The title of this paper comes from an expression current in the seventeenth century, which simply means 'all in the same boat'. The phrase was used in a letter from the Countess of Huntingdon to her brother in law, Lord Loughborough, a royalist general in the midlands. Her husband, the sixth earl of Huntingdon, had started the war as a parliamentarian, slipped into neutralism and by the time of the letter, February 1644, had become a royalist and sat in the House of Lords at Oxford. The aim of the countess’s letter was to point out to her brother-in-law that now they and their fortunes were all tied together in the same cause, and if it fell, then they and all who depended on them would fall with it. Lucy Hastings née Davies, the countess, proved to be more prescient than the male scions of the Hastings family. The cause did fall and despite judicious bargaining in 1646, they all fell too.¹

The Countess of Huntingdon’s analogy of all being together in one ship could be extended to all the people of Britain and Ireland, because it was not a war that they could avoid. For some it was fought on their doorsteps, others billeted soldiers on long or short term arrangements, all, whether lord or cottar, paid something in cash and or in kind to one or other and sometimes both causes. In the Highlands and in Ireland the situation was even more involved and the division of royalist and parliamentarian becomes meaningless and where the complexities of the rival war-efforts are still being unwound. When all four nations fell into war, the people fell with them. Clearly it was not only the combatants or the administrators who were involved in the civil wars, everyone in the four nations of Britain and Ireland was embarked in one bottom during the conflicts which took up the middle years of the seventeenth century. This article is divided into three principal sections as the title suggests, looking in turn at the soldiers, administrators and finally everybody else.

Soldiers
Most evidence for soldiers relates to the officers in the many armies which fought across the four nations in the period 1639-53. Fortunately for the genealogist, a good deal of work has been done by historians keen to examine the social origins of activists on both sides, and by military historians examining the regiments of the various armies. As a result there are several secondary sources which detail the personal details of combatants from both sides. The works written by the late Brigadier Peter Young are especially useful and are based on years of detailed research by the author. In his books on the battles of Edgehill, Marston Moor and Naseby are extensive biographical details of members of regiments on both sides involved in the respective battles.² In many cases this probably represents the sum of information available for these men, even if sometimes we are left only with a surname, rank and the flimsiest of service records.
Naturally, in many cases most of the information refers to commissioned officers, although Young did also uncover information on the non-commissioned quartermasters. In addition, Young provided useful bibliographical details and references for the information on the soldiers he dealt with.

A very useful reference work for royalist field officers (majors and above) is the biographical dictionary compiled by Dr Peter Newman. This provides a more comprehensive reference work, giving a biography and full source list for each of over 1,600 entries which are arranged alphabetically. It is well worth consulting for more junior officers too, because many officers in the royalist army were promoted during the period, and an officer serving in the regimental ranks (captain, captain-lieutenant, lieutenant, cornet and ensign) at the beginning of the war, may well have held field rank before 1646 or in the subsequent outbreaks of war or the royalist risings of the 1650s.

Further works which deal with England include Dr J. T. Brighton's *Royalists and Roundheads in Derbyshire* and the Royal Commission on Historical Monument's 1963 examination of Newark. Brighton's work is an invaluable study of the nature of the two sides in Derbyshire and his work is presented in a similar format to that used by Newman, with a biographical entry accompanied by details of sources. Extensive entries concentrate on the principal figures, but there is additional useful information too. Brighton also recreates the regimental structures of regiments raised or stationed in the county by both sides, and looks at the geographical spread of allegiance in the county. The work on Newark presents brief details of the officers in the royalist Newark garrison and on the regiments engaged in besieging them on three occasions between 1643 and 1646 and was undertaken by Peter Young, who had already examined the royalist forces involved in the second siege of 1644. The Scottish army involved in the last siege of Newark (1645-6) is also included, expanding the book's usefulness beyond the local arena. However, the main work dealing with the regimental structure of the Covenant army during the civil wars remains C. S. Terry's *Papers Relating to the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant*. This contains little in the way of biographical information, but includes useful regimental listings.

For forces raised in Wales, there is the research on Royalist officers undertaken by Norman Tucker, but little in the way of recent work. For Ireland there as yet no equivalent, although research by H. Hazlett in 1938 still provides a valuable examination of Scottish and English forces fighting the Catholic Confederation, but little in the way of regimental or biographical detail. More useful details can be found in the Historical Manuscripts Commission reports on the papers of the Marquis of Ormond, and at the National Archives in Dublin in the Lords Justices' papers. Their Treasury Order book contains lists of the regiments serving in Dublin in 1642 and 1643. It is not a complete list, but it does name troop and company commanders. Family and estate papers in Ireland can also be used to find out regimental information. The Bellows papers include a complete list of the company raised in 1649 by John Bellows for the Confederate forces allied to the Marquis of Ormond during the later stages of the Irish wars. However using such sources is time consuming and success is not guaranteed.

More general sources are available for tracing officers from both sides. County histories written since the seventeenth century also contain some useful details. Information about the officers serving with Henry Hastings, Lord Loughborough, can be found in John Nichol's *History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester*, Rev. Stebbing Shaw's *The History and Antiquities of Staffordshire*, Stephen Glover's *The History, Gazetteer and Directory of the County of Derby*, and Robert Thornton's *The Antiquities of Nottinghamshire*. All of these contain reprinted letters, newspaper extracts and contemporary reports relating to the war, allowing for the reconstruction of local events but also the reconstruction of forces from both sides, including on some occasions, biographical information. Nichols includes a whole appendix dedicated to the civil war that comprises a collection of documents linked by brief commentary. The Index Society printed one of the main lists of the earliest royalist army, that which fought at Edgehill in 1642. It was taken from a contemporary publication which was seemingly at least partially fictitious; for instance, the reference to Henry Hastings's regiment contains no-one subsequently found to be in his regiment at all.

Two formidable collections of papers, both edited by Margaret Everitt Green, can be used...
to seek royalists (and occasionally parliamentarians). These are the Calendar of the Committee of Compounding and the Calendar of the Committee for the Advance of Money. The former deals with cases of royalist ‘delinquents’ being fined for their participation in the war. Active royalists, especially soldiers and administrators, were fined for their participation in the war, the amount levied being related to their roles. The Committee for Compounding examined these cases and set the fines. The printed calendars contain information about individuals and their estates and some details of military or other service. The Committee for the Advance of Money was partly responsible for the financing of the parliamentarian war-effort and included details about men and women on both sides who were forced to contribute. Again, the calendars contain some biographical information useful to the genealogist.

In the same category of printed resources fall visitations made by the College of Heralds to the counties prior and subsequent to the civil wars. In the latter cases, there are sometimes references to military service, both for surviving gentlemen and for some of those killed in service. This is most often the case in royalist families during the triumphant days of the Restoration visitations. The records of entrants to the two English universities also provide information on some soldiers, but remain useful only in those cases when an identity has been established.12

There are a variety of primary sources within the record repositories in the four nations. One of the main sources for officers and quartermasters in the Royalist Army was created in 1663 to register the names of those living in poverty, eligible to claim money from the crown. This, A List of Officers Claiming to the Sixty Thousand Pounds Etc, Granted by His Sacred Majesty for the Relief of his Truly Loyal and Indigent Party, was created with built-in safeguards; the claimant had to name his regiment and immediate superior officer, and the list was published to allow challenges to be mounted. Even so, it remains flawed. There were many soldiers who did not give details of regimental service, and some regiments were confused. One of the main problems facing Charles II was the scale of the response; about seven thousand men registered as impoverished, negating the value of the money provided for the relief. The layout and information follows this general pattern, with men grouped under commanders, and then listed with their home in the left margin, and with regiments of horse first, followed by foot and then dragoons. Where possible the claimants were grouped into regimental troops (horse regiments) and companies (foot and dragoon regiments). The number at the top left indicates the column number, two columns were printed on each page, e.g.:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Collier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>William White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Robert Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are problems with the source. Misspellings and misinterpretations crept in as did fraudulent claims. Moreover the place of origin can be misleading too. ‘L & W’ referred to London and Westminster, which in many cases was only a temporary address whilst the ex-soldiers filed their claims.

Another important list of royalist officers was compiled by Captain Richard Symonds, a genealogist serving with Prince Rupert’s Regiment of Horse. As well as copying down the genealogical details contained on the monuments in churches wherever he was stationed Symonds kept records of the officers in regiments he came across and noted down the devices on regimental colours.

This list contains similar problems to the indigent officer list, however. Symonds often made his lists in a hurry and took the names down second-hand, leaving some men with no first names and others with misspelled names. Some regimental lists were incomplete because companies or troops were on service elsewhere when he visited the regiment.

These sources can enable the historian to recreate some of the regimental and army lists of the civil war period, but there are major problems caused by the incompleteness of the information. The further one travels down the ranks the scarcer information becomes. Although biographical details of generals, colonels, lieutenant colonels and majors can be
found in some abundance, for captains and below, the information is much harder to accumulate. For instance, for the North Midlands Army assembled and commanded by Henry Hastings Lord Loughborough, it proved possible to assemble a list of 356 officers from the various sources. Of these a reasonable amount of detail on location, social, familial and educational, political and educational status could be discovered for only 109, or around 30%, of the total. A further 247 remain almost unidentified except, in most cases, for a surname and a military rank. The majority of this latter group held the rank of captain or below, but although they were likely to have been minor gentry or, at the lowest, yeomen or urban gentry, they left no other details to enable further study.18

Naturally, for private soldiers there is even less to draw upon. Rare examples can be found in the papers of the Committees for Compounding and the Advance of Money as witnesses and occasionally as cases themselves. Muster rolls of the Trained Bands compiled in the pre-war years exist in some counties, but rolls of enlisted soldiers during the war are rarer, although they can exist, as the Catholic Irish company raised by John Bellew proves. Maimed-soldier petitions made to the justices of the peace in the hope of a pension can be very useful when looking for ordinary soldiers. These were commonly made by wounded veterans to county justices of the peace, and this practice remained the only form of pension available for most of the wounded during the civil wars. There are, of course, limitations: firstly, only wounded soldiers presented petitions, and secondly, only parliamentarians could claim a pension before 1660 and only royalists afterwards. More problematic is the complete lack of petitions and general Quarter Sessions material for many counties across England and Wales, and the entire lack of any equivalent in Ireland and Scotland.

Administrators

The royalist administrators were generally termed ‘Commissioners of Array.’ The commission of array was a general committee created in each English and Welsh county by Charles I during the summer of 1642 to wrest control of the county militia, the Trained Bands, from parliament’s Lord Lieutenants. By the end of the year they had an important fiscal function – the collection of taxation. A series of sub-committees or commissions also developed to organise the sequestration of enemy estates and later to levy excise taxes. Parliament’s administration was very similar. County committees were established from autumn 1642 onwards to fulfil similar functions, and they too had subordinate bodies working on particular issues, such as sequestration, excise and the punishment of ‘scandalous ministers’.

The starting point for the examination of these bodies is probably Sir William Dugdale’s lists now amongst the Finch-Hatton papers at Northamptonshire County Record Office.16 Garter King of Arms Sir William Dugdale noted down the names included on the commissions of array and the county committees from 1642 onwards, county by county. Each member was listed along with their social status and those with the same name and status were distinguished by place of residence. Parliament’s lord lieutenants, created by virtue of the Militia Ordinance passed in March 1642 at the height of the pre-war battle over control of the Trained Bands, were also listed, in some cases with their deputies. It must be remembered that not all of those nominated to these bodies actually served. Some had duties elsewhere, but many avoided all open association with either cause. Less than 50% of royalist nominees served as commissioners, whilst 30% of parliament’s nominees refused.17

Another Dugdale manuscript held at the Bodleian Library contains details of other Welsh and English commissions, including details of the duties and responsibilities of the commissioners.18 This can be used in conjunction with the dockets collated by W. H. Black held at the Public Record Office.19 The calendars of the committees for Compounding and the Advance of Money are also useful for looking up the royalist administrators, as they too were fined for participation in the king’s war effort. The existence of these committees is also one of the reasons for the dearth of material useful for ascertaining which of the commissioners of array were active. To avoid providing evidence for the committees, much royalist documentation, especially that bearing signatures, including taxation warrants, was destroyed before the commissioners surrendered at their various garrisons across the country. As a result few items detailing the workings of the royalist administration remain. Exceptions include a good collection of
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material from Glamorganshire, accounts books for Lichfield from 1643 and 1645 and a few regimental treasury books such as that of Lieutenant Gervase Hewet of Sir William Staunton's Regiment based at Newark. 39 This dearth throws the historian back onto hostile sources such as parliamentarian attempts in the newsbooks and in committee papers to reconstruct the workings and personnel involved in royalist administration. This is clearly not an easy method by which to deduce royalist activity.

For the parliamentarians we are assisted by the State Papers of the period which record the later committees established in the counties, many of the proceedings of which were edited earlier this century. 40 Some other committee papers exist, too, such as those of the Staffordshire committee which are held at the William Salt Library in Stafford. There are several examples in the Public Record Office in the Exchequer Papers, such as those pertaining to Leicestershire. 41 Complete sequences of these records do not exist either, as accidents overtook parliamentarians too. For instance, the pre-1645 papers of the Leicestershire Committee were destroyed in the siege of Leicester in May 1645 and many of those pertaining to Norfolk were destroyed during the rioting there in 1648.

There are some equivalents for the affairs of Scotland and Ireland, although in the latter's case much surviving material was destroyed in the disastrous fire of 1711 at the Lord Chancellor's, and of those that did survive many were destroyed when the IRA men holding out at the Four Courts in Dublin against partition were shelled in 1922. The aforementioned Treasury papers and the Ormond and Clanricarde papers can help to fill in some of the gaps. 42 For Scotland, the Parliamentary papers at the Scottish Record Office provide a good deal of detail about the war-time administrations at central and county level. Printed papers from the burghs and the regional synods, such as that of the Synod of Argyll, are also of great value. 43 There is also a very useful account book from Kirkcudbright which demonstrates the working of Scottish war-time finance and provides names of those involved at many levels. 44

In England and Wales the accounts of traditional county and parish officials can also be used in the search for royalist and parliamentarian activists. Constables' accounts, of which more will be said later, are particularly useful in this respect, as they can name both military and administrative figures for both sides. However, survival rates are low and few are as good as those for Mavsyn Ridware in Staffordshire or Upton in Nottinghamshire. 45

Exploring the papers of the various bodies organising the war across the four nations of Britain and Ireland is rewarding in itself, but it has some serious limitations. At the level of administrators and officers there is little scope for exploring the histories of women. Given that they bore the heavy brunt of the war this is problematic. However, the final section opens the subject wider, beyond the social elites directing military and administrative matters.

Civilians

Material for civilians can be found in all four nations, although once again, there is more material available for England and Wales, than there is for Scotland and Ireland. Perhaps the best sequence of Irish material is held by Trinity College Library Dublin. This is the collection of papers known as Depositions which were collected from 1642 by the Dublin government. Basically they are interviews with the Protestant survivors of the Ulster Rising of 1641, but it included interviews with people from the other provinces too. The examinations were aimed at compiling a comprehensive picture of who was involved and what damage was done. They form a valuable source for historians of the period.

One problem common to much of the material is again survival. The geographical spread is patchy with few sources from some areas and non-existent in others. The principal sources are, therefore, documents issued by the warring sides at central, county and local levels, including such diverse things as acts, warrants and records of levies. Community material includes churchwardens' accounts, overseers' accounts, constables' accounts and returns to the exchequer made by communities in the wake of the first civil war. The first body of material created by the circumstances of the period is a central English government response to problems in Ireland.

In response to the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion in October 1641, Parliament raised money from several sources. To raise one million pounds it offered the chance to buy land which would be confiscated from rebels to adventurers, who advance their payment. Lists of some of these purchasers are contained in
the Calendar of State Papers Ireland, in the volume covering 1633-1647. The list refers to those adventurers who had doubled their original investment by 1643. Of course as the war went so badly for the Protestant side outside of Ulster and pockets of resistance in Munster, Connacht and Leinster, the short-term returns for these investors looked better on paper than they did in reality.

Of more general genealogical use are the returns of money, known as the Contributions for Ireland, collected across England and Wales as voluntary payments. The returns for Buckinghamshire are printed and the material is presented village by village arranged by hundredal division as presented by the High Constables. Personal details are minimal, but each payer is listed with the amount rendered. Thus the entry for the village of Willen, Bucks., contains this information:

```
Willen

Rog Nichols esq 3 00 00
Mr Rich Baron 0 10 00
Rob Withers vicar 0 06 08
Mr John Chapman 0 03 04
Thos Peerce 0 02 00
Jn Purrut 0 02 00
Rob Chapman 0 02 00
Rog Peerce 00 02 00
Thos Woolman sen 0 01 00
Wm Lancaster Miln 0 01 00
Jn Eaton 0 00 04
Thos Cox 0 00 06
Rob Bell 0 00 06
Jn Woolman 0 00 06
Thos Woolman jun 0 00 04
Thos Page 0 00 04

servants
Wm Smith 0 01 06
Jn Kent 0 00 06
Ric Cox 0 00 04
Fran Carter 0 00 04
Jn Earely 0 00 04
Jn Nicholls 0 00 04
Rich Bechenor 0 00 04
Thos Fook 0 00 02
Ant Smith 0 00 04
Thos Rogers 0 00 04
```

One other county’s records have been transcribed: those for Surrey were transcribed by C. Webb and others in 1981. A copy of this transcript is lodged in the Public Record Office, now at Kew. The rest of the records are in manuscript form and held in the same place under SP28, 191-195. The survival rate is not consistent, and Devon records, for instance, are not there.

There is a wide range of documents which emanate from central authorities including the account books of county treasurers and regimental treasurers. For those hunting individual civilians these sources are of lesser importance. Those named within them tend to be those of the chief or head constables responsible for hundreds or wapentakes, although in some cases petty constables from parishes are included too. Such papers crop up in county archive and record offices amongst private papers and some constables’ papers. They can also be found in the PRO in the SP28 exchequer papers. The papers of the Powell family of Llanililio Crosseny in Monmouthshire contain complete rating lists for the parish during 1645, showing the names of the producers of a variety of crops and foodstuffs, but this is sadly a rare item.

Receipts were issued by various regimental treasurers of the different armies to individuals and to communities. They could also be issued directly by commissioners of array, committee men or their agents. In Scotland receipts were issued by the collectors appointed by the Committees for War in each sheriffdom. They were very necessary to communities from where tax was gathered in cash and in kind as they were the principal proof of collection and a means of working out the relative proportions. Whilst of less importance for a genealogical purpose, for examination of taxation and administration practices they are important. They demonstrate the regularity and severity of collections and the development of a stationery industry increasingly gearing itself towards the needs of bureaucratic government. Printed mass produced receipts with blanks for appropriate details were beginning to appear during the war in greater numbers and they appeared alongside handwritten ones. Receipts, whether hand written or printed tend only to furnish the personal names of the collector and the constable, or in Scotland the factor or bailiff. Comparable material for Ireland would appear to be lacking. There are some details in the Ormond papers, and perhaps more at the Ormond home at Kilkenny itself. There are some isolated papers relating to taxation and the gathering of supplies and materials in the Dublin National Archives and National Library.

Material emanating from parishes across England and Wales and intended for parish use can be a very useful range of sources for looking at non-combatants during the civil wars. Often the accounts of the overseers, churchwardens and constables were bound together in one volume, a town book. In other cases it seems that they were kept separately and remained so. Most details of the taxation collected come from the constables’ papers but the records of the churchwardens and overseers can furnish details of the rating set on individuals for the upkeep of the church and church expenditure on the one hand and on the poor of the community on the other. In some
instances, where there is ample material, they can allow for comparisons to be drawn between the normal taxes collected in the communities and those levies imposed during the war. Some accounts also contain details of war expenditure in cases where the war affected the fabric of the church such as damage done during fighting or more frequently the stabling of horses and the billeting of men. There are also entries for the ringing of bells when a notable person went through the parish and the charges for the removal of the royal coat-of-arms in 1649. More often they show the disruption to normal activities by the war. Amounts collected often fall or go into arrears and several accounts run into the red for the first time during the war years. The more useful accounts contain rating lists of the people paying the church or overseers' levies.

There are particularly good collections of churchwardens' accounts for the war period in several English counties especially Essex for example. Elsewhere, however, there are no direct equivalents. There are few similar books for Ireland, although St John's, Dublin, vestry book is extant and shows a similar pattern and contains a full rating list; Scotland is less well served. Church registers too should be mentioned at this point because they can contain details of military burials and illegitimate births, the numbers of which increased in some parishes. They can also, as in the case of St Oswald's, Durham, provide the names of plague victims. Some do not; St Helen's, Ashby de la Zouch, is blank for the period of the plague in 1645.

This type of source provides most of the details of the war as it affected individuals. In theory it should therefore be the richest of all material for the study of the material effects of war on individuals in England and Wales. In Scotland factors and bailiffs filled the same function and some material survives in estate papers, but probably not in great quantity and for Ireland there is no direct equivalent. However there are serious drawbacks because in the two nations where constables filled this office, survival rates are not uniform survival rates go. Wales is not covered at all: no constables' accounts survive for the period. The North of England presents the same picture: there are no accounts in Northumberland, Westmoreland, Cumberland or Durham. The rest of the country is patchy. Three sets for Yorkshire, two for Lincolnshire, one for Lancashire. This is not restricted to the North, Devon and Cornwall turn in one set each, but there are none for Kent, Sussex and Hampshire. There appears better news elsewhere, the Midland counties where I conducted my original research produced twenty-eight sets of accounts between them and Hertfordshire eight alone. Very few accounts are published and there are few covering the war in print other than a selection of the Goodramgate accounts for York in Peter Young's Marston Moor 1644: The Campaign and the Battle and a few selections in other works about the war, and the Upton, Nottinghamshire, accounts. But there would appear to be no rural constables' rating lists in published form and so perhaps the most valuable part of the material is missing.

From the collection of national taxes to the payments for fixing the common pound or the stocks, the constable was responsible for allotting collecting and paying out the money. At this point the accounts become useful for the family historian or the genealogist.

The accounts themselves name individuals when the constable bought goods or services, this is particularly true in the war when the taxes were paid in cash and kind. This means that people involved in particular trades or who supplied particular goods and services can be identified. Rural economies in particular can be examined as they operated from the constable's dealings with it.

Of greater value however are rating documents. They too can detail the types of crops grown and produced by individuals, and they can provide lists of the householders in the communities whether or not they paid taxes. One of the best examples is from Cheshunt in Hertfordshire. This account divided the town into its wards and listed the people who had and who had not paid their levies:

A Note of the mans names as have not paid this bill in Woodside[?] Ward

Richard Manson 0-01-00
William Stamp senior 0-01-00
George Archer 0-02-00
Thomas Haggis[?] 0-00-06
Nicholas Slighter senior 0-03-00
Thomas Loyes of hamon Strete 0-01-00
Anthony Slighter 0-03-00
Thomas Guilford 0-01-08
George Cort 0-00-06
Richard Stiles 0-01-00
Hugh Peeker 0-03-06
Richard Barnard 0-04-06
Thomas Bathhouse 0-02-00
John Surman 0-01-00
Widdow Mutton 0-01-06
Unfortunately, constables’ rating or levy lists are rare although the accounts from Hertfordshire have a good few – those of Little Munden are very good and provide details of many taxes. A particularly good set of accounts of this type is available for Hartpury in Gloucestershire which give rates for several different taxes levied at differing rates. Good material like this enables us to examine landholding and changes in ownership during the period and enables us incidentally to look at the issues of women’s landholding and women’s labour during the period too.

In the Public Record Office are several boxes of returns sent by English and Welsh communities to the exchequer after the first civil war. This type of source is similar to the material in the constables’ accounts and was compiled by constables after the first civil war when parliament promised recompense for claims submitted in 1646. The accounts were sent to the exchequer in the hope of gaining compensation for a variety of losses. The material takes many forms and can provide information for areas where there are no constables’ accounts or other material. The copies of the returns from Whorhour and its neighbouring communities in the North Riding material take the form of separate accounts compiled by individuals. They detail individuals’ taxation payments to the Royalists, then to the Scots forces which were quartered in the area during the years 1644-46 and then to Parliament’s County Committee.

In the Cheshire Record Office is a series of similar accounts submitted by individuals in a number of hands from Church Lawton. Other accounts are more often in the hands of the constable who submitted the claim as a stitched volume in one hand. From such records we can gain an idea of occupation, house contents, and layout in some circumstances. They can also provide the names of a range of parish officers as well as some military information. We can see definite patterns to the war as it affected particular communities, showing the events which were regarded as important to communities. These are not always the events which have passed down as the ‘important dates’. At Hartlebury in Worcestershire there were three important passages which framed the village response to the war. As this extract shows, they were firstly a major raid by a Captain Hitchcock, sometime before 1645, secondly, a raid by the Scots in 1645 and finally the siege of the castle in 1646.

Thomas Brooke:
Plunder by Captain Hitchcock’s company took in linen, apparel, bedding, pewter, and other necessary to housekeeping 16-00-00
House plundered by the Scots, took linen, bedding, pewter and other things fit for housekeeping 04-00-00
Plundered at the siege of Hartlebury Castle, linen, bedding, pewter, brass, beer and provision 08-00-00

Owen Powell
Plunder by Captain Hitchcock, linen, pewter 05-00-00
And almost killed him, the chirugeon had of him to heal his wounds 05-00-00
Besides he will be lame of them whilst he lives
At the siege, lost bread, drink, corn, bedding, pewter, brass, bacon 10-00-00

On the other hand those ‘important dates’ of history did resonate with those living through the period too. Wagoner William Webster of Gossford Street, Warwick, had cause to remember the battle of Edgehill. It cost him a wagon and five horses which Lord Brooke had borrowed and which were destroyed at the battle. As well as genealogical information, some of this evidence can fill in gaps in the general narrative of history too. The returns compiled by constables and communities in Radnorshire clearly indicate the process of the royalist collapse in the county from late 1644 onwards, as well as providing much needed material on local levies and losses.

For Scotland there are few similar documents, although those that do exist show certain similarities to English and Welsh sources. After the first and second civil wars some individuals and parishes submitted lists of losses to the Monies Committee of the Committee of Estates. Good examples are from Crathie in Aberdeenshire and Dolphinton on the Lanarkshire and Peebles border. At Crathie twenty-four individuals are named with losses ranging from £951-16-08 Scots to £8-00-00 Scots. At Dolphinton, the war in 1648 cost the community over £4,000 Scots, and several people were grievously wounded in deliberate attempts to make them unfit for work ever again.

There are also accounts from towns which provide the same function as constables’ accounts and exchequer returns. There are
published accounts such as the Oxford Council Acts, 1626-65, or the Leicester Borough Records 1603-88, or the Records of the Borough of Nottingham, 1625-1702, and The Chamber Order Book of Worcester, 1602-50. There are also various borough records in the Historical Manuscripts Commission volumes such as those of Exeter. There are comparable examples from Wales, such as those from Haverfordwest, and from Ireland where the records of Youghal are in print, and there are good examples for Scottish burghs, including Aberdeen, Glasgow and Edinburgh. Whilst they do give some idea of the sufferings of the urban communities during the war, they do little to provide named individuals beyond the council members and the lesser officials of the borough. Others however do, and it is worth examining the original material in the cases of edited volumes. The Records of the Borough of Scarborough held at North Yorkshire Record Office and published by them in 1991 do contain rating lists and records of the borough court.

\[Conclusion\]

The civil war saw the people of the four nations embarked in one bottom at a general level at least. The war involved massive personal cost for many people. A prime example of such costs often cited is the £900,000 spent by the Marquis of Newcastle, and this in many ways stands as a marker for the cost to the nobility. Yet others lost out too, like William Webster. In 1644 Griffith ap Stephen of St Harmon in Radnorshire had stolen from him his two pack horses and his stock of twenty-one bushels of oats. It was a devastating blow, he was a badger - a small market trader - with a wife and six children and they all depended on his horses to carry agricultural produce from market to market. When Newcastle found himself in exile on the continent he survived on the credit of Dutch financiers. His family helped out; jewels given to children there were no financiers, though there may have been a wide kinship group of his and her extended families to draw on. However, it is likely that they had to turn to the dwindling pool of poor-rates. Whatever the case, he had not received recompense by 1647.

It is not necessary to argue over whose losses were greater or who had the wherewithal to re-finance their estates. Rather, it is clear that we should stretch our horizons well beyond the great and the famous for a picture of the civil war, and we should ask questions of all our ancestors.
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