

**THE ARMY LISTS OF
THE ROUNDHEADS
AND CAVALIERS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649464098

The Army Lists of the Roundheads and Cavaliers by Edward Peacock

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

EDWARD PEACOCK

**THE ARMY LISTS OF
THE ROUNDHEADS
AND CAVALIERS**



THE ARMY LISTS OF THE ROUNDHEADS
AND CAVALIERS.



THE
ARMY LISTS OF THE ROUNDHEADS
AND CAVALIERS,

CONTAINING THE NAMES OF THE OFFICERS IN
THE ROYAL AND PARLIAMENTARY
ARMIES OF 1642.

EDITED BY
EDWARD PEACOCK, F.S.A.

"An epoch rich alike in thought, action, and passion,
in great results, and still greater beginnings."

MARGARET FULLER OSBORN.



Second Edition, revised, corrected, and enlarged.

London:
CHATTO & WINDUS, PICCADILLY.
1874.



P R E F A C E.

THOSE who have studied that period of our annals which is occupied by the reign of Charles the First and the Commonwealth, not only in the pages of modern historians and of contemporaries who wrote consciously for posterity, but also in the immense masses of unclassified and often uncatalogued documents, journals, state papers, letters, treatises, ballads, and sermons, in which the hopes, fears, and desires of the people expressed themselves from day to day, may probably have remarked, if their pursuits have led them to contrast our Civil War with other portions of British or European history, that then, for the first time in the modern world, individual personality began to exercise a marked effect upon contemporary politics. In the preceding ages, from the time indeed when freedom sunk under the organized imperialism of the Cæsars, until the outburst of modern thought in the sixteenth century, human progress had been but little accelerated by personal qualities. The ignorance of external nature was too dense, the all-pervading influence of the dominant theology too strong, the terrors it wielded and the punishments it threatened too frightful for the energy of any one person to become conspicuous in directing public events or moulding the thoughts of others, except

in those rare cases where the minds of men had already been prepared by the Church's teaching, or by their inherent or inherited superstitions. In the career of St. Bernard indeed, and the few others of his stamp, who shed such lustre over the dark times in which they were placed, we see the religious instinct of Western Christendom stirred to a higher pitch of devotion by the labours of a single man; but where the lessons of the reformer took a direction contrary to ecclesiastical teaching (and then theology seemed to embrace the whole area of human thought), one result only was possible. The fate of those who struggled to win freedom for themselves and their kind is a sufficient proof that it was neither the want of intellect, energy, nor high-souled devotion, that rendered their lives and labours unfruitful. Even the passionate prophecy and withering scorn of the great Florentine could do nothing towards rousing mankind from its lethargy. The first desire of his heart was indeed accomplished; Dante won for his Beatrice the highest place in the ideal world of love and beauty; but against the "she-wolf" even the invectives of the "Inferno" were powerless.

The education of the European mind has progressed slowly; it was not until the Tudor period of our history that society could have existed without the protection of a powerful religious caste. A universal theocracy was the only institution strong and free enough to curb the oppressor, and with a sufficiently extended mental vision to attempt the work of legislation: by its means the brutal tyranny of the feudal lord was somewhat kept in check; and his fiercer passions, at least, did not pass entirely without rebuke. Laws were made for the protection of slaves, infants, and *women*, such as even a Norman baron or an Italian count feared to disobey. It does not seem possible that moral truths could have been brought home to the hearts of the people by any other means. *If so great*

a misfortune could have happened as the premature overthrow of this spiritual dominion it is almost certain that a similar institution, or once differing in outward accidents only, would have taken its place. And if it had not been so, the people would have lapsed into mere pagan sensualism; a compound of Teutonic materialism and Southern creature-worship without the nobleness of the one or the poetry of the other.

The great religious contests of the sixteenth century, while they released the races of Northern Europe from subjection to one class of ideas which they had outgrown, left almost everything to be accomplished in the direction of personal freedom. It is doubtful whether any of those engaged on either side in that memorable strife even understood what is now meant by liberty.

The singularly complex nature of our political and social relations on the accession of the Stuart dynasty tended greatly to develope individual energies, and thus to produce that marked contrast between the Civil-War era and all preceding ones, which is perhaps the most interesting phenomenon presented by that memorable contest. Probably no descendant of the Plantagenets, then alive, was more unfitted to rule England than the weak person whom political necessity forced upon us on the death of the noble-minded Elizabeth. It would have taxed the highest energies of a wise and brave sovereign to have governed a land so distracted with religious factions with dignity and in peace. James possessed neither courage nor wisdom, but had the absence of those virtues been his chief defect, his reign might have caused less evil. His political bigotry, mitigated as it was in action by his extreme cowardice, was not calculated to produce the worst results; but unfortunately, like many other feeble-minded men, he took intense delight in theological speculation. As the head of the established religion in England it was the obvious duty of the chief magistrate to make

that body as little offensive to the people as the nature of so singular a compromise would admit of; but, from influences which it probably would be easy to trace to their origin, the king's mind was bent upon pursuing an opposite course. The extreme nature of the religious factions into which his realms were divided, spurred on the zeal of the theologian not to be a minister of peace but an enforcer of uniformity. The Catholics, who had received in the early part of the reign some slight mercy, when the monarch found himself sufficiently powerful to do so, were persecuted with unremitting severity. The increasing body of Puritans (a designation which must be understood to include persons of nearly all varieties of opinion who were opposed to despotism in the state and extreme Episcopalian views on Church government) hated the ruling powers almost as intensely as did their brethren of the Roman obedience, and with nearly as good reason; for, although they were not subject to capital punishment, like the religious teachers of the ancient faith, their lives were rendered miserable by state tyranny. The Puritans certainly had not, at first, any strong feelings against monarchical power when restrained within due bounds,—some, indeed, professing to the last their desire for “a covenanted King,” but they naturally became, as time wore on, less and less attached to the existing order of things. It is probable that a strong-willed and unprincipled monarch might have played off these factions against each other with considerable personal advantage. It is evident that James endeavoured to do so, and as he had at times able ministers about him, it is not unlikely that even he might have succeeded had England been his only kingdom; Scotland and Ireland happily presented unsurmountable obstacles to the crushing out of either of these religious bodies. The northern kingdom was entirely Puritan; the Catholic Church in that region had not merely fallen,—its members had been so hunted down by their

successors, that hardly an avowed professor of the old religion was to be found. Episcopacy, indeed, was still supposed to exist, but its strange and unedifying history was so well known, that we cannot suppose it appealed very forcibly to the consciences of any but those dependent on government patronage. On the other hand, Ireland had clung with the tenacity of despair to the mediæval form of Christianity—it was the only thing that connected her with the far-off past, that carried back the memories of her poor persecuted children to times when they had at least one powerful protector on earth from the oppression of their conquerors. This passionate attachment decked the mythic past with the rainbow tints of unreal beauty, it became part of an Irishman's faith that his country had once had a golden age of peace, prosperity, and virtue, under the mild guardianship of the Church of God.

The attempts made to convert these kingdoms to the king's views were too weak to produce any effect except irritation; but they must be borne in mind in calculating the forces which produced the revolution that followed.

Charles was a far nobler man than his father: had he ruled in other times he might have left a favourable impression on posterity; in the circumstances in which he was placed his higher qualities were almost entirely hidden. Whether it was by force of hereditary transmission, or the result of education, that Charles resembled James cannot now be known, but the same weak nature is remarkable in the child as in the parent,—the same obstinacy, the same theological instincts with even less distrust of his own power of enforcing conviction, and a greater affection for the mechanical parts of religious worship. His faith in the sanctity of his own office was probably more sincere than his father's. It was dangerous in proportion to its sincerity.

The history of the political and religious struggles of these