

**The personal and professional relationships between Thomas Wentworth, Earl of  
Strafford and his closest advisors**

**Charlotte Kate Brownhill**

**Submitted for the degree of PhD**

**Department of History, University of Sheffield**

**February 2004**

**Volume I**

## Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	iv
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
<i>Abbreviations</i>	vi
<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>Chapter 1: Clients, retinues and men-of-business: the language of political affinity in early Stuart England.</b>	5
<b>Chapter 2: Another change of sides? The political career of Christopher Wandesford, 1621 – 1629.</b>	17
- The Parliament of 1621: Political apprenticeship	
- The Parliament of 1624	
- Wandesford's involvement in Charles I's Parliament of 1625	
- The Parliament of 1626: Christopher Wandesford's chance to shine	
- The forced loan of 1626 and the response of Wentworth's cabal	
- Interim: From forced loan to parliamentary elections	
- Wandesford's final English Parliament of 1628 - 1629	
- Conclusion	
<b>Chapter 3: Thomas Wentworth, the Council of the North and his men-of-business in England, 1629 - 1641.</b>	70
- The development of George Radcliffe's political and legal career	
- Christopher Wandesford and the Council of the North	
- Edward Osborne: Vice-President of the Council of the North	
- Osborne and Wentworth's relationship prior to the Vice Presidency	
- Questions of jurisdiction and the problems of opposition	
- The practicalities of Osborne's Vice Presidency	
- Osborne's increased authority	
- The downfall of Council of the North	
- The role of Wentworth's 'Men of Business'	
- Conclusion	
<b>Chapter 4: The preparation and planning of Wentworth's Irish administration.</b>	113
- The advice of Sir Edward Stanhope	
- Wentworth's Propositions	
- Information gathering and policy formation	
- Radcliffe's role in Irish policy planning	
- Conclusion	

**Chapter 5: The establishment of Wentworth's Irish administration.** 134

- Wentworth's relations with the Irish Privy Council
- The role of Christopher Wandesford within the Irish administration
- Philip Mainwaring: a new addition to the cabal
- The role of Thomas Wentworth's brother, George Wentworth
- The two tiers of Wentworth's administration
- Conclusion

**Chapter 6: Irish Policy I – Politics, financial planning, parliament and plantation.** 156

- The financial planning of Wentworth's Irish administration
- The establishment of the customs farm
- Background to the Irish Parliament
- Parliamentary preparations and motivations
- Parliamentary preparations – elections and packing of Parliament
- James Butler, twelfth Earl and first Duke of Ormond and the plantation policy
- Background to the policy of plantation
- Wentworth and the plantation of Ireland
- The plantation of Ormond
- Conclusion

**Chapter 7: Irish Policy II: Religion and legal attacks on Irish notables.** 212

- The religious policy in Ireland
- The recovery of Church lands and proceedings against the Earl of Cork
- The involvement of the cabal in proceedings against Irish figures
- Conclusion

**Chapter 8: Parliamentary retribution and the collapse of Wentworth's administration.** 252

- The role of the cabal in Wentworth's absence
- The Irish Parliament of 1640 - preparations
- Wandesford's struggle for control over the Irish Parliament of 1640
- The death of Christopher Wandesford
- The impeachment of Sir George Radcliffe
- Why did the English and Irish Parliaments pursue Radcliffe?
- Comparison of the charges against Wentworth and Radcliffe
- The involvement of Wentworth's cabal within his trial
- Conclusion: The outcome of the proceedings and events after Wentworth's execution

<b>Chapter 9: Epilogue</b>	313
- Radcliffe: Royalist in Exile	
- Radcliffe and political authority	
- Sir Edward Osborne and Christopher Wandesford's legacy	
- Sir Philip Mainwaring: Secretary of State of Ireland	
- Sir George Wentworth's solo foray into politics	
- Conclusion	
<b>Conclusion</b>	338
<b>Bibliography</b>	346



## ABSTRACT

*Thomas Wentworth, first Earl of Strafford has usually been portrayed as an isolated figure working in Ireland for the good of the Crown, single-handedly tackling issues of policy and authority. However, the support systems behind his regime have not been examined in detail, in particular the role played by Sir George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford. This thesis aims to redress the balance concerning relationships between important and powerful members of the gentry and nobility and the support systems they surrounded themselves with. The extent of the involvement of Wentworth's closest advisors in his political career is tracked throughout the English Parliaments of the 1620s before following them into courtly careers in the North and in Ireland. Any study of Wentworth's career cannot disregard these important figures and their relationship with Wentworth. In their capacity as Wentworth's deputies, Wandesford and Sir Edward Osborne, Wentworth's Vice President of the Council in the North, were unable to exert the same influence as Wentworth as they were, in effect, the 'representative's representative' and therefore were unable to wield similar levels of authority. The downfall of Wentworth's regime in Ireland will be examined, focusing upon the English and Irish Parliament's attempt to impeach Radcliffe. The epilogue reveals that Wentworth was the lynchpin in the cabal, and once he was executed in May 1642, the strong tie between these men disintegrated. Radcliffe was the only prominent figure of the cabal during the Interregnum, becoming attached to the Court of the Duke of York in exile.*

*This thesis demonstrates that secretariats and cabals could play an integral and essential role within the political life of a prominent politician and cannot simply be dismissed as clients and men-of-business.*

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to thank a number of people without whom this research would not have been possible. I received small travel bursaries from both the Department of History at the University of Sheffield and the British Federation for Women Graduates, which enabled me to conduct research at the Public Record Office and British Library for which I am very grateful.

I would also like to thank my supervisor Dr Anthony Milton, whose level 3 undergraduate course “The Road to Civil War: England 1621 - 42” was the reason I came to Sheffield University as an undergraduate. This interest in Thomas Wentworth and the Personal Rule of Charles I led to a BA dissertation on Sir George Radcliffe and from these beginnings, a study of Wentworth’s cabal as a whole seemed inevitable.

Above all, I would like to express my thanks to my family who have supported me through all of my years at Sheffield University, especially Mum and Dad. Thank you for all your support, emotionally and otherwise! Finally, to my husband Olly, who has lived with the other men in my life – George Radcliffe, Christopher Wandesford, Edward Osborne and Philip Mainwaring - throughout my PhD. Thank you so much for all your help and endless cups of tea!

## **Abbreviations**

*CSPD* – Calendar of State Papers, Domestic

*CSPI* – Calendar of State Papers, Ireland

*HMC* – Historical Manuscripts Commission

P.R.O. – Public Record Office, Kew

Str. P. – Sheffield City Libraries, Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments, Strafford Papers

Dates are given in Old Style, but the year is taken to begin on 1 January.

## Introduction

The life and career of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford has been at the centre of a long historical debate. Historians have attributed great significance to Wentworth's career in order to facilitate a wider understanding of the politics of the period.<sup>1</sup> This is partly due to the fact that his personal and political correspondence survives in enormous quantities, although it remains relatively unexploited.<sup>2</sup> Whilst Wentworth has been regarded as one of the 'great men of History,' interpretations of his intentions and activities vary widely.<sup>3</sup> In particular, much emphasis has been placed upon the validity of the assumption that Wentworth was a noted parliamentary player in the 1620s before becoming a courtier in the late 1620s<sup>4</sup> as propounded by Zagorin who states that Wentworth 'changed sides.'<sup>5</sup> More recently, Cust has demonstrated that Wentworth was pursuing a courtly career throughout the 1620s and therefore was using his parliamentary position in order to achieve his agenda, thus in effect, not ever having 'changed sides.'<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example the surveys of the historiography of Wentworth's career in Kearney, H.F. *Strafford in Ireland 1633-1641* (Manchester, 1989), pp. xi – xv, Merritt, J.F. 'Introduction. The historical reputation of Thomas Wentworth,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 1 – 23.

<sup>2</sup> A catalogue of the voluminous Strafford MS needs consulting for an appreciation of the extent of the materials in Sheffield City Archives. See Merritt, J.F. (ed). *Crown Servants Series One: The Papers of Thomas Wentworth, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Strafford, 1593 – 1641, from Sheffield City Libraries. A Listing and Guide to the Microfilm Collection* (Reading, 1994).

<sup>3</sup> Kearney notes that the Whig view of Wentworth is significant in the work of Ranger, who saw Wentworth's rule in Ireland as an experiment in arbitrary government to be applied in England. C.V. Wedgwood's original biography of Wentworth was a Tory account that saw Wentworth as bravely pursuing the King's policies in the face of opposition. However, this first biography was written without access to the original Strafford MS. Her re-evaluation of Wentworth's career was written in 1961, and was not so favourable towards all of Wentworth's activities. See Wedgwood, C.V. *Strafford* (London, 1935), Wedgwood, C.V. *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford: A Revaluation* (London, 1961), Ranger, T. 'Strafford in Ireland: A Revaluation,' in T. Aston (ed). *Crisis in Europe 1560 – 1660* (London, 1969), pp. 271 – 295, Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. xiii – xiv.

<sup>4</sup> Wentworth was made President of the Council of the North and an English Privy Councillor in 1628, before being promoted to the Lord Deputyship of the Council of the North in 1629 and ultimately Lord Deputy of Ireland in 1632.

<sup>5</sup> Zagorin, P. *The Court and Country* (London, 1969), pp. 56 – 58. The significance of Wentworth's acceptance of a courtly career is emphasised by Zagorin in his analysis of a letter from Sir Edward Stanhope to Wentworth in his article 'Sir Edward Stanhope's advice to Thomas Wentworth, Viscount Wentworth, concerning the deputyship of Ireland: an unpublished letter of 1631,' *Historical Journal* 7 (1964), pp. 298 – 320. This letter can be found in Str. P.8 / 79 and is examined in detail in Chapter 4.

<sup>6</sup> This might explain Wentworth's policy of moderation throughout the parliaments of the 1620s. We see such manoeuvring over the issue of the forced loan of 1626 where Wentworth cleverly maintained the favour of the country by refusing to pay, but was ambiguous in his refusal and would not give a reason why, in order to enact a kind of 'damage limitation' upon his career. Cust, R. *The Forced Loan and English*

In this light, we might see Wentworth's opposition during the 1620s as tactical rather than heart-felt. This historical debate is important as it helps us to understand the motivations of a seventeenth century political figure.

However, given the importance that has been attached to Wentworth's political actions by historians who have attempted to use him as a key to understanding and interpreting the period, it is remarkable that Wentworth is consistently seen as having acted alone as a solo figure. Rather than being a further spin upon Wentworth's career, this thesis suggests an alternative method of examining Wentworth's actions. Fundamentally, it will demonstrate that Wentworth was not an isolated individual navigating through the political waters of the seventeenth century with his personality intimately bound up with his policies. This thesis intends to restore a missing dimension to Wentworth's career, by analysing the contribution of key figures, most significantly, the roles of George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford. These associates have been acknowledged, for example by C.V. Wedgwood in her influential biography of Thomas Wentworth, but have never been analysed.<sup>7</sup> Wentworth's aides were certainly identified easily enough by contemporaries, particularly during Wentworth's administration in Ireland during the 1630s, where they were often referred to as his 'confederates.'<sup>8</sup>

Thomas Wentworth is often examined as an individual player in politics and his manoeuvrings are complex. Yet through a study of the cabal, we have the opportunity to examine his group of close advisors to discover whether they imitated his pattern of

---

*Politics 1626 - 1628* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 221 – 224. See also Cust, R. 'Wentworth's 'change of sides' in the 1620's,' in Merritt, *The political world of Thomas Wentworth* pp. 63 – 80.

<sup>7</sup> Wedgwood describes Wentworth's relations with Wandesford and Radcliffe as "the two great friendships in his life..." Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 34. Similarly, Kearney notes Wandesford and Radcliffe's existence in Ireland, but does not play up their importance within Wentworth's Lord Deputyship. He describes Radcliffe as Wentworth's "former secretary" in the Council of the North, and briefly mentions his involvement in the Commission of Defective Titles, plantation policy and the Irish customs farm. He also acknowledges that both Wandesford and Radcliffe were part of the Lord Deputy's parliamentary party that would support his agenda in Parliament. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 36, 83, 101, 135, 163, 165, 173 – 174, 180, 195, 229, 256 – 7.

<sup>8</sup> For example, the Earl of Cork's agent Walley wrote to inform him in December 1640 that God had removed "owt of yo[u]r L[ordshi]ps way his Confederates Radcliffe, and Wandesford..." Walley to Cork, 12 December 1640, Chatsworth House, Lismore Papers, vol. 21 / 75. Wentworth's cabal often attracted derogatory remarks. During Wentworth's impeachment trial brought by the Long Parliament, William Drake noted that Lord Kilmallock had called George Radcliffe "the E[arl] of Strafford's echo." Jansson, M. *Two Diaries of the Long Parliament* (Gloucester, 1984). p. 62, note 136.

behaviour.<sup>9</sup> The thesis will primarily address the role of Radcliffe and Wandesford who were an integral part of Wentworth's Irish administration. Their involvement extended to formulation as well as execution of policy, to such an extent that we cannot simply identify Wentworth as having sole jurisdiction for the actions of his political career. Christopher Wandesford was closely associated with Wentworth during the Parliaments of the 1620s before becoming Master of the Rolls and Privy Councillor in Ireland. He also, on occasion, acted as Wentworth's deputy. Radcliffe became the King's Attorney in the North under Wentworth's Lord Presidency, and then preceded him to Ireland where Wentworth nominated him as an Irish Privy Councillor.<sup>10</sup>

This thesis will also study other figures that had a close political association with Wentworth, such as Sir Edward Osborne who acted as Vice President of the Council of the North during Wentworth's Lord Deputyship in Ireland and Sir Philip Mainwaring who was his Secretary of State for Ireland. We might also identify men such as Sir Edward Stanhope, Sir Gervase Clifton and Sir John Melton as close associates of

---

<sup>9</sup> By analysing Radcliffe and Wandesford's actions, we may be able to discover how far their actions and rationale mirror that of Thomas Wentworth and therefore shed more light upon Wentworth's intentions. It is perhaps reading too much into the evidence to suggest that Radcliffe's limited political career by 1628 can reveal a 'change of sides.' However, this is not to say that he could not have abandoned his political convictions for a courtly career, rather that as he did not sit in Parliament until 1628, we do not have the opportunity to develop much of an insight into his objectives or opinions. Therefore it is difficult to convincingly present a thesis that he did or did not 'change sides.' However, Prest has highlighted Charles I's denunciation of lawyers who "take upon them to decry the opinions of the judges", but then recognised that he could employ their talent by admitting many into his government during his Personal Rule. Prest, W.R. *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts 1590 – 1640* (London, 1972), p. 229. Whitaker's short biography of Radcliffe suggests that he held courtly ambitions and neglected the campaign of the Parliament against the King for a career as a prerogative lawyer. Whitaker saw Wentworth as a man who refused to work "within the limits even of ancient and established laws" and therefore saw his rule in the Council of the North as more arbitrary and offensive than ever before. It is a logical extension in Whitaker's eyes that in his role as King's Attorney, Radcliffe "must be imputed whatever of exorbitant jurisdiction was there exercised in form, as the original contrivance and suggestion of it ought to be ascribed to Wentworth." Whitaker, T.D. *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), p. 269. In reality, it was actually George Radcliffe who was behind many legal changes and attacks in Wentworth's policies. As Radcliffe had been working as a lawyer throughout the previous decade, he would have had a greater in-depth knowledge of legal techniques and loopholes than Wentworth. Wandesford's career perhaps provides the most important comparison with that of Wentworth. As we shall see in Chapter 2, his activities within the Parliaments of the 1620's may in fact be how Wentworth would have liked to behave, if this would not compromise his ambition for a courtly career. Wandesford also refused to pay the forced loan but should be noted most significantly for his role in the attempted impeachment of the King's favourite, the Duke of Buckingham in the Parliament of 1626. Wandesford experienced a more subtle change of sides at the end of the 1620's, quietly shifting into a courtly role under Wentworth's patronage in the Council of the North and in Ireland.

<sup>10</sup> Sir George Radcliffe is arguably best known for his 'An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde, in a Letter to the late Earl.' in Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols. London, 1739), vol. II, pp. 429 – 436, Str. P. 21 / 214.

Wentworth, but they were not entrusted with major political functions and therefore they cannot be included within this grouping. Wentworth also employed agents such as William Raylton and Richard Marris, but again they were part of a lower tier of administration and therefore did not operate on the same level as men such as Radcliffe and Wandesford.<sup>11</sup> Although John Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry was an important ally to Wentworth's Lord Deputyship in Ireland, this thesis will not attempt to approach his involvement in the regime in quite the same detail. His role within Wentworth's Irish administration has also been examined extensively by McCafferty and others.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, Wentworth's relationship with his closest advisors were based upon long term kinship connections supported by an appeal to the rhetoric of friendship, and Wentworth's relationship with Bramhall does not have the same longevity or intensity.

This study sheds important new light upon the politics of the 1620s and 1630s as well as revealing a fresh approach to analysing Wentworth's personal political career as Lord President of the Council of the North and Lord Deputy of Ireland. However, it also serves as a case study of how a specific form of political affinity might operate within the world of seventeenth century politics.

---

<sup>11</sup> William Raylton was Wentworth's agent in London and Richard Marris looked after Wentworth's estates. Merritt, J.F. 'Power and communication: Thomas Wentworth and government at a distance during the Personal Rule, 1629 – 1635,' in Merritt, *The political world of Thomas Wentworth* pp. 121 – 124.

<sup>12</sup> See McCafferty, J. 'John Bramhall and the Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland 1633 – 1641,' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1996), McCafferty, J. '“God bless your free Church of Ireland”: Wentworth, Laud, Bramhall and the Irish Convocation of 1634,' in Merritt, *The political world of Thomas Wentworth* pp. 187 – 208, Ford, A. *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590 – 1641* (Frankfurt, 1985).

## **Chapter 1: Clients, retinues and men-of-business: the language of political affinity in early Stuart England.**

History is frequently written around the deeds of great men. The course of History is followed through examinations of these influential characters that were single-mindedly pursuing their career. However, in early modern Europe, there was usually a broader body of men behind these central characters, facilitating their work and supporting their political activities. Although the existence of the support-mechanisms behind these great men has been acknowledged, their influence and importance has rarely been given the analysis they deserve. This chapter will reveal that historians have been keen to analyse patronage systems and present the servants of key figures as subservient and self-seeking. However as we shall see, such models cannot easily be applied to the situation of Wentworth and his associates.

The notions of clientage and noble affinity have been used in connection with the administration of important and influential statesmen. Clients are usually presented in a business context, working for or on behalf of their social superior; reminiscent of images of mediaeval vassalage and clientage, where the clients were expected to further the noble's career, land holding and perhaps even reputation. Clientage was theoretically a reciprocal process, but was typically an unequal relationship, the client being subservient to the patron. Each party did not necessarily benefit equally. Clients usually worked for the patron in return for patronage of some description, for instance financial return, prestige or career progression.<sup>1</sup> The theory of political gain was placed in a long tradition of belief that one should endear oneself to an important political figure. In keeping with this tradition, William Cecil, Lord Burghley, advised his son in 1584 that he should "Be sure to keep some great man thy friend, but trouble him not for trifles, compliment him often, present [him] with many yet small gifts and of little charge."<sup>2</sup> Many historians have continued to use the terms 'client' and 'patron' in the context of seventeenth-century

---

<sup>1</sup> This comes across clearly in Adams' article, 'The Dudley Clientele and the House of Commons, 1559 – 1586,' which examines the way in which the earl of Leicester used his clients in order to bolster his parliamentary influence. However, Adams does not wish to distort the sense that patronage was used freely. He argues that "patronage in the direct sense may have been only a last resort to place men who could not enter the House under their own auspices." Adams, S. 'The Dudley Clientele and the House of Commons, 1559 – 1586,' *Parliamentary History* 8 (1989), p. 217.

<sup>2</sup> Cecil, W. 'Certain Percepts for the Well Ordering of a Man's Life (1584),' in L.B. Wright, (ed). *Advice to a Son* (New York, 1962), p. 12.



political History.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, in many relationships between important political players and their men, we can identify a clientage process, such as in the example of Edward Cooke, a royalist colonel in the English Civil War, and his patron Henry Somerset, the first Duke of Beaufort.<sup>4</sup> Cooke exploited a number of patrons in order to pay for his expensive lifestyle that revolved around the hunting seasons, and in his relationship with Somerset he enjoyed the benefits of association with a nobleman.<sup>5</sup>

Clients expected some return from their patron (indeed this may have been the primary reason behind their association with such a man), which normally took the form of financial benefits.<sup>6</sup> This was thought to be a fair reward for the client as if he provided “support (financial as well as moral) in bad times, they would expect their reward in prosperity.”<sup>7</sup> However, it was not only financial benefits that might attract a client to a patron. There was also the possibility of gaining prominence through association with an important and powerful patron either in land or offices as well as the chance to mix in reputable circles.

A second model of patronage, ‘Men-of-business,’ has been used to define the network of clients and administrators surrounding great men. This relationship has specifically been identified in the context of parliamentary activity, where the patron had

---

<sup>3</sup> A typical example of a seventeenth century administration established as a client - patron system is that of Cardinal Richelieu in France in the 1630's. His influence was far-reaching and his clients filled the major offices of state, describing themselves as his ‘creatures.’ The use of a strong clientele could influence policy and in this case, established Richelieu as the most prominent and powerful minister in France. It is yet to be seen whether Wentworth's small network of close advisors could be presented in such a light. Briggs, R. *Early Modern France 1560 – 1715* (Oxford, 1998), p. 101.

<sup>4</sup> This example was presented as a justification of the continued use of these terms, and indeed in this context, a client-patron relationship is indeed applicable and justified. Fisher, N.R.R. ‘Colonel Edward Cooke of Highnam (c.1622 – 1684) and Henry Somerset, First Duke of Beaufort: Client and Patron,’ *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 115 (1997), pp. 245 – 264.

<sup>5</sup> Cooke also had an official capacity working as Somerset's verderer in the Forest of Dean. This duality of roles creates in itself some difficulties as it can be hard to distinguish between the “public and private aspects of their relationship.” *ibid*, p. 251.

<sup>6</sup> For example in 1567, Sir William Cecil warned Elizabeth I that if Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester was permitted to rise to the position of her consort, he would exploit his position by distributing patronage to his clients. Sir William Cecil warned that Dudley would “...study nothing but to advance his own particular friends: to wealth, to offices, to lands and to offend others.” However, we must remember that Cecil was biased, fearing that his political enemy would rise to prominence. He also warned that if the Queen married Dudley, factions would be created. Adams, S. ‘The Dudley clientele, 1553 – 1563,’ in G.W. Bernard, (ed). *The Tudor Nobility* (London, 1992), p. 243.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid*, p. 258.

an air of superiority over, and expected service from his 'man-of-business'.<sup>8</sup> Collinson argues that 'men-of-business' played a subordinate yet not insubordinate role, yet suggests that this status should not diminish their potential political contribution. He sees them as "learned and articulate," occupying the position of "political yeomanry" beneath the more influential and powerful parliamentary players.<sup>9</sup> His positive interpretation of the work of the 'men-of-business' demonstrates that we should not perhaps assume that such men were lower in status than their patron, but that "the relationship was upward as well as downward in direction."<sup>10</sup> However, despite carefully defining the term within the context of Elizabethan Parliament, Collinson feels it should still be applied cautiously, and criticises Elton's "free and frequent" use of such expressions.<sup>11</sup>

But even in a parliamentary context, men-of-business have still been identified as working on a client – patron basis. In fact, Sir Robert Wroth who sat in the Parliament of 1604 described his own relationship with Robert Cecil, the future Earl of Salisbury, in terms of service or clientage.<sup>12</sup> Men-of-business still followed the guidance of their patron in determining their parliamentary actions, and therefore although their independent contribution and thoughts may well have been appreciated, we cannot over-estimate the amount of influence they exerted in reality. Describing a wide range of

---

<sup>8</sup> 'Men-of-business' have been identified as working within the Parliaments of Elizabeth I. For example, Thomas Norton, a prominent 'man-of-business' advised that the Privy Council should recruit "some mean men of the House and use their advises." Norton also wrote that it was his aim as a parliamentary 'man-of-business' to "avoid offensive speech and proceeding in the house." Graves, M.A.R. 'The Common Lawyers and the Privy Council's Parliamentary Men-of-Business, 1584 - 1601,' *Parliamentary History* 8 (1989), p. 189. Adams has also identified men-of-business who surrounded Robert Dudley and dealt with his public and private affairs, "most of whom remained in his service on a permanent basis for the rest of their lives." Adams, 'The Dudley clientele,' p. 244.

<sup>9</sup> Collinson is anxious not to belittle their careers by describing a member of the Parliament as a man of business as they could still behave as "active politicians and strategists." Collinson describes the role in a positive light, seeing parliamentary men-of-business as "experienced, informed men, esteemed as an important intellectual resource of government and looked to not only for information, historical, legal or diplomatic, but also for ideas, in the way that modern governments set up and operate more or less informal 'think tanks.'" Collinson, P. 'Puritans, Men of Business and Elizabethan Parliaments,' *Parliamentary History* 7, No. 2. (1988), p. 196.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid*, p. 196.

<sup>11</sup> Collinson describes men of business as "secondary political figures whose identities were less important than the fact that they looked after everything admirably. They were not opponents of the regime but its functionaries..." *ibid*, p. 192.

<sup>12</sup> Nicholas Tyacke suggests that we also see a similar relationship between Cecil and Sir Edwin Sandys. Tyacke, N. 'Sir Edwin Sandys and the Cecils: a Client-patron Relationship,' *Historical Research* 64 (1991), p. 87.

characters as ‘men-of-business’ may also be over-simplifying their roles and assuming that all such men had similar functions.

Other terms such as retinue, affinity and faction have been freely applied by historians,<sup>13</sup> yet the terminology is not used consensually and is applied to widely varying situations. Others have dismissed men who supported high political figures as merely bureaucrats. In some cases, men were indeed restricted to bureaucratic activities; not being expected to contribute to the patron’s political career in an advisory capacity and therefore identified as practical facilitators of the patron’s activities. However, this did not necessarily mean that a secretariat would be subordinate and undervalued by a superior patron. For example, the Bishop of Durham Richard Neile formed a paternalistic affiliation with his secretariat and chaplains, rather than insisting upon a strongly hierarchical relationship.<sup>14</sup>

This discussion of key models has indicated that different levels of hierarchy and dependence existed. However, these case studies also show that there is a degree of heterogeneity within these categories arising from a lack of consensus and formalised definitions, and are exploited by historians who apply them with different agendas.<sup>15</sup> An example of these distorted terms is the seemingly interchangeable terms, ‘faction’ and ‘client.’ Adams has demonstrated that ‘faction’ has been applied in a confusing variety of ways, even by contemporaries who used it to outline a “personal enmity or refusal to cooperate” or as a “political alliance or following.” This, he argued, did not have the same implications as clientage.<sup>16</sup> In the context of such confusion, misapplication and

---

<sup>13</sup> See for example Greengrass, M. ‘Noble Affinities in Early Modern France: The Case of Henri I de Montmorency, Constable of France,’ *European History Quarterly* 16 (1986), pp. 275 – 311.

<sup>14</sup> Neile’s dependence upon his own men rather than local gentry enabled him to override local interests and corruption and it became a “personal, centralized government with a vengeance.” Neile was sure to care for the economic and personal needs of his secretariat that would in turn ensure loyalty. Foster, A. ‘The function of a bishop: the career of Richard Neile, 1562 – 1640,’ in R. O’Day and F. Heal, (eds.) *Continuity and change. Personnel and administration of the Church in England 1500 – 1642* (Bristol, 1976), pp. 40, 46.

<sup>15</sup> Graves has used the term ‘man-of-business’ in a broad, wide-reaching way to describe a variety of working relationships within Parliament. Yet any analysis of such models should ensure that such terms are tightly defined. See Graves, M.A.R. ‘The Management of the Elizabethan House of Commons: The Council’s “Men-of-Business”,’ *Parliamentary History* 2 (1983), pp. 11 – 36 and Graves, ‘Common Lawyers,’ pp. 189 – 215.

<sup>16</sup> Adams indicates that “A faction was not the same thing as a clientage; nor was it the exercise of patronage, nor was it the taking of sides on a major political issue; a faction was a personal following employed in direct opposition to another personal following. A faction struggle could involve disputes over patronage or debate over matters of state. but its essence was a personal rivalry that over-rode all other

interchangeability of terms, can we safely use these terms even with caution? This problem is exacerbated by the relative lack of detailed studies, particularly for the early Stuart period. Those that do exist tend to examine the patronage systems surrounding important noblemen such as the Duke of Buckingham<sup>17</sup> and comparing such examples with Wentworth's supporters have grave limitations, as he was not a member of the nobility and clearly experienced very different political circumstances. Furthermore, the more mutually supportive networks, to which a description of Wentworth's men is more suited, are given little recognition in the existing literature. These types of relationship tend to be over-ridden by the prevailing view of seventeenth century political relationships in which men were self-seeking and factious.

A consideration throughout this thesis will be the nature of Wentworth's relationship with his political allies. Historians have mainly focused upon Wentworth's relationships with high-political allies such as Archbishop Laud, Lord Cottington and the Earl of Carlisle.<sup>18</sup> The nature of Wentworth's relationship with his associates has not been considered, and this may be partially because of the atypical nature of the relationship in the context of the existing patronage models. This thesis provides a detailed and searching analysis of the type of political association that was described earlier as a serious gap in the current historiography. The client – patron model suggests that men were motivated by personal concerns in their relationship with their patrons, and

---

considerations." Adams, S. 'Faction, Clientage and Party: English Politics, 1550 – 1603,' *History Today* 32, (1982), p. 34.

<sup>17</sup> Lockyer has examined the patronage network of the Duke of Buckingham to determine how Buckingham distributed favours and to whom. Buckingham had an extensive patronage network that was not only confined to his extended family due to the extensive range of his activities. He had a range of concerns when deciding whether "to use or withhold his influence." In the case of noblemen, he balanced the "advantages of their friendship against the danger of their enmity." When appointing men to particular state offices, he had to take into account their suitability. Finally, on the lowest level of patronage "with lesser men the main consideration was whether or not they would serve him faithfully and be committed to him alone." Lockyer points out that Buckingham's insistence that his clients should be "totally and exclusively devoted to him was not a sign of neurosis, nor did it derive simply from vanity." Everyone was balanced on the "pyramid of patronage" and if there was any "movement among the lower layers [it] could bring the whole edifice tumbling down." Lockyer, R. *Buckingham The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham 1592 – 1628* (Harlow 1981), pp. 39, 40.

<sup>18</sup> See for example, Merritt, J.F. 'Power and communication: Thomas Wentworth and government at a distance during the Personal Rule,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996). pp. 117 – 120, Pogson, F. 'Making and maintaining political alliances during the personal rule of Charles I: Wentworth's association with Laud and Cottington,' *History* 84 (1999), pp. 52 – 73. We might describe these relationships as Wentworth's 'political friendships' as opposed to the 'domestic friendships' that will be examined in the course of this thesis.

although this might have been one benefit for the men near to Wentworth, their relationship was firstly grounded in a long-standing mutual association, or ‘friendship,’ which also emphasised their kinship links.<sup>19</sup> Although we can identify times where Wentworth acted as a patron towards Wandesford and Radcliffe, they were still independent characters. For example, although Wentworth used his influence to help Wandesford to obtain a seat in the Parliaments of the 1620’s, Wandesford had freedom in his actions and was not politically tied to Wentworth. Indeed, there were a number of occasions where Wandesford did not support Wentworth in Parliament, as we shall see in Chapter 2.

In this circumstance, we cannot apply terms of clientage and therefore we might challenge the use of such terms in general. Even a supporter of clientage terminology such as Tyacke, has expressed some misgivings about the use of terms commonly applied to seventeenth century political relationships. In his work on the client – patron relationship between Sir Edwin Sandys and Cecil, he admitted “Client is possibly too strong a word for Sandys, implying a greater degree of dependence than is likely to have existed between him and Cecil at any stage.” Therefore, these generic terms should only be applied with utmost care as they lose meaning if used without careful analysis and a close examination of the precise implication of the term.<sup>20</sup> In the case of Wandesford and Wentworth, as in Sandys and Cecil’s relationship, there should be no assumption that the patron would dictate the behaviour of their associate.<sup>21</sup> Such misgivings support the central tenet of the thesis, which demonstrates that models of clientage and patronage do not necessarily apply to all political relationships.

The assumption that the patron was always a social superior of his client is also challenged in an analysis of the relationship between Wentworth and his associates. Although Wandesford and Radcliffe were of a lower status, Wentworth did not exploit

---

<sup>19</sup> However, although Radcliffe, Wandesford and Wentworth frequently refer to their kinship links, Adams has suggested that we should not place too much emphasis upon this type of relationship when analysing the foundations of an alliance. Although family ties often formed the core of early modern affinities, Adams emphasises the limitation of this connection, with particular reference to the clientele of Robert Dudley. He warns that due to the extent of intermarriage amongst a relatively small network of political families, “the importance assigned to cousins can be exaggerated.” Adams, ‘The Dudley clientele,’ p. 245.

<sup>20</sup> Tyacke articulated concerns about the term ‘servant,’ which also has “misleading connotations.” In this situation, he relied upon the more indistinct definition of a “‘service’ relationship,” which might be applied more widely and freely, being “capable of almost infinite gradations.” Tyacke, ‘Sir Edwin Sandys,’ p. 88.

<sup>21</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 88 – 89.

this divide, instead fermenting relationships with these men on a comparable social standing.<sup>22</sup> We might argue that if Wentworth's supporters were self-seeking and thus conformed to the client - patron model, they would surely have attempted to distance themselves and change their alliances once Wentworth's rule in Ireland was disintegrating. However Wentworth's men remained consistently loyal and therefore this element of the clientage relationship can be dismissed.

The term 'cabal' seems to fulfill many of the requirements of an analysis of Wentworth's relationship with Radcliffe, Wandesford and other close associates. By definition, this is a political clique which implies a notion of equality in contrast to 'client - patron' and 'men-of-business' models. Wentworth's cabal was recognised by contemporaries;<sup>23</sup> however it arguably had a more secretive element as it was not an official political grouping and therefore the extent of their association may not have been explicit. For example it may have been a conscious decision for Radcliffe not to gain an official office within the Irish government to enable him greater political manoeuvrability and flexibility in his association with Wentworth when circumstances required. He was therefore able to work more as Wentworth's private agent, rather than directly as a servant of the Crown.

The notion of a small group of trusted advisors is invoked in advice literature of the period in which fathers imparted their experiences of life to their inexperienced sons. These were not necessarily 'yes-men' who would sycophantically agree to all that the political figure asked, and equally, they need not be men with an identical political and ideological stance. Often the importance and reliability of kinsmen was referred to in the belief that kin could be explicitly trusted to be honest. Wentworth's father, Sir William stated that he should choose his friends very carefully stating "Haue a verie greate care

---

<sup>22</sup> Wentworth's correspondence does not reveal a supercilious attitude to these supposedly subservient men and he did not exploit their association with him in order to obtain favours and work. In fact, Wentworth was keen to allow Wandesford freedom of initiative in the Parliaments of the 1620's, Wandesford even taking a key role in the attempted impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham in 1626, as we shall see in Chapter 2. He presented alternative viewpoints to those of Wentworth in Parliament, which gives weight to the argument that his role within this forum was not simply to bolster Wentworth's position. As Wandesford was a recognised adherent of Wentworth, surely it was not within his interests whilst attempting to forge a courtly career, to have allowed his *client* to play such an oppositionist and prominent role. This suggests that Wentworth and Wandesford's relationship was far more complex than this.

<sup>23</sup> The Earl of Cork's agent, Edward Walley, commented upon the downfall of Radcliffe, Wandesford and Wentworth in 1640, indicating that he recognised them as a unit. Walley to Cork, 12 December 1640, Chatsworth House, Lismore Papers, vol. 21 / 75.

ever to deserue ther good opinion, with all faith and observance for they are youre strengthe and comfort under God.”<sup>24</sup> It appears that Wentworth took this advice seriously and was always intent on gathering the advice of his closest advisors before making an important decision. Men of a similar or lower social standing were also thought to be more reliable. Sir William Wentworth warned Thomas Wentworth strongly against social superiors stating that “in generall itt is dangerouse to be familier with them, or to depend upon them, or to deale with or trust them too much.”<sup>25</sup>

Reliance upon close friends is a traditional theme of other ‘advices to sons’ and Sir William’s advice follows in the footsteps of other illustrious fathers such as Sir Walter Raleigh. Raleigh advised his son that “There is nothing more becoming a wise man than to make choice of friends, for by them thou shalt be judged what thou are.” Raleigh emphasised the value of friends being “wise and virtuous” and to exclude those that might “follow thee for gain.” Here, Raleigh shunned the traditional model of clientage in which relationship personal gain would likely to be the motivating force for the client.<sup>26</sup>

Thomas Wentworth actively sought the advice of Christopher Wandesford throughout the 1620’s and beyond. Trust was therefore essential and we should note that in traditional client – patron models a client might not be trusted to offer sincere advice, instead offering guidance that his patron would be flattered to hear. Wentworth and Wandesford’s correspondence reveals that they were not afraid to offer their own independent opinions on a matter, even if presenting a potentially unpopular perspective. However, Lord Burghley William Cecil was more cautious about employing kinsmen or friends “for they will expect much and do little...” describing them as “glowworms - I mean parasites and sycophants.”<sup>27</sup> Such differing perspectives might be explained by the fact that Wentworth’s cabal were not initially attracted to Thomas Wentworth’s service as

---

<sup>24</sup> ‘Sir William Wentworth’s advice to his son,’ contemporary copy in Str. P. 40 / 1 and 1a, Cooper, J.P. (ed). *Wentworth Papers 1597 – 1628* (London, 1973), p. 15.

<sup>25</sup> *ibid*, p. 11.

<sup>26</sup> Sir Walter Raleigh advised that his son should “Take care thou be not made a fool by flatterers, for even the wisest men are abused by these. Know, therefore, that flatterers are the worst kind of traitors, for they will strengthen thy imperfections, encourage thee in all evils, correct thee in nothing...” Raleigh, W. ‘Sir Walter Raleigh’s Instructions to His Son and to Posterity (1632),’ in Wright, *Advice to a Son* p. 26.

<sup>27</sup> Cecil, W. ‘Certain Precepts’ in *ibid*, p. 11.

their close and trusting relationship had been allowed to establish before Wentworth's political career became increasingly influential.<sup>28</sup>

We should not freely use the term 'friendship' as in the seventeenth century there was certainly a 'politics of friendship'. Political figures frequently exploit the rhetorical vocabulary of friendship; indeed Wentworth himself described Lord Treasurer Portland as his 'friend', despite the fact that we know that in reality he considered him to be an enemy.<sup>29</sup> The term 'friend' could be used in a calculating way. Indeed, this would have been exploited in politics as it could be manipulated to imply social intimacy, whilst glossing over the undercurrent of political manoeuvring. At the same time, there was an unpolitical notion of 'friendship' and therefore the sentiments of this relationship could be abused. In the case of Wentworth, the unpolitical form of friendship originated from his domestic rather than political life, and from this basis, he carried his relationships with these men into the political sphere. Political friendship could be exploited at court and in the political arena, with reliance upon the pretence of amicability played out in the tone and format of letters.<sup>30</sup> However as William Wentworth indicated, there was a great value in bringing together these two arenas of friendship – the political and domestic – by

---

<sup>28</sup> The issue of trust was clearly integral to Wentworth's relationship with his closest advisors and Wandesford expressed the importance of keeping secrets "committed to You by another" to his son in his Book of Advice. He stated that after being confided in, "you ow it to him in justice to conceal; for being his familiar, you are chosen like a safe place to preserve that committed to you under trust." Yorkshire Archaeological Society, DD5/12/33, 'A Book of Advice Written by The Right Honourable Christopher Wandesford Lord Deputy of Ireland to his Son and heir George Wandesford Esq. in Order to the Regulating the conduct of his Whole Life,' p. 30. Nicholas Faunt, a sixteenth century clerk of the signet, described the position of trust a secretary found himself in, and stated that during the time of his employment, the secretary should remember that "all things bee done for his Masters credit and honnour which in noe case should bee imparted or deuided to anie frend or favorite, howesoouer, otherwise neare and deare to him." The special bond between the secretary and his master "must proceed from a special loue and affeccion hee beareth towards his Master..." Hughes, C. 'Nicholas Faunt's Discourse touching the Office of Principal Secretary of Estate &c 1592,' *English Historical Review* 20 (1905), p. 501.

<sup>29</sup> Merritt indicates that Wentworth would frequently reassure a correspondent that he was his true friend at court and "deliberately sought to create an impression of intimacy, the better to convince his correspondent of the closeness of their political alliance." Merritt warns that we should be wary of such protestations as although we might accept Wentworth's interpretation of his relationship with Laud, he also used the same form of language in correspondence to Lord Cottington and Lord Treasurer Portland. Merritt, 'Power and communication,' p. 120.

<sup>30</sup> For example, Wentworth signed off his letter to Secretary Coke, dated 27 July 1633, "Your faithfull frend and humble servant." Str. P. 5 / 7. This seems to be a rhetorical and repetitive closure to his letters, as Wentworth also signed off in exactly the same way in numerous letters to Lord Cottington. See for example Wentworth to Lord Cottington, 7 December 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 91b. There are a number of variations upon the same theme in the way in which Wentworth signs off but all contain references to his relationship with and subservience to the recipient of his letter. See for example, Wentworth to Secretary Coke, 31 January 1634, "Your most faithfull humble Servant," *ibid*, 5 / 51.



enabling the ‘real’ friends from the domestic arena to become political allies whom one could really trust.<sup>31</sup>

Indeed Thomas Wentworth may have been able to trust the advice of his ‘domestic friends’ and perhaps stood upon less ceremony with them than other political allies. This is borne out by Wentworth having known them for a long time, their increasing kinship ties and the air of jocularly and unaffected social intimacy in their letters.<sup>32</sup> Wentworth believed that domestic friends would make more effective political allies and thus was keener to advance these men with whom he had already experienced a domestic friendship, rather than forging new political alliances with already prominent political figures that could be potentially dangerous. However, he still needed to exploit

---

<sup>31</sup> ‘Sir William Wentworth’s advice,’ Str. P. 40 / 1 and 1a, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 11. Here we might note the example of Laud and Sir Francis Windebank. Laud advanced his close personal friend Windebank so that he might have an ally within the Privy Council upon whom he could rely and trust. However, this plan backfired as having advanced to a high position, Windebank rejected Laud’s friendship and allied himself with Lord Cottington. See Quintrell, B. ‘The Church triumphant? The emergence of a spiritual Lord Treasurer, 1635 – 1636,’ in Merritt, *The political world of Thomas Wentworth*, pp. 85, 88, 91, 103 – 104.

<sup>32</sup> Wandesford was able to joke with Wentworth in his correspondence and offer sarcastic comments on his actions. For example, when Wentworth was imprisoned for refusing to pay the forced loan in 1627, Wandesford commented that he hoped Wentworth was “better placed ther by the state for your better education. They thinke you to be (I beleve) in your nonnadge, not fitt to governe your owne estate.” Wandesford to Wentworth, 9 September 1627, Str. P. 16 / 261, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 266. Wentworth mocked Wandesford and used jovial and sarcastic language in letters to him, and this in marked contrast to the tone of his letters with political allies such as Laud. For example, in a letter dated 17 June 1624, Wentworth joked that he was behind in his correspondence with Wandesford and warned him to “looke to yo[u]r selfe when yow deale with such fetches as I haue in store for such gentle tame Creatures as your selfe.” Str. P. 2 / 134. Noting Wandesford’s ability to provide him with detailed news of political events in London whilst Wentworth was absent in Yorkshire, Wentworth jokingly referred to Wandesford as “My Ambassadour resident” Wentworth to Wandesford, 11 October 1624, *ibid*, 2 / 148. Wentworth’s early correspondence with Wandesford is not limited to political news. On one occasion he challenged Wandesford to “deny if you dare that I haue good skill in the tearmes and art of gardeninge.” He referred to himself as Wandesford’s “absent freind” and admitted that he “right hartely wish my selfe upon the place...” Wentworth to Wandesford, 30 July 1623, *ibid*, 2 / 106. On another occasion, Wentworth wrote that he would respond to some issues raised in Wandesford’s letter in person, stating that “wee shall haue tyme sufficient to chatt of when wee meet.” Wentworth to Wandesford, 2 October 1623, *ibid*, 2 / 116. In February 1624, Wentworth was recovering from an illness and described to Wandesford the “greatest comfort” that he had had from his friends “in w[hi]ch number I esteem yo[u]r selfe a principall one” Here, he signed off as Wandesford’s “most assured freind and affecc[i]onate kinsman” and here we should note the difference to in the way he addressed more important political friends. In correspondence with Wandesford, we find more of an appeal to their shared heritage and kinship and an emphasis upon their friendship. There are also a number of allusions to social gatherings. For example, Radcliffe thanked Sir Arthur Ingram for a gift of ale sent to him and Wentworth in Ireland and promised that they would “drinke y[ou]r health, & make the welkin roare.” George Radcliffe to Ingram, 2 January 1637, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO7 / II / 21. In March 1626, Wentworth told Wandesford that he would be at Stockhill “on Palme Sunday night where (if yow haue any manners) you will meet mee...” Wentworth to Wandesford, 26 March 1625, Str. P. 2 / 169. All of this in conjunction does imply that there was more to their relationships than a purely political friendship.

his relationship with high political allies who could preserve his standing at Court and protect his political and personal interests, such as Archbishop Laud and Lord Cottington whom he obviously trusted and considered to be ‘friends’ but in a rather different way to his relationship with the cabal. His relationship with Wandesford did not simply appeal to the rhetoric of friendship, but appears to have been far more familiar than that with Laud and Cottington.

Wandesford also expressed belief in the use of domestic relationships to further political careers. In his own advice to his son, he described untrustworthy friends as “Sandy Men,” who were “light in judgement, or manners, slippery in faith...” These untrustworthy friends would not “defend you from stormes, they will fayl you when you trust to their advice.” Wandesford emphasised the value of a single strong friendship informing his son that he should place his trust and friendship

upon a Rock, the piety & Integrity of an honest Man; let the winds blow,  
& the storms rage, he will protect you against all difficultyes without  
perturbations within, & in all negotiations assist and comfort you.

He advised against a relationship with a social superior and warned his son to choose a friend with “equality in fortune... [as] the knowledge of their own condition prepares them the better to understand yours.” However, he should be aware that men might not be “affected with the same pretences you sett your self upon; for so you lean upon a broken reed which will deceive you.” Wandesford warned that to prevent this deceit, one should “communicate little of your purposes to another, before you have computed well with your self what ends the same Man may have in that particular whereof you advise with him.” Wandesford was clearly cautious in his friendships but once able to fully trust another after “perus[ing] him, as a student doth a hard Text read severall comments upon him.... then will you know, that too much care cannot be taken, in discoverys of such a treasure.”<sup>33</sup>

Evidence of the existence of domestic friendship would be supported by a contemporary ability to identify a form of political relationship that was not simply based

---

<sup>33</sup> Yorkshire Archaeological Society, DD5/12/33, ‘A Book of Advice Written by The Right Honourable Christopher Wandesford,’ pp. 35 - 37. Wentworth himself had warned Wandesford not to be so trusting of men. In March 1625, he warned Wandesford that he was about to “giue yow a notable example how carefull yow should bee of your wordes, wherof itt is to bee feared (by mee being your friend) yow w[i]th the rest of the world are but too much forgettfull.” Wentworth to Wandesford, 26 March 1625, Str. P. 2 / 168.

upon clientage or men-of-business principles, but based upon assumptions of personal equality and close social ties. Although Sir William Wentworth described to his son a political world embroiled in deception, calculation and bribery, he also discussed the possibilities of a domestic friendship that could be exploited effectively to further one's political life. The essence of his advice was that Wentworth should not trust anyone in the political arena and should not "deale with or trust them too much." Instead he should place his trust in a few family friends whom Wentworth had known since childhood.<sup>34</sup>

## Conclusion

The concepts expressed in advice literature should be regarded as a contextual notion that helps to define Wentworth's unusual relationship with the members of his cabal. What is perhaps most atypical about their situation is the extent to which they were involved in his administration at every level, being confidants, policy makers as well as actively carrying out his instructions. The more we examine the nature of the relationship between them and the reliance Wentworth placed upon these men, it is increasingly clear that this example does not fit the stereotypes of noble affinity and clientage. In the 1630s, Wentworth was the main force and his aides were his subordinate supporters. However, even if they were politically subordinate, this does not mean that we should see their relationship as one of simple subservience. In personal and domestic terms, their relationship was more based upon social equality and kinship. With such highly significant roles in the Personal Rule Government, it seems all the more remarkable that Wentworth's cabal has been largely ignored in studies of seventeenth century political history.

---

<sup>34</sup> Sir William Wentworth advised his son to "make choice especiallie of 3 or 4 or 5 knights or esquires that were faithfull to your father, for those are lykest to be faithfull to yow." 'Sir William Wentworth's advice.' Str. P. 40 / 1 and 1a. Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* pp. 11, 14 – 15.

## **Chapter 2: Another change of sides? The political career of Christopher Wandesford, 1621 – 1629.**

Thomas Wentworth's political career in the 1620s has attracted enormous scholarly attention from historians such as Cust, Salt and Zagorin.<sup>1</sup> The focus of much research has been to question whether or not he 'changed sides' and is identified as a unique case over which historians can debate. However, there has been no attempt to examine whether a similar path can be identified in the careers of his cabal of the 1630s. Christopher Wandesford was the only member of Wentworth's cabal to have a significant political career in the 1620s and this gives us an opportunity to ascertain whether he displayed a similar ambivalence in the relationship between court and country during the tumultuous 1620s. If anything, one observes an even more surprising 'change of sides' in the political career of Wandesford than that of Wentworth.<sup>2</sup>

Parliamentary history has traditionally been at the centre of the grand political narrative of the seventeenth century. Along the 'road to Civil War,' there is no period that has attracted greater scrutiny than the parliaments of the 1620s where the actions of Parliament have been examined in order to trace an inevitable progression in their opposition towards the Crown and thus providing the roots of the Civil War. But as the most detailed historical analyst Russell has demonstrated, there was neither progression nor inevitability in the complex interplay of events, personalities and issues that determined such parliamentary hostility. Due to that complexity, it is intriguing to examine the parliamentary experiences of these years through the more limited perspective of an individual to see if we can gain a different viewpoint upon the issues that affected Parliament as a whole. As Wandesford sat in every Parliament, his career can be tracked throughout the 1620s. In retrospect, we should perhaps consider Wandesford's contributions to Parliament in James I's reign as his political apprenticeship, due to the fact that his parliamentary undertakings were limited. He was initially inexperienced and appears to have entered Parliament in order to support Wentworth's interest. However, by 1625, Christopher Wandesford

---

<sup>1</sup> See Zagorin, P. *The Court and the Country* (London, 1969), Salt, S.P. 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire, 1614 – 1628.' *Northern History* 16 (1980), pp. 130 – 168, Cust, R. 'Wentworth's 'change of sides' in the 1620s,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621-1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 63 – 80.

played an important role in Parliament in his own right, and became an influential and key member. His most intriguing and powerful role in this period was his involvement in the attempted impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham in 1626.

Given that the cabal had a share in Wentworth's government in the 1630s, it is all too easy to construct a pattern that anachronistically predates this group and therefore it is essential to examine the 1620s without the benefit of hindsight. There are of course occasions when Wentworth, Wandesford and Radcliffe supported one another during the 1620s and these become more noticeable in the years after 1625. Yet even if they were supporting Wentworth's career, being identified as a coherent group may have impeded any mutual objectives and limited the impact of their work.

### **The Parliament of 1621: Political apprenticeship**

Christopher Wandesford was the first member of his family to enter Parliament. He took a burgess' seat for Aldborough in Yorkshire in 1621 and 1624. It is likely that Wandesford's association with Wentworth influenced his decision to enter Parliament in 1621. Initially, Wandesford was to sit for Appleby, through the patronage of Wentworth and Lord Clifford. Clifford had promised Wentworth a safe seat at Appleby if he failed to gain his seat for Yorkshire,<sup>3</sup> and agreed that Wandesford should have the seat if Wentworth was successful in obtaining the county seat.<sup>4</sup> Wandesford ultimately sat for Aldborough although it is not clear why Wentworth's original plan should have changed.<sup>5</sup>

Gruenfelder has suggested that Wentworth did not have any influence over Wandesford's parliamentary career until after the 1621 elections, adding that the close relationship between Wentworth and Wandesford did not develop until after the death of Wentworth's wife, Margaret in 1622.<sup>6</sup> This raises questions of whose patronage

---

<sup>2</sup> George Radcliffe and Edward Osborne did not enter Parliament until 1628 and Philip Mainwaring played only a minor role in the 1620s. The more limited experiences of these men will be examined in Chapters 3 and 5.

<sup>3</sup> Ruigh, R.E. *The Parliament of 1624* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971), p.103.

<sup>4</sup> Wentworth explained to Wandesford that he had "an absolute Promise of my Lord Clifford, that if I be chosen Knight, you shall have a Burgess-ship (reserved for me) at *Appleby*, wherewith I must confess, I am not a little pleased, in regard we shall sit there, judge, and laugh together." Wentworth to Wandesford, 28 November 1620, Str. P. 2 / 52. Cooper, J.P. (ed). *Wentworth Papers 1597 – 1628* (London, 1973), p. 141, Knowler, W. *The Earl of Strafforde's letters and dispatches* (2 vols, London, 1739), vol. I, p. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Sir Arthur Ingram ultimately took the Appleby seat. Ruigh, *Parliament of 1624* p. 103.

<sup>6</sup> J.K. Gruenfelder, 'The Electoral Patronage of Sir Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1614 – 1640,' *Journal of Modern History* 49, (1977), p. 570. Gruenfelder refers the reader to a letter from C. Pepper to Sir Henry Savile in January 1621, which reveals that Henry Savile was hoping to be returned

Wandesford did in fact use to facilitate his first foray into Parliament. However Gruenfelder's assertion was mistaken. Although the friendship between these men may have become more intense after the death of Margaret, Wentworth and Wandesford were close before 1621. In a letter dated 28 November 1620, Wentworth commented on the support that Wandesford offered him in his pursuit of his parliamentary seat for Yorkshire. He wished to meet Christopher Wandesford to show his gratitude rather than attempting to thank him through letters.<sup>7</sup> This letter certainly has the familiarity usually only demonstrated between men who have known each other for some time. Wandesford and Wentworth had known each other since their schooldays, both attending Well school in Yorkshire in the home of the Dean of Ripon, Dr. Higgins.<sup>8</sup> Wandesford was also a distant kinsman of Wentworth, and they often refer to each other as 'Cosen' in letters.<sup>9</sup> This familial connection was reinforced when Wentworth became godfather to Wandesford's son in September 1623.<sup>10</sup>

During Christopher Wandesford's first experience of Parliament, he was not very active, making just eight recorded speeches. However, his speeches were on central issues and he was also nominated to important committees. It is tempting to

---

for the Aldborough burgess' seat and Pepper for the recordership at Richmond in Yorkshire. Gruenfelder does not make it clear how this indicates why Wandesford's Appleby seat was abandoned for the Aldborough seat. C. Pepper to Sir Henry Savile, 8 January 1621, British Library, Harleian MS 7000, f. 41. Gruenfelder refers to C. V. Wedgwood's comment to bolster his argument, where she states that the death of Wentworth's wife Margaret in 1622 brought about "the two great friendships of his life, with George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford." Wedgwood, C.V. *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford: A Revaluation* (London, 1961), p. 43.

<sup>7</sup> Wentworth wrote to Wandesford that he had heard "from divers Parts how much I am beholden unto you in these my Adventures of Knighthood.... surely lodging the Remembrance of your Care and Pains in my Breast, I will cheerfully wait the good Hour wherein to give you more clear and lively Images of my Affection than by Letters and Lines." The tone of this letter from Wentworth to Wandesford indicates that the two men already had close ties. However, we should be wary of reading too much into the tone of letters, especially since Wentworth was canvassing election support at this time. Wentworth signed off his letter: "There remains nothing for my Pen but to seal up this Letter with that, which as it is found, so unalterable, even the true and sincere Affection of Your assured Friend..." Wentworth to Wandesford, 28 November 1620, Str. P. 2 / 51, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 9.

<sup>8</sup> In Radcliffe's drafts for his 'Essay on the Life of Strafford,' he noted that Wentworth "went to schoole at Well under the government of Deane Higgins, where learned together Henry Lord Clifford, the last Erle of Comberland, Sir Thomas Wharton... Christopher Wandesford of Kirklinge and diverse others." Str. P. 34 / not numbered, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers*, p. 319, Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 21.

<sup>9</sup> See for example Wentworth's letter to his patron George Calvert where he mentioned that he had "written to my Cosen Wandesford..." Wentworth to George Calvert, 31 August 1624, Str. P. 2 / 144.

<sup>10</sup> Wentworth thanked Wandesford for the good news of the birth of his son and promised that as soon as he arrived in London, "one of my first visitts, God willinge shalbee to see the yong gentleman & his vertuous mother... Let her know in assurance never any man was more willinge or proude of being a godfather." Wentworth to Wandesford, 2 October 1623, *ibid*, 2 / 116. Sir George Calvert, Wentworth's election partner in 1621, was also godfather. McCall, H.B. *Story of the Family of Wandesforde of Kirklington and Castlecomer* (London, 1904), pp. 71 – 72.

dismiss Wandesford as a mere tool to support Wentworth during the parliaments of the 1620s and indeed we find many incidents where Wandesford bolstered Wentworth's position and helped him to maintain his seat. One such example is the Yorkshire election case on which Wandesford spoke twice in 1621. The constables of the Yorkshire election were accused of using unfair measures against Sir John Savile and it was uncertain whether Wentworth and his election partner Sir George Calvert would be allowed to retain their seats. The issue was debated in the House on 16 March and Wandesford made a speech admitting that the constables in Yorkshire had "will[ed] and require[d]" freeholders to vote for Wentworth and Calvert against Sir John Savile. However, he felt that punishing the constables was sufficient and asked the House to "mix justice and mercy together" to enable Wentworth and Calvert to retain their seats.<sup>11</sup> During later contested elections, we will see that Wandesford played a prominent role in supporting Wentworth's actions and justifying them to the House.

However, it is not enough to assume that Wandesford's only function within Parliament was to support the views and needs of Wentworth as they differed on a number of key issues during their parliamentary careers. An early example is their perpendicular attitudes towards a bill discussed on 8 and 17 March that proposed to prohibit the importation of corn, which raised many concerns within the Parliament of 1621 given the period of economic depression. The bill was designed to maintain the price received by English farmers for their corn as they were being undermined by cheap imports<sup>12</sup> and was divided into two parts: The first stated that imports of corn should be banned and the second section proposed to set up stores of corn to be distributed to areas of England when it was needed.<sup>13</sup> Wentworth disliked the prospect of banning any imports but agreed that storing grain and distributing it within this country would be of benefit to the people.<sup>14</sup> Wandesford however supported the

---

<sup>11</sup> *Journals of the House of Commons 1547 – 1628* vol. I, pp. 557, 571.

<sup>12</sup> Russell highlights the importance of this bill as it created interesting declarations by members of Parliament elected by boroughs who felt "bound by constituency interest rather than their personal good." Russell, C. *Parliaments and English Politics 1621 - 1629* (Oxford, 1979), p. 95.

<sup>13</sup> Notestein, W, Relf, F.H. & Simpson, H. (eds). *Commons Debates, 1621* (New Haven, 1935), vol. III, p. 281.

<sup>14</sup> Wentworth stated "For the latter part of the bill, that is very good, and therfor to recommitt the bill and only to have that stand." *ibid*, p. 282. Some members of Parliament such as Gabriel Towerson feared that if imports were banned, there might be a grain shortage that would prove disastrous in the event of harvest failure. It is possible that Wentworth's rejection of the bill was based upon similar grounds. It was in fact fortuitous that this bill did not pass into the statute books in 1621, as in the

import ban as he felt that this would stimulate English agriculture without undermining the import trade as alternative cargoes could be found.<sup>15</sup> Wandesford's stance was possibly forged through his own vested interests, in the effect upon his constituents and possibly his own land.<sup>16</sup>

Wandesford appeared on many committees during the parliaments of the 1620s dealing with corruption or irregularities within the legal profession. He had a well-grounded knowledge of law. Despite having to finish Cambridge University just before his father died in 1612 in order to look after the estate at Kirklington,<sup>17</sup> he partook in an early form of 'distance learning' at Gray's Inn. He read many legal volumes and attended the Inn whenever he had time.<sup>18</sup> In the Parliament of 1621, Wandesford's most important committee appointment was to draft a bill to prevent corruption in law courts and he also contributed to the debate for a law to "prevent the excessive Fees of Lawyers."<sup>19</sup> The importance of membership to these committees becomes apparent when seen in the context of the wider concerns of this Parliament. After the scandal of Lord Chancellor Bacon who was deposed from his post in May 1621, Parliament had launched upon a reform of the judicial system in general and in particular the Court of Chancery. After discussion, members agreed that extortionate lawyers' fees were the basis of all other judicial abuses, and therefore should be examined and reformed.<sup>20</sup> It becomes clear then, that Wandesford's inclusion in this

---

summer there was a terrible harvest failure and there would have been no imports to sustain the country. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* pp. 95, 121.

<sup>15</sup> Wandesford stated on 8 March that "ploughing will be laid down in their county if provision not made for the price of corn." *Commons Journal* p. 545. In response to Digges' opinion that merchants would ignore Parliament's ruling if they brought in such a bill, Wandesford said "Tis not likely but that if they will bring in other commodities, they may, instead of Corne...." Notestein, W. *et al*, *Commons Debates 1621* vol. III, p. 281.

<sup>16</sup> The importance Wandesford placed upon issues concerning his constituency may show that members of Parliament were answerable to their electorate. However, it may equally be stated that Wandesford may have supported issues concerned with the North through personal interest as the outcome would affect his home. However, it seems most likely that Wandesford was named to certain committees as he was assumed to have the relevant knowledge. An example of Wandesford's involvement with local concerns appears on 26 May when Wandesford was appointed to the committee for a bill that proposed to continue a statute "made in the 7<sup>th</sup> Year of his Majesty's Reign, concerning Moor burning in several counties." *Commons Journal* p. 627.

<sup>17</sup> Firth, C.H. 'Christopher Wandesford,' *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 285.

<sup>18</sup> A few weeks after his father's death, Wandesford registered at Gray's Inn on 1 November 1612. However, as he had to attend to his estate, he would not have been able to stay in London to study for much time. McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde*, p. 67, Foster, J. *The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521 - 1889* (London, 1889), p. 131.

<sup>19</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 595. Wandesford argued "the great lawyers may pay back their fees when they do nothing for it." Notestein, W. *et al*, *Commons Debates 1621* vol. II, p. 328.

<sup>20</sup> For an important discussion on the attempted reform of the judicial system in the 1621 Parliament, see Zaller, R. *The Parliament of 1621* (Los Angeles, 1971), pp. 90 - 93.



particular committee was significant. Tackling corruption and illegality in high places becomes a consistent theme of Wandesford's early parliamentary career.

Wandesford attempted to strengthen parliamentary privileges throughout his time in the English Parliament. He commented on the case brought into the 1621 Parliament that questioned the Commons' right to punish those who were not parliamentary members independently of the House of Lords or without the permission of the King. The Commons wished to prosecute a former Catholic barrister, Floyd, who was imprisoned in the Fleet for slandering a Welsh judge and whilst detained had been overheard verbally attacking Princess Elizabeth of Bohemia.<sup>21</sup> The majority of the House agreed with Sir Francis Kynaston's opinion that Parliament was like "the high court of heaven, sitting as angels to judge the world at the last day," thus allowing them to decide the punishment of Floyd.<sup>22</sup> However, Sir Lionel Cranfield felt that the House should act in moderation, "puzzled as it is by infinite doubts"<sup>23</sup> of the scope of its jurisdiction. Christopher Wandesford supported Cranfield and felt that the best course of action was to consult with the King.<sup>24</sup> This demonstrates Wandesford's cautious and moderate attitude towards trespassing upon the prerogative of the King and also reflects Wentworth's conciliatory and moderate line seen most convincingly during James I's reign. Wandesford's attitude may have been stimulated by a concern that Parliament was encroaching upon the King's prerogative, but we might also consider whether his association with Wentworth provoked his allegiance to Cranfield: Lionel Cranfield was Wentworth's patron in the early 1620s.

Although Wandesford's contribution to the Parliament of 1621 was fairly limited,<sup>25</sup> it was an extremely informative time for him during which his attitudes

---

<sup>21</sup> Floyd had celebrated the defeat of James I's son-in law and daughter calling them 'goodman' and 'goodwife.' These terms were extremely derogatory, hardly suitable for gentry figures, let alone royalty. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 117. For a fuller investigation of this issue and its wider legal implications, see Zaller, *Parliament of 1621* pp. 104 – 115. See also Cooper, T. 'Floyd, Edward,' *Dictionary of National Biography*, p. 343.

<sup>22</sup> Notestein, W. *et al*, *Commons Debates 1621* vol. VI, p. 120. Kynaston's tone might be rather ironic here as it would have been extremely dangerous to suggest that Parliament's power was above that of the King. William Noy emphasised that it did not matter who judged Floyd as long as the punishment was executed. He stated "What court soever judges, yet the execution rests in the King." Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 104.

<sup>23</sup> Zaller, *Parliament of 1621* p. 106.

<sup>24</sup> Wandesford proposed "that the whole house may attend the King and yow [the Speaker] attend the house, beseeching him to confirme this act of ours as being a testimony of our dewty to him and his and of his love to us." Notestein, W. *et al*, *Commons Debates 1621* vol. III, p. 144.

<sup>25</sup> Wandesford does not appear in a committee or a debate after 26 May 1621 although there is no evidence that he was absent from Parliament. He is not mentioned in the *Commons Journal* throughout

towards politics would have been refined. The Parliament of 1621 is important for its attacks upon monopolists, and this may have fuelled Wandesford's strong feelings against patents and monopolies in subsequent Parliaments. The desire to punish monopolists led to the revival of impeachment and Wandesford would have witnessed at close quarters these developments. Zaller has suggested that hatred of the Duke of Buckingham was noticeable for the first time in the Parliament of 1621, amongst a minority of members. Despite his association with his brother Sir Edward Villiers, one of the patentees for gold and silver thread, Buckingham was not harassed significantly during the attacks on monopolists.<sup>26</sup> This may have been where Wandesford's later ferocity against Buckingham stemmed from.

Wandesford's attitudes towards the importance of committees were generated early on in his parliamentary career.<sup>27</sup> The amount of business discussed by the Parliament was so voluminous that much of it could not be completed.<sup>28</sup>

---

the second session of the 1621 Parliament. It is unclear whether he was simply rather inactive throughout the remainder of the Parliament or if his comments were simply not recorded by the parliamentary secretaries.

<sup>26</sup> Zaller, *Parliament of 1621* p. 116. Wandesford was genuinely driven by the desire to rid the country of monopolists and this theme continued in subsequent Parliaments where Wandesford seemed to have an agenda of attempting to root out corruption and illegality more widely. On 7 April 1624, Christopher Wandesford was entered in the Commons Journal as being one of the 64 Members of Parliament appointed by the House of Commons "to confer with the Lords about the Bill of monopolies," which he attended on 8 April. *Commons Journal* p. 757. The Monopolies Bill of 1624 was very politically significant. The issue of monopolies had caused problems for the Crown since the 1590s. The Monopoly Act was "the first important statutory limitation on the royal prerogative" of the seventeenth century and it restricted the grant of monopolies to companies rather than individuals, except those presented to inventors. It also gave the control of monopolies to the courts of common law. The issue of monopolies reared its head once again during the 1630s when Charles I issued monopolies to individuals by manipulating the terms of the 1624 Monopolies Act. Smith, A.G.R. *The Emergence of a Nation State. The Commonwealth of England 1529 – 1660* (Harlow, 1984), p. 402. Working on the Monopolies bill was clearly an important role to have played in Parliament particularly by a relatively inexperienced member but evidence of Wandesford's contribution to this conference is unfortunately limited.

<sup>27</sup> Wandesford attended a range of committees which do not appear to have an obvious link to his personal or constituency interest. He favoured a bill discussed in Parliament on 22 March, to explain the statute of Edward VI regarding the abolition of chantries. After the second reading of the bill on 22 March, Wandesford was named to the committee to discuss "whether this bill shall look back." He also spoke on the issue of the proposed bill for free trade in wool. On 13 March, the committee for the bill for buying and selling of wool reported to the House of Commons with the proposed amendments to the bill. There was particular concern over "the falsifying of Cloths, by putting several Woolls, of several Kinds, together Wandesford suggested "the Buyer may be restrained to sell only to the Clothier." Wandesford played another smaller role in parliamentary proceedings on 19 March when he gave evidence to the committee of grievances of abuses in the grant of dispensations from the Statute of Apprentices, under a monopoly approved by Lord Chancellor Bacon. This issue was "Adiuged a greevance, by question, both in the creation and execution, wherin Sir John Davis and Mr. Wandesford declared the usage, witnessynge by Justice Hutton who bound over some of them to the session." Notestein, W. *et al*, *Commons Debates 1621* vol. V, pp. 311, 316, *Commons Journal* pp. 553, 568.

<sup>28</sup> Russell believes that this was due to a lack of leadership which led to undefined priorities, and committees which were not sufficiently attended due to ill planning and the clash in timing of

Wandesford's later emphasis upon the importance of the committee to maximise the amount of business successfully carried out, may have been informed by his involvement in his first Parliament. This first venture into Parliament played an important role in Wandesford's political development. His rapid advancement to an important player in parliamentary proceedings was grounded upon his initial apprenticeship in the 1621 Parliament.

### **The Parliament of 1624**

Christopher Wandesford was once again elected to Aldborough in the Parliament of 1624.<sup>29</sup> Wandesford's brother John also entered Parliament at this time. Although they are not usually distinguished from each other, Christopher had attended Parliament before and was therefore more likely to be the more active of the two brothers.<sup>30</sup>

The public forum of the Parliament of 1624 allowed a "clash of generations" within the royal family to become a public issue.<sup>31</sup> This matter of contention originated from King James I's proposed marriage treaty for Prince Charles with the Spanish Crown. Once these marriage negotiations broke down, Buckingham and Charles returned from Madrid in favour of a war against Spain.<sup>32</sup> James I wanted to avoid a direct confrontation with Spain and preferred the option of a land expedition to relieve the Palatinate where his widowed daughter Elizabeth of Bohemia had been forced from her lands.<sup>33</sup> Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham appear to have orchestrated the inclusion of an appropriation clause into the 1624 Subsidy Act and may also have been behind the impeachment of Lionel Cranfield, Lord Treasurer Middlesex and Wentworth's friend and patron, who opposed the proposed war against Spain on grounds of cost.<sup>34</sup> Buckingham's warmongering can be seen as the first occasion where he aroused significant opposition within the House of Commons.

---

committee meetings and meetings of the whole House. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 114.

<sup>29</sup> He stood against William Peasley who was a servant of Secretary Calvert, which is significant as he was standing against the secretary of Wentworth's earlier election partner. Ruigh notes that Peasley stood very little chance against Wandesford. Ruigh, *Parliament of 1624* p. 62.

<sup>30</sup> John Wandesford is occasionally distinguished from his brother, for example 'Jo. Wainford' is noted as taking part in the Committee for Newsam's Bill on 16 April 1624. *Commons Journal* p. 768.

<sup>31</sup> Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 145.

<sup>32</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 146 – 148.

<sup>33</sup> For full details of the consideration of the Palatinate, see Cogswell, T. *The Blessed Revolution. English politics and the coming of war, 1621 – 1624* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 57 – 61.

<sup>34</sup> Smith, D.L. *The Stuart Parliaments 1603 – 1689* (Oxford, 1999), p. 111.

Indeed, Wandesford and Wentworth were united in their dislike of the Duke of Buckingham during this Parliament<sup>35</sup> and their opposition may have been exacerbated by his attack on Cranfield.

Wandesford was involved in the Parliament of 1624's agenda to undermine monopolists and this was very much tied in with an attack upon the Duke of Buckingham's interests. Buckingham's half-brother, Sir Edward Villiers found himself under investigation during the discussions of the committee appointed to investigate the offences of the monopolist Mathias Fowles. They were discussing the patent for a monopoly of the manufacture of gold and silver thread in which Villiers had invested £4,000. Wandesford reported back to the House of Commons on 8 May that "somewhat hath fallen out, in the Examination of Fowles' Business, which reflecteth upon a noble Member of this House, Sir Edw[ard] Villiers." He requested that the Committee for Fowles, in which he was included, look into Villier's involvement further.<sup>36</sup> It was felt that the Duke of Buckingham had used his influence to ensure that all manufacturers of gold and silver thread were licensed and paid a fee. Some of the manufacturers had refused and were imprisoned, which was thought to have impinged upon their rights and privileges. Lionel Cranfield did his best to prevent Buckingham from being attacked and it should be noted that both Wandesford and Wentworth were in opposition to Wentworth's patron on this point.<sup>37</sup> This attack on the Villiers family may be the root of Wandesford's later involvement in the impeachment attempt on the Duke of Buckingham. Certainly, this episode would have generated general distrust of the influence Buckingham appeared to have. It also would have burnt Wandesford's bridges with Buckingham and therefore he would have had nothing to lose when involved in the impeachment attacks upon Buckingham in 1626.

Wandesford was involved in twenty committees and made eight recorded speeches during the 1624 Parliament. One such speech on 5 March was a criticism of

---

<sup>35</sup> For detailed analysis of Parliament's attitude towards war with Spain, see Cogswell, *Blessed Revolution* pp. 137 – 261, Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics*, pp. 164 - 171.

<sup>36</sup> Feelings against monopolists ran high and Sir Edward Giles reflected the mood of the House when he described monopolists as the "bloodsuckers of the kingdom and vipers of the commonwealth." *Commons Journal* pp. 538 – 539, 701.

<sup>37</sup> Cranfield attempted to assure the Commons by saying "that Sir Edward Villiers had no encouragement or comfort from the Marquis [Buckingham] ... Sir Henry Yelverton confessed my lord of Buckingham never did write, speak or send to him about it." *ibid.* p. 539. See also Lockyer, R. *Buckingham. The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham 1592 – 1628* (London, 1981), pp. 80 – 81.

Sir Thomas Wentworth's old 'enemy,' Sir John Savile, for his readiness to pledge supply for the war against Spain.<sup>38</sup> Although it is not clear whether Wentworth and Wandesford discussed or compared their attitude towards Spanish foreign policy, their general attitudes appear to be similar. Like Wentworth, Wandesford was inclined towards friendship with Spain and his opinion may have been swayed by economic factors, perhaps fearing the disruption and cost that a war with Spain would generate, rather than any particular aversion to attacking the Catholic Spanish. With concerns about fighting Catholic Spain at this time, the recusancy issue once again came to the fore. On 26 April, a committee was nominated to examine suspected recusants, present a list of them to the King and ask that they be expelled. Wentworth requested that the committee might have the "power to send for any (except Lords) to satisfy themselves concerning them."<sup>39</sup> Wandesford's membership of this committee is significant as it demonstrates that his attitudes contradict normal assumptions: in reality, some men were anti-war, but still keen to promote attacks upon local Catholics.

It is unclear to what extent Wandesford supported Wentworth's interests in the Parliaments of the early 1620s. As Wandesford was involved in the committee that formulated the draft charges against Wentworth's patron, Lionel Cranfield, the earl of Middlesex and the Lord Treasurer, on 12 April,<sup>40</sup> we might suggest that Wandesford did not have Wentworth's interests at heart. He perhaps saw his involvement in such a high profile attack as a means of furthering his political career.<sup>41</sup> These important committees would certainly have got Wandesford noticed as a political player and perhaps therefore he saw his involvement in the attack on Cranfield as an excellent opportunity to forge his own career in Parliament away from that of Wentworth's. However, bearing in mind that Wandesford was already closely allied and associated

---

<sup>38</sup> Ruigh, *Parliament of 1624* p. 62, Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 181.

<sup>39</sup> *Commons Journal* pp. 691, 776. For a useful discussion of parliamentary attitudes to the recusancy issue, see Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* pp. 160 – 161.

<sup>40</sup> Wentworth had spoken out against the charge levied against Cranfield. He was accused of illicitly using a signature stamp and of taking bribes. Russell indicates that Wentworth's stand "did more to lose him Buckingham's favour than any supposed misdemeanours" in the Parliament of 1625. *ibid.* pp. 199 – 202. On 19 May, Wandesford is listed again in a committee concerned with Cranfield. *Commons Journal* p. 705. For details of the case against Cranfield, see also Ruigh, *Parliament of 1624* pp. 320 – 334.

<sup>41</sup> Earlier in this Parliament on 17 March, Wandesford was involved in another attack on a minister. The *Commons Journal* notes a proposal for "An Act for reversing a Decree, indirectly, and by corruption... By Lord Keeper Bacon, yet the new Lord Keeper [John Williams, Dean of Westminster] referred the Lease of 99 Years to a Trial at Law, which passed against it." Wandesford was later

with Wentworth in both a personal and parliamentary capacity, we might assume that Wandesford's role within the committee was that of a mediator and it is unfortunate that details of his involvement are lacking.

Wandesford's other committee appointments were wide-ranging and on a huge array of different issues, of which there does not always appear to be a pattern.<sup>42</sup> In his parliamentary career, Wandesford was involved in a number of committees that dealt with northern issues and the Parliament of 1624 was no exception. He appears to have been instrumental in the Act that proposed "the County Palatine of Durham may send Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses to Parliament," which was first introduced into Parliament on 28 March.<sup>43</sup> Wandesford also appeared on many committees during his English parliamentary career that tackled legal issues. His involvement in the committee of 19 April to view petitions sent to the Committee for Courts of Justice, and to find ways of preventing "irregular Proceedings" must have interested him greatly.<sup>44</sup> This variety of concerns represents Wandesford's interest in politics and his desire to be fully involved with parliamentary activities, which did not necessarily have to be instigated by his more experienced parliamentary associate Wentworth. However, Wandesford was to become even more independent of Wentworth's

---

nominated to a committee on 7 May that questioned how the House should proceed against Francis Bacon. *Commons Journal* pp. 588, 688, 700.

<sup>42</sup> On 15 March, he was involved in a committee for "an Act for the Freer Liberty of Fishing, and Fishing Voyages, to be made and performed in ...the Sea-coasts and Parts of America." He sat on committees on 22 and 23 March respectively, to deal with an Act to abolish trials by battle and to enable Sir Richard Lumley to sell lands. On 12 April he sat on a committee to consider an Act for reversing of Outlawries on 12 April. A selection of other committee that he also sat on committees regarding breweries, 19 May (on which his brother also sat), the confirmation of Wadham College, Oxford, 9 March, and for an Act to secure the "Lordship or Manor of Goteland, alias Gothland..." on 15 March. *ibid*, pp. 680, 686, 695, 705, 746, 747, 763, 790.

<sup>43</sup> This issue had been discussed at length by the Committee of Privileges, which was dominated by the dislike of elections being dominated by influential men. Russell notes that this extended into the debates concerning the enfranchisement of County Durham. Some members of the committee feared that if Barnard Castle in Durham were allowed to return burgesses to Parliament, the Prince of Wales would be able to "exercise undue influence." Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 197. Wentworth was also nominated to this committee. On 14 April, Christopher Wandesford reported the progress of the bill to the House of Commons and read the amendments twice. The bill was recommitted, read again by Wandesford on 4 May, but was recommitted for a second time as it was not agreed whether "Barnard Castell should have two burgesses." The bill was finally passed on 8 May after the committee decided that two burgesses should be sent to Parliament. *Commons Journal* pp. 697, 749, 766, 786.

<sup>44</sup> *ibid*, p. 770. Other legal committees he sat upon included the committee appointed on 9 March to discuss the "Act for avoiding vexatious Delays, caused by removing Actions and Suits out of inferior Courts," the committee on 14 April to consider "An Act for reversing and altering of erroneous Judgments and Decrees in Courts of Equity," on 21 April, a committee to deal with Sir John Reeve's bill to reverse a Decree in Chancery and held a committee post which was concerned with the "abuses, in levying of Debts for Common Persons, under the Name and Prerogative of the King" on 23 March. *ibid*, pp. 730, 731, 766, 772, 748.

political influence in the years between 1625 and 1629. He was able to emerge as an important political player in his own right although his allegiance to Wentworth was never forgotten.

In the Parliaments of the reign of James I, Wandesford emerges as someone very keen to pursue issues of illegality and corruption in high places, almost as an end in itself. Wentworth and Wandesford clearly shared some political objectives, most notably in their similar attitudes towards the proposed Spanish war. Evidence of Wandesford's parliamentary aims and objectives is limited, and therefore we can only tentatively suggest that although Wandesford was not tied to Wentworth's plans in Parliament, he did still support Wentworth as far as possible. Wandesford's assistance of Wentworth was reciprocated by Wentworth, who supported his career outside of the Parliament. On 16 June 1623, he wrote to Sir George Calvert suggesting that Wandesford would be an excellent candidate as a deputy to the superintendent of Yorkshire. Wentworth knew that the superintendent did not have a deputy as the local Justices of the Peace were carrying out the duties and Wentworth pressed to "renewe my sute for my cozen Wandesford, whose discretion and capacities euerie waies for that imployment is such, as I dare saie will allwaies approue of his choice."<sup>45</sup> Wentworth already trusted Wandesford with important information. He wrote to Wandesford on 15 August 1623 asking him to deliver a letter to the Lord Treasurer. Significantly, Wentworth included a copy of the letter for Wandesford to read so "that yow might know what yow deliuer."<sup>46</sup> This demonstrates that from the early stages of their political relationship, Wentworth trusted Wandesford implicitly and kept him fully informed of his activities.

Wandesford and Wentworth were also brought closer together when Wandesford took over the wardship of Wentworth's cousin Thomas Danby of Masham in October 1624. Wentworth persuaded Wandesford to take on this role and it seems to have cemented their friendship further.<sup>47</sup> On 5 December 1625 Wentworth

---

<sup>45</sup> Wentworth to Calvert, 16 June 1623, Str. P. 2 / 102, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 188.

<sup>46</sup> Wentworth to Wandesford, 15 August 1623, Str. P. 2 / 108, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 193.

<sup>47</sup> In 1624, Thomas Danby was left a minor on his father's death. It seemed inevitable that he would be brought up as a Catholic as this was the faith of both his mother and grandmother. However, a dispute occurred between the mother and grandmother over the custody of the ward. This led to Wandesford, originally representing the grandmother's party, bringing Thomas up in the Protestant, almost Puritan, atmosphere of Kirklington Hall. Despite being brought up in Wandesford's Protestant household, in November 1627, the Council of the North questioned Danby about "his religion and manners." The Council was concerned that he might lapse into recusancy. Wandesford wrote to tell Wentworth about the proceedings against his cousin. The Council had asked him a question that he could not answer:

wrote to Wandesford about the articles of agreement for the wardship of his cousin Danby explaining that he and George Radcliffe had closely examined the papers and had only one concern over the agreement “touching the Repair of Houses, which is straitly penned for you as we conceive...” Wentworth advised Wandesford that he took “Time to advise with your Counsel, and then direct them to propound what you think reasonable...” However, Wandesford was to be sure that “these Motions for your own Particular must not seem in the first Place to arise from me.”<sup>48</sup>

### **Wandesford’s involvement in Charles I’s Parliament of 1625**

In the first parliaments of the reign of Charles I, Wandesford’s political involvement became more significant. Just before the calling of Parliament in March 1625, Christopher Wandesford petitioned the Privy Council to express his inability to return home between parliaments, as he was “an inhabitant in the remotest partes of the county of Yorke.” As it was intended that Parliament would be re-summoned in November, he had “brought up his wife and family purposing to remaine heere untill the end of the session onely.” He asked for permission to remain in London as “the daie of the assemblie of Parliament being so neare the season of the yeare being at the worst for so great a journey and his wife being weake and sickly.” The Privy Council agreed to this request and permitted him to stay until the “end of the next session of Parliament onely.”<sup>49</sup> This petition presents an interesting glimpse into the personal life of a member of Parliament. It is easy to forget the extra-parliamentary concerns and activities of these men when focusing upon their political careers.<sup>50</sup> This petition is also intriguing if we question whether Wandesford had other motives to remain in the capital and therefore was using his wife’s weakness as a convenient excuse. The country was in a time of uncertainty, progressing from the monarchy of a father to his son, and Wandesford may have wished to remain near to the centre of politics in order to keep a check upon political developments that might affect his political objectives.

---

“how many articles is there of your Crede? And yet he receved the Communion severall tymes att Cambridge [University] and was placed under a strict Puritane who tould me he had mayde him acquainted with religion.” Knowing Wandesford’s attitude towards recusancy, he was probably extremely concerned about Danby. Wandesford to Wentworth, November 1627, Str. P. 16 / 242. Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 277, Cliffe, J. T. *The Yorkshire Gentry* (London, 1969), pp. 130, 186, 370.

<sup>48</sup> Wentworth to Wandesford, 5 December 1625, Str. P. 2 / 183, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 33.

<sup>49</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council March 1625 – July 1626* (London, 1933), vol. IV, pp. 392 – 393.



It is tempting to speculate that Wandesford's presence in London may have been beneficial to Wentworth, as he would be able to provide him with knowledge of the current political intrigues and concerns.

Wentworth was indeed concerned about the political implications of the death of James I. He enunciated his fears in a letter written to Wandesford on 4 April 1625, which will be considered in detail here. Wentworth wondered whether "the death of the kinge work lesse upon mee consideringe my pretences and hopes att Court. then one daie's intermission and pawse for aduisement how to sett my cards upon this new shuffle of the packe?" Wentworth was clearly already considering how he might use his parliamentary career to advance himself to courtly prominence and asked Wandesford's advice on how best to continue in the furtherance of his political career. This letter clearly demonstrates the importance that Wentworth placed upon gathering the advice of others. He described his position as "bare and bleake, like a beacon on the topp of a hill" if he did not gain "consultacon" and "counsell."<sup>51</sup> He arranged to meet with Wandesford so that they could discuss the issues of the day without having to commit anything to paper that might have later repercussions.

Wentworth also considered the forthcoming elections in this letter. He warned Wandesford that he would need to work to be re-elected for Aldborough despite having held the seat in earlier Parliaments. Wentworth advised Wandesford to think about "how to secure your selfe of old Aldborowe... and your burgheshippe, and whether it wilbee fitt for mee to stand to bee knight of the shire..." Turning to his own election, Wentworth sought Wandesford's "sober sadd aduice"<sup>52</sup> asking for an honest assessment of his potential election for the county seat against Sir John Savile.

As Wentworth had predicted, Wandesford was unable to retain his seat at Aldborough and sat instead for Richmond in Yorkshire. Wandesford did indeed have a family connection with Richmond and took the seat in succession to his brother John who had sat for Richmond in 1624.<sup>53</sup> However, due to the fact that Wandesford

---

<sup>50</sup> Russell argues that if we only look at events within the Parliament, the influence of activities and events between the sessions will be lost. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 121.

<sup>51</sup> Wentworth to Wandesford, 4 April 1625, Str. P. 2 / 170, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 229.

<sup>52</sup> Str. P. 2 / 171, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 230.

<sup>53</sup> The familial connection with Richmond was secured through Wandesford's great uncle, Sir Talbot Bowes, who owned much land in the vicinity of the borough. From 1614, Bowes had an agreement with Richmond that he would share the representation of the borough with a nominee of either the Lord President of the Council in the North or the Bishop of Durham. However, both seats were usually occupied by Bowes and a relative as his influence in the area was so secure. Carroll, R. 'Yorkshire parliamentary boroughs in the seventeenth century,' *Northern History* 3 (1968), p. 84. Gruenfelder

had represented Aldborough in two previous parliaments, it seems strange that he voluntarily left his seat to move to Richmond. Therefore it is likely that he was pushed from his Aldborough seat. This is reinforced by the fact that Richard Aldeburgh replaced him; the eighteen-year-old son of the local lord William Aldeburgh, who would have favoured his son to represent the family's interests as well as those of the borough.<sup>54</sup>

The first Parliament of the reign of Charles I met on 18 June after being prorogued on two previous occasions. By the end of this Parliament, the tensions between Charles I and his Parliament were already apparent.<sup>55</sup> These tensions developed further in successive parliaments and Wandesford's involvement in one of the most significant tensions, the attack upon the King's favourite in 1626, is fascinating. Wandesford began his rise to parliamentary prominence in 1625. He was an active member of parliament and was appointed to the important committee of privileges on 21 June 1625 along with Wentworth and Sir Gervase Clifton.<sup>56</sup>

Plague was rife in London in 1625 and the first day of the session was consumed with this consideration. William Mallory, the member for Ripon, proposed that "the Danger of the Plague, with other circumstances" meant that the Commons

---

believes that Wentworth's patronage that enabled Wandesford to secure successive posts as burgess for Richmond in 1625 and 1626. Gruenfelder, 'Electoral Patronage,' p. 570. However, we must emphasise the potential influence of the existing Wandesford family connection to the borough. Wentworth's influence was actually quite limited outside of the southern part of Yorkshire until he became President of the Council in the North. For example, Wentworth could not have helped Wandesford to secure Aldborough more than writing a letter to William Aldeburgh, the lord of the local manor, and nothing of this nature exists in his out-letter book. Wentworth was willing to help Wandesford retain his seat but wrote that "I loose too much tyme upon yow more indeed then Richmondshire is worth." This comment initially sounds as though Wentworth was dismissing the importance of Wandesford's seat. However, it appears that this is just a flippant comment serving to bring the letter to a close. It is important to note that Wentworth wrote 'Richmondshire,' the Yorkshire borough in which Wandesford lived, rather than 'Richmond,' the parliamentary constituency he stood for in 1625. It is also extremely unlikely that Wentworth was referring to Wandesford's parliamentary seat as earlier in this letter, he assumed that Wandesford would stand for Aldborough. Wandesford may have just referred to his standing for election without stating explicitly for which borough he intended to stand, and without asking for Wentworth's support in obtaining a particular constituency. This could explain why Wentworth just assumed that he would stand for Aldborough as he had done in two previous parliaments. Wentworth to Wandesford, 4 April 1625, Str. P. 2 / 71, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 230.

<sup>54</sup> I would like to thank Simon Healy for his interesting and informative discussions on this matter.

<sup>55</sup> For the historiography of the 1625 Parliament, see Thompson, C. 'Court Politics and Parliamentary Conflict in 1625,' in A. Hughes and R. Cust, (eds.) *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (Harlow, 1989), pp. 168 – 192, Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* pp. 204 – 259.

<sup>56</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 799. Clifton and Wentworth were related through Clifton's third wife Frances Clifford, the daughter of the fourth Earl of Cumberland and the sister of Wentworth's first wife. Frances died in 1627 and Clifton married three further wives. Keeler, M.F. *The Long Parliament, 1640 - 1641. A Biographical Study of its Members* (Philadelphia, 1954), p. 135.

should petition the King “to defer the Parliament to some other Time. or Place.”<sup>57</sup>

Wandesford was unwilling to delay the proceedings in Parliament for a third time and therefore “altered the motion a little, from a petition for an adjournment to a new tyme, to a petition for removall to another place.”<sup>58</sup> The House rejected his suggestion outright.<sup>59</sup> These discussions were suppressed by order of the King and the matter was not settled until 8 July when the announcement that Parliament was to be adjourned to Oxford was made. Sir John Eliot stated that this adjournment presented the members with an interval between 11 July and 1 August that was “just long enough to face members with an awkward problem about where to go.”<sup>60</sup> If Wandesford and Wentworth had returned to their family homes in Yorkshire they would have had little time before having to return to Parliament again. Indeed, Eliot feared that men whose homes were in remote places only had time to visit their families and then take immediate leave of them. As Wandesford had previously petitioned the Privy Council to remain in London in 1625 and also stayed with his brother-in-law Sir Edward Osborne during parliamentary sessions, it seems likely that he remained in London.<sup>61</sup>

Wandesford supported Wentworth during the initial weeks of the 1625 Parliament over the issue of the contested election between Wentworth and Sir John Savile.<sup>62</sup> During the voting, John Savile was accused of having resorted to trickery. Whilst the sheriff was preparing the election procedure, Savile spread a rumour amongst Wentworth’s supporters that the election would run over several days. Some drifted away and as they did so, Savile gathered his own voters and they rushed to vote. The sheriff stopped the voting in order to prevent rioting and declared

---

<sup>57</sup> According to Thompson, this was a deliberately obstructive move to delay the proceedings. Thompson, ‘Court Politics and Parliamentary Conflict,’ p. 172.

<sup>58</sup> Anonymously reported in the Fawley MS from the library of Sir Rainald Knightley. Gardiner, S.R. (ed). *Debates in the House of Commons in 1625* (London, 1873), p. 52.

<sup>59</sup> Thompson, ‘Court Politics and Parliamentary Conflict,’ p. 173.

<sup>60</sup> Russell, *Parliament and English Politics* p. 237.

<sup>61</sup> In 1622, Wandesford and his family left Kirklington and moved to London. He lived in the capital until 1623 then moved with his family to Stratford Langton where they shared accomodation with Edward Osborne and his family. Osborne later became Wentworth’s Vice President in the Council of the North as we shall see in Chapter 3, and the initial contact between Osborne and Wentworth was through Wandesford’s marriage to Osborne’s sister Alice on 22 September 1614. McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* p. 69, Whitaker, T. D. *A History of Richmondshire, in the North Riding of the County of York* (London, 1823), vol. II, p. 154.

<sup>62</sup> Wentworth stood for the county seat of Yorkshire at the elections for the 1625 Parliament but was careful to keep a seat open at Pontefract in case he was unsuccessful. He had canvassed his friends for their support in his bid for the Yorkshire seat. For example, he wrote to Sir John Jackson to ask that he and his friends support him in the Yorkshire election. If he was successful, the Pontefract seat was to be filled by Sir Richard Beaumont. Wentworth to Sir John Jackson, 6 April 1625, Str. P. 2 / 174.

Wentworth and Sir Thomas Fairfax the victors. Savile presented a petition to Parliament signed by 1050 freeholders that called Wentworth's election into question. He argued that Wentworth had forced the sheriff to call a stop to the election. For Wandesford, in support of Wentworth retaining his seat, stalling for time was essential. He presented the case to Parliament that they should grant "Time for Witnesses for the Gentlemen returned, or for the Sheriff."<sup>63</sup> Despite Wandesford's best efforts, he was unable to prevent a unanimous resolution which declared the Yorkshire election void. Wentworth returned to Yorkshire undeterred, to present himself for re-election. He was unanimously returned but had to wait for the Commons' permission to retake his seat.<sup>64</sup> Wandesford again supported his friend, making a speech to the House on 8 August in which he moved that "the two Knights of Yorkeshyre, who are returned (being Sir Thomas Wentworth and Sir Thomas Fairfax...) may come in."<sup>65</sup> The Yorkshire election case was Wandesford's main concern during the Parliament of 1625 and this represents the importance that it held for him. Indeed this issue took up so much of Wandesford's time that his contribution to other concerns in this session is limited.<sup>66</sup>

### **The Parliament of 1626: Christopher Wandesford's chance to shine.**

Wentworth was unable to sit in the Parliament of 1626 as he had been chosen as sheriff in 1625, preventing him from standing for election in 1626. This was a conscious decision by Charles I and Buckingham who in the autumn of 1625 had been "anxious to prevent the election of as many as possible of those members who had argued that supply must be dependent on redress of grievances."<sup>67</sup> Wentworth was

---

Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, pp. 25 – 27. See also Gooder, A. *The Parliamentary Representation of the County of York 1258 – 1832* (Wakefield, 1938), vol. II, p. 128.

<sup>63</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 802a. On 5 July, Wandesford acted as teller in support of Wentworth, but he was voted against, 133 votes to 94. *Commons Journal* p. 803b.

<sup>64</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 52.

<sup>65</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 812b.

<sup>66</sup> Wandesford's only other significant contribution was on 10 August, when the Committee of the whole House was discussing the issue of supply after receiving a message from the King. Christopher Wandesford proposed that they should form "A Committee of the whole House, to take Consideration of all the Business propounded in general." *ibid*, p. 814b.

<sup>67</sup> Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626 - 1628* (Oxford, 1987), p. 191. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 54. However, the Duke of Buckingham denied having anything to do with this shrieval selection. Sir Edward Osborne was also on Charles' original selection list, being chosen as sheriff of Nottinghamshire. However, the King had to make another choice after councillors discovered that he had left England with royal permission to travel. Noonkester, M.C. 'Charles I and Shrieval Selection, 1625 - 6,' *Historical Research* 64 (1991), pp. 306, 309.

also removed from the Commission of the Peace in 1626.<sup>68</sup> In a frank and revealing letter to Wandesford dated 5 December 1625, Wentworth told his friend that he intended to fulfil his post as sheriff wholeheartedly in the hope that he might recover the King's favour. He vowed to pursue his duties as Sheriff "in such a Temper, that for my Expence it shall participate of Moderation and Sobriety, without the least Tincture of Wantonness or Petulancy."<sup>69</sup> He planned to carry out the work with his "own servants" and would use the opportunity to further his personal finances.<sup>70</sup> Although he struggled to sound positive about his selection as sheriff, Wentworth was disappointed that he was unable to partake in the Parliament of 1626. He seemed extremely concerned about the state of the country and was anxious that the ills of the nation should be rectified. Wentworth described his distaste for royal policies, likening them to a disease needing a cure.<sup>71</sup>

In the elections for the Parliament of 1626, Wandesford's own ambitions were greater than a burgess' seat. He considered standing against Wentworth's old enemy, Sir John Savile, in the county election, but was dissuaded by Wentworth. He informed Wandesford on 5 December 1625 that Savile was "stronger than formerly," and that it would be impossible to turn his numerous supporters against him. Not wanting to see his friend disappointed, Wentworth recommended that Wandesford wait until he was in a more influential position to stand for the county seat. However, Wentworth's advice was not all discouraging. He believed that if Wandesford worked hard, he would be able to defeat Savile in future county elections. He asked Wandesford to "desist for to declare yourself at this Time...." He believed that then they could

---

<sup>68</sup> However, this exclusion from power worked in Wentworth's favour to some extent. The increasing monopolisation of power by courtly figures such as the Duke of Buckingham and his servant Sir John Savile, ensured that Wentworth was seen as a champion of country politics. Salt, 'Wentworth and Parliamentary Representation,' p. 135.

<sup>69</sup> Wentworth to Wandesford, 5 December 1625, Str. P. 2 / 181, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 32, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 245.

<sup>70</sup> Wentworth announced that "The Under-Sheriffwick I mean to execute by my own servants, and withall, closely and quietly attend my own private Fortune, repairing and settling it with innocent Hands, moderate and regulated Desires, and so repose myself upon the Goodness of the Almighty, that doth not only divert the Scourges of an Adversary, but doth even convert them into Health and Soundness...." Str. P. 2 / 181, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 32, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 245.

<sup>71</sup> Wentworth wrote to Wandesford stating, "I do lament, lament sadly the Miseries of these Times, being reduced to such a Prostration of Spirit, as we are neither able to overcome the exulcerated Disease, nor to endure a sharp prevalent Remedy.... our Ears are open, it seems, to Calumny and Detraction amongst ourselves, the proper and inward Seeds from whence springs the Ruin of States and Kingdoms." Str. P. 2 / 181 - 182, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 32, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 245.

at Ease see the skirmish beat upon other Mens Shoulders. the Sweat and Difficulty of their Labour work towards our Ends. and yourself in a Season of more Advantage (when you shall have gained by your Service that as a Merit, which these Men compass by their Alliance) carry the Place with more Honour and Safety. For. if Sir John [Savile] be out by again this Time, it will be, without fail, a Work of an easy Wit to make you one the next Parliament after this, whensoever it happens.<sup>72</sup>

Although Wentworth exploited the rhetoric of friendship in this letter, it should be questioned whether his words were genuine. Wentworth would appear to have been impartial as he was not in a position to stand for the seat himself. However, we might also consider whether as Wentworth had himself wanted the seat, he may have persuaded Wandesford not to pursue it in case he held on to it in the future.

Wentworth recommended that Wandesford focus upon his seat at Richmond where he had already generated support. He also promised that if Wandesford failed to gain the seat at Richmond, he would do everything possible to find him another place.<sup>73</sup>

Despite being excluded from Parliament in 1626, Wentworth was still excited and intrigued by central politics. We know that Wandesford kept Wentworth informed of parliamentary activities as Wentworth's father-in-law, Sir John Holles, commented upon Wandesford's newsletters. Holles wrote on 14 June 1626 that "I need not blott this paper with Parlement tantologies, yow having so good an intelligencer of all these passages, as your frend Mr. Wansford...." The use of "tantologies" implies that Wandesford was informing Wentworth of all the political intrigue and gossip of the moment. Wandesford had made a good name for himself in Parliament as early as 1626; Holles described him as "one of the chiefe. ablest, and honestest labourers in that vyneyard...."<sup>74</sup> Holles perhaps believed that Wandesford's involvement in the impeachment attempt of the Duke of Buckingham was provoked by sincere motivations for the good of the nation, and not for reasons of personal gain and prestige.

In Wentworth's absence, Wandesford emerged as an important figure in Parliament. To modern historians, Wentworth and Wandesford are recognised as

---

<sup>72</sup> Str. P. 2 / 182 - 183, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, pp. 32 - 33, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 245.

<sup>73</sup> Wentworth warned Wandesford to "Neglect not your Means, I pray you, in no Case for Richmond, wherein if the Sheriff can any Ways further you, I persuade myself you have him sure on your Side. But if you should chance to miss, you may be sure I would strain all the Points of my Hose before you wanted a Place." Str. P. 2 / 183, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 33, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 245.

having the same or similar intentions in Parliament; indeed Russell describes Wandesford as Wentworth's "able understudy" in the 1626 Parliament.<sup>75</sup> However it is not clear if at this stage contemporaries noted their shared objectives. Wandesford came from relative parliamentary obscurity to a high profile role in the impeachment attempt on Buckingham. Was this because men knew that he and Wentworth were close associates and therefore Christopher Wandesford would be 'second best' in Wentworth's absence? Or did Wandesford earn this prestigious role on his own merit? It does not seem clear why he should have come to the fore at this time, although perhaps in Wentworth's absence, Wandesford's abilities had the opportunity to shine.

Contemporaries noticed Wandesford's strong feelings towards the protection of the country's privileges even at this early stage in his parliamentary career, and this was certainly evident in 1624, as we have seen. He was also one of those to refuse to pay the forced loan of 1626. Perhaps other members of Parliament recognised him as Wentworth's confidant and therefore thought that he might follow a similar policy to his friend in his absence. Wentworth and Wandesford had already demonstrated strong hostility towards Buckingham and strongly supported parliamentary policies. Wentworth was perhaps more ambiguous than Wandesford in some of his censures of the court and the King as he was pursuing a courtly career himself. It is tempting to suppose that Wandesford's outright attack on Buckingham in 1626 was how Wentworth would like to have acted, if not restrained by his desire for a courtly career.

Wandesford played a very active role in the Commons in this session; being elected to 25 committees, making 36 recorded speeches and acting as teller in five divisions. Charles I called the Parliament of 1626 in order to raise supply for the war. However, the Parliament was determined to impeach the Duke of Buckingham before granting supply; the first time that Parliament was set upon redress of grievances before supply since 1614.<sup>76</sup> We see the Commons acting more aggressively on issues that aroused anger. Concern about false imprisonment was rife and was exacerbated by the arrest of Sir John Eliot and Sir Dudley Digges, which created much tension in

---

<sup>74</sup> John Holles, Earl of Clare to Wentworth, 14 June 1626, Seddon, P. A. (ed). *Letters of John Holles 1587 – 1637* (3 vols, Nottingham, 1983), vol. II, p. 331.

<sup>75</sup> Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 268.

<sup>76</sup> *ibid.*, p. 269.

the Commons who were attempting to maintain their privileges. Ultimately, both Houses refused to continue with business until these men were reinstated.<sup>77</sup>

Wandesford's first action of the Parliament on the opening day, 9 February 1626, was to settle a petty dispute over the preacher to be used at the opening Communion.<sup>78</sup> Wandesford was appointed on the first day to the important and influential Committee for the Privileges.<sup>79</sup> This is a significant indication of his status within the House, which demonstrates that Wandesford was keen to pursue cases of parliamentary privilege, in order to protect the interests of its members against the encroachment of the Crown upon its rights. The committee dealt with many issues where it was felt that privileges had been breached. For example, on 17 February, the committee chose a select committee of which Wandesford was a member to discuss the case of Sir Robert Howard who, "during Privilege of Parliament, was excommunicated, for not taking the Oath *ex Officio*."<sup>80</sup>

In late February, the Commons attempted to expand the number of issues that directly attacked the Duke of Buckingham. Initially, the main grievance against Buckingham had been his seizure of the ship *St. Peter* of Newhaven, which was arrested or 'stayed' in England as it was thought to be carrying goods to help Spain. However, Buckingham's actions in this case could only be described as rather high-handed rather than illegal. The House was unsure how to proceed against the King's favourite but Wandesford proposed that the best approach was to demand a settlement of impositions, which Buckingham had imposed to improve Crown finance.<sup>81</sup> The issue of supply provided the opportunity for Wandesford to make his first speech in the Parliament of 1626. On 28 February, Wandesford reported that the committee had ordered that a warrant from the Speaker of the House would be issued to the Council of War, to appear in Parliament on the following Friday. The committee was

---

<sup>77</sup> *ibid*, pp. 306 – 307.

<sup>78</sup> It was put that the Dean of Canterbury should preach but the members of parliament could not agree over this. "To end the Question, Mr. Wandesford offered to go out first; and so did." Wandesford appears upon a number of committees to deal with religious issues. On 23 February, Wandesford joined the committee to deal with recusants. This committee elected a select committee which included Wandesford on 2 March to "consider, in what Sort Sir Toby Matthew, and Mr. Gage, and all such others, as the Committee shall think dangerous Persons to the State, shall be preserved." *Commons Journal* pp. 817a, 824a, 828b.

<sup>79</sup> *ibid*, pp. 816a, 816b.

<sup>80</sup> *ibid*, pp. 820b - 821a. Sir Robert Howard had been excommunicated whilst under privilege of the house in the Parliament of 1624 for committing adultery with Sir Edward Coke's daughter. He was returned in 1626 despite being excommunicate and was allowed to take his seat without taking the normally compulsory communion. This issue represents the general increase in concern with ecclesiastical issues. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 277.



concerned that the subsidies granted in 1621 were not being spent according to the conditions within the Subsidy Act.<sup>82</sup> A select committee including Wandesford was then appointed to consider of questions that should be asked of the Council of War and of the warrant to be made by the Speaker. The select committee also included Sir Dudley Digges, Sir John Eliot, William Coryton and John Selden<sup>83</sup> who were all known for their strong support for the privileges of the House. It is especially intriguing to find the relatively inexperienced Wandesford linked to this high-profile group. Wandesford's continued reappearance in important committees reflects the trust that his fellow members of parliament had in him and perhaps also their knowledge that he would strive for their privileges. Wandesford's link to Wentworth may have played a part in this, as Wentworth was also known to hold parliamentary privilege close to his heart. Wandesford's newly found influence and importance within the House is also demonstrated by his appointment on a number of occasions to conferences with the House of Lords. On 30 March, the Lords requested a meeting with the House of Commons, and Wandesford was one of those specially highlighted as those who were desired to make the report back to the Commons.<sup>84</sup> He was also appointed to a committee to attend a conference with the Lords and along with Sir Dudley Digges, Sir John Finch, Sir Nathaniel Rich, John Pym, Sir Thomas Hoby was "specially trusted with taking the Notes, and to agree amongst themselves, who shall report."<sup>85</sup>

Another recognition of Christopher Wandesford's important status within the House was on the occasions that he acted as teller. On March 8, the House was divided whether they should attend a conference with the Lords before continuing with their business. However, some members wanted to "not give any Answer at all, but to go on with our Business." This division was resolved by a vote and Christopher

---

<sup>81</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 279, 281.

<sup>82</sup> The war was not particularly popular at this time as it was breaking out nearly two years after the failed marriage negotiations, at a time when England could least afford it, having suffered a period of plague and economic depression. A charge that the 1621 subsidies were not being used in the correct way was later thrown at the Duke of Buckingham, accusing him of misusing his influence over the King. *ibid.*, p. 263.

<sup>83</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 826a.

<sup>84</sup> *ibid.*, p. 843a.

<sup>85</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 832a, 832b.

Wandesford represented the opinion that the Commons should discuss an answer to the Lords. The motion was carried 226 votes against 166.<sup>86</sup>

Wandesford reported from the committee for Evils, Causes and Remedies on a number of occasions during the 1626 Parliament. On 18 March, he reported to the House “the six, Heads, delivered by Dr. Turnor on Saturday last, against the Lord Admiral.” Dr. Samuel Turnor had offered six queries or more precisely attacks upon the Duke of Buckingham to the House that asked whether Buckingham was the general cause of the evils in the kingdom.<sup>87</sup> His questions searched for evils that could be associated with the Duke and focused upon Buckingham’s loss of control in the Channel in his capacity of Lord Admiral, and the misuse of Crown revenue and sale of offices for his own gain. Turnor also attempted to attack Buckingham with the increase of recusancy due to his possible connection with Catholicism – a charge that would always summon disgust and passion within the Commons. However, this criticism was particularly flimsy and was only connected to the fact that some of his family were known Catholics.<sup>88</sup>

Wandesford was very conscious of ways in which to manipulate relations between Crown and Parliament, which can be seen in his clever handling of the Turnor attack upon Buckingham. Wandesford was aware that the King would believe that Parliament had encroached upon his prerogative by attacking his minister. Charles I asked the Commons to appoint a committee to investigate Turnor’s conduct. However, Christopher Wandesford made a brilliant tactical move and as the chairman of the committee reconstructed Charles I’s complaint against Turnor into an examination of whether his attack upon Buckingham was justified. Therefore the committee could continue investigations into Buckingham whilst appearing to be obeying the King’s orders.<sup>89</sup> On 25 March, Christopher Wandesford reported the findings of the Committee of Evils, Causes and Remedies. He reported that the

---

<sup>86</sup> *ibid*, p. 833a. On 9 May, the Commons discussed whether “to move the Lords, that the Duke of Buckingham may be committed to Prison.” Wandesford acted as teller that the Lords should be moved upon this point. This was obviously a contentious issue and the motion was passed 225 votes against 106 votes. The *Commons Journal* notes “The Noe yielded; but the Yea would not accept it, desiring to be numbered.” On 16 May, this entry appears in the *Journal*. “Upon Question, Mr. Herbert not exceeded his Commission, given to him by this House, in any thing, which passed from him in the Conference with the Lords. The like for Mr. Seldon, Mr. Glanvyle, Mr. Sherland, Mr. Pymme, Mr. Wandesford...” *ibid*, pp. 858a, 860b.

<sup>87</sup> ‘Dr Samuel Turnor’s six queries concerning the Duke of Buckingham,’ P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 22, 71.

<sup>88</sup> Russell, *Parliament and English Politics* p. 290.

<sup>89</sup> *ibid*, p. 290. Wandesford’s reports of the committee on 25 March and 28 April are found in P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 23, 68.

committee had reduced Turnor's six points to two: the diminution of the Kingdom and the stoppage of trade. He listed the ten causes of these in his speech and concluded that the Duke of Buckingham was found at the root of all of these abuses.<sup>90</sup> The first point of the attack, the increase of papists, was laid to one side at this stage in the proceedings.<sup>91</sup> This is perhaps because although this issue would generate much fervour within the House, it would be problematic to prove.<sup>92</sup> Wandesford's report to the House continued by describing the problems of the country as the committee saw them. Not surprisingly, Buckingham was linked to each. Wandesford highlighted issues connected to Buckingham's position as Lord Lieutenant of the Navy, in particular emphasising the lack of guard of the Narrow Seas and the loan of English ships to the French that were then used against the Protestants of La Rochelle. Many attacks were concerned with Buckingham's manipulation of the King. For example, the three subsidies and three fifteenths which had been used differently to the ends mentioned in the Subsidy Act of 1621, were used to show that Buckingham had misused his influence over the King. Wandesford's speech attacked Buckingham for numerous reasons that may equally have been targeted at other men in high places throughout the early modern period. The ills of the nation were blamed upon the plurality of offices in one man's hand, the sale of honours, offices and judicature and more generally the "Misemploying of the King's Revenue" and the increase of Papists. A final evil associated with Buckingham was the impositions upon commodities, "native or foreign, without assent in Parliament."<sup>93</sup> Wandesford had already demonstrated his concern about impositions earlier in the session on 24 February<sup>94</sup> and the resurrection of the issue of impositions is an example of Wandesford's intelligent manipulation of the suspicions that would drive Parliament into action against the King's favourite. In economic terms, impositions were thought to be severely damaging the county's finances, although Parliament was probably

---

<sup>90</sup> Wandesford gave a report to the House of Commons "whereby the Duke of Buckingham was pointed out as the great cause of the evils of the country." *CSPD 1625 – 1626* p. 292.

<sup>91</sup> For the decision to exclude this question at that time, see *Commons Journal* p. 841b.

<sup>92</sup> The belief that Buckingham was behind the increase in recusancy did not return to the House until 4 May when the Commons had been searching for more mud to throw at the Duke. It was decided that "Every man should declare what he knows or has heard to prove this against the Duke." Sir Lewis Dyve informed the House that a Mr Everard had told him that whilst Buckingham was in Spain he "did adore the Host," and was waiting outside the Commons to prove his accusation. The Speaker left the chair so that the committee for Evils, Causes and Remedies could sit. Christopher Wandesford took the floor and reported that Mr. Everard had previously produced a witness before the committee. *ibid.* p. 855a.

<sup>93</sup> For Christopher Wandesford's important speech see *ibid.* pp. 841b – 842a.

more concerned about the King being able to raise money without parliamentary consent. Whilst the Crown had to rely upon parliaments to raise supply, members of Parliament knew that they would be called again and would also have bargaining power over the Crown. This negotiating tool was used on 27 March when it was resolved to vote three subsidies and three fifteenths. However, in a move that made their intentions towards Buckingham clear, they refused to write a bill for supply until their grievances were addressed.<sup>95</sup> This was a move that would challenge the monarch's authority, as Charles I had called Parliament in order to gain supply for the Spanish war that the members of parliament had initially supported. The issue of supply was again raised in the Commons on 5 May and a select committee was chosen to "consider, and prepare, a fit Preamble for this Act of Subsidy." This committee included Christopher Wandesford, another example of his appearance in many of the most prominent and important committees during the 1626 Parliament.<sup>96</sup>

Wandesford's best reported speech in the 1626 Parliament was made on 20 April. He reported to the Commons from the Committee of Evils, Causes, and Remedies, identifying a specific event that linked Buckingham to some of the abuses mentioned in his speech of 25 March. The Commons had begun by now to pursue Buckingham more vigorously, identifying him by name rather than attacking him in an oblique manner with rather vague issues. In his speech, Christopher Wandesford highlighted the case of the East India Company whose ships Buckingham had arrested. The Duke had moved the Lords to stay the Company's ships "upon pretence of staying them for Defence of the Kingdom." However, Buckingham was in desperate financial need for the naval expedition he was planning and "he was not over-scrupulous about the means by which to raise it."<sup>97</sup> The Company was left with little choice but to pay £20,000 to Buckingham.<sup>98</sup> Wandesford was careful to show that the King was not implicated in this case as this would amount to treason. This demonstrates how he could directly attack the King's favourite and therefore indirectly the King's policies, without attacking the King.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 281.

<sup>95</sup> *ibid.* pp. 282 – 285.

<sup>96</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 856a.

<sup>97</sup> Lockyer, *Buckingham* p. 184.

<sup>98</sup> The East India Company "paid 10,000/ to the Duke, to his own Use; the other 10,000/ they paid also to one of the Duke's Servants." *Commons Journal* p. 846b.

<sup>99</sup> Wandesford stated that "...the King did nothing in it, but only made Demands for his own Right; telling them, he was no Tyrant King, but would leave all to the Law; where the Duke used Pretenses of Stay by Parliament, for his own private." *ibid.* p. 846b.

Wandesford's repeated inclusion in committees and sub-committees dealing with the attack upon Buckingham shows that his contributions to the proceedings were considered valuable. One such committee that met on 21 April was to discuss the issue of La Rochelle. On the same day, Wandesford reported that the Committee had found the Duke at the root of the problem and that he was "the Cause of the Delivery of our Ships unto the French, which were employed against the French."<sup>100</sup>

The frequent recurrence of Wandesford reporting to the Committee of the Whole House on matters concerning the possible impeachment of the Duke shows that he was an eloquent speaker. On 22 April, the Commons were concerned with the charge of the buying and selling of places of judicature. This investigation could also be conveniently applied to the case against the Duke of Buckingham. Wandesford reported the committee's concerns to the House, in particular Buckingham's purchase of the Wardenship of the Five Ports and the Mastership of the Wards and his selling of the Lord Treasurership to Lord Mandeville. Wandesford relayed "the intercepting, unnecessary exhausting, and misemploying of the King's Treasure," a theme that ran throughout the charges against Buckingham. It had also been decided that the Duke was to receive notice from the Commons about the "Things charged upon him by the House,"<sup>101</sup> so that he could prepare his defence.

The value that Wandesford placed upon the committee system is evident throughout the Parliament of 1626. Wandesford was well aware that he could manipulate the intricacies and rules of the House to his benefit by taking a discussion from the floor of the House where a member could only speak once in debates of the whole House, into the committee format. This would enable him to speak upon an issue as many times as he wished and have more control over the direction of the discussion. On many occasions during the parliaments of the 1620s, we find Wandesford moving that an issue should be passed onto a select committee of which he usually became a member.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> *ibid*, p. 847a.

<sup>101</sup> *ibid*, p. 848b.

<sup>102</sup> For example, on 8 May, Wandesford reported to the House that "somewhat hath fallen out" in the committee's examination of the monopolist Fowles' business regarding Sir Edward Villiers and he proposed that it should be examined by a committee. A particularly useful later example of this from the Parliament of 1628, occurred on 3 April when the discussion within the House turned to the wording of the Petition of Right, in particular regarding the liberty of the subject and the propriety of goods. Wandesford suggested that the issue of wording be referred to a committee "Because one cannot speak twice to one thing." *ibid*, pp. 289, 786.

Wandesford's most important and challenging role in Buckingham's impeachment case first came to the attention of Parliament on 22 April. This was the most sensational accusation of the whole attack upon the Duke and therefore it is remarkable that it fell to Wandesford to act as the spearhead of this charge. Mr Glanville reported from a select committee of twelve men their discussions on "the Examinations of a Plaister, and a Posset, given King James in his sickness." James I's physicians had agreed that "the King should have neither Meat or Drink within certain hours before his Fit." After this investigation, the committee felt that a charge concerned with the Duke of Buckingham giving the King a plaster and a drink that had poisoned him "should be annexed to the Duke's Charge, as a transcendent Presumption, of dangerous Consequence." Wandesford was in the chair at the time and presented the question to the House whether this charge should be included in the attack against Buckingham. The fact that Wandesford was in the chair is significant as he could speak as often as he desired upon the issue and could control the direction of the debate. The resolution to discuss the charge in more detail was passed 191 votes to 150.<sup>103</sup> Wandesford was involved with this charge from the start and this may provide one explanation for his later prominence in presenting it.

Wandesford continued in his role of reporting to the House upon the progress of the grand committee concerning the Duke of Buckingham on 28 April. The *Commons Journal* records his speech in detail, suggesting that the speech was recognised as being important to the House. The committee believed "that a Plaister applied, and a Drink given, to the late King.... without the Advice of his sworn Physicians, and not made by his sworn Apothecaries" had been the cause of his death. Christopher Wandesford described the administration of the plaster and drink as "an Act of a transcendent Presumption, of a dangerous Consequence." Finally, the committee had found that the "Drink was given to the late King by the Duke, and the Plaister applied to him by the Duke's Direction."<sup>104</sup> Wandesford reported that the committee had resolved that the killing of a King equated to treason. This was certainly the most dangerous charge to press against Buckingham. Whether Wandesford sincerely believed that Buckingham committed this crime is not certain, but he must have at least identified its potential in being presented as authentic, as he gambled on this at the possible expense of his political career.

---

<sup>103</sup> *ibid.*, p. 850b.

Further evidence of the high esteem in which the House held Wandesford is evident on 1 May when an extra charge was annexed to those against Buckingham. It appears that the Commons were at this stage dredging for more material with which to attack Buckingham. The attention of the House turned to the ‘stay’ of the ship, St. Peter of Newhaven by Buckingham, and it was debated whether or not it could be classed as a grievance. Wandesford acted as teller that the charge should be added to the existing list. The House supported Wandesford’s view on the matter and the motion carried 185 votes against 148.<sup>105</sup>

Wandesford seems to have held the confidence of the House throughout the Parliament of 1626 and this culminated in the events of 3 May. The team that would present the charges to the Lords against Buckingham was chosen; eight men were named of whom two were to introduce and conclude the charges and six were to present the actual charges.<sup>106</sup> Wandesford was chosen to present the most sensational accusation against Buckingham; the murder of King James through the application of a plaster and the giving of a drink. He had reported the initial enquiry into the charge on 28 April and this perhaps played a part in his being chosen to present this issue.

The impeachment case against Buckingham culminated in Charles I’s fury that the Commons had attempted to attack his friend and favourite. On 11 May, Sir Dudley Digges and Sir John Eliot were arrested in front of the assembled Commons for their speeches to the Lords regarding the impeachment. Russell identifies the “particular ground of offence” as the charge with which Wandesford was associated. In their speeches to the Lords, Digges and Eliot had alluded to Charles I being an accessory.<sup>107</sup> It is intriguing that Wandesford did not join Digges and Eliot in the Tower for his part in the impeachment attempt given that he recounted the charge of the murder of the late King. Digges and Eliot were more prominent members of the House and therefore punishing them would have more impact. However, Wandesford was later punished for his attacks on Buckingham during the 1626 Parliament. This demonstrates that his appearance in controversial and important committees and discussions throughout the 1626 Parliament was noticed and believed to be prominent

---

<sup>104</sup> *ibid*, p. 850b.

<sup>105</sup> *ibid*, p. 852b, Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 303.

<sup>106</sup> On 2 May, the House debated whether to send the charges to the Lords or to the King. They eventually resolved to go to the Lords perhaps hoping that the case would not be rejected outright. The member of Parliament Walter Long suggested that the Commons should present the charges to the Lords as the business would be “too tedious” for the King! *ibid*, p. 304.

<sup>107</sup> *ibid*, p. 306.

enough to be worthy of punishment.<sup>108</sup> Twenty-two gentlemen and two lords were dismissed from the Commission of the Peace on 8 July 1626 including Wandesford and Wentworth.<sup>109</sup> Wandesford was also punished by a harsh assessment by privy seal.<sup>110</sup>

The arrest of Digges and Eliot agitated the members of the Commons who discussed the shocking news on the day after their imprisonment. Wandesford commented that they might lose a member occasionally, but losing two was “more than ordinary.”<sup>111</sup> Did Wandesford weigh up the options of becoming involved in the Duke’s impeachment and ultimately decide that the consequences were worth pursuing so ‘evil’ a minister? Or had he simply ‘fallen’ by chance into his prominent role? It seems likely because of his calculating nature that Wandesford had consciously decided that the impeachment case presented the perfect opportunity to become a prominent member of Parliament. Wandesford’s connection to Thomas Wentworth is also worth considering. Wentworth made it clear that he thought that evil ministers were a disease in the body politic, and indeed had discussed this in a letter of 5 December 1625 to Wandesford. The above, combined with Wandesford’s actions in the Parliament of 1626 suggests that it is probable that he shared in Wentworth’s belief that these men led to the “ruines of States and Kingdomes.”<sup>112</sup>

The predicament of how to deal with Buckingham was still not resolved and the Commons was frustrated by the lack of action against him. Some of the members of the Commons feared that they were trampling more upon the King’s prerogative, than attacking the Duke of Buckingham. Wandesford suggested that the royal actions could be blamed upon Buckingham’s misinformation, which helped them to manoeuvre around the problem of being seen as directly attacking the King.<sup>113</sup> On 22 May, Christopher Wandesford agreed with John Pym to lay the attack upon Buckingham to one side and instead to concentrate on the framing of “a bill for the preservation of our liberties.” Wandesford was appointed to the committee to consider dealing with the bill but rather than focusing solely upon liberties, he used the

---

<sup>108</sup> A newsletter writer of the time wrote that “most if not all of the Parliament men that were justices and against the duke were put out of the commission.” *ibid*, p. 189.

<sup>109</sup> *ibid*, p. 327, Cust, *Forced Loan and English Politics* p. 189.

<sup>110</sup> *ibid*, p. 39.

<sup>111</sup> Diary of Sir Richard Grosvenor, Trinity College, Dublin MS E. 5. 17, in Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 306.

<sup>112</sup> Wentworth to Wandesford, 5 December 1625, Str. P. 2 / 182, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 32.

<sup>113</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 852b.



opportunity to continue in his pursuit of Buckingham. In a speech to Parliament he stated that

The power of a favourite is like the eye of the sun, the higher it grows the more intolerable.... The Duke's growing greater and greater in power is nothing but setting himself against the Commonwealth. Let us deal plainly, and tell his Majesty how the case stands with us.<sup>114</sup>

On 9 June, the Commons began to formulate their petition to Charles I, regarding the 'preservation of their liberties.' This was uncertain terrain and it was decided that the Lords should be consulted about the petition.<sup>115</sup> The backing of the Lords would give legitimacy to their case and would present a united Parliament to the King. The previous committee appointed to discuss this issue was to continue sitting but with the inclusion of Wandesford. Perhaps by this time, he was seen as a champion of the Commons' cause and was needed to help forge the new petition.

In a chronological sense, Wandesford's last committee appointment of this Parliament was to help in the creation of an Act "concerning divers Privileges of Parliament," formed on 13 June.<sup>116</sup> However, it is unlikely that the committee got very far with the formulation of this act as Parliament was dissolved on 15 June. Wandesford sat on numerous less important committees during the 1626 Parliament.<sup>117</sup> How far he was able to contribute to each committee will never be certain but his inclusion to varied committees shows that his interest in, and commitment to parliamentary activities was intense.

---

<sup>114</sup> *ibid*, p. 860b.

<sup>115</sup> It was concluded that "a Committee to be named, to consider of the Reasons to be given, at the praying a Conference with the Lords about their joining; and to draw a Petition to his Majesty, wherein a Space to be left, for the Lords to join with us if they please." *ibid*, p. 869b.

<sup>116</sup> *ibid*, p. 870b.

<sup>117</sup> Wandesford's committee memberships were wide ranging. A list of these memberships follows. Wandesford certainly appears to have been concerned with a range of clerical issues. For example, on 15 February, he sat on a committee to discuss "An Act against scandalous and unworthy Ministers." On 10 March, he was a member of the committee to formulate an act "that certain Clergymen shall not be Justices of Peace." On 3 May, Wandesford acted as teller on the discussion of the excommunication of Sir Robert Howard. Wandesford acted as teller that the High Court Proceedings against Howard should stand, along with Sir Francis Foljambe. The tellers for the yea were Sir Henry Poole and Sir Thomas Denton. The motion carried on Wandesford's side, 114 votes against 105. Other committee memberships were wide-ranging and fairly randomly dealt with a plethora of issues. For example, on 16 February. Committee for concerned with the lease of the manor of Malden "avoiding of a Leaf of 5000 Years.... Parcel of the Possessions of Merton College, in the University of Oxford, unduly procured from the said College." on 2 March, he was involved in a committee to deal with elections and on 14 March, he sat on a committee to consider Sheriff's Accounts. *ibid*, pp. 819a, 820a, 829a, 834a, 836b, 847a.

## The forced loan of 1626 and the response of Wentworth's cabal

The forced loan of 1626 has been seen as an important constitutional development in the early Stuart period, but equally provides us with a penetrating insight into the political awareness of the men who were asked to pay it. The forced loan was more like a tax than a loan as it entreated members of the higher echelons of society to make an obligatory payment to the Crown with an unspecified repayment time.<sup>118</sup> The issue of the forced loan augmented rumours that Charles I intended to rule arbitrarily. If the King were allowed to raise extra-parliamentary money, there would be little reason to recall Parliament, which would then set a precedent for further revenue raising innovations.

Wentworth's decision not to pay the loan was discreet. He made a conscious decision not to advertise the reasons for his refusal in order to minimise the damage to his courtly aspirations.<sup>119</sup> Wentworth's restraint when called before the Privy Council gained him much respect at Court, although he was still imprisoned for his refusal.<sup>120</sup> Wentworth also had to consider the impact that his decision might have upon his local reputation as the loan was seen to threaten the liberties of the subjects.<sup>121</sup> Sir Arthur Ingram thought that Wentworth would reap political benefits from his refusal and felt that it would not create negative repercussions for his career. He wrote on 16 July 1627 to reassure Wentworth that "in regard how you stod in your opinion ryssing from a good hartt and outt of a good consiens and therfor I make no doubtt thatt itt is anny trobell to you att all...."<sup>122</sup> From Ingram's point of view, Wentworth did not

---

<sup>118</sup> Cust, *Forced Loan and English Politics* p. 222.

<sup>119</sup> *ibid*, pp. 221 – 222.

<sup>120</sup> Cust praises Wentworth's minimisation of possible political damage: "He had apparently gained the status amongst the refusers of a figure of moderation and compromise, someone with whom the Privy Councillors could do business; and this perhaps helps to explain his rapid advancement after the 1628 Parliament." *ibid*, p. 235. However, there was still danger in his refusal to pay the loan. Indeed Lord Clifford, Wentworth's brother-in-law wrote to Wentworth to warn him "every man that loves you wishes you may not run so much hazard of your life and fortune." Lord Clifford to Wentworth, 20 May 1627, Str. P. 16 / 181, Knowler. *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 38 –39.

<sup>121</sup> Cust, *Forced Loan and English Politics* p. 223.

<sup>122</sup> Ingram reassured Wentworth on his confinement that "Imprissonmentt to such as dow fowell and bass offencis must needs trobell both the party committed in a causs of this nattu doth so much redown to your honor and to the honor of your postertyt thatt your friends [should] rather bee glad of itt then other wiss.... praying you to remember my seruis to your nobell Lady.... nott forgetting honest Mr. Rattclyff...." Sir Arthur Ingram to Wentworth, 16 July 1627, Str. P. 12 / 7, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* pp. 259 – 260. Others also understood Wentworth's reasons behind his refusal. Sir Richard Hutton junior wrote on 21 July, 1627; "I wish I could stand you in any stead in this your restrant, but I knowe your owne resolution giues libertie to itt, soe God giue you health...." Richard Hatton to Wentworth, 21 July 1621, Str. P. 12 / 7+1, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 260.

appear to have displeased the King as much as other refusers who had openly attacked extra-parliamentary taxation.

The reactions of George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford to the issue of the forced loan provide a unique insight into the complexities of their relationship with Wentworth.<sup>123</sup> Radcliffe discussed potential responses to the loan with Wentworth and instead of merely following Wentworth's lead, Radcliffe prompted Wentworth to stay true to his principles and resist the loan.<sup>124</sup> His influence on Wentworth was in turn recognised by others. John Holles, the Earl of Clare (Wentworth's father-in-law) wrote to his wife on 19 May 1627 stating that Wentworth was communicating with Radcliffe from their imprisonments regarding the forced loan.<sup>125</sup>

Initially Radcliffe was punished for his refusal to pay the loan by having to report to the Council Board three days a week.<sup>126</sup> However, he was unable to believe that his actions would not have more severe consequences and anticipated further repercussions.<sup>127</sup> As he expected, Radcliffe was shortly afterwards imprisoned in the Marshalsea. Radcliffe explained to his wife that his refusal to pay the loan made him

---

<sup>123</sup> Sir Edward Osborne, who was later to become Wentworth's vice-president in the Council of the North, was also a loan refuser. He took up residence at Kiveton in 1625, a house on the border of Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire. He was chosen to be a sheriff in autumn 1625 but did not serve in this post as he was travelling abroad and was still away when the loan was levied. Cliffe, J.T. *The Yorkshire Gentry* (London, 1969), p. 283. Philip Mainwaring's dealing with the issue of the forced loan is less easy to discover. He does not appear in Cust's *Forced Loan and English Politics* and there are no references to proceedings against him in the *Calendar of State Papers*. It is fair to assume that Philip Mainwaring was asked to pay the loan as he was a minor courtier. Due to his proximity to the Court, Mainwaring may have paid the loan in order to limit damage to his position.

<sup>124</sup> Cust believes that George Radcliffe would have been urging Wentworth to resist the loan because Radcliffe himself had refused to pay and thus demonstrated that he could make a stand against the loan. He describes Radcliffe as urging Wentworth to concentrate upon the "peace of mind and reputation to be gained from resisting." Cust, *Forced Loan and English Politics* p. 222, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 136 – 158.

<sup>125</sup> John Holles wrote to his wife: "what my sunn Wentworth will do in this loane, I would gladly know.... he writt to Mr. Ratcliff, (who hath been in the Marshallsea this fortnett) to conferr with me what he should do uppon the cumming down of the letters for his answear, wheruppon I writt to him, it were better for him to cum up, then to give a negative in the cuntry." Seddon, *Letters of Holles* vol. II, p. 350.

<sup>126</sup> On 27 April 1627, Radcliffe wrote to his wife who was at home in Yorkshire that he did not believe that he, or any new loan refusers would be imprisoned, "yett we shall be tyed to atende 3 dayes a weeke at the Councill Boarde, which will be much better in some respect. We shall be at our owne lodgings and dyet, and be at libertye the other 4 dayes." However, we should be aware that this rhetoric may have been to comfort her as shortly afterwards, he was imprisoned in the Marshalsea. Radcliffe to his wife, 27 April 1627, Whitaker, T.D. (ed). *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), p. 137.

<sup>127</sup> Writing from prison on 30 April 1627, Radcliffe described his satisfaction: "Accordinge to my expectation I am now committed to prison which the lesse troubles me, because it was expected, and, in trueth, although restrainte of libertye be a thing which naturally all avoid, yet in this restraint, I thank God, I enjoy as much contentment as ever I did in my life." *ibid*, pp. 139 – 40.

content, as he was not being forced to compromise his moral integrity.<sup>128</sup> Radcliffe expected to be released from prison after a short time and explained to his wife in May 1627 that he thought his release from the Marshalsea was imminent.<sup>129</sup> In the event however, he was incarcerated for nine months, until the general release of all the prisoners in January 1628.<sup>130</sup>

Radcliffe was however able to use his legal work as an excuse to gain a short release from his prison. The Countess Dowager of Leicester petitioned the Privy Council on 9 November 1627 for his release from prison. Radcliffe was working on the Countess' behalf, settling her estate after the death of the Count, as stated in correspondence with his wife from November 1626.<sup>131</sup> The Countess' petition to the Privy Council stated that Radcliffe had essential papers and was so embroiled in her legal business "that no other can for the present sollicite the same without her extreame prejudice but by his direction and informacion..." However, this plea to the Privy Council was not simply provoked by her desire for Radcliffe's legal expertise. Family ties were also a factor in the Countess' actions as Radcliffe's wife was her niece. Thanks to the Countess' pleas, Radcliffe was permitted a temporary release by the Council so that he could deliver the "aforesaid wrytings, and to direct and informe those who sollicite the said suites..."<sup>132</sup>

Radcliffe and other objectors to the forced loan must have had a strong motivation to risk incurring the displeasure of their monarch, particularly when faced with the threat of imprisonment. So why did Radcliffe refuse the Crown's order to pay the loan? As he was not a member of Parliament the respect of his electorate

---

<sup>128</sup> Radcliffe's wife was understanding of his refusal to pay and did not try to dissuade him once his determination was clear. Radcliffe thanked his wife for her understanding of his refusal to pay the loan, stating "I did and do much please myself to think with what moderation and discretion you diswaded me fro' refusing to lend, with what modesty and respect you did desist after you once p'ceived my resolution." *ibid*, pp. 139 - 140.

<sup>129</sup> He wrote to his wife: "For our confining, it is at an ende, as I thinke it was much debated yesterday at the Council Board.... we shall know more after Wednesday." *ibid*, p. 150.

<sup>130</sup> Firth, C.H. 'Sir George Radcliffe,' *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 123. The prisoners were "discharged and sett at libertie from any restraints heretofore out upon them by his Majestie's comaundment." *Acts of the Privy Council Sept. 1627 - June 1628* (London, 1940), p. 217.

<sup>131</sup> Radcliffe wrote to his wife on 1 November 1626, "Your aunt and I had this evening some speeches about her house and expences.... I am about a course to free your aunt out of debt presently, which she hearkens after." Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 132.

<sup>132</sup> The Countess informed the Council that "wrytings, without which she cannot possiblie defende her causes, are in the studie of the said George Radcliffe at Graye's Inne, where none may come at them but himselfe..." Therefore the Countess made "humble suite that he, the said George Ratcliffe, may be permitted to repaire to the city of London and Westminster for assisting of her by his direction, and for the delivery of the wrytings before mentioned." We do not know how many days he was released for as

could not have been a consideration in his refusal to pay. However, his intention to enter Parliament in 1628 may have contributed to his refusal, as the electorate may be more inclined to vote for a man who was prepared to compromise his freedom in order to stand up for the privilege of Parliament.

The experience of the forced loan cemented the relationship between Wentworth and Radcliffe. They discussed the implications of refusal and ultimately decided that their consciences could not allow them to pay. However Christopher Wandesford's refusal to pay the forced loan was distinctly different.<sup>133</sup> Unlike Wentworth's more discreet approach, Wandesford gave a direct refusal to the Yorkshire commissioners and escaped further punishment by concealing himself in his house. Despite their differences, Wandesford's evasive actions appear to have been influenced by Wentworth. Wandesford wrote to Wentworth on 9 September 1627, stating "according to your advice for absence, I have the contrary way absented my self from all other places but some private part of my owne house, knowen only to 4 or 5 of my servants." He wrote to Wentworth stating that if he needed to defend his non-reply to the letters or messengers sent by the commission, he would explain that he was ill and his wife had instructed their servants not to allow anyone to disturb him.<sup>134</sup>

Wandesford's candid defiance of the loan commissioners could have created problems for any potential future political career, however he miraculously escaped punishment.<sup>135</sup> This was not the first time he had serendipitous escape; he was not

---

the number of days was omitted in the Council's notes. *Acts of the Privy Council Sept. 1627 – June 1628* p. 133.

<sup>133</sup> Whitaker states that although Wandesford "copied the example of his friends Wentworth and Radcliffe... [he] escaped the imprisonment to which their honest and constitutional pertinancy exposed them." Whitaker, *History of Richmondshire* p. 156.

<sup>134</sup> Wandesford explained how he would respond to the potential questions of the Privy Council. If they asked him "where were you, when our messenger or letters came to your house?" he would respond, "I know not what tyme they came. I heard nothing. I was att home that very tyme you mention, but my servants denyd you. There answere is: though my master commanded us not to conceale anybody, yet our mistris did (my master not being well and not fitt to be troubled) forbid us to tell any of his being att hoame and I must blame my wife for taking so much upon her. So she must beare all and this is another poore shift of myne and please your worship, I would itt might serve there lordships as well." Wandesford to Wentworth, 9 September 1627, Str. P. 16 / 261, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* pp. 266 – 267.

<sup>135</sup> Cust describes Wandesford as an example of a prominent refuser who appears to have escaped the attention of the Council. 76 prominent refusers were released from prison in January 1628, but Cust believes that others were imprisoned without being recorded or were released early. He indicates that Wandesford's letter to Wentworth dated 9 September 1627 proves that he was one such prominent refuser, who was not detected. Cust, *Forced Loan and English Politics* p. 218, Str. P. 16 / 261, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 267.

severely punished for his involvement in the impeachment attempt upon Buckingham either.

Despite the differences in Wandesford and Wentworth's experiences of the forced loan, they did share similar views of the importance of moderation in such refusals. Wandesford disapproved of William Coryton's actions of violently refusing to pay the loan. Wandesford commented that "it is no time to play at sharp with the crown"<sup>136</sup> and may have been fearful of the repercussions of such behaviour. Wentworth's restrained refusal to pay improved his status at Court without damaging his standing in the country. However, Wentworth's stance on the forced loan went beyond his own Machiavellian motivations, as he believed that the way to heal political division was to restore unity. In response to a letter from Sir Humphrey May, he hinted that submission to the King's illegal imprisonment of the loan refusers would be a small price to pay in restoring the King's favour to the people. He wrote that he was not the type to "refuse confinement. I will not dispute but obey, albeit I must undergoe this course with as much inconueniencye... as any."<sup>137</sup>

In a letter to Wentworth in November 1627, Wandesford addressed the issue of the King's intention to introduce the privy seal loans. Wandesford stated that although he supported the King's right to levy this tax, he was concerned that his previous defiance of the King's money raising powers during the forced loan would lead to him being faced with higher charges this time around.<sup>138</sup> However, Wandesford believed that there were fundamental differences between the two loans, identifying the forced loan as extra-parliamentary and without precedent, and thus intolerable.<sup>139</sup> Wandesford was concerned that his Yorkshire neighbours would not be prepared to stand against the King in order to protect their privileges. He informed Wentworth,

many thousands privye seales are showing upon us, some for thousand pounds, the least for hundreds and so far hath these former proceedings wrought upon us and made us so malleable that in Richmondshyre we yet

---

<sup>136</sup> Unpublished *History of Parliament* article, 'Christopher Wandesford,' p. 14.

<sup>137</sup> Wentworth to Sir Humphrey May, 27 July 1627, Str. P. 21 / 45. Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 261.

<sup>138</sup> Wandesford stated to Wentworth that "when the privy seale comes, I thinke itt will be the proportion only that shall trouble me, for the king's wants must be supplied and since he declines the ordinary way, what can be more warrantable for the subject then this?" Wandesford may have been trying to justify his potential payment of this levy to Wentworth here. Wandesford to Wentworth, November 1627, Str. P. 16 / 242, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 276.

<sup>139</sup> Cust, *Forced Loan and English Politics* p. 235.

goe no further then for our *quota pars*; every man praing that the safe shelter of collectorship may cover and protect him.<sup>140</sup>

Wandesford still felt that resistance to the forced loan should be moderate as this was the only way in which relations between the Crown and Parliament could be harmonious again. This was precisely the approach that Wentworth favoured but as Wandesford indicted, it was not always the proposed course of action of their fellow refusers.<sup>141</sup>

After Wentworth's release from imprisonment, Wandesford appeared to be far more doubtful than Wentworth about the repercussions of his actions. This may have been due to the fact that Wandesford did not outright refuse the Privy Council's order to pay and thus escaped punishment. He was concerned that he would be targeted in the future for a different levy, effectively as punishment for his actions over the forced loan. He commented that in the next Parliament, Wentworth should consider granting five subsidies to the Crown rather than be subjected to privy seal loans, which he feared might amount to £1000 per person. However, he admitted that perhaps his fears were exaggerated as his own "providence is to feare and itt is a maxim concluded of both by your greater wisdome and eke Mr Radcliffe's prudence that Wansford is naturally iealous and fearefull."<sup>142</sup> However, Wandesford's risk adverse behaviour may also have stemmed from his pursuit of the Duke of Buckingham.

### **Interim: From forced loan to parliamentary elections.**

The elections to the Parliament of 1628 were of great importance to the political careers of the men who would become integral to Wentworth's government in Ireland. Wandesford and his cousin Mallory had discussed Wentworth's bid for the county seat in the election and he wrote to Wentworth, who was still confined in Dartford for his refusal to pay the forced loan, on 26 November 1627, to reassure Wentworth that partnered with Sir Henry Bellasis, he was the strongest candidate in the field, and that his stand against the forced loan would not have damaged his

---

<sup>140</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, November 1627, Str. P. 16 / 242, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 276.

<sup>141</sup> Wandesford hoped that "if the howse doe mete. I pray God send them a mixture of patience and curradge to apply the proper care to thess bleedings wounds. The fewer Corritonns and Katesbyes the better." Coryton and Catesby had forcefully objected to the forced loan. Wandesford to Wentworth, 9 September 1627, Str. P. 16 / 261, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* pp. 267 – 268. See also Cust, *Forced Loan and English Politics* p. 236.

political reputation in Yorkshire. Wandesford believed that Wentworth would defeat his old foe Sir John Savile in the fight for the county seat, despite his absence from Yorkshire.<sup>143</sup> Wandesford was also concerned for his own election to the Parliament and asked Wentworth if he could obtain him a seat elsewhere if he failed to be elected for Richmond. He suggested that Wentworth might “laye wayte with Corryton, Francis Semer and thoss tribunitiall orators of the west for a place for your servant, if you desire me to kepe your syde warme by the bar agayne.” Wandesford’s letter demonstrates his awareness of alliances that Wentworth could capitalise upon in this instance recognising that Wentworth could use his association with William Coryton in the ‘west’ or Cornwall, and thus use his political weight to gain a seat for his associates. Wandesford was perhaps concerned that his own rather private response to the forced loan would not have endeared him to the electorate and commented that their different handling of the issue was

the strandgest accident that befell me these years when I consyder howe differently this disease handles you and me that are so neare att this tyme of a temper; a fever almost pestilentiall upon you and I fynd no more then a grudging in my self.<sup>144</sup>

This issue was clearly weighing on Wandesford’s mind as in January 1628 he congratulated Wentworth upon his successful way of refusing to pay the loan which had enabled him to keep his political career in tact, in both the country and the Court. Wentworth seemed to have an extraordinary ability to know how far he should push his objections without damaging his political career. With an air of irony, Wandesford questioned

---

<sup>142</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 16 and 20 January 1628, Str. P. 16 / 245, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 285.

<sup>143</sup> Wandesford explained to Wentworth that he had told Mallory that “if the cuntry understoode themselues ... they could doe no less then make choyce of you, though absent; he [Mallory] agreed and that, H[enry] Bellassis ioyning with you, the field was yours, unless precedence hyndred the business...” Wandesford to Wentworth, 26 November 1627, Str. P. 20 / 262, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 278. Wandesford wrote to Wentworth regarding elections issues again in January 1628, outlining his distrust of Sir John Savile, particularly pointing to Savile’s reliance upon Catholic support in the elections. This highlights the fear of the threat posed by Catholicism and also was a convenient attack to use against Wentworth’s adversary. Wandesford’s concerns about Savile were reiterated throughout the 1620s, demonstrating the awareness of the threat of Wentworth’s old adversary in the parliamentary elections. Wandesford noted “That for the election (if such a harbor be to be discovered in this in this dangerous passadge) will be likewise fitt for your owne agitation; you will nowe fynde the height of our hopes here something abated with the universal dependence Sir John Savile hath from the Catholickes.... Besydes the advantadge he will have from the basness of thoss power and lowe spiritts that devotes themselves to a servile adoration of any temperary greatness.” Wandesford to Wentworth, January 1628, Str. P. 16 / 246, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* pp. 283 – 284.

<sup>144</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 26 November 1627, Str. P. 20 / 262, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* pp. 278 – 279.



What a virtue is this in Sir Thomas Wentworth that hath so fitted his vessell for every season; if the stormes blowe and the waves goe hye, he casts out the steddye ankor of resolution and patience thereby to preserve himself from shipwrack; if a calme come he hath the discretion to take the first safe harbor he metes with.<sup>145</sup>

Wandesford was disappointed in those men who, more concerned for their own safety than the privileges of the nation, had paid their loan, rather than taking a stand as Wentworth had done.<sup>146</sup> With this in mind, Wandesford appears to have wished that he had given a more vocal refusal to pay the loan, rather than simply hiding from the Commissioners.<sup>147</sup>

The correspondence between Wentworth and Wandesford in the months preceding the 1628 Parliament reveals a tableau of their political aspirations and concerns. In particular, Wandesford described the actions he felt the Commons ought to take in the forthcoming Parliament, unusually revealing the intentions of a member of Parliament before it met. He believed that the members should not be afraid to stand up for their known privileges, despite the actions of their monarch against them in the forced loan. Wandesford argued that if he

were to give direction for after adges howe people should carry themselues to there king, they shold be animated and mannadged (after the performance of there reasonable dewtyes) to maintayne that heriditary and naturall interest which God and nature hath giuen them in there libertye....<sup>148</sup>

He implied that the actions and motives of the King and his Councillors were the cause of sour relations with Parliament but believed that both Crown and Parliament should work to repair their once harmonious relations. Wandesford was hopeful that this relationship could be restored

unless there be such a fatallitye upon us that the goodly tre which hath borne the blessed fruit of tranquillitye and peace in this kingdome some hundreds of yeares (sometyme more sometyme less frutefull) shall nowe be cutt downe and the roote therof bound about with iron that itt may never grow agayne.<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 16 and 20 January 1628, Str. P. 16 / 245, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 285.

<sup>146</sup> Despite the fact that he himself had escaped imprisonment, Wandesford commented that “nowe we smell so strong of this prison spiritt that cuntry burgesses (who are not obdurate and hardned by a wilfull backe slydinge) will play the fooles forsooth, if out of misapprehensyon of the pretended doinges they giue there mony to ryddyly.” Str. P. 16 / 245, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 285.

<sup>147</sup> Str. P. 16 / 245, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 285.

<sup>148</sup> Str. P. 16 / 245, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 286.

<sup>149</sup> Str. P. 16 / 245, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 286.

## Wandesford's final English Parliament of 1628 - 1629.

Wandesford was concerned that he might not be re-elected by Richmond and therefore made efforts to secure an alternative seat through William Coryton or Sir Francis Seymour. He stood against the Lord President of the North's secretary James Howell with his cousin Matthew Hutton.<sup>150</sup> The electorate of Richmond did in fact turn their backs upon Wandesford and Hutton, instead electing the local magnate Sir Talbot Bowes and James Howell as Wandesford had feared.<sup>151</sup> However, Wandesford had no need to take a seat in Cornwall as he was elected for Thirsk, probably as part of an electoral bargain between Wentworth and Henry Bellasis.<sup>152</sup>

Wandesford was a very active member in the last English Parliament he was to sit in before his death in 1640; making 46 recorded speeches and being appointed to fifteen committees in the first session of Parliament alone. On 20 March we find Wandesford, Wentworth, Mainwaring, and Sir Gervase Clifton all sitting on the committee of privileges that dealt specifically with irregular returns and vacancies.<sup>153</sup> Wandesford's inclusion can be explained by his membership of the committee in 1625 and 1626. It is ironic that Wentworth was nominated as a member of this committee given that he was implicated in election scandals against Sir John Savile on a number of occasions. But thanks to his arrest and imprisonment for his refusal to pay the forced loan, he was seen as a champion of the parliamentary cause, which led to his previous misdemeanours being forgotten. It is always worth noting the recurrence of this group of men on committees as a pattern of their similar interests begins to emerge. They are often linked by issues to do with Yorkshire, which represents their ties to their electorate as well as to each other. For example, on 21 April, Wentworth, Wandesford, Mainwaring and Sir Gervase Clifton were involved with the discussion of an Act concerned with the inheritance, freehold and possessions of the Duke of Devonshire. This was certainly an issue that they would

---

<sup>150</sup> Matthew Hutton to his father Sir Timothy Hutton, 6 February 1628, J. Raine, (ed.) *The Correspondence of Dr. Matthew Hutton* (London, 1843), p. 317, Keeler, M.F, Cole, M.J. & Bidwell, W.B. *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* (6 vols, New Haven, 1983), vol. VI, p. 159.

<sup>151</sup> Carroll, 'Yorkshire Parliamentary Boroughs,' pp. 84 – 85.

<sup>152</sup> See Gruenfelder, 'Electoral Patronage,' pp. 557 – 574 for the election of Wandesford through the influence of Wentworth and the Bellasis family. Wandesford seems to have negotiated an alternative seat for Wentworth through the influence of Henry Bellasis. As Wentworth ultimately did not need this seat, Wandesford seems to have taken it instead. He wrote to Wentworth explaining that Sir Ferdinando Fairfax "offred a treatye with me for your ioyning with Henrye Bellasis and the busines is so agreed betwixt us that, waving al others whatsoever to stand with you, he will if he can ingadge Henrye. and giue me notice, when I promise to undertake for your pert, if I se cause." Wandesford to Wentworth, 16 and 20 January 1628, Str. P. 16 / 245, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 287.

have in common as the Duke's main home Chatsworth House. was close to Wentworth's Yorkshire interests, like Wentworth the Duke was related to the Clifford family and Chatsworth was also fairly near to Clifton's base in Nottinghamshire.<sup>154</sup>

Wandesford's intense dislike of monopolies attracted him to the committee dealing with the Muscovia Company. On 17 May, the issue of the monopolisation of whaling around Greenland and the North American coast was presented to the House.<sup>155</sup> Wandesford, Wentworth and Radcliffe were nominated to the committee to consider the English whalers' protest.<sup>156</sup> Indicating his personal concern on this issue, Wandesford acted as teller alongside Wentworth on 30 May and won the support of the House.<sup>157</sup>

The 1628 Parliament was more concerned than any other Parliament of the 1620s with the preservation of the subject's liberties.<sup>158</sup> Early in the session on 3 April a special committee was chosen to "frame a fair and indifferent bill for King and people." Both Wentworth and Wandesford were members of this committee and were probably chosen on the basis of their previous dedication to the preservation of the House of Commons' privileges and the subject's liberties. Wandesford's part in the attack on Buckingham had not been forgotten and Wentworth's refusal of the forced loan would have demonstrated his belief in the protection of liberties. This committee was one of many concerned with the question of civil rights in the Parliament of 1628 and this Parliament is remarkable as it was the first of the 1620s to

---

<sup>153</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 873a, Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. II, pp. 28 – 29.

<sup>154</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 886a. Although we can identify associations between Wentworth and Wandesford, it is often difficult to find evidence of times where he demonstrated specific allegiance to Wentworth. One such example of Wandesford supporting Wentworth's interests dates from 23 April 1628, when some sense of obligation may have inspired his motion to recommit the report on the Newfoundland plantation until Wentworth's patron, George Calvert, Lord Baltimore, could attend. Mr. Glanville reported the bill for free fishing in New England and Newfoundland to the Commons whereupon Wandesford moved that the bill should be recommitted so that George Calvert, Lord Baltimore could come to the committee and "make his claim." Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. III, p. 49.

<sup>155</sup> This monopoly had been granted to the Muscovia Company in 1613 and they leased the right to the Greenland Company. English whalers protested against the monopolisation of whaling and the cities of Hull and York petitioned Parliament against this right. *Commons Journal* p. 899b, Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. III, pp. 122, n. 1, 449.

<sup>156</sup> As we shall see in Chapter 3, there is some confusion over which Radcliffe, (John, the alderman from Chester or George) attended committees as they are both referred to as Mr Radcliffe in the *Commons Journal*. However, due to Radcliffe's connection to Wentworth and Wandesford who were both on the committee and his local interest in the petition, (the petition was from York and Hull), it was most likely to be George and not John Radcliffe involved with this committee. *Commons Journal* p. 899b.

<sup>157</sup> The House supported Wandesford and Wentworth by 169 to 129 votes. *ibid*, p. 907a. Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. IV, p. 22.

attend the House “with the conscious and deliberate aim of vindicating English liberties” which were viewed “collectively and as a body.”<sup>159</sup>

Tied to the question of liberty was the issue of compulsory foreign employment and confinement and this was heavily debated in the Commons during the 1628 – 1629 Parliament. On 25 March 1628 the Commons debated the King’s ability to send a citizen abroad in an employment. If the chosen subject refused to go, they could be imprisoned which was believed to be an infringement upon the rights of the subject. Sir Edward Coke offered his experience of being employed to visit Ireland on a commission in 1624. He said that he “would have gone, else I should have been fined and imprisoned.”<sup>160</sup> Wentworth saw an appointment outside of England as a form of banishment, and therefore if he deserved to be punished, he should be sent away. However, the employment which he obtained in Ireland was perhaps more honourable and profitable than the types of foreign employment the Commons had in mind here. Wentworth saw foreign service as “an honourable banishment” recognising the King’s right to command such service. Yet he also admitted “If anything that owes me a displeasure shall procure me to be put into foreign service, it will be a mark of displeasure unto me.”<sup>161</sup> Wandesford was troubled by the issue of foreign employment and gave a speech following that of Wentworth. He described moderation as being the only way to “wind us out of this dark labyrinth.” However, he did note that this issue raised important questions of prerogative, admitting “No question deserves more the wisdom of this House than those where the King’s prerogative and the subject’s liberty jostle together.” He felt that the King could not be blamed entirely for men being sent abroad, fearing that the King’s evil councillors might be forcing men into unfavourable occupations. He asked the House to remember “We know not what mediation of ambassadors and others that work their own ends to put us in foreign services.”<sup>162</sup> Wandesford felt that the King should no longer be allowed to use his discretion when deciding who should take foreign offices, and asked that the House should consider forming a law which

---

<sup>158</sup> For a discussion on the Commons concern to protect their privileges, see Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* pp. 343 – 350.

<sup>159</sup> *ibid*, p. 343.

<sup>160</sup> This makes an interesting comparison to Wentworth, who was given an employment in Ireland and wished to accept the employment.

<sup>161</sup> Wentworth stated that ‘I shall never decline any employment for service, but a confinement is a punishment... It should be the goodness of the King to command for his service.’ Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. II, pp. 102 – 103.

<sup>162</sup> *ibid*, vol. II, p. 103.

defined the monarch's and the people's rights. He argued "It is no matter for law if prerogatives lie open upon us. This King we fear not, but who shall answer for another?"<sup>163</sup> This again illustrates Wandesford's fear of men influencing the King for their own ends, and his wariness of directly attacking the King by suggesting that although the Commons trusted this King implicitly, they could not be so sure of future monarchs. Wandesford was equally concerned about the monarch's prerogative power in the instance of imprisonment, an issue highlighted by the Five Knights case and *habeas corpus*. On 29 March, Wandesford pointed out to the House that the Solicitor General could be asked to provide them with precedents that would demonstrate the illegal nature of Charles' actions against the Five Knights.<sup>164</sup>

Despite having earlier recommended that Wentworth press the Commons to grant the King five subsidies,<sup>165</sup> Wandesford was not now willing to be pressured into raising supply for the King in the Parliament of 1628. He recognised the value of parliamentary supply as a bargaining tool with the Crown and hoped that the Commons would consider their privileges before granting supply. On 26 March, Secretary Coke presented the King's propositions to the House in which he announced the amount of supply needed to pay for his foreign policy. Wandesford announced that the Commons did not wish to be pressured into making a rash decision over supply and asked that each member receive a copy of the King's propositions to enable them to consider the request at leisure and take time to formulate their opinion. Coke was initially concerned about confidentiality but yielded to Wandesford's request. This was an ingenious method of gaining time to generate an appropriate response to the matter of supply, without offending the King. Rather than blatantly stalling for time, Wandesford cleverly intimated that the King's

---

<sup>163</sup> *ibid*, vol. II, p. 108.

<sup>164</sup> Wandesford asked that Mr. Solicitor "bring in his books, 20 or forty if he can, and accordingly let all be argued and judged." On 31 March, Wandesford moved that the matter be referred to a sub-committee to search for precedents to vindicate Sir Edward Coke. On 1 April, the committee of the whole House discussed which words should be included and excluded from their document on *habeas corpus*. Wandesford hoped that "it might be put in, that an *habeas corpus* must be granted." *ibid*, vol. II, pp. 198, 216, 218, p. 237. Another case of unlawful imprisonment was discussed in the House on 25 April. The committee of grievances reported that John Clegate had been imprisoned for the non-payment of 50/ towards a loan of 60,000/, which was part of the royal contract with the Corporation of London. Mr. Littleton said that this imprisonment was unlawful. "Here is no custom proved, and if it were, this is collateral and not necessary." Wandesford added "more consents are required to declare the law than ours." This is revealing as it shows the emphasis that Wandesford put upon the influence and prerogative of the House of Parliament. *ibid*, vol. III, pp. 76 - 77.

<sup>165</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 16 and 20 January 1628, Str. P. 16 / 245. Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 285.

propositions were of such importance that they should be mulled over.<sup>166</sup> At Wandesford's suggestion, no committee was chosen to discuss supply and the day on which they were to meet was left unspecified so that the members might have as much time as they needed to consider how much supply to grant.

It was not until 2 April that the committee of the whole House sat to "consider of the King's propositions." Wandesford made a speech expressing his apprehension that discussing the propositions would disrupt the business of the House.<sup>167</sup> He was concerned that if the Commons were harassed into a decision regarding supply, their resolution would be uninformed and less profitable to the King. He commented "If we should have gone to debate this day what and when we should give, we should have been unable to have spoke or done anything advisedly...."<sup>168</sup> However, this was probably a shrewd move to delay the settlement so that the House could continue to consider and negotiate redress of their grievances before supply, and along with Sir Robert Phelps he pushed the House to leave the issue of supply until Friday. The Commons followed this advice and spent the day discussing abuses such as the employment of men in foreign service and the billeting of soldiers. Clearly aware of the need to legislate so that the law could be upheld in the future, Wandesford declared, "Hearing of these abuses it must awaken us to redress them. Let us determine that point in law."<sup>169</sup>

The delay of the discussion on supply meant that the issue was raised again on 4 April. Wandesford had decided during the respite, like Wentworth, that five subsidies should be granted but in return hoped for "confirmation of our liberties."<sup>170</sup> Here we see an example of supply being used as a bargaining tool: Wandesford thought that if the Commons impressed Charles I with their willingness to grant supply, he would be more amenable when listening to their grievances. However, he was aware that the King's favour might not be so easily swayed.

---

<sup>166</sup> Wandesford declared "It was the readiness of every man's heart to receive these [the propositions]. They are of great importance. They come from an advised counsel, and therefore that we may prepare ourselves, I desire we may take copies of them, and that none come to them rashly." *ibid*, vol. II, p. 121. In another recorded version of his speech, it was noted that Wandesford was not attempting to put off granting supply altogether stating "We will give it with duty, and what we deny, we will deny with duty...." He insinuated that the extra time was for the King's benefit and hoped that "we are not to think that we need to consider of these points compulsorily, but as time gives way to the best advantage of the King and subject." *ibid*, vol. II, p. 128.

<sup>167</sup> Wandesford stated "Our own business being so raw I do think we should have broke the order of the House and of our own intentions as I take it." *ibid*, vol. II, p. 263.

<sup>168</sup> *ibid*, vol. II, p. 263.

<sup>169</sup> *ibid*, vol. II, p. 254.

The necessity of the crown flows down like rivers upon us and the kingdom is diseased. I would not have a man think that money will buy the favor of the King, and yet I would have every man think that if 4 subsidies will be well bestowed, 5 will be.<sup>171</sup>

Other member of the Commons such as Sir John Strangeways were fearful that despite granting supply to the King, he might demand forced loans from them as well and therefore believed that supply should be withheld until their grievances were addressed. This was especially pertinent as in reality, the Commons were not granting enough supply for the King to desist from imposing illegal taxation upon them.<sup>172</sup>

The Commons hoped that Charles I would accept the Petition of Right in return for supply. On 16 April the progress of the petition was discussed and Sir John Coke felt hopeful that Parliament would receive a gracious answer to their Petition. He reminded the Commons that the King “gives credit to us; he desires we give credit to him.”<sup>173</sup> Wandesford was surprised by Coke’s comments as he had thought that “The supply and our grievances are to be one joint act.” He had hoped that supply would not be granted until their grievances had been rectified and moved that the best way to continue was to carry on with the Petition in the grand committee of the whole House and in doing so, they would “advance the King’s business.”<sup>174</sup> On 22 April, Wandesford proposed that the Commons should send a messenger to the Lords to call them to a conference in case “their Lordships doubt or are not satisfied” about any aspects of the petition.<sup>175</sup> He asked that a select committee, to which he was later nominated alongside Wentworth, formulate the message to the Lords.<sup>176</sup> On 23 April, the Lords responded to the message and declared that they had taken into “serious Debate the great Business” and had nominated 18 Lords to confer with the Commons. Wandesford and Wentworth attended the meeting but the committee was instructed “only to hear, and not to speak.”<sup>177</sup> Wandesford sincerely believed in the importance of the Petition of Right and his strength of feeling was revealed on 29 April. Mr Griffith made a speech stating his belief that the petition should be allowed to ‘sleep’ and that they should trust the King to rectify their grievances without the Petition.

---

<sup>170</sup> *ibid*, vol. VI, p. 63.

<sup>171</sup> *ibid*, vol. II, p. 312.

<sup>172</sup> Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 347.

<sup>173</sup> Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. II, pp. 483 – 484.

<sup>174</sup> *ibid*, vol. II, p. 489.

<sup>175</sup> *ibid*, vol. III, p. 37.

<sup>176</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 886b, Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. III, p. 22.

<sup>177</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 887b, Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. III, pp. 43, 44.

Wandesford was shocked by this proposal and attempted to silence him. He told the House that this opinion should have been raised before the Commons had decided to proceed with the Petition.<sup>178</sup> Wandesford angrily announced that if Griffith's feelings had been so "strong to have moved the House that there should have been no bill, he should have moved it before the House had resolved: but now [he is] out of time...."<sup>179</sup>

The Commons were aware of the need to tread carefully so that they did not offend the King. They had been warned on 2 May that they were encroaching upon the King's prerogative yet the following day, the House had continued to debate how they should proceed in the Petition. Wandesford was determined to continue in the quest for confirmation of their liberties and justified their continuing work on the Petition by stating that the royal warning of 2 May originated from a misunderstanding. He wanted the Commons "to declare that we want no more than former laws," and to proceed with the bill but he soon accepted the evident preference of the House for a Petition of Right.<sup>180</sup> Wandesford said that the Commons should "give [the King] answer that we add nothing to the old laws." This was a common way of justifying the actions of the Parliament when it was feared that they might be encroaching upon the King's prerogative.<sup>181</sup> On 6 May, the House discussed whether they trusted the King to accept their requests in the Petition of Right. Wandesford commented that the weight of the issue of the petition was great. "I think it will lead us to that way we all hope for. I would be sorry it should come short of that we all expect."<sup>182</sup>

The Petition of Right did not have a smooth passage through both Houses of Parliament. On 9 May, the Petition was taken to the Lords who were astounded by the forceful nature of the document. The Earls of Pembroke and Dorset wished to

---

<sup>178</sup> Wandesford stated that Mr Griffith had broken "the order of the House to speak against the order." Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. III, p. 161.

<sup>179</sup> *ibid*, vol. III, p. 156.

<sup>180</sup> Wandesford stated that "At the first delivery of this last message it struck much upon me, but I am since comforted again, in that I rest confident there has been no straining on our side. Two particulars are considerable: first, that it cannot be but there is much misunderstanding; 2ly, to declare that we require more than former laws. While these are presenting to his Majesty, we may go on with our bill." *ibid*, vol. III, p. 237.

<sup>181</sup> *ibid*, vol. III, p. 240. By May 1628, it had become clear that the Commons were not simply requesting that their liberties as stated with Magna Carta were confirmed: "it was a new legislative enactment, giving statutory force to their own interpretation of Magna Carta and the six statutes confirming it." Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 354.



“sweeten the manner” of the Petition before it was presented to the King.<sup>183</sup> This is important as it shows how the Commons now had to either yield to the Lords’ request to soften the Petition or to fight against them.<sup>184</sup> During the afternoon of 20 May, Wandesford proposed that the Commons send a messenger to the Lords to ask for a conference with them “to acquaint them with our resolutions in the particulars of the petition, and how far we yielded.”<sup>185</sup> Throughout the debates upon the Petition of Right, Wandesford appears to be very aware of the importance of the support of the Lords. With the Lords’ backing, the Petition would gain further creditability and their involvement, as traditional strong supporters of the monarchy, would add legitimacy to the Parliament’s requests. On 23 May, the Lords proposed to form a joint committee with the Commons, which would deal with the Petition to the King. This unusual and unprecedented proposition shocked the Commons. Wandesford’s reaction was typical of his desire not to be rushed into important decisions. He declared, “If this motion had been made 6 weeks since, I should have yielded.” However, he argued that the Commons “have been so retarded, and the children ready to the birth, yet no strength to bring forth.” Therefore he suggested that the House should consider the Lords’ offer until the next day.<sup>186</sup>

On 31 May, the Commons had finally conceded to write the subsidy bill but was embroiled in an unnecessary dispute about the wording.<sup>187</sup> With the subsidy bill in motion, the House was now under pressure to gain a satisfactory result with the Petition of Right. Wandesford was aware that the Parliament’s time might be running out and on 3 June he proposed that the House should meet at seven in the morning in order to maximise the time that the Parliament had left. This pre-empted the King’s

---

<sup>182</sup> Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. III, pp. 272 – 273. Another report recorded that Christopher Wandesford also stated “The first question must be whether by petition or no. It will follow more properly afterward to say what shall be put in and what not.” *ibid*, vol. III, p. 296.

<sup>183</sup> Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 371.

<sup>184</sup> The Lords were concerned that some of the wording in the Petition was too harsh. The Earls of Pembroke and Dorset wished to “sweeten the manner” of the Petition. *Lords Debates* pp. 148 – 149 in *ibid*, p. 371.

<sup>185</sup> Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. III, p. 501.

<sup>186</sup> *ibid*, vol. III, p. 586.

<sup>187</sup> The members debated whether Oxford or Cambridge University should come first in the list of those contributing to supply! Wentworth and Wandesford were both affiliated to Cambridge and both spoke in the ensuing debates. Wandesford stated that Cambridge should come before Oxford “For if Oxford had a good cause they would stand upon reason, not numbers.” His argument boiled down to the fact that Oxford had emphasised their being the larger university rather than offering a more impressive reason why they should go first in the list! Sir John Wray offered one solution to Oxford if they were desperate to go first on the list. “If Oxford will needs have the precedency, I humbly move that she may pay double subsidy.” *ibid*, vol. IV, pp. 43, 48.

message of 5 June determining the last day of the current Parliament, and which also asked them not to discuss any new business. Wandesford told the Commons to “recollect our English hearts” and take the Petition of Right to the King without the Lords, otherwise Parliament would end without this issue having been resolved.

for this does concern our liberties.... Let us make our remonstrance for our right. We are his counselors. We are fallen into a dangerous time; some call evil men good, and good men evil, and bitter, sweet.  
[Isa. 5: 20] Justice is now called popularity and faction. Let us show that the things we are about are for his Majesty’s honor and safety.<sup>188</sup>

Here again we should note Wandesford’s distrust of the men that the King surrounded himself with. The Petition of Right was ultimately brought to a successful conclusion for the House of Commons. The King assented to the petition on 7 June, an event that Wandesford witnessed. Wandesford’s earlier proposition to grant supply once their privileges had been settled was now proven to be sincere. He argued “The fullness of our hearts is such with this cheerful and hearty expression of his Majesty, let us put down our thankfulness therefore in the preamble of the subsidy.”<sup>189</sup>

Wandesford was a highly respected member of the House and was frequently called upon to deal with matters of urgency. The recurrence of his involvement in such committees suggests that his previous parliamentary activities had been recognised and appreciated. He was certainly not seen simply as Wentworth’s sidekick and his reliability and hard work was noted. For example, he was nominated to a committee on 11 April that was to discuss a printed book that related some of the recent proceedings in Parliament. The committee was to consider whether the book was fit to be read in the Commons and to send for anyone who could inform them who printed the text.<sup>190</sup> This has strong similarities to the committee Wandesford was appointed to later in the session on 23 June, which was to read a letter that had been

---

<sup>188</sup> *ibid*, vol. IV, pp. 114 – 115.

<sup>189</sup> The writing of the subsidy bill did not run smoothly. The Lords requested alterations in the preface to the bill, particularly where the bill was described as “the Commons grant.” Wandesford urged the Commons not to admit that they would alter the bill, as this would suggest that they would allow further and perhaps more substantial changes to it. Whilst the bill was still being discussed in the Lords, Wandesford saw no point in worrying about the rumours that the Lords wished to see alterations. He urged the House to wait and see if the Lords would really press for changes. “Let us not say ‘If they send it down, [i.e. from the Lords back to the Commons] we will do what is fit’; that admits we will alter it. I know not what alteration may creep upon us by this. Let us not confer or dispute about the bill of subsidy. We can do nothing about it out of the House.” *ibid*, vol. IV, pp. 182. 349.

<sup>190</sup> *ibid*, vol. II, p. 411. The book under consideration was entitled *The Proceeding of the Parliament being this day related to the King by councellors of the Commons House of Parliament* (London, 1628).

put under the door of the Commons. On the same day the committee reported their findings to the Commons. Sir Edward Coke said that the letter was unfit “for any Subject’s Ear to hear.” He had read just one and a half lines of it and “could not endure to read more of it.” Wandesford had the important task of being part of a small group chosen to take the letter to the King and to inform him about the proceedings of the Commons in the matter.<sup>191</sup>

Wandesford’s interest in a wide range of issues is apparent by the numerous committees that he attended during the Parliament of 1628 – 1629. On 24 May, Christopher Wandesford became involved with the committee to inquire into “the two Commissions, of the North and South Parts, for compounding with Recusants.”<sup>192</sup> This is interesting as Wentworth later took control of this commission whilst Lord President of the Council in the North. Wentworth was also nominated to this committee that inquired into the activities of his old enemy Sir John Savile, the director of the recusancy commission in the North. This appointment must have been partly inspired by this old rivalry between the two men and it is possible that Wentworth enjoyed pursuing his Yorkshire neighbour in this way. Wandesford’s nomination to this committee can almost certainly be attributed to his connection to Wentworth.

Wandesford was obviously an eloquent public speaker and addressed the House on a number of occasions in this Parliament.<sup>193</sup> Wandesford’s final speech in

---

<sup>191</sup> The committee was to “view privately a letter now delivered into the House by Mr. Tomlins, sealed up and found under the door, and to report whether fit to be read in the House.” The committee members were able to reassure the king that “upon the reading of one Line and a half at most, they would read no more, but sealed it up, and brought it to the House.” *Commons Journal* pp. 917a, 917b, Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. IV, p. 424.

<sup>192</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 904a, Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. III, p. 593.

<sup>193</sup> For example, he spoke about the case against Sir Reginald Mohun, later Lord Mohun. Sir John Eliot introduced the bill against his local rival because of his dislike of Mohun’s administration of the Stannary Court in Cornwall. He was accused of raising money through the court and also of “holding pleas of life and limb” in the Stannary Court. The charge was discussed in the Commons on 28 May, and Wandesford queried whether Mohun had taken any notice of the charge. Wandesford believed that if Mohun was “such a man as he was reported he was fitter to have a dominion of his own in America than in this kingdom.” On the same day, Wandesford also moved that privilege should be granted to a servant of Sir Guy Palmes, Mr. Boswell, who had been arrested. *ibid*, vol. IV, pp. 10 – 11, Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 375. Wandesford was only voted to the chair once during this Parliament and this was to present the inquiry into Richard Montagu’s behavior. The recurrent problems with Richard Montagu concerned the House again during the Parliament of 1628. The mayor of Windsor was called into Parliament on 13 June to report Montagu’s speeches and “unbecoming actions.” The people of Windsor had been celebrating the grant of the Petition of Right with a bonfire and Mr. Montagu attempted to dampen the atmosphere. The mayor reported that “Montagu, coming by the castle gate and seeing a great bonfire, asked the cause of it. They tell him. He ... kicked at it with his foot.” Wandesford was one of a small group of men who were to examine witnesses of Montagu’s

the 1628 session of Parliament was given when the Commons feared that they were about to be prorogued. On 24 June, the Commons debated the possibility of the Parliament being adjourned rather than prorogued so that they could return for another session without elections. Sir Francis Seymour suggested that the Commons petition the King for an adjournment because if he understood their reasons, he might yield to it. Wandesford obviously thought that their position was not strong enough to present such a request and replied that “We are not fit to petition his Majesty now in this kind.”<sup>194</sup>

We gain some sense of which issues were important to Wandesford when the Commons were discussing which business to examine before the prorogation of Parliament. Wandesford urged the House to “consider of the bill of arms” which would give legal authority to the Lieutenancy.<sup>195</sup> The attack of Buckingham was still important to Wandesford however, as although he had expressed his desire to give priority to the bill of arms, he ultimately supported the renewed attack on the King’s minister.<sup>196</sup> Opening the debate in the grand committee on 5 June, Wandesford argued that a remonstrance against Buckingham to the King was likely to be more effective than an impeachment before the Lords. He admitted that he was “one of those that are full of this general apprehension.” But he felt that the House should “recollect our spirits, and to do that which shall be fit for Englishmen and honest men...” He asked why they should not “do anything till we be righted? If we must not speak of ministers, what must we do?” Wandesford admitted that this was a dangerous time “when bitter are called sweet, and sweet sour, good were ill and ill good.” He felt that the House faced the problems of “puritanism, faction, popularity.”<sup>197</sup>

Illustrating his belief that the King’s ministers should be identified as the cause of poor relations between Parliament and the King, when the remonstrance

---

actions and the following day, he reported the committee’s findings. *Commons Journal* pp. 912b, 913b, Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. IV, pp. 291, 298, 308.

<sup>194</sup> *ibid*, vol. IV, p. 450.

<sup>195</sup> *ibid*, vol. IV, p. 206.

<sup>196</sup> Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* p. 384. Wandesford’s significant participation in the attacks upon Buckingham was noted in an interesting poetical libel written in 1628, which refers to speeches made in the Commons between 3 – 11 June.

“All that long day sat Wentworth at the bar,

Bravely expecting the issue of the war.

Till at the last he saw that the report,

Would keep him loner at the hungry sport.

But lustier Wandesford well the question did frame,

And Valentine put in his Grace’s name.”

Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. VI, pp. 245 – 246.

against Buckingham was reported to the House, Wandesford commented; “the excessive power is the principal cause of these evils.”<sup>198</sup> However, he did act as teller with Sir Francis Seymour for deferring the naming of Buckingham on 11 June, a vote that they lost 145 to 235.<sup>199</sup> Wandesford’s attitude towards the King’s evil counsel should be noted, as this was a recurrent theme in his concerns during this Parliament. Blaming the King’s ministers was a tried and tested method to attack royal policy without crossing over the line into treason. However, Wandesford’s continued pursuit of Buckingham seems to suggest that he was convinced that he was the root of many of the problems of the country.

Wandesford appears as a dynamic force within the Parliament of 1628. He was active in committees and played an important role in the considerations of the Petition of Right. He seems to have acted fairly independently of Wentworth during this Parliament and this may be explained by the fact that Wandesford had now served his apprenticeship within Parliament, and had emerged as a loyal member during 1626 in Wentworth’s absence.

In the recess between the 1628 session and the second session called in January 1629, the dynamic of the relationship between Wandesford and Wentworth in Parliament was altered. Wentworth was raised to the peerage in the summer of 1628, gaining the title Baron Wentworth of Wentworth Woodhouse, Newmarch and Oversley<sup>200</sup> and took a seat within the House of Lords. The alliance that the two men had created throughout the 1620s now changed. Although Wandesford remained a member of the House of Commons, outsiders commented upon the changing fortunes of both Wentworth and Wandesford. Howell reported that they were both “grown great courtiers lately, and come from Westminster Hall to Whitehall.... The Lord Weston tampered with the one, and my Lord Cottington took pains with the other, to bring them about from their violence against the prerogative.”<sup>201</sup> This comment is invaluable as it shows that contemporary figures linked Wentworth and Wandesford without the benefit of hindsight. It is also intriguing that Howell labelled Wandesford

---

<sup>197</sup> *ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 268.

<sup>198</sup> *ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 268.

<sup>199</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 911b, Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. IV, p. 237.

<sup>200</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 68.

<sup>201</sup> James Howell to the Countess of Sunderland, 5 August 1629, in Jacobs, J. (ed). *Epistolae Howellianae. The Familiar Letters of James Howell* (London, 1892), vol. II, p. 269. The link between Wandesford and Cottington is intriguing as it was later thought that Cottington had attempted to procure the ambassadorship to Spain for Wandesford, as we will see in Chapter 3.

as a courtier, even though he had not actually abandoned his parliamentary role. This seems to suggest that he and Wentworth were so closely linked to each other that it was thought that once Wentworth was raised to the peerage, Wandesford would be associating with courtiers and therefore would surely soon abandon his principles as Wentworth had done.

What were the implications for Wandesford in Parliament now that Wentworth had been promoted to the Upper House for the second session of Parliament? Wandesford remained quite a regular speaker but was perhaps less attracted to the views of more radical members of Parliament. Wandesford had been a very regular committee member throughout the majority of his parliamentary career, but this seemed to be slowing down. The session lasted from January to March 1629, yet Wandesford was only involved with four committees. Two of these committees were to consider private bills.<sup>202</sup> Wandesford attended a committee on 23 January appointed to consider the bill to prevent bribery, enabling people to procure judicial places.<sup>203</sup> This harps back to the criticisms of Buckingham in 1626.

Although Wandesford's committee attendance was limited in this session, he did make some key speeches. He was incensed by the pardon granted to Montagu's friend John Cosin, a prebendary of Durham. Reports were rife that Cosin believed that the King should not be the head of the Church, and therefore his authority to excommunicate citizens should be questioned. The Commons debated whether Cosin had committed treason. Mr. Attorney, who had heard Cosin's speech, had not questioned Cosin further as he thought that this case was not a great issue. Wandesford declared on 6 February 1629 that

Neyther Mr. Cosens nor Mr. Atturney [were] fitt to sleepe.... this greves us, when his Majesties grace goes swiftly to these malignant persons and slowly towards his best subjects: who have as good an interest.<sup>204</sup>

It is interesting that given his new association with the Court, Wandesford still acted against Arminianism.

Wandesford made an influential speech on 19 February in which he rejected the proposal to declare the customs farmers as delinquents for seizing the goods of

---

<sup>202</sup> The first committee was concerned with Edmond Hammond, on 12 February, 1629 and the second, nominated on 20 February was to enable "the better.... Performance of the last Will and Testament of Tho[mas] Sutton.... Concerning the Manors of Littlebury and Hadstocke" in Essex. *Commons Journal* pp. 929a, 931b.

<sup>203</sup> *ibid.*, p. 922a.

John Rolle. He thought that it was important to take the issue straight to the King “by way of a Remonstrance”<sup>205</sup> in order to gain possession of the goods before legalising tonnage and poundage. He felt this would be the safest approach “because the Kings interest [was] much in this.”<sup>206</sup>

Wandesford’s preference for moderation is apparent throughout the parliaments of the 1620s. He often attempted to lessen disruption to the House by referring contentious matters to a committee where the issue could be battled out. On 2 March, Wandesford made an effort to lessen disruption by moving the adjournment until the House was in a fit condition to hear the defenders of Lord Treasurer Weston.<sup>207</sup> This might also suggest that there was indeed something in James Howell’s comment that there was an alliance formed between Wentworth and Wandesford and the courtiers Lords Weston and Cottington. Wandesford commented upon the unfair system of attacking an important person, yet members were attacked if speaking in their defence. Here we see Wandesford’s sense of men being innocent until proved guilty, although this does not appear to have been his opinion towards the Duke of Buckingham. It appears that in this instance, Wandesford was just attempting to find ways around the attempted attack on Lord Weston. He asked “If it be free for any man here to lay aspersions upon any great person, I know not why it should not be as lawful to speak anything freely in excuse of him until that which he is charged with be proved against him.”<sup>208</sup> Wandesford admitted that the charges against Weston were unlikely to be proven at that time and therefore felt that there was no alternative but to adjourn the Parliament. This again seems to suggest that Wandesford was attempting to block the charges against his new ‘patron.’

## Conclusion

The Parliament of 1628 – 1629 was the last English Parliament that Christopher Wandesford was to sit in before in death in 1640. However, he used his

---

<sup>204</sup> Notestein, W. & Relf, F.H. (eds). *Commons Debates for 1629* (Minneapolis, 1921), p. 176.

<sup>205</sup> *ibid*, p. 85.

<sup>206</sup> It was also reported that Wandesford “Desires that though we shal distinguishe this busines from the consideracion of our priviledges, yet he wisheth we should forbear and decline att this tyme to consider of the delinquency of these men, and would have us first to take a course to establishe the merchants in possession of their goods.” *ibid*, pp. 156, 222.

<sup>207</sup> Wandesford said “That since we have named the Lord Treasurer would not have us out the question of Mr. Hollis and the rest, but if it had bene att first putt in generall he should not have dissented.” *ibid*, p. 172.

<sup>208</sup> *ibid*, p. 266.

experiences of English Parliaments in the 1620s in Ireland, where he sat in the parliaments of 1634 and 1640. Wentworth initiated Wandesford's involvement in Parliament but as we have seen, this did not mean that Wandesford was brought in to Parliament in order to serve his interests and was thus tied to Wentworth.

Wandesford's pursuit of the Duke of Buckingham reveals much about his attitude towards the influence of servants of the Crown, which might not be for the best interests of the monarch. It is therefore interesting that by 1633, Wandesford had become a minister of the Crown in Ireland and by the demise of Wentworth's regime was identified as part of a self-seeking cohort of men, who bolstered their own positions at the Crown's expense. Wandesford appears to have been a strong supporter of parliamentary privilege and therefore it is even more intriguing although the importance of Wentworth's 'change of sides' has been recognised in the historiography, Wandesford's more radical change in stance has been neglected.



### **Chapter 3: Thomas Wentworth, the Council of the North and his men-of-business in England, 1629 - 1641.**

The period 1629 to 1633 marks a transitional time in this study of Thomas Wentworth and his cabal. Wentworth has been accused of ‘changing sides’ in the late 1620s, contemporaries later describing him as an ‘apostate.’ Rather than seeing his ‘change of sides’ as a sudden decision however, we should see his parliamentary apprenticeship as a means to achieve courtly prominence. In this interpretation, Wentworth does not appear to have betrayed his personal political beliefs. The rapid chain of events that saw the promotion of Wentworth to his barony in the summer of 1628, quickly followed by the title of Viscount in December 1628, enabled his admission to the House of Lords where he sat during the Parliament of 1629.<sup>1</sup> Wentworth was duly publicly promoted to his post as Lord President of the Council of the North, making his first speech as President on 30 December 1628 in the same month as the removal of Lord Scrope.<sup>2</sup> Even after Wentworth’s promotion to the Lord Deputyship of Ireland, he unusually was permitted to retain the Presidency of the North<sup>3</sup> and ruled the North by proxy, through Sir Edward Osborne, his Vice-President in the Council of the North. This chapter will identify the members of Wentworth’s cabal who gained roles within his administration of the Council of the North. From Wentworth’s government in the North, Radcliffe would emerge as an integral part of the Irish government, whilst Edward Osborne became his representative in England after 1633 as Vice President of the Council of the North. Christopher Wandesford played a more minor role in this transitional period, and did not hold a particular office within the Council of the North. Other minor but indispensable figures will also be examined; Wentworth’s steward Richard Marris who was charged with looking after his estates, and William Raylton, his agent in London. Although these were lesser figures in Wentworth’s cabal, their role in supporting Wentworth’s personal

---

<sup>1</sup> Wedgwood, C.V. *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford: A Revaluation* (London, 1961), pp. 70, 72.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* pp. 72 – 73, Reid, R.R. *The King’s Council in the North* (London, 1921), p. 403.

<sup>3</sup> It was usual to relinquish such an office when taking up another more prominent post and it was rumoured that the Earl of Newcastle would replace Wentworth. Pogson, F. ‘Wentworth as President of the Council of the North, 1628 – 41,’ in J.C. Appleby & P. Dalton, *Government, Religion and Society in Northern England 1000 – 1700* (Stroud, 1997), p. 192. If Wentworth accepted the Lord Deputyship of Ireland, he would “have a lease of the Alum mynes conferd on you for lyfe. And the places of Lieutenant, and President of the North.” Sir Edward Stanhope to Wentworth, October 1631, Str. P. 21 / 79, Zagorin, P. ‘Communication: Sir Edward Stanhope’s Advice to Thomas Wentworth, Viscount Wentworth, Concerning the Deputyship of Ireland: An unpublished letter of 1631,’ *Historical Journal* 7, no. 2 (1964), pp. 298 – 320.

and public businesses became more essential once Wentworth became Lord Deputy of Ireland. He was reliant upon them to carry out financial transactions, keep a check upon Wentworth's interests and communicate information to him in Ireland. The role of these figures will be dealt with in turn, beginning with an examination of the contribution of George Radcliffe, whom Wentworth was most keen to appoint.

### **The development of George Radcliffe's political and legal career**

Radcliffe was surprised by Wentworth's sudden rise to prominence. In a letter to his wife dated 1 December 1628, he explained that he was already referring to Wentworth as Viscount Wentworth "for so he will be before Munday at night." He also revealed that it was commonly known that Wentworth was soon to become Lord President of the Council of the North even though this had not yet been officially announced. The speed with which Wentworth was assuming his new courtly career was clearly a shock to Radcliffe who quipped "God knowes what he may be by Sunday or Munday next."<sup>4</sup>

Even in the midst of his own transition to a courtly career, Wentworth was concerned to secure a prominent and key role in the Council of the North for George Radcliffe. Although Wentworth's succession to the Presidency had not been publicly announced, Radcliffe informed his wife that Wentworth had offered him the position of King's Attorney in the North. He admitted that he was "very likely to have it," but revealed to his wife that he did have some reservations about accepting the post. Indeed, he felt that Wentworth was "more eager of my beinge there than I myselfe am."<sup>5</sup>

Wandesford helped Wentworth to secure selected personnel for his administration in the North and approached important men at Court on Wentworth's behalf. Wandesford wrote to Wentworth explaining that he had spoken to Lord Treasurer Weston about the position of the King's Attorney in the North. Despite the fact that the Treasurer wanted to obtain the position for Sir John Finch, Wandesford requested on Wentworth's behalf to "reserue Finches for Radcliff w[hi]ch I knowe yurr L[or]d would take very kindly from him..." Wandesford informed his friend that if Radcliffe's abilities were "as well knowne to his l[ordshi]p [Weston] as they weare

---

<sup>4</sup> Radcliffe to his wife, 1 December 1628. Whitaker, T.D. *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), p. 172.

<sup>5</sup> Radcliffe to his wife, 1 December 1628. *ibid*, p. 173.

to us he would thinke him very woorthy of itt.” In actual fact the Treasurer had initially opted to support Sir John Bankes for the position but felt that “the Step was to easye” for his favourite, who was later to become the Attorney General in 1634. Wandesford reported that Weston was thus “very willing to make Geordge of the Kings Councell if thess things thus happen” and was confident that this post would be left to Wentworth’s disposition.<sup>6</sup> Wentworth was able to exploit his newfound influence with the King and Court to secure the King’s Attorneyship for his trusted friend.

As Radcliffe was a relatively minor legal figure during the 1620s, why should Wentworth have entrusted the position of King’s Attorney in the North to him? Although Radcliffe had limited political experience, Wentworth placed his trust in his close friendship with Radcliffe, which had developed throughout the 1620s.<sup>7</sup> Wentworth had also participated in Radcliffe’s fledgling parliamentary career in 1628 – 9 and this combination of friendship and experiences enabled mutual trust and respect for each other to develop. Knowing the value Wentworth placed upon kinship, it is not surprising that we find that Radcliffe and Wentworth were also related to each other. Radcliffe married Wentworth’s cousin Anne Trappes in 1621.<sup>8</sup> Another connection with Wentworth was through Charles Greenwood. Radcliffe had been tutored by his cousin Greenwood at University College, Oxford.<sup>9</sup> Greenwood also had a long-standing friendship with Wentworth, having been chosen to accompany him on his tour around France in 1611.<sup>10</sup> It was Greenwood who recommended that Radcliffe

---

<sup>6</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, Str. P. 16 / 258. This letter is undated although is most likely to have been written in late November or early December 1628.

<sup>7</sup> Tracing Radcliffe’s early career and professional relationship with Wentworth is difficult, due to the limited sources available. Whitaker’s *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe* presents a large amount of his correspondence. There are also five early Radcliffe letters in the Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Leeds (DD175). Unfortunately, as Whitaker has indicated, Radcliffe’s letters from July 1617 to June 1624 are missing. This is particularly disappointing as at this time Radcliffe’s friendship with Wentworth was forged, his career developed significantly and he became “an eminent practising lawyer.” Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 123.

<sup>8</sup> Wentworth’s mother Anne had a sister Mary, who married Sir Francis Trapps. Their daughter Anne married George Radcliffe in 1621. Cooper, J.P. (ed). *Wentworth Papers 1597 – 1628* (London, 1973). Table II, p. x. Whitaker wrote that this connection “laid the foundation of an intimacy equally useful and honorable to both parties, which was only dissolved by the death of Strafford.” Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 123.

<sup>9</sup> Radcliffe’s father Nicholas had a sister, Cecilia, who was Greenwood’s mother. *ibid*, p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Wedgwood found Greenwood to be a key link in the friendship between Wentworth and Radcliffe. She identifies Radcliffe as another one of Greenwood’s pupils. Charles Greenwood and George Radcliffe were also later participants in the running of Wentworth’s estates in the 1620s, meeting with Richard Marris and Peter Man three times a year to discuss how to improve the Wentworth estates. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* pp. 24, 29, 43.

should pursue a career in law in order to make him “serviceable to Sir George Savile, my godfather.”<sup>11</sup> This legal work first brought him into contact with Wentworth as Wentworth was also connected to the Savile family as his sister Anne married Sir George Savile. After the death of her husband in 1614, Anne and her children “were leaft without any meanes att all,” and Wentworth helped his sister to settle the estate of her late husband in a commission at Rotherham in December 1618. As he had participated in these proceedings, Radcliffe later noted that it was here that “occasioned my beinge knowne to Sir Thomas Wentworth.” Radcliffe had returned to Wentworth Woodhouse with the Wentworth family after the commission was dispatched, where his friendship with Wentworth developed and there “grew a most intimate familiarity betwixt us, dayly increasing and never interrupted as long as wee lived.”<sup>12</sup> After this initial meeting, Radcliffe advised Lady Savile and Thomas Wentworth “in all their law businesse and indeed in all other affaires.”<sup>13</sup> This early

---

<sup>11</sup> Sir George Savile of Thornhill, Yorkshire, was a patron of the Radcliffe family and George Radcliffe’s godfather. ‘Extracts from Sir George Radcliffe’s draughts for his life of Strafford,’ Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 322, Str. P. 34 / unnumbered. Radcliffe was well respected for his education and legal expertise within Wentworth’s administration. He attended school in Oldham from 1607 and entered University College, Oxford in 1609. He was unsure whether to complete his degree before attending to his legal training and he communicated with his mother asking her advice, in a series of letters. On 18 December 1610, he wrote to ask his mother what she thought about his continuing at Oxford to obtain his BA. “...if I do, I intend to stay one year longer before I go to Inns of Court.... for if I proceed not Bacchelor, I will, as my tutor advised me, enter my name in Gray’s Inn.” It may have been due to financial reasons that he felt the need to abandon his degree and he reassured his mother in a letter of 13 February 1611 that “The Degree of Bacchelor is a thing not necessary, and therefore (according to the counsel of my friends) I am resolved to lette that passe...” intending to attend Gray’s Inn to which he had been admitted at the beginning of February. However, he did remain at Oxford and was awarded his degree on 25 May 1612. It appears that the University may have offered some kind of concession to Radcliffe and he told his mother that in the business of his degree, he would “ever to acknowledge our Vice-Chancellour’s kindnesse.” Radcliffe now turned his attention to his legal training. Radcliffe was forced to take accommodation outside Gray’s Inn as more entrants had been admitted than there was accommodation for. Radcliffe found lodgings in Holborn but he found this “both chargeable and inconvenient.” He asked his mother for £20, which combined with what friends could lend him, would help him to purchase a “faire chamber.” Radcliffe’s legal training was well respected and six years later, he was called to the bar. Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 11, 55, 65, 67, 76 – 77, 83, Foster, J. *The Register of Admissions to Gray’s Inn, 1521 – 1889* (London, 1889), p. 1227, Prest, W.R. *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts 1590 – 1640* (London, 1972), p. 13, Firth, C.H. ‘Sir George Radcliffe,’ *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 123. Throughout his time at Gray’s Inn, Radcliffe was already preparing legal documents for family members. On 23 October 1613, he informed his mother that he would “send downe.... a draught of a will, and a forme of a bonde for the payment of my Sister: if she be contente, uppon advise, to accepte that money (agreed uppon) at such tymes as you have appointed; and release all other claimes.” In another letter dated 18 December 1613, he referred to his work for Sir George (presumably Savile) “against the Assises in Lent, if he desire it, to doe unto him there all the honour and service I may: apointed, in such habits as may besee me a member of the Socyety, wherein I live. w[i]th a man or two to weare his liverye.” Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Papers of George Radcliffe, DD 175 / 2 and 3.

<sup>12</sup> Str. P. 34 / unnumbered, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 322.

<sup>13</sup> Radcliffe recollected that there were “Some other little suits Sir Thomas Wentworth had of his owne wherein I doe not remember any thinges very remarkeable and the passages of them doe appeare in the

connection was further reinforced after the death of Wentworth's first wife, Margaret who died in August 1622 when both Radcliffe and Wandesford helped him through his grief.<sup>14</sup>

Radcliffe was a recognised associate of Wentworth throughout the 1620s, although his activities within the parliamentary arena were limited, unlike Christopher Wandesford. George Radcliffe's letters to his wife reveal much about his developing legal career, and later about his parliamentary career and relationship with Wentworth.<sup>15</sup> Radcliffe was mainly concerned with the development of his legal career in the 1620s, but he also accepted the responsibility of looking after the affairs of Wentworth's estate in 1626.<sup>16</sup> Despite the fact that Radcliffe was involved with Wentworth's activities, he still had his own legal work to pursue. George Radcliffe was by this stage a lawyer attending to the Northern Circuit and therefore needed to be at Haughton by 1 March "or else I shall fall short of assizes."<sup>17</sup>

Wentworth engineered Radcliffe's first venture into Parliament. This may have been due to the fact that Radcliffe had expressed interest in the proceedings of Parliament throughout the 1620s,<sup>18</sup> but Wentworth could also potentially use

---

writings left in his study concerning them." Clearly Radcliffe was quickly entrusted with Wentworth's legal affairs. However Radcliffe had refused to take any part in the settlement of Sir George Savile's estate as he could never offer council "against him or his interest" remembering the patronage the Savile family had shown him. Str. P. 34 / unnumbered, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 323.

<sup>14</sup> Radcliffe also proved to be a tower of strength to Wentworth after the death of his second wife on 5 October 1631. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* pp. 43, 101. John Holles, the Earl of Clare, wrote that Radcliffe had been an enormous support to Wentworth after the tragic loss of his second wife and Clare's daughter, Arabella Holles. John Holles to his son Lord Haughton, 1 November 1631, Seddon, P.A. (ed). *Letters of John Holles 1587 – 1637* (3 vols, Nottingham, 1983), vol. III, p. 435.

<sup>15</sup> Writing from Gray's Inn on 10 November 1626, he explained to his wife that he would need more money as he had "laid downe this tearme more for other men than myself; playinge the solicitor and factor for them." Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 134. Radcliffe was married twice and although Whitaker correctly identified his two wives, the daughter of John Finch, who later became Baron Finch of Fordwich and Keeper of the Great Seal, and Anne, the daughter of Francis Trappes of Knaresborough in Yorkshire, he placed them in the wrong order. Radcliffe's first wife was actually Anne Trappes who appeared on Wentworth's household list for 1622 – 23. 'Ane Radcliffe' is eleventh on the list and George Radcliffe is sixth. Str. P. 28 / unnumbered. In February 1635, Sir John Finch wrote to Wentworth and asked him to send his regards to 'sonne' George. 23 February 1635, Str. P. 14 / 303.

<sup>16</sup> On 27 April 1627, Radcliffe asked his wife to send him a sheet of paper which "I leaft behinde me, where are written the names of diverse mannors and townes, where Sir Thos. hath landes. I pray you looke for it, and send it me as soone as you canne." Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 136 - 137.

<sup>17</sup> Radcliffe informed his wife on 20 February 1625 that he would soon be leaving Gray's Inn to return home to his family and had resolved not to wait for Wentworth as his "goinge from hence is so very incertaine..." *ibid*, p. 126.

<sup>18</sup> Radcliffe wrote to his wife on 14 June 1624 explaining that the Parliament had finished and "many good lawes were made...." His knowledge of parliamentary activity appears to have been gained

Radcliffe to support his interests. Despite Radcliffe's Yorkshire roots, he sat for Callington in Cornwall and it is likely that he obtained this seat through Wentworth's influence.<sup>19</sup> During the elections for the 1628 Parliament, William Coryton who held lands close to the borough placed the Callington seat at Wentworth's disposal.<sup>20</sup> The seat was originally to be held by Sir William Constable, but when he chose to sit for Scarborough,<sup>21</sup> it seems probable that William Coryton allowed Wentworth to replace him with another one of his nominees, Radcliffe. Identifying Radcliffe as a member of Parliament has eluded historians, as he does not appear in the list of speakers in the 1628 Commons Debates. However his correspondence from London during 1628 – 1629 proves that he was sitting in Parliament.<sup>22</sup>

We should not assume that Radcliffe was in Parliament as a tool for Wentworth's benefit. He was involved in a significant number of committees that were notably separate from the concerns of his friend. However, determining precisely which committees he sat on is complicated by the fact that a namesake, John Radcliffe, appears in the *Commons Journal*. John Radcliffe was a brewer from Chester. The clerk of the Commons rarely confused knights and esquires in the Journal, but as George and John Radcliffe were not particularly prominent members, they are both identified as Mr Radcliffe. It is possible that the clerk of the Commons did not even realise that there were two men of the same surname in the Commons. In order to distinguish between the two men, we need to identify which Radcliffe sat on

---

through his friendship with Wentworth, with whom he frequently dined. Radcliffe to his wife, 14 June 1624, *ibid*, p. 124.

<sup>19</sup> Until recently, the History of Parliament had not included George Radcliffe as a Member of the 1628 Parliament and it was assumed that the seat for the Cornish borough of Callington, left vacant by Sir William Constable who was elected for Scarborough, was taken by a 'Mr. Marsh,' who was appointed to a committee on 17 May. The Yale Centre for Parliamentary History overlooked the vacancy at Callington and dismissed the mention of 'Mr. Marsh' as a clerical error.

<sup>20</sup> As we saw in Chapter 2, Wandesford had already shown awareness of the Wentworth / Coryton connection when he asked Wentworth to see if he could gain a place for him through Coryton or Sir Francis Seymour in 1628 if he failed to gain his seat in Richmond, Yorkshire. He asked Wentworth to "laye wayte with Corryton, Francis Semer and thoss tribunitiall orators of the west [i.e. Cornwall] for a place for your servant, if you desire me to kepe your syde warme by the bar agayne." Wandesford to Wentworth, 26 November 1627, Str. P. 20 / 262, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 278.

<sup>21</sup> Firth, C.H. 'Sir William Constable,' *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 46.

<sup>22</sup> Radcliffe explained to his wife that he was so dedicated to his time-consuming parliamentary work, that his legal practice had been overshadowed. On 25 May 1628 he wrote: "Since I was of the Parliament I have not bene absente fro' Westminster forenoone nor afternoone." On 24 May 1628, Radcliffe again wrote to his wife telling her that "the Parliament was almost hopeless for any good succes last week; but now it begins to piece again, and I p'suade myself we shall have a good conclusion." In an earlier letter to his wife, sent from Gray's Inn on 18 May 1628, Radcliffe wrote, "We are now agreeinge or breakinge with the Lords about our petition [the Petition of Right] and shall see this day what we may hope for from them; and then to the Kinge shall we address ourselves, and hope for a gracious answe." Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 159, 160, 161.

each committee by discerning their local interests and connections with the issue that the committee was dealing with.<sup>23</sup> This is not a very exact science but we can afford to make an educated guess, having some knowledge about George Radcliffe's career, associates and background.

Committees that met to discuss matters of legal importance can fairly confidently be attributed to George Radcliffe. For example, the committee meeting on 23 January 1629 to deal with an act "against begging of Forfeitures before Attainder." was likely to have included George Radcliffe since he was a qualified barrister and John Radcliffe was not.<sup>24</sup> It also seems likely that it was George Radcliffe who was involved in the committee employed to search the Exchequer for a precedent on 14 February.<sup>25</sup> George was also more likely to have been involved in the committee for the drafting of the preamble of the subsidy bill on 7 June 1628 due to his legal expertise. As Wentworth also sat on this committee, we might suggest that his influence facilitated Radcliffe's nomination.<sup>26</sup>

Committees in which George Radcliffe had a local interest can also tentatively be attributed to him rather than John Radcliffe. Although George Radcliffe represented a Cornish constituency in 1628, he lived in Yorkshire and this tie would have influenced his opinions.<sup>27</sup> The Yorkshire connection probably explains

---

<sup>23</sup> I would like to thank Simon Healy from the *History of Parliament* for useful discussions concerning the Radcliffe problem.

<sup>24</sup> Lawyers were often chosen to chair committees, as their legal knowledge was invaluable in the drafting of bills. Radcliffe was even singled out of the list of committee members "to take special Care of this Bill." *Journal of the House of Commons of England* vol. I, pp. 921b, 922a.

<sup>25</sup> The committee was to examine an answer from the Lord Treasurer, Chancellor and Barons of the Exchequer which was about the "Injunctions, and other Proceedings in the Exchequer, concerning the Merchants Goods, detained for not Payment of certain Duties demanded by the Customers." The committee was to search for precedents in the Exchequer and in other similar cases. Radcliffe's legal expertise would have been invaluable to such a committee. *ibid*, p. 930a.

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*, p. 910a.

<sup>27</sup> For example, the Estofte bill, discussed on 19 February was a bill connected to Yorkshire lands and therefore is likely to have been dealt with by George. The committee was to examine an act for the reversal of a decree against John Estofte "concerning, and for the Assurance of, certain Manors, Lands, and Tenements.... unto the said Jo. Estofte, and his Heirs for ever." The committee was also open to Knights and burgesses of York, Yorkshire and Lincolnshire so George Radcliffe certainly appears to have had more connection with this bill than John Radcliffe. In another example concerning the dispute over the Muscovy Company patent, led by the Hull member of parliament John Lister, a Radcliffe appears in the committee listing. John Radcliffe's constituency of Chester had no interest in whaling and therefore it is extremely unlikely that he was nominated to this committee. We can therefore assume that it was George Radcliffe who was the chairman of this committee, especially with his legal knowledge in formulation of bills. On 25 June, a report was made from the committee dealing with the Muscovia Company. Although the Journal does not state who made the report, it was likely to have been George Radcliffe as he was chairman of this committee. It was resolved that the company was causing a grievance by barring Englishmen from fishing in Greenland and George Radcliffe was on the smaller committee to draw up a petition against them. *ibid*, pp. 919a, 931a.

Radcliffe's involvement with Levitt's patent for tolls on Doncaster bridges. 'Mr Ratcliffe' was noted as a specific extra to this committee, presumably because he was representing a Cornish borough in Parliament, despite the fact that he was from Yorkshire.<sup>28</sup>

A third type of committee where we can attribute membership to George rather than John Radcliffe are those where he had a connection to other committee members or the person being discussed. For example, the committee concerned with the petition by Mr. Hilton against Sir John Savile on 16 February was almost certainly attended by George Radcliffe due to his relationship with Wentworth who was Savile's long-standing rival. The committee, which also included Wandesford, was to consider the petition and "the Commission, and Instructions, for compounding with Recusants."<sup>29</sup> Upon a number of occasions, George Radcliffe is found on committees with other men who can be identified as Wentworth's supporters. For example, although we might suggest that John Radcliffe was the member of Parliament linked to the bill concerning the Bromfield and Yale copyholders as this lordship was adjacent to Chester, Wandesford and Mainwaring also sat on this committee appointed on 13 June 1628,<sup>30</sup> and they had little connection with the area. Therefore it is conceivable, even in this case, that it may have been George Radcliffe who served on the relevant committee along with his friend Wandesford and later associate Philip Mainwaring.<sup>31</sup> The difficulty of discerning which connection is more convincing demonstrates how difficult it can be to determine which member sat for which committee and that we cannot be absolutely certain that such interpretations are correct.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Levitt had a toll on two bridges in Doncaster granted to himself and his heirs. The patent was found to be a grievance by the committee "both in the Creation, and Execution." It was decided that the knights and burgesses of Yorkshire should draw up a petition to the King. *ibid*, p. 916a.

<sup>29</sup> *ibid*, p. 930b. George Radcliffe also seems the likely candidate for a speech made by one Radcliffe regarding Sir Thomas Mounson's revival of Lepton's patent for the making of bills before the Council in the North. Christopher Wandesford also commented upon this patent on 30 May 1628, and this link could imply that George Radcliffe was also involved in this issue. Keeler, M.F, Cole, M.J. & Bidwell, W.B. *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* (6 vols, New Haven, 1983), vol. IV, p. 31.

<sup>30</sup> *Commons Journal* p. 913a, Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. IV, pp. 291 – 292.

<sup>31</sup> Wandesford had also made an earlier speech concerning this act on 19 April 1628. Sir Dudley Digges announced that he was not willing to consent to an act that confirmed anything taken from the Crown, and disliked the taking of tenures from the Crown. Wandesford said that he would "rather pass the bill than adjourn the debate." He also proposed an alternative option, that of letting "this bill sleep, and then to put in a new." *ibid*, vol. II, p. 570.

<sup>32</sup> Other committee memberships such as those concerning the clerk of the market on 27 May, 1628, the preservation of timber on 30 May, 1628, and London metage and portage on 25 June, are unlikely to ever satisfactorily be assigned to either Radcliffe, although the metage and portage bill could perhaps be assigned to George because it concerned the Newcastle coal trade. Also George Radcliffe's



The committees attributed to Radcliffe demonstrate that Yorkshire issues were more important to him than those issues that were specifically related to his Cornish constituency. For example, Mr Hilton's petition against Sir John Savile specifically referred to the recusancy issue that was especially pertinent in the North, and Mounson's proposal to revive Lepton's patent for the making of bills before the Council in the North, both reveal Yorkshire concerns. Radcliffe's committee attendance also reveals an intense interest in the application of law and his skill was recognised. Despite being a new member of Parliament yet to make his name, he was in a number of committees concerned with legal issues. Although his English parliamentary career was fairly limited, it is clear that due to his inclusion in committees requiring a person with legal knowledge, he was a useful and respected addition to the House. In Radcliffe's parliamentary activities, we also see some association with members of Wentworth's later cabal, although this should not be over-emphasised as we might be grouping them together mainly with the benefit of hindsight. Despite Radcliffe's recent imprisonment for his refusal to pay the Forced Loan, we do not find specific concerns against the Crown expressed in his committee membership. Although the records are fairly limited, Radcliffe did not appear to be taking an oppositional standpoint against the Crown. His membership to specific committees reveals a wide-ranging interest in various aspects of parliamentary work. Perhaps as this was his first foray into Parliament, Radcliffe engaged fully in committee work in order to gain as much as possible from the experience. Radcliffe's experiences within the Parliament of 1628 served to strengthen his friendship with Wentworth and the observations he made in the House of Commons were to be a useful reference point when he later dealt with the Irish Houses of Parliament, as we will see in Chapters 6 and 8.

Radcliffe should be scrutinised to see if he mirrored Wentworth's 'change of sides.' However, as he only became a member of Parliament in 1628, it is difficult to develop a clear interpretation of Radcliffe's political motivations before Wentworth's acceptance of a courtly position in 1629. Despite being so close to Wentworth, Radcliffe was not aware that his fortunes were about to shift dramatically to the service of the King. He continued to draft important legal documents and explained to

---

fellow-Yorkshireman William Mallory was especially concerned with this bill. *Commons Journal* p. 905b, 909a, 919a. Notestein, W. & Relf, F.H. (eds). *Commons Debates for 1629* (Minneapolis, 1921), p. 202, *Commons Journal* p. 929b.

his wife that he had been “busy about a patent or 2 to be made ready for the Kinge to signe for a friend of myne.”<sup>33</sup> These patents were quite probably for Wentworth’s peerage and promotion to President of the Council of the North. Radcliffe inquired into the possibility of becoming Recorder for Doncaster after learning that Sir John Jackson had recently died and was also aware of a vacancy at Pontefract that he wished to pursue as a secondary option. He wrote to his uncle, Henry Leadbetter, to ask for his help in procuring such a position.<sup>34</sup> Although his enquiries came to nothing, Radcliffe was not to need such a minor country post. He replaced Sir William Dalton as King’s Attorney in December 1628 and succeeded him as the legal member of the Council of the North.<sup>35</sup>

One of the first indications of George Radcliffe’s appointment as the King’s Attorney was in a short letter from James Howell to Thomas Wentworth dated 5 May 1629. Howell was the secretary to Lord Scrope, Wentworth’s predecessor as President of the Council of the North.<sup>36</sup> Wentworth had granted Howell “the disposing of the next Attorney’s place that falls void in York,” which Howell later told his father was worth £300.<sup>37</sup> In May 1629, Howell sent Wentworth his official permission to select Radcliffe as King’s Attorney in the North, which he professed gave him much satisfaction.<sup>38</sup> Why might Wentworth have made such a generous grant to Howell? Howell later wrote to the Countess of Sunderland that Wentworth had explained to him that the grant “had no relation to my Lord [Scrope] at all; but it was merely done out of a particular respect to me.”<sup>39</sup> However, Wentworth’s ‘gift’ that Howell had

---

<sup>33</sup> Radcliffe to his wife, 12 November 1628, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 168 – 169.

<sup>34</sup> Radcliffe informed his uncle that he thought the Recordership of Doncaster “is a place worth the having, if it might be procured without too much troubling of my friendes.” He asked his uncle “if you have the meanes with any conveniency, to labor with your friends to put of the election until the ende of the terme...” The Recordership of Pontefract also appealed to Radcliffe “wherein your friends may stande me in sted.” Radcliffe promised that he “would neglect neither, hoping that if the one slip, the other may hold; but Doncaster is better.” Radcliffe to Henry Leadbetter, 28 October 1628, *ibid*, pp. 167 – 168.

<sup>35</sup> Reid, *King’s Council* p. 408.

<sup>36</sup> Howell was popular in Yorkshire and was elected as the parliamentary representative for Richmond in the Parliament of 1628 / 9 against Christopher Wandesford. Howell had obtained this seat through the influence of Lord Scrope to whom he was private secretary until Scrope’s death in 1630. Jacobs, J. (ed). *Epistolae Ho-Eliauae. The Familiar Letters of James Howell* (London, 1892) vol. I, p. 37. Sidney Lee, ‘James Howell,’ *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 110.

<sup>37</sup> Howell to his father, 3 December 1630, Jacobs, *Epistolae Ho-Eliauae* vol. II, p. 282.

<sup>38</sup> Howell to Wentworth, 5 May 1629, Str. P. 22 / 75. Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford’s Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols, London, 1739), vol. I, p. 50.

<sup>39</sup> Howell to the Countess of Sunderland, 4 June 1635, Jacobs, *Epistolae Ho-Eliauae* vol. II, p. 320.

received when he first went to pay his respects to him,<sup>40</sup> was part of Wentworth's plan to install Radcliffe into that post. Wentworth obviously believed that he could influence Howell to sell his reversionary patent to the candidate he wanted, and this was indeed the case. Howell wrote to Lady Scrope on 1 July 1629 explaining that he had hoped to sell the patent for £300. However, he was "forc'd to go away contented with 100 Pieces."<sup>41</sup>

Radcliffe's role within the Council of the North may not have been limited to the legal arena<sup>42</sup> and probably encompassed a range of administrative activities.<sup>43</sup> Wentworth knew that he could trust Radcliffe explicitly and therefore perhaps used him on occasion as a private secretary for confidential matters. However, Radcliffe's official capacity was in the legal sector and it was in this capacity that Wentworth addressed him in his first speech as President of the Council of the North at York on 30 December 1628. Wentworth outlined his expectations of Radcliffe in his capacity of King's Attorney and gave instructions directly to him.<sup>44</sup> He asked his "eye of the Court" to "look abrode upon the pressure of the grievances of the subject, to bring

---

<sup>40</sup> Howell to his father, 3 December 1630, *ibid*, vol. II, p. 282.

<sup>41</sup> Howell stated that Radcliffe had given the money to him in his chamber at Gray's Inn "and so to part with the legal Instrument I had, which I did rather than contest." *ibid*, vol. II, p. 275. See also Whitaker, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 163 – 4, 167 – 74, Reid, *King's Council* pp. 410, 490, 498, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 50, Str. P. 22 / 75.

<sup>42</sup> His work as King's Attorney also did not prevent Radcliffe from offering legal advice to others. Radcliffe was working on a legal matter for John Holles, the Earl of Clare and it appears that Clare was not very satisfied with the way Radcliffe was handling the case. The legal suit centred on monies owed to Holles by one Mr Walker. Holles wrote to his son on 24 Nov. 1631 urging him to "speake with Mr Ratcliff concerning Waker: so allso speake to Watt Stewart, that after so long patience I may be satisfied, and for want of my owne I am driven to borrow." Writing to Wentworth's wife, on 4 October 1631 the day before she died, Holles wrote that he "would gladly hear from Mr. Radcliff, sum good news concerning Walker..." The case was clearly worrying Clare but the matter dragged beyond 29 March 1633 when Clare was still mentioning the suit in letters to his son. Seddon, *Letters of Holles*, vol. III, pp. 437, 439, 446 – 447. However, it might be pointed out the Holles was a kin of Wentworth and therefore perhaps this connection should be identified as the reason why Radcliffe was acting on his behalf, rather than assuming that he continued to offer legal services to any great extent. Radcliffe is also mentioned in a letter from the Privy Council to Thomas Wolveyris, the Collector of Southampton. It appears that Radcliffe had communicated Wolveyris' good work for the King to the Privy Council in order to support Wolveyris' case against Captain Barnes. It is not clear whether Radcliffe was acting in a legal capacity for Wolveyris and there is no obvious kinship connection between Wolveyris and Radcliffe. The Privy Council stated that "By your lettre to Mr. Radcliff" they had found Wolveyris' "care and diligence in that which concerneth his Majesties service." In his case against Captain Barnes, the Council now intended to call him to account for his "miscaryage" and therefore Wolveyris was to provide information on the case. 17 July 1629, *Acts of the Privy Council May 1629 – May 1630* (London, 1960), p. 89.

<sup>43</sup> Aidan Clarke has described Radcliffe as being Wentworth's secretary in the Council of the North and it is certainly plausible that he performed administrative duties, although it was not his official role. Clarke, A. 'The Government of Wentworth, 1632 – 40,' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (eds). *A New History of Ireland* (Vol. iii, Oxford, 1976), p. 244.

delinquents to justice, so the oppressed may go free.” He asked Radcliffe to ensure that the legal men beneath him were scrutinised and forced to reduce their fees. Wentworth clearly believed that the lawyers did not carry out their duties satisfactorily. He described them as nettles, which when gently touched will ‘sting’ and ‘bite,’ but when dealt with in a firm manner “loose their heat, their venom.”<sup>45</sup> He believed that it was an integral part of Radcliffe’s duties to keep tight reins on, and not to fear using a heavy hand against, those beneath him in the legal profession. This illustrates Wentworth’s agenda more widely within the Council of the North. He insisted upon protecting the poor against what he saw as the corrupt rich and penny-pinching lawyers who he believed unnecessarily created conflict.<sup>46</sup> Wentworth was keen to present himself as a Lord President that would serve the people of the North and emphasised his openness and accountability in this post. He offered himself as “an instrument for good in every man’s hand.... he that thus useth me most hath the most of my heart.”<sup>47</sup>

The Council of the North functioned as a court of law as well as an administrative body, handling civil and criminal cases and facilitating “easier access to the law” in the North.<sup>48</sup> This legal capacity had already created opposition to the Council amongst the common lawyers. Wentworth however aimed to reinstate the legal influence of the Council of the North and to repair the damage done by his predecessors, through the work of the King’s Attorney. Wentworth saw the employment of an attorney as a fulfilling and satisfying profession. He could not think of a greater honour than for Radcliffe to use his God-given ability to reinforce the power of law in the North.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Gardiner, S.R. ‘An unpublished speech of Lord Wentworth,’ *The Academy* 7 (1875), pp. 581 - 583. This is a Restoration copy of Wentworth’s original speech and is thought to be a genuine representation of the speech he gave.

<sup>45</sup> *ibid.*, p. 582.

<sup>46</sup> As Anthony Milton has indicated, Wentworth criticised lawyers and judges in his private correspondence. There was a tradition of popular distrust of lawyers as it was thought that they exploited ordinary people, but Wentworth felt that the real danger of lawyers lay “more in their trespassing on the rights of the Crown.” Milton, A. ‘Thomas Wentworth and the political thought of the Personal Rule,’ in J.F. Merritt, (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621-1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 138 – 139.

<sup>47</sup> Gardiner, ‘Unpublished speech of Lord Wentworth,’ p. 583.

<sup>48</sup> Pogson, ‘Wentworth as President of the Council of the North’ p. 186. The Instructions to the President and the Council in the North that were issued on 22 June 1629 explicitly stated that the activities of the Council were to be the “Speedy administration of Justice and ease of our good people in those remote partes without drawing them to attendance here at Westm[inster].” ‘Instructions to the Council of the North,’ 22 June 1629, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 145, 23.

<sup>49</sup> Gardiner, ‘Unpublished speech of Lord Wentworth,’ p. 583.

As the King's Attorney in the North, Radcliffe honed his legal skills and expertise. He would surely have drawn upon his experiences within the Council of the North when in Ireland during the following decade and therefore it is unfortunate that George Radcliffe's activities in the North are so difficult to trace. As Thomas Wentworth and Radcliffe worked so closely together, the majority of their private transactions would have been verbal, leaving only a few glimpses of Radcliffe's work in the limited Council records. With George Radcliffe's extensive legal knowledge and training, it is tempting to wonder how far he played a part in the formulation of Wentworth's legal agenda in the North. He must surely have played at least an advisory role in the legal challenges that Wentworth was plagued by. For example, during the first session of his Council, the common law courts interfered with the proceedings by issuing prohibitions and writs of *habeas corpus*. Prohibitions enabled a plaintiff or defendant dissatisfied with the justice received at York, to have their case transferred to Westminster.<sup>50</sup> This would undermine the legal capacity of the Council of the North by preventing it from bringing successful prosecutions.<sup>51</sup> By continuing to issue prohibitions, the common law courts were directly challenging Wentworth's legal policy that he had outlined in his opening speech as Lord President.<sup>52</sup> Wentworth was aware that under weak Presidents, prohibitions had impeded the work of the Council as they challenged the jurisdiction of the Council.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 104, Reid, *King's Council* p. 411.

<sup>51</sup> Issuing prohibitions could also severely delay legal proceedings and this was acknowledged in the new 1629 Instructions to the Council of the North which recognised that the "too frequent granting of prohibitions forth of our Courts of Com[m]on Law in Westm[inste]r" inhibited the "Speedy and ready course of our Justice..." Charles I declared "we will not haue our Courts of Justice... Clashe one with an other, but that in all these questions of Iurisdiction assuming the iudgm[en]t thereof to our selues we will euer be ready to heare and iudge equally betwixt them..." 22 June 1629, P.R.O. S. P. 16 / 145, 23, Reid, *King's Council* pp. 410 - 412.

<sup>52</sup> In his opening speech, Wentworth described prohibitions as "the bleeding evil. which unless it be stanch'd, closed by a ready, a skilfull hand, will quickly let out the very vitals of this Court." He advised that the Council should be courageous in their proceedings against prohibitions and "not fall away as water spilt upon the ground, from that which is once justly, warrantably done; nor yet give off upon prohibitions till the suitor hath the fruit of his plaint..." He argued that the rights of the subject were not to be challenged and stated that these attacks were "only disputes betwixt courts." He was attacking prohibitions as although justice should "nourish, establish a perfect harmony betwixt the head, the members, and amongst themselves," prohibitions had caused justice to "degenerate, become instruments of strife, of seperacion..." Gardiner, 'Unpublished speech of Lord Wentworth,' p. 582.

<sup>53</sup> We should however note that Wentworth did not intend to extend the boundaries of the Court's jurisdiction, but wished to ensure that the Council of the North had the same status as the Court of Wales and the Court of Chancery. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 104. In his opening speech on 30 December 1628, Wentworth stated that he hoped that resolving these issues of jurisdiction would enable "the tent of this court then [to] be enlarged, the curtains drawn out, the stakes strengthened, yet no farther than shall be for a covering to the common tranquillity, a shelter to the poor and innocent from the proud and insolent." He promised that the Council of the North would not assume powers apart from those granted in the Instructions to the Council, stating that "we can go no farther than our

He warned in his opening speech that the Council would appeal to the King, “the sovereign judge of us all”<sup>54</sup> as the sole arbiter between his Courts in any dispute over jurisdiction. The Attorney General of England was directed by the King in 1629 to issue new Instructions to the Council which would define the judicial authority of the Council in the North more exactly to prevent legal challenges to the Council’s authority and jurisdiction. These new Instructions allowed the Council in the North to exercise its own jurisdiction but warned the Councillors to not to extend their prerogative beyond the powers outlined in the Instructions.<sup>55</sup> With these carefully defined limits and his declared policy on prohibitions, Wentworth was able to strengthen his position within the North.<sup>56</sup> Edward Osborne later reported to Wentworth in Ireland that the Lord Keeper had promised him that if any prohibition challenged the Court’s jurisdiction, he personally would ensure that the Court would “receae all right w[i]thoutt further troble.”<sup>57</sup>

Thomas Wentworth was keen to emphasise the need for respect of the King’s ministers in the North and he strove to improve their standing and authority. For example, when Sir Thomas Gower of Stittenham, a local JP, verbally attacked the

---

instruccion lead us, move only within their circle.” Gardiner, ‘Unpublished speech of Lord Wentworth,’ p. 582.

<sup>54</sup> *ibid*, p. 582.

<sup>55</sup> 22 June 1629, P.R.O. S. P. 16 / 145, 23, Reid, *King’s Council* pp. 410 - 412.

<sup>56</sup> However, although the King endorsed Wentworth’s policy against prohibitions in the Instructions of June 1629, it was only moderately successful. Reid’s analysis of prohibitions has shown that there were still some defendants who refused to admit defeat, and lawyers who were willing to risk Wentworth’s wrath by continuing to seek prohibitions to the Court at York. Many of these men would have obtained their revenge during Wentworth’s impeachment trial where one of the charges against him was that he had “obtained and executed an illegal Commission and Instructions.” However, it should be noted that the Instructions given to Wentworth were the same as those given to the Earl of Mulgrave in 1609. If Wentworth had committed treason in procuring them, feasibly, the Earl of Mulgrave might also be accused of having committed treason. *ibid*, pp. 367, 439. Criticisms levied against Radcliffe and Wentworth in their trials for impeachment accused them of making the Council of the North more arbitrary under Wentworth’s direction, and that Radcliffe was enforcing these arbitrary policies. For example, during Wentworth’s impeachment trial, John Maynard attacked the arbitrary rule and unfair justice administered by Wentworth in the Council in the North. Maynard, J. *Mr. Mainard’s Speech before both Houses in Parliament, on Wednesday the xxiii of March, in reply upon the Earle of Straffords answer to his Articles at the Barre* (London, 1641), p. 5. Mr Hide also presented a case against the Council of the North to the Lords in April 1641 stating that of the 58 Instructions issued to Wentworth and the Council of the North, there was “scarce one that is not against, or besides the Law.” *Mr Hides Argument before the Lords in the Vpper House of Parliament Aprill 1641* (London, 1641) p. 5. However, we must remember that such criticisms may have been another convenient attack to remove a powerful man from power. As we shall see in Chapter 8, although both men were accused of being innovators of an arbitrary rule, Wentworth and Radcliffe did not wish to impose unfavourable policies. Their commitment to the monarch’s prerogative meant that laws were more ‘thoroughly’ imposed and legal innovations brought in, to improve the wealth and status of the King’s government in the North and in Ireland. However, Wentworth and Radcliffe were careful not to portray any new policies as innovations. They presented an image that they were working for the King’s benefit, enforcing policies more successfully.

King's Attorney in the North whilst he was on the Council bench in 1632. he invoked Wentworth's wrath. Gower was ordered to appear in front of the Court at York in May 1632 accused of speaking scandalous words against the King's Attorney whilst acting as a Justice of the Peace in Yorkshire.<sup>58</sup> Although Wentworth's actions against Gower were partially motivated by the desire to enforce his personal authority as the personification of the King's rule, and to reinforce the authority of the Council of the North by demonstrating his intolerance of the President's officials being openly criticised by a lesser official, Wentworth must also have been driven by the desire to protect his friend.<sup>59</sup> As George Radcliffe was officially the King's legal representative in the North, Gower's attack amounted to an attack upon the Crown. Gower refused to submit to the Council of the North in its capacity as a legal court claiming that he could not expect fair trial and might be used as an example by Thomas Wentworth to demonstrate his power. He also feared unfair treatment, as he had not only attacked a Council official, but one whom was also Wentworth's friend. In order to explain his apparent shunning of the Council's jurisdiction, Gower stated that he had tried to find a lawyer to advise him but that "they refused, alledging Mr Ratcliffe to be soe powerfull their that it would be much p[re]iudice to them...."<sup>60</sup> Gower finally gained legal representation by petitioning Sir Thomas Tilsley, a member of the Council in the North, who assigned an attorney to the case. However, despite this progress, Gower alleged that Radcliffe still blocked the attorney's work when he attempted to obtain a copy of the charge against Gower in order to prepare their answer. Radcliffe kept the information from him until Gower had "not above three howres liberty to put in his Answere" and was forced to flee "for feare of having bin laid upp by an attachment which he could not possibly avoid..."<sup>61</sup>

Gower probably truly believed that he would not receive a fair trial in York. The Council of the North wielded much authority and it is conceivable that Wentworth's friendship with Radcliffe would have generated the belief that he would defend him at the expense of other subjects. Gower committed contempt of Court and left Yorkshire for London. Whilst in London, Gower was arrested by Wentworth's sergeant-of-arms, but insisted that he should be released as the Council of the North

---

<sup>57</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 3 November 1633, Str. P. 13 / 83.

<sup>58</sup> 'Affidavit of Sir Thomas Gower,' 15 February 1633, P.R.O. S. P. 16 / 232, 55, Reid, *King's Council* p. 416.

<sup>59</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 110.

<sup>60</sup> 'Affidavit of Sir Thomas Gower,' 15 February 1633, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 232, 55.

had no authority to arrest him outside its jurisdiction.<sup>62</sup> Gower protested that he was willing to stand trial and had written to Wentworth in August 1632 to assign a lawyer to him “that he might not stand in contempt.”<sup>63</sup> The Privy Council rejected Gower’s plea and asked the Attorney General to send for George Radcliffe “to examine the state of the cause” and determine “what righte and power, by what article of the Lorde Presidents Instructions, an arrest be made in London upon a warrant of the Counsell at York.”<sup>64</sup> Wentworth and the Council of the North also sent an explanation to the Privy Council with their justification for Gower’s arrest, stating that Gower had made many ‘contempts’ and through his attack on Radcliffe had “fixed a great imputation upon [us] all.”<sup>65</sup> The Attorney General, William Noy made a report in December 1632 that found in favour of the Council of the North and Gower was returned to York to answer his charges.<sup>66</sup> As a result of this attack upon the definition of the Council of the North’s jurisdiction, new Instructions were issued which gave some powers to the Council of the North that were also enjoyed by the Star Chamber.<sup>67</sup> This case demonstrates that Wentworth was forced to impose his authority by crushing important local figures that made a stand against the Council of the North. This would demonstrate that the King supported his actions and increase his strength and authority in the future. However, this heavy-handed action also served to create further contempt of his rule with its perceived extended power and generated dislike of his officials such as George Radcliffe.

George Radcliffe played an important role in this transition period between the cabal’s parliamentary careers of the 1620s and their work within Ireland in the 1630s. Radcliffe enjoyed a rapid promotion from being a lawyer, to being a servant of the Crown. This was made possible due to his already close relationship with Wentworth who had identified the potential in Radcliffe for future political and legal work. As we

---

<sup>61</sup> *ibid.*, S.P. 16 / 232, 55.

<sup>62</sup> Gower explained his absence from his trial at the Council of the North in a petition to the Privy Council, claiming he had been attending to pre-arranged suits in the Star Chamber, Chancery and Exchequer in London. ‘Petition of Sir Thomas Gower to the Privy Council,’ 23 November 1632. P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 225, 58.

<sup>63</sup> ‘Affidavit of Sir Thomas Gower,’ 15 February 1633, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 232, 55.

<sup>64</sup> Order of the Privy Council, 23 November 1632, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 225, 59.

<sup>65</sup> Wentworth and the Council of the North to the English Privy Council, 1 December 1632, *CSPD 1631 - 1633* p. 450.

<sup>66</sup> Reid, *King’s Council* p. 417, Cliffe, J.T. *The Yorkshire Gentry* (London, 1969), p. 302. The case ended satisfactorily for Wentworth and Radcliffe. Wandesford wrote in a letter to Wentworth in January 1633 that he was “glad the rascall [Radcliffe] is to secure in his business w[i]th Gower.” Wandesford to Wentworth, 1 January 1633, Str. P. 16 / 237.

<sup>67</sup> Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* p. 302.



shall later see, Radcliffe would later play an even more integral role in Wentworth's government in Ireland and his employment with Wentworth in the Council of the North formed a strong foundation for their working relationship.

### **Christopher Wandesford and the Council of the North**

Wandesford first heard about Wentworth's official appointment to the Lord Presidency at third hand, which seems strange as they were such close friends and their correspondence so regular and personal. It seems likely that Wentworth's promotion may have been so rapid that he had not had chance to inform Wandesford. Only the day before Wentworth made his inaugural speech, Wandesford wrote to ask whether the rumour of his promotion was true.<sup>68</sup> Wandesford reported hearing "from all hands" that Wentworth had "Come down a Viscount and a President." He professed to being very pleased for his friend but "till I have it from yourself, I will be the last that shall seem to believe it."<sup>69</sup> It was not a complete surprise to Wandesford, as it appears that they had already discussed the possibility that Wentworth might be offered this post. In fact, Wandesford stated that Wentworth's last words to him "ended in just so an Air, though they came from a striking String, That I hope there is no Discord in this we now hear." Wandesford perhaps felt that Wentworth was rushing into his acceptance of the post and was concerned that he had heard that Wentworth would be in York the following day, declaring that he could not "give the least Ear at all unto it, remembring your Resolution when we were last together, not to appear there before the Summer." Although Wandesford appeared to be wary of Wentworth's promotion, he was hopeful that the new Lord President would be "in the midst among us to be a Light and Comfort to the whole Country."<sup>70</sup> Wandesford hoped that Wentworth would reverse the lax policies of his predecessor Lord Scrope. In particular, Wandesford reported that Catholics in the North believed that "their Days of Security and Quietness, in which they were lulled asleep by the Indulgence of the last," were now to change into "Anxiety and Watchfulness to defend themselves

---

<sup>68</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 29 December 1629, Str. P. 16 / 227, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 49 - 50.

<sup>69</sup> Str. P. 16 / 227, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 49.

<sup>70</sup> This was in contrast to Wentworth's predecessor Lord Scrope who he described as "that Candle hid under a Bushel," who whilst President of the North "darkened himself and all that were about him, and dieth towards us.... Like a Snuff unmannerly left in a Corner." Str. P. 16 / 227, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 49.

from the Vigilancy of your Justice.”<sup>71</sup> As well as taking this opportunity to watch over the recusants’ actions, Wandesford recommended that Wentworth reinforced the laws against them, which had been so little used in the past that he would need to “file off the Rust” which “hath almost eaten out the very Iron, the Strength that was in them.” This letter is invaluable as it reveals the frank manner in which Wandesford was able to offer advice to his friend. He was able to criticise the speed with which Wentworth had accepted his new courtly positions, and warned him of the potential danger of his enemies who were jealous of his newfound favour with the King.<sup>72</sup> Even at this early stage in the development of Wentworth’s career, his close friends were painfully aware of the danger of his being absent from the King’s Court, leaving envious men to undermine Wentworth’s position.

Christopher Wandesford’s ‘change of sides’ should be noted as perhaps even more remarkable than that of Thomas Wentworth. His openly defiant actions against the King’s favourite in the Parliament of 1626 did not prevent him from becoming a servant of the Crown and Charles I was prepared to forgive him. Wandesford was offered the lucrative post of ambassador to the Court of Spain, probably towards the end of 1630.<sup>73</sup> In an undated letter of 1630, Wandesford wrote to Wentworth explaining that Cottington had completed his Spanish “Ambassye w[i]th singular dexterity and advantadge to us.” Wandesford had learnt that the King would not appoint a new ambassador before Cottington returned and Wandesford professed “what use your l[ordshi]p will make of this when you come I leave to your wisdom.”<sup>74</sup> Ralph Hutton wrote to Wandesford on 27 January 1631 asking to be “certified by your letter whether you goe into Spayne as the report tells us, if so my praiers shall ever attend you since my person is unapt to doe you service.”<sup>75</sup> However, Wandesford did not take up this post and it appears that Lord Cottington may have

---

<sup>71</sup> Wandesford added that the “Papists already hang down their Heads like Bulrushes, and think themselves like Water split on the Ground, which cannot be gathered up again” after hearing the news that Wentworth had been appointed Lord President. Str. P. 16 / 227, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 50.

<sup>72</sup> Wandesford reminded Wentworth of the “Breath of Envy” which “hath been always blown strongly against you.” Str. P. 16 / 227, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 50.

<sup>73</sup> Wandesford’s biographer T.D. Whitaker, wrote that Wandesford was not offered this post until 1633 and that Wentworth convinced the King to offer Wandesford the Mastership of the Rolls in Ireland rather than the Spanish appointment. Whitaker believed that “This request, in the early sunshine of Wentworth’s favour, was not likely to be refused” and believes that this was how Wentworth was able to obtain such a lucrative post for his friend in Ireland. Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 157. However, other evidence suggests that Whitaker’s dating is incorrect.

<sup>74</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 2 December [?] 1630, Str. P. 16 / 233.

double-crossed Wentworth and Wandesford by securing the position for his secretary Arthur Hopton. Stanhope later asked Wentworth to recall “How did... [Cottington] walke (like a Crab) in the business concerninge Wansfoard...” Cottington had apparently pressed that Wandesford should take the ambassadorship, “advisinge speedy preparations for the iourneye...” However at the same time, Cottington had taken a house in Madrid, and was preparing it for “for the conveniency of Arthur Hopton his Secritarye, to place him where he stood ingaged both by his owne propositions and faythfull promise for the investing of Wansforde?”<sup>76</sup> However, McCall suggests that Wandesford would never have accepted such a post anyway due to his “zealous attachment to the reformed faith”<sup>77</sup> and indeed Wandesford’s earlier comments on recusants would seem to support this assertion.

Christopher Wandesford’s biographer Whitaker believed that Christopher Wandesford had not abandoned his principles in order to gain a particular post within the Court: Indeed, he felt that Wandesford gained no personal or financial benefit from his change of sides, and in particular, he did not think he had taken a seat within the Council of the North.<sup>78</sup> However, Reid does identify Wandesford as a Councillor of the North from June 1629 until August 1641.<sup>79</sup> Other mentions of Wandesford in a political capacity also seem to support Reid’s assertion. A letter from Wandesford to Wentworth dated 29 November 1632 suggests that Wandesford did have a seat within the Council of the North. He explained to Wentworth that the “passadge at the table yesterday my Cosin Radcliff hath related: you must be content w[i]th this until you come.”<sup>80</sup> Wandesford had earlier referred to the meeting of the Council stating that “you weare pleased to salute my beginning of this sitting w[i]th a noble and freindly welwishing...”<sup>81</sup> The most convincing evidence that Wandesford officially sat as a

---

<sup>75</sup> McCall, H.B. *The Story of the Family of Wandesforde of Kirklington and Castlecomer* (London, 1904), pp. 75 – 76.

<sup>76</sup> Arthur Hopton travelled to Spain with Cottington as his secretary during his embassy in October 1629. Hopton remained in Spain as an English agent. Sir Edward Stanhope to Wentworth, October[?] 1631, Str. P. 8 / 79, Zagorin, ‘Sir Edward Stanhope’s Advice,’ p. 305, Rev. Canon Venables, ‘Sir Arthur Hopton,’ *Dictionary of National Biography*, p. 345.

<sup>77</sup> McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* p. 57.

<sup>78</sup> Whitaker, T.D. *A History of Richmondshire, in the North Riding of the County of York* (2 vols, London, 1823), vol. II, p. 157.

<sup>79</sup> Reid states that Wandesford was a member of the Council of the North from June 1629 – August 1641, not recognising that Wandesford died in December 1640 and accepting that he was a member until the demise of the Council as a whole. Strangely, she does not include Radcliffe in her list of members. ‘List of the members of the Council of the North,’ Reid, *King’s Council* p. 498.

<sup>80</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 29 November 1632. Str. P. 16 / 236.

<sup>81</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 21 March (year not given but might be 1630 if linked with Str.P. 16 / 239), Str. P. 16 / 240.

Councillor of the North is an undated account within the Strafford Papers of a Council meeting in which Wandesford, Ellis, Ingram, Lowther and Radcliffe discussed where and when the decrees against Sir Conyers Darcy should be read. These elaborate council meeting minutes were perhaps to keep Wentworth fully informed of their discussion. Wandesford asked whether the decrees against Darcy should be read immediately, but Ellis wished to delay. As Secretary of the Council, Ingram refused to look out the precedents for the case until asked by the Vice President. Indicating the authority vested in him, Wandesford stated that as the committee had nominated him to be “in my lords place” he therefore had to “imagin what he would doe if he were p[re]sent.” Wandesford was aware that his words “haue not that authority and weight my lord may chalendge from you, yet I thinke it is fit for you to heare me.” Wandesford recognised that as Wentworth’s representative, he had “no power to command any of you in this case to advuse you I haue” but he asked that

all things be quieted amonst us for w[hi]c[h] p[re]sent until my lord come, to him it belongs to order and despose all thess questions incident to the gouernment, he is able and will doe it, therefore no Complaint of thess things to the Concell I beceech you, but leaue things as before untill his cuming.<sup>82</sup>

Wandesford’s other businesses may have prevented him from playing a very active role in the Council of the North and this may explain the limited evidence of his involvement.<sup>83</sup> Wandesford’s personal business was taking up so much of his time that he had to apologise to Wentworth, stating that “I am so lost in my business that I knowe not when to attend your L[ordshi]p.”<sup>84</sup> Wandesford had been reinstated by Wentworth into the Commission of the Peace from which he had been removed as punishment for his part in the attack upon the Duke of Buckingham in 1626.<sup>85</sup> On 17 April 1630, he was appointed as a member of a commission appointed to inquire into

---

<sup>82</sup> Undated, but follows the business of Sir Conyers Darcy being settled (1630), Str. P. 16 / 239.

<sup>83</sup> For example, Wandesford had accepted Wentworth’s offer of making him Deputy Bailiff of Richmondshire and Deputy Constable of Richmond and Middleham Castles and Master of the King’s forests, following in such illustrious footsteps as those of John Lord Scrope, Thomas Lord Scrope, Thomas Earl of Northumberland and Emanuel Earl of Sunderland. McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* p. 75.

<sup>84</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 25 August 1629[?] Str. P. 16 / 230. Indeed, when Wentworth’s son died in October 1630, Wandesford wrote a long letter of condolence and expressed his sorrow that he could not be with Wentworth in person to console him, but apologised that his “business (as your l[ordshi]p knows) for a few dayes cannot be dispensed with.” Wandesford to Wentworth, 12 October 1632, Str. P. 16 / 235.

<sup>85</sup> Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* p. 294, P.R.O. Chancery, Crown Office, Doquet Books. Index 4211, ff. 260, 261, 262.

fees and new offices.<sup>86</sup> Thomas Wentworth also persuaded Sir Thomas Hoby of Hackness to resign from his office of chief steward of Ripon manor so that Wandesford could take it over, Ripon being close to Wandesford's estate at Kirklington.<sup>87</sup>

Despite his other preoccupations, Wandesford appears to have been a useful servant for Wentworth in London.<sup>88</sup> On one occasion, Wentworth had been summoned to London immediately, and Wandesford was able to urge the Lord Treasurer of Wentworth's "necessarye occation of stay" in Yorkshire. If he had not interfered, Wandesford stated that "we might haue expected you here the end of the next weake instantly taking horse upon receipt of the letters."<sup>89</sup> In September 1632, Wandesford carried messages and presented Wentworth's service to notable figures at Court. He reported to Wentworth that he had met the Court at Somerset House and presented the Lord Deputy's service to the Earl of Carlisle. He also attended Laud, the Bishop of London.<sup>90</sup> Wandesford was also an informant of potentially inflammatory rumours to Wentworth. In October 1632, it was Wandesford that warned Wentworth about the rumours that he was pursuing the Lord Treasurership. Wentworth wrote to

---

<sup>86</sup> 17 April 1630, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 164, 63. On 27 December 1630, Wandesford reported to Wentworth that Lord Cottington had ordered him to present to him "what our Commission of fees hath done since our last meeting." Wandesford to Wentworth, 27 December 1630, Str. P. 16 / 232.

<sup>87</sup> Hoby had held this church appointment since 1607 which raises the question why Hoby should have been willing to surrender this office to Wandesford. Hoby was a strong Puritan and this might suggest that he viewed Wandesford as being a man with similar principles who would be suitable to take over from him. Hoby was very concerned about the threat of Catholicism to England and Yorkshire in particular and pressed this issue in parliaments of the 1620s. It may be the case that Hoby did not give up his seat for Wandesford's benefit, but rather that he gave up his seat out of loyalty to Wentworth. He had previously shown allegiance to Wentworth in the election of 1625 against Savile. Hoby had also been removed from the Commission of the Peace at the same time as Wandesford for refusing to pay the forced loan in 1626. Wentworth re-instated them both within a few days of his taking up his seat as President. More cynically, Hoby may have been bribed or forced from his seat by the incoming President. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* pp. 88, p. 136, 283, 285, 294, McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* p. 75, Sir Thomas Hoby to Wentworth, 22 September 1629, Str. P. 12 / 84.

<sup>88</sup> Wandesford's daughter Alice described her father and mother being "att Court" when a fire broke out out his house in St Martin's Lane in Westminster. Although Alice recalls this event as happening in 1631, she misdated other key events in Wandesford's life and therefore we cannot rely upon her accuracy. For example, Alice described her father leaving his family in London and going to Ireland, having arranged for them to join him in Ireland a year later. In his daughter's autobiography, she describes her family going to Ireland in 1632, but the Wandesfords were actually reunited in 1634. Jackson, C (ed.) *The Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton of East Newton Co. York* (Edinburgh, 1875), pp. 7 - 8.

<sup>89</sup> Wandesford believed that Wentworth could now safely stay in York for a further week as long as he arrived in London by 15 December. Wandesford to Wentworth, 1 December 1632, Str. P. 16 / 236. It appears that Wentworth protracted his stay in York even longer. Wandesford wrote to him on 1 January 1633 asking "haue you triumph w[i]th your Confydence ouer me for my doubdting of your long stayer at yorke; you will neuer leaue this bragging of your owne resolutionns until you haue smarted soundlye for being guided by them." Wandesford to Wentworth, 1 January 1633, *ibid.* 16 / 237.

<sup>90</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 12 September 1632, *ibid.* 16 / 238.

Lord Treasurer Weston to reassure him that “since I had the Honour to serve his Majesty, Calumny and Mis-report have been my Portions.” He admitted to Weston that Christopher Wandesford informed him of this rumour “cursorily and slightly in a Letter” but yet to Wentworth the news “imprints, sinks, strikes deeper than to pass along so easily from me.”<sup>91</sup>

Wandesford may have had a less prominent role than Radcliffe within the Council of the North, but he fulfilled an invaluable role within Wentworth’s administration. As Wentworth had rapidly gained promotion and was seen by some to have abandoned his parliamentary principles, Wandesford could play the essential role of protecting Wentworth’s position at Court. He could ensure that Wentworth was warned in advance of potentially dangerous rumours that might undermine him and maintain relations with important figures who could offer their support to Wentworth. In much the same way as Radcliffe performed a more flexible role in the Irish government, not having an official office to restrain him, Wandesford could help Wentworth when needed in either the North or in London. Unlike Radcliffe who was tied to the North in his capacity as King’s Attorney, Wandesford’s role was not limited by an official function to perform.

### **Edward Osborne: Vice-President of the Council of the North**

This section will analyse the relationship between Wentworth and his Vice President in the Council of the North, Edward Osborne. This will reveal issues concerning the problems of deputyship and the extent to which Osborne was really able to assume Wentworth’s authority in his absence, which forms parallels with the issues faced by Wandesford when deputising for Wentworth in Ireland. In particular, Osborne’s relations with the Council of the North and those whom he presided over will be examined, focusing upon his implementation of Wentworth’s recusancy policy,<sup>92</sup> wider financial issues and his role in the military preparations once Charles I’s negotiations with the Scots began to deteriorate.

---

<sup>91</sup> Wentworth to Lord Treasurer Weston, 21 October 1632, *ibid*, 21 / 98, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 80. Wandesford’s function as a reporter of news to Wentworth was recognised by Francis Cottington in November 1632 when he stated that he would leave the news of “All other Business... to the Pens of Mr Wandesford and Mr Radcliffe, who I am sure will give your Lordship perfect Account of every particular.” Cottington to Wentworth, 30 November 1632, Str. P. 12 / 312. Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 81.

<sup>92</sup> Wentworth’s personal business was also entangled within the recusancy policy as in June 1629 he had acquired the permanent position of receivership of recusants’ rents. Cooper, J.P. *Land, Men and Beliefs* G.E. Aylmer & J.S. Morrill (eds.) (London, 1983), p. 156.

It is unusual that Charles I allowed Wentworth to appoint a deputy to rule over the North once promoted to the Lord Deputyship of Ireland. Normally, a new President of the Council would be selected once the former President took up his new post.<sup>93</sup> Wentworth may have believed that his good work in the North could continue if he was permitted to appoint a Vice President, rather than being succeeded by a replacement President. Wedgwood suggests that Wentworth may have believed a Vice President would command greater respect than a successor acting in his own right.<sup>94</sup> Therefore, Wentworth convinced the King to allow him to appoint Osborne as his deputy to “rule the North on his behalf and in his name.”<sup>95</sup>

The choice of Osborne as Vice President of the Council of the North leads us to question why Wentworth did not choose either Wandesford or Radcliffe. This question may never be fully resolved but it may simply be the case that Wentworth felt that Osborne was more suited to the post in the North and he needed his close allies Wandesford and Radcliffe with him in Ireland. Perhaps Wentworth felt that Osborne faced enough challenges in his service in the North, without being transported to an unfamiliar country. However arguably, Osborne had a more difficult job to control the northern gentry on Wentworth’s behalf without a strong body of supporters, unlike Wentworth who had his cabal.<sup>96</sup>

### **Osborne and Wentworth’s relationship prior to the Vice Presidency**

At first sight, Edward Osborne and Thomas Wentworth do not appear to have had the depth of relationship as experienced between Wandesford, Radcliffe and Wentworth. However, this may be due to the minimal sources available, as on closer

---

<sup>93</sup> However, Reid noted that there was an earlier precedent in Sir Henry Sidney, who retained his position as Lord President in the Council in Wales and the Marches, whilst acting as Lord Deputy of Ireland intermittently in the years 1565 – 79. Sidney was Lord President of the Council in Wales and the Marshes, 1559 – 67 and Lord Deputy of Ireland, 1565 – 67, 1568 – 71 and 1575 – 79. Reid, *King’s Council* p. 427, Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 114.

<sup>94</sup> The Earl of Newcastle had in fact put himself forward as a potential replacement for Wentworth. William Murray to Sir Henry Vane, 18 December 1631, *CSPD 1631 – 1633* p. 205, Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 114.

<sup>95</sup> Reid, *King’s Council* p. 426. Osborne was assisted by a personal secretary of his own named Francis Watts. *HMC Various Collections VIII*, p. 55, *CSPD 1625 – 49*, p. 621.

<sup>96</sup> Wentworth may have had other political motivations behind his decision to nominate Osborne as his Vice President. Osborne was married to the daughter of Thomas Bellasis, Lord Fauconberg from 1618 until her death in 1624. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 115. Therefore, Wentworth might appease Fauconberg by appointing his former son-in-law as he represented a somewhat discontented faction in the North who had called Wentworth’s integrity into question. Reid, *King’s Council* p. 427. This may have been a contributory factor in Wentworth’s decision but it seems unlikely that this was a strong enough reason alone to convince Wentworth of Osborne’s value.

inspection we do obtain glimpses of a close friendship between them during the 1620s. Wandesford probably provided the initial link between Wentworth and Osborne as he married Osborne's sister Alice in September 1614.<sup>97</sup> The earliest surviving letter from Wentworth to Osborne dates from October 1618, in which he reported that a letter bearer had arrived declaring that he belonged to Osborne. Wentworth had refused to entertain him until he delivered Osborne's letter to prove that that "hee dep[ar]ted w[i]th yo[u]r fauour and good allowances." There is no news or references to friends or family. Although we might argue that this was a politeness convention,<sup>98</sup> Wentworth signed off as "your very affecc[i]onate friend."<sup>99</sup> Two further early letters from Wentworth to Osborne survive, dating from 1624 and these are friendly and informal. Wentworth stated that he was writing "to offer yow at least my respect albeit no newes" as Wandesford and Sir Thomas Bellasis were visiting Osborne and therefore could better "relate unto yow then my selfe."<sup>100</sup> In the second letter of September 1624, Wentworth acknowledged Osborne as part of his circle of close friends. Wentworth noted the absence of Osborne who was detained by his sick wife, professing that he did "allwaies unwillingly heare of any occasions that hinder mee from the companie of my friends," but he was "more then ordinarily affected to bee seperated from such as yourself whome I respect (to say no more) in a stronger degree than others...."<sup>101</sup> From the basis of this friendship, Osborne was to become integrated into Wentworth's political career.

Although Osborne did not attend Parliament until 1628, he did participate in local politics and had already begun to support Wentworth politically by the mid-1620s. For example, during Wentworth's disputed election to the Parliament of 1625, Osborne was amongst the principal landowners who signed a poll in support of him.<sup>102</sup> Osborne's parliamentary career cannot be wholly attributed to Wentworth's

---

<sup>97</sup> Wandesford married Edward Osborne's sister Alice, the daughter of Sir Hewet Osborne of Kiveton on 22 Sept 1614. Dugdale, W. *Dugdale's Visitation of Yorkshire* R Davies (ed). (London, 1859), p. 100, McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* pp. 68 – 69. There are only three surviving letters between Osborne and Wentworth prior to the Parliament of 1628 in the Strafford Papers and Wentworth was the sender of each of these. The first evidence of contact between Wentworth and Osborne post-dates Wandesford's marriage to Osborne's sister and this further supports the assertion that Wandesford provided the link between them. Wentworth to Osborne, 4 October 1618, Str. P. 2 / 24.

<sup>98</sup> Fairclough, N. *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language* (Harlow, 1995), p. 2.

<sup>99</sup> Wentworth to Mr Edward Osborne, 4 October 1618, Str. P. 2 / 24.

<sup>100</sup> Wentworth to Osborne, 4 June 1624, Str. P. 2 / 131 – 2.

<sup>101</sup> Wentworth to Osborne, 7 September 1624, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* p. 211.

<sup>102</sup> Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* p. 283.



influence. He represented East Retford thanks to Sir Gervase Clifton, the high steward of Nottinghamshire, to whom he was related through his stepfather.<sup>103</sup>

Sir Edward Osborne's first venture in Parliament was not very rewarding. He made no recorded speeches and did not serve on any committees, but claimed privilege in both sessions.<sup>104</sup> It is perplexing that Osborne had such a limited role in Parliament. It seems unlikely that he was there in order to support Wentworth's interests as he did not serve on committees with other members of the cabal or which may have helped Wentworth's business. However despite the fact that Wentworth relied heavily upon Osborne as his Vice-President in the North during the next decade, we should not attempt to scrutinise Edward Osborne's actions for evidence of Wentworth's influence in the 1620s.

We gain a glimpse of Osborne's political concerns in a letter of August 1628 to Wentworth. This letter informed Wentworth of the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham on the previous day.<sup>105</sup> Osborne passed on the news "with noe less

---

<sup>103</sup> Osborne's own estate, Kiveton was in Nottinghamshire and he was probably more associated with Clifton than Wentworth in local politics. It may be impossible to determine whether it was Clifton or Wentworth who brought Osborne into Parliament as Clifton was a close friend and ally of Wentworth with whom he corresponded regularly, and therefore we might argue that it was Wentworth who pushed Clifton to use his influence to obtain a seat for Osborne. Clifton and Wentworth corresponded even more frequently during Wentworth's Deputyship in Ireland. Clifton often expressed his intention to visit Dublin but does not appear to have made the journey. For example, in April 1635, he wrote "I shall not attend y[o]ur Lo[rdshi]p this summer, unless much urgd by my L[ord] Clifford, intending the next yeare godwilling to waite on you by Scotland," Sir Gervase Clifton to Wentworth, 28 April 1635, Str. P. 15 / 38.

<sup>104</sup> The first, dated 25 June 1628, was on the behalf of two of his servants, Talbot Benbrigge and Mr. Bolton, who had been arrested. Richard Marsh, the man who arrested Osborne's servants, was to be called to the House. Keeler *et al*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* vol. IV, p. 467, *Commons Journal* p. 919a. The 'Mr Bolton' may be the Thomas Bolton or Boulton who appears in a number of Osborne's personal papers. In 1638, there is a paper concerning a suit between Francis Bullock, Edward Osborne and Thomas Boulton. He appears on a number of occasions alongside Osborne in the papers dealing with this suit. Yorkshire Archaeological Society Library, Duke of Leeds MS, DD5/3/446,469.

The second privilege gained by Osborne was for himself in a suit in the court of requests on 27 January 1629. The *Commons Journal* records that "Sir Edward Osborne to have Privilege; and Thomas Barnes, at whose Suit he was served with a Note, to appear in the Court of Requests at his Suit, to be sent for." *Commons Journal* p. 923a.

<sup>105</sup> Osborne was well informed about the assassin whom he learnt about through "2 seuerall posts from Portesmouth, bringinge newes that the duke of Buckingham was slaine by one Liewtenant Felton." Osborne described the distress of the King who "was said to be sicke before, but now much perplexed more." Osborne admitted that this story might just be a rumour but believed it to be true as "it is soe generall a reporte, none contradicting it." Osborne seemed well informed about events in Portsmouth telling Wentworth that Felton "demaunded his pay soe peremptorily (with his hat on) of the Duke," as he kicked him and then "stabde him in the back." Osborne says that this is "a iust rewarde for killing a poor marriner the day before with his owne hands" who, like Felton, had asked for his pay. Osborne also told Wentworth about two strange chronograms with two verses after them, given to him just before Buckingham's death. "*Jacobus Stuardus Magnae Britanniae Rex*, the numerall letters whereof makes iust this present year of our lord 1628; the other is *Georgius Buckinghamiae Dux* the numerall letters whereof likewise makes iust the same year and the verses were these:  
As both these Stiles with this yeare doe agree

sorrow in your behalfe then ioy for the state.” This reveals that Osborne shared Wentworth and Wandesford’s obvious dislike of the Duke of Buckingham and was well aware that Wentworth would not be disappointed to hear this news. Although this is mainly a newsletter reporting a serious political incident to Wentworth, the tone reveals a concern for his friend’s career. Osborne must have had confidential knowledge of Wentworth’s activities and ambitions at least to some extent.<sup>106</sup> Clearly Osborne distrusted Buckingham and felt confident enough in this friendship to offer his opinions on Wentworth’s actions as one that was “zealously desirous of your Lordship’s honour and aduancement as any man’s....” Although we must allow for rhetorical excess, Osborne seems to have been one of Wentworth’s confidants and therefore was aware of how Buckingham’s assassination might affect Wentworth’s plans. During the 1630s this close friendship becomes even more obvious in the correspondence between them.<sup>107</sup>

By the late 1620s, the friendship between Osborne and Wentworth was already firmly established. In the early days of his Presidency, Wentworth asked Osborne to stand in as his deputy during the next sitting of the Council. Only Osborne’s response to this request survives, and he politely rejected Wentworth’s offer due to an “infirmite of winde in my stomake.” He admitted that he was “very loathe to make this weknesse knowne” but did not wish to let Wentworth down.<sup>108</sup> Despite the fact that Osborne felt unable to accept this task, it reveals that Wentworth must have trusted him enough to perform the duties of Vice President in his absence.

Wentworth must also have been reassured that Edward Osborne’s talents had been recognised by other influential political figures. In a letter to Wentworth dated

---

So thou to it or it to thee shall fatall bee.

What change this will worke God knowes, butt I would to God you were here to play your owne cardes, I would nott doubt, butt your game would be fairer nowe then euer, for I feare he was not soe reall as he seemed.” Osborne to Wentworth, 24 August 1628, Str. P. 12 / 36, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* pp. 303 – 304.

<sup>106</sup> Osborne wished that Wentworth “were here to play your own cards” and believed that now Buckingham was removed, his “game would be fairer nowe then euer.” Str. P. 12 / 36, Cooper, *Wentworth Papers* pp. 303 – 304.

<sup>107</sup> For example, Osborne was able to offer his opinion upon Wentworth’s actions without fear of reproval, such as advising his friend to look after his health better. “. . . unles your L[ordshi]p haue some regard to your health, & Spend nott your Spiritts w[i]th too much labour both of body and mind, you will certainly bringe the infirmities of ould age upon you on a Suddaine...” Osborne to Wentworth, 5 May 1635, Str. P. 15 / 58.

<sup>108</sup> Osborne professed that he was very flattered to be offered the Vice Presidency in January 1629. He saw it as “a highe fauour, and the more for that it is the first that yo[u]r lo[rdshi]p bestoweth in that kinde, though I haue tasted of maney others from yo[u]r Lo[rdshi]p.” What these might have been is elusive and of course this might be purely rhetoric and flattery. Osborne to Wentworth, 22 January 1629, *ibid*, 12 / 52.

11 June 1633, Coke described Osborne as a “young man of good Understanding and counsellable, and very forward to promote his Majesty’s service.”<sup>109</sup> Unfortunately, evidence of Osborne’s activities as a Councillor of the North is limited so it is unclear if his work there had persuaded Wentworth of his abilities to represent him. However, Wentworth also employed Osborne in other capacities. In a Commission issued on 14 January 1630, Wentworth acknowledged Osborne’s “fidelitie, care, & sufficiecie” and granted him “the charge, and com[m]and of a Troope of one hundreth and three score horses Curiassiers, or Dragones...”<sup>110</sup> Osborne’s duties included the commanding, training and discipline of the troop. Osborne was also given the opportunity to demonstrate his skills in the early years of Wentworth’s Presidency as a Justice of the Peace for the West Riding of Yorkshire from 1629 – 44 and in the North and East Ridings from 1633 – 44.<sup>111</sup>

### Questions of jurisdiction and the problems of opposition

It is not precisely clear how close a supervision Wentworth intended to exercise over Osborne. Indeed, it appears that Osborne was not even particularly well informed about the activities he was expected to control.<sup>112</sup> However, Osborne was required to communicate frequently with Wentworth in Ireland to keep him fully informed of any issues that arose in the North.<sup>113</sup> As President, Wentworth was ultimately responsible for the actions of his deputy and therefore it was understandable that he needed to know what was happening. Prior to 1639, Osborne was not allowed to make council or military appointments without Wentworth’s command. Whenever a vacancy arose, Osborne had to write to Wentworth with his

---

<sup>109</sup> Coke to Wentworth, 11 June 1633, *ibid*, 13 / 14, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 91.

<sup>110</sup> Commission as Lord Lieutenant of Yorkshire to Sir Edward Osborne, 1630, British Library, Additional MS 28094, f. 3.

<sup>111</sup> Unpublished *History of Parliament* article, ‘Sir Edward Osborne,’ p. 1. In 1631, Osborne reported to Wentworth the news of the Justice of the Peaces’ monthly meeting at Rotherham. The poor of the town were so desperate that Osborne begged Wentworth to overturn his order that the parish should not join in the relief of the poor of the town. Osborne argued that although overturning the rule would be an innovation, the JPs had been “Stricktly com[m]anded” by Wentworth and the Lords of the Privy Council “to prouide for the poore & to keep them w[i]thin their owne parishes.” Osborne to Wentworth, 4 May 1631, Str. P. 12 / 218.

<sup>112</sup> For example, Osborne was not certain who would be involved in the recusancy committee that Wentworth had appointed. Pogson, F. ‘Wentworth and the Northern Recusancy Commission,’ *Recusant History* 24, no. 3 (1999), p. 275. Osborne to Wentworth, 10 September 1633, Str. P. 13 / 43.

<sup>113</sup> Even once Osborne was granted more extensive powers in a Commission from the King in 1639, Wentworth still required Osborne to “acquaint me w[i]th what you purpose.” Wentworth to Osborne, March 1639, *ibid*, 10a / 274.

recommendations.<sup>114</sup> Problems of communication made this task especially cumbersome and Osborne would have to wait for weeks to hear Wentworth's answer.<sup>115</sup>

Not having such basic aspects of authority would have created questions about Osborne's status as Vice President. If he was seen as effectively Wentworth's puppet in the Council of the North, opponents might take the opportunity to undermine the regime as a whole. Indeed, in April 1633, Sir John Melton expressed his fears to Wentworth that "the Kinges President heare, wilbee wounded in the person of yo[u]r Lo[rdshi]ps Substitute." Melton argued that as Wentworth had so successfully increased the Court of the Council of the North "to a greater height in power in Jurisdiction" than for many years, "as it hath gotten growth Soe itt hath likewise drawn upon itt much envye and opposici[o]n." Melton stated that the Judges were ignoring Osborne's authority and were refusing to attend the Vice President during the King's visit to York.<sup>116</sup> Osborne had been fighting to assert himself over the Judges at the bar where as Vice President, he should have sat in the prime seat. Osborne complained "they make a question of it by nott yealdinge it..." Although this was a matter in which Osborne had "nott your Lo[rd]sh[i]ps particular directions," he was nonetheless confident that he had the "apparent right on my Side..." He asked that his precedence be asserted in cases that were "doutfull in your absence, when before your goinge that right is denied w[hi]ch admits noe dispute w[i]thoutt contempt of the Counsell order & incurringe the Kings displeasure."<sup>117</sup>

Osborne complained about the lack of respect shown to him as Vice President.

---

<sup>114</sup> Cliffe has noted that although Osborne's suggestions were normally accepted, this procedure was rather "irksome" to Osborne. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* p. 237. Osborne's letters to Wentworth in Ireland are littered with requests and suggestions for replacement Deputy Lieutenants and Colonels. For example, Str. P. 10a / 199, 266, 18 / 157. In May 1638, Osborne asked Wentworth to choose a new Councillor and a civil lawyer to add to the membership of the Council of the North where the numbers were diminishing. Osborne to Wentworth, 13 May 1638, *ibid*, 18 / 35.

<sup>115</sup> For example, Osborne wrote to Wentworth on 31 July 1638 to inform him that "There is now such a want of deputy Lieutenants in the North Rideing as I know not how the Seruice Can be p[er]formed there for the p[re]sent." Wentworth's response arrived six weeks later on 13 September 1638, *ibid*, 10a / 199 and 200.

<sup>116</sup> Melton complained that it "is not fitt that the Vice President should appeare alone att such tymes." Sir John Melton to Wentworth, 13 April 1633, *ibid*, 13 / 4. Osborne was also concerned about the imminent visit of the King to York and asked Wentworth to intercede with the Judges, as unless Wentworth did something to help, Osborne would be "butt Slenderly accompanied to meet the Kinge." He told Wentworth that he had sent a letter to the Judges with a copy of the order of precedence in the planned procession to York Minster, but the Judges had not responded to him and "absented themselues... & heard prayers in a church neere their lodgings." Osborne to Wentworth, 8 April 1633, *ibid*, 13 / 3.

<sup>117</sup> *ibid*, 13 / 3.

For example, he had been forced to wrangle with the Mayor of York who questioned his right to a particular seat in church.<sup>118</sup> Osborne found that even the Council of the North did not respect and support him. On one occasion, the Councillors were refusing to accompany him from the King's Manor to York Minster in a procession during the King's visit to York. The Council had assured him that it was "their constant custome w[i]th Vicepresidents" yet Osborne recalled that Wentworth's "opinion was otherwise."<sup>119</sup>

Wentworth was resolute that his deputy in the North should be respected in much the same way as he insisted on the honour due to him as the King's representative in Ireland. By promoting his link to the King, Wentworth could augment his own position as well as that of his deputies. However, if Wentworth emphasised the significance of his representation of the King too far, this could in turn diminish the status of his deputies. In effect, they would be seen as 'the representative's representative' and therefore could not exert the same status and thus command the same respect. Osborne struggled to command respect and authority in the same way that any deputy or Vice President might struggle to assert authority on behalf of a powerful figure. As we will see in Chapter 8, Christopher Wandesford also faced problems of asserting his authority in Ireland when standing in for Wentworth as his deputy. This may be due to the fact that opponents tried to exploit the situation of dealing with a 'stand in' for the authority figure himself, or simply that the deputies just did not command the same level of personal authority. Osborne revealed that in Wentworth's absence, there had been a notable change in attitude towards the government of the Council of the North. Osborne warned Wentworth that since his departure only nine months earlier, he "must expect, & I beleeeue doe finde opposition in some things, interruption in others, & Slownes in all."<sup>120</sup> In order to maintain his position Osborne was forced to identify himself even more with Wentworth, in order to bolster his own authority, but at the same time, he ran the risk of being opposed by

---

<sup>118</sup> Osborne asked Wentworth to "descide the question between the Lo[rd] Maior & Vicepresident for precedence, himselfe hauinge needlesly mooued the question by the unmannerly takinge away the Seate..." Osborne to Wentworth, 8 April 1633, 23 March 1634, *ibid.*, 13 / 3, 233. This issue was finally resolved by Osborne following Wentworth's advice to occupy the seat despite the Lord Mayor's objections who "did endeauour by all meanes to diuerte itt butt absented himselfe...." Osborne to Wentworth, undated letter, *ibid.*, 13 / 88

<sup>119</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 21 February 1634, *ibid.*, 13 / 198. However, Sir Arthur Ingram had remained loyal to Osborne and attended him "dayly both to church & the hall." However Osborne was not under any illusions believing this to be "onely for your Lo[rd]sh[i]ps sake." Osborne to Wentworth, 23 March 1634, *ibid.*, 13 / 233.

men who had already proven to be Wentworth's opponents. Osborne found himself in an impossible position, needing to ally himself with Wentworth, but trying to detach himself from the Lord Deputy in order to avoid aggravating his enemies.

Osborne's position as Vice President was fundamentally unclear. He had supposed status of the President, but few of the powers without deferring to Wentworth. For example, the Councillors refused to work with Wentworth's preferred recusancy policy in the North, which aimed to limit the amount that Catholics were troubled.<sup>121</sup> Osborne complained of the lack of respect from one particular councillor, Sir William Ellis, whose "ouer legall and full of Scruples" behaviour had impeded the recusancy business.<sup>122</sup> Osborne felt that the Council of the North was being too cautious in their dealings with recusants, not wishing to compound with them before conviction. His task was made all the more difficult as the Commission for compounding with recusants was well aware that their Instructions did not give a deputy the right to safely compound with recusants who were not convicted.<sup>123</sup> However, Osborne had to write to Wentworth to avoid being tied by the Instructions, asking him in a letter of 10 September 1633 for his advice on "inlarginge" the Instructions for the commission for the composition of recusants which he feared would be "very defectiue for the Seruice..."<sup>124</sup>

Osborne was frequently frustrated by his lack of authority over the Council. In August 1633, he wrote to Wentworth to request that he send a letter to the Council in

---

<sup>120</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 16 April 1634, *ibid*, 14 / 30.

<sup>121</sup> For example, Wentworth attempted to curb the activities of pursuivants that actively searched out Catholics and did not push many to swear the oaths of supremacy and allegiance. However, by Charles I's reign, most Catholics were willing to take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* p. 203.

<sup>122</sup> Osborne struggled with Ellis for some time and requested that Wentworth "affrighte him a little, by letteng him know you will complaine of his backwardness in these Services." Osborne to Wentworth, 10 September 1633, Str. P. 13 / 43. Osborne also reported that ecclesiastical men were ignoring Wentworth's recusancy policy. Osborne had no power to prevent the actions being taken by the Archbishop and Bishop of Durham in the North, who had issued new commissions to search recusants' houses for "Preists, Reliques, & popish ornaments." This action directly opposed Wentworth's policy and Osborne feared that "the seruice will fall to nothings" if "both such that haue compounded & are yet to compound are soe molested..." In a later letter dated 3 November 1633, Osborne reported to Wentworth that Laud and the Bishop of Durham were concerned that their actions against the recusants in the North had been misinterpreted and that Laud "professes to me all readines to further the Seruice of compositions..." After Osborne's complaint, the Bishop of Durham had "called in" a commission that had been appointed to search the homes of Catholics. Osborne to Wentworth, 26 September 1633, 3 November 1633, *ibid*, 13 / 56, 83.

<sup>123</sup> Osborne complained that the Council were "all unwilling to proceed but according to the strickt words of the com[m]ission & Instructions." *ibid*, 13 / 56. The commissioners were dragging their feet in direct opposition to Osborne's rule, knowing that they could not compound with unconvicted recusants without Wentworth's explicit instruction to do so. Reid, *King's Council* p. 278.

<sup>124</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 10 September 1633, Str. P. 13 / 43.

order to quicken the hearing of information on the King's behalf.<sup>125</sup> Even after being in post for four years, Osborne still felt that Wentworth had greater influence and control over the North. He reported to Wentworth that he would not begin reprimand proceedings against one Mr Farrington as he had heard news that Wentworth was expecting to visit England and that his presence alone would make Farrington more "flexible."<sup>126</sup> Osborne also experienced more personal attacks upon his position and even a relative of Wentworth did not feel obliged by his kinship with the President to make him acknowledge and respect the authority of his Vice President. Archbishop Laud warned Wentworth that Osborne was embroiled in a dispute with Wentworth's nephew, Sir William Savile. Laud told Wentworth that this argument was making "the King's businesses go worse in that great county, which hath hitherto been so forward upon all occasions."<sup>127</sup> Osborne felt that Savile was neglecting his duties in the King's service. Wentworth acknowledged the problems that Osborne faced with his nephew and assured Osborne that he would plainly deliver to his nephew his interpretation of the events at York "w[hi]ch may perchance p[re]uent the like hereafter, if not the hono[u]r and prosperity of my Maisters Seruice is w[i]th me before all Kindred."<sup>128</sup> Wentworth did indeed write to Savile to censure him for his behaviour towards his representative. He emphasised that even if Savile did not like Osborne personally, he should "Call to mind that the Respects you afford to the vicepresident are not to his person, but his Place..."<sup>129</sup> However, at the same time, Wentworth was concerned that whilst Osborne argued with his opponents such as Sir William Savile, he was giving fuel to his critics. Therefore Wentworth was not necessarily supporting his friend Osborne out of loyalty, but rather believed that both should be working to improve the King's revenue and business in the North rather than becoming engrossed in petty squabbles.<sup>130</sup> On other occasions, Wentworth used rather forceful language to his

---

<sup>125</sup> Osborne asked Wentworth to "write a l[ett]er to the Counsell & me to quicken us in the prosecution & hearinge of Informations for the King for that, you will heare how backwarde we are in that Seruice both when they come to be censured & before, takinge all aduantages that may be to discourage the relators in the prosecution, & soe tis true S[i]r Will[iam] Ellis doth, who leadinge the rest, I cannot my Selfe amend it." 21 August 1633, *ibid*, 13 / 31.

<sup>126</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 8 March 1637, *ibid*, 16 / 150.

<sup>127</sup> Bliss, J. (ed). *The works of the most reverend father in God, William Laud, D.D.* (7 vols. London, 1847 – 1860), vol. vii, p. 554.

<sup>128</sup> Wentworth to Osborne, 13 September 1638, Str. P. 10a / 200.

<sup>129</sup> Wentworth to Sir William Savile, 19 September 1638, *ibid*, 10a / 208.

<sup>130</sup> In a disagreement with Savile and Sir John Hotham, Wentworth chided Osborne that by their actions they "doe but distract the Seruice, wound one another, and giue occasion to others that loue none of us, to speake things to all yo[u]r disadvantages" and Wentworth's personal prejudice.

deputy, reminding him of his responsibilities in the North and the need to preserve Wentworth's reputation. In February 1638, to combat his despondency. Osborne was ordered to "buckle" himself and continue to work "to vindicate His Maj[es]ties Royall Rights and Prerogatiues from the Rebelliouse..."<sup>131</sup>

Osborne also had to ask Wentworth to step in to settle a disagreement with Sir Arthur Ingram. Osborne struggled to deal with Ingram's arrogance and self-importance, reporting to Wentworth in January 1635 that Ingram "carryes his Sailes loftier than euer."<sup>132</sup> Osborne wrote to Wentworth in Ireland in the spring of 1634, telling him of his concern that Ingram was attempting to take over the management of recusancy compounding in the North. He described Ingram's tactics believing that Ingram had made a "false suggestion" to Lord Treasurer Weston and Lord Cottington pretending that "the Seruice of composition uppon the new com[m]ission is neglected and delayed." Osborne argued that Ingram was motivated by the desire to obtain "vaine glory &... the good opinion of my Lord Treasurer... [and] perhaps some profit to himselfe."<sup>133</sup> Wentworth did accept Sir Edward Osborne's version of events but was unable to immediately take action against Ingram, as he was involved in the negotiations over the leasing of the alum farm on Wentworth's behalf.<sup>134</sup>

Wentworth understood the difficulties that Osborne faced and tried to reassure him in his correspondence that he was performing a good service to the Crown.<sup>135</sup> He assured his deputy that their opponents, although troublesome, would not be able to hurt them. He reminded Osborne that "yo[u]r illwillers and mine, haue not hither too

---

Wentworth warned Osborne that "if I were amongst you, as once I was in good hope I should, I would haue Chidd you all, right hartily..." Wentworth to Osborne, March 1639. *ibid*, 10a / 278.

<sup>131</sup> Wentworth to Osborne, 15 February 1639, *ibid*, 10a / 251.

<sup>132</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 9 January 1635, *ibid*, 14 / 255.

<sup>133</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 28 March 1634, *ibid*, 14 / 8.

<sup>134</sup> Osborne's family eventually gained some profit from Wentworth's lease of the alum farm. In 1649, Osborne's widow attempted to compound for a rent of £200 per year, issuing out of the alum patent. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* p. 91, Reid, *King's Council* p. 282, Pogson, 'Wentworth and the Northern Recusancy Commission,' p. 275.

<sup>135</sup> Wentworth made efforts to reward Osborne with praise in order to encourage his work. In 1639, Osborne was under a great deal of pressure with the impending Bishops' War and Wentworth rewarded him with the news that the King was extremely pleased with Osborne's work and would protect him and his estates in the future. Wentworth to Osborne, 15 February 1639, Str. P. 10a / 250. Osborne needed Wentworth's friendship and support in 1638 when his son died in an accident at the King's Manor in York. Archbishop Laud wrote to Wentworth in Ireland on 5 November 1638, with some unhappy news "of the lamentable accident of Sir Edward Osborne's son's death, by the fall of the chimneys at York Manor, the last of October." Two other children "narrowly escaped the same fate." Osborne wrote to tell Wentworth that he could not "yet indure the sight of that place w[hi]ch was the destruction of soe deare a sonne in such miserable manner" and therefore requested his leave to be absent from York "somewhat longer on this occasion then ordinary." Wentworth offered his sincere condolences in March 1639. Osborne to Wentworth, *ibid*, 10a / 265, 273.



bene able to hurt either of us, nor I trust euer shall.” Wentworth professed that he wished that he could be “at yo[u]r Elbow to take part of their high lookes off you, upon my selfe.”<sup>136</sup> Wentworth also supported Osborne fully in matters concerning the security of the North and the King’s service. Osborne had experienced problems of authority when calling the troops to York to be trained, and he worried that the Captains of the horse troop might not bring their men to York to be “exercised in one body” rather than apart. He was prepared for the disloyalty of Sir William Savile who might “preuayle in his accustomed wayes of opposition.” However, Wentworth insisted that the military owed Osborne all allegiance and that the King would “Support you in the Rights & Honours of yo[u]r Place...”<sup>137</sup>

Osborne often appeared to be lacking in confidence in his own actions and authority. He often felt it necessary to qualify his advice to Wentworth about issues in the North, stating for example, “I dare nott presume to aduise beinge an attempt beyond mine ability.”<sup>138</sup> Early in his career in particular, Osborne sounded insecure in his assertions and asked Wentworth to step in to deal with difficult matters. He stated that he was “very doubtfull I shall nott be able to Satisfy the kings expectation & com[m]ands in S[i]r Ihon Bouchers cause... unless your L[ordshi]p interpose your power w[i]th them beforehand.”<sup>139</sup> This may have been a mechanism to protect himself from reprimand, but it is conceivable that Osborne did indeed feel out of his depth, being left to deal with the North with an unsupportive Council and a President with whom communications were arduous.

### **The practicalities of Osborne’s Vice Presidency**

Osborne did demonstrate some independence of judgment in his Vice Presidency and although he enforced Wentworth’s policies, on occasion, he appears to have put his own slant upon proceedings. In Wentworth’s recusancy policy, Osborne saw the need for sympathy towards some recusants, concerned that the recusants might refuse to pay altogether as the fines were rising too quickly.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> Wentworth to Osborne, March 1639, *ibid*, 10a / 275.

<sup>137</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 31 July 1638, *ibid*, 10a / 198, Wentworth to Osborne, May 1639, 10a / 325. Wentworth also promised to write to Sir William Savile “and plainly deliuer him my sense of what hath past at York w[hi]ch may perchance p[re]uent the like hereafter.” Wentworth to Osborne, 13 September 1638, *ibid*, 10a / 200.

<sup>138</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 16 April 1634, *ibid*, 14 / 30.

<sup>139</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 21 August 1633, *ibid*, 13 / 31.

<sup>140</sup> Osborne reminded Wentworth that “The Recusants that haue Compounded Claime a promise from yo[u]r lo[rds]hip that their Leases should be past for twelue pounds tenn shillings.... and now the

Perhaps as a direct result of this, Osborne suggested in 1635 that in the recusancy commission's renewal (due to the fact that there was not enough commissioners as a number were absent at that time), the commissioners should have the power to take oaths on the true value of recusants' estates. This would not however extend to the parties involved, who could not be trusted to give an accurate analysis of their lands. The commissioners, he argued, should also be able to test the truth of the deeds and leases that were presented to them, which they "haue often greate cause to suspect..."<sup>141</sup> However, so as not to allow the King's revenues to suffer, he was prepared to "Goe on as formerly" with the compositions if any recusant "voluntary offer themselues to Compound..."<sup>142</sup> Osborne's interpretation of the recusancy policy did create some trouble for him. He asked Wentworth for his advice on how to deal with a petition filed by one Richard Heaton who had charged him with "things wherof I am altogether ignorant." Heaton accused Osborne of favouring recusants but Osborne insisted to Wentworth that he had only once moved Sir Robert Heath, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas to prevent a proceeding against his "brother Sherburne for his wiues recusancy..."<sup>143</sup> Challenges such as this to Osborne's religious orthodoxy would have further undermined his authority, raising potential concerns in men's minds even if the rumours had no foundation.

Concern to continue raising large sums of money for the King from the recusancy fines was always present in Osborne's mind. He drew Wentworth's attention to cases where "under pretence of the Kings aduantage, butt really for some mens priuate profit," the collectors of the fines were attempting to draw the "Reuenue of Recusants in the Northeren partes into another course then now it runs in." Osborne was aware that his authority in these matters was limited, and continually referred such issues to his President in Ireland. However, in 1638, Osborne described the prompt payments of the Yorkshire compounders. He wrote that "noe reuenue the

---

Charge of our Lease will be thirty pounds or therabouts..." Osborne to Wentworth, 28 August 1639, *ibid*, 10a / 363. Osborne highlighted the case of Mr Sare of Worsall who had inherited the estate of his father and was expected to provide £260 each year for his recusancy. Osborne was unsure how the family could raise this amount of money "who by reason of debts, children & other charges... cannot subsist w[i]th the like proportionate payment." Osborne to Wentworth, 8 June 1635, *ibid*, 15 / 98.

<sup>141</sup> He also put forward the idea that the commissioners should have the power to take complaints against the commission under oath which "are frequently offred us touchinge the abusiue words & carriages" of the undersheriffs and jurors. He had experienced a worrying complaint recently against the undersheriff of Lancashire that the Commission was "a new & unlawfull inuention..." Osborne to Wentworth, 17 November 1635, *ibid*, 15 / 262.

<sup>142</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 16 September 1639, *ibid*, 10a / 364.

Kinge hathe comes in soe speedily or certainly as this...”<sup>144</sup> Osborne may have had little real need to be so concerned about the amounts of money raised from recusancy fines. Perhaps his desire to work efficiently for the Crown exacerbated his fears that he was not raising enough money for the King.

Other forms of revenue collection in the North added to Osborne’s responsibilities. In the Ship Money contributions, which had been extended to inland counties during Charles’ Personal Rule, Osborne experienced some opposition from those who saw Ship Money as extra-parliamentary and therefore illegal. Wentworth was very upset to hear that Sir John Hotham had refused to contribute in May 1639.<sup>145</sup> In this atmosphere, Osborne was contending with dissatisfaction towards the King’s policy as well as attempting to assert himself over his peers, who were often less than willing to accept his predominance. Osborne was also expected to handle the collection of revenue to pay for the militias.<sup>146</sup>

Osborne’s involvement in military preparations took up a great deal of his time after 1638. Osborne reported to Wentworth in the summer of 1638 that he had called the deputy lieutenants together, and described in detail the state of the militia’s training and the work that needed to be done. Wentworth required Osborne to reorganise the troops in order to make their numbers more equal across the North, admitting that it might be necessary to “borrow and send from one to another Rideing.”<sup>147</sup> Osborne was responsible for the smooth running of the military and checking upon the training of the troops. This proved to be a difficult task throughout his Vice Presidency and in particular he complained to Wentworth about the lack of

---

<sup>143</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 5 May 1635, *ibid*, 15 / 58. Heaton was a “notorious agent” for levying arrears and searching recusants’ property. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* pp. 216 – 7.

<sup>144</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 13 May 1638, Str. P. 18 / 35. In actual fact, the Yorkshire compounders paid compositions fairly promptly and Cliffe pointed out that this demonstrated their continued abilities to pay the reasonably low rates. Very few gentry had to pay one-fifth of their income and many contributed less than one-tenth. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* p. 220.

<sup>145</sup> Wentworth wrote that he was “sorry the Ship money is denied by any in Yorkshire Especially that S[i]r John Hotham is one, I haue writt to him Concerning that businesse very plainly. If that worke not w[i]th him there will be necessity to free myselfe from seeminge to haue any priuity w[i]th him therin...” Wentworth to Osborne, May 1639, Str. P. 10a / 324. In 1630, Osborne had himself tried to get out of paying the Knighthood fine, another of Charles I’s extra-parliamentary taxes during the Personal Rule and in this had Wentworth’s compliance. He asked Wentworth “nott to certifie my name into the Exchequer” as he thought he would “escape undiscovered, seinge euerybody here believes I haue paide my monye to your Lo[rd]sh[i]p in the Cuntrye & those that know the contrarye are now perswaded I haue paide itt into the Exchequer...” Osborne to Wentworth, 8 November 1630, *ibid*, 12 / 161+1.

<sup>146</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 5 May 1635, *ibid*, 15 / 58.

<sup>147</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 31 July 1638, *ibid*, 10a / 198, Wentworth to Osborne, May 1639, 10a / 274.

training and the problem of delinquents in the forces.<sup>148</sup> Even in his capacity as deputy-lieutenant, Osborne was not able to prevent a petition by the soldiers against their officers.<sup>149</sup>

### **Osborne's increased authority**

In 1638, frustrated by his lack of authority, Osborne complained to Secretary Coke and suggested that Wentworth's authority should be vested in his Vice-President and the Council in the North.<sup>150</sup> It is unclear what Osborne's motivations might have been. It might seem that Osborne was effectively going behind Wentworth's back in order to assume greater personal authority and status, and this would suggest a rather arrogant attitude to his Vice Presidency. However, it appears that Osborne was genuinely frustrated by the continual reproaches to his authority and opposition which was exacerbated by the fact that he was often unable to act quickly having first to seek Wentworth's permission. The distance between Wentworth and his Vice President and the problems of communication between them meant that it was not practical for the deputy to continually defer decisions to the President. Also, by 1638, Osborne had been in post for five years and had proven to Wentworth that he could be trusted. Wentworth may also have been confident that Osborne shared his own ideals and would therefore continue to run the government of the North in the same vein as Wentworth. The issue was resolved in February 1639 when Wentworth's request that Osborne become the deputy-lieutenant-general was granted. The King was "much satisfied" with Osborne's work and Wentworth was permitted to allow Osborne to have "absolute power amongst them, as if I were present in p[er]son." Although his authority was not extended into all spheres, Osborne would now have complete authority in military decisions.<sup>151</sup> It is notable that Osborne had

---

<sup>148</sup> See for example, Osborne to Wentworth, 8 June 1635, *ibid*, 15 / 98.

<sup>149</sup> The complaints were levied against the Captains and Officers "for takeing moneyes for Chandging and discharging of Soldiers... amounting to a great summe." Osborne to Wentworth, 13 August 1639, *ibid*, 10a / 362.

<sup>150</sup> Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry*, p. 237, *HMC Coke MSS II* p. 204, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, pp. 282, 285.

<sup>151</sup> Wentworth told Osborne that "Henceforward you will not need to send for warrants to me for Captaines.... Only I shall desire, That you will still acquaint me w[i]th what you purpose..." March 1639, Str. P. 10a / 274. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* p. 237, *HMC Coke MSS II* p. 204. An example of the problems Osborne faced before having complete authority in military spheres is demonstrated in 1638. The King ordered that the trained bands in the six northern counties be prepared for military activity in case of problems with the Scots. Osborne held a conference with the deputy lieutenants of Yorkshire on 27 July 1638 in order to carry out Charles I's order. However, he had been told not to divulge the reasons behind the preparations and therefore experienced difficulty in convincing those at the meeting

managed to work on Wentworth's behalf since 1633 without this power and express authority, and thus had had to communicate frequently with Wentworth to obtain his permission for any actions. However, Wentworth was keen that Osborne kept Wentworth's involvement in this promotion a secret so that he could "auoyde the displeasure of my other friends."<sup>152</sup> In gaining this extra authority, Wentworth was keen to impress on Osborne "how much I haue undertaken for you." This suggests that Osborne did have Wentworth's support in his approach to Secretary Coke for extended authority in Wentworth's absence. Wentworth reminded Osborne that he would be "sure to be looked on w[i]th an euill eye by such of the Greate ones. as loue me not." Their opponents would be waiting for "any thing you Chance to doe amisse" but this should just alert Osborne to the continued need to do "euery good & Carefull duty."<sup>153</sup> This demonstrates that Wentworth and Osborne would still be linked despite Osborne's newfound authority, and ultimately, Wentworth would still be responsible for the actions of his Vice President and Council. We should note that in this same letter, Wentworth promised to send his "Aduice in all things else w[hi]ch Concernes that Government," clearly indicating that Wentworth would still play a key role in important decisions.<sup>154</sup>

### **The downfall of Council of the North**

Osborne managed to keep a hold over the North throughout the 1630s despite the problems he had experienced due to his authority as Vice President being questioned. However, when the Long Parliament of 1640 attacked Wentworth's regime, inevitably the position of the Council of the North began to deteriorate.

---

that there was any need for haste in the measures. Finally, Wentworth had to intervene in order to speed up the training of the militia as Osborne was facing delays. This was presumably due to the lack of respect for his authority, as the other deputy-lieutenants were not prepared to take his word for the need for haste. Cliffe, *Yorkshire Gentry* pp. 310 – 311, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, pp. 193 – 194, 215 – 216, 218, *HMC Coke MSS II* p.189.

<sup>152</sup> It is not clear exactly whom Wentworth was referring to here. It is unlikely that he was hoping to keep Osborne's promotion a secret from his friends Radcliffe and Wandesford as we know that they knew Wentworth's policies intimately. It may be that Wentworth was referring to men in the North whom he did not wish to aggravate with the news of Osborne's power and this might further increase opposition to his regime. Finally, we might consider that Wentworth was being sarcastic here. Osborne and Wentworth faced a number of opponents in the North and these would not have been pleased to hear that Wentworth's deputy was to be vested with increased powers as this might threaten their own positions. Wentworth to Osborne, 10 February 1638, Str. P. 10a / 249.

<sup>153</sup> *ibid.*, 10a / 249.

<sup>154</sup> *ibid.*, 10a / 250.

Osborne was involved in the Parliament of 1640, although again, he was not a particularly prominent member of the Parliament.<sup>155</sup>

Despite Wentworth's downfall, Osborne was not punished or removed from the Council of the North as one might have expected. He continued in his post of Vice-President of the Council in the North until the Council was dissolved in 1641. This is notable as the first charge levelled against Wentworth by the English Parliament was that he had obtained an "unwarranted, unwarrantable and illegal extension of his Presidential powers to satisfy his own ambitious lust," referring to the new Commission and Instructions to the Council of the North he had obtained in March 1633. However a new Commission had been necessary, as it had to be renewed each time a new secretary to the Council was appointed. The Instructions would also have provided "enlightenment and guidance" for Edward Osborne.<sup>156</sup> In Wentworth's defence, we might argue that if anyone was to be accused for using a new Commission and Instructions in order to extend the Council of the North's prerogative, it was Osborne. He was in effect actively working in the capacity of President of the Council in the North during most of the 1630s and Wentworth actually never sat in judgment under the new Instructions. This interpretation might have led to Osborne having been tried for treason. However, as he was Wentworth's deputy, he was only seen as responsible for carrying out his President's orders and therefore Wentworth had the ultimate responsibility for the Council of the North. Wentworth was perceived as the real threat to Parliament, not his deputy who in any case for much of the 1630s had worked with very restricted powers.

### **The role of Wentworth's 'Men-of-Business'**

Thomas Wentworth was not simply reliant upon Edward Osborne for support and information about political and personal activities in England. He also had a network of lesser officials and advisors who played an integral role in his finances, estates and political intrigue in the 1630s. These men-of-business have a distinct

---

<sup>155</sup> His election as a member of Parliament was not straightforward. There was initially some confusion over where he would sit. Wentworth had done some electioneering on his behalf in Scarborough in the spring of 1640, and Scarborough had accepted Osborne as its candidate. However, Osborne decided to serve for York, and Scarborough refused Wentworth's second candidate, George Butler. The autumn election was 'troublesome and disorderly' and finally York rejected Osborne. However, Sir Edward Osborne and Sir Thomas Widdrington were elected for Berwick, probably thanks to Wentworth's influence. Gruenfelder, J.K. 'The Electoral Patronage of Sir Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1614 - 1640,' *Journal of Modern History* 49 (1977), pp. 572 - 573.

<sup>156</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 112.

relationship to that between Wentworth, Radcliffe and Wandesford who formed a close political alliance based around long-term kinship ties. Philip Mainwaring and Edward Osborne, to some extent, also fit into this group of men. although they did not have the same longevity of friendship to rely upon as Radcliffe and Wandesford. However, the men of business in England existed in a client-patron type of relationship and in the study of such men, we can clearly distinguish between the unique form of relationship Thomas Wentworth had with his closest advisors. and these essential men in England who carried out more administrative functions.<sup>157</sup> Wentworth employed William Raylton to act on his behalf and to represent him whilst he was absent from London from the early 1630s. Raylton's actions in London are frequently referred to in the Strafford Papers and it is clear that Wentworth was very reliant upon Raylton to administer his business from an English perspective, to carry letters and information to others on his behalf and to deal with his personal finances and those of the Irish administration.<sup>158</sup> Raylton's services to Wentworth were recognised by the King who, in October 1634 wrote to Wentworth to order that Raylton should receive £200 for his work.<sup>159</sup> After Strafford's execution, the King refunded any expenses Raylton had incurred on Wentworth's behalf.<sup>160</sup>

It is unclear why Wentworth should have risked so much in the person of Raylton, entrusting him with essential financial and diplomatic work that on occasion may have been extremely confidential. Raylton was certainly a respected and trusted person and indeed, Philip Burlamachi described him as an "honest man" in a letter to

---

<sup>157</sup> Sainty has drawn attention to the need to examine the separate secretariat of the Lord Deputies of Ireland who resided in London. Governors needed to employ an agent who would carry out transactions for them whilst they were away in Ireland. Sainty, J.C. 'The Secretariat of the Chief Governors of Ireland, 1690 – 1800,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 77, Section C (1977), p. 11.

<sup>158</sup> For example, it was Raylton who usually paid the recusant monies into the exchequer, although Richard Marris, Wentworth's steward, did on at least one occasion. Pogson, 'Wentworth and the Northern Recusancy Commission,' p. 276, Str. P. 20 / 41, 21 / 102, 167. Raylton carried important letters to key figures within the English Court. In December 1633, Wentworth wrote to his secretary Thomas Little enclosing a warrant for Sir John Melton which he was to "deliuer unto Will[ia]m Raylton, who is to attend Mr Secretary Coke for to procue his Ma[jes]tes hand thereunto." Wentworth to Thomas Little, 23 December 1633, *ibid*, 21 / 108.

<sup>159</sup> King Charles I to Wentworth for William Raylton, 26 October 1634, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 254, 170, *CSPI 1633 – 47*, p. 81.

<sup>160</sup> In 1640, Charles had ordered that £50,000 was to be paid from the English Exchequer in order to pay for an Irish Army to be raised. William Raylton had only received a proportion of this money and now, along with "Various other disbursements, made on the Earl of Strafford's warrant," Raylton was owed £14,313 15s. The King wrote to the Vice Treasurer of Ireland to order that he accept the warrants given to Raylton by the Earl of Strafford before his death and to settle this account with him. "As he has paid over £450 more than he has received, you shall make good that balance to him as soon as

Sir Arthur Ingram.<sup>161</sup> It appears that Philip Mainwaring was related in some way to William Raylton and it may be that it is through this association that we can trace their initial contact. In October 1630, Mainwaring recommended Wentworth's "very careful Servant" Raylton, adding that "if I had not that Relation unto him, that I have. I would say more in his behalf, but I do not doubt your Lordship finds his Industry."<sup>162</sup>

William Raylton clearly played a key role as a surveyor of political opinion whilst Wentworth was in Ireland and was an invaluable means by which Wentworth could contact important Privy Councillors with news and courtesies. Raylton regularly called on ministers such as Laud and Cottington with letters from Wentworth. Correspondence in the Strafford Papers regularly refers to dealings with Wentworth's agent. His official duties at Court were as Clerk of the Council Chamber and later Clerk of the Privy Seal,<sup>163</sup> so he was well placed to learn of Court intrigues and news and pass this information on to the absent Wentworth. However, Raylton's work was very much in the domain of the capital city and the Court. On the other hand, Wentworth was also reliant upon other figures to administer his personal estates and finances, particularly those based in Yorkshire. The most important of these, Richard Marris, was Thomas Wentworth's steward.<sup>164</sup> Wentworth must have trusted Marris explicitly as he allowed him to handle his finances and revenues. In particular Marris dealt with the recusancy revenues from the northern counties as Wentworth continued to hold the receivership of recusants rents, despite being in Ireland.<sup>165</sup> Marris was in close contact with Wentworth in Ireland and corresponded with him regularly, keeping Wentworth informed on the state of his finances.

---

possible." King to Vice-Treasurer of Ireland for William Raylton, 28 May 1641, P.R.O. S.P. 16, Signet Office III, pp. 461 – 3, *CSPI 1633 – 47*, p. 292.

<sup>161</sup> Philip Burlamachi to Sir Arthur Ingram, 27 August 1639, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 52.

<sup>162</sup> Philip Mainwaring to Wentworth, 29 October 1630, Str. P. 12 / 158, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 54.

<sup>163</sup> Merritt, J.F. 'Power and communication: Thomas Wentworth and government at a distance during the Personal Rule, 1629 – 1635,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 122.

<sup>164</sup> Cooper, *Land, Men and Beliefs* p. 148.

<sup>165</sup> Fiona Pogson has described Richard Marris' most important duty as guaranteeing that money raised through recusancy fines were transmitted to Wentworth via his agent quickly. Pogson, 'Wentworth and the Northern Recusancy Commission,' p. 276, Str. P. 21 / 73. Wentworth was clearly worried about the recusancy money when he was in Ireland. He asked his secretary Thomas Little to "spend some time at Yorke; and settle the moneys, rents and all other things concerning the Recusants moneys at York with the help of S[i]r John Melton... and Rich[ard] Marris, that soe there be order and due care used therein. w[hi]ch is the onely thing w[hi]ch now troubles my thoughts." Wentworth to Little, 23 December 1633, *ibid*, 21 / 108.



Although Thomas Wentworth was reliant upon Wandesford, Radcliffe and Osborne for advice and opinions, he was also dependent upon the activities of this lower stratum of his administration. Sir George Radcliffe's biographical essay on the life of the Earl of Strafford acknowledged the importance of Richard Marris' role by including him in his description of those men whom advised Wentworth in the running of his estates and his domestic affairs.<sup>166</sup> Radcliffe described how Wentworth valued the advice of Charles Greenwood, his solicitor Peter Man, Richard Marris and Radcliffe himself. They had regular meetings in the 1620s where issues concerning Wentworth's estate and financial affairs were discussed.<sup>167</sup> This type of analysis would have altered once the close group was fragmented by Radcliffe and Wentworth's departure to Ireland and Wentworth had to rely upon these men to continue in the effective running of his English estates without such close supervision. Richard Marris' main and most important duty appears to have been the accounts that Wentworth ordered to be completed twice yearly.<sup>168</sup>

Richard Marris is a useful figure to study in the administrative system that backed up Thomas Wentworth's career. His work illustrates that the personal and political business of Wentworth often overlapped.<sup>169</sup> He remained in England and provided Wentworth with a contact for news on events in England and also kept him

---

<sup>166</sup> This essay entitled 'An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde, in a Letter to the late Earl,' is printed in Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, pp. 429 – 436.

<sup>167</sup> Resolutions were decided upon and then the men would work upon the issues raised until the next meeting where "...an Account was taken of all that was done in Pursuance of the former Orders, and a new Note made of all that was rested to be done..." *ibid*, vol. II, p. 433.

<sup>168</sup> Radcliffe stated that Wentworth's "whole accounts were ordered to be made up twice every year... For by that Time the former half Year's Rents were commonly received, or else the Arrears were fit to be sought after. *ibid*, vol. II, p. 433.

<sup>169</sup> After Marris' death, Wentworth wrote to Charles Greenwood asking him to take over much of Marris' work temporarily. Greenwood was George Radcliffe's tutor at University and a family friend of the Savile's. Thomas Wentworth's long letter to Charles Greenwood, which he feared "multiplies upon me like Hidraes head, soe as I feare you by this tyme thinke, I shall neuer get to an end w[i]th it," set out his orders for his trusted friend to deal with his English estates after the death of his steward, Richard Marris. The reference to the complete letter is Str. P. 8 / 299 – 316. Wentworth was most concerned that Greenwood dealt with the payment of £3000 to the Duchess of Buckingham for her share of the Irish customs. Greenwood was to fulfil Marris' task by giving the money to Raylton. Private concerns were mixed up with political ones here as Wentworth and Radcliffe had shares in the Irish customs farm as well as formulating an Irish financial policy that hoped that Irish revenue would be much improved by this scheme. Greenwood was also to facilitate the gifts that Wentworth allowed a select few friends, which again Marris would usually have settled. Wentworth normally gave a gift of deer from his deer park. This again was both a private and political matter as Wentworth needed to maintain the support of key figures in England in order to ensure that his position was protected in his absence. Osborne was awarded responsibility of Master of the Game in New Park and to "dispose of the Deare he pleaseth, only I doe desire him to take Care the Deare be increased as much as is possible..." Sir William Pennyman was permitted in this agreement a buck and a doe each year, and later more, if the stock increased. Wentworth to Greenwood, 27 November 1635, *ibid*, 8 / 299, 308, 309 – 310.

informed on the running of his estate. Marris was invaluable to Wentworth who needed a trustworthy person in England upon whom he could rely to keep his accounts in order.<sup>170</sup> However, Marris was also a flawed character. Osborne disliked Marris' attitude and queried with Wentworth how often Marris was due to pay Wentworth's allowance. Osborne asked that this should be given to him in advance of the due date and demanded "some warrant from your Lo[rd]sh[i]p wherby I may demaund it of him... for I thinke he will be slow inough."<sup>171</sup> Wentworth was not always satisfied with the way in which Marris worked, yet it would have been difficult to interfere in his methods from a distance. Thomas Wentworth commented that "I feare his witt was soe often out of his head, as gaue him not tyme to keep cleare Accompts of those smaller matters."<sup>172</sup> Marris suffered a fatal accident in 1635. Wentworth believed that Marris had not drowned as Greenwood had reported but suggested rather that "heauy w[i]th drinke," Marris had fallen from his horse "neare the place where his Cloke lay, and... was dragged by the Horse and the Girthes looseing, left in that wett place where he was found dead... stormed to death...."<sup>173</sup> Having lost his trusted servant Marris, Wentworth was forced to deal with the business of his estates, seeking the assistance of his friend Charles Greenwood upon whom he was "infinitly much beholden unto your selfe and the rest of my priuate affaires."<sup>174</sup>

## Conclusion

The men charged with the administration of Wentworth's business in England faced many challenges and difficulties. Even whilst Wentworth was a physical presence in the Council of the North, his advisors and confidants were criticised and disparaged. Once Wentworth was removed into Ireland, the men he left behind to

---

<sup>170</sup> There were matters that Wentworth required Greenwood to keep until he personally was able to come to England to deal with them. This demonstrates that Wentworth had great trust in Marris as he was able to trust him with all of his personal finances. "For all my accompts w[i]th Rich[ard] Marris, I would haue them safely kept locked, as they are, till my Comeing into the Country... I am very sure there are many things in his bookes not fitt to be viewed w[i]thout me..." *ibid*, 8 / 300.

<sup>171</sup> This may not be a fair representation of Marris' work as Osborne later assured Wentworth that if he "conceaue any difference growen between Mr Marris & me, we shall easily compose it ourselues w[i]thoutt your Lo[rd]shi]ps troble." Osborne to Wentworth, 21 February 1634 and 23 March 1634. *ibid*, 13 / 198, 233.

<sup>172</sup> Wentworth also mentioned some improvements he desired to be carried at Ledston; "I did Continually speake to Rich[ard] Marris of it, but I know not how the good man euer forgott it." Wentworth to Greenwood, 27 November 1635, *ibid*, 8 / 305, 306.

<sup>173</sup> *ibid*, 8 / 310.

<sup>174</sup> *ibid*, 8 / 299.

attend to his personal and political affairs, also had to contend with the problems of an absentee master, with whom communications were slow and infrequent. This spelt potential disaster for both Wentworth and his unfortunate representative if matters became out of control. So what did these men, in the face of opposition, lack of advice and supervision and the envy of others, have to gain from an association with Wentworth? In the seventeenth century, local and national politics required careful networking with influential men in order to increase one's financial and political opportunities. It was a chance for personal gain as well as being a social expectation that men of a certain standing would embark on such a career. We might also propose that as Wentworth himself placed so much emphasis upon the need for kinship and personal alliances, these men were willing to work hard to support Wentworth's estate, reputation and political standing, whilst they too could benefit from having a man who could influence others for their benefit.

Wentworth's key associates in England were expected to report news and rumours to Ireland, partake fully in his political dealings, ensure the smooth running of his personal effects as well as maintain the reputation of their friend. In the case of Edward Osborne in particular, he suffered the problem of being promoted above his fellow gentry through Wentworth's patronage, which gave them little incentive to respect his authority. At times, Wentworth's men in England acted like a well-oiled machine, working efficiently in Wentworth's absence without the need for his interference. However, on a number of occasions, this was thrown into jeopardy. Marris' death in 1635 and the repeated challenges to Edward Osborne's authority in the North threatened to prevent Wentworth's duality of roles from working.

## Chapter 4: The preparation and planning of Wentworth's Irish administration

Wentworth was appointed Lord Deputy of Ireland in July 1631, although the official announcement did not take place until January 1632.<sup>1</sup> The King intended that Wentworth would take up his Deputyship with all possible speed. In the face of Wentworth's imminent arrival, the Lord Justices of Ireland were only to "look to the ordinary Administration of Civil Justice, and to the good Government of our Subjects and Army there."<sup>2</sup> However, Wentworth delayed his departure for many months not arriving in Ireland until eighteen months after his official appointment.

Why did Wentworth remain in England for so long after his official appointment in January 1632? Wentworth may have consciously decided to remain "aloof from Irish politics."<sup>3</sup> Indeed, there was perhaps some benefit in remaining in England until a financial settlement in Ireland had been reached, providing Wentworth with manoeuvrability. Kearney identifies external political reasons that may have contributed to the delay. The former Lord Deputy Falkland informed Sir William Parsons in December 1631 that the new Lord Deputy would not arrive in Ireland until the King returned from his visit to Scotland. The King's trip was delayed until May 1633 – and this may in part explain Wentworth's delay.<sup>4</sup> However, if this were the case, it is conceivable that we would not find so many examples of Charles I pressing Wentworth to leave for Ireland as soon as possible.<sup>5</sup> There may also have been more personal reasons that prevented Wentworth from embarking upon his

---

<sup>1</sup> Kearney points out that the news of Wentworth's appointment began to circulate during the summer of 1631. In particular, a letter of July 1631 from Laud to Wentworth implied that Wentworth had been chosen as the new Lord Deputy. Kearney, H.F. *Strafford in Ireland 1633-1641* (Manchester, 1989). pp. 26 – 27, Laud to Wentworth, 30 July 1631, Str. P. 20 / 110, Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols, London, 1739), vol. I, p. 58. King Charles I wrote to the Lord Justices of Ireland on 12 January 1632 with the official news that "We have made Choice of our Right Trusty and well beloved Cousin and Counsellor, Thomas Lord Viscount Wentworth our President of the North, to be our Deputy and Governor General of that our Kingdom of Ireland, and of our Army there..." Str. P. 12 / 272, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> Charles I ordered the existing Lords Justice in Ireland to refrain from passing any "Pardons, Offices, Lands, or Church-livings... nor to confer the Honour of Knighthood upon any, or to dispose of any Company of Horse or Foot there..." King Charles I to Lord Justices, 12 January 1632, Str. P. 12 / 272. Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I. p. 63.

<sup>3</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 34.

<sup>4</sup> Falkland to Parsons, 17 December 1631, Public Record Office, Ireland, MS 2445, f. 241 in *ibid*, p. 35.

<sup>5</sup> For example, after receiving Wentworth's recommendations to the Lord Justices which commanded the continuance of the Irish contributions, Cottington explained that the King "for many Reasons, thought it not safe, you not being there, but rather thought fitting that your Lordship's Journey thither should be hastened." Cottington later warned Wentworth that "I should advise your Lordship to put yourself instantly upon the Way, for I hope you have by this Time finished those Businesses which

journey to Ireland. His wife Arabella died in October 1631 and his grief may have delayed his desire to leave. He also needed time to deal with his personal estates and the business of his Lord Presidency of the North.

### **The advice of Sir Edward Stanhope**

Although we have Radcliffe's retrospective positive account of Wentworth's appointment to Ireland, this was written with the justification of Wentworth's regime in mind. We know little about the thoughts of Wentworth's closest friends and advisors and whether they approved of his acceptance of the role. However, the advice of Wentworth's cousin, Sir Edward Stanhope of Grimston in Yorkshire survives and he was extremely suspicious about the reasons behind Wentworth's nomination to this Irish post.<sup>6</sup> Stanhope warned Wentworth that he feared that his reputation and fortunes would be ruined if he accepted the Lord Deputyship. Despite the fact that they are rarely associated with each other, this letter provides evidence that Wentworth and Stanhope were close. Indeed prior to this occasion, Wentworth had confided in Stanhope.<sup>7</sup>

Stanhope believed that Lord Treasurer Weston, now the Earl of Portland, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer Lord Cottington were plotting Wentworth's downfall by suggesting to the King that he be sent to Ireland. Stanhope thought that the Lord Deputyship of Ireland was a particularly undesirable post, urging Wentworth to consider "Why is Ireland picked out for the purpose, why you for itt?" Ireland was a country "whether never man of eminency went, but was driven as the surest meanes

---

occasioned your Stay." Cottington to Wentworth, 18 October and 30 November 1632, Str. P. 1 / 78b, 12 / 312. Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 78, 80.

<sup>6</sup> See Zagorin, P. 'Communication: Sir Edward Stanhope's Advice to Thomas Wentworth, Viscount Wentworth, Concerning the Deputyship of Ireland: An unpublished letter of 1631,' *Historical Journal* 7, no. 2, (1964), p.300. Str. P. 8 / 79, Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 30 – 31.

<sup>7</sup> Although the letter is not signed or dated, it is generally accepted that the letter was written by Stanhope after analysis of the handwriting. This is reinforced by the fact that Wentworth's letter that responds to the issues raised in Stanhope's letter, is addressed to Edward Stanhope. Stanhope's letter was probably written in October as Wentworth's reply is dated 25 October 1631. Zagorin, 'Sir Edward Stanhope's Advice,' pp. 299 – 300, Str. P. 21 / 76, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 60. It is clear that Stanhope and Wentworth had communicated important and confidential information with each other previously and this enabled Stanhope to feel confident that he could offer frank advice to Wentworth. Stanhope felt that Wentworth's affection for him had been "manifested and enlarged.... By communicatunge with me your greatest secretts." Str. P. 8 / 79, Zagorin, 'Sir Edward Stanhope's Advice,' p. 312. As Stanhope was clearly able to offer unsolicited advice to Wentworth, it is perhaps surprising that Radcliffe does not mention Stanhope in his biography of Wentworth. Radcliffe, 'An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde, in a Letter to the late Earl,' in Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, pp. 429 – 436.

of his overthrow...”<sup>8</sup> Stanhope felt that if the post was truly lucrative and rewarding, then Cottington and Portland would pursue it for themselves.<sup>9</sup> Stanhope was suspicious of Portland and Cottington and reminded Wentworth of Cottington’s self-serving interest when Wandesford was put forward as a candidate for the ambassadorship of Spain, as noted in Chapter 3. Stanhope clearly thought that Cottington would only do a favour for Wentworth if it were in his own interest. In the case of Wandesford, Cottington had strung Wentworth along and then double-crossed him by placing his own secretary Arthur Hopton into the post.<sup>10</sup>

In Stanhope’s opinion, there was very little opportunity in Ireland to fulfill the King’s objective that Ireland should no longer be a drain on English resources. He could only identify four possible areas to increase wealth although even these had limitations. He thought that customs might yield revenue but then pointed out the error of picking “fruite whylst itt is in rypeninge, before itt coms to perfect maturitye.” He believed that Waterford and Galloway were the only places with significant enough traffic and even here, it was the “poorest, meanest merchandise of any Nacione.”<sup>11</sup> He argued that if Wentworth tried to exact tenure from the Irish, he would “impoverish the tenants soe much.” Enforcing wardships in Ireland that were “newly knowne amongst them” would be unfair. The final method of raising revenue suggested by Stanhope was the “inhancinge of lands,” but even this was rejected as the Irish “can yield little, for they posses not much.”<sup>12</sup>

If Edward Stanhope was able to offer unsolicited advice such as this, we might assume that something more direct and solicited was coming from Wentworth’s most trusted friends, Radcliffe and Wandesford. Although there is no evidence that Radcliffe and Wandesford held similar feelings regarding the Deputyship in Ireland, it is fascinating that others close to him advised against this promotion and were fearful for his reputation and status if he accepted the post in Ireland. We might also note the

---

<sup>8</sup> Stanhope could only recall one man that had returned from his Deputyship in Ireland “with out dishonor.” This was Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, 1603 – 1606, who successfully ended the Irish War. Zagorin, ‘Sir Edward Stanhope’s Advice,’ pp. 307 – 308.

<sup>9</sup> Stanhope asked Wentworth to consider “whye did never man in speciall favor and estimation with the Princes then reigninge, and in honorable office either about their persons or in the state, sue for it?” In his opinion, Wentworth should ask himself “whye doe neither of your two greate frends doe the like for themselves...” Str. P. 8 / 79, Zagorin, ‘Sir Edward Stanhope’s Advice,’ p. 303.

<sup>10</sup> Str. P. 8 / 79, Zagorin, ‘Sir Edward Stanhope’s Advice,’ p. 305.

<sup>11</sup> Stanhope argued that the exportation of Irish hides had its limitations as they were so poor and “not much better then many english Calves Skynes, and Wolle.... scarce equallinge the hayre of water spaniell.” Str. P. 8 / 79, Zagorin, ‘Sir Edward Stanhope’s Advice,’ p. 308

<sup>12</sup> Str. P. 8 / 79, Zagorin, ‘Sir Edward Stanhope’s Advice,’ pp. 308 – 309.

parallel to Wandesford's warnings to Wentworth in 1628 regarding his promotion to the Lord Presidency of the North, when he warned about Wentworth's envious enemies.<sup>13</sup> If Wandesford were concerned about Wentworth's nomination to the Council of the North, surely his concerns about an Irish occupation would be exacerbated, due to Wentworth's inevitable removal from England where courtly ambitions could be quickly undermined.

### **Wentworth's Propositions**

Wentworth used his time in England prior to leaving for Ireland, to negotiate a number of concessions and benefits with the King. This may account for Wentworth's delay in taking up the post, as he needed to ensure that the extent of his jurisdiction and authority in Ireland was fully defined. This was a kind of damage limitation exercise in which he attempted to gain the best possible contract for his potentially dangerous removal into Ireland. In February 1632, Wentworth presented a list of propositions to the King and the English Privy Council whose detailed responses survive in the margin of the Council Book.<sup>14</sup>

Wentworth reinforced the King's hope that his Deputy would ensure that Ireland would no longer be a drain on English resources<sup>15</sup> but the main thrust of his

---

<sup>13</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 29 December 1629, Str. P. 16 / 227, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 50.

<sup>14</sup> 'Thomas Wentworth's Propositions, to be considered of by his Majesty, concerning the Government of Ireland, with the Judgment of the Council thereupon,' 17[?] February 1631, and 'Thomas Wentworth's Private Propositions concerning Ireland,' 17[?] February 1631, Str. P. 21 / 86, 87, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 65 – 67. Wentworth was careful to maintain that these propositions regarding Irish government were just recommendations. He did not wish to sound too forceful or presumptuous in his assertions and he described his intentions to the Lord Treasurer in a letter of 3 June 1633. "...it hath been a Resolution in me, not to deliver any Opinion concerning his Majesty's Affairs within that Kingdom, 'till I had seen with my own Eyes, and heard with my own Ears; and that Rule I shall govern myself by still." Wentworth to Lord Treasurer Portland, 3 June 1633, Str. P. 3a / 1, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 88 – 89.

<sup>15</sup> Wentworth asked the King not to present suits to his servants "before the ordinary Revenue there become able to Sustain the necessary Charge of that Crown, and the Debts thereof be fully cleared." This was to give him chance to settle the Irish Treasury before the King began utilising it. The King and Council agreed to Wentworth's request. 'Thomas Wentworth's Propositions.' 17[?] February 1631, Str. P. 21 / 86. Wentworth hoped to reverse the trend of Ireland being exploited by the monarch's subjects and make Ireland profitable for the King. Wentworth explained to the King that "Others have taken and inned the plentiful Harvest for themselves, and left us only such Gleanings as these, to pick up for the Benefit of your Crown..." He believed that it was all too common in Ireland that those with 'Gifts' or offices in Ireland to exploit the revenue and keep profits for themselves which were owed to the Crown. Wentworth hoped that if the profits were redirected to the King's coffers, diligent ministers of the Crown would be "much quickened and encouraged, seeing their Services made appear to their Master, and the Profit gotten by them emptied into the right Cistern..." Wentworth to King Charles I. 22 June 1633, Str. P. 3a / 4, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 92. The King frequently reminded Wentworth that his main duty in Ireland was to raise money from the people, and in particular to ensure that the Irish paid for the army there. Charles I was perplexed by a letter from the

Propositions was to make certain that his position would not be destabilised in his absence from the English Court by false rumours or personal attacks.<sup>16</sup> Wentworth pressed that he should not be bypassed in any decision concerning Irish policy and hoped to bolster the importance of the Deputy, by placing him at the centre of Irish policy and concerns. For example, Wentworth proposed that he should deal directly with the Lord Treasurer of England in financial matters, rather than having to deal with the whole of the Committee for Ireland. Not only would this speed up transactions and negotiations, it would also serve to bolster Wentworth's status, putting the Lord Deputyship on a par with the Lord Treasurer of England.<sup>17</sup> The Privy Council consented to Wentworth's request and saw the value of the Deputy having all orders passing through him, as this would enable the King to "clearly see into the true inward Value of all Things." In this way, Wentworth ensured that the Deputy's inside knowledge of Irish affairs would be utilised, rather than over-ridden. Wentworth asked that all accusations of injustice or oppression in Ireland must first be presented to the Deputy, making sure that his jurisdiction and potential to suppress dangerous rumours, was not bypassed. This could also prevent the Irish from taking legal cases

---

Irish Council which reported that "all sort of Men, as well British as Natives, should so far declare Averseness and Impatience in the Payment of the Contribution toward the Payment of our Army..." Charles I expected Wentworth to attend to this business, especially since Wentworth had informed him that payments for the Army were "not at all as formerly burdensome unto them." Charles felt that heavy taxation to pay for the Army was justified as the Irish "enjoy in a large Manner the Protection and Care of our just and peaceable Government, and...they have largely tasted of our Acts of Grace and Bounty..." Charles was willing to admit that if the payments could not be settled, "we must be constrained, if they be not freely and thankfully continued, to streighten our former Graces vouchsafed during those Contributions." King Charles I to Lord Justices, 14 April 1632, Str. P. 1 / 37b – 38a, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, pp. 71 – 2.

<sup>16</sup> The Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Adam Loftus reinforced Wentworth's concern about the particular danger of being absent from the centre of politics. Loftus described the intrigues he had faced which had been stirred up by men both in England and Ireland "who never accorded more in any one Thing than in Work that might tend to my Prejudice and Diminution." He described the "Disrespects, daily Endeavours to irritate and stir up Clamours and Complaints, some exhibited here, others to the Lords there..." Loftus to Wentworth, 16 March 1632, Str. P. 1 / 37a, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, pp. 70 – 71. Wentworth had himself experienced the damage that rumours could inflict upon political relationships in October 1632. On this occasion, it was rumoured that Wentworth intended to obtain the Lord Treasurership. He wrote to Lord Treasurer Portland to explain that Wandesford had warned him of this rumour "cursorily and slightly," but that with Wentworth, the rumour "imprints, sinks, strikes deeper than to pass along so easily from me." He protested to Portland that these rumours were untrue and "Since I had the Honour to serve his Majesty, Calumny and Mis-report have been my Portions..." Wentworth to Lord Treasurer Portland, 21 October 1632, Str. P. 21 / 98, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 79.

<sup>17</sup> 'Thomas Wentworth's Propositions,' 17[?] February 1631, Str. P. 21 / 86. Wentworth also asked to deal with just one of the King's Secretaries of State, which the King and Council consented to, believing that it would "less perplex his Majesty's Ministers there, who otherwise can hardly carry themselves so evenly." However, the Committee was concerned that "one of them will take Offence, and cause the Affairs to be more warily attended, more readily dispatched, and the Register thereof



to English courts when the outcome of their trial was not the verdict they had hoped for.<sup>18</sup>

Wentworth also addressed the issue that Irish matters have “from so great a Distance, slipt away here, as little understood by the Crown.” If unchecked, Irish ministers and political players might “sacrifice rather to their own Wit than to the Bounty or Goodness of Kings.” Therefore, he wished to ensure that particular ministers were responsible for certain affairs so that “nothing can pass to the Disadvantage of the Crown.” This would ensure accountability and transparency within the Irish government. Ministers of the Crown could be “immediately faulted, and justly called to a severe Account for their Negligence or Unfaithfulness” and this would in turn promote faithful government where the ministers were concerned about “his Majesty’s Rights and their own Duties.”<sup>19</sup> In the Propositions, Wentworth propounded that he should nominate ‘credible’ persons to take Irish office. This would enable him to fill Irish vacancies with men whom he felt had demonstrated their ability and trustworthiness. Therefore Wentworth could implant men into the Irish administration who would be faithful to his own interests, such as Radcliffe and Wandesford. Wentworth asked that the King would “vouchsafe to hear the Advice of his Deputy, before he resolve of any” to take office in Ireland. In return, Wentworth promised to “truly and impartially” inform the King of his chosen ministers “Diligence and Care in his service there.”<sup>20</sup> Wentworth hoped that if men in Ireland proved their ability, the King would reward “the well-deserving, by calling them home to better Preferments here.”<sup>21</sup> We might therefore see Radcliffe, Wandesford and Mainwaring’s work in Ireland as a potential apprenticeship for a more gratifying employment in England after proving themselves in the difficult circumstances of Irish politics. The King and Council recognised the importance of having “able and well affected Ministers” in Ireland as this would encourage “the best Men to spent Part of their stronger Years there, when they shall see their elder Age recompensed with Ease and Profit in their native Soil...”<sup>22</sup> This might help to explain Radcliffe’s

---

more orderly kept here, when one only is accountable, and so cannot excuse himself upon the other.”

‘Thomas Wentworth’s Private Propositions,’ 17[?] February 1631, Str. P. 21 / 87.

<sup>18</sup> ‘Thomas Wentworth’s Propositions,’ 17[?] February 1631, Str. P. 21 / 86.

<sup>19</sup> *ibid*, 21 / 86.

<sup>20</sup> *ibid*, 21 / 86.

<sup>21</sup> *ibid*, 21 / 86.

<sup>22</sup> *ibid*, 21 / 86. Indeed Wentworth himself was insistent that he too would return to England as soon as he could. He wrote to Laud on 9 September 1633 explaining that young clergyman should be

work in Ireland in particular. He left a thriving legal post behind in England and as we will see later, he did not take a specific employment in Ireland. Perhaps he hoped that his political ability and hard work would be rewarded with a high position once he had returned to England. His desire to continue assisting Wentworth was almost certainly Radcliffe's primary consideration in his move to Ireland however.

Wentworth's lengthy list of propositions was accepted by the King and was ordered to be observed at all times. The extent of Radcliffe and Wandesford's participation in the formulation of his propositions is purely speculative. However, knowing Wentworth's reliance on them throughout the 1620's, and the fact that they were integral to his Irish government in the 1630's, it would seem likely that Radcliffe and Wandesford were consulted to some extent. Working on a document of such importance, Wentworth would surely have valued the advice of his closest confidants. Indeed, Radcliffe later recalled that "not so much as a Letter written by him to any great Man, of any Business," was sent without showing it "to his Confidants, if they were near him."<sup>23</sup>

### **Information gathering and policy formation**

Wentworth must have spent some time whilst in England preparing for his Irish occupation. There are a number of avenues Wentworth may have explored in order to fully inform himself about the possibilities of rule in Ireland.<sup>24</sup> He may have taken into account the work of previous Lord Deputies, the report of the Commission of 1622 and the recommendations of contemporary authors such as Edmund Spenser, Sir John Davies and Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon.

Many of Wentworth's policies follow in the lines of previous Lord Deputies. As many of his predecessors, Wentworth's objectives were to consolidate the authority of the King in Ireland, weaken the power of the magnates and strengthen

---

encouraged to work in Ireland rather than elderly clerics as they would energetically "bestow their travail" on Ireland "in the hope to be then called back" to England. Wentworth stated that he judged "the clergy by the laity for this is, in my own walk, my own desire." *ibid*, 8 / 17. See also Canny, N. 'The attempted Anglicanisation of Ireland in the seventeenth century: An exemplar of 'British History', in J.F. Merritt, (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 170 – 171.

<sup>23</sup> Radcliffe, 'An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde,' in Knowler. *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 433, Str. P. 21 / 214.

<sup>24</sup> See Kearney for a useful survey of the sources of information Wentworth might have exploited in preparation for his Lord Deputyship in Ireland. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. xv – xvii.

that of the Crown and thus bring the people into a suitable state of docility.<sup>25</sup> Overall, his aim might be seen as the conversion of potential power into actual power. In order to prepare himself fully for his Irish occupation, Wentworth was keen to obtain as much information from his predecessor in the post, Lord Falkland. In his Propositions to the King and English Privy Council, Wentworth asked that Falkland should be required to outline the state of the King's revenue and condition of the government in Ireland. Wentworth was eager to learn from Falkland's experience and mistakes. He requested that Falkland should provide "a Particular of such Designs for advancing his Majesty's Service, as were either unbegun or unperfected by him when he left the Place; as also his Advice how they may be best pursued and effected."<sup>26</sup>

We might argue that many of Wentworth's Irish policies originated from the recommendations of the Commission sent to Ireland in 1622.<sup>27</sup> James I wanted the Commissioners to consider how to "advance the flourishing Estate of our Realme of Ireland," and then to "perscribe such wayes, and courses, as may tend to the Advancement of Religion, and Justice, the removeing of greivances, encreasing of trade, settleing of Plantac[i]ons and secureing of that Kingdome."<sup>28</sup> Lionel Cranfield, earl of Middlesex, was the instigator of the Commission of 1622 and was also an early patron of Wentworth. Wentworth may have wished to continue the work of his former patron, having heard about Cranfield's plans and recommendations at first hand. It is certain that Wentworth at least considered the recommendations of the Commission in his preparation for his Irish policy when he arrived in Dublin. In a letter to the Earl of Portland dated 31 January 1634, Wentworth stated that he and the Irish Privy Council "went over euery branch of the Reuenue, as allsoe the Estimate of Improuem[en]t made by the Commissioners, sent hither forth of England in the yeare 1622."<sup>29</sup> Wentworth may also have read the report prior to leaving for Ireland. Kearney has identified a number of similarities between Wentworth's policies and the Commission's recommendations. In particular he points to the comparable proposals

---

<sup>25</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 136.

<sup>26</sup> 'Thomas Wentworth's Private Propositions,' 17[?] February 1631, Str. P. 21 / 87.

<sup>27</sup> Kearney saw Wentworth's policies as 'unoriginal' and that his achievement was to effectively carry out the 1622 'reforms.' Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. xvii.

<sup>28</sup> 'The report of the Commission of 1622,' British Library, Additional MS 4756, p. 2a.

<sup>29</sup> Wentworth added that the Commissioners "opinions and advises theron I send your Lo[rds] here inclosed under their hands, w[i]th some notes of my owne in the Margint." Wentworth to the Earl of Portland, 31 January 1634, Str. P. 3a / 42.

and policies concerning the reform of the army, the reorganisation of customs, and the enforcement of the Court of Wards and the Commission for Defective Titles.<sup>30</sup>

Wentworth may also have consulted the works of contemporary authors in order to fully inform himself of successful and failed policies in Ireland. Philip Mainwaring, Wentworth's Secretary of State, owned a copy of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon's *The government of Ireland under the honorable, iust, and wise gouernor Sir Iohn Perrot Knight* (1626) and this might suggest that Wentworth's administration more broadly had consulted this text.<sup>31</sup> Perrot advised Queen Elizabeth I that a Parliament in Ireland was needed in order to revive old statues and enact new ones "that shall be consonant to a reformed Gouernment..."<sup>32</sup> Law and legal procedures were to become more transparent with a collection to be made of the laws already in force and "a publique denunciation made by Proclamation, for the putting of them in present Execution..." Perrot suggested that efficient English servants of the Crown within the Courts of Record should be placed in Ireland for "their better encouragement to doe well, that in respect of their honest trauels, they be promised preferments of Offices in the Courts here, as any doe fall fit for them." This has resonance with Wentworth's suggestion in the Propositions to the King and Privy Council that men should serve an 'apprenticeship' in Ireland before being rewarded with prominent office in England.<sup>33</sup>

Perrot also recommended that Irish habits and language be removed and replaced with English manners and language. This was part of the English desire to reduce the Irish to 'civility.' As in Charles I's reign, it was feared that an invader might use Ireland as the back door into England and in order to protect against this Perrot suggested that all the Irish ports, especially in Munster "may be inhabited and fortified against forraigne attempts."<sup>34</sup> Perrot described issues that still concerned the

---

<sup>30</sup> Kearney identifies Wentworth's ecclesiastical policy as diverging from the recommendations of the 1622 Commission, as he was heavily influenced by the Church policies of Archbishop Laud, as we shall see in Chapter 7. The Commission also did not make any recommendations concerning the land policy in Connaght and therefore we cannot see any parallels between Wentworth's work there and the report of the Commission. Kearney, 'Strafford in Ireland 1633 – 40,' *History Today* 39 (1989), pp. 23 – 24, Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. xix.

<sup>31</sup> Philip Mainwaring's personal copy of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon's *The government of Ireland under the honorable, iust, and wise gouernor Sir Iohn Perrot Knight, one of the Priuy Councill to Queene Elizabeth, beginning 1584, and ending 1588* (London, 1626) can be found in Chetham Library, Manchester. His signature is on the inside cover of the book.

<sup>32</sup> He suggested that these were set up at Lymbrick in southern Ireland and Armagh in the North. Hyde, *The government of Ireland* no page numbers, article 1.

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*, articles 2, 4 and 12, 'Thomas Wentworth's Propositions,' 17[?] February 1631, Str. P. 21 / 86.

<sup>34</sup> Hyde, *The government of Ireland* article 10.

English Crown in the 1630's. Ireland remained fairly unstable, without a strong legal system and with the danger of piracy, invasion and the nobility's lack of allegiance. Wentworth and his advisors may have read this text for inspiration, comparing the situation that Perrot faced to the one awaiting them in Ireland.

Another potentially useful source for Wentworth and his advisors was the text written by Sir John Davies, the former Attorney General for Ireland from 1609 to 1619, entitled *A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued*.<sup>35</sup> However, although Sir John Davies is traditionally accredited with the success of establishing the Irish circuit and is identified as having a central role in the planning stages of the Ulster plantation, we should note that he was not even a member of the Irish Privy Council and therefore his influence may have been in reality limited.<sup>36</sup> The cabal may also have consulted Edmund Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland*, which was written in the 1590s but not published until 1633. This supposition is supported by the fact that the publisher, Sir James Ware, dedicated the book to Thomas Wentworth.<sup>37</sup> Both Sir John Davies and Edmund Spenser set out coherent reasons why Ireland should be 'Anglicised,' primarily to allow English systems of land tenure and law to be introduced.<sup>38</sup>

A range of possible sources that may have influenced Wentworth in the formulation of his Irish policies has been considered. However, despite such detailed analysis of his policy formation by Kearney, the involvement of Thomas Wentworth's close associates in this process has been neglected. Although it is almost impossible to decisively identify occasions where Radcliffe and Wandesford recommended certain policies to Wentworth, it is likely that due to the nature of their friendships, their past experiences, and the fact that both Radcliffe and Wandesford gained prominent

---

<sup>35</sup> Davies, Sir John. *A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued* (London, 1612).

<sup>36</sup> John McCavitt argues that it was Sir Arthur Chicester, Lord Deputy of Ireland from 1605 – 16 who established the assize circuits in Ireland. McCavitt, J. "Good planets in their several spheres" – the establishment of the assize circuits in early seventeenth century Ireland,' *Irish Jurist* n.s. 24 (1989), pp. 248 – 9. For a full account of Sir John Davies' career in Ireland, see Pawlisch, H. *Sir John Davies and the conquest of Ireland: A study in legal imperialism* (Cambridge, 1985).

<sup>37</sup> The book was dedicated "To the Right Honourable Thomas Lo[rd] Viscount Wentworth, Lo[rd] Deputy Generall of Ireland, Lo[rd] President of his Maiesties Covncell established in the North parts of England, and one of his Maiesties most honorable priuie covncell." Spenser. *E View of the Present State of Ireland* (Dublin, 1633). For a useful discussion of the influence of Spenser's work, see Maley, W. 'How Milton and some contemporaries read Spenser's *View*,' in B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield and W. Maley (eds). *Representing Ireland. Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534 – 1660* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 191 – 208.

<sup>38</sup> Canny, 'Attempted Anglicanisation of Ireland,' p. 164.

positions in Ireland, that they would have had some part in the formulation of the policies that they were to implement.

It is quite conceivable that Wentworth would have asked his closest friends of their opinions regarding Irish policy, especially as he and Radcliffe were working closely together in the Council of the North. Radcliffe was later prominent in Irish affairs, and left England prior to Wentworth in January 1633 to prepare the way for his arrival and advise him upon the state of the government. Radcliffe would prove to be a useful advisor in the Irish preparations, with his knowledgeable legal mind and experience in Wentworth's Council in the North. If Wentworth already had in mind that George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford would contribute to his Irish government, it would seem sensible to involve them even at the planning stage. Radcliffe later described the close relationship between Wentworth, Wandesford and himself in his essay about Thomas Wentworth's life, published by Knowler, in which he described Wentworth's reliance upon his advisors. 'He never did any Thing of any Moment, concerning either political or domestic Business, without taking Advice... By this Means his own Judgement was very much improved.'<sup>39</sup> Thomas Wentworth later confirmed his reliance upon his close friends and advisors. He trusted Radcliffe and Wandesford stating in a letter to the Earl of Portland that "There is not a minister on this side, that knows anything I write or intend, excepting the Master of the Rolls [Christopher Wandesford] and Sir George Radcliffe."<sup>40</sup>

Evidence for Wentworth's use of Radcliffe and Wandesford in policy planning procedures is speculative, but we do know that as early as 1632, Wentworth was utilising what he termed 'servants' to obtain realistic information from Ireland and how his policies might be received. Wentworth had sent a messenger into Ireland who had reported back that the Catholic Old English would not be willing to continue paying the Contributions that provided for the Irish standing army. As we shall see in Chapter 6, Wentworth was anxious to extend this payment for another year. Wentworth informed Vice Treasurer Mountnorris that his 'servant' who was travelling to and from Ireland would "feel their Pulse underhand..." and had specific

---

<sup>39</sup> Radcliffe, 'An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde,' in Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 433, Str. P. 21 / 214.

<sup>40</sup> Wentworth to the Earl of Portland, 31 January 1634. Str. P. 3a / 46, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 194.

instructions to “communicate his secret only with your Lordship....”<sup>41</sup> In July 1632, Wentworth had informed Mountnorris, but not the Lord Justices, that he had employed a papist agent to discuss with the Catholic gentry the extension of the contributions for another year. This servant was to negotiate with the recusant party and convince them to send deputies into England “to make offer unto his Majesty of half a Subsidy to be paid this next Year; so as all further Prosecution upon the Statute might be respited till the coming over of the Deputy....”<sup>42</sup> Clearly Wentworth thought it essential to obtain first hand information from Ireland, and in such a contentious matter as recusancy fines, he needed to employ a Catholic servant to inform him of the true feelings of the Catholics within that country. The papist agent was Michael Hopwood and it was his role to convince the Catholics that Wentworth did not wish to enforce recusancy fines upon the Irish Catholics.<sup>43</sup> However, if they refused to pay the contributions, Wentworth wished to indicate that he would have no alternative but to levy recusancy fines in order to pay for the army. Michael Hopwood was therefore involved in delicate and complicated negotiations and this seems to support Kearney’s assertion that Hopwood may have been a pseudonym. As Wentworth had previously permitted only close friends to be involved in his business, it seems unlikely that he would have entrusted such potentially destructive negotiations to someone he was not completely able to trust. Wentworth described Hopwood as “an honest man, sure I am hee is fit for that purpose I imploy him.”<sup>44</sup> The Catholic Old English also had a high opinion of Hopwood, the Earl of Westmeath commending him on how “wisely and stoutly” Hopwood had conducted himself.<sup>45</sup> We also know that Hopwood was expected to negotiate with highly influential characters in Irish politics such as the Earls of Antrim and Westmeath, and then report the proceedings back to Wentworth in England. These transactions were conducted in the name of the new Deputy and

---

<sup>41</sup> Wentworth to Lord Mountnorris, 19 August 1632, Str. P. 1 / 59a – b, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 73.

<sup>42</sup> “The Instrument I employ’d was himself a Papist, and knows no other than that the Resolution of the State here, is set upon that Course, and that I do this privately in favour and well-wishing, to divert the present Storm; which else would fall heavy upon them all.” Wentworth to Cottington, 1 October 1632, Str. P. 1 / 76b, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 74.

<sup>43</sup> Kearney plausibly suggests that ‘Hopwood’ may have been a pseudonym as he has been unable to trace Hopwood in the historical record. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 38.

<sup>44</sup> Wentworth to Mountnorris, 2 September 1632, Str. P. 1 / 63a.

<sup>45</sup> Westmeath to Wentworth, 15 December 1632, *ibid.* 1 / 93.

therefore Wentworth had to trust Hopwood to conduct himself as his representative, passing on Wentworth's instructions and negotiating a good deal for the Crown.<sup>46</sup>

However, even Hopwood was only trusted to a certain extent with potentially dangerous information. Wentworth informed Mountnorris that he had told Hopwood to advise with Mountnorris "in all thinges, and to acquaint yow with all that passeth amongst them [the Catholic Old English]." However Hopwood thought that Wentworth's negotiations with the Old English "is rather an aduise of my owne in fauour of the Recusants (w[hi]ch God knows is farr from my thought) then perswaded in respect of the present pressure of the affaires there."<sup>47</sup> Wentworth supported Hopwood in his role and let him know that Mountnorris was to "furnish you with money, in case yow want anie before my Cosen Radcliffes comeinge ouer, who wilbee uerie shortlie with yow, and my selfe presently after."<sup>48</sup> Hopwood and Mountnorris were successful in obtaining the contributions for a further year and the Irish Catholics sent the Earl of Westmeath to London as their agent to conclude the negotiations. Wentworth was hopeful that "if this businesse bee rightly handled for the present, there may bee hope to gaine from them a much greater supply hereafter."<sup>49</sup>

### **Radcliffe's role in Irish policy planning**

Radcliffe was perhaps Wentworth's most significant contributor to Irish planning and preparation. Wentworth informed Mountnorris that in October, he proposed to "send my Cosin Radcliffe to London full instructed in all things with direcons soe soone as hee can possibly get his dispatch to come ouer to yo[u]r Lo[rdshi]p at Dublin..." Wentworth was confident in Radcliffe's abilities and felt that Mountnorris would be "much assisted" by Radcliffe and they would "together bee able to ouercome all difficulties well enough and keepe things in good state till my comeing ouer." Wentworth added that Mountnorris "may reckon Radcliffe that long nose wilbee with yow by the midst of the next month at furthest, as sound againe as a

---

<sup>46</sup> Mountnorris assured Wentworth that "Mr Hopwood hath acquainted mee w[i]th yo[u]r l[ordshi]ps instrucc[i]ons to him, and of his proceedings therin, and perticulerly of his conference with the Earle of Antrim, and some others of the Recusant p[ar]tie, whome he finds very inclinable to yeeld equall contribuc[i]on with the Protestants, towards the supporte of his Ma[jes]ties Army, soe there may bee a succese of the proceedings against them upon the statute of Recusancy..." Mountnorris to Wentworth, 17 September 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 64b.

<sup>47</sup> Wentworth to Mountnorris, 24 September 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 67a – b.

<sup>48</sup> Wentworth to Hopwood, 19 October 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 80b.

<sup>49</sup> Wentworth to Lord Treasurer Portland, 6 December 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 88b.



fish.”<sup>50</sup> However Radcliffe was delayed in his going to Ireland until January 1633 due to the fact that he was in London, involved in settling the business of the Contributions.<sup>51</sup> The Old English had sent the Earl of Westmeath to London to negotiate the continuance of the payments towards the army for a further year. However, the negotiations were delayed and therefore Radcliffe had to remain in London longer than expected. Writing from the Strand, Westmeath protested to Wentworth that due to illness, he could not “at the time yo[u]r hono[u]r expecteth meete Mr Radcliffe...” Wandesford was also participating in these negotiations with Westmeath and it appears that the cabal was working on Wentworth’s behalf in London, whilst the Lord Deputy was still in Yorkshire. The issue of the Contributions was so important to Wentworth’s policy in Ireland that it is remarkable that he allowed Radcliffe and Wandesford to carry out the negotiations without him. This is a clear indication of how far the cabal were integrated into his regime, and how much he trusted them.<sup>52</sup> Radcliffe was also responsible for passing information on to important figures within the Irish administration on Wentworth’s behalf and this shows that Radcliffe was being recognised as Wentworth’s right-hand man from very early on in Wentworth’s Deputyship. For example, Wentworth had asked Radcliffe to “advise my lord of Corke and S[i]r William Parsons from mee” regarding the offer of the Catholic Old English in the Contributions.<sup>53</sup>

Radcliffe may also have been delayed due to the lack of a patent that the King had “gratiously promised” to Wentworth that would make Radcliffe “one of his Councill learned in this Kingdome...” In the end, Radcliffe went to Ireland as

---

<sup>50</sup> Wentworth to Mountnorris, 16 October 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 75a.

<sup>51</sup> Wentworth assured Cottington that “the more to facilitate the worke,” Radcliffe would soon be leaving for Ireland and this had prompted him to send Radcliffe to “my Lo[rd] Tre[asure]r and yow, to receaue full direcons in all perticulars.” Radcliffe was clearly privy to all of Wentworth’s intentions concerning the Contributions and asked Cottington to tell either himself or George Radcliffe “if yow eyther dislike anie thing, or think fitt to add further matter” which “upon the least notice... it shall be obeyed.” Wentworth to Cottington, 21 October 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 81b.

<sup>52</sup> The Earl of Westmeath wrote to Wentworth “I haue some other matters to impart unto yo[u]r hono[u]r w[hi]ch I forbear to write for that Mr Wandesforth assureth mee that y[ou]r lo[rdshi]p wilbee here as soone as you can possible.” This does not suggest that Westmeath was unwilling to negotiate with the cabal as Westmeath had already stated in his letter that the Old English would be willing to continue the payment to the sum of £20,000. Westmeath to Wentworth, 15 December 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 93a. Cottington acknowledged that Radcliffe and Wandesford were heavily involved in Wentworth’s business in 1632 when he was aware that Wentworth “will know by Mr Radcliffe’s Letter, that my Lord of West-Meath is come, and peradventure you will judge his Business to be some cause of your hastning hither. All other Business I must leave to the Pens of Mr. Wandesford and Mr. Radcliffe, who I am sure will give your Lordship perfect Account of every particular.” Cottington to Wentworth, 30 November 1632, *ibid*, 12 / 312, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 81.

<sup>53</sup> Wentworth to Coke, 22 December 1632, Str. P. 1 / 95a.

Wentworth's representative, without the personal authority of being a Privy Councillor. He was therefore reliant upon the status that being an ambassador of the Lord Deputy gave him, rather than exerting any particular influence in his own right.<sup>54</sup> Wentworth had simultaneously requested that Radcliffe be sent letters of recommendation for the Lord Justices which would give him "estimac[i]on and meanes to serue his Ma[jes]tie in this business with more credit, and strength. then in a meare priuate Condic[i]on" and this would give Radcliffe the status of being an agent of the King. The King agreed to grant Radcliffe these letters patent. The impact of such letters becomes apparent when we learn that Wentworth referred directly to Radcliffe's position as recommended by the King. He assured Cork that Radcliffe was trustworthy and honest but felt that he did not need to promote him "when he comes soe highly approued to yow by his Ma[jes]tes owne letters, soe as I assure myselve yow will giue him full credence in all things."<sup>55</sup>

Radcliffe finally arrived in Ireland in January 1633. There is some evidence to suggest why Radcliffe was sent to Dublin prior to Wentworth's arrival in July 1633. Wentworth was being constantly harassed by the Privy Council to take up his position in Ireland and he retaliated by reassuring the King and Councillors that despite his delayed removal into Ireland, his government there would not suffer as he was "sending ouer my Cosen Radcliffe to settle the businesse before I come."<sup>56</sup> He was almost certainly using Radcliffe to defend himself against criticism here, but also must have felt confident that Radcliffe could represent him effectively. In December 1632, Wentworth was continuing to delay his move into Ireland and under the pretence of simply thanking the King for allowing Radcliffe to go to Ireland, he used Radcliffe's attendance there to justify his own continued presence in England.<sup>57</sup> Wentworth reassured Cottington that if Radcliffe felt it necessary that he was present

---

<sup>54</sup> Wentworth to Cottington, 21 October 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 81b. Despite this request, Radcliffe had to go into Ireland without the status of a Privy Councillor. Wentworth was still petitioning for Radcliffe to be part of the Council in August 1633. Wentworth to Coke, 3 August 1633. *ibid*, 5 / 10, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 100. The King finally consented to it and the news was relayed to Wentworth in a letter from Secretary Coke dated 20 September 1633. Str. P. 13 / 49, Knowler, vol. 1, p. 115. *CSP/ 1633 – 1647* p. 62.

<sup>55</sup> Wentworth to Cork, 25 December 1632, Str. P. 1 / 95b.

<sup>56</sup> Wentworth argued that he was correct to firstly "acquitt my selfe of the old before I undertake a new employment." Wentworth to Cottington, 21 October 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 82b.

<sup>57</sup> Wentworth offered King Charles "all possible and most humble thanks" for allowing Radcliffe to go into Ireland, and promised that "there shall not preiudice fall upon yo[u]r seruice, thorrow my absence a while forth of that Kingdome." Wentworth to King Charles I, 6 December 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 90a – b.

in Ireland, he would go immediately.<sup>58</sup> However, Wentworth was warned that he was not to use Radcliffe's presence in Ireland as an excuse to delay his departure further. Secretary Coke informed Wentworth that despite the fact Radcliffe was leaving for Ireland to convey letters,<sup>59</sup> his "going thether must not retard yo[u]r p[re]sent coming to London; w[hi]ch his Ma[jes]tie requireth yow, to hasten all yow can."<sup>60</sup> Wentworth was to attend the King in London before leaving to take up his Deputyship in Ireland.

Radcliffe would also be able to assess the Irish situation and reliably report back to Wentworth. For example, he informed Wentworth about the problem of piracy that was affecting the Irish economy and trade. In their capacities as Irish customs farmers, which will be explored fully in Chapter 6, the policy towards piracy might have been shaped by personal expediency. Wentworth informed Portland that Radcliffe had described to him how a pirate had pursued a Dutch vessel until it ran aground. It was then set on fire "so as there she burnt two Days together. till it came to the Water, and was then all in a Flame, when my Cousin Radcliffe writ me that Letter to be seen forth of his Majesty's Castle."<sup>61</sup> Radcliffe was on the scene of this destruction and he may have advised Wentworth of the necessity to remove piracy in order for trade and customs to improve, which in turn would increase Crown revenue.<sup>62</sup>

Radcliffe was seen as Wentworth's representative in Ireland and he was used to transport information to the Lord Deputy. On one occasion, the Earl of Cork acquainted Radcliffe with two letters which, "after Mr Radcliff had p[er]used them I

---

<sup>58</sup> Wentworth to Cottington, 21 October 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 82b.

<sup>59</sup> Radcliffe carried letters from Wentworth to the Earl of Cork for example. Cork wrote to Wentworth on 12 February 1633 acknowledging that he had "had the honno[u]r to receav yo[u]r l[ett]res by mr Ratcliff..." Chatsworth House, Boyle Letter book, vol. 17 / 133.

<sup>60</sup> Coke to Wentworth, 12 December 1632, Str. P. 1 / 92a.

<sup>61</sup> Wentworth himself had lost "Goods worth 4000 l and amongst them as much Linen as cost me 500 l and in good Faith, I fear I have lost my Apparel too..." Wentworth lamented that the loss of his goods was less disruptive than "the Inconvenience which lights upon me, by being disappointed of my Provisions upon the Place." Wentworth to the Earl of Portland, 9 June 1633, *ibid*, 3a / 3, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, pp. 89 – 91.

<sup>62</sup> Wentworth may have exploited the problem of piracy as a delaying tactic for going into Ireland. He explained to Coke that he had enclosed 2 letters "by which you will find what a Disquiet is given to the Trades and Commerce of that Kingdom, through the daily Robbing and Spoil the Pyrates do upon the Subjects in those Parts, so as it were Madness for me to think of crossing the Sea, without Captain Plumleigh to carry me and my Company over in Safety. The Pyrate hath already light of two hundred Pounds worth of my Goods; but I should be sorry indeed his Majesty's Deputy were indangered through my untimely Haste..." Wentworth to Coke, 3 June 1633, Str. P. 5 / 1, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 87.

sent the originall l[ett]res to my lo[rd] Chancellor & gaue Mr Radcliff coppies of them ... to be by him transmitted to yo[u]r lo[rdshi]p...<sup>63</sup>

Radcliffe had Wentworth's permission to deal with specific business without having to check with Wentworth first. However, even on these occasions, Radcliffe referred the final say to the Lord Deputy. Wentworth had written to the Earl of Cork informing him that regarding the marriage treaty between the Earl of Cork's eldest son, Lord Dungarvan and the daughter of Lord Clifford, who was Wentworth's kinsman, Radcliffe "hath power from my lord to treat with yow, and acquaint yow w[i]th his full resoluc[i]on."<sup>64</sup> Cork replied to Wentworth's letter in February 1633 stating that he had received Wentworth's letters from "mr Ratcliff intimating that y[o]w had given him power to resolve w[it]h me in the business between us, And that he knew yo[u]r resoluc[i]ons..." However, "Mr Ratcliff thought it not fytt to grow to any Conclusions untill he had by l[ett]res exprest his observacons & opinion to yo[u]r L[ord] and receaved your further resolucon therin..."<sup>65</sup> This presumably reflected Wentworth's instructions to Radcliffe to enable them to have more time to consider the business, or perhaps Radcliffe was genuinely unsure if Wentworth wished to proceed on these terms. Radcliffe was later involved in the negotiations for a marriage between the children of the Earl of Cork and Lord Goring. Cork presumably recognised Radcliffe's influence as Wentworth's representative, and therefore sought to ally himself with Wentworth's cabal in the hope that it might further his own business and political career.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Cork to Wentworth, 2 April 1633, Chatsworth House, Boyle Letter Book, f. 621. The Earl of Westmeath assured Wentworth that he had delivered copies of important letters to Radcliffe "who hath faithfully promised to send it to your hono[u]r." Westmeath to Wentworth, 30 November 1632, Str. P. 1 / 88a. On another occasion, Radcliffe was to meet the Earl of Westmeath at Chester to carry a letter over to the Irish together. Wentworth to Lord Treasurer Portland, 6 December 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 89b. Wentworth wrote to Cottington the following day stating that "my lord Westmeath p[re]sently dispatched with good contentment to Chester; my Cosen Radcliffe shall meet him there on Saturday fortnight, and soe both together for Ireland; and then I will become soe far accomptable for the good successe of the businesse Godwillinge, as that nothing shall suffer by my stay here, or passe to his Ma[jes]t[ie]s disadvantage there..." 7 December 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 91a.

<sup>64</sup> Wentworth to Cork, 25 December 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 95b.

<sup>65</sup> Cork to Clifford, 12 February 1633, Chatsworth House, Lismore Papers, vol. 17 / 133.

<sup>66</sup> In March 1634, Cork described to Sir William Beecher "...there was noe word nor Sillable but that had a Strickt, & Judiciall exa[i]c[i]on by the Lord Deputie, the M[aste]r of the Rolls, [Christopher Wandesford] and S[i]r Geoarg Radcliff." Cork to Sir William Beecher, 20 March 1634, *ibid*, f. 757. The treaty was being carried by Sir John Leek but was unfortunately lost in transit. Cork checked his copies of the letters to see if anything of disadvantage could be used against him or his son. However, "not relying wholly upon my owne weake Judgment, in a matter of that consequence," a meeting was called with Lord Rannelagh, the Master of the Wards and Sir Adam Loftus "where wee privately read, and over read, every word & Sillable of the entry of my l[ett]res. & weighed, and considered of every part of them, as exactly, & carefully, as the Lo Deputie, the M[aste]r of the Rolls & S[i]r George

Radcliffe was involved in highly confidential transactions in Ireland, which Wentworth did not wish to commit to paper. For example, Wentworth added a postscript to a letter to the Privy Councillor and Master of the Court of Wards, Sir William Parsons to alert him to “Something my Cosen Radcliffe hath to say from mee wherein yow wilbee pleased to giue him credence.”<sup>67</sup>

Key Irish officials and gentry clearly recognised Radcliffe as Wentworth’s official and granted him much respect. There is evidence of important men flattering Radcliffe in the hope that he would pass on good reports of them to Wentworth and we might argue that this was part of the Earl of Cork’s agenda. A critical Robert Cogan, one of the Irish customs farmers, described Lord Mountnorris’s recognition of George Radcliffe’s important position in Wentworth’s government, describing how Mountnorris “Courtes and Complementes and feastes him & carryes him a broade into the Contrey to greate Lo[rdshi]ps howses and so Ingroases him with fawninge and flatteringe him that he allowes of all he doth.”<sup>68</sup> Radcliffe’s initial work in Ireland involved making friendships with such men so that he could report to Wentworth who can be trusted and used in their government. Effectively, he had the chance to influence Wentworth with regard to the policies he should pursue, and whom their government could work with.

What is intriguing about Radcliffe’s work in Ireland is that he never obtained an official office in the Irish administration. The Earl of Cork recommended to Thomas Wentworth that George Radcliffe fill the post of Master of the Rolls that had been left vacant by the death of Francis Aungier, baron of Longford (1558 – 1632). Cork argued that the post required “an able and worthie gentleman” as it was “one of the best offices in this Kingdome...”<sup>69</sup> Cork now suggested that for Radcliffe’s “advancement thereunto yo[u]r l[ordshi]p hath now a fitt opportunity offered unto

---

Radcliff did the draught of the Articles, and the Articles themselues, when they were engrossed or sealed...” The meeting declared that they could “fynde nothing but hono[u]r & honestie in them...”  
Cork to Cousin Stockdell, 20 March 1634, *ibid*, f. 765.

<sup>67</sup> Wentworth to Sir William Parsons, 26 December 1632, Str. P. 1 / 96b.

<sup>68</sup> Robert Cogan to Sir Arthur Ingram at Westminster from Dublin, 8 May 1633, Leeds District Archives, TN/ PO 7 II 5.

<sup>69</sup> A Mr Giffard had the reversion of the Mastership of the Rolls which Cork suggested that his “his p[ar]ts & knowledg in the Lawe, not to bee altogether capable thereof...” However Cork admitted that Giffard was “a stranger to me, and therefore I will not wrong his habilities but leaue it to yo[u]r l[ordshi]ps better considerac[i]on.” However, he had sown the seeds of doubt in Wentworth’s mind of his abilities which helped in his recommendation of Radcliffe. Cork to Wentworth, 9 October 1632, Chatsworth House, Boyle Letter Book, f. 472.

you... ”<sup>70</sup> Wentworth himself answered Cork’s recommendation for Radcliffe’s installment as Master of the Rolls with an interesting response that helps to explain why, at least initially, Radcliffe did not obtain an Irish post. Wentworth professed that he thought Radcliffe did not desire to obtain the Mastership of the Rolls “or anie thing els there, that might occasion his stay in that kingdome, after my comeing thence. or that might not well admit him to practise his owne vocation here as the Kings Attorney.”<sup>71</sup> This was despite the fact that Wentworth requested only two days later that Radcliffe be given “full powers to depute one here in his absence to execute the office of Attorney for his Ma[jes]tie before his Councill...”<sup>72</sup> Radcliffe was potentially free to obtain a further office in Ireland, even though employing a deputy King’s Attorney in the North was thought to have been a temporary measure. Radcliffe may have only intended to participate in the preparatory stages of Wentworth’s administration, before returning to England to continue in the Council of the North. As we shall see in Chapter 5, Wentworth appears to have had other plans for the Mastership of the Rolls and procured it for Christopher Wandesford. This may also help to explain why Radcliffe did not pursue the office as Wandesford was lined up for that particular office and Radcliffe intended to continue in his role as the King’s Attorney in the North.

It seems a logical extension to his existing career and experiences that Radcliffe might have obtained the post of Attorney General in Ireland. As George Radcliffe had had an important title in the North as King’s Attorney, it seems possible that his ambitions would have led him to be recognised as the key legal figure in Ireland. The office of Solicitor General, which was held by Sir Edward Bolton until 1640, did not become available during Wentworth’s Lord Deputyship.<sup>73</sup> However, the post of Attorney General did become available. Sir William Reeves was Attorney General from 1619 and replaced in 1636 by Sir Richard Osbaldeston.<sup>74</sup> As a vacancy

---

<sup>70</sup> Cork had written an earlier letter dated 5 October 1632 to warn Wentworth that Aungier was seriously ill and suggested that “great office may bee supplied w[i]th an hable & iuditious lawyer to succeed him.” 5 October 1632, *ibid*, f.480.

<sup>71</sup> Wentworth to Cork, 19 October 1632, Str. P. 1 / 80b.

<sup>72</sup> Wentworth to Cottington, 21 October 1632, *ibid*, 1 / 81b.

<sup>73</sup> King Charles I to Wentworth, 8 June 1640, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / Signet Office III, pp. 367 – 368, *CSPI 1633 - 47* p. 241.

<sup>74</sup> King Charles I to Wentworth, 20 July 1640, P.R.O. S.P.16 / Signet Office III, p. 383, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* p. 244. Pollard, A.F. ‘Sir Thomas Ryves,’ brother of Sir William Ryves. *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 72. Wandesford reported to Radcliffe in June 1640 that Osbaldeston had died and therefore for the second time during Wentworth’s Deputyship, the office fell vacant. “Yesterday about six in the afternone Mr Attorney dyed. this Morning my lord Lowther and myself perused his Will, by

arose during Radcliffe's time in Ireland, it is even more surprising that he did not succeed to this office, especially since he had been in Ireland for three years and had not returned permanently to England to take over from his Deputy as King's Attorney in the North. We might perhaps suggest therefore that Radcliffe's role in Ireland would remain more flexible if he acted in the capacity of a 'private' rather than public servant, primarily owing his allegiance to Wentworth, without an official job description to restrain him. Working in this way might have enabled Radcliffe to sail closer to the wind in terms of rooting around potentially inflammatory situations without endangering the King's reputation, as he did not have an official role. However, Radcliffe was still an Irish Privy Councillor and thus could be heavily penalised for acting unprofessionally. It may be that Wentworth wanted Radcliffe to be classed as his own servant rather than the King's servant, and therefore Radcliffe was not obliged to serve the King first. This would have helped him to follow Thomas Wentworth's directions without having the pull of the King's work to do. The term 'roving agent' could be considered more appropriate for the type of advisory work Radcliffe appears to have carried out.

Some controversy has surrounded the question of whether Radcliffe acted as a 'secretary' to Thomas Wentworth. Kearney has argued that Radcliffe had experience in the role of secretary having acted as Wentworth's secretary within the Council of the North, which presumably was in addition to his official role as King's Attorney in the North.<sup>75</sup> Radcliffe may indeed have acted as a secretary on occasions, but his role crossed into the realm of the advisor and more active participant in the administration and rule of Ireland. The definition of Radcliffe's role in the letter from Charles I that appointed him is vague. It describes Radcliffe's involvement and service in "our affaires of Ireland," and provides £500 a year to compensate for his loss of "his practise & profession in our law here in England."<sup>76</sup> This leads to the conclusion that Radcliffe may have been seen as a private secretary to Wentworth, but this was a

---

w[hi]ch yourself and we two are appointed Executors." Wandesford to Radcliffe, 12 June 1640, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 25r, Whitaker, T.D. *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), pp. 249 – 251, (with some omissions and change in the order of the letter).

<sup>75</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 36. In Hughes' list of the Irish Secretaries, Philip Mainwaring is not included, despite most often being associated with the Irish Secretaryship of State, and he instead listed George Radcliffe as secretary. Hughes, J.L.J. 'The chief secretaries in Ireland 1566 - 1921,' *Irish Historical Studies* 8 (1952), pp. 59 - 72.

<sup>76</sup> King Charles I to Wentworth, 17 May 1633, Str. P. 4 / 13, P.R.O. S.P.16 254, 292, *CSPI 1633 - 47*, p. 11.

private arrangement and not an office of state. The argument that Radcliffe was more than a secretary to Wentworth, being a private or personal advisor, is supported by their long-standing personal and professional relationship. He maintained his supervision over Thomas Wentworth's affairs in Ireland as he had done in England from about 1626 or 1627 onwards. Along with William Billingsley, Joshua Carpenter and Bartholomew Pesely, he acted as a land agent for Wentworth, bargaining with the owners of selected estates and purchasing them for Wentworth. The manor of Elsmore in Kildare was acquired in this way, at the price of £13,700.<sup>77</sup>

## **Conclusion**

Only a confidant who had proven his ability to handle highly sensitive and confidential information could possibly act as Wentworth's representative at a distance in Ireland. If Radcliffe had failed to tackle this first foray into Ireland on Wentworth's behalf effectively, he could have created additional problems for the absent Lord Deputy. Wentworth had experienced at first hand Radcliffe's intelligent and diplomatic work and therefore could confidently dispatch him into Ireland to begin the process of testing the waters – in terms of policy and people they could work with in the future, as well as those who needed to be 'converted' to the Lord Deputy's way of thinking.

---

<sup>77</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 173.



## Chapter 5: The establishment of Wentworth's Irish administration.

Wentworth finally arrived in Dublin in July 1633, a delay of 18 months after his official appointment in January 1632.<sup>1</sup> This chapter will examine the establishment of Wentworth's administration in Ireland, focusing primarily upon his relations with the Irish Privy Council and the insertion of his own trusted servants into positions of influence and authority. Wentworth was aware that his first actions in Ireland could have great implications for his rule and admitted in a letter to Lord Treasurer Weston "what is to be done must be speedily Executed; It being the Genius of this Country to obey a Deputy better upon his Entrance than upon his Departure from them."<sup>2</sup> Therefore he had to be sure to set up a functional and strong regime that centred on his personal authority, although as we shall see later, this would have wider repercussions for anyone deputising for him.

We learn something of Wentworth's immediate actions upon his arrival in Ireland from his detailed letter to Secretary Coke dated 3 August 1633. Wentworth recounted how he had visited the Lord Justices in their homes, two days after his arrival in Dublin. Previous Lord Deputies had not traditionally done this, but until he had ceremoniously received the sword of state, Wentworth was not officially the Lord Deputy. Wentworth later explained his visit to the Lord Justices stating that he had "conceived it was a Duty I owed them, being as then but a private Person." However, his action would serve as "an Example to others what would always become them to

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert Cogan, one of the farmers of the Irish customs, informed his cousin Sir Arthur Ingram that Wentworth had landed on 23 July 1633. Robert Cogan to Sir Arthur Ingram the elder, 5 September 1633, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> Wentworth to Lord Treasurer Portland, 3 August 1633, Str. P. 3a / 8, Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols, London, 1739), vol. I, p. 96. Wentworth's fear was illustrated by the anonymous writer of the pamphlet *A Discourse between two councillors of State, the one of England, and the other of Ireland* (1642), which takes the form of a dialogue between two Privy Councillors, one from England and one from Ireland. Clarke indicates that this pamphlet seems to have survived only in the form of a manuscript transcription and was formerly part of the papers amassed by Sir Robert and Sir Edward Southwell, Secretaries of State for Ireland between 1690 and 1730. The point of views expressed by the author suggests that he was of Old English identity and the information presented suggests a Connacht connection. Although the author was clearly influenced by knowledge of later events, the value of the manuscript is that it gives an Old English perspective of the powerful reaction of the population towards Wentworth after the first year of his Lord Deputyship. In the early stages of Wentworth's deputyship, Wentworth was not opposed greatly, but the author believed that the opposition had burgeoned by 1634. The English Councillor asked: "He pleased you well then the first year?" The Irish councillor responded that Wentworth "was always very high, and kept too much distance with the officers of state and the nobility, by which he lost ground in the affections of men, but generally gave hopes that he would prove a just though an austere governor..." Clarke, A. 'A Discourse between two Councillors of State, the one of England, and the other of Ireland (1642) From B.M. Egerton MS 917,' *Analecta Hibernica* 26 (1970). pp. 161, 166.

the supreme Governor, whom it should please his Majesty to set over them.”<sup>3</sup> As Merritt has indicated, it was Wentworth’s intention to make a distinction between himself as a private citizen and his new authority as the King’s official representative as Lord Deputy of Ireland.<sup>4</sup>

The ceremonial aspect of his arrival was central to Wentworth’s legitimisation of his rule and also served to impress upon the Irish his authority as their new governor. After meeting with the Lord Justices on the morning of 25 July, Wentworth met the Irish Privy Council and Lord Justices in the afternoon in order to conduct the ceremonial aspect of his arrival. This would mark the transference of power from the Lord Justices and officially vest it upon Wentworth.<sup>5</sup> The ceremony took place in the council chamber of Dublin Castle. Christopher Wandesford took an important role in this having been created Master of the Rolls in May 1633. In front of the Council, Wandesford read aloud the King’s Commission to Wentworth. He administered the oath of supremacy to Wentworth, and then swore him into his position as Lord Deputy. This first encounter with the Irish Privy Council was ceremonial rather than an opportunity to conduct any business.<sup>6</sup>

### **Wentworth’s relations with the Irish Privy Council**

Wentworth was already aware of the precedents that indicated that traditionally Lord Deputies left Ireland in disgrace or ruin.<sup>7</sup> Wentworth was keen to avoid any charges of over-zealous government in his early months in Ireland,

---

<sup>3</sup> Wentworth to Secretary Coke, 3 August 1633, Str. P. 5 / 8, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 97.

<sup>4</sup> Merritt, J.F. ‘Power and communication: Thomas Wentworth and government at a distance during the Personal Rule, 1629 – 1635,’ in J.F. Merritt (ed), *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 114 – 115.

<sup>5</sup> The King had already written to the Lord Justices in October 1632 asking that on Wentworth’s arrival, “in the Presence of as many of our Council as are then in Dublin,” the Lord Justices were to deliver the Sword of State to Wentworth. This ceremony was to confirm Wentworth’s position and to ensure that he was “afterwards to be respected by you our Council, and the rest of our Subjects there as our Deputy, and chief Governor of that our Kingdom.” King Charles I to Lord Justices of Ireland, 16 October 1632, Str. P. 12 / 303, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 78.

<sup>6</sup> Wentworth also used the occasion to swear Christopher Wandesford into the Privy Council as Master of the Rolls. Wentworth also knighted his brother George Wentworth, his nephew Thomas Danby (the ward of Wandesford) and a Yorkshire man, Mr Remington. Carte describes Wentworth’s arrival in Ireland and ceremony at the Privy Council in detail although it is not clear on what sources he was basing his account. Carte, T. *The life of Ormonde* vol. I, pp. 111 – 114.

<sup>7</sup> Wentworth has been reminded of this by his friend Sir Edward Stanhope warned him of the potential dangers of the post, as we have seen in Chapter 4. Prophetically, Stanhope warned “whoe must goe over thether that he may retorne hether to end his dayes on a Scaffold.” See Zagorin, P. ‘Sir Edward Stanhope’s Advice to Thomas Wentworth, Viscount Wentworth, concerning the deputy of Ireland: An unpublished letter of 1631,’ *Historical Journal* 7, 2 (1964), p. 316.

professing to Cottington in August 1633 “how carefull we are the Deputy should not growe too absolute...”<sup>8</sup> He needed to at least be seen as working in conjunction with his more experienced Privy Councillors, (even if in reality, he was more independent from them), as this might alleviate any potential criticisms of his regime. Initially, Wentworth would benefit from the Privy Councillors’ experience of Irish government, and at the same time, he could develop an opinion of whom he could work with in the long term. In the seven months prior to Wentworth’s arrival, George Radcliffe may have formed some opinion of the relative trustworthiness of members of the Council, but this was Wentworth and the cabal’s first opportunity to observe the behaviour of the Council at first hand.

Wentworth inherited a Privy Council that contained forceful personalities who had detailed knowledge of the Irish administration. Wentworth faced the challenge of tackling a well-established body of government, which had more experience of the Irish systems than he did. Clearly he was to need the support and inclusion of his own trusted advisors as soon as possible. At the first ‘business’ meeting with the Irish Privy Council on 26 July,<sup>9</sup> Radcliffe’s impending importance in the regime became apparent.<sup>10</sup> Although he was not yet officially a member of the Irish Privy Council,<sup>11</sup> Radcliffe attended the first session of the Privy Council. At this meeting, Wentworth appears to have demonstrated to the Privy Councillors that both George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford would play an integral and essential role in his regime. Radcliffe was promoted as a trusted servant who was already embroiled in the legal proceedings against key Irish figures. Wentworth declared that the King was aware of

---

<sup>8</sup> Wentworth to Cottington, 26 August 1633, Str. P. 3a / 11.

<sup>9</sup> Wentworth to Coke, 3 August 1633, *ibid*, 5 / 8, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 98.

<sup>10</sup> Wentworth also demonstrated how important Radcliffe was to his regime by installing him into lodgings within the court at Dublin Castle. Wandesford’s daughter Alice described a fire at Dublin Castle in 1638. Luckily, some men in the “other part of the court where Sir George Ratclif’s lodgings was” saw it and prevented the Castle from burning to the ground. “A dreadfull fire in the Castle of Dublin, 1638,” Jackson, C. (ed). *The Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton of East Newton, Co York* (Durham, 1875), p. 11. Radcliffe’s proximity to the Lord Deputy reinforced the importance of his political position and clearly demonstrated this to the other members of the Privy Council.

<sup>11</sup> Almost immediately on his arrival in Ireland in August 1633, Wentworth petitioned the king to swear George Radcliffe a member of the Irish Privy Council. He justified this request by stating that there were “already at this Board, [people] almost as far beneath him in Estate as they are in Parts and Understanding to serve his Majesty.” Wentworth to Coke, 3 August 1633, Str. P. 5 / 10, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 100. Charles I granted Wentworth’s appeal unhesitatingly in recognition of Radcliffe’s “good Services [which] his Majesty taketh Notice.” Coke to Wentworth, 20 September 1633, Str. P. 13 / 49. Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 115, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* p. 62. Later, acknowledging Radcliffe’s “good and faythfull seruices... his constant endeauo[u]r, and uigilance for the aduancem[en]t of our seruice,” the King officially appointed him as a Privy Councillor on 23 September 1634. Str. P. 4 / 43.

the “late Insolence” of the Bishop of Kilfanora and Lord Balfour<sup>12</sup> that concerned Kilfanora’s attempt to remove tenants from the Church lands under his control.<sup>13</sup> The King ordered that Wentworth was to settle this matter. This incident is important as Radcliffe was chosen by Wentworth to give “both the Charge and the Proofs” against the party, offering “a very full and particular Relation, and was avowed in all by Sir William Reeves his Majesty’s Attorney General...”<sup>14</sup> Having the Attorney General’s support would also serve to bolster Radcliffe’s legal position within Wentworth’s administration. The fact that Wentworth used Radcliffe to present the particulars of this case to the Privy Council was, in effect, a statement of Wentworth’s reliance upon Radcliffe and the trust that he had invested in him. Wentworth valued Radcliffe’s legal abilities and used him from the outset of his administration. It would have been obvious to the Irish Privy Council that Radcliffe was integral to Wentworth’s regime, even if he was not yet a member of the Council or an office holder within the Irish government. Wentworth decided to proceed against Kilfanora and Balfour and accordingly appointed a Council to “direct a several Proceeding to be had against them accordingly” in order to produce a case against them.<sup>15</sup>

Wentworth was faced with a polarised Irish Privy Council and in these early months of his Deputyship, he had to be especially careful to manipulate these factions. In effect, he might be able to exploit the divisions between them in order to promote allegiance to his regime. But initially, Wentworth faced the uncertainty of how the various factions would react to his regime.

The New English party within Irish government could be defined as mainly Protestant planters, having settled in Ireland in order to exploit the land financially. However, even before his arrival in Ireland, Wentworth did not have a good opinion of the New English. The most prominent member of this group, Richard Boyle, the earl of Cork, probably had the clearest policy and ideals of government. He was a Puritan and believed that in the long term, the Catholics should meet the cost of the

---

<sup>12</sup> Wentworth to Secretary Coke, 3 August 1633, *ibid*, 5 / 8, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 97.

<sup>13</sup> The Bishop of Kilfanora wrote to the Bishop of London, 15 December 1631, “My letters from the King have been in dispute at the Council Board all this term. My tenants have asked for a mutual conference with me in the country, to which I have agreed. I hope to oust them from the Church lands which they seized in time of war. I fear they will try to encroach on these lands when they get their titles confirmed...” *CSPI 1625 – 1632* p. 637.

<sup>14</sup> Wentworth to Secretary Coke, 3 August 1633, Str. P. 5 / 8, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 97.

<sup>15</sup> Str. P. 5 / 8, Knowler, vol. 1, p. 97.

Irish army. In his opinion, it was the presence of the Catholics within Ireland that created the necessity for a standing army, and therefore, they should meet the cost through recusancy fines. He believed that this policy would have a two-pronged attack. Firstly, if the Catholics were to pay for the army, the pressure on the Protestant planters would be relieved. Secondly, he hoped that recusancy fines would convince the Catholics to convert.<sup>16</sup> However, the obvious problem with this being a long-term solution to the Irish Exchequer was that if Catholics converted in large numbers, the revenue extracted through fines would quickly diminish. Whilst acting as one of the Lord Justices, Cork had generated Wentworth's wrath by sidestepping an order from the King in an attempt to implement a policy of recusancy fines. Charles I authorised this policy in a letter of 14 April 1632, yet ordered that the Lord Justices made it clear that the Irish government had propounded the policy by making his letter public.<sup>17</sup> Charles did not wish to enforce recusancy fines, but hoped that the threat of this policy would ensure that his Irish subjects continued to pay the Contributions.<sup>18</sup> From England, Wentworth was able to manipulate the voluntary payment of the contributions by projecting the image that he preferred a more moderate policy to that suggested by the Irish government, in order to generate support for his regime. However, Cork attempted to scupper this by concealing the letter from the King, which made it clear that the policy arose from the Irish government, and therefore, the policy would appear to have come from Wentworth, the new Lord Deputy.<sup>19</sup> However, as we have seen, Wentworth was able to negotiate the continuation of the contributions with the Catholics through the work of his agent Michael Hopwood. Cork's plotting gave Wentworth a very negative opinion of the Old English<sup>20</sup> and he

---

<sup>16</sup> Boyle had expressed this policy in a letter to Lord Dorchester in January 1632. Boyle to Lord Dorchester, 2 January 1632, Chatworth House, Boyle Letter Book, f. 381

<sup>17</sup> Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, pp. 75 – 76, Clarke, A. *The Old English in Ireland, 1625 – 42* (London, 1966), p. 66.

<sup>18</sup> *ibid.*, p. 66.

<sup>19</sup> *ibid.*, p. 66, Kearney, H.F. *Strafford in Ireland 1633-1641* (Manchester, 1989), pp. 38 – 41.

<sup>20</sup> However, it was not simply Boyle's policy towards revenue raising that dissatisfied Wentworth. He discovered that Boyle had been perpetuating internal corruption by offering favours towards his local towns, effectively letting them off from their contributions to the army. He described the situation to Cottington in a letter dated 26 August 1633: "...the Earl of Corke since his being Justice, hath in fauour to diuers townes of his owne, dischargd them, wholly of those quarterly Payments w[hi]ch formerly they were sett at towards the Contribution for the Army. forth of the Prouince of Munster and sayd it soe much more heauyly upon the rest of the inhabitants..." Wentworth may also have had in mind that the Earl of Cork was a figure that he wished to humiliate as we will see in Chapter 7. Wentworth to Cottington, 26 August 1633. Str. P. 3a / 11.

felt that they were mainly concerned with their own self-interest.<sup>21</sup> Wentworth felt that his council's "Aspects and Actions lye extreame inwards to our owne affectiones and benifitt," and therefore the King's best interests were not necessarily the aim of the Irish Privy Council.<sup>22</sup> He described the Irish Privy Council as "a Company of Men the most intent upon their owne endes that euer I mett w[i]th" after only two meetings.<sup>23</sup>

However, despite generating a dislike towards the attitudes and characteristics of the New English party, Wentworth was equally disinclined towards the Old English Councillors.<sup>24</sup> The Catholic Old English had been reaping the benefits of the Graces since 1628 when Charles I granted them certain rights in return for a supply of money. They were expecting these to become statute law under Wentworth's regime. The Graces were a series of propositions put forward in 1628 by a delegation of Old English supporters. On 14 May, they had dispatched the series of fifty-one 'Instructions and Graces' to the Irish government.<sup>25</sup> The Graces were concerned with a range of Old English grievances, particularly addressing the concern that the army should be placed under proper control in garrisons and subject to civil law, and the financial arrangement to provide for the army settled. Other grievances were of concern to the Irish more generally. The courts of law were targeted, mainly concerned with the control of fees and fines, the Court of Wards was to be prevented from pursuing titles beyond the deceased ancestor of any person, ecclesiastical fees should be controlled and revenue farming was to be suppressed.<sup>26</sup> If the Graces were enacted, Catholic landowners stood "to gain secure title to those of their estates which had previously been exposed to plantation" and also concessions in practicing their faith.<sup>27</sup> In order to gain supply of three annual contributions of £40,000, the King had indicated that the Graces would pass into law at the next Parliament. This would

---

<sup>21</sup> Clark described the members of the New English party as "natural victims of thorough," a policy dedicated to the removal of the influence of self-interest and promotion. Clarke, A. 'The Government of Wentworth, 1632 – 40,' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (eds). *A New History of Ireland* (3 vols, Oxford, 1976), vol. III, p. 246.

<sup>22</sup> Wentworth to Cottington, 26 August 1633, Str. P. 3a / 11.

<sup>23</sup> Wentworth to Lord Treasurer Portland, 3 August 1633, *ibid*, 3a / 8, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 96.

<sup>24</sup> We should not assume that all Old English supporters were Catholic. The Earl of Ormond, for example, was of English descent, aligned himself with the Old English yet had close Catholic family and friends. Russell, C. 'The British Background to the Irish Rebellion of 1641,' *English Historical Review* 61 (1989), p. 167.

<sup>25</sup> Clarke, *Old English* p. 47.

<sup>26</sup> *ibid*, pp. 47 – 49. See pp. 47 – 54 for a full discussion of the wider implications of the Graces.

<sup>27</sup> Canny, N. *Making Ireland British, 1580 – 1650* (Oxford, 2001), p. 267.

cause particular problems for Wentworth in the Parliament of 1634. Wentworth had no intention of allowing all of the Graces to pass into law, as some would effectively prevent him from proceeding with a number of important policies, in particular the pursuit of defective titles and the plantation of Connacht, which we shall explore in Chapters 6 and 7.<sup>28</sup> The implications of the Graces would affect Wentworth's attitude towards the Old English and shape his dealings with the Old English party.<sup>29</sup> Despite the potential avenues of disagreement with various groups within the Privy Council, Wentworth indicated that he could rely upon Lord Chancellor Loftus, Vice Treasurer Mountnorris and Sir Adam Loftus, although as we shall see in Chapter 7, his opinions of such men could change rapidly.<sup>30</sup>

We have seen the problematic circumstances of Wentworth's immediate relations with the Irish Privy Council, unable to find a coherent policy that the Council as a whole could support him in. Wentworth felt that the main factions within Irish government did not share his ideals and were aiming to make profit for themselves rather than for the King. In this light, we can understand Wentworth's need to build up his own support network within the Council consisting of his own tried and trusted support system. He could be confident that these men would share his political aims and would offer him truthful advice. Wentworth may of course have been rather negative about the quality of the Irish Council in order to gain support his request for Wandesford and Radcliffe to be sworn of the Council, but he may also have believed that he could not work with what he saw as a self-seeking group of men. In either case, this would justify his use of his own 'inner' privy council, which he presented as essential to the success of his rule. Wentworth intended to control

---

<sup>28</sup> For a full discussion of Wentworth's denial of the Graces, see Clarke, *Old English* pp. 75 – 89.

<sup>29</sup> A further Irish group that deserves at least a mention is that of the native Irish. However, their political influence within the government was non-existent within the Privy Council. Russell has noted that due to the destruction of the archives at Kilkenny Castle, which did contain information about the native Irish and the Irish rebels, an investigation into their feelings prior to the Irish Rebellion is now impossible to guess. Russell, 'The British Background,' p. 168.

<sup>30</sup> Wentworth to Secretary Coke, 3 August 1633, Str. P. 5 / 9 – 10, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 98 – 99, Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 42. Wentworth had already encountered Mountnorris whilst a member of the English Privy Council in his work for the Irish Committee, where he had examined the work of Francis Annesley, later Lord Mountnorris. The committee was set up to inquire into charges brought against Annesley. He was accused of "tergiversacions, oposicions, wilfull absence, undue payments of Arrere or otherwise, for frustrating of good Orders to the prejudice of the Subject or of the Armie and dishonor of the Government." Mountnorris was required to answer the charges in England and was formally exonerated from the charges in March 1632. By this date, the relationship between Wentworth and Mountnorris had been established and he was already participating in Wentworth's introductory inspection of the difficulties he might face in his Lord Deputyship. *Acts of the Privy Council 1630 June – 1631 July* pp. 134 – 135, 136, 316.

both Parliament and the Irish Privy Council by developing his own party of supporters, within which Radcliffe and Wandesford would be prominent. Due to his distrust of the Irish Privy Council and their motives, Wentworth was forced into the habit of keeping “his own counsel secret and reveal[ing] his intentions to virtually no-one.”<sup>31</sup> Of course, it was his confidants, Radcliffe and Wandesford who had proved their reliability in both personal and business matters over a number of years, whom he allowed into this secretive world of politics and planning. They were each to have designated functions and tasks within the government as well as acting as personal advisors. Wentworth was still required to meet and consult with the Irish Council but “the discretionary nature of such an obligation” became apparent due to the Crown’s concession that Wentworth could consult with a select group of handpicked men.<sup>32</sup>

### **The role of Christopher Wandesford within the Irish administration**

Christopher Wandesford was an important part of Wentworth’s administration in Ireland. He was created Master of the Rolls and thus permitted to be a Privy Councillor in May 1633, a post that he held until his death in 1640.<sup>33</sup> Wandesford’s predecessor, Francis Aungier, baron of Longford (1558 – 1632) had been appointed Master of the Rolls in 1609 and had held the office until his death in 1632. He was an eminent lawyer with impressive legal training, attending Gray’s Inn in 1577, being

---

<sup>31</sup> Merritt, ‘Power and communication,’ pp. 115 – 116.

<sup>32</sup> Brady, C. ‘England’s Defence and Ireland’s Reform: The Dilemma of the Irish Viceroy, 1541 – 1641,’ in B. Bradshaw and J. Morrill, (eds.) *The British Problem, c. 1534 – 1707* (Basingstoke, 1996), p. 89.

<sup>33</sup> In the letter of commission from Charles I, it was noted that due to his “Sufficiency and Abilities to do us Service, we hold it fitting to advance him to be one of our Privy Council of that Kingdom.” King Charles I to Thomas Wentworth. 17 May 1633, Str. P. 4 / 26, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 84, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / Signet Office II, pp. 291 – 2. A second letter from the King to the Lord Deputy for Christopher Wandesford on 4 January 1634 prescribed “a Latin form, in which the Lord Deputy is to appoint Wandesford Master of the Rolls, in accordance with the patent of 11 May 1633. The form contains all the conditions upon which he is to hold the office.” *CSPI 1633 – 47*, p. 37. This original letter appears to have been a temporary measure as when Wentworth arrived in Dublin in July 1633, he wrote to Cottington to press that Wandesford be appointed to work on the Commission for Defective Titles, whose work was being delayed due to the Master of the Rolls having died and therefore the work could not be carried out. Later in this same letter, Wentworth pressed that Wandesford be made Master of the Rolls. He told Cottington that he hoped “as many of those defects in the Graunts or Titles of the Subject” as possible would be settled, yet with Aungier being dead since the Commission being issued, he desired that a letter under the King’s Signet be sent to him in order to add Christopher Wandesford to the Commission “who (besides the fitnessse of his place w[hi]ch perswades it) is of great paynes upright affections, and of Exceeding much ability in all thinges w[hi]ch concernes his Ma[jes]tyes Service.” After asking for Wandesford to be included in the Commission for Defective Titles, Wentworth added that “the Graunt of the M[aste]r of the Rolls to my Cosin Wandesford should be passed here alsoe under the Seale of Ireland...” They were sending the commission, ready drawn up to William Raylton “who will Sollicite your L[ordshi]p about it I beseech you gett it him dispatched as soone as may be.” Wentworth to Cottington, 26 August 1633. Str. P. 3a / 11, 12.



called to the bar in 1583 and achieving the position of bencher in 1602.<sup>34</sup> In comparison, his successor Christopher Wandesford was not so well qualified. Wandesford had been admitted to Gray's Inn in 1612 but he had not practiced law and as such must have appeared a less convincing replacement for Aungier.<sup>35</sup> In the absence of thorough legal training, we can only see Wandesford's appointment as Master of the Rolls as thanks to Wentworth's influence.

It is fortunate that we are able to examine the relationship not just between Wentworth and his cabal, but also between two of his closest advisors. Christopher Wandesford corresponded with George Radcliffe during the Irish administration, and although only the letters received by Radcliffe survive, we can learn much about the form of their relationship. An examination of their correspondence reveals a frank and honest relationship between them and demonstrates that they were not only linked through their mutual friend Wentworth, but were also friends with each other.

Radcliffe dealt with matters that entwined Wentworth's plantation policy with Wandesford's personal interest, as we shall see in Chapter 6. However, Radcliffe was also concerned with Wandesford's personal business such as a marriage treaty that had been arranged for Wandesford's son and the daughter of Mistress Janes. Radcliffe had clearly warned Wandesford against pursuing this treaty yet Wandesford was determined that his profit from it would not be foiled.<sup>36</sup> Going against this advice, Wandesford sent Radcliffe his instructions for the marriage treaty.<sup>37</sup> This demonstrates that although advice was shared freely between them, Wandesford did not feel under any obligation to follow Radcliffe's counsel. A later letter, in which Wandesford thanked Radcliffe for sharing with him the "knowledge of your affayres," confirms that this process was reciprocal.<sup>38</sup> Although business transactions determine a large proportion of their correspondence, on occasion we do obtain glimpses of their

---

<sup>34</sup> Ohlmeyer, J. 'Records of the Irish Court of Chancery: a preliminary report for 1627 - 1634,' in D.S. Greer & N.M. Dawson (eds.) *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History* (Dublin, 2001), pp. 32 - 33.

<sup>35</sup> However, Ball has argued that Wandesford was qualified for the position through his entrance into Gray's Inn alone. Ball, F.E. *The Judges in Ireland, 1221 - 1921* vol. I, (Dublin, 1993), p. 252.

<sup>36</sup> Wandesford intended to proceed with the treaty, "Albeit by yourself and my nerest freinds I am persuaded not to procede in the match agreed upon betwixt Mis[tress] Janes and myself. yet why I should not honestly make some advantadge by that business (w[hi]ch was always intended to be a profitt to me, and a reward for the good offices I did them) I cannot tell..." Wandesford to Radcliffe, 17 August 1636, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library. MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 8v.

<sup>37</sup> See "The Lord Justice Wandesford his Instructions about a treaty to be had w[i]th Mr Wells concerning Mrs Janes &c." 17 August 1636, *ibid*, ff. 10v - 12r.

<sup>38</sup> Wandesford thanked Radcliffe for his letters of 27 June and 16 July showing that they were in regular correspondence. 9 August 1636, *ibid*, f. 13r. Wandesford's letter to his old parliamentary friend

family life. Wandesford reported to Radcliffe in March 1637 that his new son had been born and also hoped that Radcliffe's wife had recovered from her illness.<sup>39</sup>

### **Philip Mainwaring: a new addition to the cabal**

The nature of the relationship between Wandesford, Radcliffe and Wentworth has been explored in great detail and it is apparent that their long-standing friendship with each other had enabled Wentworth to place complete trust and confidence in them. However, there is another important member of the cabal in Ireland whom we have not yet encountered and his rather different history with Wentworth raises questions about their nature of their relationship. Philip Mainwaring was appointed as Wentworth's Secretary of State for Ireland on 16 June 1634<sup>40</sup> and as was traditional, sworn into the Irish Privy Council.<sup>41</sup> He was included in a portrait by Van Dyke.

---

Sir Gervase Clifton dated 7 July 1637 indicated that the King had granted the custody of Mistress Janes' children to the Earl of Holland contrary to an earlier arrangement where Wandesford had negotiated the "Tuition of the second daughter Elizabeth" along with "the marradge of my Eldest sonn w[i]th that Chylde concluded upon, betwixt the mother and my self..." In case Elizabeth, upon reaching the age of consent, refused to marry Wandesford's son, he had negotiated a £2000 settlement. Wandesford had intended to finalise the marriage treaty of his son and Elizabeth now they were aged 14 and 12 respectively. However, now the King had decided "for the Custody of all the Children. Itt doth not become me to take the Chylde from the mother, untill his Ma[jes]tyes pleasure shall be informed of my Interist..." However, Wandesford was very concerned that he would not be able to justify this to the King "w[i]thout offense to the Earle of Holland, and yet to secure my self will be some difficultye." Wandesford hoped that Sir Gervase Clifton might be able to negotiate with the Earl of Holland on his behalf, demonstrating the need for Wentworth's cabal to maintain friendships with men in England who would be able to serve their interests on their behalf. Wandesford declared that he was "very hopefull that I shall receive lyght from you, howe to direct my Course." Wandesford to Sir Gervase Clifton, 7 July 1637, Nottingham University Library, Cl C 476.

<sup>39</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 26 March 1637, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 21r, Whitaker, T.D. *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), pp. 242 – 3.

<sup>40</sup> Charles I gave his order to Wentworth in Ireland that Mainwaring was to replace Sir Dudley Norton who was retiring from the post due to old age. Mainwaring was to receive a salary of £200 a year as well as the usual fees due to the holder of this office. King Charles I to Wentworth, 16 June 1635, Str. P. 4 / 88 – 89. On 21 October 1634, the King wrote to Wentworth from Hampton Court with an order that Philip Mainwaring, who was now the principal secretary of Ireland, should be paid £100 a year "for intelligence and such private service." *CSPI 1633 - 1647* p. 81, P.R.O. S.P.16 / Signet Office II, pp. 391 - 2. Mainwaring held the post of Secretary of State on two separate occasions, the first from 1634 - 1648 and the second from 1660 - 1661. As an earlier secretary of state, Francis Annesley, Lord Mountnorris had the right to succeed Sir Dudley Norton to the fees and signet of the Secretaryship of State but Wentworth managed to get Mainwaring appointed to the position in spite of Mountnorris' opposition. Annesley did manage to obtain the Secretaryship once again by order of the House of Commons in 1648 but it once again reverted shortly to Philip Mainwaring on the Restoration of Charles II. Wood, H. 'The Office of Secretary of State for Ireland and Keeper of the Signet or Privy Seal,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 38, Section C, (1928), p. 64.

<sup>41</sup> King Charles I to Wentworth for Mainwaring, 16 June 1634, P.R.O. S.P.16 / 254, 132, S.P. 16 / Signet Office II, 370, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* p. 55. Wood indicated that Mainwaring's inclusion in the Privy Council was normal: "The secretary of state was always admitted a member of the privy council, and was usually a member of Parliament." Wood, 'The Office of Secretary of State,' p. 54.

attentively writing a letter being dictated by Wentworth.<sup>42</sup> Wentworth's usual reliance upon kinship ties and lengthy friendships in which his friends had gained his full trust seems to have been neglected in the case of Mainwaring. There does not appear to be any kinship connection between them and neither does it appear to be the case that Mainwaring served one of Wentworth's relations as a secretary.<sup>43</sup> As discussed in Chapter 1, kinship ties further augmented Wentworth's other close friendships with Radcliffe and Wandesford. Wentworth perhaps felt this ensured their allegiance to him and therefore he could place his trust in them. However, Philip Mainwaring was a close friend and kinsman of William Raylton, Wentworth's trusted agent in London. This may help to explain Wentworth's desire to encompass Mainwaring into his cabal.<sup>44</sup> Wentworth's relationship with Mainwaring perhaps suggests that he placed more value upon friendship than familial connections. However, there is not a huge archive of correspondence between Mainwaring and Wentworth during the 1620's so it is difficult to deduce how close their friendship had become.

It is intriguing that Mainwaring's promotion to Secretary of State of Ireland was not universally supported and had aroused suspicion in the minds of influential political figures such as Archbishop Laud. Laud was glad that Wentworth had found a secretary that he could trust, despite his own reservations about Mainwaring. "I am glad you are so sure of him. You could never have been so fitted with any but an Oxford man."<sup>45</sup> Yet he was extremely concerned that Wentworth had admitted Mainwaring into his service and wrote to Wentworth to warn him against this appointment. Although Laud liked Mainwaring personally, writing "I profess I should be right glad to hear of any good come to him," he felt that he "cannot put him in the scales with you, and rather than that you should run upon a rock..." Laud promised that Cottington would move the King to appoint Philip Mainwaring, but professed

---

<sup>42</sup> Sir Anthony Van Dyke, *Thomas Wentworth, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Strafford with Sir Philip Mainwaring* (1636).

<sup>43</sup> Sutherland argued that a long secretarial apprenticeship with a relative was usual in the French context. Sutherland, N.M. *The French Secretaries of State in the age of Catherine de Medici* (London, 1962), p. 2.

<sup>44</sup> William Raylton's will, dated 27 February 1651 and proved 1 June 1653, described Philip Mainwaring as "my antient and much honoured freind Sir Phillip Mainwaring knt" and left him £10. P.R.O. PROB 11 / 231, quire 335. I would like to thank Dr Fiona Pogson for this reference. As we saw in Chapter 3, Mainwaring expounded the virtues of Raylton, stating that Wentworth had "a very careful Servant of Mr. Raylton." Mainwaring to Wentworth, 29 October 1630, Str. P. 12 / 158. Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 54.

<sup>45</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 12 January 1634. Bliss, J. (ed). *The works of the most reverend father in God, William Laud, D.D.* (7 vols, London, 1847 – 1860). vol. VII, p. 101. Mainwaring attended Brasenose College at Oxford, matriculating on 29 August 1610 and graduating with a BA on 8 February 1613. He

that “he is very much troubled at it, and I know to whom he said, that of his knowledge, if you meddled with making him Secretary, you would burn your fingers...”<sup>46</sup> The situation was obviously resolved, as Philip Mainwaring did become Secretary of State for Ireland.

The fact that influential courtiers in England were concerned about Wentworth’s adoption of Mainwaring into his administration is fascinating. Wentworth’s relationship with Mainwaring differed from that with Radcliffe and Wandesford as these were based on long-term friendships. Therefore we might question why Wentworth should have allowed Mainwaring into his government. One possible explanation is although Wentworth would have to work closely with Mainwaring in his capacity as Secretary of State, it may not have required so much trust on Wentworth’s part. Effectively, the Secretaryship was related to work for the King, rather than any particular involvement in Wentworth’s personal affairs. Thus Mainwaring might have heard confidential information, but he was in less of an influential position than Wentworth’s trusted men, Radcliffe and Wandesford.<sup>47</sup>

During the 1620s Mainwaring was a minor courtier who reported courtly gossip and news to a number of contacts.<sup>48</sup> In August 1631, Mainwaring accompanied

---

then progressed to study at Gray’s Inn from 1609. Foster, J. *Alumni Oxonienses 1500 - 1714* (Oxford, 1891), p. 960, Goodwin, G. ‘Philip Mainwaring,’ *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 348.

<sup>46</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 11 March 1634, Bliss, *Works of Laud* vol. VI, p. 359. Shortly afterwards, Laud wrote to Wentworth and again referred to the ill feeling in England towards his proposal that Mainwaring be made secretary for Ireland. Although Laud appeared to like Mainwaring personally, and told Wentworth that he was right to “carry it as you do, and to be as ready to go out of your opinion as to hold it,” he feared that this employment would create trouble for Wentworth. He warned Wentworth that he saw “some clouds here hang over that business. And whether they will fall or blow over I am not wise enough to foresee.” Laud to Wentworth, 12 April 1634, *ibid*, vol. VI, p.65.

<sup>47</sup> Indeed, Banks has argued that Wentworth did not trust Mainwaring and did not tell him the cipher to the letters he was transcribing for the Lord Deputy. Banks argued that by 1634, Wentworth did not trust anyone and “even worked out the figures of his ciphers himself in order that his secretary, Sir Philip Mainwaring, should not know the key.” However, this is not supported by any evidence and forms part of an argument that attempts to show that Wentworth was ill and unable to function properly. Banks, A.L. ‘Strafford – the Medical Background,’ *Journal of Royal Society of Medicine* 52 (1959), p. 364.

<sup>48</sup> Mainwaring reported courtly gossip to the Earl of Arundel and the first instance of his correspondence with the Earl dates from 22 November 1618. It is apparent from this letter that Mainwaring was present at court and perhaps was seen to some extent as a court hanger-on, which might go some way to explain his slightly unreputable character. In this letter, Mainwaring described Prince Charles’ party (later King Charles I) to which it was decided that every man would bring a dish of meat. “It was left to their own choyces what to bring; some strove to be substantiall, some curios, and some extravagant.” He also reported upon the sighting of a comet which some thought to be a prophecy but admitted that “The King takes no more notice of the blasing starre then he hath alwayes done of the daystarre, nor will acknowledge it for any other.” Mainwaring to Arundel, Newmarket, 22 November 1618, Lodge, E. *Illustrations of British History, Biography, and Manners, in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, and James I, exhibited in a series of Original Papers*.

Charles I on a visit to Portsmouth.<sup>49</sup> Mainwaring was also gossiped about in a courtly context. John Woodford reported the latest news from the Court to Sir Francis Nethersole and related a strange rumour about Philip Mainwaring. “Sec[retary] Cottington is married to Lady Brett, Mr. Hopton to Lady Lewin. and some say Phil[ip] Mainwaring to the Countess of Berkshire.”<sup>50</sup> Mainwaring’s supposed connection with the Countess of Berkshire, whether true or false, would have had quite an impact upon his reputation due the events surrounding her husband, Francis Norris, the Earl of Berkshire who had committed suicide in January 1623.<sup>51</sup> Even if these were only rumours, the fact that he was talked about as someone of lowly birth who was hoping to marry an earl’s widow would have branded him as a gold-digger. It is strange that Philip Mainwaring was associated with Berkshire’s widow shortly after this event. This might be the key to Philip Mainwaring’s slightly untrustworthy reputation that Archbishop Laud later warned Wentworth about. What is intriguing is why Arundel, Calvert and later Wentworth would have wanted any contact with Mainwaring, and we can only intimate that he was seen as a useful contact. Perhaps Wentworth ‘adopted’ him as due to his poor reputation. Mainwaring would be indebted to Thomas Wentworth and devoted to his service.

Wentworth received a number of letters from Mainwaring prior to his employment in Ireland and it is clear from these that Wentworth used him as a useful reporter of political and foreign news.<sup>52</sup> The first surviving letter from Mainwaring to Thomas Wentworth in October 1630 also reveals that he already had contact with

---

*selected from the manuscripts of the noble families of Howard, Talbot, and Cecil* (3 vols, London, 1791), vol. III, pp. 403 – 404.

<sup>49</sup> A party of courtiers took leave from the King to visit the Isle of Wight with Lord Weston, who was Captain of the Island. The group included Viscount Conway, Lord Mountnorris, Sir Henry Mainwaring and Mr Mainwaring “besides many other knights and gentlemen of quality, the total amounting to 300 horse.” Bamford, F. (ed.) *A Royalist’s Notebook. The Commonplace Book of Sir John Oglander Kt of Nunwell* (London, 1936), pp. 62 - 63.

<sup>50</sup> John Woodford to Sir Francis Nethersole, 15 February 1623, *CSPD 1619 – 1623* p. 492.

<sup>51</sup> Francis Norris, Earl of Berkshire, shot himself with a crossbow and died of his injuries on 29 January 1623 after a quarrel Lord Scrope, who pushed past him in a narrow corridor leading to the House of Lords. Berkshire lost his temper and argued with him. The lords were sitting and were informed of the encounter between the two noblemen and Prince Charles was also present in the House. Berkshire was committed to the Fleet prison and never recovered from the humiliation. He shot himself shortly after his release at his house at Rycote, Oxfordshire. Lee, S. ‘Francis Norris,’ *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 120.

<sup>52</sup> It is clear from this letter that Mainwaring and Wentworth had been corresponding for some time and Mainwaring defends himself from an unknown accusation from Wentworth. “I confess I lie open to your Lordship’s Censure, though I am not altogether guilty of that which your Lordship accuseth me of. I confess likewise that your Lordship hath more business than I have, and it is fit you should have so, for your Lordship knows very well how to dispatch it.” Mainwaring to Wentworth, 29 October 1630, Str. P. 12 / 158, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 54.

Christopher Wandesford, perhaps unsurprisingly knowing how closely Wentworth and Wandesford worked together by the late 1620s.<sup>53</sup> Mainwaring reported that the peace between England and Spain appeared to be hopeful and “Don Francisco will be at home about Christmas or near after it. His Lady is extraordinary well: The little Boy was puling, when Mr. Wandesford and I were there.” Mainwaring appears to have already been close to Wentworth by time this letter was exchanged. He stated that he longed to hear of “your Lordship’s coming up” and asked Wentworth to “give me Leave to put you in mind of your Health, for I hear you take no Recreation at all.” This is reminiscent of the reminders that his closest advisors, Radcliffe and Wandesford constantly plied Wentworth with.<sup>54</sup>

Wentworth’s relationship with Mainwaring might have been prompted through their association with the Earl of Arundel. Salt has argued that Wentworth’s marriage to the daughter of the Earl of Clare in 1625 ensured that he would be involved in the circle of influence surrounding the Earl Marshal Arundel. Although Arundel’s influence was limited after the succession of Charles I, this initial friendship may account for Wentworth’s encounter with Philip Mainwaring.<sup>55</sup> We find a number of references to Arundel’s business in Mainwaring’s letters, which are tantalising glimpses into Mainwaring’s political life and early career.<sup>56</sup>

Mainwaring also had a connection with another point of contact with Wentworth, his friend and patron, Sir George Calvert. Evidence of Mainwaring’s ‘newsletter’ correspondence with Calvert survives.<sup>57</sup> Wentworth’s contact with the Court was initially through the patronage of Calvert in the 1620s and after Calvert’s downfall in 1624, Wentworth was able to maintain a network of Court friends and

---

<sup>53</sup> Str. P. 12 / 158, Knowler, p. 54.

<sup>54</sup> Str. P. 12 / 158, Knowler, p. 54.

<sup>55</sup> S.P. Salt, ‘Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire, 1614 – 1628,’ *Northern History* 16, (1980), p. 135.

<sup>56</sup> In a letter to Mr Peasley dated 13 August 1623, Mainwaring reported: “An effort was made by Mr. Reynell to obtain the King’s Letter for the small building in St. Martin’s Lane. The Earl Marshal says his Majesty’s pleasure must be attended.” Also included in this letter was a copy of a note dated 7 August 1623 from Robert Spiller to Catharine Reynell indicating that Arundel was “willing to favour her husband and Mr. Mainwaring about the building, but advises that nothing further be done till the King’s Letter be obtained, as it is invidious to yield to one and restrain others.” *CSPD 1623 - 1625* p. 54.

<sup>57</sup> One such letter relates the arrival of “three Gentlemen, whoe made such haste in that passage, and used such prouidence in the disposing of the rest of their Company, as that caused the people there to take more notice of them, then otherwise they would have done; and the more, because they shunned the ordinary place of landing, of purpose to miss the Towne.” This raised suspicion and the mayors of Canterbury and Dover were sent to intercept the men, one of whom “had a false beard, and a kinde of Maske...” The disguised man turned out to be Prince Charles! Copy of letter from Mainwaring to Sir George Calvert, 20 February 1622, British Library, Additional MS. 35832, f. 82.

contacts. This may also partly explain another way in which Wentworth's trust in Mainwaring was able to build up over a number of years.

Mainwaring's contact with Wentworth might have been built upon through their parliamentary activities, perhaps augmented by their Court connection, and it might be intimated that it was in Parliament that Wentworth's recognised Mainwaring's political talents and saw him as a man close to his own heart. However, analysing Mainwaring's engagement with Wentworth's interest is problematic as we may be tempted with the benefit of hindsight, to read more into their relationship than is actually deserved. Philip Mainwaring was the first member of his family to enter Parliament and did so for the first time in 1624 when he sat for Boroughbridge in Yorkshire.<sup>58</sup> Mainwaring's link to influential Courtly patrons such as the Earl of Arundel, who tried to help Mainwaring in his initial foray into Parliament, might have further endeared Mainwaring to Wentworth.<sup>59</sup>

Philip Mainwaring's parliamentary contributions were fairly limited in the parliaments of the 1620s. Evidence of his involvement in the Parliament of 1624 is as elusive, amounting only to two comments that appear in the *Commons Journal*.<sup>60</sup> Philip Mainwaring was re-elected for Boroughbridge in 1625 and 1626 and again his

---

<sup>58</sup> Mainwaring was involved in all of the parliaments held in the early years of Charles I's reign, sitting for Boroughbridge in 1624, 1625 and 1626 and later for Derby in 1628. Henning, B.D. (ed). *The History of Parliament. The Commons 1660 – 90* (London, 1983), vol. III, p. 4. It is still unclear what Mainwaring's connection with Boroughbridge in North Yorkshire might have been, particularly as he hailed originally from Cheshire, and this suggests that he must have had the support of a patron to obtain this seat. Although with the benefit of hindsight we might try to link Wentworth with the acquisition of Mainwaring's seat, in reality Wentworth had little influence over constituencies in North Yorkshire. Equally, there is no evidence in his letterbooks that he asked for a seat for Mainwaring. Gruenfelder argued that Philip Mainwaring obtained his seat at Boroughbridge through the influence of the duchy of Lancaster. Boroughbridge had been loyal to the duchy from 1588 – 1601 but at this time was thought to be more loyal to the Council of the North's influence. Gruenfelder uses the election of Mainwaring to suggest that the duchy still had influence over the town. Mainwaring's grandfather, Sir Edward Fitton had also served Boroughbridge as a member of Parliament. This suggests that it was Mainwaring's contact with the court and particularly the duchy of Lancaster that enabled him to obtain the seat. Gruenfelder, J.K. *Influence in Early Stuart Elections 1604 – 1640* (Ohio, 1981), p. 83.

<sup>59</sup> The Earl of Arundel had written to the constables and electorate of Steyning in Sussex recommending Mainwaring and William Gardiner in the elections for the Parliament of 1624. He described them as being in "every way worthy and fit for those places; and for whom I will undertake that they shall not require any parliamentary wages." Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey to the borough of Steyning, 9 January 1624, Mereweather, H.A. and Stephens, A.J. *The History of the Boroughs and Municipal Corporations of the United Kingdom* ((Brighton, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1835, this edition 1972), vol. III, pp. 1513 – 1514. Neither Philip Mainwaring nor William Gardiner was elected to the constituency, which elected instead Sir Edward Francis and Sir Thomas Farnfold. Ruigh, R.E. *The Parliament of 1624* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971), p. 62.

<sup>60</sup> On 26 May, a comment in the *Journal* mentions a 'Mr. Manwaring.' "The Writ of Covenant is now in Mr. Manwaring's Hands towards the Lord Keeper," and later, 'Mannering' is described as "a servant of the now Lord Keeper." *Journal of the House of Commons of England*, vol. I, pp. 712, 738.

parliamentary involvement was limited.<sup>61</sup> Mainwaring was again a low-key character in the Parliament of 1628, sitting for Derby,<sup>62</sup> but he was involved in the committee of privileges that was chosen on 20 March 1628.<sup>63</sup> Mainwaring's parliamentary contribution was not significant in the Parliaments of the 1620s but his experience there may have provided an initial link to Wentworth or perhaps reinforced an acquaintanceship between them. He was later a member of the Irish Parliament and therefore his work in the English Parliament, although limited, might be seen as his apprenticeship.

The evidence for Wentworth's early relationship with Mainwaring is rather piecemeal and speculative. It may be the case that it was a combination of these connections with Philip Mainwaring that enabled Wentworth to see his potential as a Secretary of State in Ireland. He needed to rely on a close circle of advisors and although their relationship cannot be as satisfactorily explained as his connections with Radcliffe and Wandesford, Wentworth must have been able to appreciate Mainwaring's qualities, especially since close allies in England had warned him against employing Mainwaring.<sup>64</sup> Mainwaring had close contact with Wentworth and his other advisors in the Irish government. This is reflected in the requests sent to Mainwaring, asking him to gain the support of influential members of the Irish Council in matters of policy and legal dispute.<sup>65</sup> Although Mainwaring was closely

---

<sup>61</sup> Ironically, there is a reference to Mainwaring's lack of contribution to parliamentary proceedings when on 5 April the Commons debated how to punish those who were absent from the House. It was reported that "Mr. Manwaring, now in Town, sick," would be excused from paying a fine as he was ill and therefore had a legitimate reason for his absence. *ibid*, p. 844a.

<sup>62</sup> As Mainwaring appeared to have no connection with this area, Gruenfelder attributed his election to the influence of the Earl of Pembroke, who was the high steward for the town and had influence with the Cavendish family. Gruenfelder, *Influence in Early Stuart Elections* pp. 127 – 128.

<sup>63</sup> Mainwaring also appeared on the committee of 11 June 1628 "concerning the Title, Name, and Dignity, of Earl of Arondell, and for the annexing of the Castle, Honour, Manor, and Lordship of Arondell.... with the Titles and Dignities of the Baronies of Fitz-allen, Clunn, and Oswalstrey, [Oswestry, on the Welsh borders] and Maltravers....being now Parcel of the Possessions of Tho. Earl of Arondell and Surrey, Earl Marshal of England, to the same Title, Name, and Dignity, of Earl of Arondell." This is interesting given Arundel's earlier failed electioneering with Mainwaring in 1624. In this Parliament, Mainwaring may have had contact with Wentworth's cabal; on 12 June, Christopher Wandesford was added to this committee. *Commons Journal* pp. 873a, 911a, 912a.

<sup>64</sup> Despite Laud's uncertainty about Mainwaring's position in Ireland, Laud recommended the promotion of his brother, Thomas Mainwaring, the rector of Weldon in Northamptonshire from 19 May 1614. Archbishop Laud wrote to Wentworth in 1635 describing Thomas as "an honest man and a good scholar." Laud was in favour of his promotion although if "a good bishopric fall there, I shall not be able to get it for him, the King will be for his Chaplains. If he take this, I may easily get him removed to a better bishopric." Philip Mainwaring's position in Ireland enabled him to use his profile in order to improve the standing of his family due to his influential contacts. 23 January 1635, Bliss, *Works of Laud* vol. VII, p. 238.

<sup>65</sup> For example, Sir Philip Perceval wrote to Mainwaring on 7 April 1634, asking him to present a suit (if he thought it reasonable) to Wentworth and Radcliffe. *HMC Earl of Egmont I*, p. 76.



associated with such figures, we might see him as a more marginal member of Wentworth's cabal as his background and relationship with the Lord Deputy fundamentally differed from those of Radcliffe and Wandesford.

### **The role of Thomas Wentworth's brother, George Wentworth**

Another more high profile figure who should be acknowledged as part of this closely knit system of administration, was Wentworth's brother George who worked in a number of capacities throughout Wentworth's regime. He was sixteen years younger than Wentworth, born in 1609. His familial connection to the Lord Deputy allowed him to fulfil a more intimate role within England, often acting as Thomas Wentworth's representative in courtly and gentry circles. His role could be described as that of an ambassador, carrying letters between England and Ireland that could only be trusted to the most discreet hands and meeting with important political characters to remind them of their connection to his brother. One such highly confidential mailing was entrusted to George Wentworth's hands in January 1634 when he carried Wentworth's memorandum for his reasons for an Irish Parliament to the King.<sup>66</sup> George arrived at Westminster on 1 March, calling on Cottington, Laud, and Lord Treasurer Portland, before travelling to Newmarket, to present Wentworth's correspondence to the King. George Wentworth returned to Ireland with the permission for Wentworth to hold Parliament by the end of April 1634.<sup>67</sup>

George Wentworth was questioned on Irish affairs by important courtiers and he relayed their questions to his brother. For example, the Lord Keeper pressed George for news on Wentworth's activity against the Earl of Cork and George was able to assure him that Wentworth's "carriage towards them and all others, was w[i]th all indifferency, soe farr as it stood w[i]th honour and Justice... not respecting their persons but their Causes."<sup>68</sup> George wrote a long and detailed letter to Wentworth from England describing whom he had met, conversed with, delivered letters to and any news he learnt.<sup>69</sup> George Wentworth was able to easily mix with courtly circles

---

<sup>66</sup> Poyning's Law required the English Privy Council to permit the Irish Parliament to be summoned and afterwards its ratification of the legislation. Brady 'England's Defence and Ireland's Reform,' p. 92.

<sup>67</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* pp. 144, 148, Str. P. 13 / 204. Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 186, 233, 415.

<sup>68</sup> 'Journal of the Busines com[m]aunded me by your Lo[rds]hip to the Court of England,' March 1634. Str. P. 13 / 220.

<sup>69</sup> This letter took the form of a diary. *ibid.* 13 / 220. Another letter from this visit survives and shows that George was handling sensitive information on his brother's behalf as many of the names

due to his kinship to Wentworth and this formed an essential contact with the English Court for Wentworth. Although absent from the political centre, through his brother George, Wentworth was effectively able to maintain contact with these influential men who would in his absence, be able to support his interests. The obvious danger of being absent from the centre of politics worried Wentworth and he relied upon acquaintances and friends in England to honestly report the situation as they saw it.<sup>70</sup> However, he was well aware of the value of letters and his presence through proxy, which “when properly monitored and backed up by an efficient information network” could maintain his position in English politics.<sup>71</sup>

Whilst on Wentworth’s business in England, George handled extremely sensitive information that he was careful not to allow to fall into the wrong hands. In April 1635, George was keen to report some news to his brother but considering the messenger being “not so fit for that employment” and his own return to Ireland being imminent, he was “ambitious to giue you them my selfe...”<sup>72</sup> The close personal relationship between George and Thomas Wentworth as well as their kinship created a strong foundation of trust between them. George expressed how much he owed allegiance to his brother and how grateful he was to be working alongside Wentworth in Ireland. He proclaimed how thankful he was that “in your gracious opinion, soe weake an instrument should be thought fit to execute soe mighty an employment...”<sup>73</sup> George was keen to emphasise their kinship in a demonstration of loyalty, professing that Wentworth’s service was owed “the respect of a brother, and duty of a servant.” He asked that whilst he was in England on Wentworth’s business, “your affection as it euer hath, may, at this distance also, protect, and patronize your poore brother.”<sup>74</sup> George was clearly close to his brother and wrote to him whilst Thomas was in England to settle his estate and visit the King in 1636. He professed that “the best news I could receaue to heare for certaine,” would be that Wentworth’s meeting with

---

mentioned are written in cipher. “Sir George Wentworth’s Relation,” March – April 1634, *ibid.* 13 / 238.

<sup>70</sup> Wentworth wrote to Cottington to remind him that “the Allome businesse still stickes... It is in my Lo[rd] Treasurers hands and yours, soe I assure my self I cannot suffer by my absence.” Wentworth to Cottington, 26 August 1633, *ibid.* 3a / 12. Wentworth also needed men to support his legal business in his absence: “I have now sent over my secretary to attend my counsel with the book of pleadings in the cause between Sir David Fowlis and me appointed to be heard the 20<sup>th</sup> of this month. If you meet any of my noble friends you may do me a favour by mentioning it and desiring their presence.” Wentworth to Ingram, 4 Nov 1633, *HMC Various Collections VIII*, p. 41.

<sup>71</sup> Merritt, ‘Power and communication,’ p. 132.

<sup>72</sup> George Wentworth to Thomas Wentworth, 6 April 1635, Str. P. 15 / 10.

<sup>73</sup> George Wentworth to Thomas Wentworth, 24 February 1634, *ibid.* 13 / 204.

the King had been successful and that his “Yorkshire affaires, will be well concluded in some reasonable time...”<sup>75</sup> George also acted as a conciliator in Wentworth’s broken friendship with Sir Arthur Ingram. He wrote to Ingram on 6 July 1635 offering him his help in reconciling their disagreement, stating that “if to the perfectinge thereof, any hower of mine can contribute, you may rest confident, that I shall not faile to showe you, how really I shall labour therein...”<sup>76</sup>

George Wentworth did not play an official central role in Wentworth’s administration, possibly due to his age, but he was an invaluable asset to Wentworth as an ambassador. He acted as a proxy in Wentworth’s absence and was accepted by influential political players in England in this capacity due to his familial connection to Wentworth.

### **The two tiers of Wentworth’s administration**

We have seen in detail the high profile duties ascribed to Radcliffe, Wandesford and Mainwaring, and now we need to turn our attention to the lesser figures within Wentworth’s government, who might be seen as occupying the second rung on his ladder of administration. Wentworth’s advisors could not possibly have carried out all of the administrative and political tasks in which he was involved and this led to the establishment of what we might see as the two levels of his administration. These were men who still owed their primary allegiance to Wentworth, and although we know little about their activities as they often fulfilled minor secretarial duties, they all appear to have been men with whom he had a long-standing relationship. They had often first worked for Wentworth in England before being transferred to the Irish administration. Traces of these men are most often found in the signing of letters, carrying of letters and messages and trivial mentions of their activities in correspondence. But the fact that Wentworth placed the same value upon their being long-standing associates demonstrates that he needed to explicitly trust them and assure himself of their commitment and allegiance to him. This second level of men might be described as ‘administrators.’ Here we might utilise Aylmer’s distinction between ‘policy-makers’ such as Radcliffe and Wandesford, and ‘administrators’ such as Thomas Little and George Carr. However, Philip Mainwaring

---

<sup>74</sup> *ibid.*, 13 / 204.

<sup>75</sup> George Wentworth to Thomas Wentworth, 21 August 1636, *ibid.*, 16 / 48.

<sup>76</sup> George Wentworth to Sir Arthur Ingram, 6 July 1635, Leeds District Archives, FN / PO 7 H 28.

does not fit neatly into either category working in both a secretarial capacity as well as having a prominent public profile as a member of the Irish Privy Council. Aylmer has described the importance of Secretaries of State seeing them as administrative officers as well as having executive powers. The Secretary of State often had their own secretariat beneath them to deal with most of the correspondence of the country, drafting and copying letters.<sup>77</sup> Thomas Wentworth handled a massive amount of correspondence as Lord Deputy of Ireland and this could not possibly have been handled by one secretary alone. It was essential that some of the work be delegated to minor secretaries.

Wentworth's lesser secretariat sometimes appears in non-administrative business. For example, many of them took seats in the Parliament of 1634, in order to build up Wentworth's government faction within the House of Commons. Guilford Slingsby<sup>78</sup> sat for Carysfort in Wicklow, Thomas Little<sup>79</sup> for Cashel in County Tipperary, Thomas Edmonds<sup>80</sup> for Castlebar and George Carr for Roscommon, both in Connacht.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Aylmer, G.E. *The King's Servants* (London, 1961), p. 16.

<sup>78</sup> Kearney mistakenly identifies Guilford Slingsby as Gerard, but does describe him as a member of Wentworth's Irish administration. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 237 – 8. Guilford Slingsby acted as one of Wentworth's secretaries in Ireland and later became Lieutenant of the Irish Ordnance and Vice-President of Munster. His father was Comptroller of the Navy from 1625 – 1631. Aylmer, *The King's Servants* p. 81. It may be due to his father's work that Guilford was included in shipping transactions on Wentworth's behalf. In a letter from Wentworth and the Irish Council to the Lords of the Admiralty, we learn that the King had declared that the ships guarding the Irish coast should be "victualled and furnished in Ireland." Prior to this agreement, the magazine of supplies had been obtained from London, "through Guilford Slingsby" although in the future "we shall get these stores in Ireland..." Guilford Slingsby was appointed to a committee along with Sir John Borlase, Sir James Ware, Captain Kettleby and Joshua Carpenter "to discuss the affairs of these ships." Guilford must have proven his financial abilities as he was appointed to "take charge of the financial part of the business and should have £100 a year." Lord Deputy and Irish Privy Council to the Lords of Admiralty, 20 February 1638, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 256, 74, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* pp. 180 - 181.

<sup>79</sup> Thomas Little was another essential, yet less recognised character within Wentworth's second level of administrators. We occasionally glimpse his activities as a letter carrier but mainly he is referred to as being Wentworth's secretary. Richard Boyle, the earl of Cork referred to Little as "my Lord Deputie's secretary." James Frey informed Wentworth that he had received a number of letters from Ireland including "one from Mr Littel y[ou]r L[ordshi]ps Secretary." Boyle, R., Earl of Cork. *The Lismore Papers* Grosart, A. (ed). (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> series, each 5 vols, London, 1886 - 1888), series I, vol. IV, p. 30, James Frey to Wentworth, 17 October 1635, Str. P. 15 / 292.

<sup>80</sup> We might identify Little and Edmonds as private secretaries rather than state-appointed administrators. For the majority of the time, they would have worked behind the scenes and this helps to explain the difficulties in tracking their activities.

<sup>81</sup> See list of members of the Irish Parliament in 1634, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 254, 138, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* p. 67 and Appendix 1 in Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 223 – 259.

George Carr was a key member of Wentworth's lower level of administration. He had been Wentworth's chaplain in Yorkshire<sup>82</sup> and this firm basis to their friendship enabled Wentworth to trust Carr with sensitive information. During Wentworth's visit to England to settle his estates after the death of Marris in 1636. Wentworth asked Carr to gather together letters that he needed in England. In response to Wentworth's request that he collect letters concerning the Irish customs that he had written to the King, Laud and Windebank, Carr wrote "...for yo[u]r l[ordshi]ps perfecte recollection of the intire of that businesse I haue also gathered what I find of that Subiect in each of their lett[er]s respectiueley..."<sup>83</sup> We learn that Carr did have access to the ciphers used in these letters, which challenges the assumption that Philip Mainwaring did not know the code to Wentworth's cipher, being a higher figure in the administration. Carr acknowledged that Laud might be dissatisfied if he had deciphered his letters to Wentworth and therefore he had copied the letters as he found them. This would ensure that

if yo[u]r lo[rdshi]p should haue any occasi[on] to shew his Grace any passages therein, it may truly appeare to him as yo[u]r lo[rdshi]p hath formerly mentioned that the Cipher is only in yo[u]r lo[rdshi]ps owne keeping.<sup>84</sup>

This clearly shows that Wentworth felt he was able to trust his cabal – perhaps more than other important figures were willing to. George Carr was also employed as a letter distributor whilst Wentworth was absent, delivering letters to Radcliffe "Concerning the Customes" and to George Wentworth. Carr was clearly close to all of Wentworth's associates, being able to report to Wentworth that Wandesford, who was acting as Lord Justice, was "troubled w[i]th the Collick indeed of yo[u]r lo[rdshi]ps disease, sick w[i]th multitude of businesse...."<sup>85</sup> The lack of information regarding Carr's activities suggests that he was more of a personal assistant within the secretariat, rather than an influential Crown servant. However, Kearney indicated that Carr did obtain an official employment within Ireland, and was appointed Clerk of the Council in Munster in 1636.<sup>86</sup> Carr's importance and honesty was even recognised and commented upon by other members of Wentworth's cabal. Christopher

---

<sup>82</sup> In a letter to Wentworth, Carr signs off "Your L[or]dships Chaplaine in all duty & service..." 10 April 1630, Str. P. 20 / 103.

<sup>83</sup> George Carr to Wentworth, 6 July 1636, *ibid.* 16 / 31.

<sup>84</sup> *ibid.* 16 / 31.

<sup>85</sup> *ibid.* 16 / 31.

<sup>86</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 248.

Wandesford told Radcliffe that he had “gud cause to thinke myself beholden to mr Carr for he is very helpfull to me and a most honest diligent man.”<sup>87</sup>

Wentworth’s system of government ensured that he had men upon whom he could rely at all levels of his administration. Having had previously worked with even this second tier of secretariat in other circumstances, Wentworth felt that he could confidently allow them to work on his behalf upon important matters in Ireland.

## Conclusion

In a discussion of Wentworth’s trusted servants, we should also point to Wentworth’s reliance upon certain churchmen such as John Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry, who we shall discuss in Chapter 7. The appointment of English clerics to Irish bishoprics was another aspect of Wentworth’s desire to rely upon men brought from outside the existing Irish system. Bramhall was not a member of the cabal in the same way that Radcliffe and Wandesford were, but he had close connections to Wandesford in Yorkshire and therefore came strongly recommended to Wentworth’s service. In the early stages of his administration, Wentworth was sure to make the most of his close advisors, bringing them in to his government and essentially forming an inner Privy Council, which in the face of an existing Irish Council which he could not necessarily win over to his way of thinking, he would be able to rely upon for truthful advice and hard work. Wentworth would continue to use these support systems throughout his Lord Deputyship.

---

<sup>87</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 12 September 1636, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 15v. On another occasion, Wandesford noted that “I forget in every Letter to tell you howe much helpe I have from Geordge Carr he is a most honest man, I must thanke my L[or]d for him.” At this time, it appears that Carr was working directly for Wandesford, suggesting that these ‘lower’ servants were interchanged between the more important members of Wentworth’s cabal. Wandesford again praised Carr’s service, possibly indicating that Radcliffe did not hold him in such high esteem as Wandesford appeared to be stading up for his point of view. “What I writt of Mr Carr I protest the man deserves and a thousand tymes more for I holde him very woorthy of great estimation and Incouradgement.” Wandesford to Radcliffe, 9 August 1636 and 16 October 1636, *ibid.* ff. 13v, 18v – 19r.