local concerns would become national ones since the final arbiter was the king. As this study has noted, a relationship of interdependence was beneficial not just to the crown but also to those who conducted politics and administration at a local level. There needed to be both give and take between the two in order for everything to run smoothly. Carpenter emphasises the significance of this link between the centre and localities, commenting that this was 'a period of significant changes which had profound

[145] Wedgwood, *History of Parliament*, p. 394.
[146] M. Hicks, *Richard III and his Rivals: Magnates and their Motives in the Wars of the Roses* (London, 1991), p. 318. For a detailed overview of this dispute see pp. 317-21. By this point both trustees were knights.
[147] C 1/52/139-45.
[148] C 1/52/139.
[149] C 1/52/140, 142, 143.
[150] Hicks, *Richard III and his Rivals*, p. 519.
[151] Richard continued to favour Greenfield following this and if he had not won the case then he would not have relied on him again. Secondly the issue roll of the exchequer for the Michaelmas term 1480 records that the king paid £200 to Richard for the purchase of the manors of South Wells and Roke and other lands in Odiham, late of John Greenfield. See F. Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer* (London, 1837), p. 501; Hicks, *Richard III and his Rivals*, p. 320.

effects on both local and national politics' and that 'national politics and policies could not but affect the shires, for the nation was after all the sum of its localities'.[152] This statement rings true and captures the nature of fifteenth-century society suggesting that everyone, whether it was the king, the nobility or the gentry, was working toward the same goal: a stable and peaceful existence. This is exactly what took place within Hampshire in the late fifteenth century.

[152] Carpenter, *Locality and Polity,* pp. 643-4.

The Seventeenth Century

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the period of civil unrest in seventeenth-century Hampshire and explores the lives and the relationships of the local gentry both at a local and a national level. It specifically covers the period from 1640 to 1660, which saw a number of far-reaching regime changes and important dates.[1] These included the Bishop's Wars (1639-40), the meeting of the Short Parliament and the beginning of the Long Parliament (1640), the First Civil War (1642-46), the Second Civil War (1648), Pride's Purge (1648) which was followed by the period of the Rump Parliament, the execution of Charles I (1649) and abolition of the monarchy by the Rump, the Third Civil War (1651) and the Interregnum (1649-60). During the Interregnum, the English Commonwealth (1649-53) was born, soon replaced by the Protectorate under Oliver Cromwell (1653-8) and then under his son Richard (1658-9), with the rule of the major-generals during this time (1655-57). The restoration of the monarchy in May 1660 was the final regime change (at least, until the Glorious Revolution of 1688). This period of history has generated a great amount of research and debate regarding the experience of the local gentry from the rise of the gentry to the county community.[2] Such is the volume and importance of this historiography that it has influenced the study of other periods, as shown in the previous chapter. Many historians have attempted to explain why this period came to be one of the bloodiest and most destructive times in British history. R. H. Tawney, Lawrence Stone and Christopher Hill all contributed to the so-called gentry controversy, or 'storm over the gentry', by suggesting that the growing economic power of the gentry earlier in the century had caused the tensions which led to civil war. This hypothesis came under attack from Hugh Trevor-

[1] See Appendix 1 for full chronology of events.

[2] For works relating to the gentry controversy, see R. H. Tawney, 'The rise of the Gentry, 1558-1640' *Economic History Review,* vol. 11, no. 1 (1941), pp. 1-38; L. Stone, 'The anatomy of the Elizabethan aristocracy', *Economic History Review,* vol. 18. no. 1. (1948), pp. 1-53; C. Hill, *The English Revolution, 1640* (1940); H. R. Trevor-Roper, 'The Elizabethan aristocracy: an anatomy anatomized,' *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser. 3 (1951), pp. 279-98; H. Trevor-Roper, 'The social origins of the Great Rebellion' *History Today,* vol. 5 (1955), pp. 376-382. For examples of seventeenth century studies relating to the county community debate, see A. Everitt, *The County Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion* (Leicester, 1966); A. J. Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660* (London, 1975); J. Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-60: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (London, 1974); D. Underdown, *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum* (Newton Abbot, 1973); C. Holmes, *Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1980); A. Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, 1987); J. Eales and A. Hopper (eds.), *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales* (Hertford, 2013).

Roper who suggested that whilst the office-holders and lawyers were prospering, the lesser gentry were actually in decline.[3] Further qualifications came from Brian Manning who saw the civil wars as a social revolution rather than an economic one involving the common people taking advantage of the conflict within the gentry class (and the elite's subsequent loss of social control) to gain popular political agency, and finally Jack Hexter and Geoffrey Elton who both denied that the gentry were responsible for any of it.[4]

The sustained interest in these landowners suggests that whilst they may not have caused the civil war, their position within both local and national society had grown in political significance.[5] Alan Everitt's work on Kent sparked a new interest in the localities and although his view that the localities were insular and antipathetic toward the national arena was later vigorously disputed, the examination of the gentry has continued to stimulate historiographical debate, inspiring later generations of scholars to invaluable insights into the workings of the localities.[6] Whilst scholars such as Ann Hughes have admitted that 'county boundaries are no guide to social and economic characteristics', it seems logical to use a county for study owing to the fact that the country was divided administratively along county lines and local men would inevitably identified themselves to some extent (there were of course exceptions where men identified more so with abstract religious and political ideologies than their native counties) as belonging to a particular county.[7] The county community debate has stretched over many decades and whilst it might be suggested that a stalemate has been reached, what can be taken from it is that the gentry were leaders in their localities in a political and administrative sense and it was these local landowners for whose support the king and Parliament fought. However, measuring this support and allegiance has provided the scholar with difficulties, owing to the

[3] See works in fn. 2 of this chapter for evidence of their arguments.
[4] J. Hexter, 'Storm over the Gentry,' *Encounter*, 10 (1958). Reprinted in J.H. Hexter, *Reappraisals in History* (London, 1961) pp. 117-163; J. Hexter, 'The English aristocracy, its crises and the English Revolution, 1558-1660', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 8 (1968), pp. 22-78; G. Elton, *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government*, vol. 2 (Cambridge University Press, 1974); Finally, later toward the end of the last century, Marxist Brian Manning argues that it was actually the lower classes of society who brought on the revolution following a division within the gentry which opened the way for them to exploit the situation, see B. Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution,* 2nd ed. (London, 1991).
[5] This began in the 1950s with the works of K. B. Macfarlane on the fifteenth century who enabled interest in the lower echelons of society which then encouraged Alan Everitt in the following decade to begin his pioneering work relating to local society. See the works of K. B. Macfarlane, especially that of 'bastard feudalism'. For a good overview of this topic see K. B. Macfarlane, 'Bastard Feudalism' in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays* (London, 1981), pp. 23-45.
[6] See fn. 3 of the 'Introduction' for works relating to this topic.
[7] Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire,* p. 1.

problems of definition, the question of loyalty and how this was interpreted in a contemporary sense.[8]

As the previous chapter has shown, local landowners and office-holders were important in the earlier period, possessing enough influence to ensure that their support was needed. By the seventeenth century this had only increased. Hughes's 'integrationist' theory shows that the local gentry were integral to the situation at the centre and indeed played a key role in the outcome of the Civil War and the theory suggests that Parliament was successful over Charles in overcoming localism and cooperating with those leaders of local political society. Early modern politics was about negotiation and cooperation as opposed to enforcing will.[9] Most historians have accepted this premise, agreeing that Parliament's effort to overcome localism was a major factor contributing to their success. Hughes outlines the difference in opinion between herself and Holmes as opposed to Hutton and Morrill. The former believe that the overcoming of localism was a more difficult and transient process than do the latter, with their denial that localism encompassed an extended legitimating ideology and their belief that national developments determined the outcome of events.[10] A large part Parliament's success was due to the fact that 'the representation of local interests and the bringing together of provincial and central concerns were at the heart of Parliament's function and purpose'.[11] That said, it must be noted that in the later years of the Interregnum (notably the experiment of the rule of the major-generals which will be discussed later in this chapter) religious and political factions as well as personal allegiances meant that complete integration of local and national interest was not possible.

---

[8] This only touches on the idea of allegiance, which will be discussed further in this chapter. For examples of recent secondary works relating to this topic see, R. Weil, 'Thinking about allegiance in the English Civil War', *History Workshop Journal*, vol. 61. no. 1 (2006), pp. 183-91; A. Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegadoes: Changing Sides in the English Civil Wars* (Oxford, 2012); G. Robinson, *Horses, People and Parliament in the English Civil War: Extracting Resources and Considering Allegiance* (Aldershot, 2012). See also C. H. Firth and G. Davies, *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army,* 2 vols. (1940, reprinted in 1991).

[9] See A. Hughes, 'The King, the Parliament, and the localities during the English Civil War', *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 24, no. 2, Politics and Religion in the Early Seventeenth Century: New Voices (1985), pp. 236-263.

[10] See C. Holmes, *The Eastern Association in the English Civil War* (London, 1974), pp. 1-2 for the view that Parliament had to overcome localism. See also P. Edwards, *Dealing with Death: The Arms Trade and the British Civil Wars, 1639-52* (Stroud, 2000) and R. Hutton, *The Royalist War Effort, 1642-46* (Harlow, 1982). I agree with the former owing to the fact that having studied the localities it must be acknowledged that they were a powerful force who even in the medieval period could influence national events. By the seventeenth century their support was vital to success.

[11] Hughes, 'The King, the Parliament, and the localities during the English Civil War', p. 242.

Allegiance itself presents problems, not just due to the private motivations of the participants but because there was not a clear-cut division between royalist and parliamentarian. Andrew Hopper, in his recent book, *Turncoats and Renegadoes: Changing Sides in the English Civil Wars,* provides valuable discussion on the topic of varying types of royalism and parliamentarianism, as well as commenting that individuals appeared as different things to different people, with the matter of allegiance often remaining in the eye of the beholder.[12] Rachel Weil has suggested that contemporaries themselves did not conform to a coherent understanding of allegiance and that it was 'rarely just a matter of inward belief'.[13] There were, in fact, many different factions within the parliamentarian and royalist causes and although this thesis will not be able to address all of these, an awareness of their existence is crucial.[14] Many hoped to remain neutral and although some were uninvolved in local politics, it was impossible (particularly for the gentry) to remain completely aloof. On this topic Hopper concludes that those who followed the path of least resistance in attempting to accommodate the demands of both sides were 'particularly vulnerable because some were unfairly stigmatised as turncoats who had never voluntarily engaged themselves in the first place.'[15] He suggests that this was because activists on both sides frequently considered that those who proclaimed themselves neutrals really had underlying sympathies with the enemy. According to Hughes in her study of Warwickshire, there were many types of neutralism: gentry who tried to remain aloof for as long as possible but who were finally driven into some commitment, usually on the royalist side; gentry who retreated into pacifism after the activity of 1642; and the largest group of all – gentry who apparently never stirred.[16] Whilst Warwickshire, as any county, was different in its own way this description provides an indication of the different levels of support or indeed the antipathy. This chapter is a counterpart to the first chapter on the fifteenth century, as it examines who the local office-holders within Hampshire were during this turbulent period and the relationships they had both with the centre and within their locality.

[12] Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegadoes*, pp. 5, 8.
[13] Weil, 'Thinking about allegiance in the civil war', p. 190. See p. 70-5 for further discussion on the topic.
[14] Manning has provided useful discussion of Puritans and radicals in terms of allegiances and factions within the Parliamentary cause, see Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution,* pp. 30-32.
[15] Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegadoe*, pp. 10-11.
[16] Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire,* p. 164. It must be noted that was specifically related to Warwickshire, each county was different in its involvement and allegiances.

(i)

Local Office and Landowners

Office-holding: Overview

Keith Wrightson has suggested that mediating between the national legislative ideal and ambivalent local realities was the whole apparatus of Tudor and Stuart local government.[17] Upon the county's officers was devolved the essential task of balancing out the needs and requirements of both provincial society and the royal government. Appointment to local office in the seventeenth century was still through nomination from central government, yet the nominee was able to choose whether to accept office or not (although most would, for the prestige and to maintain their position within society). The period from 1640 to 1660 was an extremely complex time with an ever-changing political climate and this uncertain environment unsurprisingly meant that there were 'ambivalent and ambiguous motivations existing side by side within both Whitehall and local society'.[18] Andrew Coleby in his study of Hampshire quotes David Underdown, commenting that despite the equivocal motivations of many, the pattern of local government appointments has been used to assess the willingness of members of central government to come to terms with their opponents and the willingness of these opponents to serve at a local level. This has been taken as showing a widespread acceptance of the Interregnum regimes.[19] Whilst this study has used appointments to local office in Hampshire as a way of determining some degree of allegiance, it has been approached keeping in mind the abstruse and personal reasons behind acceptance of such offices.

In her study of Warwickshire, Hughes admits that although on the surface Parliament was more successful at retaining support, many who committed themselves did so reluctantly and briefly.[20] Similarly Anthony Fletcher in his study of Sussex found that most of the inhabitants of West Sussex were 'sullen and apathetic' about the war.[21] Both Fletcher and Hughes, whose

[17] K. Wrightson 'Two concepts of order; justices, constables and jurymen in seventeenth-century England' in J. Brewer and J. Styles (eds.), *An Ungovernable People: the English and their law in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (New Brunswick, 1980), p. 26.

[18] A. M. Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649-1689* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 17.

[19] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities,* p. 17; See also D. Underdown, 'Settlement in the counties 1653-8', in G. E. Aylmer (ed.), *The Interregnum* (London, 1972), pp. 165-82.

[20] Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire,* p. 163.

[21] Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660,* p. 271. Fletcher commented that the inertia of the western gentry in the summer of 1642 was in marked contrast to the response of the east to parliamentary preparations for war. The justices did as they were asked in administering the Protestation

divergent views regarding the gentry and their horizons have found supporters among historians working in specific local contexts,[22] have discussed the prospect of the protection of the gentry's estates and position within society and 'the natural desire for many to carry on their normal lives.'[23] That said, there were a number who did support a side and remained with that side to the end. As well as these individuals, there were many in between who held office either quietly the whole way through, remaining constant in their position regardless of the situation at the centre, or those who withdrew from national politics at various times, such as following the period following Pride's Purge, (when troops under the command of Colonel Thomas Pride forcibly removed from the Long Parliament all those who were not supporters of the New Model Army and the Independents, or who were unlikely to support the trial of the king). This section will examine who the local officers were in Hampshire during this period.[24]

The office of Justice of the Peace (JP) was originally conceived as just one of a number of medieval royal experiments for suppressing disorder, but the office survived its rather shaky origins, and by the fifteenth century had become an essential part of local government.[25] Professor James Sharpe has stated that throughout this period, the JP played a vital role in both law enforcement and county administration in general.[26] The justice had many duties including the power to conduct the preliminary examination of suspects and witnesses in cases of felony, to commit felons to prisons, to call out the county trained bands to quell riots, to stop affrays and to enquire into apprenticeship disputes amongst others.[27] Fletcher has also examined the justices, commenting that the scope of the JP's remit had been much extended by the Tudors,

---

Oath…but the reaction to the financial schemes such as the contributions for Ireland and the Propositions indicated a general hesitancy and inertia. (p. 257).

[22] For example, see Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-60*, p. 330; J. S. Morrill, *The Revolt in the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630-50*, 2nd ed. (London, 1999), p. 180; Underdown, *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum*, p. 20; A. R. Warmington, 'Civil War, Interregnum and Restoration in Gloucestershire, 1640-1672', *Royal Historical Society Studies in History, New Series*, vol. 104, no. 2 (1997), pp. 19, 98; K. Wrightson, *English Society, 1580-1680* (London, 1982), p. 48.

[23] Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire*, p. 167. Fletcher also comments that concern for the preservation of their estates may have prompted a number of magnates, who secretly sympathised deeply with the King's cause, to hold back from positive action, in Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War*, p. 278.

[24] See Appendix 2 for a list of office-holders in Hampshire for this period.

[25] J. A. Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750*, 2nd ed. (London, 1999), p. 40.

[26] Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England*, p. 40.

[27] Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England*, p. 40. Sharpe discusses at length the various duties bestowed upon the justices and went on to comment that their local government functions included fixing poor rates and supervising the repair of the high-ways, and appointing overseers of the cloth; they were empowered to take action against Jesuits and tax-evaders.

their duties springing from two sources: statutes, and the commissions of the peace by which they were appointed. Many of these statutes extended the administrative role of the justices, imposing on them tasks in the fields of religion, economic regulation, upkeep of roads and bridges and the relief of poverty.[28]

By the seventeenth century the commissions had grown since the medieval period, with at least twenty men listed for each year, although it is unlikely that they all attended (see Appendix 4). For the 1650s a list of those who were registered exists, as do records of the quarter sessions which reveal who actually sat in sessions during this time. Fletcher draws a neat summary of the distinct sections to every commission of the peace and whilst his ideas may be somewhat dated, they do act as a template for understanding the makeup of the Bench.[29] The men named at the head of the list were by and large honorary justices: principal officers of state who played little part in county government; royal judges who sat with the gentry at the twice yearly assizes; members, where relevant, of local prerogative councils; and the nobles with local territorial influence whose participation was normally limited but who could provide the local gentry with useful links with the royal court. Then came the working commission. It is this body of men, resident or at least partly resident, country gentlemen who bore the day-to-day burden. The choice of men with whom to entrust these duties was obviously of great importance. Justices were appointed by the sovereign under the Great Seal, although in practice the Lord Chancellor or the Lord Keeper had responsibility for the composition of the commissions of the peace. As might be expected, those chosen were often the nominees of others in position of authority such as royal servants, courtiers, and officials.[30] Sharpe also highlights the fact that the traditional qualification for membership of the bench, that the aspirant should be a £20 freeholder was patently obsolete by the mid-sixteenth century; long before that time justices has been drawn from the upper echelons of society. In choosing justices, therefore, the central government had to square the age old problem of finding local governors of sufficient wealth and local standing to command respect. As this chapter will show, the above qualification also became obsolete following a period where any support was valued, regardless of wealth. Particularly during this period the JPs were vital to central government because from the outbreak of the civil war until the Restoration, control of the commissions of the peace was at the heart of the

[28] A. J. Fletcher, *Reform in the Provinces: the Government of Stuart England* (London, 1986), p. 3.
[29] Fletcher, *Reform in the Provinces*, p. 5.
[30] Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England*, p. 41.

struggles for power in the localities. At this time the county committees emerged, made up of men loyal to Parliament, who collected taxes, mustered horses and carried out parliamentary orders within the counties, providing support and help which led to Parliament's victory. Unfortunately, there is limited surviving information about the composition of the county committee of Hampshire during this time. Succeeding regimes in London were well aware that finding able and willing JPs meant wooing men with the office and being 'prepared to sacrifice ideological purity for quiet acquiescence.'[31]

Whilst the responsibilities and powers of the JPs had increased, between the fourteenth and late sixteenth centuries those of the sheriff had undergone a decline.[32] In the medieval period the office of sheriff had held great prestige and usually was bestowed on the most important members of local society because the office constituted a crucial link between central and local government. However, other local offices began to impinge on the shrievalty. Most importantly the rise of the JPs and quarter sessions eroded the importance of the sheriff and his courts. The diminution of jurisdictional powers was followed by the loss of the sheriff's military function which was superseded by the mid-Tudor innovation of the lord lieutenant and militia. The social status of those filling the shrieval office fell steadily between 1550 and 1750. Sharpe indicated that whereas the sheriff in 1550 was still drawn from the county elite, by 1750 he was usually gentry of middling form.[33] This is shown in the list of sheriffs in Hampshire for the period, for the majority of those recorded as sheriffs do not seem to have been involved in any other form of local politics, such as JP or MP and interestingly there was no case of any man holding the office more than once in the period.[34] Of the nineteen within the twenty year period (there is no record for 1642) seven of the men listed held other offices within both the county and on a national level, whether it was inclusion in various ordinances or holding an office, which would suggest that although the office was in decline, it had not become defunct. Of

[31] Fletcher, *Reform in the Provinces*, p. 12.

[32] Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England,* p. 44. See also T. G. Barnes, *Somerset 1625-1640: a County's Government during the "Personal Rule"* (London, 1961), chapter 5, 'Shrievalty'; T. E. Hartley, 'Under-sheriffs and bailiffs in some English shrievalties c.1580 to c.1625', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 47 (1974), pp. 164-85.

[33] Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England,* pp. 44-5.

[34] This will be discussed further in the following chapter; however, those holding the office were not as prominent in county affairs as their predecessors in the fifteenth century suggesting that the pattern in Hampshire correlated with the fact that the status and importance of the office was diminishing.

these nineteen all but one were of esquire status, with the one being a knight.[35] Of the seven men who held other titles,[36] as well as that of the sheriff, six were resident in Hampshire. The seventh, Thomas Bettesworth, came from neighbouring Sussex but he held many offices and much land within Hampshire and married into the ancient Hampshire Uvedale family. The fact that there was a knight present in the office, even if only one, would suggest that it would be inaccurate to assume that the office of sheriff was completely insignificant by this period, for the sheriff still remained responsible for collecting certain royal dues, administering the county court and supervising elections to parliament. The sheriff had also been important in collecting ship money in the 1630s, one of the main tensions leading to civil war and he continued to contribute to local policing and the maintenance of law and order. Writs from the law courts at Westminster continued to be sent to the sheriff, who served them and returned the writs through his under-officers.[37] Whilst this office still held importance, sheriffs were now more employees than managers; their powers increasingly arrogated by the rising JPs and the new rival office of lord lieutenant.

As well as the offices of sheriff, JPs and of course MPs – whose status remained as important as ever within each province – a new office had emerged during the previous century. The office of the lord lieutenant had been founded by the Tudors, and by early seventeenth century noble lord lieutenants were firmly established in every county. Victor Stater has devoted much attention to this newer office and confirms that it was 'the most prestigious and potentially the most powerful local office in the crown's gift.'[38] Discounting the nobility, the sheriff had been the main link between the localities; the link that oversaw the goings on within the county whom the king could trust to be his agent. However, with the creation of the lord lieutenant – as well as the decline in power of the shrievalty – the king had a new trusted representative who he could rely on to control the provinces (although in 1642 this changed). The lord lieutenant's official duties were laid out by the crown: to defend public order, to represent the crown's interests in the provinces, to oversee the county trained bands and to carry out the

[35] For a list of sheriffs see A. Hughes (ed.), *List of Sheriffs for England and Wales, from the Earliest Times to A.D. 1831*, Public Record Office Lists & Indexes, 9 (New York, 1963), p. 56. A list of sheriffs for the town of Southampton is recorded on p. 226. For a list of those in Hampshire see Appendix 3.

[36] Richard Norton, Thomas Bettesworth, Francis Tilney, John Hiddesley, John Hooke, Henry Worseley and John Fielder.

[37] Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England*, p. 44.

[38] V. Stater, *Noble Government: The Stuart Lord Lieutenancy and the Transformation of English Politics* (London, 1994), p. 8.

orders of the Privy Council.[39] Lord lieutenants and their deputy lieutenants were primarily concerned with the perpetuation of their family's influence, the maintenance of stability in the shire and the pursuit of local interests at court, a familiar set of ideals for the majority of the local gentry. In common with the justices and sheriffs, lieutenants had to be the leaders of their shires. Their efficacy depended on their ability to retain the respect and deference of the gentry. They needed to be of sufficient standing to unite all local factions. Thus, the most important quality a lord lieutenant could possess was his membership of a powerful local family.[40] This was a characteristic which remained a constant in the selection of local officers.

John Sainty, in his works relating to lieutenants in the counties, found that during this period the office of lieutenant began to be recognised as permanent in the sense that lieutenants, once appointed, continued to act until their death or replacement.[41] He also stated that whilst it was normal to have a joint appointment, there were not usually more than two, whereas in Hampshire James Lennox, 4th duke of Richmond was appointed between 1635 and 1642 alongside Jerome Portland, 2nd earl of Weston and Thomas Wriothesley, 4th earl of Southampton.[42] Interestingly, Stater commented that although the institution of lieutenancy continued to exist, the civil wars reduced it to irrelevance, for it never completely abandoned the defence of local interests and maintenance of local stability.[43] The war demanded more than compromise; it demanded victory and Parliament ultimately devised methods that did not require lord lieutenants in order to triumph. Sainty examines the lieutenants up to 1642 and then in a separate work from 1660 onwards, commenting that his list does not extend into the time when Parliament was appointing them instead of the king. In 1660 the 4th earl of Southampton, Wriothesley, was appointed again until his death in 1667.[44] David Appleby draws attention to the change in the lieutenancy at the Restoration, arguing that Charles II made the re-establishment of the lieutenancy a priority in 1660, appointing each lord lieutenant primarily on the basis of their commitment to Church and State.[45] As well as this, the

[39] Stater, *Noble Government,* p. 11.
[40] Stater, *Noble Government,* p. 13
[41] J. C. Sainty (ed.), *Lieutenants of Counties, 1585-1642* (London, 1970), p. 1.
[42] Sainty, *Lieutenants of Counties,* p. 22.
[43] Stater, *Noble Government,* p, 64.
[44] J. C. Sainty (ed.), *List of Lieutenants of Counties of England and Wales, 1660-1974* (London, 1979), pp. 21, 138.
[45] D. Appleby, 'The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture', in J. Eales and A. Hopper (eds.), *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales* (Hertford, 2013), p. 117.

lieutenancy's increasing tendency to encroach on the preserve of other county institutions was effectively legitimised by the Militia Acts of 1662 and 1663, by which justices were often required to act under the command of the deputy lieutenants. Appleby concluded that the Militia Acts settled the rivalry between the justices and the lieutenancy by placing the militia unambiguously under the command of the latter.[46] It is clear therefore that this office was of huge importance, although its foundations were not as secure as that of Justice of the Peace, as illustrated by personnel changes during the period within the county Lieutenancy nationally, and the powers associated with the office.

With regard to the MPs, there are not many returns for the county of Hampshire during this period. Yet, where returns do exist, the same names reoccur. Sir Henry Wallop is listed for the county in the 1640 and 1645 returns, whilst his son, Robert, is recorded in the 1658-9 parliament.[47] Robert Wallop played a large part in local and national politics during this period, which will be examined later in this chapter. Richard Norton, another prominent figure during the period and especially during the rule of the major-generals, was listed for 1645 and 1660 and John Bulkeley, a member of the gentry who retained his position as local officer throughout the changing regimes, for 1660.[48] These men were all prominent and active players throughout the period and especially so during the Interregnum. There were numerous levels of involvement and support here and these will be discussed throughout this chapter but Norton and Bulkeley, despite serving the successive regimes of the period in question, managed to survive into the Restoration which might indicate that they were concerned not only with religious ideology but also with the maintenance of law and order.

The commissions of the peace had grown considerably over the course of their development, however as highlighted by Fletcher, a good number of those listed as JPs did not serve.[49] As seen in the previous chapter many non-residents sat on the Hampshire commissions and although they all held land in the county, which enabled them to acquire offices there too, they cannot be classed as residents. What is striking about the lists of surviving justices and quarter session records is that the majority were resident, both in the 1640s and 1650s. Whilst the

[46] Appleby, 'The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture', p. 117.
[47] *Lists of Members' Returns. Members of Parliament, Part 1, Parliaments of England, 1213-1702* (London, 1878), pp. 493 and 509. See Appendix 3 for a full list of Hampshire MPs.
[48] *Lists of Members' Returns. Members of Parliament,* pp. 493, 509.
[49] See p. 58. See also Appendix 4 for a full list of JPs for Hampshire.

commissions did change somewhat during the 1650s, perhaps more so than the previous decade, most of the men involved in Hampshire's government were in fact resident in the county. The table below shows the breakdown of these commissions.

Figure 1: Hampshire Justices of the Peace 1640-1660 [50]

	1640s (up to regicide)	1650s
Resident Knights	1	4
Resident Esquires	17	21
Non-Resident Knights	1	3
Non-Resident Esquires	1	12
Others*	6	5
Total	26	45

** This includes those who only sat once, those of higher status who are simply named (see Fletcher's groups, p. 50 of this thesis) or men who are listed but who have no information relating to them.*
NB/ The term 'resident' is used to describe those men who resided permanently and/or who had their main residences in Hampshire.

Figure 1 shows that not only had the commissions become much larger by the seventeenth century,[51] even discounting those groups who were rarely present, but that during this period the majority of local officers were resident in the county, with more non-residents joining following the regicide. Although there was a noticeable increase in non-residents in the later period, there was actually less movement within the commissions than was to be expected during the different regimes, especially following key moments that threatened not only the political constitution but also the 'real politik', such as Pride's Purge (1648), the regicide

[50] Evidence of the justices of the peace has been drawn from a number of sources. It must be noted that less records were used for the 1640s. For the 1640s the names have been taken from the Quarter Sessions records, based in the Hampshire record office; HRO Q1/2 for 1640, 1641, 1642, 1646, 1647, 1648 and 1649. Further names for 1649 were taken from HRO Q1/3. For the 1650s the Quarter Sessions records were also used for the years 1650-8, HRO Q1/3. Lists of justices also survive for the 1650s. For 1650 the list is presented in the form of a document, *The names of the justices of the peace, England and Wales, as they stand in commissions in their several counties in this Michaelmas terme, 1650* (London), pp. 49-50. For the remainder of the 1650s there are records held at the National Archives; 1652- C193/13/4; 1656 - C193/13/6; 1657 - C193/13/5. See Appendix 4 for lists of JPs.
[51] See p. 109 for comparative discussion.

(1649) and the rule of the major-generals (1655-57), a period of military rule during the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell whereby England was split into regions and governed each by a major-general with deputies under him.[52] It seems a dozen or so extra men joined the rulers of the county following the execution of Charles I in January 1649, but few Hampshire gentry actually withdrew from local politics. Fletcher felt that the most striking feature of local politics between 1649 and 1653 was the narrowing of circles of power, as the retreat of traditional ruling families from both administrative and political activity reached its climax.[53] He found that individuals rather than cliques now exercised the predominant influence over appointments in many shires.

However, Figure 1 would suggest that although traditional families no longer dominated the commissions and that appointments seemed to have been open to a much wider selection of willing candidates, this had happened in Hampshire earlier than 1649 (earlier than 1640 in fact). This is indicated by the fact that within the local office-holding community there is no evidence of family groups holding office as there is for the fifteenth century with the Uvedale and Berkeley families.[54] There were of course a small number of individuals who bowed out of local politics at the extreme moments of civil strife and there were a number of men who replaced them, however, overall there does not seem to be an enormous shift in who was running county affairs. Despite his earlier comment, Fletcher still suggests that for most country gentlemen and townsmen the overriding priority throughout these years was the maintenance of local order.[55] This idea has been an ongoing theme throughout county studies and in fact loosely relates to Everitt's theory that the gentry's horizons were limited to the locality and that they felt antipathy to the centre. This is not in the sense that they were an insular group with no interest in national politics, but that overall the locality was their main priority and many preferred to remain neutral when possible.[56] David Underdown found, for

[52] William Goffe took charge of the region including Hampshire.
[53] Fletcher, *Reform in the Provinces*, p. 15.
[54] William Uvedale, who died in 1652, withdrew from politics following bad health increasing financial embarrassment, he was the last of his family to sit, see A. D. Thrush and J. P. Ferris (eds.), *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1604-1629,* 4 vols (Cambridge, 2010), vol. 4, p. 599. Part of the Berkeley family emigrated to Virginia, America during the initial movement out there and established themselves by founding the Berkeley Plantation.
[55] Fletcher, *Reform in the Provinces*, p. 12.
[56] This idea has already been discussed with regards to Fletcher's study of Sussex, finding the gentry there remained apathetic to war. Hughes also agreed that the Warwickshire gentry attempted to remain aloof in her study, p. 163. That said, it was near to impossible for a member of the gentry class to remain completely neutral.

example, that in Somerset the first priority of the lower orders was to protect their home, family and communities from the armies of both sides and even the gentry with their broader horizons and closer involvement in a national political culture often tried to stay out of the conflict.[57]

Office-holding: Personnel

Although the next two sections of this chapter will be examining the local officers in more depth in terms of their relations within the county and also on a national level with the king and Parliament, the rest of this section will highlight who these men were.[58] Whilst there was less movement and change in the Hampshire commissions than was to be expected given the circumstances and extremity of events in the late 1640s, it is important to note that the group of men listed as JPs did expand significantly in the 1650s. The main increase was the number of non-resident esquires holding the office, rising from one to twelve, but the group as a whole almost doubled. It could be expected following the utterly unprecedented events of 1649, which caused shock and confusion throughout the realm on all sides of the civil wars, that many local officers would actually withdraw from local politics, however, the figures for Hampshire suggest the opposite. This could be due to a more centralised policy by the newly established military regime, placing or elevating those whom it trusted in power in the local arena. It will be shown later in this chapter that there were a number of Hampshire men who were trusted by the Rump and who wielded much power in the locality. As well as this, a further reason behind the increase may have been power and status based, with many benefitting greatly from the bishop of Winchester's sequestered land which in turn would have elevated their status. This chapter will address the concept of allegiance, which in this period is especially complex and many found that pledging allegiance and loyalty to a cause near to impossible due to the constant change within the opposing factions themselves. That said, a certain number of men who joined the Hampshire commissions during the 1650s certainly managed to enhance their status by acquiring office during such a turbulent period, suggesting that they must have had strategies for survival in place to overcome the difficulties of loyalty in order to remain in favour.

[57] Underdown, *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum*, p. 2.
[58] See Appendix 2 for a full list of local officers.

Due to the number of men involved, the local office-holders will be split into resident and non-resident, the latter obviously a smaller group. Some were more prominent in county affairs, holding numerous titles other than simply having a presence on the commissions, whereas there were a few who remained fairly aloof from affairs, either from the start of the conflict or at least as the turbulence of this period progressed. Whilst those men who took little part in local politics have been included in Figure 1, due to limitations of space they will not be discussed within this chapter at length. The main focus will be on those who were openly involved in local and national politics to see how their political position changed during the period. Those who were initially involved in the running of the county but removed themselves from the political scene at various milestones will also be examined, as will be their reasons for doing so.

Because Hampshire lacked a resident magnate, county affairs, administration and security were left largely to the local office-holders. The main resident gentry in charge during this twenty-year period, in varying degrees of involvement, were Robert Dillington, Francis Rivett, Robert Wallop, John Lisle, Richard Norton, Richard Whitehead, John Hook, John Cole, Thomas Cole, John Bulkeley, Nicholas Love, Francis Tilney, Richard Cobb, William Collins, Richard Kingsmill, Thomas Jervoise, Thomas Clarke, Thomas Boreman, John Dingley, Richard Major, John Kemp, Edward Hooper, William Wither, William Willoughby, John Pittman, John Hildesley, Alexander Wilson, John Fielder, John St Barbe, Samuel Bull, William Uvedale, Peter Murford, Henry Bromfield and George Wither. There were also a number of non-residents who took part in local politics, most of whom had lands within the county. The main non-residents were Thomas Bettesworth, Robert Hammond, Francis Allen, Henry Mildmay, Thomas Hussey, William Sydenham, Robert Reynolds, Charles Fleetwood, Francis Willoughby, Nathaniel Fiennes, Thomas Tipping, Peter Legay, John Dove, John Evelyn and Richard Cromwell (who spent much of this period living in the county following his marriage to Dorothy Major). Some of these acquired their lands through marriage or purchase, whereas others benefitted through the process of sequestration.

The Sequestration Committee was set up during the First Civil War (1642-46) to confiscate the estates of the royalists who had fought against Parliament.[59] The Committee for Compounding

[59] The exact date for the inception of the Hampshire sequestration committee was in March 1643, see, 'March 1643: An Ordinance for sequestring notorious Delinquents Estates', in C. Firth and R. S. Rait (eds.), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660,* vol. 1 (London, 1911), p. 106.

with Delinquents allowed those royalists to compound for their estates – that is, pay a fine and recover them – in return for pledging not to take up arms against Parliament. Joan Thirsk commented that the sale by Parliament of crown, church and delinquents' lands during the Interregnum led to a redistribution of ownership 'comparable in scale with that achieved by the sales of dissolved monastic land a century earlier.'[60] However, she also concluded that the social upheaval was diminished by royalist tactics, for many royalists paid the fine in order to reacquire their property. In Hampshire, the Marquis of Winchester re-purchased his lands at vast sums of money, employing six personal agents to conduct the business resulting in his buying back of all but two of his fifteen estates in Hampshire and Berkshire.[61] Thirsk recorded that in Hampshire, where 26 parcels of land were put up for sale, there were only nine that promised any real changes of permanence. Many other historians have agreed that the redistribution of land was not as extreme as it could have been.[62] The Calendar for the Committee of Compounding records 86 cases involving land within Hampshire between 1643 and 1660. Of those cases, eighteen show sequestered land being returned to original owners and only four cases of the land being discharged to a new purchaser. Interestingly, the majority of cases simply record the outcome as a fine being set or that the case was to be referred to the County Committee or to Reading.[63] We are therefore unable to determine what actually happened to the land, but what is interesting is that there were only two cases where the outcome was recorded as 'land sequestered'.[64] However, although this process may not have caused a complete reorganisation of landowning society (many remaining lands were in fact restored following the Restoration), it did further highlight the growing and dangerous change

[60] J. Thirsk, 'The sales of royalist land during the Interregnum', *The Economic History Review,* New Series, vol. 5, no. 2 (1952), p. 188.

[61] Thirsk, 'The sale of royalist land during the Interregnum', pp. 193-4. See also *State Papers of John Thurloe,* edited by Thomas Birch (1742) IV, 444.

[62] Thirsk, 'The sale of royalist land during the Interregnum', p. 194. For examples of other historians who agree that the extremity of change was not as drastic see, for example, I. Gentles, 'The sale of bishops' lands in the English revolution, 1646-1660', *The English Historical Review,* vol. 95, no. 376 (1980), p. 573 and J. Habakkuk, 'Landowners and the civil war', *The Economic History Review,* New Series, vol. 18, no. 1 Essays in Economic History Presented to Professor M. M. Postan (1965), p. 130.

[63] Where the County Committee was usually based. Winchester was in royalist hands for most of the war and Reading was an important royalist garrison as it provided a constant threat to the royalist capital of Oxford.

[64] Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding, edited by M. A. E. Green (1889-1892). For individual cases see part 2 (1643-1646), pp. 830, 846, 882, 970, 976, 1059, 1060, 1065, 1068, 1085, 1089, 1093, 1095, 1119, 1177, 1183, 1275, 1487, 1517, 1523, 1539, 1553, 1563; part 3 (1647-1650), pp. 1658, 1688, 1751, 1755, 1788, 1793, 1812, 1831, 1873, 1922, 1940, 1944, 1965, 1973, 1976, 1994, 2041, 2079, 2087, 2088, 2095, 2113, 2221; part 4 (1650-1653), pp. 2009, 2437, 2516, 2531, 2567, 2612, 2697, 2723, 2725, 2781, 2794, 2807, 2833, 2846, 2847, 2875, 2895, 2986, 3036, 3114, 3115, 3119, 3136, 3138, 3144, 3146, 3147; part 5 (1654-1659), pp. 3233, 3234, 3188, 3190. Some of these cases will be discussed further in the following section.

in the political climate of the realm during this time. It was not even the king who was ordering such measures. This process may well have benefitted a large number of the gentry and there was such a group in Hampshire, who will be discussed in the following section. However, regardless of whether lands were sold on to eagerly awaiting opportunistic members of the gentry or whether they were restored to their owners through re-purchase (in the case of the Marquis of Winchester), nobody could deny a growing feeling of unease at such extreme and unheard of measures.

Seventeenth-century Hampshire was controlled by a number of individuals and although the Commissions of the Peace were large, there were varying degrees of involvement from different men.[65] Beginning with the resident Hampshire gentry, Robert Dillington, of Knighton, was a JP throughout the 1640s and 1650s and was named on the county committee of the Interregnum.[66] Similarly Francis Rivett, of King's Sombourne, as well as holding the office of JP throughout the period was also a member of the county committee and elected as MP for the town and parish of Stockbridge in the late 1650s.[67] A large majority of these men held office throughout the 1640s and 1650s, with Robert Wallop, John Lisle of Wooton and Richard Norton of Southwick all listed. Wallop, as mentioned earlier was an MP, born of an ancient Hampshire family, and held numerous amounts of land as well as being listed in many ordinances and commissions.[68] Like Wallop, Lisle and Norton both held substantial land within the county and a number of titles, with Norton holding the prestigious offices of deputy lieutenant and sheriff in 1643 and Lisle as MP for Winchester and recorder for Southampton to name but a few.[69] Like these men, Richard Whitehead, Thomas Cole, John Hook and John Bulkeley all graced the commissions in both the 1640s and 1660s and were listed as justices of

[65] Those men who nominally are listed as justices but who do not appear in any of the records for other titles, or indeed as holding land in the county, have been discounted in this study due to space restriction.
[66] He held much land in the county; see A. H. Doubleday and W. Page (eds.), *Victoria County History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, vol. 5 (1908-14), pp. 181, 183, 185, 219 and 253. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series,* [*Commonwealth*] *1649-1660*, vol. 8: Jan-Oct 1655. p. 162.
[67] For a list of Rivett's lands see, *VCH,* vol. 4, pp. 259, 471, 472. See also B. D. Henning (ed.), *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1660-1690*, 4 vols. (London, 1983), vol. 3, p. 335.
[68] For his lands see *VCH,* vol. 4, pp. 253, 289, 301, 358, 409, 515 and 532. He is also listed multiple times in the State Papers, mostly in various commissions from the centre. For example; SP 21/18, f.167, SP 21/19, f.95 and SP 25/96, f.125.
[69] For Lisle's land-holding see *VCH,* vol. 3, pp. 415, 484, and vol. 4, pp. 313, 388, 563-5. For his MP status and recorder see *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, John Lisle,* accessed 24th April 2014. For Norton's lands see *VCH,* vol. 3, pp. 31, 264, 304, 387, and vol. 5, p. 336. His deputy lieutenancy is also listed in *VCH,* vol. 5, p. 336 and Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 160.

the peace as well as owning land.[70] Whitehead, of West Tytherley, as well as holding several titles in other counties, was MP for Lymington; Cole, of Liss, was appointed to the county committee in 1645 and MP for Petersfield; Hook, of Bramshott, was sheriff in 1649 and MP for Winchester; and Bulkeley, of Nether Burgate, was elected as a recruiter MP for Hampshire.[71]

Another set of men who were listed as JPs for the whole period were Richard Major, Nicholas Love, William Wither, Thomas Jervoise and Henry Bromfield. Major, a substantial landholder in the county and originating from Southampton, served as sheriff in 1640 and served on all assessment committees between 1643 and 1657 as well as representing Southampton in parliament in 1653.[72] His most prominent role, however, was as father-in-law to Richard, son of Oliver Cromwell. Nicholas Love, of Winchester, held extensive lands within Hampshire and the office of MP of Winchester as well as the post of one of the Six Clerks of the Chancery.[73] Wither, of Manydown was uncle to George Wither the satirist who also sat on the commissions in Hampshire in the 1650s. As well as holding the office of JP he held extensive land.[74] Like William, George also held office during this period, as a justice in the 1650s but in the 1640s he inherited the family estate and was appointed to a Hampshire committee responsible for raising funds to support the militia, suggesting his role was significant within local politics.[75] Thomas Jervoise, of Herriard, was another Hampshire landholder, originally from London, holding the office of MP for Whitchurch during the period and was listed in numerous commissions.[76] Through his father's marriage, Henry Bromfield became a resident, based at Chawcroft with a manor elsewhere also. He appears on various commissions throughout the 1640s and 1650s.[77] Edward Hooper, of Hurn Court, held land in Hampshire and is recorded as

[70] Whitehead, *VCH*, vol. 4, pp. 148, 520, 523 and 524; Cole, *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 85; Hook, *VCH*, vol. 2, pp. 492 and 495; Bulkeley, *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 570.
[71] For the offices of these four men see Henning, *History of Parliament*, vol. 1, p. 743, vol. 2, pp. 105, 578, and vol. 4, p. 764.
[72] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 419. See also *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Richard Major,* accessed 24th April 2014.
[73] For his lands, see *VCH*, vol. 4, pp. 6, 92, 253, 254. For his title of MP, *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Nicholas Love,* accessed 24th April 2014, and Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 18.
[74] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 39 and vol. 4. p. 223, 239, 241. See also Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 751. This relates to his son, however there is information listed regarding him.
[75] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, George Wither,* accessed 24th April 2014. For his lands, see *VCH*, vol. 3, pp. 203, 239, vol. 4, pp. 28, 201, 207, 221. See p. 90 for further discussion of the importance of his role.
[76] For lands see *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 367 and vol. 4, pp. 125, 301, 267.
[77] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 200 and vol. 4, p. 618. See also Henning, *History of Parliament*, vol. 1, p. 725.

an MP for Hampshire but was excluded from sitting by the Protector's council.[78] John Pittman, who held land at Maplederwell and Quarley, was one of the militia troop captains, suggesting he had influence within the county during the civil wars and Richard Cobb who held the manor of Swarraton held no offices aside from the office of justice.[79] Finally, of those resident officers spanning both decades, was Thomas Clarke, Henry Worseley and John Kemp who remained only as justices, John Cole of Odiham who owned some land but whose office-holding was also limited to JP, and Richard Kingsmill from Kingsclere who, like Clarke, seemed less involved in local politics other than holding the office of JP.[80] John St Barbe, who owned the manor of Romsey and held local office from 1643, represented Hampshire in 1654 to his death in 1658.[81]

So far the residents noted were active for most of the 1640s and 1650s. There were, however, a few who only took part in politics in one decade or another. William Uvedale, of Wickham, was a member of an old family of Hampshire who, as this study has shown, had been prominent in the fifteenth century. Uvedale held a large area of land in Hampshire and graced many commissions during the earlier part of the seventeenth century as well obtaining the title of Charles I's treasurer of the Chamber and position of deputy lieutenant.[82] His health declined soon after the start of the civil wars and he died in 1651 after withdrawing from politics. No other members of the Uvedale family were active in local politics during the rest of this period. Aside from Uvedale no other active resident gentry withdrew from the Bench after 1649.

Moving on to the 1650s, there were a number of new resident officials listed as justices. John Hildesley of Christchurch was listed as a justice from 1649 onwards, following the change in regime after the regicide. He represented both Winchester and Christchurch in parliament during the 1650s.[83] Francis Tilney, of Rotherwick, held the title of sheriff in 1647, however, he was not an active justice until the 1650s. Thomas Bowreman, of Broake, listed on various commissions was a garrison commander for the Isle of Wight and John Fielder, who was elected to the Council of State in 1651, was a member of the Rump Parliament, suggesting the

[78] *VCH,* vol. 3, p. 468 and vol. 4, p. 453. See also Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities,* p. 72.
[79] *VCH,* vol. 4, p. 196.
[80] For Cole, see *VCH,* vol. 3, p. 427 and vol. 4, pp. 85, 631. For Kingsmill's land see *VCH,* vol. 4, pp. 240, 285, 327. He was also a neuter, Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities,* p. 20.
[81] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 381; *VCH,* vol. 4, p. 454.
[82] *VCH,* vol. 3, pp. 153, 233 and vol. 4, pp. 153, 232. See also Thrush and Ferris, *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1604-1629,* vol. 4, p. 599.
[83] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 2, p. 548.

New Model Army thought he was reliable and willing to do the unthinkable (execute the king), something many who had supported Parliament in the 1640s were not.[84] Samuel Bull, listed in the commissions of the 1650s, was deputy to Colonel William Sydenham and an officer in the Isle of Wight but discharged from his command in July 1659. There was also John Dingley who, although High Constable in Surrey, was born in Hampshire and was a justice of the peace during this period.[85] Alexander Wilson and William Collins both appear in the 1650s as justices, the latter holding some land, part of which was bought following sequestration of royalist lands.[86] The final residents were Peter Murford, William Willoughby and Francis Willoughby. Murford, as well as a justice, was governor of Southampton (1656-62) whilst William Willoughby was the Navy Commissioner of Portsmouth (1648-51).[87] William's son Francis then became Navy Commissioner of Portsmouth also (1652-1660) and an MP for Portsmouth in 1659.[88] This evidence shows that there was a growing military presence in Hampshire during the 1650s with a number of military personnel joining the running of the county, which indicates a growing element of central influence within the localities during this period.

Moving on to the non-residents who took part in Hampshire affairs, Thomas Bettesworth of Sussex, who was perhaps the most constant non-resident, held the office of justice throughout the entire period, was included in a number of commissions and held some land within the county.[89] A second non-resident who was also involved for the whole period was Henry Mildmay of Essex. He was named as a justice during the 1640s and 1650s and although he was not heavily involved in the day-to-day affairs of the county he did own some land in

[84] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, pp. 24, 69. See also *The Grand memorandum, or, A True and perfect catalogue of the secluded members of the House of Commons, sitting 16. March, 1659, being the day of their dissolution also a perfect catalogue of the Rumpers, some of them sitting with the secluded members the same day : together with the names of such as were the kings judges, and condemned him to death under their hands and seals* ... (London, 1660).

[85] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 74. See also, SP 25/79 f.19. Bull appears frequently in the State Papers usually with relation to the goings on in the Isle of Wight. For Dingley's lands see VCH, vol. 5, p. 282 and http://www.lincstothepast.com/Estates-in-Hampshire-belonging-to-the-Dingley-family/635464.record?pt=S, accessed 24th April 2014.

[86] *VCH*, vol. 3, pp. 248, 320.

[87] For Murford see SP 25/63/2, f.165 and SP 18/101, f.116. He was commandant of the town, see *VCH*, vol. 5, p. 342. For Willoughby see SP 18/1, f.160 and Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 18.

[88] http://history.inportsmouth.co.uk/people/willoughby.htm accessed 29th July 2015.

[89] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 244 and vol. 4, p. 424. For examples of his involvement see *VCH*, vol. 5, p. 12 and SP 16/539/3 f.190.

Hampshire.[90] These men were the only ones to have a constant presence in local political activities during the period for, as with the residents, most men were involved for only part of the period. Robert Hammond of Surrey, a cousin of Oliver Cromwell, was involved during the 1640s but took no part in public affairs following 1651. Hammond became more prominent than most during his time as governor of the Isle of Wight, for he was captain of Carisbrooke castle in 1647 when Charles I was confined there for a year, more of which will be discussed in the following sections.[91] John Evelyn, of Wiltshire was a clerk in the chancery as well as a justice for Hampshire and although he was named as a justice throughout the 1650s he remained away from the Commons following Pride's Purge in 1648, going into retirement until the return of the secluded MPs to the Long Parliament in 1660. Yet, despite limited involvement he gained a large amount of land from the bishops of Winchester's estate following its confiscation.[92] This is significant because despite not serving the Rump, Evelyn still managed to benefit greatly in the acquisition of land as well as being able to function at a local level.

There were also a few men, like Evelyn, who benefited from the sequestration by gaining lands in the county from the bishop of Winchester following the abolition of Archbishops and Bishops in 1646. Francis Allen, Robert Reynolds, John Dove, all justices during the 1650s, were such men. Allen, a goldsmith from Fleet Street in London, held the manor of Droxford within the county which was sold to him by the Long Parliament following its confiscation from the bishop. He was involved in multiple commissions and a member of the Rump Parliament.[93] Reynolds, of Cambridgeshire, was named on several commissions for Hampshire alongside resident gentry and was also an MP for Whitchurch.[94] John Dove, of Wiltshire,

[90] For information on Mildmay see Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 64 and *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Henry Mildmay,* accessed 24th April 2014. He owned the manor of Marwell, *VCH,* vol. 3, p. 333. He was included in the State Papers frequently and at least once was he called upon alongside resident Richard Norton; SP 16/442 f.113.

[91] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Robert Hammond,* accessed 24th April 2014. See also *VCH,* vol. 5, pp. 224, 347. Clarendon is less than kind when discussing Hammond commenting 'this man was thought a person of honour and generosity enough to trust the king's person too' when really he should not have been trusted.

[92] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, John Evelyn,* accessed 24th April 2014; *VCH,* vol. 3, pp. 42, 43, 494, 497.

[93] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Francis Allen,* accessed 24th April 2014. *VCH,* vol. 3, p.286. Allen was named on many occasions in the State Papers, for example, SP 63/295 f.84 and SP 16/539/3 f.56.

[94] *VCH,* vol. 3, pp. 77, 312, and vol. 4, p. 75; *A perfect list of the Lords of the other House, and of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, and barons of the Cinque Ports, now assembled in this present parliament holden at*

acquired the manor of East Dean following the Act of Parliament for the Abolition of Deans and Chapters.[95] As well as holding the office of justice in Hampshire, he was also active on the commissions of his own county. Thomas Tipping of Gloucestershire and Thomas Hussey of London also held the office of justice of the peace during the 1650s. Hussey managed to acquire a huge amount of land from the bishop of Winchester.[96]

As well as the above non-residents there were also more powerful men listed, who would have fallen into the category that Fletcher described as those who were listed, but rarely had fully active roles within local affairs. In Hampshire during the 1650s Charles Fleetwood, governor of Ireland (a radical related to Cromwell by marriage) appeared on the commissions.[97] It is, however, unlikely he would have served often as he was in Ireland for a large part of the period. Nonetheless, it is significant that he was named on the commission because it suggests that the Interregnum government was using such men as way of curbing the control of the local officers by instilling a sense of discomfort and uncertainty. Although he was never directly involved in local affairs, there was no indication to the Hampshire officers at the time that he would not suddenly join local affairs and take over. It is appointments such as these where signs of central oversight of local affairs becomes evident. As well as Fleetwood, William Sydenham of Dorset and Nathaniel Fiennes of Oxfordshire joined the Hampshire justices. Fiennes also had little to do with the county, perhaps providing a similar role as Fleetwood in the eyes of the central regime. Sydenham, by contrast became governor of the Isle of Wight, was appointed captain of Carisbrooke castle like Hammond and served on many committees.[98] The final new addition to local politics in Hampshire was Richard Cromwell. Although technically a non-resident initially, following his marriage to Dorothy Major he spent most of time living at their estate in Merdon until his Protectorate began in 1658. He also was elected as an MP for the county following his marriage.[99]

Westminster, for the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Jan. 27, 1658 [i.e. 1659] (London, 1659).

[95] *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 499.

[96] *VCH*, vol. 3, pp. 305, 334, 340, 349, and vol. 4, pp. 74, 302, 513. He died in 1657 but he was elected as MP for Andover in 1656, see W. Browne, *Notitia Parliamentaria, Part II: A Series or Lists of the Representatives in the several Parliaments held from the Reformation 1541, to the Restoration 1660* (London, 1750), pp. 229–239. For further discussions of sequestered lands, see the next section on horizontal relationships.

[97] Fleetwood is listed in the commissions for 1650, 52 and 56; Willoughby is listed in 1656, 57 and 58.

[98] *VCH*, vol. 5, p.224; Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 18; SP 18/13, f.2.

[99] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 419.

The early modern political system underwent significant changes during the mid-seventeenth century, placing substantial strain on the structure of local and national government, as well as on all of those who operated within it. Between 1642 and 1652 the nation witnessed three periods of civil war and desperate attempts by both Parliament and the king to gain support and allegiance as well as three different parliaments (The Short Parliament, the Long Parliament and the Rump Parliament – the residue of the Long following Pride's Purge. This is not including the brief Nominated Assembly preceding the Protectorate), which resulted in turmoil and mistrust.[100] By the time the king was executed in 1649 the country had been thrown into complete uncertainty, for the majority of the population had never contemplated this happening. This event changed the world for much of the population, for it was not simply a question of a change in the political climate or a change of regime (as happened in the fifteenth century) but a catastrophic turn of events resulting in the abolition of an ancient establishment. The king was thought by many to be chosen by God, divinely appointed, and so when he was executed it threw the county into shock, disarray and panic. The fact that so many were willing to serve the Rump (and there were many in Hampshire) is particularly important because their actions could be interpreted as accepting what had just taken place. That said, there were many reasons for wishing to remain within Parliament at this time. Some continued to serve in support of the events that took place in 1648/1649 or at least in the hope that it was a prelude to revolutionary change, whereas others sat with the desire to moderate the course of events by influencing them from within.[101] But overall, many became unsure what they were fighting for or which cause they supported due to the constant shift in factions that existed in the opposing sides.

Following the shock of the late 1640s and early 1650s during which the political climate had shifted beyond recognition, with the abolition of the monarchy and the establishment of the Commonwealth and then the Protectorate, there was still more for the population to contend with. This came in the form of direct military rule; that is to say, the regime of the major-generals, 1655-57. The list of justices of the peace and county committees (although the information is limited for Hampshire) provides us with a good idea of who was in charge of local affairs, and the quarter session records are even better as they give an even more accurate indication of the main officers who were actually active. However, those listed as supporting

[100] See Appendix 1 for a full chronology detailing the constant regime changes.
[101] B. Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-53* (Cambridge, 1977), p. 26.

the rule of the major-generals provide fascinating evidence of those local officers willing to support such a new and alien regime, essentially one that represented direct military intervention from the centre, threatening the growing autonomy of the locality. With regards to the local officers chosen as helpers, exhaustive searches among the Interregnum state papers in The National Archives have failed to uncover a definitive national list of commissioners, and in the absence of such documents the names of a large number of the commissioners remain unknown.[102] In most counties, however, the reluctant commissioners and those less than fully committed to the work of the major-generals played at best only a minor role on the commissions, leaving the brunt of the work to be carried out by the more enthusiastic colleagues. These more ardent commissioners were in the main local military figures and zealous puritans.

What is known for Hampshire is that William Goffe was the general in charge of the region of Sussex, Hampshire and Berkshire and the Hampshire commissioners who supported and helped him included representatives from several leading county families, including Richard Norton and Richard Major. Particularly active in Hampshire was a group of individuals who exercised considerable power within the principal towns of the county, including John Hiddesley and Thomas Cole. Two captains of the county militia troops, John Dunch and John Pittman, were both named as commissioners as were a contingent of regular army officers, including Colonel Norton, governor of Portsmouth, Col John Fiennes, Major Richard Bull, Major Edward Hooker and Captain Thomas Chase. [103] The fact that there were a number of army officers actively running the county suggests that Hampshire was very much affected and impacted by this new regime of military intervention, with a number of important local office-holders willing not only to accept this new regime, but actually support it. This in turn suggests that there were a number of radical Protestants within the local elite of Hampshire, a conclusion drawn due to the ubiquitous godliness associated with these major-generals. They were willing to support a regime providing it served their requirements in religious reforms, similar to the desires of law, order and justice of the Presbyterians who would be likely to lend support to a regime if these criteria were fulfilled.

[102] C. Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals: Godly Government during the English Revolution* (Manchester, 2001), p. 61.
[103] See Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals*, p. 62.

The major-generals were an extremely important phenomena because they further represented the extremity of change witnessed by the counties during this period. However, the extent of this change was not as large as one might expect. This would suggest that perhaps the Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell realised the dangers of alienating the localities and rewarding existing local gentry, knowing that their support was key. Those in the localities realised the need for favour from the centre in order to maintain their position. That said, despite the limited change on the commissions during the major-generals' rule, as well as there being several supporters for them amongst the local Hampshire office-holders, the major-generals experiment was unpopular with the localities. Many historians have agreed that they were seen as agents of central control who were resented and opposed primarily because they represented a threat to long-established traditions of local autonomy and self-government: Durston, for example, describes the general view of this regime by generations of historians as 'ill conceived, unconstitutional, oppressive and deeply unpopular';[104] Paul Christianson declared that their rule was 'the most stringent central invasion of local privileges and customs of the century';[105] and Clive Holmes argued they were 'the epitome of central interference in local government and their operations aroused considerable antipathy.[106] The fact that the rule of the major-generals lasted less than two years lends credence to this assumption. However, although Durston comments that many saw the military regime as negative, he does go on to highlight that to a degree both the new and old local governors realised that they were intended to be partners rather than rivals and thus made some effort to treat each other with respect and consideration.[107] William Goffe's first act on arriving in Hampshire, for example, was to pay his respects to two prominent local justices, Richard Cromwell and Richard Major.[108] Goffe is also recorded in the quarter session records in 1655 and 1656, suggesting he did take an active role in the county.[109] How involved each general became depended also on the man himself as many found themselves in a struggle with the local gentry. Goffe was conspicuous for his radical religious and political beliefs and whilst there were a number of supporters for him he

[104] Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals,* p. 7.
[105] P. Christianson 'The causes of the English Revolution: a Reappraisal', *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 15 (1976), p. 74.
[106] Holmes *Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire,* p. 214.
[107] Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals,* p. 73.
[108] Bod. Lib., *Rawlinson MSS,* A 32, fos. 797-800. Of course it must be noted here that both were tied to Oliver Cromwell in friendship and marriage and so more than likely to have supported this new regime regardless of whether Goffe had paid respect or not.
[109] See Appendix 4.

may have also risked alienating himself and the regime he represented from those who did not share such extreme views.

Alienation of the localities, as already noted, was unwise and Underdown, in his examination of Somerset, commented that 'inexorably the first fifteen years of Charles I's reign confirmed the alienation of the Country from the Court', which undoubtedly contributed to his unpopularity and eventual defeat.[110] Therefore, one might conclude that Ronald Hutton and Ann Hughes's 'integrationist' theory (that Parliament were ultimately more successful due to their ability to integrate with the localities) holds much truth and that the local officers were more than simply pawns for the central government to play with. As already noted, their priority was in the main their locality and so whilst central government would try to win them over, many would serve successful regimes in order to maintain their position. In Hampshire, very few served in the 1640s who then did not continue under the Commonwealth which would suggest that many supported Parliament. However, the problem with this conclusion is that there were so many variations within the parliamentary side that it meant constant change in who one would support. Many supported successive regimes as long as they fulfilled certain requirements. The Presbyterians, for example, supported the regime providing law and order was maintained - which would explain why many moved toward royalism in the lead up to the Restoration. Similarly, the rule of the major-generals found much of its support in the puritans and those who identified with their religious and societal aspirations.[111] David Appleby suggests that the conservative Presbyterians can be distinguished from Puritans by their 'desire for a national disciplined Calvinistic church run by elders [presbyters] or conceivably a primitive episcopacy.'[112] The confusion over a set 'cause' emphasises how difficult it was for many to continue to serve and whilst there were obviously a number who simply served whoever was in power, there were a large majority who found themselves in very difficult

[110] Underdown, *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum*, p. 20.

[111] The term 'Puritan' is problematic with differing views regarding its definition. Patrick Collinson defines Puritanism 'not by the contentions of its adherents, but by the assessments of its observers', see P. Collinson, *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture* (Los Angeles, 1989), p. 29. Whereas John Spurr has warned against associating them solely with Dissent, see J. Spur, *English Puritanism 1603-1689* (1998), p. 131. David Appleby notes the variation in definition but suggests the term is used to indicate a godly individual who believed in moral conduct and worship according to Scripture. See D. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconformity* (Manchester, 2007), p. 4.

[112] See Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day,* pp. 4-5.

positions. The following two sections will now assess their relations both within their county and with central government.

(ii)
Horizontal Relationships

Having ascertained who the main officers were in Hampshire between 1640 and 1660, this section will investigate their relationships with each other at a local level. The county community debate found its roots within twentieth-century scholarship focusing on the seventeenth century, beginning with Alan Everitt in the 1960s. Local studies tended to focus on the gentry within specific English counties, as they were seen as ideal for a more specific exploration of the inner-workings of local politics and administration. The actual debate surrounding the 'county community' stems from the differing approaches to localism during the seventeenth century. Everitt saw England as a union of partially independent county 'states', each with their own separate ethos and loyalties. He continued to stress throughout his study on Kent the insularity of the county, especially for the gentry in terms of their marriage alliances as well as their social network. He believed that 'the dominant desire of the community of Kent, in 1660 as much as in 1640, had been to live a life of its own apart from the mainstream of national development'.[113] Everitt insisted that the gentry were both ill-informed and relatively unconcerned with the affairs of the state. The leading gentry of each county had grown within this close community over the centuries and so their loyalties lay within their native county with regards to national affairs.[114] This idea gained much interest and support amongst historians of the seventeenth century during the mid-twentieth century.[115] However, there were a number of flaws with the argument, one being that a community could be made up of many different components, such as shared interests, social status, trade, kinship, marriage, political affiliations, education and so on. People could belong to more than one

[113] Everitt, *The County Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion*, p. 326.

[114] A. Everitt, 'The county community' in. E.W.R Ives (ed.), *The English Revolution, 1600-60* (London, 1968), p.52. See also, C. Holmes, 'The county community in Stuart historiography', *The Journal of British Studies*, 19 (1980), p. 54.

[115] See, for example, Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War*; Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-60*; Underdown, *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum*. For discussions of a general idea of a 'community' see H. P. R. Finberg, 'Local History' in H. P. R. Finberg (ed.), *Approaches to History* (London, 1962), pp. 116-117.

'community', possibly on a national and local basis, whether in a town or smaller neighbourhood. These factors posed serious challenges to the 'county community' idea and specifically it raised questions about whether people thought of themselves as belonging to a county community.

Everitt's approach remained largely unquestioned until the 1980s when Clive Holmes and Ann Hughes challenged this orthodoxy.[116] Holmes argued against insularity and antipathy to central government and attempted to provide an alternative viewpoint, suggesting that the education of the gentry and marriage outside of the county, along with a growing contact with London broadened their horizons beyond their locality. He felt that the orthodox view had over-emphasised the extent of localism and the neglect of, and antipathy toward, national issues.[117] Ronald Hutton and Ann Hughes agreed that Everitt's approach was too narrowly focused, suggesting that it was in fact actually the cooperation and support between Parliament and the localities that resulted in Parliament's success over the royalist cause, which has already been discussed in the form of the 'integrationist' argument.[118] The revised approach had quite an impact and even John Morrill, whose study of Cheshire during the seventeenth century lay firmly in the Everitt camp, revised his own thinking as well as his own works, writing a second edition in 1999 to his book *The Revolt in the Provinces.* He pointedly changed 'of' to 'in' the provinces admitting that the approach that he shared with Everitt and Fletcher contained serious exaggerations and that Holmes and Hughes had taught him to acquire a more balanced view of the relationship between locality and centre.[119] Saying this, it would be incorrect to discredit Everitt's innovative work completely and Andrew Hopper has recently commented that his work 'bestowed a new scholarly respectability onto county studies of the civil-war period by showing that wide-ranging conclusions could be drawn from the study of a particular county, and that counties were worth studying in their own right rather than merely to illustrate the national narrative.'[120]

---

[116] David Underdown, although remaining within the confines of Everitt's model, did show signs of new ideas emerging in his study of Somerset, *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum,* p. 20.
[117] Holmes, 'The county community in Stuart historiography', p. 64.
[118] See p. 46. See also Hughes 'The King, the Parliament and the localities during the English Civil War'. Ronald Hutton also came to this conclusion in *The Royalist War Effort,* pp. 105-109.
[119] J. Morrill, 'Introduction: county communities and the problem of allegiance in the English Civil War' in J. Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London, 1993), p. 183.
[120] A. Hopper 'The impact of the county community hypothesis' (introduction) in Eales and Hopper, *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales,* p. 1.

This debate feeds into the question of allegiance, not just in terms of the gentry's allegiance to their neighbourhood or 'community', but also allegiance to an abstract cause. The question of loyalty for the king was not ambiguous; if one was neutral or not fighting for the king, one was invariably considered disloyal. As everyone was the king's subject, being neutral meant you were essentially rejecting royal authority.[121] Most subjects did not want to fight against the king and were left unsure of how to act, initially including many staunch parliamentarians such as Oliver Cromwell. The concepts of allegiance and loyalty are complex, with different opinions from scholars. Ian Gentles, for example, discusses the religious cause at great length, stressing that it was the most important consideration for the majority of the population.[122] He describes how in 1644 captured parliamentary soldiers were quoted as explaining their allegiance in apocalyptic terms: 'Tis prophesised in the Revolution, that the Whore of Babylon shall be destroyed with fire and sword, and what do you know, but this is the time of her ruin, and that we are the men that must help to pull her down.'[123] Fear of popery was the thread running through the petitions sent up from the counties to parliament in early 1642. The great bulk of pamphlets and books published in 1641-2 were not about constitutional issues but about religion. Manning suggested that puritans looked to parliament for the reform of religion and so they became involved in politics, growing increasingly concerned about the divisions in parliament which delayed decisions on religion.[124] He also suggested that the fear of papists did not arise from the existence of known recusants but from the belief in the existence of unknown numbers of secret Catholics and sympathisers with Catholicism. David Cressy has also recently discussed the growing resentment and blame toward the bishops for the ensuing crisis in the early 1640s and noted that the 'rise of radical sectarianism, whether real or imagined' was sending fear into the country.[125] Many of the moderate gentry were therefore in a difficult position, battling between the desire for law and order as well as remaining faithful to their religious and political ideological views.

---

[121] See, for an example of this idea, Robinson, *Horses, People and Parliament in the English Civil Wars*, p. 17.

[122] I. Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652* (Harlow, 2007), pp. 137-140. See also J. Morrill, 'The religious context of the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (Fifth Series), vol. 34 (1984), pp. 155-178.

[123] Gentles, *The English Revolution*, p. 139; See also the speech of those from Colchester who comment on the invasion and plunder of suspected Roman Catholics on Essex's Stour Valley. The attack was anti-popery and the source from the Colchester masses signals the extreme feelings against 'popish Lords' and 'the insolencies of papists in this land', p. 137.

[124] See W. H. Mildon 'Puritanism in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight from the reign of Elizabeth to the Restoration' (London Uni, unpub thesis, 1934), p. 6; See also Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 6; Manning, *The English People and the English Revolution*, p. 31.

[125] D. Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-42* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 149, 246.

The growing fear of the Catholic religion did not cease following the regicide in 1649, and by the time the Protectorate was created in 1653 the Independents had risen to power with Cromwell at their head. Even more extreme in their godliness were the major-generals, aided by their local helpers, who began to spread their teachings and devoutness during their rule in the late 1650s. The major-generals' entire manifesto centred around religion; they believed that they had a divinely inspired mission, meaning that they could rely on God's providence to bring them eventual success, which is shown by the correspondence that they sent back to London from their associations.[126] Durston comments that some passages in their letters closely resemble sermons and extempore prayer which were such prominent features of puritan worship and that their most important connection was their radical puritanism.[127] It was the failure of the 1654 parliament to pursue godly reformation, which was so central to the aims of Cromwell's regime, that explained why the Protectorate was loathe to break its ties with the army which was still firmly committed to the godly cause (as well as the fact that without the army, the Protectorate would fall). As shown in the previous section, there was support for the major-generals within the local elite of Hampshire which in turn indicates that religion did affect a number of those in charge of the county. However, whilst religion clearly sparked allegiances and fear for many, David Underdown has alluded to the idea that although puritans were found among all sort of conditions of men, the appeal of their ideas was strongest in the middle ranks of society.[128] Religion held sway with all members of society, however, landowning society had more to lose during this uncertain time and so loyalties would be dictated by a number of other factors as well as religion. Andrew Hopper has dedicated much attention to the prospect of changing sides and has resolved that the pattern of switching allegiance broadly reflected the fortunes of war, but was complicated by changing political circumstances as well as being subject to distinctive regional and local views.[129] This can be seen also within the Hampshire community, for whilst there were a number of supporters for the godly major-generals, there were also many who remained within their offices throughout this turbulent period, desperately seeking to remain in their positions as local leaders.

[126] Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals,* p. 53.
[127] Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals,* p. 53.
[128] D. Underdown, *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1971), p. 11.
[129] Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegadoes,* p. 41. See also conclusion, especially pp. 207, 215.

Weil and Robinson have challenged the 'essential assumptions' that the idea of allegiance rested solely 'in a person's heart of hearts', refusing to believe it was simply about personal beliefs.[130] Whilst this may be true, one cannot assume any type of definite motivation, be it personal belief or other, because it is impossible to determine allegiance by people's actions alone, especially during a civil war where so many factors and outside variables could determine actions, or indeed inaction. Eales has commented that whilst religion was at the forefront of the argument to begin with, once war broke out the issue of resistance was tackled more directly and the familiar argument of the king having two bodies, a physical and a corporeal one, and that the war was fought not against the king's person but in self-defence began to be the principal argument used when discussing the war.[131] In the main, personal motivations are difficult to interpret, just as allegiance is difficult to define because it changed so regularly with the atmosphere during this time. William Cliftlands, in his unpublished PhD thesis, provided discussion on the 'well-affected' and commented that they were 'a complex, composite group which…. changed over time.'[132] Whilst in 1642 the 'well-affected' were men who sought to preserve the 'country', by 1649 they were men who wanted to transform it.[133] Cliftlands highlights the fact that allegiance was forever changing because the ground was continuously moving and forcing men to make choices that they never imagined they would face. He also touched upon the idea of religious propaganda and the parliamentary efforts to elicit support by spreading fear of a popish plot, the idea of which has been discussed by others such as Cressy who commented on the 'explosion of print in the opening years of the Long Parliament' which would have been used to elicit support through the medium of propaganda.[134] These attempts to secure allegiance are also another reason why allegiance is so difficult to define because it is highly reliant on the context of the time.

Overall, if one was to make an assumption based on the data from the commissions and lack of movement between 1640 and 1660, it appears that Hampshire predominantly supported the

[130] Robinson, *Horses, People and Parliament,* p. 16; Weil, 'Thinking about allegiance in the English civil war', p. 184. Weil refuses to believe the war was simply about religion.
[131] J. Eales, 'Provincial preaching and allegiance in the First English Civil War (1640-6)', in T. Cogswell, R. Cust and P. Lake (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 189-90.
[132] W. Cliftlands, 'The "well-affected" and the "county": politics and religion in English provincial society, c.1640 – c.1654' (University of Essex, unpub. Thesis, 1987), p. 10.
[133] Cliftlands, The "well-affected" and the "county", p. 11.
[134] Cliftlands, The "well-affected" and the "county", p. 13; Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution,* p. 292. These lines of discussion can also be related to Hopper's side-changing examination.

parliamentary cause. Whilst there were clearly different levels of support involved (just as there were different factions and branches within the parliamentary and royalist causes in general), the obvious lack of movement would suggest a generalised declaration for Parliament. The Calendar for the Committee of Compounding of course shows that there were royalist supporters within the county. However, as previously mentioned, many of the recorded cases show no actual outcome and those that did mostly were discharged back to their owners. Interestingly, there were a few names within these cases that are familiar from the commissions. The Knollys family are one such case, with Thomas Knollys appearing as JP in the early 1640s. Cases relating to this family and their land appear three times in the calendar, all of which were recorded with the outcome as referred to Reading or the County Committee.[135] William Kingsmill, brother of Richard who acted as JP for most of the period, also appears in the records and paid the fine, although his lands were not recorded as being returned and Thomas Chandler, another JP from the early 1640s, was recorded as paying the fine to reclaim his land.[136] Old Hampshire families such as Philpott, Tichebourne and Paulet also appear in these records and all such cases show the estates to be discharged back to the owners. Although there were a number of records relating to Hampshire men in the calendar, there are very few who played an active role in local politics which supports what the data from the commissions suggests of limited movement. More importantly, there were only two cases that show that an estate was sequestered with many others being discharged following payment. The fact that most of these cases were referred or heavily drawn out would suggest that many of those accused were not outright or obvious royalists, for otherwise there would have been no question within the cases as to whether their estates should be released. One such case involving Christopher Hawksworth, who was accused of fighting for the king, records that following referral Robert Reynolds and Francis Allen (two prominent parliamentarian supporters in local politics) begged favour for him and eventually his estate was discharged.[137] This further emphasises the extent to which this was a 'war without an enemy' and how old friends frequently helped one another even if they were on opposing sides.

In his study of the civil war in Hampshire, G. N. Godwin observed that 'on the 21st June, 1642, the deputy-lieutenants, colonels and captains of the county declared for Parliament, with the

[135] Cal. for Committee of Compounding, part 2, p. 1065; part 4, p. 2875; part 5, p. 3190.
[136] For Kingsmill see Cal. for Committee of Compounding, part 2, p. 882; For Chandler see Cal. for Committee of Compounding, part 2, p. 970.
[137] Cal. for Committee of Compounding, part 4, p. 2723.

cheerful assent of the county bands….'[138] He also found, at least in Alresford, the principal inhabitants favoured the parliamentarian cause, also mentioning that although the Marquis of Winchester declared for the king, his kinsman Robert Wallop favoured the parliamentarian cause.[139] Coleby also concluded that there was a higher proportion of parliamentarians in the county and that in the ensuing crisis a substantial majority of Hampshire MPs sided with Parliament against the king (out of 26 sitting in 1642, sixteen sided with Parliament, two others who had expressed support died on the eve of war).[140] He even suggests that the desire to keep war out of their locality turned many of those who were neutral into moderate parliamentarians.[141] With the benefit of hindsight, this might be deemed a flippant assumption because there were a number of staunch parliamentarians within the Hampshire office-holders and it became near to impossible to avoid involvement if one's position was important enough. Their turn to moderate parliamentarianism would not have kept war out of the locality; however, what Godwin highlights here is that during this period, many thought that turning to moderate parliamentarianism would help to shield their locality from warfare and it further emphasises the sheer panic and desperation experienced during this period. The change may well have also been in order to protect their positions and support the side that was proving the most successful. However, as noted, the situation changed so frequently and therefore allegiances were often made with this in mind. Nevertheless, the data does suggest a higher allegiance, regardless of intensity, toward Parliament. Godwin also recorded another example which suggests favour for Parliament, noting that in August 1642, the sheriff, escorted by some 80 men, endeavoured to raise the county militia for the Parliament, but was attacked by between 'sixty and seventy Cavaliers and about 100 persons who disliked proceedings'. He proceeded to describe how 'fifteen of the King's party were killed and nine wounded, with a loss of five on the other side….the country people came in great numbers to help the sheriff, as did numerous well-armed volunteers from Southampton.'[142]

There were, of course, royalist pockets within the county, with Winchester being a royalist garrison and the Marquis of Winchester declaring for Charles I at the beginning of the war, an

[138] G. N. Godwin, *The Civil War in Hampshire, 1642-5 and the Story of Basing House* (Alresford, 1973), p. 5. See ch. 1 for general discussion of 'taking sides'.
[139] Godwin, *The Civil War in Hampshire*, pp. 3-5.
[140] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 6; See also M. Keeler, *The Long Parliament 1640-41: A Bibliographical Study of its Members* (Philadelphia, 1954), passim.
[141] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 6.
[142] Godwin, *The Civil War in Hampshire*, p. 6.

important source of support for the king in Hampshire. Interestingly, Godwin notes that although the Catholic Marquis supported the king, the majority of his kinsmen - men who are in fact many of those listed in this thesis as active members of the office-holding community - took the other side and adhered to Parliament. Peter Gaunt's *The Cromwellian Gazetteer* observes that although Hampshire was largely parliamentarian during the opening of the war, from the outbreak the king's supporters held a number of isolated bases within the county and in 1643-4 they overran most of north, west and central Hampshire.[143] Gaunt goes on to record that the battle of Cheriton in March 1644 ended royalist dreams of taking the whole county and of pushing further east to threaten London, and the areas which remained in the king's hands were gradually reconquered by Parliament in 1644-5. Cromwell also travelled through Hampshire on many occasions during the 1640s on his way between London and the west, campaigning there in 1645, seeing action at Winchester and joining the bloody siege of Basing House, home to the Marquis of Winchester. Evidence of the county identifying so strongly with the parliamentary cause is further supported by the list of indigent royalist officers which appeared in 1663. P. R. Newman has provided extensive discussion regarding this list and has suggested that despite certain limitations it sheds light on geographical distribution of active royalism in military terms.[144] Whilst obviously many officers would not necessarily have claimed (if they were not penniless) and so it must not be classed as a definitive list, it does at least indicate the proportion of those actively involved from each county and for Hampshire this number is really very low. There are only 48 men from Hampshire listed and these are spread out thinly amongst the various commanders which would enforce the idea that royalist military activism was really quite limited in the county.[145] The limited number can be emphasised further when compared to other counties. For example, there are 186 men in total listed for Devon and 213 for Durham.

[143] P. Gaunt, *The Cromwellian Gazetteer: An Illustrated Guide to Britain in the Civil War and Commonwealth* (Gloucester, 1987), p. 73. For further information about exact fighting in specific places, see pp. 73-78 where Gaunt goes into detail about each town that was directly involved.

[144] P. R. Newman, 'The 1663 List of Indigent Royalist Officers considered as a primary source for the study of the Royalist Army', *The Historical Journal*, vol. 30, no. 4 (Dec., 1987), p. 885.

[145] For evidence of these men see *A List of Officers Claiming to the Sixty Thousand Pounds, &c. Granted by his Sacred Majesty for the Relief of his Truly-Loyal and Indigent Party* (London, 1663). The pages are split into columns and for Hampshire men see columns 10, 12, 14, 17, 27, 29, 32, 40, 50, 58, 71, 72, 85, 86, 94, 102, 111, 126, 143,150, 151, 156, 157 and 159. It is important to note here that many may have claimed from London and Westminster also and therefore this record may not reflect the true number from Hampshire.

Office-holders: Social Relationships

Having established that the general feeling was support of Parliament by many of the local officers throughout the period in question, attention can now be focused on the type of relationships that existed between them. It is well known that land was at the heart of the gentry's power, with most of the local officers holding at least one piece of land within the county. The ownership of estates could change in several ways: by inheritance and marriage; by sale and purchase; or by crown confiscation (up to 1640) and sequestration (post 1642). There is evidence of a few examples of land transactions between the local officers suggesting ties of friendship. Francis Rivett, of King's Sombourne owned a few properties in Hampshire, one of which was sold to him in 1649 by fellow resident office-holder, Robert Wallop.[146] Similarly, the Hundred of Chutley was in possession of the crown until it was given to the Tilney family, one member of which was Francis Tilney who was a justice throughout the Interregnum.[147] They then sold it to William Wither of Manydown, a fellow Interregnum justice. Wither was also sold the manor of Woodgarston by fellow justice, William Uvedale earlier in the century.[148] There were also a number of examples of land movement due to sequestration, which of course signalled favour on those that received them. In Hampshire the majority came from the bishopric of Winchester following the abolition of episcopal power in 1646. Robert Wallop, although already part of an old and ancient Hampshire family with plenty of inherited lands, acquired much following the establishment of the Interregnum, including the manor of Basing which had been sequestered from the Marquis of Winchester.[149] Similarly Nicholas Love acquired the manors of Nuthanger and Echinwell, although it was restored to the bishop in 1660, and Francis Allen gained the manor of Droxford.[150] William Collins bought the manor of Exton in 1649; Robert Reynolds purchased Bishop Waltham in 1647 for £7,999 14s 10 ½d and is recorded as holding the manor of Cheriton in 1651; and John Dove bought the manor of East Dean (known as Lockerley) in 1650.[151] John Evelyn purchased Bishops Sutton, land and the manor, in 1649 for £2,727 13s 9d.[152] All of these lands were reinstated to the bishop following the Restoration in 1660. Perhaps the two who benefited most from the episcopal lands were George Wither and Thomas Hussey. Wither bought the manor of

[146] *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 471.
[147] *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 239.
[148] *VCH*, vol. 5, p. 232.
[149] *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 116. See also Cal. for the Committee of Compounding, vol. 1, p. 348 and *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 301.
[150] *VHC*, vol. 4, pp. 253, 254; vol. 3, p. 286.
[151] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 320; *VCH*, vol. 3, pp. 77, 312; *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 499.
[152] *VCH*, vol. 3, pp. 42-3.

Alverstoke, which had been retained under the bishops since the thirteenth century until the Act of 1641 confiscating all episcopal lands, as well as the manors of Hambledon, Bentley, the advowson of the church of Holy Trinty and St Andrews in Overton and the manor of North Waltham.[153] Hussey acquired the manor of Old Aresford, as well as the liberty which he purchased in 1648 for £2,683 9s 1½ d, Longwood warren and land at Twyford which were sold to him by the Commissioners for the Sale of Bishops Lands for £351 3s 4d.[154] As with all of the other beneficiaries, both Wither's and Hussey's lands were returned to the bishop after 1660.

The above men benefitted enormously from the confiscation of episcopal land and whilst this was all reinstated to the bishop of Winchester following the Restoration, this does not diminish the significance of these land transactions. Coleby found that, in general, the Interregnum regimes had 'by and large failed to break the mould in local government. They continued to rely upon office-holders drawn from the local gentry…'[155] As well as this, he also concluded that unlike some other counties, the Hampshire commissions were not significantly purged by the Rump as many royalists had disappeared at the start of civil war (which the data from the commissions, as well as the Calendar for the Committee of Compounding, supports) and so there were limited alterations to the makeup.[156] This study confirms these findings, with a similar emphasis placed upon the lack of obvious movement during extreme periods of strife. Whilst there were of course new additions and an increase in the number of men involved in the running of local government, the change was not as great as might have been expected under the circumstances of the late 1640s. What the land transactions show is that central government was able to utilise the large amount of land that became available within Hampshire to secure the support of certain members of the local elite by rewarding them with vast amounts of land. The sudden availability of so much land meant that central government was able to use this to its advantage. Whilst in some counties it may have had success in dominating the local elite by placing many of their men in positions of importance in local government, they were able to solidify the support of the already established elite in Hampshire by offering them more power in the form of land-holding.

[153] *VCH*, vol. 3, pp. 203, 239; vol. 4, p. 221.
[154] *VCH*, vol. 3, pp. 305, 334, 340, 349.
[155] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 31.
[156] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 19.

Marriage was another way in which the landowning class enhanced their position and connected themselves with other powerful families. Marrying heiresses was one of the main ways in which local landowners acquired more land. John Habakkuk has dedicated attention to the subject of the rise and fall of landed families and marriage in this period. He explained that when the property passed on to an heiress, the consequences 'were more interesting' as the estate as an entity essentially disappeared when the heiress was married.[157] Since the husband was usually of a landowning family, the heiress would rarely marry below her status. Marriage to the heiress led to a reduction in the number of estates and an increase in their average size.[158] Yet even when an heiress brought property into the family, it was often regarded as different from the original estate of the family even if it was held by them in following generations. The family saw it as a reserve property and if the necessity to sell arose this type of land tended be the first to be sold. Marriage was usually the principal means by which landed families established and extended their estates, just as purchase was the main way by which newcomers acquired theirs.[159] It could be said for some therefore that marriage was a form of survival strategy, further cementing their positions as landowners and extending their estates and family connections within the county which in turn increased their power as local leaders.

There were a number of marriage alliances amongst the local officers of Hampshire. Non-resident Thomas Bettesworth married the daughter of William Uvedale which drew him into the circle of Hampshire gentry owing to the Uvedales ancient status as important landowners.[160] As well as this, Bettesworth married his daughter to Thomas Bilson, a member of the gentry who remained uninvolved in local politics, which further solidified his status with the local community in Hampshire.[161] Edward Hooper also married into a family who were not involved in local politics but who enabled him to gain more land within the county, elevating his status. Whilst his marriage to Anne More, daughter of John, did not link him to another local office holder, it did mean that he acquired the manor of Chilworth and of Romsey Infra.[162]

---

[157] J. Habakkuk, 'The rise and fall of English landed families, 1600-1800', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* Fifth Series, vol. 29, (1979), p. 192.
[158] Habakkuk, 'The rise and fall of English landed families, 1600-1800', p. 192
[159] Habakkuk, 'The rise and fall of English landed families, 1600-1800', p. 194.
[160] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 244 and vol. 4, p. 424.
[161] J. Dallaway, *A History of the Western Division of the County of Sussex: Including the Rapes of Chichester, Arundel and Bramber, with the City and Diocese of Chichester,* 3 vols. (London, 1815), vol. 1, p. 211.
[162] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 468 and vol. 4, p. 453. Although Romsey Infra is recorded as belonging to John St Barbe in 1653 who was another of the local officers – it is unclear as to how this happened yet likely that one was leaseholder and the other the freeholder. See *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 454.

Henry Bromfield married Francis Kemp, daughter of Thomas Kemp who owned the manor of Heywood which passed to Bromfield who died seised of it in 1682.[163] Francis's son from her previous marriage was John Kemp, JP also during this period. Perhaps the most famous of marriage alliances that took place during this period was that of Richard Cromwell to Dorothy Major. Not only did this marriage alliance unite Richard Major and Cromwell but it was actually arranged by a mutual friend, Richard Norton. Cromwell apparently admired Major's godliness and wrote that he found him to be 'very wise and honest, and indeed much to be valued', but 'some things of common fame did a little stick' with him.[164] However, the pair were married in 1649 in Hampshire. Richard in fact spent much time in Hampshire once they were married and definitely more so than in London up until 1658 when he became Protector. Following his resignation of power he retired with Dorothy to Hursley in Hampshire once more. All of the above marriages benefitted these men in more ways than just a marriage alliance. They also bought land which increased their power and position within the county and they opened ties with other landed families which brought allies. Whilst in Hampshire there was not an overwhelming amount of evidence for these inter-marital alliances, there were at least a few and they can definitely be seen to have taken into account how marriage could help them in their strategy for survival and furthering their position as leaders of local society.

Land and marriage are both good indicators of how the gentry might be connected to one another; however, a further method of investigation is by examining ordinances, declarations and general lists signifying who the top local officers were. Whilst this has been discussed in the previous section and will also be investigated in the following when examining relations between locality and central government, it is also useful for looking at local relations because it provides solid information as to whether there was a close-knit group operating within the county or whether a wider group of different men served. This, in turn, will suggest how the local gentry operated with one another at a local level. There are numerous acts and ordinances during this period relating to varying subjects such as the militia, sequestration, assessment and defence and what is striking is that for Hampshire, the same names appear, in the main, for all. For example, in December 1648 an ordinance was given for 'settling the Militia in several counties, cities and places…' and nearly every name included was that of a local officer for the

[163] *VCH*, vol. 4. p. 681.
[164] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Richard Major,* accessed 24th April 2014.

county.[165] This included Thomas Jervoise, Henry Mildmay, Richard Kingsmill, Robert Wallop, Richard Whitehead, Richard Norton, John Lisle, John Bulkeley, John Kemp, Thomas Cole, John St Barbe, Edward Hooper, John Hook, Thomas Bettesworth, Robert Reynolds, Francis Allen, Francis Rivett, Henry Bromfield, Richard Major, Francis Tilney and John Hildesley amongst others. Whilst this is just one example it is not unique and the above men, as well as some of the others listed in the previous section, appear frequently in many of the ordinances and commissions that were sent to Hampshire.[166] Many of them also appear as those listed as prominent helpers and supporters of the major-generals, Richard Norton, Richard Major, John Hiddesley, Thomas Cole, John Pittman and Thomas Bettesworth and deputy lieutenants, Richard Norton, his sergeant major being Peter Murford.[167]

Godwin has also drawn attention to an ordinance recorded in the Journal of the House of Commons in 1642 at the outbreak of the civil wars, remarking at how interesting it is that so many of the Hampshire gentry were noted,

> Call for sheriff, JPs, mayors, constables and all other his majesty's officers (1642) and do hereby authorize the Deputy Lieutenants of the said county, or one of them; Henry Wallop knt, Henry Clerk knt, John Compton knt, Richard Gifford esq, Thomas Clarke esq, John Kemp esq, John Hook esq, Richard Major esq, Thomas Hussey esq, Thomas Chandler esq, Edward Goddard esq, Francis St Barbe esq, Williams Collins esq, James Nutt esq,Thomas Creswell esq, William Pawlett esq, John Miller esq, Francis Rivett, Nicholas Love, John Pittman, William Carrick, William Withers, John St Barbe, Richard

[165] 'An ordinance for the settling the militia in several counties, cities and places within the kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, and towne of Barwick upon Tweed', in Firth and Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660* (London, 1911), vol. 1, March 1642 – January 1649, p. 1242.

[166] See also, for some further examples of ordinances including many of the local elite, 'An Ordinance for the speedy Raising and Levying of Money, for the Maintenance of the Army raised by the Parliament, and other great Affairs of the Commonwealth.' (August 1643) in Firth and Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum,* vol. 1, pp. 230-231; 'An Ordinance for continuance of a former Ordinance for foure Moneths longer, from the time of the expiration of the said Ordinance, For the Raising, maintaining, paying, and regulating of 3000. Foot, 1200. Horse, and 500. Dragoons, to be commanded by Sir William Waller, in the Associated Counties of Southampton, Surrey, Sussex, and Kent' (1644) in Firth and Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum,* vol. 1, p. 450; An Act for settling The Militia in England and Wales.' (1659) in Firth and Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum,* vol. 2 February 1649 – March 1660, pp. 1332-1333. These are just a few examples, with many more existing, yet in all of these examples the same members frequent the list of those relied upon in the county by the centre.

[167] *VCH,* vol. 5, p. 342.

> Love, Henry Kelseym Thomas Hambergh, Arthur Bromfield, Thomas Bettesworth, John King, Robert Knapton, Francis Palmes, George Wither, George Baynard.[168]

Most of those listed above are the same names that appear over and over again with regards to the political side of county affairs. It seems that from the data collected, the local officers were a cohesive group, who acted together in the running of the county. Land transactions and marriage alliances suggest there were a number of personal relationships and the appearance of so many of them together on the commissions, county committees and major-general helpers, central ordinances for militia, defence, assessment and more would suggest a relatively strong working relationship.

(iii)
Vertical Relationships

This section will examine the relationships between the centre and the localities. The civil wars and successive governments directly affected the localities during the seventeenth century and at times tended to spill over into them, as was the case on many occasions in Hampshire. There was an element of understanding between central government and the local officers that a relationship of mutual understanding was needed, supporting arguments that Parliament was victorious in part because of its ability to integrate with the provinces. This realisation had already happened centuries earlier, with medieval kings taking care not to alienate the growing powerful local landowners, and whilst the civil war of the seventeenth century was more destructive than had ever been seen before, the understanding of the need for a working relationship between local and national was still apparent on both sides. This was even more necessary as there was in fact extensive fighting in Hampshire during this period, including a royalist incursion (July 1643), the sieges of Basing House (July 1644 – October 1645), the battle of Cheriton (1644), the siege of Winchester (a royalist garrison) and campaigns by both William Waller (1644) and Oliver Cromwell (1645) to name but some, with the situation further emphasised by sergeant major Peter Murford describing events to a friend in London

[168] Godwin, *The Civil War in Hampshire*, p. 7.

saying 'this poor county of Hampshire…having had its share of blood and misery in this sad tragedy of our nation…'[169] As well as this, although the rule of the major-generals later in the period could be seen as supporting the 'integrationist' argument (i.e. the integration of centre and the locality), on the other hand it challenges it as this led to direct central control filtering into the provinces and it arguably represented a shift in power with the centre imposing its will on the localities. This section will focus on the relationships between the local officers and the centre, king and parliament.

Although allegiance has already been discussed, it is important to emphasise how ambiguous a word it can be. It was not as clear-cut as simply being a royalist or parliamentarian and within each cause there were different levels of support and different religious views (such as the Independents and Presbyterians within the parliamentary cause), as well as many who attempted, unsuccessfully, to remain neutral. Local historians have established that many wished overall to remain aloof and neutral, however this was not the case for all, possibly because those who did act were doing so due to religious or political conviction, or because they were given no choice (which would have been the case for many, including those who desired neutralism). Within Hampshire allegiance could quite literally mean life or death owing to the fairly extensive fighting which took place on county soil. In neighbouring Sussex, Fletcher wrote that it was at the heart of Parliament's Southern Association, yet although the east of the county was actively parliamentarian, the west remained less enthusiastic. However, in frustration at their obstruction, Sir William Waller issued a warrant against neutrality in April 1644, which bitterly attacked the negative and defensive mentality of the county.[170] Whilst this was perhaps a more extreme incident, the gentry were often forced to choose sides usually due to the presence of county committees or major-generals, for example. Many also did not feel it was worth risking their estates and social positions for a cause that they did not identify with strongly. Commenting on the Cheshire rebellion of the 1659, John Morrill found that this was the first time since 1640 that the elite landed families had found a common cause.[171] Most of their grievances had existed for years, which would suggest that only until there was no other option would some want to put themselves and their family at risk.

[169] *VCH*, vol. 5, p. 342. Numerous letters remain in existence from Murford to his friend Captain Thomas Harrison in London. For further examples of texts related to fighting in the county see J. Adair, *Cheriton 1644: the Campaign and Battle* (Kineton, 1973); Gaunt, *The Cromwellian Gazetteer;* Godwin, *The Civil War in Hampshire.*

[170] T. Webb (ed.), *Military Memoir of Colonel John Birch* (Camden Society, new series, vii, 1873), p. 217.

[171] Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-1660*, p. 299.

In Hampshire, there was a mixture of zealous and tepid supporters. Overall, it can be deduced that the county was parliamentarian in its sympathies like neighbouring Sussex, but the level of support had quite a range. That said, whilst there were a number of men who were ardent parliamentarians the vast majority were in fact horrified by the trial and execution of Charles I and none of those men listed as present at the trial from Hampshire signed the death warrant. Residents Robert Wallop, John Lisle and Nicholas Love and non-residents Francis Allen and Henry Mildmay were all judges at the trial but did not sign the death warrant.[172] Robert was son of Henry Wallop, who held local office but was permanently opposed to Charles I until his death on the eve of the civil war.[173] Robert held local office in his native Hampshire from the 1630s, as well as in other counties, and was on various commissions and committees such as the Committee of Both Kingdoms (1644-8; a committee set up by the parliamentarians in association with representatives from the Scottish Covenanters) and as a commissioner for scandalous offences to name but a few.[174] It has been suggested that he identified with the opposition from about 1640 and in 1642 became the linchpin of the parliamentarian war effort and administration in Hampshire.[175] Willing to sit in the Rump after Pride's Purge, Wallop was made a commissioner for the high court of justice to try the king; however, he was notably absent at the sentencing.[176] He served through the Interregnum, however, unlike other men who were active for the parliamentary cause and present at times during the trial, he did not flee at the Restoration. Wallop was attainted at the Restoration, losing the majority of his lands, although Farleigh Wallop passed to his sons. His punishment was to be 'drawn upon a sledge under the gallows of Tyburn [every year] with a halter round his neck and to be imprisoned for life', which continued until his death, despite petitioning, in 1667.[177]

[172] *A list of the Names of the Judges of the High Court of Justice, for Tryall of the King Appointed by an Act of the Commons in England in Parliament Assembled. And a List of the Officers of the said Court, by them Elected* (London, 1649). It is likely that they never expected the trial to end in the murder of the king.
[173] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 661.
[174] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 661. Wallop, as already noted, held numerous amounts of land within the county, potentially more so than any other of the local officers and was also in many ordinances from the centre, See SP 21/18, f.167, SP 46/95, f.168 and SP 21/19, f.95.
[175] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Robert Wallop,* accessed 24th April 2014.
[176] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Robert Wallop,* accessed 24th April 2014. See also *VCH, vol. 4*, p. 358 for further reference to his motivations.
[177] *VCH 3*, p. 261*;* Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 661; *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Robert Wallop,* accessed 24th April 2014.

Like Wallop, John Lisle was from an ancient Hampshire family and held important offices including MP for Winchester, commissioner for the trial of Charles I and later as one of the committee of five trusted to select councillors of state and Lord Commissioner of the Great Seal.[178] Interestingly, Lisle came from a divided family, with his brother William becoming a zealous royalist who went into exile with Charles II and whose manor passed to John.[179] Lisle remained loyal to the cause, displaying hostility to the crown, like Wallop, early on in the 1640s. He took on a leading role funding the war effort and defending Hampshire, Portsmouth and the Isle of Wight, where his estates were situated.[180] The fact that he was on so many of the commissions and that he was picked to help draw up the sentence for Charles I, suggests that he was clearly trusted by the military-led junta who staged the trial. He remained in office under Cromwell but fled abroad at the Restoration to Lausanne, where he was eventually murdered by an Irish royalist in 1664.[181]

Another fellow resident, Nicholas Love, was also active on behalf of Parliament from the early 1640s. He had strong connections to Winchester College, his father being the headmaster and canon there, and he also owned much land, including even more that he acquired after the abolition of the bishops.[182] Love sat on a number of committees and served 'energetically' throughout the Commonwealth; but what he is perhaps most remembered for was his part in the trial where he too was appointed to the high court of justice. But when the sentence was read he apparently advised that 'conference might be had before any further proceedings', and consequently refused to sign the death warrant. [183] He was violently opposed by Oliver Cromwell, Ireton and others, and 'clamorously reviled as an obstructer of that black designe'.[184]

---

[178] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, John Lisle*, accessed 24th April 2014. For Commissioner of the Great Seal see *A perfect list of the Lords of the other House, and of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, and barons of the Cinque Ports, now assembled in this present parliament holden at Westminster, for the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Jan. 27, 1658 [i.e. 1659]* (London, 1659).

[179] *VCH*, vol. 4, p. 313.

[180] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, John Lisle*, accessed 24th April 2014.

[181] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, John Lisle*, accessed 24th April 2014. He was included, with his fellow parliamentarians, in many ordinances including *A declaration and ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament for the seizing and sequestring of the estates, both reall and personall, of certaine kinds of notorious delinquents, to the use, and for the maintaining of the army raised by the Parliament; and such other uses as shall be directed by both houses of Parliament, for the benefit of the Common-wealth...* (London, 1643) and as an example of his position, see SP 18/25 f.97 (where he was nominated to be the Council of State in 1652) and SP 63/307/2, f.259 (which references his title of Commissioner of the Great Seal).

[182] *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 458; C*SPD, 1660*, p. 343; for extra and see *VCH*, vol. 4 pp. 92, 253, 254.

[183] See *VCH*, vol. 3, p. 458; SP 29/1, f.162.

[184] *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* vii, p. 119.

At the Restoration, Love fled to the continent and, like Lisle, ended up in Switzerland. A non-resident judge and radical parliamentarian was Francis Allen. Although not active in politics in Hampshire until the Commonwealth, Allen did become a commissioner of customs in the 1640s and was appointed as one of the treasurers-at-war in 1645.[185] He was described as a radical figure, labelled as a political Independent by the late 1640s.[186] Allen was present at nine out of the twelve meetings for the trial but did not sign the death warrant.[187] He was one of the most active members of the Rump Parliament, but fell out with Cromwell and withdrew from politics after being arrested.[188] He died in 1658 before the Restoration but was named in the Act of Indemnity in 1660. Finally, Henry Mildmay, a non-resident office-holder in Hampshire was to suffer the same fate as Wallop, as well as losing his knighthood.[189] Mildmay held the office of justice in Hampshire throughout the entire period in question and was also named on various commissions for multiple counties.[190] He was actually nominated alongside Wallop, Lisle and Love to the high court of justice for the trial, however did not sit.

The above were perhaps the most radical of the Hampshire local officers, pledging complete allegiance to one side and benefitting from it until the final change in regime. They may have received many offices and much land throughout the 1650s, but their activities cost them once Charles II returned. These were in fact the only men, from those holding office within Hampshire, to be attainted or imprisoned. The rest of the local office-holders managed to escape with limited punishment. Robert Hammond could be included in the above group as an active and staunch parliamentarian; however, he was reluctant and because he withdrew from public affairs following 1649, he escaped unpunished. Nevertheless, despite his unwillingness, he displayed an act of loyalty when the king was imprisoned in Carisbrooke castle whilst he was governor of the Isle of Wight.[191] It was thought that Hammond might desert the parliamentarians and join the royalists; however, when it was heard the king was planning an

[185] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Francis Allen,* accessed 24th April 2014; SP 63/295, f.84 and SP 16/539/3, f.56.
[186] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Francis Allen,* accessed 24th April 2014.
[187] *Collections of notes taken at the Kings Tryall, at Westminster Hall, on Munday last, Janua. 22. 1648.* [London, 1648 [i.e. 1649], p. 2. See also *Oxford Dictionary for National Biography*.
[188] Allen is listed in many ordinances and commissions throughout both the 1640s and 1650s but more so in latter, see for example, SP 16/539/4, f.47 and SP 46/108, f.189.
[189] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 64. See also, *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Henry Mildmay,* accessed 24th April 2014.
[190] SP 25/64, f.439; SP 18/33, f.148; SP 25/41, f.88.
[191] *VCH*, vol. 5, pp. 347-358, dedicates much attention to Hammond's role during this year, however *VCH* quotes Clarendon a lot which cannot be seen as a reliable, unbiased source.

escape, Hammond tightened security and the king was eventually handed over after a year of imprisonment whilst negotiations were attempted.[192]

There were still groups of more moderate parliamentarians including men who were less candid in showing their political affiliations (aside from holding appointment as JP), men who aligned themselves with whoever was in power and men who supported Parliament but who removed themselves from politics once the atmosphere became too tumultuous. Thomas Bettesworth, whilst listed on many ordinances and holding title of JP for most of the period, remained fairly quiet on the political scene except for his support of the major-generals,[193] as did men such as Thomas Clarke, Richard Kingsmill, John Cole, Francis Tilney, Richard Cobb, William Collins, Alexander Wilson, Peter Legay, Thomas Tipping, John Kemp and Thomas Hussey. They were, of course, involved in local politics, holding the office of JP – for some throughout the whole period. However, with regards to taking sides they seem to have attempted to serve central government, keeping hold and acquiring their land and concentrating on their positions as opposed to the troubles at the centre.

There were also men who recoiled from national affairs but who still held local office and reconciled with the Restoration government. Robert Dillington, MP for Newport in the Isle of Wight during the 1650s retained local office throughout the 1640s and 1650s, and whilst he was not still sitting in the 1660s which may have been due to exclusion from politics by the newly restored monarchy, there is no solid evidence of an attainder or punishment. Similarly, Francis Rivett, a Cambridge graduate, was listed as an MP for Stockbridge in 1660 and held the office of justice during the 1640s and 1650s.[194] Rivett supported Parliament and was active on the county committees, suggesting an element of identification with the cause but there is no evidence of a deep-set loyalty. Although he did not sit in the Restoration, there is no evidence of severe punishment, suggesting – as with many gentry of this time – that his support only went so far.[195] Similarly, Thomas Jervoise is noted as a supporter of Parliament and even as taking up arms for them and sitting on the Rump.[196] Yet, he was also appointed to the militia

[192] *VCH*, vol. 5, pp. 347-358. See also *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Robert Hammond,* accessed 24th April 2014.
[193] Durston, *Cromwell's Major-Generals,* p. 62.
[194] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 335. The Cambridge Alumni Database for the University of Cambridge also shows him graduating with a BA.
[195] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 335.
[196] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 2, p. 651. He is also noted as signing ordinances and as on various committees throughout the period, see SP 21/18, f.167 and SP 46/97, f.116.

commission and the commission of the peace in 1660, sheriff in 1666 and deputy lieutenant for Hampshire in 1673, which suggests he too was reconciled to the Restoration and that the Restoration government recognised his potential in their new regime.[197] The desire of the gentry to keep their offices within the locality as opposed to on a national basis could suggest a shrewd pragmatism on their part, remaining in the local arena and acquiring prestigious offices, but not to the point where they could be risking everything by being involved in national politics.

Four further resident gentry who held office for the whole period through several regimes, but who were noted as parliamentary supporters, were Henry Bromfield, Richard Whitehead, Thomas Cole, Richard Norton and Richard Major.[198] Bromfield, as well as being a JP was also appointed to various commissions including one focusing on the defence of Hampshire and one in which he was appointed as a verderer of the New Forest.[199] He was actually returned as an MP for Lymington in 1660 which further emphasises the constant shift and confusion for many during this period. Presbyterians, for example, found themselves in a difficult position, for they identified with Parliament in 1642, but were appalled by the regicide in 1649 and then gradually moved toward royalism in the late 1650s. Their desire was to maintain law, order and justice but due to the constant changes and horrifying events that this period witnessed it became increasingly difficult to align themselves with any set cause, mainly because these also constantly altered. The sheer confusion of the 1640s and 1650s meant that many simply strove to survive the chaos and this can be seen in Hampshire, with many appearing on the commissions and in local office very sporadically throughout the period.

Like Bromfield, Cole and Whitehead, who held multiple offices between them in Hampshire, are both described as parliamentarian, with Whitehead as a 'staunch parliamentarian'.[200]

[197] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 2, p. 651.

[198] As well as Bettesworth, Cole, Norton and Major were also known for their support of the major-generals, as were John Hildesley and John Pittman, believing heavily that their mission from God. See Durston, *Cromwell's Major Generals,* pp. 53, 62.

[199] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 1, p. 725. See also *Die Sabbati 15. Junii. 1644. An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament. For continuance of the former ordinance for four moneths longer, from the time of the expiration of the said ordinance, for the raising, maintaining, paying, and regulating of 3000…..* (London, 1649), p. 16.

[200] For Whitehead see Thrush and Ferris, *The History of Parliament,* vol. 4, p. 464. The commissions which he participated in include goal delivery, oyer and terminer, assessment, sequestration and safety. For Cole, see Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 2, p. 105. He held offices in neighbouring counties too but for Hampshire he was captain of the milita.

Whitehead, although he did not sit in parliament after Pride's Purge, still held a number of important local offices during the Interregnum, as did Cole; yet both appear unscathed at the Restoration suggesting their power within the county was important to central government. Like Whitehead, Richard Norton held a large amount of land in Hampshire and a number of offices including deputy lieutenant and governor of Portsmouth.[201] Although a Presbyterian, he was close to Oliver Cromwell, arranging his Richard Cromwell's marriage. Yet, despite his close connection and beliefs in the parliamentary cause, Norton survived the Restoration, although Coleby notes that he may not have favoured an unconditional restoration of the monarchy and wished to preserve the ecclesiastical reforms of the 1640s.[202] This immediately suggests that his support was governed by his religious beliefs, not wholly his desire to remain loyal to one side or another and he was actually allowed to retain his command of the Portsmouth garrison in 1660. Richard Major, inclined towards puritanism, had a personal relationship with Oliver Cromwell through the marriage of their children and acted as MP whilst also sitting on all of the commissions or assessments from 1643 to 1657.[203] He died in 1660. Timothy Venning described him as zealous and grasping, always attempting to further his family's position within society.[204] It could therefore be predicted that had he survived the Restoration he would have attempted to reconcile with the newly established government. That said, Venning suggests his death was suicide for fear of punishment of prosecution.[205]

These officers show that, despite a fairly definitive support for a side (Parliament), they were only willing to provide support whilst they were in power. They were able to make their peace with the Restoration government and maintain their status which had been enhanced over the previous two decades. Essentially it seems that they were only willing to support Parliament as far as it enhanced their interests. Even further down the ladder in terms of active support was Henry Worseley, John Hook and John Bulkeley. They all held local office throughout the 1640s and 1650s, but remained, for the most, fairly inconspicuous in terms of political activity. All

[201] For his offices see Henning, *History of Parliament*, vol. 3, p. 160; *VCH*, vol. 5, p. 336; SP 16/452 f.163, SP 21/19, f.209 and *A perfect list of the Lords of the other House, and of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, and barons of the Cinque Ports, now assembled in this present parliament holden at Westminster, for the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Jan. 27, 1658 [i.e. 1659]* (London, 1659).
[202] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 82.
[203] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Richard Major,* accessed 24th April 2014. Major lent his support to the Rump Parliament and was very influential in his native Hampshire according to Coleby (p. 20) however his main concern was his religion. His relationship with Richard Cromwell will be examined in the next section.
[204] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Richard Major,* accessed 24th April 2014.
[205] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Richard Major,* accessed 24th April 2014.

three maintained a positive working relationship with whichever government was serving and were all listed on various ordinances and commissions. All were classed as moderate parliamentarians with all of them continuing to be part of the local office-holding group into the 1660s.[206] Bulkeley is thought to have converted to royalism at the fall of Richard Cromwell, which might suggest a desire to serve whomever might further his position, or that he was aligned with the Presbyterian thinking of concern over law and order.[207]

Even those men who were appointed and active in Hampshire following the events of 1649 managed to escape punishment.[208] These included William Sydenham, John Dove, Robert Reynolds and John Hildesley. Reynolds only joined the Hampshire commissions in the 1650s, although he had been active in other counties before. He had been asked to act as a juror during Charles I's trial but had refused, contented with withdrawing from national politics and furthering his career within local office. This was similar to the case of John Dove, who also managed to enhance his career and land-holding in the 1650s by acting as an MP.[209] At the Restoration both appealed and requested to depart unpunished, and both were reconciled to Charles II. This again suggests a mutual understanding between the centre and the localities and that a relationship of interdependence existed between king and subjects, as well as a shared desire for peace and cooperation. Hildesley can be included in the same category as Norton and Major for, although not active in local office until the 1650s, he has been described as a staunch parliamentarian, gracing a number of commissions and holding the office of sheriff and MP for Winchester and Christchurch. Yet, because of his allegiance he was removed from the commissions of the peace at the Restoration, which although a blow for his career, was a

[206] For Hooke see Henning, *History of Parliament*, vol. 2, p. 578. He was also appointed to the commissions for ejecting scandalous ministers in 1658, SP 25/78, f.649. For Worseley, see Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 3, p. 578; *An exact and perfect list of the names of the knights of the counties, citizens of the cities, burgessses of the boroughs and towns and barons of the cinque-ports that serve in this present Parliament taken at this last session, annoq. Regni Car. 2 Regis I 6/7* (London, 1660), p. 11. For Bulkeley see, Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 1, p. 743 and SP 46/97, f.116. Bulkeley was imprisoned briefly at Prides' Purge, possibly because he was a moderate. He was also recruiter MP for the Isle of Wight.

[207] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 1, p. 743.

[208] Men such as Charles Fleetwood will not be discussed owing to space restrictions and to the fact that he was not really part of the local officialdom.

[209] For Reynolds see *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Robert Reynolds,* accessed 24th April 2014 and the same for John Dove. See also for Reynolds, *A perfect list of the Lords of the other House, and of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, and barons of the Cinque Ports, now assembled in this present parliament holden at Westminster, for the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Jan. 27, 1658 [i.e. 1659]* (London, 1659). This idea of withdrawing from national politics but remaining in local suggests a cleverness on their part as they maintain titles and lands but risk less in the uncertain times of domestic strife.

fairly lenient punishment all things considered.[210] Lastly, William Sydenham, who took up arms for Parliament at the start of the civil war, held important positions such as governor of the Isle of Wight. His involvement in politics fluctuated, with limited involvement following Pride's Purge. At the Restoration he received the same treatment as Hildesley and was no longer able to hold office.[211]

For the remaining office-holders of the county, many suffered the same fate, being included in the Act of Indemnity[212] which forbade them from holding office, whilst some continued down the route of men like John Hook who served whichever regime would continue to reward him with offices and further his status within local and national society.[213] For example, garrison commander Thomas Bowreman who had served with vigour the parliamentary cause conformed to the new regime.[214] The new regime in 1660 may, however, not have trusted such people but needed their support at a time of uncertainty. This, of course, worked both ways and Coleby commented on the fact that John Fielder 'conformed in 1649…and became a very active member, in contrast to his absenteeism before Pride's Purge'.[215] George Wither, who settled in Hampshire in 1650 and became a justice, supported Cromwell although he became disillusioned with him during the Protectorate.[216] He was imprisoned in 1661 owing to his writings, which had very strong political connotations. Of course, whilst many served the changing regimes in order to enhance their status in the locality this is not to suggest that political and religious ideology played no part in their allegiance. As already noted, the Presbyterians desired law, order and justice and so their allegiance could change depending on which regime could offer such security. Many would have welcomed the Restoration regime if they interpreted it as a conclusion to the violence and chaos of the past twenty years. The Restoration government, in turn, needed the support of the local officers and so unless a

[210] Henning, *History of Parliament,* vol. 2, p. 548; SP 25/75, f.749, SP 25/94, f.475, SP 25/71, f.166, SP 25/75, f.591 and *A perfect list of the Lords of the other House, and of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, and barons of the Cinque Ports, now assembled in this present parliament holden at Westminster, for the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Jan. 27, 1658 [i.e. 1659]* (London, 1659).

[211] See *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, William Sydenham,* accessed 24th April 2014; *VCH,* vol. 5, pp. 224, 351.

[212] Passed in 1660 this acted as a general pardon for those who committed crimes during the civil war – with the exception of some crimes including murder and participation in the regicide.

[213] This is especially poignant as evidence of limited loyalty because Hook was actually the nephew of John Pym, see *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, John Hook,* accessed 24th April 2014.

[214] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 148. That said, Coleby does point out that despite conforming, Bowreman remained clearly hostile and suspicious.

[215] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 75.

[216] *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, George Wither,* accessed 24th April 2014.

gentleman had played a significant role in the opposition to the crown, such as Robert Wallop or John Lisle, it was in the interest of the newly established regime to look toward reconciliation as opposed to a complete purge of local commissioners.

Whilst this study has been unable to touch too much upon the Restoration government, it is important to consider one or two key aspects. It could be suggested that many local officers survived the Restoration because they had only pledged tepid support to the changing regimes and only to an extent which would allow them to continue in their positions in local office. Their efforts to remain in local rather than national office would have increased their chances of survival, as has been seen in the evidence for Hampshire. David Appleby has dedicated time to the discussion of the post-conflict culture following the seventeenth-century civil wars and drawn attention to G.C.F. Forster's survey of the government of provincial England under the late Stuarts.[217] Forster believed that local government had survived the Interregnum and that the restored monarchy had not engaged in wholesale reform but had simply purged the magistrates' benches and council chambers, replacing dubious individuals with nominees from leading county families.[218] Appleby, however, disputes this idea, insisting that Restoration communities were far more deeply affected and immeasurably more divided by the civil wars of the mid-seventeenth century than has been suggested, commenting that the idea that the Restoration somehow represented a return to 'normality' is bizarre.[219] Appleby also comments how 'the maimed, the bereaved, the traumatised and the indigent were everywhere to be seen and so visible reminders of the troubled past in communities burdened by heavy taxation, damaged local economies and degraded infrastructure.'[220] It is difficult to make general assumptions due to the variations present within every county, a factor that Appleby certainly notes. Some may have recovered more quickly than others. It depended on the geographical location of the county during the wars, friendships and ties within the local communities and how radical the local elite were amongst other possible factors. Whilst the evidence suggests that in Hampshire many escaped punishment, aside from those such as Robert Wallop who actively took up arms against the monarchy, looking more closely at the data there is a certain

[217] G.C.F. Forster, 'Government in provincial England under the late Stuarts' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society'*, 5th series, 33 (1983), pp. 29-48. See also Appleby, 'The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture', pp. 100-124.
[218] Forster, 'Government in provincial England under the late Stuarts', pp. 32, 42-43; Appleby, 'The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture', p. 105.
[219] Appleby, 'The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture', p. 123.
[220] Appleby, 'The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture', p. 123.

amount of evidence of loss of office which in itself could ruin the career, and in turn the position, of a member of the gentry.

Conclusion

It is fair to say that Alan Everitt's theory of an insular community, concerned as it was with only the locality and a desperation to remain indifferent to central government, has been proved incorrect. The gentry were keen to further their positions as leaders of local society, a phenomenon that had been true for previous centuries, and they did this by acquiring lands, various offices and titles that drew them closer to central government. By the seventeenth century these local landowners had gained a significant amount of power and influence that the centre needed to curb and control, which may have been what the county committees and major-generals were designed to do. That said, whilst their desire to increase their social standing had become high, their priority was still to maintain their position, family and estate as well as ensure the smooth running of their locality, for they saw themselves as protectors of their locality. Aside from a few radicals, like Robert Wallop, Nicholas Love and John Lisle, the majority offered support to an extent but in reality were willing to serve whichever regime would help them keep their position within local political society. However, this became less simple for them to do and they were forced to make choices that they never dreamed of having to make. The execution of the king plunged the country into confusion, horror and fear. The local officials were torn between protecting their family and status, their locality and their political and ideological principles. This in turn led to numerous different levels of support from the local gentry and whilst Hampshire showed itself to be predominantly sympathetic to the parliamentary cause at the beginning of the civil war, the events of 1648-9 led to serious fractures within this camp and consequently the uncertain allegiance of many.

Remaining in the local political arena but not the national, as many of the Hampshire gentry did, meant that many were in fact able to keep their positions and suffer fewer consequences after the Restoration due to their limited central involvement. Whatever their private thoughts, the desire to avoid too open a commitment was a compelling emotion for many gentry. Thus neutralism had had a strong appeal, even if had not proved a realistic option for many.[221] They

[221] Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War*, p. 276. See also, B. Manning 'Neutrals and Neutralism in the English Civil War 1642-46' (DPhil thesis, Oxford, 1957).

were given little choice in terms of involvement, for any gentleman with social standing simply would not have been able to remain neutral for fear of accusations of disloyalty, not to mention the lack of choice due to active fighting that took place within the county. Of course, there were men who served before Pride's Purge or only throughout the Interregnum, but it has already been established that there was no clear-cut allegiance to either one side or another, with Fletcher agreeing that in general there were many different degrees of royalism and parliamentarianism and Hughes commenting that there were also different types of neutralism.[222] What can be taken from an examination of the relationship between the centre, whether that centre was king or Parliament, and the local officers of Hampshire is that there was a relationship of interdependence. Coleby supports this view, writing that the evidence he found in Hampshire revealed 'how dependent those in Whitehall were upon the cooperation of office-holders drawn from the local elites to enforce their policies. The lack of consent and cooperation from many in these localities seriously undermined the achievements of successive governments.'[223] The centre needed to keep the support of the local officers in order to maintain stability in the local communities and the local officers in order to preserve their local hegemony needed the support of the centre. However, their support was not only dependent on personal motivations but also on the political climate of the time. Hampshire experienced a fair amount of actual fighting on its soil during this period which in turn brought the civil war firmly and inexorably into the county. There was, therefore, no option for the local officers of Hampshire to avoid the conflict and by the mid-1640s allegiance was no longer an abstract question but a matter of fortune and ruin. Obviously there were many different types of motivations and private thoughts, religious and political ideology being key, and one must never generalise completely; but for the majority it would take a great deal to risk their fortune and many lived in confusion and uncertainty, waiting for stability and order to be reinstated.

[222] Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War*, p. 276, Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire*, p. 164.
[223] Coleby, *Central Government and the Localities*, p. 233.

Continuity and Contrast – Hampshire in the Fifteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

Having explored in detail who the local office-holders were and their relationships at both a local and national level in fifteenth- and seventeenth-century Hampshire, this chapter seeks to draw contrasts and comparisons between the two periods in order to ascertain how the impact of civil war on landed society in Hampshire changed between the medieval and early modern worlds. As well as a general discussion on how the composition of the local political systems changed, whether the social status of the gentry had transformed and indeed the difference in relations between local and national government, important reoccurring concepts such as loyalty, local autonomy, royal authority and political ideology will also be explored.

The use of comparative study within the field of history is something that has been both criticised and praised by scholars. Raymond Grew admitted that for many professional historians comparative study 'evokes the ambivalence of a good bourgeois toward the best wines: to appreciate them is a sign of good taste, but indulgence seems a little loose and wasteful.'[1] In the previous century Karl Marx had written that 'events strikingly similar but occurring in a different historical milieu lead to completely different results' and that 'by studying each of these evolutions separately and then comparing them, it is easier to find the key to the understanding of this phenomenon.'[2] This opinion is unquestionably applicable to this study, for it enables a clear examination of how landed society survived through periods of central turmoil and how the local gentry managed to maintain their positions as leaders of local society. Grew and Marx's comments are merely representative of the different standpoints attached to the methodology, and there are a number of other scholars who have provided discussion surrounding the nature of its use. For example, Victoria Bonnell commented that the sociological study of history (where the comparative methodology stems from) only achieved full recognition in the second half of the last century, when 'a small chorus of voices called for a more historical approach to sociological problems and closer cooperation between

[1] R. Grew, 'The case for comparing Histories', *The American Historical Review*, vol. 85, no. 4 (1980), p. 763.
[2] K. Marx, Letter published in a Russian newspaper, as quoted in Edward Hallett Carr, *What is History?* (New York, 1961), p. 82.

the two disciplines.'[3] Similarly, Auguste Comte considered comparison to be the highest form of observation and believed that when undertaken through the historical method it was 'the only basis on which the system of political logic can rest.'[4] The views presented here simply emphasise the use of the theory within historical research. The benefits of a comparison of the two different time periods explored within this study are that it allows the scholar to identify common features in the way pre-industrial society was organised and how it coped with civil strife, as well as how, over a period of two hundred years, there were also changes.

Marc Bloch, in his 1928 article 'Pour une histoire comparee des societies europeenes', believed that history could not be intelligible unless it could 'succeed in establishing explanatory relationships between phenomena.' The comparative method is essentially a tool for dealing with problems of explanation.[5] The use of comparison within this thesis further assists our understanding of how local political society developed as well as the nature of relationships at both a local and national level. Grew commented that the willingness to compare societies rests, most attractively, on the assumption of a certain universality in the human condition, on the belief that, just as individuals and societies can learn from each other, historians can learn by comparing human behaviour in similar or different contexts.[6] In her paper, focusing on the uses of the comparative methodology, Victoria Bonnell outlines the two different types of comparative research; first, the analytical, which has the main point of comparison between or among equivalent units, involving an identification of independent variables that serve to explain common or contrasting patterns or occurrences; and second, the illustrative, that is the main point of comparison between equivalent units on the one hand and a theory or concept on the other (i.e. it evaluates individual units not in relation to one another but in relation to a basic theory or concept applicable to all of them).[7] This study is aligned to the analytical, as it compares the two time periods in order to draw conclusions and contrasts regarding the nature of local political society.

[3] V. Bonnell, 'The uses of theory, concepts and comparisons in historical sociology', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 22, no. 2 (1980), p. 156.
[4] A. Comte, "Cours de Philosophie Positive" in G. Lenzer, (ed.), *Auguste Comte and Positivism: The Essential Writings* (New York, 1975), pp. 247, 249.
[5] W. H. Sewell, 'March Bloch and the logic of comparative history', *History and Theory*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1967), p. 208.
[6] Grew, 'The Case for Comparing Histories', p. 767
[7] Bonnell, 'The uses of theory, concepts and comparisons in historical sociology', p. 164-5.

(i)

Contrasts

The main contrast between the civil wars of the fifteenth and seventeenth century was the actual context and nature of the wars, which in turn had differing implications for local reactions.[8] The wars of the fifteenth century stemmed from a split at the centre resulting from a dynastic dispute between rival families fighting for the crown. The constitution of England, for the most part, remained the same, in the sense that the actual establishment of the monarchy continued. Whilst to an extent medieval kings had been able to sit back on the legitimacy of their succession and divinely approved status, during this period there was a dynastic struggle whereby legitimacy was questioned, royal authority was challenged and the country witnessed the advent of usurper kings. This, in turn, resulted in pressure on the localities, forcing people to consider what they believed about the king and his divine right to rule. For the local officers the domestic unrest threatened their social and political position which they had been carefully building and strengthening through acquisition of land and offices. The wars of the seventeenth century took on a very different nature, whereby the country saw actual constitutional change (not to mention the shocking events of the regicide). Two separate governmental foci emerged, with the crown and parliament at their (now disconnected) heads. Again, the local elite were forced to consider their beliefs about divine right (and after 1649 about kingship itself and whether England should be a monarchy or a republic) as well as consider how to protect their status, as had their fifteenth-century ancestors. Yet now not only were the seventeenth-century gentry pressured into facing an extreme and unheard of schism in political ideology, but they were confronted with an even bigger and more dangerous factor to contend with: religion.

Religion is the main and most obvious contrast between the periods. It had a direct effect on how the localities responded to civil unrest at the centre. Religious rhetoric was ubiquitous in seventeenth-century England. The line of argument taken by Parliament can be summed up by the words spoken by the earl of Essex, 'we, the lords and commons assembled in parliament, have… for the just and necessary defence of the Protestant religion, of your majesty's person, crown and dignity, of the laws and liberties of the kingdom, and the privileges of parliaments, taken up arms…'[9] Charles I's opponents stood for a reform of the Church and a limitation of his constitutional powers. Ronald Hutton believes that their position was calculated to appeal

[8] See Appendix 1 for full chronologies and events that took place in each period.
[9] T. May, *The History of Parliament of England* (1884), p.247.

to the most powerful political instinct of the average Englishman of the day: entrenched conservatism.[10] The two main threads of justification for the parliamentary cause were religion and the protection of the King from his evil councillors, an argument that has been repeated over and over throughout history. These two threads were also very much interlinked, for the one of the main 'evil councillor' in the eyes of the opposition was Archbishop Laud and his innovations in religion. It has been argued by many that the parliamentarians were very cautious about putting the case for resistance to royal power.[11] This is shown clearly by Lord Brooke in his speech in 1643,

> we behold the flourishing and beauteous face of this Kingdome, over-spread with the leprosie of a Civill War: In which, since we are forced for the safeguard of our lives, the preservation of our liberties, the defence of Gods true Religion (invaded by the practises of papists and malignants).[12]

Whilst the fifteenth century experienced significant upheaval and strife, the most obvious reason to fight was an obligation to support the divinely appointed monarch, as well as fulfil any contractual ties resulting from the bastard feudal society. However, by the seventeenth century political ideology had changed and the introduction of the Protestant religion a century earlier had caused a new type of identification that ran deeper than the straightforward expectation to support the monarch.

This difference in context has resulted in further implications for the concepts of loyalty and allegiance. These have been explored at length in the two previous chapters, with the conclusion being that they are extremely complex in their nature as well as different in their makeup in each period. They rested heavily on context as well as personal motivation. When examining loyalty and allegiance during the Wars of the Roses – aside from the overall loyalty to one's family and the maintenance of their estate – the most common foundation for these

[10] Hutton, R. *Royalist War Effort, 1642 – 1646*, 2nd ed. (London, 2003), p. 5. By Charles' reign this 'entrenched conservatism' might be argued to be Calvinist Protestantism, or more generally, anti-Catholicism.
[11] See J. Eales, 'Provincial preaching and allegiance in the First English Civil War (1640-6)', in. T. Cogswell, R. Cust and P. Lake (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 189; C. Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990), p. 132-6.
[12] '*A worthy speech made by the Right Honorable the Lord Brooke…*' (London, 1643) Thomason / E.90 [27], p. 3.

concepts appears to relate to the bastard feudal relationship between lord and retainer.[13] The phrase 'bastard feudalism' was coined by Charles Plummer in the late nineteenth century; however, most associate the concept with K. B. McFarlane who explored the system and the relationships that it produced. Opinion toward this system has changed over the last fifty years, with historians such as J. G. Bellamy and R. L Storey seeing bastard feudalism as a destabilising force, suggesting that it contributed to the civil war of the late fifteenth century, whilst more recent historians have seen it in a positive light.[14] McFarlane's work overshadowed earlier negative accounts and persuaded many that bastard feudalism was in fact a natural successor to the older practice of feudalism, no longer based on tenure, but on a system of relationships built on mutual benefit between lord and retainer; essentially that loyalty was secured through payment of a retaining fee. Christine Carpenter defined it as 'a tie between the greater and lesser aristocracy – the nobility and the gentry – and its importance lay primarily in its social function in binding the ruling elite of society together'.[15] The relationship between lord and retainer rested upon a system of mutual benefit: the lord provided protection and assistance to his retainers during their daily lives, as well as patronage and cash rewards in some case, although these were not the main benefit in this kind of relationship. In return, the retainer provided the lord with material support, in times of peace and war. It has generally been agreed that men were not retained for life, nor were they retained on a hereditary basis, as had been done during the old feudal system.

That said, whilst bastard feudalism might account for the relationship between the gentry and the nobles this did not necessarily explain the relationship that existed between the king and the gentry. Basing assumptions on the hierarchical structure of society, the gentry served the nobles who served the king, meaning the gentry indirectly served the king. Yet, this period witnessed the weakening of noble power due to the unrest of the second half of the century

[13] A number of studies regarding specific affinities exist, see for example; C. Carpenter, 'The Beauchamp affinity: a study of bastard feudalism at work', *English Historical Review,* 95 (1980), p. 514; W. H. Dunham, 'Lord Hastings' Indentured Retainers, 1461-1483: the lawfulness of livery and retaining under the Yorkists and Tudors', *Transaction of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences,* 39 (1955), pp. 1-175; A. C. Reeves, 'Some of Humphrey Stafford's military indentures', *Nottingham Medieval Studies,* 16 (1972), pp. 80-91.
[14] J. G. Bellamy, *Crime and Public Order in England in the Later Middle Ages* (London and Toronto, 1973); Storey, *The End of the House of Lancaster*; Coss calls into questions a number of McFarlanes' points regarding the emergence and formulation of bastard feudalism however, overall, he appears to agree with McFarlanes' revised ideas relating to the effects and nature of the system, see P. Coss 'Bastard Feudalism Revised', *Past and Present,* 125 (1989), pp. 27-64.
[15] Carpenter, 'The Beauchamp affinity: a study of bastard feudalism at work', p. 514.

which resulted in the gentry being left to manage affairs themselves.[16] Their powers therefore strengthened and they gained wider recognition from the crown as important figureheads and the key to control of the localities. Although, as mentioned, the gentry were obliged to fight for the monarch, this study has shown that in Hampshire many served and supported whoever rewarded them and kept them in their positions of power as local leaders. More importantly, because Hampshire did not have a resident noble man there was less likelihood that the local gentry would have been tied to a specific affinity which would ensure that they supported a certain rival. There were a number of men who did serve a specific regime loyally, the most obvious being Maurice Berkeley who was a retainer of Hastings and a loyal supporter of Edward IV.[17] However, he was more of an exception to the group as a whole, certainly within Hampshire. As the powers and status of the local elite increased there emerged a developing relationship of interdependence whereby the crown realised the importance of these local officers in terms of securing stability within the realm.[18] The absence of a resident noble would have helped this growing necessity for cooperation between king and gentry and the evidence for Hampshire certainly supports the premise that a reciprocity of interest existed. That said, this cooperation only went so far, for the gentry were very reluctant to jeopardise their position by raising their colours to the mast, such that they stood to suffer serious loss if caught out on the wrong side.[19] The dynastic struggles that plagued the centre were not cause enough for most of the local officers to take up arms and risk the livelihoods that they had so carefully cultivated.

Although this desire for self-preservation was still evident during the seventeenth century, the ability to remain detached, protect the locality and stay loyal to personal, political and religious ideologies was impossible, which meant that the local officers found themselves in a very difficult position in terms of loyalty and allegiance. The religious aspect complicated the nature of loyalty, for it questioned at what point one should obey God over the king because Charles' desire to rule alone meant that many were torn between obedience to an increasingly tyrannical

[16] See, for example, C. Carpenter, *Locality and Polity; A study of Warwickshire Landed Society* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 640: P. Coss, 'The formation of the English Gentry', *Past and Present,* no. 147 (1995), p. 61.
[17] See chapter 1, p. 38 for evidence of this.
[18] This will be discussed in the comparative section of this chapter.
[19] For evidence see p. 28. See also A. J. Pollard, *North Eastern England during the Wars of the Roses: Lay Society, War and Politics, 1450-1500* (Oxford, 1990); M. Mercer, *Medieval Gentry: Power, Leaderships and Choice during the Wars of the Roses* (London, 2010), pp. 96, 107, 127-130; see also S. Payling, *Political Society in Lancastrian England: the Greater Gentry of Nottinghamshire* (Oxford, 1991), p. 105.

monarch – who, to some, not only threatened the stability of the realm but also the Protestant religion – and obedience to their religion. As chapter two has shown, the wars did not present two rival camps with which one could straightforwardly align oneself. There were numerous factions within the parliamentary and royalist parties and a recurring reason behind these inner factions was disputes over religion. For example, the varying levels of zealousness experienced in the Protestant cause meant that there were many who, despite sharing a similar religious ideology, became suspicious and mistrustful of one another due to differing principles, motivations and level of radicalness. By the mid-1640s Catholic gentry had dropped out of the commissions in Hampshire, and whilst the majority of the Protestant gentry supported the nebulous and fractious parliamentary cause, this thesis has shown that the extent of support varied significantly with many showing obvious anxiety as to what action they should take or what they were actually fighting for. Yet, despite the confusion and hesitancy of many, it was now impossible for them to remain ignorant of the troubles that plagued the realm.

The main reason for this was due to a further element of contrast between the periods which impacted and influenced the reaction and allegiance of the seventeenth-century local officers: the emergence of print culture. This brought the localities directly in contact with the turmoil at the centre, ensuring that they were regularly informed of what was happening and constantly reminded of the religious and political obligations which they were struggling to uphold. As already noted, Hampshire endured much fighting on its soil in the seventeenth century and so it was already difficult to avoid the conflict; but with the emergence of print culture pleading ignorance of political realities was no longer possible.[20] The localities in the fifteenth century would have experienced far less contact and information about central tensions and whilst there was certainly a large amount of preaching and propaganda during the medieval period (in the form of chronicles and proclamations, for example) the content of such propaganda would have had less impact, and the speed and extent of such methods were not advanced enough to fully influence the localities as was seen in the later period.[21] In Hampshire, propaganda was even more prominent than many other counties in the country due to its strategic importance and proximity to London, as well as the amount of actual fighting and activity which took place in the county. The overwhelming desire to understand the unprecedented events which took place

[20] For examples of such fighting see ch. 2, p. 83. See also Appendix 1 which includes detail regarding military activity within the county.

[21] Propaganda in both periods will be discussed in the next section.

throughout this period meant that many were actually desperate to remain informed on all details, if anything due to the utter confusion that the country was experiencing.[22]

The art of preaching and the use of the sermon will be discussed in the next section, for there is evidence in both periods of these being used as a tool for propaganda. Nevertheless, what really differentiates the two periods in terms of media was the introduction of print and the increase in literacy. By the late fifteenth century the use of print was available; however, it was not until the beginning of the seventeenth century that it became increasingly popular with its extra efficiency, ease of production and, as James Rigney puts it, its facility to offer 'a range of additional resources for elaborating or refining, expressing and enclosing meaning'.[23] Due to the negative aspects of print culture,[24] many preachers refrained from publishing through fear of exposing themselves to critical readers and damaging the reputation that they had won in the pulpit.[25] This meant that for the majority, preaching remained the main and most efficient way to reach out to the masses.[26]

That said, print was becoming an increasingly popular way of gaining support, criticising the opposition, and most importantly drawing the localities firmly into the national conflict during the seventeenth century. This made it harder for local gentry to avoid the consequences of events at the centre. Jason McElligott offers an informative discussion of books of weekly printed news, known as newsbooks. These first appeared in 1641, shedding light on many aspects of the civil wars, including the Regicide and the Cromwellian invasion of Ireland, as well as on aspects of popular culture, print-culture, clandestine printing, propaganda and the

[22] For further discussion on this point see R. Cust, 'News and politics in early seventeenth-century England', *Past and Present*, vol. 112, no. 1 (1986), especially pp. 60-1.

[23] J. Rigney, 'To lye upon a Stationers stall like a piece of coarse flesh in a Shambles': the sermon, the print and the English Civil War', in L. Ferrell and M. McCullough (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised* (Manchester, 2001), p. 191.

[24] See Rigney in Ferrell and McCullogh. The main issue that faced preachers was that by writing down their sermons and having them published meant that it opened the way for others to have a voice, like the reader, editors, booksellers with whom the operation of print forced the preacher to share his space. It was felt like the author lost his authority through printing his sermons. There was also concern about the close association of sermons with other sorts of literature, which was matched by concern about the undisciplined independent interpretation of sermons by readers.

[25] Whilst many preachers felt this way, it did not stop some listeners supplying shorthand notes to printers resulting in sermons being published anyway without the preachers' approval.

[26] Cust, 'News and politics in early seventeenth-century England', p. 65.

theory and practice of censorship. Despite their obvious importance, McElligott draws our attention to the fact that these newsbooks have been vastly understudied.[27] The use of print also reflected political and religious agendas, and 'personal' propaganda could extend to policies and personalities with which individual grandees were associated. Jason Peacey notes that both royalists and parliamentarians recognised the need to exploit the press and to communicate with the people in order to justify their policies, and to try and counter the impact of their opponents' efforts.[28] It is this point that caused the use of print to become so popular, for it enabled a quick, common message to be communicated to the nation. Above all else, it offered a variety of opinions and interpretations of events: between 1642 and 1646 a range of writers in London produced more than 800 titles in a variety of formats and genres including sermons, royal proclamations, theological tracts, poetic works, satiric, railing pamphlets and popular songs, catches and ballads.[29]

Preachers and rhetoricians for Parliament remained within the confines of the general parliamentary arguments, these being that they were fighting to protect the king from those evil men surrounding him and for the reformed Protestant religion. Whilst preachers did not first advocate armed resistance, they gave their hearers a clear view of where the right lay in the coming conflict. For the general population, it is clear that it was the protection of the Protestant religion that appealed to them and encouraged them to provide support for the parliamentarian cause. We know, for example, that in Coventry preaching under the patronage of the puritan Lord Brooke produced 'a high state of godly excitement', resulting in hundreds of volunteers for Brooke's army.[30] Similarly a number of historians have signalled that whilst many who fought saw themselves as defending 'just English liberties' against royal tyranny, John Pym

[27] J. McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 1. Throughout this book McElligott continues to stress the importance of the newsbook as a historical source, not just for identifying propaganda, but also for the deployment and development of images, ideas, arguments and tropes at regular intervals over a long period of time. They also provide a regular narrative; For studies relating to these see J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641-49* (Oxford, 1996); D. O'Hara, *English Newsbooks and Irish Rebellion, 1641-49* (Dublin, 2006); J. B. Williams, *A History of English Journalism to the Foundation of the Gazette* (1908); J. Frank, *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, MA, 1960).

[28] J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004), p. 36.

[29] McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England,* p. 17.

[30] A. Hughes, 'Coventry and the English Revolution' in R. C. Richardson (ed.), *Town and Countryside in the English Revolution* (Manchester, 1992), p. 79-80.

aptly observed, 'the greatest liberty of our kingdom is religion'.[31] In the data for Hampshire those who were the most ardent supporters of the parliamentary cause (in its many forms), such as Robert Wallop, Richard Norton or John Lisle, were all decidedly godly Protestants, who stood firmly for religious reform. Those willing to risk their status and position were certainly more radical in their religious beliefs than those who focused more so on their own social status within the local administration.

Whilst this was true for the more radical members of the localities, examining the county elite in Hampshire has shown that politics and religion were so closely connected that many of the officers were put under significant strain. The local officers not only needed to consider their private motivations and ideological beliefs, but also their obligation to the central government, which was problematic in itself following the drastic constitutional changes that took place in the late 1640s and early 1650s. With the dramatic turn of events came further implications in the form of direct central interference in the provinces. Active fighting on Hampshire soil, as well as the increasing production of newspapers and other methods of communicating information (such as written documents, oral discourse – most obviously sermons and gossip) about the chaos plaguing the country meant that the local officers were almost too informed in comparison to the relative ignorance of their fifteenth-century forebears.

As well as an increasing awareness of the events taking place in the realm, a further contrast between the periods was the great level of centralisation in the seventeenth century. Office-holding will be discussed later in this chapter, yet certain elements of local office-holding in the seventeenth century directly correlate to the growing threat of centralisation to local autonomy. During the wars of the fifteenth century, it is clear that whilst the localities were not separate from the centre, there was limited direct involvement and fewer incidences where actions could be inferred as assertions of control by the crown over county affairs. Two hundred years later, there were certainly more examples of central government attempting to bring the localities more into its sphere of control. The overall makeup and nature of local office-holding was similar in both periods in terms of appointments being made by central government and

[31] L. Hutchinson, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson,* edited by J. Sutherland (London, 1973), p. 53; J. Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads: the Harleys of Brampton Bryan and the Outbreak of the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 200; I. Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652* (Harlow, 2007), p. 137.

there was no mass overhaul of the commissions in Hampshire, with many of the same men serving in offices and overseeing the general administration of the county throughout the period.[32] Yet, the introduction of the office of lord lieutenant during the sixteenth century presented a more centralised rival to the office of sheriff and whilst the sheriff ruled by cooperation, the lord lieutenant was designed to rule by diktat. This office was seen as one particularly beholden to the king, given only to those he trusted (and of higher status than the county gentry) to support the Crown above all else. According to Victor Stater the crown relied on the peerage to serve as lords lieutenant which reflected Charles' view that the aristocracy should be preeminent in local society.[33] In Hampshire this office was given to Thomas Wriothesley, earl of Southampton, with Richard Norton, a key figure in the local elite, as deputy. Their main responsibilities were to defend public order, to represent the crown's interests in the provinces, to oversee the county trained bands and to carry out the orders of the Privy Council.[34]

Whilst the lord lieutenants were expected to earn the respect of the locality and provide assistance in managing affairs, the office was still seen as a centralised institution which was inferred as an intrusion into local affairs by the crown. The introduction of this new office also came at a time when the office of sheriff had been in a decline, although many argue that the status of the office had been diminishing over several centuries.[35] Nevertheless, it had certainly deteriorated in importance and prestige in comparison to earlier centuries and by the end of the seventeenth century it was almost completely controlled by lesser gentry, as opposed to the county elite in the fifteenth century when the Berkeleys and Uvedales had dominated the office. During the mid-seventeenth century over a twenty year period only seven of the nineteen listed held other important local offices. This was a huge decline compared to the fifteenth century when almost all of the sheriffs commanded other offices such as JP or MP. It would be incorrect to assume that by the latter period the office was obsolete because the sheriff still held

[32] Evidence for this limited movement within the commissions can be seen in Appendices 3 and 4.
[33] V. Stater, *Noble Government: The Stuart Lord Lieutenancy and the Transformation of English Politics* (London, 1994), p. 11.
[34] Stater, *Noble Government,* p. 11.
[35] See pp. 15-16, 51-2 for full discussion on the fifteenth and seventeenth century sheriff. See also R. Gorski, *The Fourteenth-Century Sheriff: English Local Administration in the Late Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2003) and J. A. Sharpe, *Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750,* 2nd ed. (London, 1999), p. 44. See also T. G. Barnes, *Somerset 1625-1640: a County's Government during the "Personal Rule"* (London, 1961), chapter 5, 'Shrievalty'. See also Appendix 3 for a full list of sheriffs for both periods in Hampshire.

responsibilities such as collecting taxes and supervising elections to Parliament. However, with the introduction of the newer office of lord lieutenant, the office of sheriff had definitely lost considerable importance. This decline of a once desirable office limited availability of prestigious local offices and this, along with the intrusion of the centre represented by the office of lord lieutenant, led to a growing interpretation by the local officers that their positions as leaders of local society were seen as being in jeopardy.[36] During the period where Parliament gained control of country, from 1642 to 1660, the office of lord lieutenant became less important because Parliament found less of a need for it as much of their function was being performed by the parliamentary county committees. This suggests that it had some way to go before being a stable and established office. However, it was re-established by Charles II following the Restoration and can very much be identified as an example of attempted centralisation.

The institutions that represented an intrusion of Parliament into local affairs during the 1640s and early 1650s were the Parliamentary County Committees and although Cromwell had done away with the traditional parliaments by 1653 when he established his Protectorate, he introduced a novel and far more intrusive instrument in the form of the major-generals. This was the biggest example of the centre enforcing direct control on the provinces in the form of military governors being installed in regions, again ruling by diktat.[37] A decade earlier, in the early 1640s there was a pressing need for restricting royal authority (or central interference) due to the autocratic nature of Charles I and his moves to establish personal arbitrary rule. Charles's opponents stood for reform of the Church, but also for the limitation of his constitutional powers both on a national and a local basis. Ultimately, their distrust of him had forced them into the role of reformers, to limit his powers in both Church and state, whereupon Charles had turned the tables on them.[38] Ian Gentles commented that 'Charles engaged in a high-risk policy of locking horns with the leading power groups in the country' which was, as this study has shown, an unwise and risky undertaking.[39] The local officers saw themselves as important figures in the local arena and as semi-autonomous, occupying all of the top and

[36] See chapter 2, p. 52-3 for an overview of the office. The fact that the office of lord lieutenant was not available to the local gentry meant that there was now a rival figure for the leadership of the locality.

[37] See chapter 2, p. 66-68 for further discussion of the implications of the rule of the major-generals.

[38] R. Hutton, *The Royalist War Effort, 1642-46* (Harlow, 1982), p. 5.

[39] Gentles, *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms*, p. 72. This idea is also supported by the integrationist theory discussed by Ronald Hutton and Ann Hughes which presents the idea that Parliament was successful over Charles due to cooperating with the local leaders.

desirable offices available. Yet, throughout this period the officers had to contend with the growing threat to their autonomy, including the arbitrary attitude of Charles I and the presence of various institutions – like the office of lord lieutenant and the rule of the major-generals – which were designed to curb the power of the localities and bring them further under the direct control of central government. The relationship between the centre and the localities will be discussed further in the following comparative section; however it is certain that there was a higher level of attempted centralisation in the later period. This, again, can be seen as a further factor which resulted from the complex, chaotic and confusing nature of the civil wars of the seventeenth century.

This signals the most important contrast between the two periods, this being that the local officers of the seventeenth century experienced higher levels of pressure and had more factors to consider when reacting to the strife at the centre. The fifteenth-century gentry were able to concentrate far more on solidifying their position as leaders of local society because of the limited military activity experienced in the county during the period, less contact and information filtering to them from the centre and overall fewer ideological obligations (i.e. religion) to consider. Of course, it would be incorrect to suggest that they were totally unaffected by the civil unrest, as chapter one of this thesis has discussed.[40] However, the burdens that they were faced with were far less. The evidence from the fifteenth-century records show that there were a number of the local office-holders performing many of the tasks related to the overall running the county, as shown by a number of record series such as the Kings Bench records, the Pipe Rolls and the Early Chancery Proceedings.[41] This therefore suggests that they were left more to their own devices when it came to county affairs, unlike the office-holders of the seventeenth century, who although were holding important positions within county affairs, were subjected to more interference and involvement from the centre. Not only did the seventeenth-century local officers have to cope with maintaining their autonomy against an increasing central presence and their positions as leaders of local society whilst performing the traditional obligations of office, but they experienced events that were unheard of until this period – not least the abolition of the monarchy.[42] Witnessing a complete

[40] See chapter 1, p. 12-13.

[41] See chapter 1 for further discussion.

[42] The increasing central presence has already been discussed but for further information of the inability to escape involvement in national turmoil see chapter 2, for example pp. 58-89 for discussions of the Sequestration

change in the constitution following the regicide called into question everything that they had based their principles on. With the prominence of religious ideology and the inability to completely ignore national events through the exploding media culture and active fighting in their county, the seventeenth-century gentry of Hampshire were placed under considerably more pressure to decide on the best way to react to the situation of domestic turmoil in comparison with their fifteenth-century ancestors.

(ii)

Continuities

Identifying and exploring the differences between the two periods is important because the impact of, and reaction to, civil war directly relates to the context it is fought in. Yet despite these significant contrasts, the evidence that this thesis has uncovered in relation to Hampshire has shown that there is actually much continuity between the periods both in terms of the structure of local society as well as the overall reaction of local society to the pressures bought about by civil strife. There are also many similarities in both periods in terms of the cohesiveness of the Hampshire office-holding community as a whole, as well as the prominent relationship of interdependence between it and the centre. Although local society was reacting to different scenarios overall, it is interesting to see that despite enormous contextual differences there were still large areas of continuity. This provides much insight into the nature of pre-industrial local society and to how the gentry reacted when their positions in the locality were threatened.

Office-holding has been discussed at length for both periods in this thesis and the overwhelming conclusion for both the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries is that Hampshire experienced a very limited turnover in personnel.[43] The duties performed by local landowners remained substantially the same between the two periods. With the exception of the innovation of the office of lord lieutenant (and the Elizabethan invention of the local defence force known as the 'county trained bands' which came under the direct jurisdiction of the lord lieutenant),

Committee and The Committee for Compounding with Delinquents, as well as military activity within the county.

[43] See chapter 1, pp. 14-22 and chapter 2, pp. 48-56 for detailed discussion on office-holding. See also Appendices 3 and 4.

the positions of MP, JP and sheriff were all still available to those hoping to increase their social and political status as leaders of local society (despite the slightly lower status of the sheriff). In both periods, members of the county elite who acquired the office of MP also normally held other offices within the county, as well as plenty of land. The office of MP was especially important and so was mainly occupied by those wealthier and more powerful landowners. There are of course slight differences between the periods, the most noticeable being the number of MPs to come from the county. As shown in Appendix 3, in the fifteenth century those recorded as attending parliament were representing the county and occasionally the borough of Portsmouth or Southampton or the city of Winchester. By the seventeenth century there had been a huge increase in the number of boroughs and their representatives at parliament, including a number from the Isle of Wight. This increase meant that for the parliaments where returns have survived, there were significantly more MPs present than there had been two hundred years previously, possibly due to the growth and importance of the boroughs throughout the Tudor period.[44] Nevertheless, despite the difference in number of local men going to Westminster to represent their communities, the office was seen as highly prestigious to the gentry and their status and responsibility remained as significant in the later period as in the earlier.

Similarly, the office of JP retained its status as a highly desirable local office, the main difference between the periods being the size of the commissions, with those of the seventeenth century becoming much larger in their makeup. Chapter one has already drawn attention to the invaluable work of Simon Walker relating to the fourteenth-century Yorkshire JPs and whilst every county was different, this study adds to our understanding of the patterns in the development of the medieval justices.[45] Local men and families were elevated by the kings of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries in order to increase their chances of suppressing disorder within the locality, whilst gaining the support of the local elite. By the seventeenth century, this office had retained its importance and remained vital to law enforcement and county administration. The office continued to attract local landowners and the general county elite and the data from both periods show that many of those who were listed as JPs also held other offices within the county and certainly took part in local administration as well as sitting

[44] C. F. Patterson, 'Town and City Government', in R. Tittler and N. Jones (eds.), *A Companion to Tudor Britain* (Oxford, 2004), p. 118.
[45] S. Walker, 'Yorkshire Justices of the Peace, 1389-1413', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 108, no. 427 (1983), pp. 281-313.

on other commissions. The JPs' powers varied, however the main responsibility that existed in both the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries was the maintenance of social cohesion, making it an essential part of the local administration and an attractive role for the local elite. Although chapter two suggests that the role of sheriff had changed the most from its medieval occupation, it still remained a part of local political society and provided further opportunity for the local landowners to acquire office and increase their powers within their county as well as a further step in the *cursus honorum* of county government.

In both periods those who held these offices and essentially oversaw the running of the county tended to be the same men listed in various records relating to administration, peace-keeping in the realm and law and order within the county, such as the Pipe Rolls and the King's Bench records in the fifteenth century and in the various acts and ordinances listed in the State Papers of the seventeenth century. The limited turnover in the makeup of the local political structure of Hampshire, in both the fifteenth and the seventeenth centuries, suggests a relatively cohesive and stable group, managing county affairs and filling the vacuum of power left by the absence of a dominant noble. This absence may also explain why the Hampshire gentry were perhaps a stronger and more cooperative group than was seen in many other counties. Evidence explored in chapters one and two certainly suggests that overall the county elite had positive relationships with one another, maintaining order within their locality and forming alliances through marriage and land transactions, sharing the responsibility for serving on peace commissions and most importantly maintaining their own positions as local leaders throughout the civil wars, with many present throughout the entirety of each period. This lends questions to the nature of local office-holding, most importantly whether it was very much directly related to central government or whether it was more of a local phenomenon. The lack of turnover for both periods would suggest that, in Hampshire at least, office-holding remained very much a local phenomenon. Whilst they were still ultimately appointed by central government, the limited movement in Hampshire's social and political structures, especially following periods of extreme instability at the centre (notably 1461, 1470-1 and 1483-5; 1641-2, 1648, 1649 and 1653-4) suggests that the local elite, in both periods, wielded a certain amount of power as local leaders that was respected by the centre, as well as within their locality.[46]

[46] An assumption that will explained further in the following paragraphs.

This in turn supports the idea that there existed a relationship of interdependence between central and local government that can be clearly identified in the late medieval and early modern periods. The two previous chapters have highlighted the uncertainty in relations between the centre and the localities in terms of power, for whilst the general hierarchy of king, aristocracy and gentry remained the same for both periods (at least until the point of the regicide and abolition of the monarchy), the actual dynamic was far more complex than a simple hierarchical power structure. The very fact that the regime changes of the fifteenth century and the constitutional upheaval of the seventeenth century did not directly affect local power structures to the extent that would be expected at such unstable times suggests that central government had come to recognise the importance of these local men and that during times of extreme domestic turmoil it was imperative to maintain as much stability within the realm as was possible. Completely replacing the local leaders might have led to rebellion and further confusion. Although there is evidence, certainly in the seventeenth century, of new appointments following periods of increased tension, these men usually had ties to the county even if simply holding a parcel of land there. These newcomers were integrated with the existing elite as opposed to replacing them.[47] The 'integrationist' theory, discussed in chapter two, supports this idea and maintains that the reason Parliament was ultimately successful was due to its ability to harness localism (whereby interest, in terms of defence, support and ideology, remained most importantly within the county) and cooperate with local leaders, ensuring that there was limited antagonism between the centre and provinces.[48]

This raises the question of where power truly lay: with central government or with the county elite of the provinces? Rather than being about power, this underlines the realisation from both sides that cooperation was needed in order to restore some form of order. It signified the curbing of central interference as well as the growing autonomy of the county in a political and administrative sense and a clear realisation by the crown, and later Parliament, that the support

[47] Richard III for the most part ignored this developing relationship and replaced many of the local leaders in the southern counties with his northern men, which proved unsuccessful and his undoing. See chapter 1, p. 27 for further evidence. See also chapter 2, pp. 62-5 for discussion on those who joined Hampshire's local office-holders after 1649. The major-general experiment is a good example of when extreme central interference can be met with local unhappiness and whilst chapter 2 suggests that Goffe, Hampshire's major-general, did attempt to integrate with the local leaders the overall response to this experiment was negative.

[48] See A. Hughes, 'The King, the Parliament, and the localities during the English Civil War', *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 24, no. 2, Politics and Religion in the Early Seventeenth Century: New Voices (1985), pp. 237-8 especially. See also J. S. Morrill, *The Revolt in the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630-50*, 2nd ed. (London, 1999) p. 194.

of these influential local officers was needed in order to control the realm. After examining the data collected for Hampshire, in both periods one is able to detect the existence of this relationship of mutual understanding and an acceptance of the importance of cooperation between the centre and localities. In the seventeenth century the offices of JP, MP and to a certain extent the sheriff all retained many of the characteristics of their medieval counterparts and those chosen to run county affairs were still usually chosen from the wealthy landowners of the county, with many commanding long and successful careers as local leaders. Whilst the political and administrative autonomy had developed further in the later period, it is clear that by the fifteenth century the importance of local officials was already fully recognised by central government.

The previous section has already addressed the concepts of loyalty and allegiance, as have the two previous chapters and it can be generally concluded that there was a high level of contrast between the periods in terms of what influenced these principles. Yet, the centre's recognition of the importance of the local officers meant that, in both periods, it needed to implement methods of gaining their support. The term 'propaganda' tends to be seen as a modern invention, in many cases as a form of mental conditioning. Both periods under discussion were unstable to varying degrees and the authority of the crown was challenged which resulted in all parties attempting to establish a support base through various methods, which can all be seen as different types of propaganda. The centre needed the support of the provinces and the key to gaining this was through the powerful landowners residing there. Charles Ross suggests that it was the Yorkists who were the most sophisticated in their use of propaganda in the fifteenth century. The campaign of 1460-61 for example included all the propaganda devices then known: political songs and poems, ballads and rhymes, broadsheets pinned up in public places advertising the many virtues of the Yorkist leaders and the righteousness of their cause, the harnessing of the papal legate to invest them with clerical blessing, address to convocation political sermons at St Paul's Cross,[49] the use of every possible ceremonial precedent in the ceremonies of accession and coronation to emphasise their proper title to the throne, and finally - since they claimed the throne as the basis of legitimacy - the production of a number of genealogical rolls taking their supposed descent right back through the earlier kings of England

[49] These continued in the seventeenth century, see M. Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons 1558-1642* (Oxford, 2011).

and the Roman Emperors to the kings of Israel.[50] The use of chronicles, most notably *The Arrivall* and *Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire,* also appeared during the reign of Edward IV.[51] Whilst Ross makes a convincing case for the Yorkist's talent in their use of propaganda, it would be unwise to dismiss the Lancastrian efforts. Professor McKenna's study of the cult of Henry VI indicates that the Lancastrians were just as skilled in their use of propaganda and appealed to the masses using a language that could be understood by all – religion. Despite the type and nature of this use of religion being different to the later period, it is interesting that even before the split from Rome, religion was used as a tool for propaganda and appealing to the masses. Begun in opposition to the Yorkist Edward IV and nourished by popular distrust of Richard III, this sanctification of the unworldly and ineffectual Henry fed on the flourishing lay piety of the age.[52] It seems that royal messages could be communicated through objects, such as coins and medals, portraits, including those on charters, seals, buildings, tombs and anything that might carry a royal badge.[53] This was an age where propaganda was flourishing, presumably with the intention of influencing how people thought.

One very important method of communication for the government to the population was the development of the proclamation, for this took the form of a writ and added to it a text which was specifically designed to be interpreted orally to a group of listeners. The most important development was the consistent introduction of English texts to proclamations, a change that happened in the reign of Edward IV. This gave the government closer control over the actual

[50] C. Ross 'Rumour, propaganda and popular opinion during the Wars of the Roses' in R. A. Griffiths (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981), p. 23; See also, V. J. Scattergood, *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1971), especially p. 173 and A. Allan, 'Yorkist propaganda: pedigree, prophecy and the "British History" of Edward IV' in Griffiths, *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England,* pp. 171-92, and more generally C. Ross, *Edward IV* (London, 1974), pp. 24-25 and C. Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1913), p. 193.

[51] See C. Richmond, 'Propaganda in the Wars of the Roses', *History Today,* vol. 42 (1992), pp. 12-18; A. Grandsden, 'Politics and historiography during the Wars of the Roses' in D. O. Morgan (ed.), *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic Worlds* (London, 1982), pp. 125-48.

[52] J. W. Mckenna,'Piety and propaganda: the cult of Henry VI', in B. Rowland (ed.), *Chaucer and Middle English Studies, in honour of Russell Hope Robbins* (1974), p. 72.

[53] T. Thornton, 'Propaganda, political communication and the problem of English responses to the introduction of printing', in B. Taithe and T. Thornton (eds.), *Propaganda: Political Rhetoric and Identity, 1300-2000* (Stroud, 1999), p. 42. See also J. W. McKenna, 'Henry VI of England the dual monarchy: aspects of royal political propaganda, 1422-1432', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, xxviii (1965), pp. 145-62.

words spoken to the assembled populace.[54] Other forms of manuscript were designed for reading by their audience, as well as (and combined with) reading out loud and listening: bills, to be passed from hand to hand, or to be posted, became a common feature of the later fifteenth-century political scene.[55] James Doig has provided insightful discussion regarding royal proclamations highlighting the conflicting opinion of their use as a tool for propaganda.[56] The proclamation was designed to be communicated through sheriffs to the wider community and so its message and how it was conveyed was mainly reliant on these men, the local elite of the county. It is for this reason that there has been contention as to its usefulness as propaganda.[57] That said, in terms of reaching the local leaders, those key figures who were in charge of the provinces, it would certainly have been adequate. Doig concludes that whilst the proclamation was useful for spreading news, it was not as effective in shaping public opinion as letters and commissions. Nevertheless, the use of these can reveal much about the state of mind of those involved in their writing and their distribution. Threats to those who refused to deliver them, as well as the refusal of delivery, can offer invaluable insight into the general mindset of the time. It is therefore important that rather than asking how useful a propaganda tool these proclamations were, we investigate instead the thought-processes of the writers, as well as the sheriffs and bailiffs who promulgated them, in order to accomplish a well-rounded understanding of the general frame of mind and attitude of society during civil war.

The most popular method of communication during both periods was through the art of preaching and even in the seventeenth century, when print culture was quickly growing, it remained the most efficient method of disseminating ideas to the masses.[58] Because of this, it was also easily utilised as a tool for propaganda, especially in the early modern period whereby

[54] Thornton, 'Propaganda, political communication and the problem of English responses to the introduction of printing', p. 43. See also Ross, 'Rumour, propaganda and popular opinion during the Wars of the Roses' and A. Allan, 'Royal propaganda and the proclamations of Edward IV', *Bulletin for the Institute of Historical Research,* 59 (1986), pp. 146-54.

[55] Thornton, 'Propaganda, political communication and the problem of English responses to the introduction of printing', p.43; Grandsden, 'Politics and historiography during the Wars of the Roses', pp. 127-8.

[56] J. Doig, 'Political propaganda and royal proclamations in late medieval England', *Historical Research,* 71 (1998), pp. 253-80.

[57] Doig, 'Political propaganda and royal proclamations', pp. 258, 266, 270, 275.

[58] For general texts on medieval preaching see G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England: An Introduction to Sermon Manuscript of the Period, 1350-1450* (Cambridge, 1926); H. L. Spencer, *English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1993) and A. J. Fletcher, *Preaching, Politics and Poetry in Late Medieval England* (Dublin, 1998).

sermons were often used for political purposes and the rhetoric included within them can be interpreted clearly as propaganda for a cause. Yet, even in this area there is debate. Mary Morrissey, an early modernist, has challenged the assumption that preaching should be considered simply as a branch of rhetoric (which at the time of her writing was how many early modernists saw it), rather than a sacred office that makes use of the techniques of rhetoric.[59] Whilst there is no mistaking her persuasiveness one cannot deny that the art of preaching and that of rhetoric were closely related, in both periods. Phyllis Roberts has concluded that along with poetics and the theory of letter writing, the art of preaching had a prominent place in the development of medieval rhetoric, drawing upon sources of classical rhetoric which continued to play a significant role in medieval intellectual life.[60] Similarly Jacqueline Eales highlights the fact that the clergy played an important role throughout the wars of the seventeenth century, not only through preaching but also because they were required to read official proclamations from both the king and Parliament from their pulpit.[61] It therefore becomes clear that preachers were particularly valuable in the struggles, and indeed much attention has been given to the sermon and the role that it played in society.[62] Scholars such as David J. Appleby, Tony Claydon and Lori-Ann Ferrell have all drawn our attention to the importance of the sermon, as well as reminding us to interpret them with care.[63] Increasingly, academics have begun to appreciate that sermons can offer valuable insight not only into the theological issues of the day, but also into the relationship between religion, politics and culture. Thompson indicates

---

[59] M. Morrissey, 'Scripture, style and persuasion in seventeenth-century English theories of preaching', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 53 (2002), p. 686; Her main argument seeks to dispel the ideas put forward by Perry Miller and Fraser Mitchell who appear to assume that both preachers and rhetors used the same forms of persuasion, as opposed to preachers merely using certain rhetorical techniques. They saw politics and religion in close relationship with one another, whereas Morrissey viewed religion as completely separate. See W. F. Mitchell, *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson* (London, 1932) and P. Miller, *The New England Mind: the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1954).

[60] P. Roberts, 'The ars praedicandi and the medieval sermon' in C. A. Muessig (ed.), *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2002), p. 42; see also H. Caplan, 'Classical rhetoric and the medieval theory of preaching', in A. King and H. North (eds.), *Of Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Medieval Rhetoric*, (Ithaca, 1970), pp. 105-134.

[61] Eales, 'Provincial preaching and allegiance in the First English Civil War (1640-6)', p. 187.

[62] Carolyn Muessig has commented about how important medieval sermons are in providing insight into medieval thought and practice in *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2002), p. 1; For discussions on seventeenth-century sermons see for example, J. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640-1648* (Princeton, 1969); H. Trevor-Roper, 'The fast sermons of the Long Parliament', in H. Trevor-Roper (ed.), *Religion, Reformation and Social Change* (1972); S. Baskerville, *Not Peace but a Sword: The Political Theology of the English Civil Revolution* (London, 1993); Ferrell and McCullough *The English Sermon Revised*.

[63] D. Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconfirmity* (Manchester, 2007), p. 9; Ferrell and McCullough, *The English Sermon Revised,* p. 10.

that over the last forty years focus has shifted to preaching as a system of communication, and scholars have exploited sermons as sources for medieval attitudes toward death, the body, society, marriage, women and sanctity.[64] Appleby attributes the improvement of methodology towards the interpretation of sermons to the challenges posed by postmodernism and the linguistic turn.[65]

Roger Chartier believed that whilst books do not make revolutions, 'the ways they are made, used and read just might', and so although texts do not make histories, the ways in which they are recovered, interpreted or ignored just might.[66] As with all primary evidence, it is important to be aware of its context and author. Sermons provided an aural as well as a literary experience. Many were preached in great public spaces and sermons were also often commissioned by 'trading companies and lawyers (to petition God's approval of their profession and enterprises), the aristocracy (to mark rites of passage) and the monarch (to broadcast policy and tout the divine rite to rule)'.[67] It is for these reasons that sermons could become propaganda, and why Mary Morrissey's argument can be disputed; during the Civil War years preaching was used in order to spread propaganda and gain support, and whilst generalising would be unwise, the line between rhetoric and preaching became blurred. Similarly, during the Wars of the Roses preaching was regularly utilised, from the sermons at St Paul's Cross, which were under the control of the bishop of London – and therefore, more or less closely aligned to the government – to sermons preached at royal command elsewhere.[68] Susan Wabuda has also dedicated attention to late medieval preaching, commenting that preaching was 'public instruction in matters of faith and morality, to deflect the people from sin and vicious living towards the path of virtue. Sermons were guideposts that established standards for approved sets of belief and for proper behaviour'.[69] The idea that these sermons were seen as 'guideposts' for behaviour

[64] A. Thompson, 'From texts to preaching: retrieving the medieval sermon as an event', in C. A. Muessig (ed.), *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2002), p. 13.
[65] Appleby, *Black Bartholomew's Day,* p. 9; See also S. Boettcher, 'The linguistic turn' in G. Walker (ed.), *Writing Early Modern History* (London, 2005), pp. 71-114.
[66] R. Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution* (Durham, 1991), p. 85-7.
[67] Ferrell and McCullough, *The English Sermon Revised*, p. 10.
[68] Thornton, 'Propaganda, political communication and the problem of English responses to the introduction of printing', p. 42; See also Fletcher, *Preaching, Politics and Poetry in Late Medieval England*; M. MacLure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons: 1534-1642* (Toronto, 1958).
[69] S. Wabuda, *Preaching During the Reformation* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 24.

can certainly be related to propaganda; for this is exactly their purpose – to shape behaviour and opinion.

The recognition that the centre needed to reach out to the localities by using various forms of propaganda again supports the idea that the rival sides in the civil wars could not simply expect allegiance based on the obligation to support either the divinely appointed monarch or the rights of Parliament. They needed the support of the local leaders in order to acquire a firm power base throughout the country. This mutually beneficial relationship certainly contributed to the relatively constructive relations that were evident in both periods between central government and the Hampshire local office-holders. The previous chapters have concluded that both the fifteenth and seventeenth century gentry, overall, had good relationships with each other on a local level, as well as with those in power in central government during times of civil conflict, with limited turnover seen within the commissions and positive working relationships between the local elite. Whilst there were exceptions to this rule,[70] the majority of the county elite in fact managed to survive the domestic turmoil in both periods and for the most part maintain their position, which can be attributed to their varying strategies for survival, as well as limited power on the part of the ruling regime. Considering the different contexts of the two periods of civil war, it is actually surprising to see such similarities between the approaches for survival employed by the local elite. Land transactions and marital ties remained firm tactics for strengthening of positions within local society during both periods and the desire of the gentry to continue to solidify their social status can be interpreted also as a way of protecting themselves from national threats.[71] Conclusively it can be said for the members of the fifteenth-century gentry that their main and most important aim was to protect their family, their status and position within the social and political hierarchy.[72] Although the nature of the wars in the seventeenth century meant that there were more factors to consider when it came to personal

[70] See for example, chapter 1, pp. 23, 37-8 and chapter 2, pp. 84-7.

[71] For further comprehensive discussion on marriage, land ties and other forms of strategies used by these men to ensure their positions as local leaders remained concrete see the sections covering horizontal relations in both chapters.

[72] The evidence for Hampshire certainly supports this view, see chapter 1, however this also equates to other counties. See for example, Carpenter, *Locality and Polity*, p. 621; Mercer, *Medieval Gentry: Power, Leaderships and Choice during the Wars of the Roses*, pp. 128-130; Pollard, *North Eastern England during the Wars of the Roses*; Payling, *Political Society in Lancastrian England*, p. 105.

motivations, it could also be said that for many this too was one of the most important goals.[73] During both periods of civil war this aim was threatened and so whilst strategies such as marriage and land ties were good safeguards, if they were serious about protecting the careers they had so carefully cultivated, they needed to employ efficient and shrewd strategies that would provide a high chance of survival.

In both fifteenth- and seventeenth-century Hampshire, there is evidence to show that the local gentry had managed to develop fairly successful survival methods. The most obvious course of action that the fifteenth-century officers adopted was to remain as aloof from national events as possible. The concept of 'neutrality' was not recognised during the late medieval world because there was no such thing. English subjects were expected to serve the monarch regardless, and if one did not support the monarch then one's disaffection could be assumed, and easily interpreted as treason. However, the idea of being neutral, or passive in support, can be considered because the concept can be used to highlight what many of the fifteenth-century Hampshire gentry chose to do. Because there was more than one legitimate claimant to the throne, the obligation to support the divine right of the monarch had become less clear and so for many, remaining distant from providing active support to one or another side presented a higher chance for survival. The majority of the main and most powerful local officers, such as Thomas Uvedale, Edward Berkeley, Thomas Pounde, John Wallop, John Lisle and John Rogers for example, managed to maintain office throughout the whole period and acquire further rewards and titles from the different regimes. This was because they served their locality, managing the day-to-day affairs and maintaining law and order which ensured the centre recognised their value as local leaders. However, they never pledged full support to any one claimant throughout the period of unrest, which guaranteed there was limited, if any, retribution when regimes continued to change.

In the seventeenth century the idea of 'neutrality' was even less of an option, although many would have desired this.[74] A large proportion of the local elite would have happily remained neutral, not just as a strategy for survival but also due to the sheer confusion over what was

[73] See chapter 2 for further discussions on allegiance. For support for the idea of protection of estates in other counties, see for example, A. Hughes, *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 167; J. Morrill, *Cheshire, 1630-60: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (London, 1974), p. 299.

[74] For discussion about this concept see pp. 47, 56, 71, 84, 93-4.

being fought for, and the numerous factors to consider when assessing one's loyalties as well as the chaotic factions that emerged within each cause. Whilst there were radicals within the Hampshire elite who pledged their full support to a particular faction, the evidence shows that these were in the minority (as had been the case in the fifteenth century). However, owing to the active fighting and general involvement of the county in national events, remaining aloof from central affairs was not as easy an option as it had been for the gentry of the fifteenth century. Therefore the seventeenth-century gentry needed to employ a similar tactic to their forebears that would limit retribution and cause as little damage to their careers and social position as was possible. This strategy was to remain firmly within the political scene, showing tepid support for whichever cause was prominent by continuing to serve in office, even after the wholly shocking events witnessed during this period. However, this involved serving only in local office as opposed to taking part in the national arena. This enabled many to maintain their positions as local leaders but allowed them to keep a distance from the tensions at the centre. This strategy proved successful and meant that many of those who served in local office in Hampshire during this period escaped severe punishment following the establishment of the Restoration. Men such as Robert Dillington, Francis Rivett and John Hammond withdrew from national politics following periods of intense tension but remained on the peace commissions for the county in the following decades, ultimately surviving the Restoration. This wise tactic meant that a number of the local leaders were able to protect themselves and their position, as their ancestors had done, by recognising that there was a possibility to survive by employing the line of least possible resistance.

(iii)

Conclusion

This study sought to explore and investigate how local political society was affected by domestic strife brought on by civil war, as well as how the local leaders reacted to heightened national tension. Despite the different contexts of the wars of the fifteenth and seventeenth century, the evidence for Hampshire suggests that there was a large element of continuity between the medieval and early modern period regarding the nature and makeup of local society, as well as how the local officers reacted to the situation at the centre. Owing to the obvious differences between periods it is unsurprising to uncover that the actions of the gentry in each period were different in a number of aspects, mainly because of the varying pressures

that they faced. Yet overall, in Hampshire, it seems that although the local gentry were faced with such different factors to consider, in both periods many sought to employ similar strategies for survival and enhancement of their positions as leaders of local society, avoiding retribution and involvement when possible and capitalising on the fact that there was no resident noble present in Hampshire which left them in charge of running county affairs. Both periods had a cohesive group at the top of county society, working together and with the centre when possible to maintain peaceful coexistence within the locality as well as to preserve their power during times of political and civil strife. Despite the tumultuous environment brought about by growing central tensions and open warfare, followed by the regicide in the later period which would have terrified many, the actual structure and makeup of local political society within Hampshire remained remarkably solid in its composition.

The conclusions reached by this study are based on data relevant to Hampshire and it is important to remember and acknowledge the criticisms of the county community school of thought (which have been discussed at length in the previous chapters) meaning that evidence from other counties may provide different results. However, what can be inferred from the evidence collected for Hampshire is that by the fifteenth century local political society had clearly established itself and was recognised by the crown as an important element in the constitution of the realm. This refers not just to the type of offices that had emerged within the political structure, but also the type of individual who filled them. The limited change in its makeup by the seventeenth century clearly supports this idea because aside from the introduction of offices such as the lord lieutenant, overall the general structure remained much as it had been two centuries earlier, employing those from the county elite who held land and had connections within the county. The vast majority of local officers took their responsibilities seriously and the fact that so many managed to remain in office throughout these periods of extreme central confusion and chaos would suggest that the local societal structure was more than a mere tool used by central government to control the country.

In fact the locality was advanced in its nature and, certainly within Hampshire, was efficiently ruled and managed throughout these periods of domestic turmoil. The local land owners clearly realised that they could advance their social positions and their careers by becoming involved within local politics and the fact that there are actually a few examples found in Hampshire of families surviving both periods – namely the Uvedales, the Wallops and the Lisles – suggests that with shrewd strategies and careful planning (as well as the survival of a male heir, of

course), it was possible to advance one's position successfully in the local political arena *and* ensure that the family name remained prominent and firmly within the county elite. Despite there being some significant differences between the periods, the evidence implies that local political society in Hampshire was as established in the medieval period as it was two hundred years later and that although national politics was important (more so for some than others), the general desire to look after their positions as well as their locality appears to be the most important goal for most of them. The main contrast between the periods was the question of how easy, or difficult, it was for them to achieve this.

Appendix 1
Chronology

Wars of the Roses Chronology

(Y) – Yorkist victory

(L) – Lancastrian victory

1422	Henry V dies, accession of 9-month-old Henry
1429	Charles VII crowned king of France at Rheims
	Henry VI crowned king of England at Westminster (November)
1431	Joan of Arc burned for heresy in Rouen (May)
	Henry VI crowned king of France at Paris
1435	John, Duke of Bedford, uncle to Henry VI and regent of France dies
1436	Paris falls to the forces of Charles VII
	Richard, Duke of York, appointed lord lieutenant of France
1437	The minority of Henry VI ends
1443	Henry appoints John Beaufort, Duke of Somerset captain of France and Gascony
1445	Henry marries Margaret of Anjou
1447	Death of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, uncle and former lord Protector of Henry
1448-9	England surrender Le Mans and Rouen, and lose most of Normandy
1450	William de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk, murdered following banishment
	Jack Cade's rebellion
	French capture Cherbourg ending English rule of Normandy
1452	York ends his opposition and submits to the king at Dartford
1453	Gascony lost, only Calais remains
	First bout of king's illness, his son, Edward of Lancaster born
1454	York named lord Protector (March)
	Henry recovered (December) York surrenders Protectorship following

	January
1455	First Battle of St Albans, wars begin (May) **(Y)**
	York appointed Protector for the second time (November)
1456	York resigns as Protector (February)
1458	Henry mediates 'love day'
1459	Battle of Blore Heath (September) **(Y)**
	Battles of Ludford Bridge (October) **(L)**
	Lancastrian controlled Parliament opens at Coventry
1460	Battle of Northampton (July) **(Y)**
	Henry VI captured by earl of Warwick
	Battle of Wakefield (December) **(L)**
	Richard, Duke of York, killed
1461	Battle of Mortimer's Cross (February) **(Y)**
	Second Battle of St Albans (February) **(L)**
	Margaret of Anjou defeats Warwick and reunites with Henry VI
	Edward, son of Richard Duke of York, takes coronation oath and
	is proclaimed king as Edward IV at Westminster (March)
	Battle of Ferrybridge **(Y)**
	Battle of Towton (March) **(Y)** Edward IV wins throne, Henry VI flees
	Edward opens first Parliament (November)
1464	Battle of Hedgeley Moor (April) **(Y)**
	Edward secretly marries Elizabeth Woodville
	Battle of Hexham **(Y)**
1465	Henry VI captured in Lancashire and imprisoned in the Tower
1469	Robin of Redesdale's Rebellion fomented by Warwick
	Battle of Edgecote Moor (July) **(L)**
	Edward IV taken into custody by Warwick (July) but was forced to
	release him due to rebellion.
1470	Battle of Losecoate Field (March) **(Y)** rebels defeated under Warwick
	and George, Duke of Clarence.
	Warwick and Clarence flee England (April)
	Warwick and Clarence land in West country and declare for Henry VI
	(September) Elizabeth Woodville and children take sanctuary
	Edward IV departs to Burgundy, Warwick enters London (October)

	Edward V born in sanctuary
1471	Edward lands in England and reconciles with Clarence
	Battle of Barnet (April) **(Y)** Warwick defeated and killed
	Margaret of Anjou and Prince Edward land in England
	Battle of Tewkesbury (May) **(Y)** Prince Edward killed
	Margaret of Anjou captured and taken to the Tower (May)
	Edward IV enters London, Henry VI murdered in the Tower
1473	Richard, second son of Edward IV is born
1475	Edward IV concludes Treaty of Picquigney with Louis XI, ending the English invasion of France
1478	George Duke of Clarence is executed in the Tower
1483	Death of Edward IV, accession of Edward V (April)
	Richard, Duke of Gloucester, takes charge of his nephew, Edward V, on the road to London
	Execution of William Hastings (June)
	Richard joins his brother, Edward V, in the Tower
	Coronation of Richard III (July)
	Buckingham's Rebellions (October)
1485	Battle of Bosworth, Richard III killed, accession of Henry Tudor – Henry VIII (August)
	Coronation of Henry VII (October)
1486	Henry marries Elizabeth of York, daughter of Edward IV
1487	Henry defeats Lambert Simnel, who claims to be a nephew of Edward IV at the battle of Stoke

<u>English Civil Wars Chronology</u>

(R) – Royalist victory

(P) – Parliamentarian/New Model Army victory **(NMA)**

1625	Charles I accedes to the English throne

1628	Charles recalls Parliament (after dismissing in 1626) and is presented with the Petition of Right, which he reluctantly accepts
1629	Charles dismisses Parliament (does not recall until 1640) his Personal Rule begins
1633	William Laud appointed as Archbishop of Canterbury
1637	Charles attempts to impose Anglican services on the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, leading to the National Covenant
1639-40	Bishops' Wars start in Scotland
1640	First meeting of the Short Parliament (April) then dissolved (May) Charles signs Treaty of Ripon (October) First meeting of the Long Parliament (November) Root and Branch petitions submitted
1641	Root and Branch petitions rejected (August) Outbreak of Irish Rebellion (October) Grand Remonstrance is presented to the king and Parliament passes the Bishops Exclusion Act (December)
1642	Charles attempts to arrest the 5 members in the House of Commons, unsuccessfully (January) Long Parliament passes Militia Ordinance (March) The Nineteenth Propositions are rejected (June) Parliament appoints Committee of Safety (July) **First Civil War** Charles raises army at Nottingham and war begins (August) Battle of Southam (August) Portsmouth successfully besieged by William Waller **(P)** (August-September) Charles' Wellington Declaration (manifesto) (September) Battle of Powick Bridge **(R)** (September) Battle of Edgehill – first pitched battle (October) **(drawn)** Battles of Aylesbury **(P),** Brentford **(R)**, and Turnham Green **(P)** (November) William Waller storms Winchester **(P)** (December)
1643	Battle of Braddock Down **(R),** Long Parliament sends commissioners to negotiate Treaty of Oxford (January)

First Battle of Alton, Hampshire **(drawn)** (February)

Battles of Hopton Heath **(?)** and Seacroft Moor **(R)** (March)

Battles of Camp Hill **(R)** and Stourton Down **(R)** (April)

Battle of Stratton **(R)** (May) Royalists control Cornwall and destroy Parliamentary army in Devon

Parliament passes Licensing Order, Battles of Chalgrove Field **(R)**

Adwalton Moor **(R)** (June) Royalists control Yorkshire

Battles of Burton Bridge **(R)**, Lansdown **(R)**, Roundway Down **(R)**, Gainsborough **(R)**, Storming of Bristol **(R)** (July)

Richard Norton **(P)** attacks marquess of Winchester's garrison at Basing House (July)

William Waller storms Romsey, Hampshire **(P)** (July)

Church of Scotland ratifies Solemn League and Covenant (August)

Siege of Hull **(P),** First battle of Newbury **(P)** Long Parliament ratifies Solemn League and Covenant, Committee of Safety becomes Committee of both Kingdoms (September)

Royalist unsuccessfully lay siege to Southampton (September)

Royalists briefly – and unsuccessfully – besiege Portsmouth (Autumn)

Battle of Winceby **(P)** (October)

William Waller **(P)** lays siege to Basing House (November)

Second Battle of Alton, Hampshire **(P)** (December)

1644 Battle of Nantwich **(P)** (January)

Royalists storm Warblington, Hampshire **(R)** (January)

Siege of Newcastle **(P)** (February)

Battle of Cheriton **(P)** (March)

Parliamentarians storm Bishops Waltham, Hampshire **(P)** (April)

William Waller retakes town of Winchester, but not the Castle **(drawn)** (April)

Bolton Massacre **(R)** numerous civilians slaughtered by Rupert's forces (May)

Large skirmish at Odiham, Hampshire **(P)** (31 May/1 June)

Battle of Cropredy Bridge **(R)** (June)

Battle of Marston Moor **(P + Scots)** (July)

Richard Norton lays siege to Basing House (July-November)

Battle of Aberdeen **(R)** (September)

Richard Norton's leaguer at Basing attacked by royalist relief force led by Sir Henry Gage **(R)** (September).

William Waller **(P)** attempts to prevent a further royalist relief force bound for Basing, and is attacked by George Goring **(R)** at Andover, Hampshire (October)

Siege of Newcastle ends, Second battle of Newbury **(P)** (October)

Parliament sends Propositions of Uxbridge to Charles at Oxford (November)

A third royalist relief force reaches Basing House, to find that Richard Norton has abandoned the siege (November)

1645 Committee of both Kingdoms order the creation of the New Model Army, Parliament appoints commissioners to meet Charles (January)

Treat of Uxbridge unsuccessful (February)

Parliament passes Self-denying Ordinance (April)

Battle of Auldearn **(R)** (May)

Battle of Naseby **(P/NMA)** (June)

Battles of Alford **(Scots)** and Langport **(P)** Royalist field army destroyed, Parliament control west of England (July)

Battle of Kilsyth **(R)** (August)

Local Hampshire parliamentarians attack Basing House (August)

Battles of Philiphaugh **(P/Scots)** and Rowton Heath **(P)** (September)

Basing House besieged by Colonel John Dalbier (September)

Cromwell besieges to Winchester Castle **(P)** (September)

Cromwell arrives to take command of the siege at Basing House, bringing Parliament's heavy siege artillery. After a six-day bombardment Basing is stormed with over 300 royalist defenders killed or captured **(P)** (October)

1646 Siege of Dartmouth – Royalists surrender garrison (January)

Siege of Chester – Royalists surrender garrison, Battle of Torrington **(NMA)** (February)

Royalist army surrender at Tresillian Bridge, Battle of Stow-on-the-Wold **(NMA)** (March)

Charles surrenders to Scottish army at Southwell (May)

Siege of Exeter **(P)** (May)

Sieges of Oxford, Worcester and Wallingford Castle – Royalists surrender garrisons (June/July)

Ragland Castle surrendered **(P)** (August)

Parliament passes ordinance for abolishing Archbishops and Bishops and or settling their lands on Trustees of Commonwealth (October)

1647 Harlech Castle, last Royalist stronghold in Wales, surrenders (March)

NMA seizes Charles from Parliamentary guards at Holdenby House and places him in custody (June)

Army offers the Heads of Proposals (settlement proposition) (August)

'Agreement of the People…' presented to Army Council (October)

Putney Debates begin (November)

Faction of Scottish Covenanters sign the Engagement with Charles (December)

1648 **Second Civil War**

Battle of St Fagans – NMA defeat former Parliamentarians, Siege of Pembroke – Parliamentary troops rebel (May)

Battle of Maidstone **(P)**, Siege of Colchester **(P)** (June)

Battle of Preston **(NMA)** Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle are shot at surrender of Colchester (August)

Treaty of Newport – failed (September)

Army leaders draft Remonstrance of the Army (November)

Pride's Purge – Col. Thomas Pride's troops remove opponents of Cromwell resulting in the Rump Parliament (December)

1649 An Agreement of the People…. Presented to the Rump, trial of Charles I (20th), death warrant signed (27th), execution beheading of Charles I (30th), Rump passed proclamation prohibiting anyone to proclaim to be king (January)

Charles' eldest son proclaimed king by Scottish Parliament and Irish royalists later that month, Rump votes to abolish the English monarchy, *Eikon Basilike* published, Rump creates English Council of State (February)

Act officially abolishing kingship passed by Rump (March)

Commonwealth of England 1649-53

1650	**Third Civil War (Interregnum begins 1650-60)**
	Treaty of Breda – between Charles II and Scottish Covenanters (May)
	Charles II signs Solemn League and Covenant (June)
	Battle of Dunbar, Scotland **(P/NMA)** (September)
	Battle of Hieton, Scotland (**P)** (Decmeber)
1651	Charles II crowned king of the Scots (January)
	Battle of Inverkeithing, Parliament vs Covenanters **(P)** (July)
	Battles of Wigan **(P/NMA)** and Upton **(P/NMA)** (August)
	Battle of Worcester **(P)**, last battle of civil wars, Charles II begins escape hiding in Royal Oak (September)
	Charles lands in Normandy (October)
1652	Act of Pardon and Oblivion, aiming to win support of Royalists (February)
	Act for Settlement of Ireland (August)
1653	Cromwell dissolves the Rump Parliament (April)
	Nominated Assembly surrenders powers to Cromwell, Cromwell installed as Lord Protector (December)
	The Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell 1653-8
1654	Monck appoint commander of Commonwealth forces in Scotland, Ordinance for the union of England and Scotland (April)
	First Protectorate Parliament assembles – the Barebones Parliament (September)
1655	Cromwell dissolves Parliament (January)
	First instructions to the Major-Generals issued (August)
	Decimation Tax confiscates 1/10 Royalist property (September)
	Commissions issues to Major-Generals, rule of Major-Generals proclaimed in England and Wales – country divided into 11 regions (October)
1656	Charles II signs alliance with Spain against the Protectorate (March)
	Second Protectorate Parliament assembles and approves war with Spain (September/October)
1657	Decimation Tax and Major-Generals abandoned (January)
	Cromwell refuses the English crown (May)
1658	Second session of Second Protectorate Parliament begins (January)

	Cromwell dissolves Parliament (February)
	Oliver Cromwell dies, his son Richard proclaimed as his successor (September)
	The Protectorate of Richard Cromwell 1658-9
1659	Third Protectorate Parliament assembles (January)
	Rump Parliament restored, new Council of State elected (May)
	Richard Cromwell resigns leaving a new Commonwealth for a 1659-60 (May)
1660	**The Restoration of the English Monarch and return of Charles II**
	Charles proclaimed king (January)
	Convention Parliament elected (March)
	Charles issues Declaration of Breda – his conditions, Convention Parliament meets (April)
	Charles II arrives in London and the monarchy is restored (May)
	Richard Cromwell leaves England for France (July)
	Convention Parliament disbanded by Charles II (December)
1661	12th anniversary of Charles I's beheading, Oliver Cromwell's remains exhumed and displayed on a pole outside Westminster (January)
	Coronation of Charles II at Westminster (April)

Appendix 2

List of fifteenth and seventeenth-century office-holders

15th century office-holders	17th century office-holders
Edward Berkley	Thomas Bettesworth
Maurice Berkeley	Robert Dillington
William Berkeley	Francis Rivett
Thomas Uvedale	Robert Wallop
William Uvedale	John Lisle
John Wallop	Richard Norton
John Rogers	Richard Whitehead
Geoffrey Gate	John Hook
Thomas Welle	Thomas Cole
John Tichborne	John Cole
William Sandes	John Bulkeley
Thomas Troys	Nicholas Love
Walter Moyle	Francis Tilney
John Audley	Richard Cobb
Richard Choke	Francis Allen
John Whitehead	William Collins
John Paulet	Richard Kingsmill
Henry Moore	Henry Mildmay

John Cook

Richard Darell

John Pounde

Thomas Pounde

William Brocas

John Brocas

John Lisle

Thomas Arundell of Matravers

John Hammond

William Stourton

Robert Carre

John Catesby

John Blount of Mountjoy

William Fiennes of Say and Seel

Thomas Danvers

Robert Bluet

Thomas Thames

William Warbelton

Henry Bruyn

Michael Skyllyng

Anthony Woodville

Nicholas Ayssheton

Edward Hooper

Henry Bromfield

William Withers

William Willoughby

John Pittman

John Hiddesley

Alexander Wilson

John Fielder

Thomas Jervoise

Thomas Clarke

Richard Cromwell

Thomas Boreman

Robert Reynolds

John Dingley

Charles Fleetwood

Francis Willoughby

Peter Legay

Samuel Bull

William Uvedale

Peter Murford

Nathaniel Fiennes

Thomas Tipping

Richard Dalyngrigge

Edward Hardgyll

John Dove

Richard Major

Henry Worseley

George Wither

John Evelyn

John Kemp

Robert Hammond

John St Barbe

William Sydenham

Thomas Hussey

William Goffe (major-general)

Appendix 3
List of Sheriffs and MPs

Fifteenth Century

- *Sheriffs*

1450	William Warbelton, esq
1451	Thomas Uvedale, esq
1452	Thomas Thame, esq
1453	John Seymore
1454	John Wallop, esq
1455	Maurice Berkeley, esq
1456	Bernard Brocas, esq
1457	John Paulet, esq
1458	Henry Bruyn, esq
1459	John Philpot, esq
1460	John Wallop, esq
1461	John Paulet
1462	**no record**
1463	Thomas Uvedale, esq
1464	Edward Berkeley, esq
1465	Geoffrey Gate, knt
1466	Maurice Berkeley, esq
1467	John Roger, esq
1468	John Whitehead, esq
1469	Richard Darell, knt
1470	Nicholas Huse, esq (did not account)
1470	Thomas Basset, esq (did not account)
1471	Maurice Berkeley, esq (knighted later in 1471)
1471	Edward Berkeley, esq
1472	John Roger, esq

1473	Charles Bulkeley, esq
1474	Thomas Troys, esq
1475	Edward Berkeley, esq
1476	William Berkeley, esq
1477	Edward Hargill, esq
1478	John Cook
1479	William Uvedale, esq
1480	Edward Berkeley, esq
1481	John Brocas, esq
1482	Robert Poyntz
1483	William Berkeley, esq (knighted later in 1483)
1483	John Roger, esq
1484	Robert Carre, esq
1485	Edward Berkeley (knighted in 1490)
1485	John Cook
1486	William Uvedale, esq

- *MPs*

1467 returns	Edward Berkeley, esq	Southampton County
	Reginald Uvedale, esq	Southampton County
	Henry Uvedale, esq	Portsmouth Borough
	Richard Gray	Portsmouth Borough
	John Hammond, esq	Winchester Borough
1472 returns	Maurice Berkeley, knt	Southampton County
	John Wallop, esq	Southampton County
	Thomas Brwne	Portsmouth Borough
	John Pounde	Portsmouth Borough
	Robert Bluet	Southampton Borough
	Walter Fetplace	Southampton Borough
1477-8 returns	William Berkeley, esq	Southampton County

	Thomas Troys, esq	Southampton County
	Thomas Uvedale, esq	Portsmouth Borough
	Richard Botelar	Portsmouth Borough
	John Walker	Southampton Borough
	Roger Kelsale	Southampton Borough
1483	John Hammond, esq	Winchester City

Seventeenth Century

- *Sheriffs*

1640	Hugh Stewkley, knt
1641	John Fielder, esq
1642	**no record**
1643	Richard Norton, esq (appointment cancelled after 1 month)
1645	Thomas Bettesworth, esq
1646	Richard Bisshop, esq
1647	Francis Tilney, esq
1648	Walter Rogers, esq
1649	John Stewkly, esq
1649	John Hooke
1650	Thomas Bilson
1651	John Trott, esq
1652	John Bromfield
1653	Andrew Henley, esq
1654	Bartholomew Smith, esq
1655	John Holte, esq
1656	John Hiddesley, esq
1657	Henry Worseley, esq
1658	Henry Crowther, esq
1659	Edward Thissel, esq
1660	John Smyth, esq

1661	Hugh Stewkley, bar	
1662	William Wither, esq	

- *MPs*

1640	Henry Wallop, knt	Southampton County
	Richard Whitehead, esq	Southampton County
	Richard Wynn, bart	Andover Borough
	Robert Wallop, esq	Andover Borough
	Sir Arnold Herbert, knt of London	Christchurch Borough
	Henry Tulse, esq	Christchurch Borough
	John Doddington, esq	Lymington Borough
	John Kempe, esq	Lymington Borough
	Luke Viscount Faulkland	Newport Borough (IoW)
	Sir Henry Worseley, bart	Newport Borough (IoW)
	Nicholas Weston, esq	Newton Borough (IoW)
	John Meux, esq	Newton Borough (IoW)
	Sir William Lewys, bart	Petersfield Borough
	Sir William Uvedale, knt	Petersfield Borough
	Sir John Mill, knt	Southampton Borough
	Thomas Levingstonne, esq	Southampton Borough
	William Jephson, esq	Stockbridge Borough
	William Heveningham, esq	Stockbridge Borough
	Sir Thomas Jervoise, knt	Whitchurch Borough
	Richard Jervoise, esq	Whitchurch Borough
	John Lisley, esq	Winchester City
	Sir William Ogle, knt	Winchester City
	Philip Lord Lisle	Yarmouth Borough (IoW)
	John Bulkeley, esq	Yarmouth Borough (IoW)

1640	Henry Wallop, knt	Southampton County
(Long Parliament)	Richard Whitehead, esq	Southampton County

Richard Norton, esq	Southampton County
Robert Wallop, esq	Andover Borough
Sir Henry Rainsford, knt	Andover Borough
Henry Tulse, esq	Christchurch Borough
Mathew Davis, esq (Dorset)	Christchurch Borough
John Kempe, esq	Christchurch Borough
Richard Edwards, esq (Bedford)	Christchurch Borough
John Button, esq	New Lymington Borough
Henry Campion, esq	New Lymington Borough
Lucius Lord Vct Faulkland	Newport Borough (IoW)
Sir Henry Worseley, bart	Newport Borough (IoW)
William Steephens, esq	Newport Borough (IoW)
John Meux, esq	Newton Borough, (IoW)
Nicholas Weston, esq	Newton Borough (IoW)
Sir John Barrington, bart	Newton Borough (IoW)
John Bulkeley, esq	Newton Borough (IoW)
Sir William Lewys, bart	Petersfield Borough
Sir William Uvedale, knt	Petersfield Borough
Henry Percy, esq	Portsmouth Borough
George Goringe, esq	Portsmouth Borough
Edward Dowce, esq	Portsmouth Borough
Edward Boote, esq	Portsmouth Borough
George Gallop, alderman	Southampton Borough
Edward Exton, alderman	Southampton Borough
William Heveningham, esq	Stockbridge Borough
William Jephson, esq	Stockbridge Borough
Sir Thomas Jervoise, knt	Whitchurch Borough
Richard Jervoise, esq	Whitchurch Borough
Thomas Hussey, esq	Whitchurch Borough
John Lisley, esq	Winchester City
Sir William Ogle, knt	Winchester City
Nicholas Love, esq	Winchester City
Philip Lord Lisle	Yarmouth Borough (IoW)
Sir John Leigh, knt	Yarmouth Borough (IoW)

1654	**No Returns for Southampton County**	
	John Dunch, esq	Andover Borough
	John Lisle, esq	Southampton Borough
	Col. William Sydenham (Gov.)	Isle of Wight
	John Lisle, esq	Isle of Wight
	Sir Robert Dillington, bart	Isle of Wight
	Thomas Boreman, esq (Dept. Gov)	Isle of Wight
1656	Lord Richard Cromwell	Southampton County
	Col. William Sydenham	Isle of Wight
	William Lawrence, esq (Dorset)	Isle of Wight
1658-9	Robert Wallop, esq	Southampton County
	Gabriel Beck, esq (London)	Andover Borough
	Robert Gough, esq	Andover Borough
	John Bulkeley, esq	Christchurch Borough
	Henry Tulse, esq	Christchurch Borough
	John Button, esq	New Lymington Borough
	Richard Whitehead, esq	New Lymington Borough
	Thomas Boreman, esq	Newport Borough (IoW)
	Robert Dillington, esq	Newport Borough (IoW)
	William Laurence, esq	Newton Borough (IoW)
	John Maynard, esq	Newton Borough (IoW)
	Sir Henry Norton, bart	Petersfield Borough
	Josias Child, esq	Petersfield Borough
	Francis Willoughby, esq	Portsmouth Borough
	John Child, esq	Portsmouth Borough
	Francis Rivett, esq	Stockbridge Borough
	Richard Whitehead, esq	Stockbridge Borough
	Sir Henry Vane, knt (Kent)	Whitchurch Borough
	Robert Reynolds, esq	Whitchurch Borough
	Richard Lucey, esq	Yarmouth Borough (IoW)
	John Sadler, esq	Yarmouth Borough (IoW)

1660	Richard Norton, esq	Southampton County
	John Bulkeley, esq	Southampton County
	John Trott, esq	Andover Borough
	John Collins (Wilts)	Andover Borough
	John Hiddesley, esq	Christchurch Borough
	Henry Tulse, esq	Christchurch Borough
	John Button, esq	Lymington Borough
	Henry Bromfield, esq	Lymington Borough
	Sir John Barrington, knt, bart	Newton Borough (IoW)
	Sir Henry Worseley, knt	Newton Borough (IoW)
	Thomas Cole, esq	Petersfield Borough
	Arthur Bold, esq	Petersfield Borough
	Richard Norton, esq	Portsmouth Borough
	Henry Whitehead, esq	Portsmouth Borough
	Andrew Henley, esq	Portsmouth Borough
	Francis Rivett, esq	Stockbridge Borough
	Sir John Evelyn, knt (Wilts)	Stockbridge Borough
	Robert Wallop, esq	Whitchurch Borough
	Giles Hungerford, esq	Whitchurch Borough
	Henry Wallop, esq	Whitchurch Borough (replaced Robert who was discharged from attendance in June)
	Thomas Cole, esq	Winchester City
	John Hooke, esq	Winchester City
	Hon. Charles Pawlett	Winchester City
	Sir John Leigh, knt	Yarmouth Borough (IoW)
	Richard Lucey, esq	Yarmouth Borough (IoW)

Appendix 4

List of Justices of the Peace

Fifteenth Century

1452 - 1461	1461 – 1467	1467 – 1477	1476 – 1485	1485 - 1494
Nicholas Aysshetton	Nicholas Aysshetton	Antony Wideville of Scales & Neucels, knt, earl of Rivers	Thomas Arundel of Matravers, knt	Thomas Matravers, knt
Walter Moyle	Walter Moyle	John Audeley of Audeley, knt	John Audeley of Audeley, knt	Thomas Arundel of Matravers, Mautravers, knt
Maurice Berkeley	John Lisle, knt	William Fenys of Say of Seel, knt	William Stourton of Stourton, knt	William Berkeley, knt
John Lisle	Maurice Berkeley of Beverston, knt	Walter Moyle, Moile, knt	John Blount of Mountjoye, knt	John Catesby, knt
Geoffrey Hilton	John Paulet	Thomas Younge	Richard Chokke, knt	William Collowe, Colowe
William Brocas the Elder	Thomas Uvedale, knt	John Lisle, knt	John Catesby, knt	Edward Berkeley, Berkley, knt
William Warbelton	Michael Skyllyng	Richard Darell, knt	Thomas Seintleger, knt	William Overdale
Thomas Uvedale	Thomas Welle			William Uvedale, knt
William Brocas the younger	Thomas Pounde			

John Roger

Michael Skyllyng

Thomas Tame

Richard Holt

Thomas Welle

Richard Earl of Salisbury

Henry Bruyn

Richard Dalyngrigge

Maurice Berkeley

Richard Duke of York

John Wallop

John Audeley of Audeley

John Wallop

Thomas Heyno,

Reginald West de la Warre, knt

Richard Dalyngrigge

Geoffrey Gate, knt

William Brocas

William Uvedale

Reginald Uvedale

William Fenys of Say & Seell, knt

George Bremshet

Henry Courtenay

Henry Trenchard

John Hammond

Thomas Younge

Richard Darell

Thomas Uvedale, knt

Geoffrey Gate

Maurice Berkeley of Beverston

John Paulet

Nicholas Gaynesford

Thomas Welle, Welles

John Wallop, Walop

Thomas Pound

Henry More

John Hammond

Thomas Heyno, Hayno

Thomas Arundell of Matravers, knt

William Stourton of Stourton, knt

John Dudley

Edward Berkeley

Williams Sandes, knt

Thomas Welle

Richard Jay

John Paulet, Poulet

John Roger, Rogers

Thomas Davers, Danvers

Henry More

John Coke

William Barkeley

William Overdale

Edward Berkeley

John Brocas

Nicholas Lysle

Thomas West de la Ware, knt

Thomas Brugge

John Colowe

John Cook, Coke

Thomas Troys

John Gifford, Gyfford

Thomas Danvers

Thomas Welles, Wellys

Richard Jay, Jaye

John Hayward, Heyward

Thomas Tichebourn, Tichebourne, Tycheburn

William Froste, Frost

William Whitehede

John Whitehede, Whytehed

John Brocas, Brokas

John Rogers

Henry More

John Dale

Nicholas Lysle, knt

Henry More

Richard Wallop

Edward Berkeley

Antony Wydeville of Scales

Richard Jay

Henry Court

John Whitehead

John Tyccebourne

Richard Chokke, knt

John Catesby

William Sandes, knt

William Notyngham

John Roger

John Blount of Mountjoy

Thomas Danvers

John Haywarde

William Collowe, Colowe

Robert Carre

John Tychebourn

John Sayvyll, knt

Morgan Kydwelly

Christopher Warde, knt

John Hooton

Richard Hansard

Thomas Wode

John Newport, Neweport

Robert Rede

James Audeley, knt

Reynold Bray, knt

John Pounde

William Tysted, Tystede

John Philpot

John Kyngesmyll

Seventeenth Century

1640	1641	1642	1646	1647	1648	1649
Robert Dillington	Jon Mill, Bar	Robert Dillington, Bar	Robert Dillington, Bar	Robert Dillington, Bar	Robert Dillington, Bar	Henry Mildmay
John Lisle	John Dillington, Bar	Thomas Clarke, knt	Richard Whitehead	Richard Kingsmill, knt	Richard Whitehead	Richard Kingsmill, knt
John Whitehead	Richard Goddard	William Kingsmill	Richard Norton	Richard Whitehead	Richard Norton	William Kingsmill
Richard Goddard	Thomas Brooks	Robert Norton	John Button	Richard Norton	Edward Hooper	Robert Wallop
Edward Hooper	Edward Hooper	Richard Goddard	Robert Dillington	John Bulkeley	Jonh Kemp	Robert Reynolds
Christopher Bromfield	John Hook	Edward Hooper	John Bulkeley	Edward Hooper	Francis Rivett	Francis Rivett
John Mill, Bar	Charles Bromfield	Thomas Brooks	John Kemp	Henry Bromfield	John Hook	Henry Bromfield
William Jervoise, Bar	Thomas Chamidlier	John Hook	Edward Hooper	Bettlesworth	John Woolceridge	Thomas Bettlesworth
Thomas Worseley knt	Roger Hide		Richard Major	Harold Cutt	Henry Bromfield	Richard Cobb
Thomas Jervoise, knt	Robert Dillington, Bar		John Fielder	John Hiddesley	Thomas Bettlesworth	John Pitman
William Jury	William Jervoise, Bar		Francis Rivett	Robert Wallop		Francis Rivett
	Henry Mildmay, knt					Richard Major

Robert Wallop	Thomas Jervoise, knt	Thomas Bettelsworth	Thomas Bulkeley	Richard Cobb
Thomas Villiers	Robert Wallop	John Hook	Francis Rivett	Thomas Clarke
	Thomas Withers	Thomas Cole	Thomas Cole	John Hiddesley
	John Lisle	Henry Bromfield		
	Richard Norton	John Woolceridge		
	Richard Jervoise	Harold Cutt		
	Thomas Knollys	William Kingsmill		
	John Bulkeley	William Withers		
	John Kemp	John Cole		
	Richard Major			

N.B. the 1640s data has been taken from Quarter Sessions records.

N.B. the 1650s data below is also from Quarter Sessions records. For full further lists from the Patent Rolls see C 193/13/4 (1652), C 193/13/6 (1656), C 193/13/5 (1657), C 220/9/4 (1660) and *The names of the justices of the peace, England and Wales, as they stand in commissions in their several counties in this Michaelmas terme*, (1650).

1650	**1651**	**1652**	**1653**	**1654**
Robert Wallop	Richard Kingsmill	Robert Reynolds	Richard Whitehead	Richard Cromwell
Thomas Hussey	Francis Rivett	Sir Richard Kingsmill	Richard Major	Richard Kingsmill
Thomas Clarke	Richard Cromwell	Nicholas Love	Richard Cromwell	Richard Whitehead
Francis Rivett	Thomas Clarke	Richard Major	William Wither	Richard Norton
Thomas Bettlesworth	Thomas Bettlesworth	Richard Cromwell	Thomas Bettlesworth	Francis Rivett
Nathaniel Wheatham	Richard Cobb	Francis Rivett	Thomas Clarke	Thomas Clarke
Thomas Cole	Henry Bromfield	Francis Allen	John Hiddesley	Thomas Bettlesworth
Henry Bromfield	William Wither	William Withers	Richard Cobb	Richard Cobb
Richard Cobb	John Baskett	Thomas Clarke	William Collins	Henry Bromfield
John Pittman	John Pittman	Thomas Bettlesworth	Alexander Wilson	Thomas Cole
Robert Wallop	Thomas Goals	John Cole	Thomas Cole	Edward Brighes
Richard Major	Edward Hayes	William Collins	Thomas Goals	Richard Cobb

William Wither
John Hiddesley
Peter Murfod

Richard Cobb
Francis Tilney
Richard Solis
Edward Hooper
Thomas Goals
Thomas Pittman

John Pittman
Francis Rivett
Richard Cromwell
Francis Tilney
Thomas Knowllys
Edward Brighes

Francis Allen
William Withers
William Collins
Thomas Goals
Alexander Wilson

1655

Richard Kingsmill, knight
Richard Norton
Francis Rivett
Richard Cobb
Henry Bromfield
Thomas Bettlesworth
Thomas Cole
William Collins

1656

William Gladsand
William Goffe
Richard Norton
Nicholas Love
Francis Rivett
Thomas Bettlesworth
Thomas Clarke
Edward Brighes

1657

Richard Cromwell
Richard Norton
Nicholas Love
John Hooke
Thomas Bettlesworth
Richard Cobb
Thomas Clarke
Edward Brighes

1658

Francis Rivett
Thomas Bettlesworth
Henry Bromfield
William Collins
William Withers

Edward Brighes
Thomas Goals
Alexander Wilson
William Withers
Richard Cromwell
Thomas Clarke
Richard Cromwell
Nicholas Love
John Pittman
William Bettlesworth
William Goffe
Nicholas Love

William Collins
Richard Cobb
John Hooke
Thomas Cole
Thomas Goals
Alexander Wilson
Robert Wallop
Henry Bromfield
William Wither
Richard lord Cromwell
William Goffe
Richard Goffe
Edward Brighes
John Pittman

Robert Wallop
Alexander Wilson
John Pittman
Thomas Goals
William Withers
Francis Rivett
Thomas Clarke
Henry Bromfield
William Withers
Francis Allen
Edward Brighes
William Collins

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- *Manuscripts*

Hampshire Record Office

HRO Q1/2 – Order Book; 1628 - 1649

HRO Q1/3 – Order Book; 1649 – 1658

The Bodleian Library

Rawlinson Manuscripts: English History

The National Archives

C 1 – Early Chancery Proceedings

C 54 – Close Rolls

C 60 – Fine Rolls

C 66 – Patent Rolls

C 139 – Inquisitions *Post Mortem,* Henry VI

C 140 – Inquisitions *Post Mortem,* Edward IV

C 141 – Inquisitions *Post Mortem*, Richard III

C 193 – Crown Office, Miscellaneous Books

CP 40 – Common Pleas

E 372 – Exchequer, Pipe Rolls

E 403 – Exchequer, Issue Rolls and Registers

KB 9 – King's Bench, Ancient Indictments

KB 27 – King's Bench, Coram Rege

JUST 3 – Gaol Delivery

SP 16 – State Papers Domestic, Charles I

SP 18 – State Papers, Domestic, Interregnum

SP 21 – State Papers, Domestic, Interregnum (Committee for both Kingdoms)

SP 25 – State Papers, Domestic, Interregnum (Council of State)

- *Printed Sources*

A declaration and ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament for the seizing and sequestring of the estates, both reall and personall, of certaine kinds of notorious delinquents, to the use, and for the maintaining of the army raised by the Parliament; and such other uses as shall be directed by both houses of Parliament, for the benefit of the Common-wealth... (London, 1643).

A list of the Names of the Judges of the High Court of Justice, for Tryall of the KING Appointed by an Act of the Commons in England in Parliament Assembled. And a List of the Officers of the said Court, by them Elected (London, 1649).

A List of Officers Claiming to the Sixty Thousand Pounds, &c. Granted by his Sacred Majesty for the Relief of his Truly-Loyal and Indigent Party (London, 1663).

A perfect list of the Lords of the other House, and of the knights, citizens, and burgesses, and barons of the Cinque Ports, now assembled in this present parliament holden at Westminster, for the commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Jan. 27, 1658 [i.e. 1659] (London, 1659).

An ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament. For continuance of the former ordinance for four moneths longer, from the time of the expiration of the said ordinance, for the raising, maintaining, paying, and regulating of 3000…..(London, 1649).

A worthy speech made by the Right Honourable the Lord Brooke, at the election of his captaines and commanders at Warwick Castle, as also at the delivery of their last commissions (London, 1643). Thomason E.90 [27].

Birch, T. (ed.), *A collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe: containing authentic memorials of the English affairs from the year 1638 to the restoration of King Charles II ... / to which is prefixed the life of Mr.Thurloe* (London, 1742).

Browne, W. *Notitia Parliamentaria, Part II: A Series or Lists of the Representatives in the several Parliaments held from the Reformation 1541, to the Restoration 1660* (London, 1750).

Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1454 – 1485, 3 volumes (London, 1955 – 1963).

Calendar of the Fine Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1454 – 1485, 3 volumes, (London, 1911 – 1962).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, 1452 – 1485, 3 volumes (London, 1901 – 1907).

Calendar of the Proceedings of the Committee for Compounding, 1643-1660, preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office, edited by Mary Anne Everett Green, 5 volumes (London, 1889-1892).

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of Charles I, 1625 – 1649, preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office, 23 volumes (London 1858 – 1897).

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, [*Commonwealth] 1649-1660,* preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office, 13 volumes **(**London, 1875 – 1886).

Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion*, in ed. W. D. Macray (Oxford, 1888).

Collections of notes taken at the Kings Tryall, at Westminster Hall, on Munday last, Janua. 22. 1648. (London, 1648).

Devon, F., *Issues of the Exchequer* (London, 1837).

Doubleday, A. H. and Page, W. (eds.), *Victoria County History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, 5 volumes (1900 – 1914).

Dunham, W. H., *Lord Hasting's Indentured Retainers 1461-1483: the Lawfulness of Livery and Retaining under the Yorkists and Tudors* (Hamden, 1970).

Ellis, H. (ed.), *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, Comprising the Reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III.* from an early translation, preserved among the mss. of the old royal library in the British museum (London, 1844).

Firth, C. H., and Rait, R. S. (eds.), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660*, 3 volumes (London, 1911).

Gairdner, J. (ed.), *The Paston Letters 1422-1509*, volume II (Edinburgh, 1910).

Given-Wilson, C. (ed.), *Parliamentary Rolls of Medieval England, 1275-1504* (Leicester, 2005).

Henning, B. D. (ed.), *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1660-1690*, 4 volumes. (London, 1983).

Hughes, A. (ed.), *List of Sheriffs for England and Wales, from the Earliest Times to A.D. 1831*, Public Record Office Lists & Indexes, 9 (New York, 1963).

Keeler, M., *The Long Parliament 1640-41: A Bibliographical Study of its Members* (Philadelphia, 1954).

Luders, A., Edlyn Tomlins, T., France, J., Tauton, W. E. and Raithby, J. (eds.), *The Statues of the Realm, 1101-1713,* 11 volumes (London, 1810-28).

Lists of Members' Returns. Members of Parliament, Parliaments of England, 1213-1702, 2 volumes (London, 1878).

Macphearson, D. (ed.), *Rotuli Scotiae,* Record Commision, 2 volumes (London, 1814-19).

Putnam, B., *Proceedings before the Justices of the Peace: in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, Edward III to Richard III,* edited for the Ames Foundation. With a commentary by Theodore F. T. Plucknett (London, 1938).

Rothwell, H. (ed.), *English Historical Documents, 1189-1327* (London, 1975).

Sainty, J. C. (ed.), *Lieutenants of Counties, 1585-1642* (London, 1970).

- *List of lieutenants of counties of England and Wales, 1660-1974* (London, 1979).

Stagg, D. J. (ed.), *A Calendar of New Forest Documents: The Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries*, Hampshire Record Series, volume 5 (Winchester, 1983).

Webb, T. (ed.), *Military Memoir of Colonel John Birch* (Camden Society, new series, vii, 1873).

Seventh Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. Part 1. Report and Appendix (London, 1879).

The Grand memorandum, or, A True and perfect catalogue of the secluded members of the House of Commons, sitting 16. March, 1659, being the day of their dissolution also a perfect catalogue of the Rumpers, some of them sitting with the secluded members the same day : together with the names of such as were the kings judges, and condemned him to death under their hands and seals ... (London, 1660).

The names of the justices of the peace, England and Wales, as they stand in commissions in their several counties in this Michaelmas terme, 1650 (London).

- *Electronic Sources*

The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

http://www.lincstothepast.com/Estates-in-Hampshire-belonging-to-the-Dingley-family/635464.record?pt=S

http://www.history.ac.uk/makinghistory/historians/namier_lewis.html

http://history.inportsmouth.co.uk/people/willoughby.htm

Secondary Works

Acheson, A. E., *Gentry Community: Leicestershire in the Fifteenth Century, c.1422 - c.1485* (Cambridge, 1992).

Adair, J., *Cheriton 1644: the Campaign and Battle* (Kineton, 1973).

Allan, A., 'Yorkist propaganda: pedigree, prophecy and the "British History" of Edward IV' in Griffiths, R. A. (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981), pp. 171-92.

- 'Royal propaganda and the proclamations of Edward IV', *Bulletin for the Institute of Historical Research*, 59 (1986), pp. 146-54.

Applebaum, R. and Sweet, J. (eds.), *Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of a North Atlantic World* (Philadelphia, 2005).

Appleby, D., *Black Bartholomew's Day: Preaching, Polemic and Restoration Nonconfirmity* (Manchester, 2007).

- ‘The Restoration county community: a post-conflict culture’, in Eales, J. and Hopper, A. (eds.), *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales* (Hertford, 2013), pp. 100-124.

Barnes, T. P., *Somerset 1625-1640: a County's Government during the "Personal Rule"* (London, 1961).

Baskerville, S., *Not Peace but a Sword: The Political Theology of the English Civil Revolution* (London, 1993).

Bellamy, J. G., *Crime and Public Order in England in the Later Middle Ages* (London and Toronto, 1973).

Bendix, R., *Work and Authority in Industry. Ideologies of Management in the Course of Industrialisation* (New York, 1956).

- ‘Concepts and generalisations in comparative sociological studies’. *American Sociological Review,* vol. 8, no. 4 (1963), pp. 532-39.

- *Kings or People. Power and the Mandate to Rule* (Berkeley, 1978).

Bennett, M. J., ‘A county community: social cohesion amongst the Cheshire gentry, 1400-1425*’, Northern History*, 8 (1973), pp. 24-44.

Bloch, M., “Toward a Comparative History of European Societies” in Lane, F. C. and Riemersma, J. C. (eds.), *Enterprise and Secular Change* (Homewood, 1953), pp. 494-521.

Boettcher, S., ‘The linguistic turn’ in Walker, G. (ed.), *Writing Early Modern History*, (London, 2005), pp. 71-114.

Bohna, M. L., ‘Political and criminal violence in 15th century England’, in Kaeuper, R. (ed.), *Violence in Medieval Society* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 91-107.

Bonnell, V., ‘The use of theory, concepts and comparison in historical sociology’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* vol. 22, no. 2 (1980), pp. 156-73.

Brown, L., ‘Continuity and change in the parliamentary justifications of the fifteenth century usurpations’, in Clark, L. (ed.), *Conflicts, Consequences and the Crown in the Late Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 157-174.

Caplan, H., ‘Classical rhetoric and the medieval theory of preaching’, in King, A. and North, H. (eds.), *Of Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Medieval Rhetoric* (Ithaca, 1970), pp. 105-134.

Carpenter, C., ‘The Beauchamp affinity: a study of bastard feudalism at work’, *English Historical Review,* 95 (1980), pp. 514-533.

- *Locality and Polity; A Study of Warwickshire Landed Society* (Cambridge, 1992).

- ‘Gentry and Community in Medieval England’, *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 4, Vill, Guild, and Gentry: Forces of Community in Later Medieval England (1994), pp. 340-380.

- *The Wars of the Roses: Politics and the Constitution of England, 1437-1509* (Cambridge, 1997).

Chandler, R., *The Life of William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester* (1911).

Chartier, R., *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution* (Durham, 1991).

Christianson, P., 'The causes of the English Revolution: a Reappraisal', *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 15 (1976), pp. 40–75.

Coleby, A. M., *Central Government and the Localities: Hampshire 1649-1689* (Cambridge, 1987).

Collinson, P., *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture* (Los Angeles, 1989).

Coss, P., 'Bastard Feudalism Revised', *Past and Present,* no. 125 (1989) pp. 27-64.

- *Lordship, Knighthood and Locality: A Study in English Society 1180-1280* (Cambridge, 1991).

- 'The formation of the English Gentry', *Past and Present,* no. 147 (1995), pp. 38-64.

- *The Origins of the Gentry* (Cambridge, 2003).

Cressy, D., *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-42* (Oxford, 2006).

Cust, R., 'News and politics in early seventeenth-century England', *Past and Present,* vol. 112, no. 1 (1986), pp. 60-90.

Dallaway, J., *A History of the Western Division of the County of Sussex: Including the Rapes of Chichester, Arundel and Bramber, with the City and Diocese of Chichester,* 3 vols. (London, 1815).

Davies, J. C., *The Baronial Opposition to Edward II* (Cambridge, 1918).

Denton, W., *England in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1888).

Doig, J., 'Political propaganda and royal proclamations in late medieval England', *Historical Research,* 71 (1998), pp. 253-80.

Durston, C., *Cromwell's Major-Generals: Godly Government during the English Revolution* (Manchester, 2001).

Dunham, W. H. and Wood, C. T., 'The right to rule in England: depositions and the kingdom's authority, 1327-1485', *The American Historical Review,* 81 (1976), pp. 738-761.

Eales, J., *Puritans and Roundheads: the Harleys of Brampton Bryan and the Outbreak of the English Civil War* (Cambridge, 1990).

- *Community and Disunity: Kent and the English Civil Wars, 1640-1649* (Faversham, 2001).

- 'Provincial preaching and allegiance in the First English Civil War (1640-6)' in Cogswell, T., Cust, R. and Lake, P. (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 185-207.

Eales, J. and Hopper, A. (eds.), *The County Community in Seventeenth-Century England and Wales* (Hertford, 2013).

Edwards, P., *Dealing with Death: The Arms Trade and the British Civil Wars, 1639-52* (Stroud, 2000).

Elton, G., *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government: Volume II* (Cambridge University Press, 1974).

Everitt, A., *The County Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion* (Leicester, 1966).

- 'The county community' in Ives, E. W. R. (ed.), *The English Revolution, 1600-60* (London, 1968).

Ferrell, L. and McCullough, M. (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised*, (Manchester, 2001).

Finberg, H. P. R., *Approaches to History* (London, 1962).

Firth, C. H. and Davies, G., *The Regimental History of Cromwell's Army,* 2 vols. (1940-1991).

Fletcher, A. J., *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600-1660* (London, 1975).

- *Reform in the provinces: the government of Stuart England* (London, 1986).

- *Preaching, Politics and Poetry in Late Medieval England* (Dublin, 1998).

Flemming, P. and Wood, M., *Gloucestershire's Forgotten Battle, Nibley Green 1470* (Stroud, 2003).

Forster, G. C. F., 'Government in provincial England under the late Stuarts' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society',* 5th series, 33 (1983), pp. 29-48.

Frank, J., *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, MA, 1960).

Gaunt, P., *The Cromwellian Gazetteer: and Illustrated Guide to Britain in the Civil War and Commonwealth* (Gloucester, 1987).

Gentles, I., 'The sale of bishops' lands in the English revolution, 1646-1660', *The English Historical Review,* vol. 95, no. 376 (1980), pp. 573-596.

- *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652* (Harlow, 2007).

Given-Wilson, C., *English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages* (London, 1996).

Godwin, G. N., *The Civil War in Hampshire, 1642-5 and the story of Basing House* (Alresford, 1973).

Gorski, R., *The Fourteenth-Century Sheriff: English Local Administration in the Late Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2003).

Grandsden, A., 'Politics and historiography during the Wars of the Roses' in Morgan, D. O. (ed.), *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic Worlds* (London, 1982), pp. 125-48.

Grew, R., 'The case for comparing histories', *The American Historical Review*, vol. 85, no. 4 (1980), pp. 763-778.

Habakkuk, H. J., 'Landowners and the civil war', *The Economic History Review*, New Series, vol. 18, no. 1, Essays in Economic History Presented to Professor M. M. Postan (1965), pp. 130-151.

- 'The rise and fall of English landed families, 1600-1800', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, vol. 29 (1979), pp. 187-207.

Harriss. G., ‘Society and the Growth of Government in Late Medieval England’, *Past and Present*, no. 138 (1993), pp. 28-57.

Hartley, T. E., ‘Under-sheriffs and bailiffs in some English shrievalties c.1580 to c.1625’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research,* 47, (1974), pp. 164-185.

Herrup, C. B., ‘The counties and the country: some thoughts on seventeenth-century historiography’, *Social History*, vol. 8 (1983), pp. 169-181.

Hexter, J. H., *Reappraisals in History* (London, 1961).

- ‘The English aristocracy, its crises and the English Revolution, 1558-1660’, *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 8 (1968), pp. 28-78.

Hicks, M., *Richard III and his Rivals: Magnates and their Motives in the Wars of the Roses* (London, 1991).

- *English Political Culture in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 2002).

Hill, C., *The English Revolution, 1640. Three Essays* (London, 1940).

- *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (London and New York, 1972).

Holmes, C., *The Eastern Association in the English Civil War* (London, 1974).

- ‘The County Community in Stuart Historiography’, *The Journal of British Studies*, 19 (1980), pp. 54-73.

- *Seventeenth-Century Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1980).

Hopper, A., *Turncoats and Renegadoes: Changing Sides in the English Civil Wars* (Oxford, 2012).

Horrox, R., ‘England: Kingship and the Political Community, 1377 – 1500’ in Rigby, S. H. (ed.), *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 224-242.

Hughes, A., ‘The King, the Parliament, and the Localities during the English Civil War’, *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 24, no. 2, Politics and Religion in the Early Seventeenth Century: New Voices (1985), pp. 236-263.

- *Politics, Society and Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660* (Cambridge, 1987).

- ‘Coventry and the English Revolution’ in Richardson, R. C. (ed.), *Town and Countryside in the English Revolution* (Manchester, 1992), pp. 69-99.

- *The Causes of the English Civil War*, (Basingstoke, 1998).

Hutchinson, L., *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, ed. J. Sutherland (London, 1973).

Hutton, R., *The Royalist War Effort, 1642-46* (Harlow, 1982).

Kantorowicz, E. H., *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957).

Kendall, P., *Richard the Third* (New York, London 1975).

Kleineke, H., *Edward IV* (London, 2009).

Kingsford, C. L., *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1913).

- *Prejudice and Promise in Fifteenth-Century England* (London, 1962).

Lander, J. R., *English Justices of the Peace, 1461-1509* (Gloucester, 1989).

- 'The significance of the county in English government, in Fleming, P., Gross, A. and Lander, J. R. (eds.), *Regionalism and Revision: The Crown and its Provinces in England, 1200-1650* (London, 1998), pp. 15-27.

Lenzer, G. (ed.), *Auguste Comte and Positivism: The Essential Writings* (New York, 1975).

MacLure, M., *The Paul's Cross Sermons: 1534-1642* (Toronto, 1958).

McElligott, J., *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, 2007).

McFarlane, K. B., 'The Wars of the Roses' *Proceedings of the British Academy,* 50 (1964).

- *The Nobility of Later Medieval England* (Oxford, 1973).

- *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays* (London, 1981).

Mckenna, J. W., 'Henry VI of England the dual monarchy: aspects of royal political propaganda, 1422-1432', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, xxviii (1965), pp. 145-62.

- 'Piety and propaganda: the cult of Henry VI', in Rowland, B. (ed.), *Chaucer and Middle English Studies, in honour of Russell Hope Robbins* (1974), pp. 72-88.

Maddicott, J. R., 'The county community and the making of public opinion in fourteenth-century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 5th ser., 28 (1978), pp. 27-43.

Manning, B., *Neutrals and Neutralism in the English Civil War 1642-46* (DPhil thesis, Oxford, 1957).

- *The English People and the English Revolution,* 2nd ed. (London, 1991).

Makinson, A., 'The Wars of the Roses: who fought and why?', *History Today*, 9 (1959).

Mercer, M., *Medieval Gentry: Power, Leaderships and Choice during the Wars of the Roses* (London, 2010).

Mildon. W. H., 'Puritanism in Hampshire and the Isle of Wight from the reign of Elizabeth to the Restoration' (London Uni, unpub thesis, 1934).

Miller, H., *Henry VIII and the English Nobility* (Oxford, 1986).

Miller, P., *The New England Mind: the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1954).

Mingay, G. E., *The Gentry: The Rise and Fall of a Ruling Class* (London, 1976).

Mitchell, W. F., *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson* (London, 1932).

Morrill, J. S., *Cheshire, 1630-60: County Government and Society during the English Revolution* (London, 1974).

- *Reactions to the English Civil War, 1642 – 1649* (London, 1982).
- 'The religious context of the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (Fifth Series), vol. 34 (1984), pp. 155-178.
- *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London, 1993).

- *The Revolt in the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630-50*, 2nd ed. (London, 1999).

Morrissey, M., 'Scripture, style and persuasion in seventeenth-century English theories of preaching', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 53 (2002), pp. 686-706.

- *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons 1558-1642* (Oxford, 2011).

Newman, P. R., 'The 1663 List of Indigent Royalist Officers Considered As a Primary Source for the Study of the Royalist Army', *The Historical Journal*, vol. 30, no. 4 (Dec., 1987), pp. 885-904.

Nightingale, P., *Medieval Mercantile Community: The Grovers' Company and the Politics and Trade of London, 1000-1485* (New Haven, 1995).

O'Hara, D., *English Newsbooks and Irish Rebellion, 1641-49* (Dublin, 2006).

Owst, G. R., *Preaching in Medieval England: An Introduction to Sermon Manuscript of the Period, 1350-1450* (Cambridge, 1926).

Patterson, C. F., 'Town and City Government', in Tittler, R. and Jones, N. (eds.), *A Companion to Tudor Britain* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 116-132.

Payling, S., 'County parliamentary elections in fifteenth-century England', *Parliamentary History*, vol. 18, pp. 237-259.

- *Political Society in Lancastrian England: the greater gentry of Nottinghamshire* (Oxford, 1991).

Peacey, J., *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004).

Pollard, A. J., 'The Richmondshire community of gentry during the Wars of the Roses', in Ross, C. (ed.), *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England* (Gloucestershire, 1979), pp. 37-59.

- *The Wars of the Roses* (New York, 1988).

- *North Eastern England during the Wars of the Roses: Lay Society, War and Politics, 1450-1500* (Oxford, 1990).

Radulescu, R. and Truelove, A. (eds.), *Gentry Culture in Late Medieval England* (Manchester, 2005).

Raymond, J., *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641-49* (Oxford, 1996).

Reeves, A. C., 'Some of Humphrey Stafford's military indentures', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 16 (1972), pp. 80-91.

Richmond, C., 'Propaganda in the Wars of the Roses', *History Today*, vol. 42 (1992), pp. 12-18.

Rigney, J., ‘To lye upon a Stationers stall like a piece of coarse flesh in a Shambles’: the sermon, the print and the English Civil War’, in Ferrell, L. and McCullough, M. (eds.), *The English Sermon Revised,* (Manchester, 2001), pp. 188-207.

Roberts, P., ‘The ars praedicandi and the medieval sermon’ in Muessig, C. A. (ed.), *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2002), pp. 41-62.

Robinson, G., *Horses, People and Parliament in the English Civil War: Extracting Resources and Considering Allegiance* (Aldershot, 2012).

Rogers, T., *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England,* vol. 4 (Oxford, 1866-1902)

Ross, C., *Edward IV* (London, 1975).

- *Richard III* (London, 1981).

- ‘Rumour, propaganda and popular opinion during the Wars of the Roses’ in Griffiths, R. A. (ed.), *Patronage, the Crown and the Provinces in Later Medieval England* (Gloucester, 1981), pp. 15-32.

Saul, N., ‘The Gloucestershire gentry in the fourteenth century’, unpubl. D. Phil thesis, Oxford University (1978).

- *Knights and Esquires: The Gloucestershire Gentry in the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1981).

Scattergood, V. J., *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1971).

Sewell, W. H., 'March Bloc and the logic of comparative history', *History and Theory*, vol. 6, no. 2 (1967), pp. 208-18.

Sharpe, J. A., *Crime in Early Modern England, 1550-1750*, 2nd ed. (London, 1999).

Smelser, N., *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution; An Application of Theory to the British Cotton Industry* (Chicago, 1959).

Spencer, H. L., *English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1993).

Spur, J., *English Puritanism 1603-1689* (1998).

Stanard, M. N., *Colonial Virginia: Its People and Customs* (Virginia, 1917).

Stanard, W. G. (ed.), *Some Emigrants to Virginia: Memoranda in Regard to Several Hundred Emigrants* (Virginia, 1911).

Stater, V., *Noble Government: The Stuart Lord Lieutenancy and the Transformation of English Politics* (London, 1994).

Stone, L., "The Anatomy of the Elizabethan Aristocracy," *Economic History Review"* vol. 18. no. 1. (1948), pp. 1-53.

- *The Causes of the English Revolution*, (London, 1972).

Storey, R. L., *The End of the House of Lancaster* (London, 1966).

Tawney, R. H., 'The Rise of the Gentry, 1558-1640' *Economic History Review*, vol. 11, no. 1 (1941), pp. 1-38.

Thirsk, J., 'The sales of royalist land during the Interregnum', *The Economic History Review*, New Series, vol. 5, no. 2 (1952), pp. 188-207.

Thompson, A., 'From texts to preaching: retrieving the medieval sermon as an event', in Muessig, C. A. (ed.), *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2002), pp. 13-37.

Thornton, T., 'Propaganda, political communication and the problem of English responses to the introduction of printing', in Taithe, B. and Thornton, T. (eds.), *Propaganda: Political Rhetoric and Identity, 1300-2000* (Stroud, 1999), pp. 41-60.

Thrush, A. D. and Ferris, J. P. (eds.), *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons 1604-1629*, 4 volumes (Cambridge, 2010).

Tilly, C., *The Vendee* (Cambridge, 1964).

- *The Rebellious Century 1830-1930* (Cambridge, 1975).

Trevor-Roper, H. R., 'The Elizabethan Aristocracy: An Anatomy Anatomized', *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser. 3 (1951), pp. 279-98

- 'The social origins of the Great Rebellion' *History Today,* vol. 5 (1955).

- 'The fast sermons of the Long Parliament', in Trevor-Roper, H. (ed.), *Religion, Reformation and Social Change* (1972), pp. 85-138.

Underdown, D., *Pride's Purge: Politics in the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1971).

- 'Settlement in the counties 1653-8', in Aylmer, G. E. (ed.), *The Interregnum* (London, 1972).

- *Somerset in the Civil War and Interregnum* (Newton Abbot, 1973).

- 'The chalk and the cheese: contrasts among the English clubmen', *Past and Present,* 85 (1979), pp. 25-48.

- 'The problem of popular allegiance in the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 5th series, 31 (1981), pp. 69-94.

Vickers, K. H., *England in the Later Middle Ages* (Methuen, 1913).

Wabuda, S., *Preaching During the Reformation* (Cambridge, 2003).

Walker, S., 'Yorkshire Justices of the Peace, 1389-1413', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 108, no. 427 (1983), pp. 281-313.

Warmington, A. R. ‘Civil War, Interregnum and Restoration in Gloucestershire, 1640-1672’, *Royal Historical Society Studies in History*, New Series, vol. 104, no. 2 (1997), pp. 633-34).

Watts, J. L., ‘Ideas, Principles and Politics’, in Pollard, A. J. (ed.), *The Wars of the Roses* (Basingstoke, 1995), pp. 110-133.

Wedgwood, J. C. (ed.), *The History of Parliament: Biographies of the Members of the Commons House, 1439-1509* (London, 1936).

Weil, R., ‘Thinking About Allegiance in the English Civil War’, *History Workshop Journal*, vol. 61. no. 1 (2006), pp. 183-191.

Williams, J. B., *A History of English Journalism to the Foundation of the Gazette* (1908).

Wilson, J., *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640-1648* (Princeton, 1969).

Worden, B., *The Rump Parliament, 1648-53* (Cambridge, 1977).

Wright, S., ‘A gentry society of the fifteenth century: Derbyshire c. 1430-1509’, unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, Birmingham University (1978).

- *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century*, Derbyshire Record Society (Chesterfield, 1983).

Wrightson, K., 'Two concepts of order; justices, constables and jurymen in seventeenth-century England' in Brewer, J. and Styles, J. (eds.), *An Ungovernable People: the English and their law in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (New Brunswick, 1980).

- *English Society, 1580-1680* (London, 1982).

Unpublished Theses

Cliftlands, W., *The "well-affected" and the "county": politics and religion in English provincial society, c.1640 – c.1654* (unpublished University of Essex PhD thesis, 1987).