and Bishops war. However, the difference between both historians is that Russell’s focus is more on the structural and functional issues of the three kingdoms whereas Morrill argues that the numerous events caused by religious divisions and Charles’ actions triggered the downfall of the crown. Russell points out that Charles faced armed resistance in all three kingdoms and within three years there was war; 1639 – 42. This is similar to Morrill who also believes the conflict in each kingdom derived from the same factors, primarily Charles and religious divisions. Russell states ‘We will not find them in their social systems, for they were even more different’\(^\text{10}\) which shows he too doesn’t believe in approaching the causes of the war from a social aspect. Furthermore, Russell mentions the difficulty in managing all kingdoms at once, he states ‘there was no institutional equivalent of the Spanish council of state, which could advise on issues affecting all three’\(^\text{11}\) which again reflects his emphasis on structural problems. Both historians tend to focus on the role of Charles, as their purpose wasn’t to identify the structural and societal problems, they wanted to identify the unforeseen problems. While Morrill focuses on the religious aspect in more depth, Russell touches on it and points out that ‘the most famous cause of multiple kingdoms with different religions is that of Spain and Netherlands and that produced disturbances’ which shows religion was always going to be a problem; religious conflict made the civil war inevitable.

Clearly, there are a variety of reasons which explain why historians disagree and have various explanations for the outbreak of the civil war. The sources they had access to, their purpose and their different ideologies played a key part in their judgement. These different interpretations can be explained in many ways. Firstly, the historians were writing at different time periods. Both Morrill and Russell were historians who solely focused on factors which arose not too far from the start of the civil war. They wrote at the same time period; Russell published his work in 1987 and Morrill in 2000, in contrast to Hill writing at an earlier time, 1940. Works of historians like Kevin Sharpe and Mark Kishlanksky can be seen to have similarities when compared to Morrill and Russell, as contingent causes were what most historians studying the war were studying throughout the late 1900s.

Hill’s interpretation can be seen a response to the Whig view of history; in which they believe the war was progress towards liberty; a clash between liberty and absolutism. Hill differs from the orthodox view of his time, which was focused on the gentry and their problems. In comparison to Morrill, Hill rules out religion being an important factor, his purpose was to highlight how social tensions led to the war. Although Hill does not focus on religion and his purpose is to show it was a war of classes, he explains the role of Puritanism and Presbyterianism. He argues Presbyterianism was an oligarchical theory, therefore this appealed to the bourgeoisie who wanted the Church organised in such a way that it could encourage political and economic ways of thinking for the merchant class\(^\text{12}\), so they could be equipped with the qualities to rebel against the feudal system. Furthermore, he displays how Puritanism also inspired others, such as merchants and labourers because it

\(^{10}\) Ibid, p.397
\(^{11}\) Ibid, p.404
\(^{12}\) Christopher Hill, *The English Revolution 1640* (1940) p.15