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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the extent of support for Parliament in a county that was militarily vital at the outbreak of civil war. It was in Yorkshire that the King’s person was first openly defied, and the parliamentarian allegiance of a minority of Yorkshire’s population was the decisive factor in denying the King victory in 1643. The presence of the earl of Newcastle’s royalist ‘Popish Army of the North’ from December 1642 makes possible a study of parliamentary allegiance at its most imperilled and embittered. Rather than studying army structures, this thesis examines the diversity of support throughout the county.

Sub-gentry social strata in the West Riding cloth manufacturing districts were conspicuously parliamentarian and provide us with an example of a rare case in the seventeenth century where members of the middling and poorer sorts dictated a military campaign, setting a national precedent of ‘club-law’ that left lukewarm parliamentarian gentry ready to change sides. Through studying the correspondence of the parliamentary gentry, their differing levels of commitment and fragmented leadership are now revealed. The readiness of a section of the clergy to provide leadership in a religious war is another central factor analysed in explaining the endurance and motivation of heavily outnumbered military forces.

The thesis provides a brief sketch of Yorkshire and a chronology of the war there, before examining issues of recruitment, gentry honour and allegiance, club-law and popular allegiance, anti-catholicism, and changes in allegiance. An assessment of the strength of parliamentary allegiance is provided along with a reassessment of the value of regional studies for exploration of issues raised in the thesis. The thesis concludes that areas of popular parliamentarian allegiance did not correlate with areas of gentry allegiance, and so ultimately addresses the changing relationship between the gentry and the people in the seventeenth century.
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INTRODUCTION

The civil wars of the seventeenth century were of vital importance to the development of subsequent, and arguably current, British political culture. Given this, the problem of allegiance is crucial. How parliamentarians and royalists alike attracted or coerced support, and from what social groups they drew their respective followings, remains more significant in casting light upon seventeenth-century social and political relationships than the outcome of the often indecisive battles. John Morrill has even argued that this process of forming allegiance, and consequently of raising and establishing armed forces was more significant in the outcome of the war than battlefield action itself: ‘The battles which were fought in the inns and secluded manor houses of rural England were to prove more decisive in deciding the outcome of the civil war than were most of the events on the battlefield.’1

The allegiance of Yorkshire was strategically crucial to the outbreak of war. The absence of scholarly study examining parliamentary allegiance in Yorkshire is surprising, considering that it was where the King was openly defied for the very first time. It was in Yorkshire that the King first began raising troops, yet within two months of his departure, frightened royalist gentry in York were reduced to requesting an army from outside the county to come to their aid. Subsequent royalist successes in the county owe much to the total failure of Yorkshire parliamentarians to produce a unified army in the war’s first twelve months. The geographical pattern of parliamentary allegiance in the county presented the leadership with a strategic nightmare. The areas in which the parliamentary cause was likely to have the most popular appeal were distant, inconvenient regions, especially if Hull was to serve as its principal headquarters. The bitter rivalry within the county’s parliamentary leadership would make the concentration of such dispersed support into a single army even more unlikely. Opposing a royalist army the size of the earl of Newcastle’s, operating from a single command, with a centrally located base such as York, the prospects for the continued survival of dispersed parliamentary forces in the county were poor. The dogged resistance of the exposed cloth manufacturing districts of the West Riding was therefore particularly striking. The very survival of a parliamentary army in this region was impressive enough, but its military successes in early 1643 were nothing short of spectacular. The

---

storming of Leeds and Wakefield have traditionally been attributed to the inspirational leadership of Sir Thomas Fairfax, yet this one-dimensional focus has neglected the significance of the army that purchased these victories, and what it can teach us about the nature of seventeenth-century political culture. Before war-weariness set in, the early stages of the First Civil War were the times in which the proportion of volunteers among the parliamentary soldiery was likely to be highest, and volunteers at their most committed, for from 1642 to 1644, rebellion was a more risky and uncertain enterprise.

A useful guide to the approximate population of Yorkshire at the time of the outbreak of civil war are the Hearth Tax returns of the 1660s and 1670s. J.D. Purdy has calculated that the population of Yorkshire at this time was between 344,500 and 430,000. Wartime losses through dearth, military action, plague and disease indicate that if anything the population was likely to have been higher in 1642. According to Purdy's estimates, perhaps as many as 220,000 people were resident in the West Riding, over half of the entire county's total population, compared to maximums of 80,000 and 120,000 for the East and North Ridings respectively. The largest towns were York with around 10,000 inhabitants, followed by Hull and Leeds with populations of between 6,000 and 7,000. Beverley was the next largest with a population of up to 3,000, while Halifax, Wakefield, Sheffield, Doncaster, Scarborough and Whitby were the only other towns consisting of over 400 households.

2 All three biographies have suffered from limited historical horizons, merely praising Sir Thomas for his military skill and gentlemanly demeanour: C.R. Markham, A Life of the Great Lord Fairfax (London, 1870); M.A. Gibb, The Lord General (London, 1938); J. Wilson, Fairfax (London, 1985).


4 Ibid., pp.50,69,95,123.


6 Ibid., p.129.

Within the county in 1642, there were 14 parliamentary boroughs each electing two members of Parliament, while the two M.P.s elected as knights of the shire in the county elections took Yorkshire's representation up to 30. These boroughs consisted of the city of York and port of Hull, the West Riding towns of Aldborough, Boroughbridge, Knaresborough, Pontefract and Ripon, the East Riding towns of Beverley, Hedon and Malton, and the North Riding towns of Northallerton, Richmond, Scarborough and Thirsk. A number of towns with populations markedly less than 2,000 were enfranchised while the populous West Riding cloth towns were not, the incorporated town of Leeds being the most striking omission from representation.

The future civil war allegiances of M.P.s elected to the Long Parliament in October 1640 were very much an equal split. The knights of the shire were Sir William Savile and Sir Richard Hutton, supporters of the President of the Council of the North, the earl of Strafford, defeating the anti-court challenge of Lord Fairfax and Henry Belasyse. Strafford had drastically intervened in the King's interest, and secured the return of a further thirteen other future royalists. However, the anti-court interest was not without guile in election management, and on 2 November 1641, Fairfax's faction managed to eject the Queen's protege Henry Benson from Knaresborough, replacing him with Fairfax's brother-in-law, Sir William Constable. Fifteen other future parliamentarians were returned.

Given that the Yorkshire gentry were the driving influence in elections, the success of the anti-court faction was impressive, especially as the parliamentary gentry were

---


9 Aldborough and Boroughbridge were in the same parish and harboured tiny populations, but each elected two members of Parliament: R. Carroll, 'Yorkshire Parliamentary Boroughs in the Seventeenth Century', *Northern History*, 3 (1968), p.71.


outright outnumbered two to one by the royalists at the outbreak of war. This merely underlines the important point that anti-court feeling in 1640 did not always translate to armed rebellion in 1642. Henry Belasyse and Sir Henry Slingsby are just two examples of prominent critics of Caroline government who returned to a committed royalist allegiance. Within a year, the subsequent defections of Sir John Hotham, Michael Wharton, John Hotham and Sir Hugh Cholmley might be interpreted as a continuation of this process.

Although economic life throughout Yorkshire was still predominantly agricultural, by the time of the civil war distinct regions of the West Riding had emerged that were engaged in manufacture and industry as well as farming. Finding their income from agriculture alone to be insufficient, Pennine farmers in the western half of the riding took up additional occupations such as clothworking, coal, lead and iron mining, tanning, metalworking and charcoal-burning, usually residing in ‘scattered settlements that were free from tight manorial control and regulation.’ These areas were also traditional strongholds of Protestant nonconformity, concentrated around Sheffield and the clothing districts of Leeds, Bradford, Halifax and Wakefield. Historians would broadly agree this correlation is no coincidence, but consensus ends in discussing exactly what the formative relationship was between radical religion and rural industry.

The cloth manufacturing districts were largely contained within a quadrilateral running from Leeds to Otley through to Rochdale and then to Wakefield, although they were also found in Pennine regions further south and west. The most widespread popular support for the parliamentary cause was located in this region, which appears very similar to the wood-pasture areas analysed by David Underdown in the West Country. The patterns of


settlement tended to be scattered, in less fertile and moorland regions, engaged in the cloth industry as well as farming. They also tended to be extremely populous, with people living in isolated farmsteads, hamlets and townships rather than nucleated villages. Purdy has pointed out that Morley wapentake was 'the heartland of the West Riding cloth industry and contained many populous villages, a large proportion of whose inhabitants were dependent for their livelihood on the small-scale domestic production of cloth, which was marketed at the large towns of Halifax and Bradford.'

It was a family industry, and one easily compatible with the management of a smallholding. Women and children prepared and spun the yarn, while the men were weaving. On the 14 May 1638, Robert Benson, Clerk of the Peace in the West Riding reported that: 'The country subsists chiefly by trade of clothing... The west part of the riding is partly barren land, and replenished with clothiers that have spread themselves all over the country, as well in closes and parcels of waste ground as in towns.' Often combining cloth manufacture with husbandry, an independent and self-sufficient plebeian population had emerged.

Doncaster and Wakefield were the leading wool markets, while Leeds was the finishing centre for locally produced cloth, almost entirely broadcloths and kerseys usually designed for plebeian consumers. Here dealers would buy from the smaller domestic producers, employing dressers, croppers and dyers to finish the cloth and then arrange for the transport of the goods to Hull, or even London, for export abroad. Leeds was granted


Purdy, Yorkshire Hearth Tax Returns, p.143.

Hey, Yorkshire from A.D. 1000, pp.151-2.


Kerseys were small and light fabrics, three of which were equated to the heavier broadcloth by customs officers: Hey, Yorkshire from A.D. 1000, p.139; Ramsey, The English Woollen Industry, 1500-1750, p.13.

P.R.O., S.P. 19/113/198.
a corporation in 1626 and two years later London surveyors noted that the entire town, 'cheefely, and in a maner wholie dependeth' upon the cloth trade.23 Like many of the other clothing towns, the rural-urban boundary at Leeds was blurred; the town 'merged almost imperceptibly into its huge rural hinterland',24 in direct contrast to the more nucleated settlements of the East Riding.

One eighteenth-century antiquarian listed 26 townships or hamlets in Halifax parish and remarked on how often its size was compared to the slightly smaller county of Rutland.25 Purdy notes that the 'vast and populous' parish of Halifax contained 21 townships, while Bradford contained a further 11.26 Halifax was the largest parish in the county,27 and along with Bradford, Batley, Birstall, Calverley and Dewsbury, comprised Morley wapentake, containing 5,302 households in the 1660s,28 encompassing a possible pre-war population of up to 25,000. When pointing out how they had suffered for the parliamentary cause, local petitioners claimed: 'Our p[ar]ish of Birstall being populous, consisting of 2000 communicants at least.'29 In 1642, 10,000 people were living in the parish of Bradford,30 while Herbert Heaton asserted that by 1638, 22,000 were employed in the textile industry in the parishes of Bradford, Bingley, Halifax and Keighley.31

The cloth district contained a high proportion of the middling sort. Yeomanry, richer

28 Ibid., p.108.
29 P.R.O., S.P. 23/190/578.
husbandmen, merchants, well off tradesmen and artisans in towns like Halifax and Bradford comprised the local ruling elite in their capacities as churchwardens, constables, overseers and jurors.\textsuperscript{32} Based on the Hearth Tax returns, Purdy estimates their number in the West Riding in 1672 to have been 18 per cent of the total population, compared to only 13 per cent and 10.5 per cent for the East and North Ridings respectively. They may even have comprised 20 per cent of the inhabitants at Halifax.\textsuperscript{33}

William Coster's study of Almondbury neatly summarises the nature of a clothing district parish. Emphasizing the scattered patterns of settlement, Coster reveals there were many isolated farmsteads and hamlets in addition to the parish's 13 townships: 'The surviving records indicate that Almondbury was a large, but dispersed community or series of communities, in which the population of the parish was dependent on mixed agriculture, probably heavily weighted toward pastoral use, and where a considerable clothmaking industry had developed.' Coster points out that the Hearth Tax records suggest a high proportion of members of the middling sort here also, with comparatively few poor labourers, 'perhaps because of the large areas of common land and small scale industry which may have allowed greater economic independence.'\textsuperscript{34}

So with Pennine soils unable to maintain crops, the grasslands were used as pasture for livestock, most extensively sheep for wool for the resident cloth industry. The moorland soil and cold, wet climate ensured that the grain harvests were hardly sufficient for household needs;\textsuperscript{35} Daniel Defoe commented of the people around Halifax: 'As for corn, they scarcely grow enough to feed their cocks and hens.'\textsuperscript{36} In addition, the labour intensive nature of the cloth industry led these areas to become increasingly dependent upon the fertile


\textsuperscript{33} Purdy, \textit{Yorkshire Hearth Tax Returns}, p.123; for Halifax see Bennett, ‘Enforcing the Law in Revolutionary England’, p.37.


\textsuperscript{36} D. Hey, \textit{The Rural Metalworkers of the Sheffield Region: a study of rural industry before the Industrial Revolution} (Leicester, 1972), p.16.
Vale of York for their food.\textsuperscript{37} Therefore these districts were exceedingly sensitive to any depression in the cloth trade and in 1642, when such a crisis did come, it was easy to point to a collapse of confidence in the King’s policies as an explanation. The King’s siege of Hull had disrupted the summer’s cloth shipment so irretrievably that some of the poorer clothiers of these areas may have been on the verge of starvation. This dearth caused a social disorder that the resident Fairfaxes were able to exploit. Another factor in Parliament’s favour was that these areas had an established tradition of Godly reform, so as we shall see at a later point, it was natural for such people to view their decaying trade as a result of Charles I’s ungodly religious innovations.

East of the cloth districts lay the coalmines south of Leeds stretching to Wakefield, Sheffield and Barnsley.\textsuperscript{38} There were coal measures at Shafton and Worsborough,\textsuperscript{39} while the Tankersley ironstone seam extended from near the lower Wharfe as far south as Derbyshire, with ore smelted in the iron mills on the River Dearne.\textsuperscript{40} The town of Barnsley, overwhelmingly consisting of labourers, colliers and wiredrawers was very poor indeed, dependent on the charity of other towns.\textsuperscript{41}

Merging into this region were the metalworking areas of Strafforth and Tickhill wapentake, centring on the towns of Sheffield and Rotherham. There was a large grouping of ironworks in the Sheffield locality,\textsuperscript{42} and no resident lord.\textsuperscript{43} By 1637, there were thirty cutlers’ wheels on Hallamshire rivers attended by over 400 master workmen, basing their industrial success on water power. In 1624, Sheffield town had been incorporated as ‘the company of Cutlers of Hallamshire’, the legislation declaring that the ‘greatest part of ye inhabitants of ye Lordshipp and Liberty of Hallamshire... doe consist of cutlers.’ Thirty years later around 40 per cent of occupations listed in local parish registers were producers

\textsuperscript{37} Heaton, \textit{The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries}, p.211.
\textsuperscript{38} Hey, \textit{Yorkshire from A.D. 1000}, pp.155-6; P.R.O., S.P. 23/133/457.
\textsuperscript{39} Hey, \textit{Yorkshire from A.D. 1000}, p.150.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., pp.152-3.
\textsuperscript{41} Its population in 1638 was around 700: R. Jackson, \textit{History of the Town and Township of Barnsley} (London, 1858), p.235n.
\textsuperscript{42} P.R.O., S.P. 23/115/1000-1005.
\textsuperscript{43} D. Hey, \textit{The Making of South Yorkshire} (Ashbourne, 1975), p.147.
of cutlery. Local gentlemen like Christopher and Lionel Copley invested in the ironworks. This region lay west of the main road and river network, and the River Don was not yet navigable so Sheffield manufacturers were compelled to undertake a twenty mile cart or packhorse journey to Bawtry where the goods could be sent down the River Trent to Hull. The Bright family exported lead from Sheffield this way in 1640, dealing directly with their merchant contacts in Amsterdam. The area shared some common characteristics with the clothing districts. Both regions were known centres of Godly reform, both regions were engaged in industry as well as agriculture, and both areas would suffer due to royalist domination of their trade routes to Hull.

On the most easterly fringes of the West Riding were the marshes and fenlands of Hatfield Chase, grouped around the convergence of several rivers into the Humber estuary. Regular winter flooding in this locality submerged large areas, leaving silt deposits which produced excellent summer grassland for livestock. The arable land which was out of flood range was very fertile and grain harvests could be abundant enough to export overseas while the inhabitants enjoyed extensive common rights and few resident gentry. The proliferation of smallholding farmers and the lack of a significant local gentry presence made the area an attractive candidate for royal drainage projects; Charles I had recently allowed Sir Cornelius Vermuyden to commence drainage work, causing the local fee farmers to petition against unjust sales of their land brought on by the commissioners of sewers. Vermuyden claimed that he suffered £60,000 damages through nocturnal sabotage at the

---

46 Hey, The Rural Metalworkers of the Sheffield Region, p.15.
47 Hey, Yorkshire from A.D. 1000, pp.135-6.
hands of the local populace, and a further £150,000 in lawsuits. Farmers at Fishlake and Sykehouse complained that Vermuyden's work had put them at greater risk from flooding.

The inhabitants of Hatfield Chase shared more common cultural characteristics with adjacent parishes such as Misterton in Nottinghamshire, and Crowle and the Isle of Axholme in Lincolnshire, than with the rest of the West Riding. The clash of this region's plebeian population with royal prerogative did not dictate a parliamentarian allegiance and Keith Lindley has emphasized the lack of any ideological or political motivation in the fenland rioters. Nevertheless, in August 1642 when Charles I passed through Hatfield, he heard that armed men had gathered against him in the Isle of Axholme, and on the night of the following New Years' Day, the sewer was pulled up to deny the royalist Sir Ralph Hansby's forces access to the Isle. Despite their previous lack of opposition to Vermuyden's drainage projects, the people of nearby Crowle petitioned on 21 April 1645, that they had raised both horse and foot for the Lord Fairfax at their own charge, having 'ever been faithfully adhered to the Parliament uppon all Emergencyes.' However, such evidence must be treated with caution in view of Clive Holmes's assertions concerning the astute manner in which fenmen framed their petitions to changing government authorities from Charles I to the Protectorate. They were later organised by John Lilburne to join with tenants of the Isle of Axholme and Misterton to seize 10,240 acres for themselves, thereby 'taking advantage of the late troubles.' Despite the assertions of Holmes that fenmen's

50 J. Bruce (ed), Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1637-1638 (London, 1869), pp.12,533.
51 Hey, Yorkshire from A.D. 1000, p.145.
53 This anti-royalist activism was more likely to be inspired by fear of plunder and the Array than genuine devotion to Parliament, yet anxieties such as these were powerful forces shaping early popular parliamentarianism: B.L. Lansdowne MS, 897, ff.206,209.
54 P.R.O., S.P. 19/99/90.
traditions of self-government were compatible with Leveller ideas on the franchise and political authority, theories of this region producing a popular parliamentarian activism comparable to the clothing districts are notoriously difficult to substantiate. At the Restoration, fen drainers may have provided Charles II with plentiful evidence that fenland communities had supported his father’s enemies, but they had obvious reasons of self-interest for so doing. 57

The East Riding provides many contrasts with the larger and more populous West. It was overwhelmingly an agricultural county, consisting of three geographical regions: the plain of Holderness, the Yorkshire wolds and an area of no predominant character west of the wolds bounded by the Ouse and Derwent rivers, the Howden marshes and the limestone hills north-east of York. 58 Anthony Fletcher has referred to it as ‘a basically centralised county’ and compares it to Essex. 59 Beverley with its Minster and brick gatehouses was the county town and host to the county Quarter Sessions. Six miles to the south lay the independent borough of Hull, with the extensive river networks of the Trent and Ouse forming its hinterland. Between 1618 and 1640 the exports of the cloth trade through Hull were steadily growing, enjoying more success than the textile industry further south. 60 The inhabitants took civic pride in their town walls and the achievements of their corporation. 61 The town contained the second largest arms magazine in the country, the denial of which to the King was arguably the parliamentarians’ greatest strategic achievement of 1642. The formidable and comparatively modern fortifications of the town made it an attractive and secure base for the parliamentarians of the East Riding, safe in the knowledge that it could withstand siege by receiving supplies and reinforcements from the parliamentary fleet.

East of the River Hull lay the low lying coastal region of Holderness, an area of land

61 Cross, Urban Magistrates and Ministers, p.2.
formed by water, from silt on the coast and peat on a clay base inland. The area was served by dykes and drains rather than rivers, providing rich summer grazing on saltmarshes and pastures gained from the sea. The inhabitants were concerned with grain growing and pasture, even supplying wheat to other regions. Already intensively farmed for centuries, Holderness enjoyed some of the most fertile soils in Yorkshire. The immense open common fields, stretching for miles over boulder clays made the area a fertile corn and cattle district, but the villages in the west of the region along the Hull river valley were particularly susceptible to flooding. The Holderness coast was dominated by the estates of the Roman Catholic family of Viscount Dunbar, the Constables of Burton Constable, and was widely perceived to be the ideal location for an invasion or Catholic uprising, a fear on which John Hotham was to capitalise in 1642.

In a crescent extending from Hessle to Flamborough and the coast were the Yorkshire wolds, another mixed farming region which was compared by Daniel Defoe early in the eighteenth century to the Wiltshire downs near Salisbury. Sheep were grazed on the high wolds to provide wool for the West Riding clothiers. Henry Best, a wold farmer, wrote in 1641:

We usually sell our wooll at home unless it bee by chance that wee carry some to Beverley on Midsummer day: those that buy it carry it into the West, towards Leeds, Hallifax and Wakefield; they bringe pack-horses, and carry it away in great packes; these wool-men come and go continually from clippinge time till Michaelmasse.

However, there was also extensive arable land in enormous common fields beginning to be enclosed during this period yielding barley and wheat. Nucleated villages containing landless labourers were dominated by single resident landlords. Indeed, in contrast to the

---

62 Thirsk, England’s Agricultural Regions and Agrarian History, p.25.
63 Ibid., pp.29,45.
64 English, Great Landowners of East Yorkshire, p.102.
65 Hey, Yorkshire from A.D. 1000, p.140.
66 English, Great Landowners of East Yorkshire, p.135.
67 Ibid., p.2.
69 Thirsk, England’s Agricultural Regions and Agrarian History, p.40.
West Riding gentry, the wealth of most East Riding landlords was more firmly rooted in agriculture alone.\textsuperscript{70}

Protestant nonconformists were most firmly established in Beverley, Hull and the adjacent villages such as Cottingham, Rowley and Sculcoates, well situated to consolidate Parliament’s hold on the area. J.T. Cliffe has pointed out that their strength was also considerable ‘in a chain of parishes along the northern fringe’ of the East Riding, noting that 14 out of the 30 gentry families of the Dickering and Buckrose wapentake were ‘Puritan’, a higher proportion than in any other Yorkshire wapentake.\textsuperscript{71}

Apart from the centre of government for the entire north of England, and seat of the Council of the North, York remained an important commercial centre and inland port. The city served as the market for the surrounding villages; its annual fairs attracted people from across the entire county and beyond. Baltic goods were imported to the city through Hull, and sometimes as far upstream as Ripon or Bedale.\textsuperscript{72} The city was governed by its corporation, a narrow oligarchy drawn from the trade guilds. Its jurisdictional rivalry with the cathedral clergy encouraged many aldermen to develop Puritan sympathies which became inconvenient under the royalist military occupation of the city.\textsuperscript{73} One historian has gone so far as to argue that the city was ‘apathetic towards the royalist cause’,\textsuperscript{74} but such a wide generalisation remains dangerously difficult to substantiate. While the majority of the corporation were not enthusiastically royalist, a minority were actively zealous.\textsuperscript{75}

Much of the Vale of York was rich arable farmland that had been enclosed by the mid-seventeenth century, perhaps as much as 70 per cent in the areas north of the city. Corn and livestock were of equal importance, farmers having the luxury of being able to adapt their

\textsuperscript{70} English, \textit{Great Landowners of East Yorkshire}, p.102.


\textsuperscript{72} Hey, \textit{Yorkshire from A.D. 1000}, pp.134-5.


activities in accordance with the fluctuating grain prices, and devote attention to horse breeding for which the area was becoming famous. Even to the east and south-east of the city where the vale was low lying and poorly drained, with the emphasis on pasture farming, the inhabitants were still able to grow enough corn for their own requirements.  

The vast and sparsely populated North Riding lay under royalist domination for much of the early stages of the war. Parliamentarian gentry were either captured and imprisoned, or they fled south to Lord Fairfax or sought safety with Sir Hugh Cholmley at Scarborough. Like the East Riding, this was very much an agricultural area. The Yorkshire Dales and adjoining districts of the Craven region of the West Riding were other pastoral areas able to grow very little corn. Mid-seventeenth-century Richmondshire J.P.'s commented that the region was too mountainous to grow its own corn. The finest meadow and pasture land in the river valleys was almost entirely enclosed and given over to beef and dairy cattle, with sheep grazing on the higher slopes. There were also a number of lead mines in the locality. 

The coastal ports of the North Riding were chiefly Scarborough and Whitby. Jack Binns reckons Scarborough's population in 1640 was 2,800, and that of Whitby nearing 2,000. Their populations were heavily involved in fishing, while ships from these towns were deeply engaged in the coal trade, carrying from Newcastle and Sunderland to London. Although Scarborough's fortifications were not as impressive as Hull's, the castle on the headland was situated on a towering natural strongpoint which would prove very difficult to reduce. Local alum works at Guisborough, Mulgrave and Sandsend had recently enabled striking economic growth to occur in Whitby, which had rapidly become a major coal-carrying and ship-building port. Pickering forest near Scarborough was Yorkshire's main horse breeding region.

The gentry correspondence available for the period is considerable, including valuable
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collections of letters of the Hothams and the Fairfaxes in the British Library and several Yorkshire archives. The numerous Yorkshire autobiographies, memoirs and commonplace books studied have enabled an exploration of the ways in which individuals saw themselves fitting into the pattern of allegiance. The Commonwealth exchequer papers and trustees for the sale of crown lands provide a detailed picture of the parliamentarian military establishment in the county, along with details of individual officers’ careers. The papers for the Committee for the Advance of Money, and the Committee for Compounding with Delinquents, have aided the reconstruction of local networks and disputes, giving occasional hints of the allegiance of sub-gentry groups and individuals. Quarter Session and Assize records have helped to indicate areas of pre-war unrest, the problem of poaching, and seditious libels.

The local antiquarian works which so abound in Yorkshire facilitate the acquisition of detailed local knowledge, often giving leads to valuable primary material. Civil war tracts from the Thomason collection and elsewhere have provided a sure way of witnessing how allegiance and events in Yorkshire were perceived in the rest of the kingdom, especially London. Corporation records have ranged from being of very limited use to being so overwhelming, as in the case of Hull that they almost warrant a separate study in themselves.

While recognising the importance of earlier studies, the problem of regional allegiances in the civil war was given a new focus by David Underdown’s pioneering work on Somerset, Dorset and Wiltshire, entitled ‘Revel, Riot and Rebellion’. His theory of contrasting civil war allegiances rooted in contrasting pre-war religious and cultural traditions is one that has been continually praised, attacked and reassessed for 14 years. Ann Hughes, Mark Stoyle and most recently Andrew Warmington have assessed this hypothesis in their work on the nearby counties of Warwick, Devon and Gloucester. However, such a study for Yorkshire is long overdue. Yorkshire is of a similar geographical size to Underdown’s three counties combined, and his theories have so far lacked analysis in a northern setting. While this thesis only claims to be an examination of parliamentarian allegiance, the importance of major royalist concerns in its development have not been ignored.
Despite the concentration of 'revisionist' historians upon constitutional issues, aristocratic faction, high politics and events in the London Parliament,\textsuperscript{81} Yorkshire and its inhabitants were central to the outbreak of war. Not only was the King in Yorkshire during those vital months of March to August 1642, but the military allegiance of so large and populous a county was a matter of paramount importance to both sides. The contemporaries Sir Thomas Jermyn and Secretary Windebanke had already agreed in August 1640 that if Yorkshire committed its full support to the King, the Scots Covenanter rebels would be vanquished.\textsuperscript{82} Similar expectations were likely from the emerging royalist party two years later. Martin Rackstraw, in his study of royalism in Yorkshire at the outbreak of war, concluded that 'The Civil War was not made at Westminster and imposed upon the provinces; it was made in the provinces too. It is therefore valid to study political behaviour in a local context.'\textsuperscript{83} The foremost authority on northern royalism, P.R. Newman has produced several articles and books arising from his doctoral thesis that advance our understanding of the principles of the royalist gentry, which he evidently finds so attractive, chiefly those of loyalty, honour and sacrifice.\textsuperscript{84} Parliamentary allegiance in Yorkshire has never received comparable attention, the only study being Jennifer Jones's account of the northern parliamentarian army.\textsuperscript{85} Aside from a useful chapter on the northern army's officer class, she concentrates entirely on military events, and chronological narrative. Paying little attention to the fundamental question of allegiance patterns, her work is a poor comparison


\textsuperscript{82} D. Scott, ' "Hannibal at our Gates": Loyalists and Fifth-columnists during the Bishops' Wars- the Case of Yorkshire', \textit{Historical Research, }70 (1997), p.269.


to Newman’s more scholarly and engaging studies. This thesis seeks to redress this imbalance and illustrate the character and diversity of parliamentarian allegiance across England’s largest county.
CHAPTER ONE
THE COURSE OF THE WAR IN YORKSHIRE

Throughout the First Civil War, as with most wars, territorial domination was a necessary step towards controlling a region’s human and material resources. Activists on both sides endeavoured to administer as large a territory as possible in order to maximise support. John Morrill points out that, ‘Side taking for the great majority was largely contingent. Men delayed declaring themselves until forced to do so by the appearance of activist groups on one or both sides.’

Even in hostile areas, military domination could generate support from reluctants who feared the consequences of disobedience. It would also provide a secure environment for wholehearted supporters to lend the greatest assistance they could. As the fortunes of war fluctuated, the areas of Yorkshire controlled by parliamentarians contracted and expanded as towns and villages changed hands, changes which had implications for their financial and military strength. The course of the war in Yorkshire and also in the wider national struggle would affect decisions about allegiance, and especially how far people committed themselves to their allegiance. To understand the chapters which follow, it is therefore necessary to provide a brief sketch of early military operations in Yorkshire.

1:1 The struggle for control of Hull, January to April 1642

In January 1642 most people in Yorkshire probably believed there would be no war. When John Hotham arrived before the gates of Hull on 18 January at the head of 300 men of his father’s East Riding trained bands, the mayor and corporation reacted in the same disapproving manner as they had to the IC-ing’s agent, the earl of Newcastle a few days earlier. On 15 January, the earl explained to the King his failure to secure the town: ‘the town will not admit me by any means, so I am very flat and out of countenance here, but I will stay until I know your majesty’s pleasure.’ This did not mean that the corporation supported Parliament in preference to the King; even their resentment of Charles I’s


appointment of Sir Thomas Glemham as governor of the town in 1640, and the billeting of his soldiers upon them did not necessarily dictate a parliamentary allegiance. They were more concerned with protecting their charter and privileges, including their conviction of their right to appoint a governor. Even if they had known that Sir John Hotham had been appointed Governor of Hull by Parliament on 11 January, barely a week after Charles I had marched soldiers into the House of Commons, they still sent a letter to his son three days later denying him admission to the town. They did not admit John Hotham or his local troops into Hull until he had procured threats against them from Parliament. Remembering the grisly fate of the town’s high steward the previous year, they decided it would be safer to admit Hotham than risk journeying to London and appearing before the House of Commons. A further consideration for them was the letter sent from Westminster on 13 January, perhaps penned by Sir Henry Vane, explaining to the corporation that the King, inclined to popery, intended to subject the nation to foreign military power. England’s second largest military magazine containing arms for 20,000 men, 7,000 barrels of powder and 120 pieces of field artillery was situated at Hull, so it follows that this near-coastal town was most likely to be the first objective of any such strike from overseas. So that is how on 23 January, amidst an environment of anxiety and threats, John Hotham was able to march his father’s trained bands into Hull and only five days later muster companies of the town’s own militia to join them under his command.
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The King still had sympathisers in the Hull corporation, notably aldermen Cartwright, Dobson and Parkins, but they were powerless to act; a torrent of rumours encouraged by John Hotham had bolstered his position. The papists along Humberside were arming themselves! The Spanish intended to land a mighty fleet! John Hotham used this atmosphere of emergency to increase his control, and with the arrival of his father by 22 March, the town became more securely held for Parliament. John Hotham claimed the majority of the town were in favour of his admission, and he had received support from local gentlemen such as Christopher Legard of Anlaby, William Goodricke of Skidby, John Anlaby of Etton and Matthew Appleyard of East Halton, whom Sir John was to commission as lieutenant-colonel, sergeant-major and captains respectively. Nearly 600 soldiers greeted the arrival of Sir John in Hull, and a further 300 were recruited in the following two weeks, including Captain Lowinger, a Dutch professional.

Upon receiving intelligence of the King leaving York, his headquarters since 17 March, and drawing near to Hull, Sir John Hotham contacted his friends and tenants in the adjacent country. Having no naval support at this stage, Hotham positioned two keels full of soldiers in the harbour in response to rumours that the King intended to enter the town by water. On 23 April, the day the King arrived before the walls of Hull, and on the day after, Sir John distributed a total of £101/19/- to his soldiers. He ordered the bridges to be drawn up, the gates to be shut, his soldiers to man the walls and the inhabitants to stay indoors. Although sympathies in the town were clearly divided, with the mayor inclining
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to royalism, Parliament had sent Peregrine Pelham, M.P. for Hull, to support Sir John who was now relatively well prepared to deny his sovereign entrance into Hull. Expecting such a possibility for some time, a man of his political experience would never have taken such a gamble unless the odds were massively in his favour. So he stood on his home ground, with his kinfolk, friends, tenants and soldiers of his regiment of trained bands around him, and when the royalist gentlemen around the King called on them to throw him from the walls, no one within the town stirred.

Two days later, the King wrote to the corporation threatening the very thing they cared for most—their charter. He charged the entire population of the town to prevent the export of the Hull magazine, and demanded a declaration be published proclaiming it treason to oppose the King to the hazard of ‘Lives, Lands, Tenements, Goods, or any thing... knowing both the peril of the Law on the one side, and the security of such as shall adhere to Us on the other.’ Within a week, the corporation had drafted a letter to the High Sheriff and Yorkshire gentry attending the King, claiming to speak for the town’s inhabitants. The letter declared in their defence: ‘In Hull are embark’d two of the richest Jewells in the world. Gods Truth, and Christendomes Peace: each of which in valuation far exceed a Kings ransome.’ They then warned that if the King’s party attempted to seize Hull by force they would ‘kindle such a fire in England, as will never be quenched.’ Now a declared traitor, Sir John Hotham engaged in further preparations to defend Hull. On 16 May, he noted in his accounts the attractive wages he offered for artillerymen, generating enthusiasm for military employment among the townsman:

In this and some of the weeks following, you will find a most unjust, unheard of proportion of Canoniers, more I believe than was payed at Ostend. But I was forced to do it to give the towne Content, every Seaman almost tendering himself for a Canonier, and it was no time to argue it... I payed as you may see more than a good number of those that I allowed of.
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Petitioning at York, April to July 1642

Outside the locality of Hull, there were no signs of military preparations from parliamentary sympathisers. The King arrived at York on 18 March, and such preparations would have been inflammatory and foolhardy. In their belief that war could still be avoided, they placed their hope in traditional means of redress. Sir Richard Earl and a party of gentlemen petitioners arrived in York but it was reported that they were jeered at as 'Roundheads' and attacked by a mob of 60 men armed with clubs and bills. The day before the King appeared before Hull, a petition was framed by the 'Gentry and Commons of the County of York', begging his Majesty to allow the magazine to remain at Hull. Given the King's refusal of these petitions, and the vandalising of the house of the parliamentary sympathiser Alderman Vaux, the four parliamentary negotiators in York were taking increasing risks with their continued presence. These men were prominent members of Yorkshire society: Lord Ferdinando Fairfax, Sir Hugh and Sir Henry Cholmley, and Sir Philip Stapleton. Within four days of their arrival at York on 8 May, the King had condemned them for refusing to follow his order to leave the county. They disobeyed by claiming they were a committee ordered by Parliament. Considering that Parliament had declared the Militia Ordinance only the previous week which authorised the raising of an army without royal assent, and had commanded Sir John Hotham to raise the whole East Riding trained bands and gather the county's arms in Hull, these four men were living dangerously indeed. Yet it was a calculated risk. With such a small following in York, the King could ill afford to alienate the Yorkshire gentry by maltreating these well-connected local gentlemen. At this stage it was still doubted whether the King could raise any forces in Yorkshire at all, John
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Pym expressing these hopes in a letter to Sir John Hotham on 18 May. Fairfax and his colleagues reported how the King claimed they preached a 'doctrine of disobedience to the people', necessitating the raising of a royal guard. Shortly afterwards, they told Charles it would be dangerous to summon in trained band horsemen as his guard. He responded by threatening to 'clap them up' if they attempted to raise a party to hinder him.

Affronting the freeholders by excluding them, in early May the King summoned the county's nobility and gentry to York, making a speech to them on 12 May. Nevertheless, thousands of freeholders came to press their grievance at not being consulted:

considering ourselves, according to the Proportion of our Estates, equally interested in the Common Good of the Country did take boldness to come in person to York... conceiving ourselves abundantly injur'd in the Election... and in our Absence a Referee of Knights and Gentlemen chosen without our Knowledg [sic] or Consent, to draw up the said Answer.

Sir Thomas Gower of Stittenham observed that: 'The freeholders being not called with the gentry, have delivered a protestation that nothing done without their consents shall bind them.' He added that the King's neglect to summon them had caused over 1,000 gentry and freeholders to petition against forming a royal guard. Ainsty freeholders had petitioned for a voice in elections at York in 1641, and subsequent royalist attempts to exclude yeomen from Grand Juries were hardly likely to win over trust or deference from such

groups. Rather they were more likely to identify with the parliamentary sympathising Justices who were soon removed from the Commission of the Peace. Lord Fairfax realised that this distrust of the King’s party might strengthen allegiance to Parliament among these yeomen and freeholders, and protested personally against their exclusion.

Perhaps in response to this miscalculation, the King summoned the freeholders to him on Heworth Moor just outside York on 3 June. Reporting to Parliament, Lord Howard of Escrick estimated the turnout to be around 40,000, adding: ‘There were but few gentlemen at this Meeting, excepting those who put themselves upon the King’s Guard; this Summons being intended, by his Majesty, only for the Ministers, Freeholders, Copyholders and Farmers.’ Howard reported that the King commanded the parliamentary commissioners not to attend the meeting. They complied, but sent their associates, notably Sir Thomas Fairfax and Sir John Bourchier. Once more the Fairfaxes were keen to lend their endorsement to a petition representing sub-gentry groups. When Sir Thomas Fairfax tried to present this petition to the King, he came close to being trampled on by the King’s own horse. Sir John Bourchier complained that on his way to the meeting he had endured flaming objects being thrown into his coach, and that Lord Savile had violently interrupted his private reading of the petition and had later sent a Captain Playne to goad him. Among the petition’s many grievances were the claims that papists were flocking to the King at
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York, that the King’s guard was illegal, and that the county was exhausted having already suffered the billeting of armies upon it for three years. It included an ominous warning about the decaying cloth trade in the West Riding, while it flatly told the King to be guided by none but Parliament, bitterly condemning the court at York: ‘their Language and Behaviour speaking nothing but Division and Wars, and their Advantage consisting in that which is most destructive to others.’\textsuperscript{39} It is difficult to ascertain the real level of support for this petition on the moor; Sir Henry Slingsby recorded that he felt the situation was confused, some calling for the King, others for Parliament.\textsuperscript{40} The following day, Sir Matthew Boynton wrote to his close friend Sir William Constable that the reason why there were so few signatures to the petition was that many people unexpectedly went home rather than follow the gentlemen into the city.\textsuperscript{41} A parliamentary declaration from York three years later observed in retrospect: ‘It is no great wonder though the Common sort were deceived and came up in such flockes to Heworth-Moore to doe service to the golden Idoll.'\textsuperscript{42} It is probable that parliamentary sympathisers among the Yorkshire gentry had overestimated the commitment of their supporters at this early stage.

The King’s reaction to their petition was predictable. He announced that the petition Sir Thomas Fairfax presented appeared to be supported by none but himself, and that the amount and quality of the petitioners ‘was not in truth so great as is pretended’, and that it was ‘solicited by a few mean inconsiderable Persons, and disliked and visibly discountenanced by the great Body of the known Gentry, Clergy and inhabitants of this whole County.’\textsuperscript{43} Shortly afterwards, he ejected up to twenty justices from the Commission of the Peace for their parliamentary sympathies.\textsuperscript{44} A warning from York was published in
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London: 'the Justices that are Round-heads, they are expelled their Commissions; for the Militia, here it will not be obeyed, nor dare any speake in defence thereof... for truth is, we thinke delay which you practise, will bring Yorkshire to be quite against you.'

Some of the petitioners at Heworth were greatly affronted by the whole affair and wrote to Parliament relating how the earl of Lindsey with ‘a great Troop attending him in an imperious Way’ came among them, ‘violently interrupted them and refused them entry into the Castle Yard to deliver their petition.’

The King, angry at Parliament’s subsequent public condemnation of Savile and Lindsey as ‘incendiaries’ and ‘enemies of the State’, said that this ‘exposed them to the Rage and Fury of the People.’

It was fortunate for Charles that opposition outside Hull continued to lack a safe opportunity to manifest itself and further lacked the will or confidence to do anything more than frame petitions and complain to Parliament.

1:3 The first siege of Hull, July 1642

Further assistance was given to Sir John Hotham at Hull by the four sea captains whose ships were defending Hull that May. Parliament granted indemnity to Captains William Driver, George Swanly, Lawrence Moyer and John Pigot for their refusal of a royal order of 10 May requiring them not to remove any of the town’s magazine. The House of Commons was quick to urge Sir John Hotham to thank the ordinary mariners as well as the captains ‘of whose forwardness in this Service they are also informed.’

Many of the navy’s sailors by 1642 were in a deplorable condition; they had not been paid for seven years, some were even naked and starving. It is hardly surprising that they hoped Parliament would be a fairer employer than the King had been.

Sir Hugh Cholmley recollected that the seamen at Hull ‘who had great influence on this as on other maritime towns found it stand with their
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Plate 1: Wenceslaus Hollar's engraving of Kingston-upon-Hull before 1640.\textsuperscript{50}

The impressive defences of the town are well illustrated here, including the castle and blockhouses east of the River Hull.

\textsuperscript{50} Tickell, \textit{History of the Town and County of Kingston-upon-Hull}, pp.202-3.
interest and trade to stick to the Parliament. On 24 May, Parliament assented to Sir John Hotham’s request for a committee of M.P.s to be sent to Hull to aid his government of the town, sending Sir William Airmyn, Sir William Strickland, John Alured, Michael Wharton, Henry Darley, John Hotham and Peregrine Pelham. Now Sir John would feel less isolated, and with three further foot companies raised in June under Captains Legard, Alured and Scarfe soon totalling over 400 men between them, the size of the garrison was swelling rapidly.

The King appeared before Hull again on 7 July, this time with a small army. Again, Sir John Hotham was well prepared. The previous day three new companies totalling over 500 men under Captains Matthews, Purefoy and Carter had arrived by sea from London, along with the veteran Scots commander Sir John Meldrum. Parliament could supply Hull by sea from Boston and Lynn, and proclaimed the raising of 2,000 men for the town in London. Royalist attempts to construct forts at Paull and Hessle were already being battered by parliamentary warships. At the cost of alienating the farmers of Holderness
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by cutting the Humber banks, Sir John Hotham was able to flood the approaches to Hull, frustrating royalist hopes of storming the town. Furthermore, on 11 July the parliamentary admiral, the earl of Warwick, sent two powerful second rate warships, with a combined total of 86 guns, to Hull’s relief. The committee at Hull confidently reported to Parliament that the town was well supplied and their position strong: ‘We are here in a very good condition; the King’s forces that block us up from victuals are small and inconsiderable, not above 2,500 horse and foot; so that if any force had been sent down, we might before this time have scattered them all.’

Reluctance to go to war continued to exercise the strongest influence on allegiance as the King soon discovered to his cost. Sir Philip Stapleton had already petitioned the King warning him that the Yorkshire trained bands would only fight ‘faintly’ for him. After a successful night attack launched by the garrison against royalist quarters at Anlaby, the royalist trained bandsmen, fearful of being forced to serve outside the county, began to desert en masse. A letter allegedly written in York to a correspondent in London described how ‘since a few men came from London, Sir John hath sent the Kings Army a Message that caused most of the Leaguer to run away... The King hath beat up his Drums but none cometh here, he beats his Drums, but not a man.’ It was not just parliamentary propagandists who observed that the trained bands besieging Hull did not want to fight. The future royalist Sir Thomas Gower wrote to Sir Richard Leveson that ‘most of the trained bands began to examine why they should fight one another, and why they whom it least concerned should lie in the works, and the Cavaliers more interested lie at Beverley,
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and neither ease their watches or assist in danger.\textsuperscript{66}

The experience of being besieged stimulated anti-royalist sentiment in the townsfolk. Parliamentary claims that the King intended to have his agents in Hull fire it in four places as a diversion for an assault, bonded the inhabitants to Sir John Hotham through shared adversity.\textsuperscript{67} On 11 July, the King’s forces burned the mills outside Hull, intensifying the hitherto less than fervent parliamentary allegiance of many of the inhabitants.\textsuperscript{68} The preacher John Shaw noted: ‘this did wonderfully set the hearts of all, both rich and poor, against them (their food being endangered), whereas some of them before were not so fully affected to the parliament and that cause.’\textsuperscript{69} Hull’s parliamentary leadership could now arouse empathy by highlighting their own sufferings; the royalists plundered the houses of Christopher Legard and the Hothams at Anlaby and Scorborough.\textsuperscript{70} The siege began to increase parliamentarian support in Hull, as one report observed: ‘We pack out knaves daily, which makes the rest conforme; it is marvellous to one to see all men in our towne muster and fight, that was on the other side before.’\textsuperscript{71} The parliamentary activists grew confident that ‘the Countrey have no mind to fight against us, the peoples hearts of the Countrey do much incline to us, and divers would come safely; but if any come, they sease upon their
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means. With the garrison's soldiers growing to over 2,000 in number, plus up to 1,000 armed civilians, the town was no longer thinly defended. However enthusiastic the London press became about mass support among Hull's inhabitants, such activism only lasted as long as the immediate danger to the townsmen's homes and families. Yet Sir John Hotham could now become more despotic in government, imprisoning the royalist sympathising mayor and throwing his gown over his head. London newsbooks portrayed the town growing more vitriolic against the royalists: 'We and all the world do know the Cruelty and tyranny of that party that sideth with you whose religion is founded upon blood and holds it meritorious to destroy us (Hereticks as they falsely call us).'

1:4 Autumn campaigning, August to November 1642
With the successful defence of Hull, and the King's departure from Yorkshire, local parliamentary activists became more confident. On 12 August, the King announced he intended to raise his standard at Nottingham in ten days time. This left Yorkshire more open to Hotham's forces, who were already organising the raising of two troops of horse financed from London under John Hotham and John Alured. Soon after the King returned to York, Sir John Hotham's nephew, Colonel Francis Boynton swiftly recaptured Beverley, and the advance of the Hull forces caused anxiety in York. At midnight on 3 September the alarm was raised there, 300 horse assembling and the trained bands woken and alerted, only to find that the emergency was merely the result of two inebriated Scotsmen discharging their pistols in drunken merriment. The next day an agitated Sir Henry Griffiths brought the
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news that the Hothams had plundered his house and were marching on York. By 8 September the Hothams caused great alarm in York, when it was reported they were at Pocklington, and within ten miles of the city.79

The growing success enjoyed by the Hothams in the East Riding, and the royalists’ plundering of the homes of key parliamentary supporters such as Sir Henry Cholmley and George Marwood, spurred West Riding parliamentary sympathisers into action.80 They composed a list of nominees for Parliament’s approval to raise and officer men in the county,81 and met at Otley, the resident parish of Lord Fairfax.82 There they prepared an appeal to the people for publication in all the churches and markets of the county. Printed on 29 August, it condemned the King’s raising of forces, declared the garrison at Hull to be necessary and warned that they would ‘resist and suppress’ the bringers of violence to their county.83 On 7 September, they wrote to Sir John Hotham requesting he supply them with arms for 500 foot and 100 horse, together with 30 barrels of powder, warning: ‘though there bee neyther want of affection, nor resolution to serve our Country, yet there is soe great a desert of Armes that for the present ’tis doubtfull that our Endeavours may... prove fruitlesse.’84

Then came the news of the burning of the wealthy Sir Edward Rodes’s outhouses, the

79 B.L. TT E116(43), A Remonstrance of all the Proceedings Passages or Occurrences at Nottingham, Yorke and Newcastle, 3-10 September (London, 1642), pp.2-5.
80 B.L. TT E112(40), A Full Relation Of all the late proceedings of his Majesties Army in the County of Yorke, declaring His Majesties intention to advance his Standard at Nottingham, 13-19 August (London, 1642); Rushworth, Historical Collections, part iii, vol. i, p.787.
81 M.L. CWT, 42-08-19, A Full Relation of all the late proceedings of His Majesties Army in the County of Yorke: with the present state and conditions of things there (London, 1642).
82 On 17 June it was reported that Lord Fairfax had fallen from his horse at York, and breaking two ribs, he retired to Denton Hall to recover: Sutherland MS, H.M.C., 5th Report, Appendix (London, 1876), p.141.
83 M.L. CWT, 42-09-08, The Reall Protestation of Manie and Very eminent Persons in the County of Yorke declaring their resolution concerning the present distractions (London, 1642); Rushworth, Historical Collections, part iii, vol. i, pp.648-9.
84 University of Hull, Brynmor Jones Library Archive: Hotham MS, DDHO/1/9.
murder of his servant, mistreatment of his wife and the plundering of £600 from his house at Great Houghton.\footnote{B. L. TT E118(10), Speciall Passages, 13-20 September (London, 1642), p.41; J.T. Cliffe, Puritans in Conflict: The Puritan Gentry During and After the Civil Wars (London, 1988), p.35; C.W. Hatfield (ed), Historical Notices of Doncaster, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ser. (Doncaster, 1870), p.204; J. Wilkinson, Worthies, Families and Celebrities of Barnsley and the District (London, 1883), p.140.} Shaken with alarm at this incursion by cavaliers from outside the county, local people assembled on Rotherham Moor and built earthworks around the town.\footnote{Boyle (ed), Memoirs of Master John Shawe, p.27n.} At last, many West Riding parliamentary sympathisers now realised that none of them would be safe unless they armed and organised. They met at Leeds on 19 September and proclaimed Lord Ferdinando Fairfax their leader.\footnote{Lord Fairfax’s appointment was approved by Parliament on 27 September: B.L. TT E240(20), A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament, 26 September-3 October (London, 1642); Woolrych, ‘Yorkshire’s Treaty of Neutrality’, p.700; D.N.B., Ferdinando, 2nd Baron Fairfax.} Two days later, John Hotham quartered in Howden with 500 foot and the two new troops of horse.\footnote{B.L. TT E118(45), Speciall Passages, 20-27 September (London, 1642).} On 23 September, Hotham rode into Doncaster unopposed with his troop of horse and three companies of foot.\footnote{G.W. Johnson (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence: Memorials of the reign of Charles I (London, 1848), vol. ii, p.414.} Sir Edward Rodes was raising a force to join him from among the worried populace around Rotherham.\footnote{B.L. TT E119(24), Speciall Passages, 27 September-4 October (London, 1642).} It was not the Fairfaxes, but John Hotham ‘infesting the Countrey’,\footnote{M.L. CWT, 45-00-00, A Declaration by the Direction of the Committee at Yorke to Their deluded and oppressed Countrey-men (York, 1645), p.17.} that so worried the royalists at this time, as large areas from which parliamentary leaders could draw in manpower and money now at last became accessible.

While Sir John Hotham raised large sums of money from the estates of local gentlemen who had assisted the King in the siege,\footnote{Henry Hildyard of Hull had briefly served Charles I as a colonel of trained bands for eight days during the siege; Sir John Hotham seized £787 from his estate well before Parliament passed any sequestration ordinances: Green (ed), Calendar of the Committee for Compounding (Domestic), 1643-1660, p.1093.} his son was freely campaigning in adjoining districts of the West Riding. Leaving Doncaster on 29 September, he rode
through Hatfield to a rendezvous with further Hull forces under Sergeant-Major John Gifford with the objective of investing Selby.\textsuperscript{93} As he rode through Hatfield, he learned that Lord Fairfax and his allies around Leeds had abandoned him and made a separate treaty at Rothwell with the Yorkshire royalists, led by their General, the earl of Cumberland. The treaty stipulated that all forces in the county would disband, both the Commission of Array and the Militia Ordinance would cease, plunderers were to be brought to justice according to law, while military forces would be forbidden passage through the county, and no one was to be arrested for delinquency by either side.\textsuperscript{94} Despite Fairfax’s appointment as commander of the Yorkshire forces and his earlier requests for arms from the Hothams, without their knowledge he had made a peace which dictated terms to them. Understandably furious, John Hotham launched a combined political and military campaign to make the treaty unworkable.

He wrote to William Lenthall, Speaker of the House of Commons, complaining about the treaty and enclosed a copy of it.\textsuperscript{95} With 300 foot and a troop of horse left in Doncaster to watch the royalists at Pontefract, on 1 October with a troop of horse and nearly 900 foot Sir Edward Rodes, John Hotham and John Gifford captured Selby.\textsuperscript{96} On 4 October, they captured Cawood castle, completing their stranglehold on the river network upon which York depended for its trade, and situating themselves favourably for expected reinforcements from Lincolnshire.\textsuperscript{97} By a swift march from Doncaster on 13 October,

\textsuperscript{93} B.L. TT E119(24), Speciall Passages, 27 September- 4 October (London, 1642), pp.61-2.

\textsuperscript{94} The treaty procured the release of Sir John Savile who had been arrested by royalist forces three days earlier in the act of leading a band of his tenants to join Lord Fairfax at Leeds: Woolrych, ‘Yorkshire’s Treaty of Neutrality’, pp.696-704; B.L. TT E119(29), Fourteen Articles of Peace Propounded to the King and Parliament by the Gentry and Commons of the County of York, 4 October (London, 1642); B.L. R.P. 57, The Commonplace Book of Ralph Assheton of Kirkby Grange. My thanks to Dr. M.S.R. Jenner for kindly locating this last valuable source.

\textsuperscript{95} Portland MS, H.M.C. 29, 13\textsuperscript{th} Report, Appendix, Part I (London, 1891), vol. i, p.64.

\textsuperscript{96} B.L. TT E119(24), Speciall Passages, 27 September- 4 October (London, 1642), pp.61-2.

\textsuperscript{97} B.L. TT E240(36), A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament, 3-10 October (London, 1642), p.8; B.L. TT E121(21), A True Relation of the taking of a great Ship at Yarmouth, sent from the Queen out of Holland to the King. Also
Hotham forced Sir Thomas Glemham’s royalists to abandon Leeds, capturing all the money Glemham had intended to collect. Sir Edward Rodes was equally active, sending out Captain Lowinger to plunder Lord Savile of 16 fine horses to strengthen his troop at Doncaster. On 8 October, Hotham published a declaration against the treaty, arguing that gentlemen had been plundered by the cavaliers since the treaty was in force, and proclaiming that he would protect the people from the cavaliers, ‘for the effecting of which I doubt not of the assistance of all those that are sensible what it is to have neither Religion or Liberty, but at other men’s pleasures.’ He procured the agreement of a large group of influential parliamentary gentry.

Parliament’s continued eagerness to secure Lord Fairfax’s support was evident in their tempering of their condemnation of the treaty with a glowing respect for Fairfax. They could ill afford recriminations, and encouraged Fairfax and his followers to return to the fold. On 21 October, a royalist force from Leeds attacked Lord Fairfax’s recruiting headquarters at Bradford. The town was unfortified and thinly defended by four under

---

*Her Majesties Letter to the King, taken in the said ship. Likewise the manner of Master Hothams taking of Keywood Castle in Yorkshire, 4 October* (London, 1642).

For these victories Hotham won the praise of an enemy who commented that he was ‘a very vigilant Soulgier, made long marches, and often in the night; he would march 16 miles in the night to take a delinquent out of bed’: Parsons (ed), *The Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby*, pp.78-9.


These gentlemen included Sir Thomas Norcliffe, Sir Henry Foulis, Sir Thomas Remington, Sir Matthew Boynton, Sir John Bourchier, Francis Boynton, Francis Lascelles and Arthur Beckwith: B.L. TT E121(32), *The Declaration of Captaine Hotham sent to the Parliament, wherein he sheweth the reasons of his marching into the County of York, 6-11 October* (London, 1642), pp.3-4; B.L. TT E121(45), *A true and exact Relation of the several passages at the Siege of Manchester, 25 September- 4 October* (London, 1642), p.14.

One newsbook proclaimed that Parliament was sure that if Lord Fairfax had known the other party’s ‘dangerous and mischievous’ motivations for the treaty, he would never have consented to it: M.L. CWT, 42-10-05, *The Declaration and Votes of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament Concerning the late Treaty of Peace in Yorkshire* (London, 1642).
strength companies of foot under the captains Sir John Savile, Henry Atkinson, William Lister of Thornton and John Farrer of Ewood, with a half troop of horse under Sir Thomas Fairfax. The royalists had an opportunity to finish the Fairfaxe almost before they had raised a force, but not for the last time they reckoned without the activism of the forewarned people of Bradford: ‘their horse could not enter though they went neare the endes of the streetes, w[hi]ch were blocked upp w[i]th harrowes, waynes & the Ld Fayrfaxe & they within the towne w[i]th burning strawe & such stuffe caused that scarce any of their men could be seene for the smoake.’ The royalists were compelled to retreat to Leeds, where the next day they found John Hotham with three troops of horse and five companies of foot waiting for them at Hunslet. The next day, the 23 October, Fairfax’s men joined Hotham’s and the royalists abandoned Leeds. Ralph Assheton noted that the parliamentarians captured arms and raised from Leeds by borrowing or composition the sum of £2,000.

Rather than consolidating their hold on the clothing districts, the parliamentarians pursued the royalists and set up new quarters at Wetherby, Cawood and Tadcaster, blockading York from the west. Lord Fairfax expected to be speedily reinforced by 500 Lincolnshire dragoons, the horse troops of Sir Henry Foulis, Captains Alured and Mildmay, with the foot regiments of Sir Matthew Boynton and Sir Hugh Cholmley raised from among

102 Captain Henry Atkinson was most probably the Lieutenant Atkinson for whom Ferdinando Fairfax endeavoured to obtain a captaincy in his regiment of trained bands in 1639: Johnson (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, p.363.

103 In his memoirs, Sir Thomas Fairfax reckons his father’s force as 300 men; Lord Fairfax’s closest advisers Thomas Stockdale of Bilton Park, Thomas Lister of Westby and William White were also among them: M.L. CWT, 42-11-11, True Intelligence from Yorkshire (London, 1642); B.L. R.P. 57, The Commonplace Book of Ralph Assheton; T. Fairfax, ‘A Short Memorial of the Northern Actions during ye warre there, 1642 till 1644’, in F. Grose and T. Astle (eds), Antiquarian Repertory, 3 (1808), p.11.


105 The horse troops were John Hotham’s, and two troops that arrived the day before from Lincolnshire under Sir Christopher Wray and Thomas Hatcher. The foot were led by Sergeant-Major John Gifford, and the captains sent from London, Carter and Purefoy. Assheton believed the size of this force to be 600-800 men: ibid.; B.L. TT E126(1), Speciall Passages, 25 October- 1 November (London, 1642), p.102; W. Wheater, The History of Sherburn and Cawood (London, 1882), p.243.
the trained bands around Cleveland, Scarborough and Whitby. In theory, he could look forward to commanding some 3,000 men. Royalists in York were understandably worried, one writing on 11 November: ‘We are here in a manner blockt up by the Parliament’s forces, insomuch that not any provisions can be suffered to be brought into us.’ Parliamentary troops rode up to the very walls of York to jeer at the defenders. An extract from the city’s House Books reveals how seriously the corporation took the threat: ‘[Ordered that 4 Aldermen] goe to my Lord Generall to shew unto him that in respect what danger this Citie now standeth wheither it be fittinge to move a treaty with my Lord Fareffax and the rest.’

With the news that contrary to most expectations, the first battle between the two main armies at Edgehill had proved inconclusive, Lord Fairfax must have realised that the war was likely to continue through the winter. Uncomfortably aware that the earl of Newcastle was raising a large royalist army in Northumberland and Durham, Fairfax knew that to convince waverers he would have to take York swiftly. The time won by Fairfax as a result of the Yorkshire royalists’ procrastination in agreeing to all of Newcastle’s conditions for marching to their aid, was now fast running out.

The few North Riding parliamentarians met at Bedale in October to oppose the earl of Cumberland’s captains who had his commission ‘to force up the said traine Bands.’ They tried to organise the trained bands under Sir Edward Loftus and wrote to Sir John Hotham for a supply of arms and ammunition, but even after a public meeting in Richmond to raise


107 W. Page (ed), The Victoria History of the County of York (London, 1913), vol. iii, p.420; Parsons (ed), The Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby, p.82.


110 M.L. CWT, 45-00-00, A Declaration by the Direction of the Committee at Yorke to Their deluded and oppressed Countrey-men (York, 1645), p.17.
money, horse and plate they were in no position to oppose the royalists who lay across the River Tees to their north.\textsuperscript{111} The Cleveland trained bands’ arms had already been carried off during the Bishops’ Wars, leaving much of the populace feeling very vulnerable.\textsuperscript{112} To encourage them to raise further forces to prevent Newcastle’s southward march, on 9 November John Hotham, Thomas Hatcher and Sir Christopher Wray marched northwards out of Fairfax’s headquarters at Wetherby with their troops of horse and three companies of foot.\textsuperscript{113}

Hotham had received assurances from Richmondshire gentry that they would raise men, yet he was unimpressed by their forces he met at Northallerton and Yarm, and wrote to Lord Fairfax from Darlington on 23 November, complaining that ‘The Trayned Bands of Richmondshire gett up very slowly neither are they in Cleveland very considerable’, and that ‘if the hearts of the Bishopric forces had been equall to their number they might have proved too hard for us.’ However, Hotham did encourage Fairfax to continue blockading York, informing him that the retreat of the royalists from Piercebridge had given him ‘the opportunity to beate downe Pierce bridge w[hi]ch hitherto they have defended & begunne to make works and fortifie.’ With the main crossing of the River Tees in his hands and winter closing in, Lord Fairfax could feel relatively pleased in his domination of almost the entire county with so few soldiers, Hotham assuring him ‘for the wayes now grow so III as will be soone unpassable.’\textsuperscript{114} The day after Hotham wrote this letter, the earl of Essex commissioned Lord Fairfax, a man who had scarcely raised 1,000 men, the commander-in-

\textsuperscript{111} Sir Henry Anderson of Long Cowton received authority from Parliament in October to raise two troops of horse in Cleveland, while Lord Loftus was attempting to raise a troop of Richmondshire horse, and John Dodsworth of Watlas a company of dragoons: B.L. TT E240(20), \textit{A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament, 26 September- 3 October} (London, 1642), p.2; P.R.O., S.P. 19/120/128.


\textsuperscript{113} The royalist Sir Marmaduke Langdale felt Wray and Hatcher’s troops to be particularly effective, referring to their activities: ‘by whose only means our miseries were brought to this height.’ \textit{Portland MS}, H.M.C., 29, 13\textsuperscript{th} Report, Appendix, Part I, vol. i, pp.68-9.

\textsuperscript{114} Hotham MS, DDHO/1/13.
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chief of not just Yorkshire, but all the northern counties.\footnote{115}

It is from this point that the disaffection of the Hothams from the parliamentary cause can be traced. Sir John Hotham probably felt that Fairfax’s reputation had been damaged by his engagement in the failed treaty, and confidently expected the commission of general to be offered to him. However, perhaps key parliamentarians in London felt Hotham too abrasive and temperamental for the task of attempting to unify support in the north. He had already quarrelled with Henry Barnard, the Mayor of Hull, and Peregrine Pelham, M.P. for the town.\footnote{116} He had already mobilised much of his support in the East Riding, and with few connections in the West Riding, he was hardly the man to rally potential support there. Lord Fairfax was appointed general, in spite of doubts over his military ability,\footnote{117} because as the natural figurehead for the West Riding Godly, it was still believed he could raise an army there. It may also have been suspected, as we shall see in chapter three, that Fairfax’s ideals of honour were more suited to service, and less prone to personal aggrandisement than Sir John’s. Fairfax was certainly less likely than Hotham to take as a personal insult

\footnotetext[115]{The counties were York, Lincoln, Nottingham, Derby, Stafford, Chester, Lancaster, Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland, Durham and Newcastle. Lord Fairfax received the commission on 3 December: P.R.O., S.P. 28/3A/195; Lords’ Journals, vol. v. p.494; Saltmarshe, History and Chartulary of the Hothams of Scorton and South Dalton, p.130.}

\footnotetext[116]{In July 1642, Sir John Hotham arrested Barnard for unco-operation, and he later demanded that Parliament punish Pelham for affronts to his name. On 4 October, John Hampden had to write to Sir John to convince him that the criticisms of him in London were not being taken seriously, and to reassure him that his judgement and allegiance ‘shall never be called in question by mee upon slight grounds’: E. Gillet and K.A. MacMahon, A History of Hull (Oxford, 1980), p.170; Hotham MS, DDHO/1/8; B.L. TT E244(15), A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament, 12- 19 December (London, 1642).}

\footnotetext[117]{Lord Fairfax admitted his appointment was ‘above my Ambition or Merit’, and his father, the first baron Fairfax had uncharitably derided him to Toby Matthew, Archbishop of York, as a ‘mere coward at fighting’. The earl of Essex felt he had to refer Fairfax to a printed book to instruct him in regulating his forces, and probably personally preferred Sir John Hotham for the command, a veteran of the Battle of White Mountain outside Prague in 1620. On 31 January 1643, he took steps to ensure the continued independence of the Hothams’ forces from Fairfax’s command: Lords’ Journals, vol. v. p.494; D.H. Atkinson, Ralph Thoresby, the Topographer; His Town and Times (Leeds, 1885), vol. i, p.68; P.R.O., S.P. 28/3A/195-6; B.L. Add. MS, 18,979, f.131.}
Parliament's endless delays over paying his forces.\textsuperscript{118}

Sir Hugh Cholmley had been appointed by the earl of Essex in August 1642 to raise a foot regiment in the Whitby area and to hold Scarborough.\textsuperscript{119} Despite earlier recruitment made in the same area by his brother Sir Henry Cholmley for the earl of Essex's parliamentary field army, Sir Hugh had raised 400 men by the end of October.\textsuperscript{120} A degree of enthusiasm for him can be noted in the local elite; there were 27 votes in the Common Council of Scarborough's corporation in favour of raising him a company of dragoons in the town.\textsuperscript{121}

Marching 300 of his recruits with a troop of 40 horse out of Scarborough, he met 220 foot from Hull with the horse troops of Captains Alured and Mildmay. He then proceeded to blockade the eastern approaches to York from his new headquarters at Stamford Bridge, later recalling: 'I moved both my Lord Fairfax, and Sir John Hotham that we might quarter ourselves within the Suburbs of the City.' He then claims he received notice from John Hotham to reinforce him on the Tees, but upon joining Colonel Boynton's fledgling regiment at Thirsk, he received news of the rout of Hotham's force at Piercebridge.\textsuperscript{122}

\textbf{1:5 'Lightning before death', December 1642 to May 1643}

After Hotham's defeat at Piercebridge on 1 December, the collapse of the North Riding

\textsuperscript{118} Lord Fairfax wrote off over £4,000 of his own arrears of pay, foregoing his pay as Governor of Hull, and Colonel and Captain of horse and foot, only claiming his pay as General. This contrasts sharply with the hidden stores of money, plate and valuables worth up to £9,000, discovered in the houses of the Hothams after their arrest: P.R.O., S.P. 23/1/128; Wildridge (ed), \textit{The Hull Letters}, pp.152,162-3; Hotham MS, DDHO/1/77; Saltmarshe, \textit{The History and Chartulary of the Hothams of Scborborough}, p.144.

\textsuperscript{119} Reckitt, \textit{Charles the First and Hull}, p.64.

\textsuperscript{120} J. Binns, 'A Place of Great Importance': \textit{Scarborough in the Civil Wars, 1640-1660} (Preston, 1996), p.83.


\textsuperscript{122} Bouverie MS, H.M.C., 10\textsuperscript{th} Report, Appendix, Part VI (London, 1887), pp.90-1; M.L. CWT, 43-01-18, \textit{Newes from Yorke. Being a true Relation of the proceedings of Sir Hugh Cholmley since his comming to Scborborough: with the reasons why he did not march to Tadcaster, as was desired by the Lord Fairfax} (London, 1642); H. Cholmley, \textit{The Memoirs of Sir Hugh Cholmley, Knt., and Bart., Addressed to his Two Sons} (London, 1787), p.40.
parliamentarians was total. Nearly all those suspected of supporting them had their goods and estates seized. Of the 1,000 men that Lord Fairfax believed they had mustered, only 130 foot under Sir Matthew Boynton, and two troops of horse under Sir Henry Foulis and Captain Henry Anderson reached him. Sir Henry Foulis recounted that Sir Matthew Boynton's Cleveland foot regiment mustered 500 men at Yarm, but that they deserted in droves at the first approach of the enemy, their numbers soon dwindling to just 80 men.

A number of gentlemen were required to serve as under-officers or troopers, as Lord Fairfax pointed out that all their men had returned to their homes. Within four days the earl of Newcastle was in York with an army of 6,000 foot and 2,000 horse, which dwarfed anything Fairfax could muster. Even after calling in his forces from Wetherby, he could only muster 18 companies of foot and 7 troops of horse, scarcely 2,000 men. Abandoning the blockade of York, he could now only hope to impede Newcastle's southward march until spring, and to protect his own West Riding supply base by contesting the crossing of the River Wharfe from his headquarters at Tadcaster.

On 6 December, Newcastle attacked Tadcaster. The Fairfaxes held the town all day until nightfall, in an engagement that witnessed bloody street fighting with up to 40,000 shots fired. Foulis informed a friend in London, 'you cannot imagine how hot service it was.' That night, in dire need of food and ammunition, Lord Fairfax evacuated the town,

---


124 Eldest son of Sir Henry Anderson of Long Cowton.

125 M.L. CWT, 42-12-20, An Exact and True Relation of A Bloody Fight, Performed against the Earl of Newcastle and his Forces before Tadcaster and Selby in Yorkshire in his march towards London (London, 1642), p.3.

126 These gentry included Henry Wilkinson of Melsonby serving as a trooper, with Robert Barwick of Skelton and Arthur Scaife of Hartley castle serving as corporals: P.R.O., S.P. 28/129/6, f.9; P.R.O., E121/5/5, f.1; P.R.O., E121/1/7, f.59; R. Bell (ed), Fairfax Correspondence: Memorials of the Civil War (London, 1849), vol. i, pp.25-30.

127 Sir Henry Foulis clearly felt that Newcastle was marching south to join the King: M.L. CWT, 42-12-20, An Exact and True Relation of A Bloody Fight, Performed against the Earl of Newcastle and his Forces before Tadcaster and Selby in Yorkshire in his march towards London (London, 1642), p.5.
his forces slipping away to Cawood and Selby. \(^{128}\) The Fairfaxes had been fortunate: the earl of Newport's 1,500 horse and dragoons intended to cut off their retreat never arrived, \(^{129}\) while Newcastle could not easily pursue them because of the terrain's 'low and boggy Scituation, and foul and narrow Lanes and passages.' \(^{130}\)

Lord Fairfax could now direct his energies into recruiting from the East Riding, and fortifying his new headquarters at Selby with reasonable hope of support from a parliamentary garrison network running from nearby Cawood and Wressle castles through to Beverley and Hull. \(^{131}\) With the royalists at York and Pontefract both within twelve miles, cavalry raids were launched by both sides against outlying enemy quarters. On 13 December, Captain John Hotham and Sir Thomas Fairfax with five troops of horse successfully raided Sherburn, while a similar attack on the Fairfaxes’ outlying quarters at Brayton was repelled on 29 December. Despite being reinforced by Colonel Francis Boynton with 500 foot and 40 horse, the Fairfaxes were losing men to desertion as swiftly as they recruited new ones. \(^{132}\) It was no secret that Newcastle’s army outnumbered them by at least four to one, and Charles I was not alone in his expectations of Newcastle expressed on 15 December: 'The business of Yorkshire I account almost done.' \(^{133}\) Fairfax had received no money from Parliament to pay his soldiers, \(^{134}\) and he warned Parliament that

---

\(^{128}\) Ibid., pp.6-7.

\(^{129}\) Parsons (ed), *The Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby*, p.86.


\(^{134}\) Speaker Lenthall did not write to Lord Fairfax to inform him Parliament had voted him two payments of £10,000 until 23 December, and Fairfax was kept waiting until the following April for receipt of the second £10,000: Bell (ed), *The Fairfax
his army would disintegrate through desertion. Almost all Captain Crompton's dragoons deserted, and on 17 December, Sir Edward Ayscough requested the return of Wray and Hatcher's troops to Lincolnshire.135

Forced to free quarter an unpaid soldiery upon Selby's inhabitants, Fairfax was now also unable to protect his original supporters in the clothing districts, without whom his army would have long since collapsed. Lord Fairfax informed Parliament:

I have hitherto supported this army by the loans and contributions for the most part, of the parishes of Leeds, Halifax, and Bradford, and some other small clothing towns adjacent, being the only well-affected people of the country, who I much fear, may now suffer by this popish army of the North, merely for good affection to the religion and public liberty.136

Moved by his guilt at their abandonment, Lord Fairfax sent Sir Thomas Fairfax with two troops of horse and five companies of foot to attempt a breakthrough to them: 'But the enemy's forces were laid so strong in the way that he could not pass.'137

Yet on 18 December, the townspeople of Bradford demonstrated that they were prepared to fight the royalists without aid from parliamentary soldiers. In the pivotal event of early parliamentary allegiance in Yorkshire, and to the relish of the London press, they repelled a royalist attempt to take the town. Realising that the affronted pride of royalist commanders bettered by common townsmen could precipitate violent retaliation, Lord Fairfax sent out his son again, this time with three troops of horse and 120 dragoons.138 The response of the area to Sir Thomas Fairfax's arrival in Bradford was staggering; in scarcely three weeks, he recruited an army larger than that of his father. Writing to him on 9 January 1643, he reckoned on the support of 600 musketeers and 3,000 with other arms.

Correspondence, vol. i, pp.30-31.


137 His passage was blocked at Pontefract and Ferrybridge: ibid., p.28; Fairfax, 'A Short Memorial of the Northern Actions', p.13.

138 The horse troops were those of Sir Thomas Fairfax, Sir Henry Foulis and Captain Mildmay, while the dragoons were drawn from Sir Anthony Irby's Lincolnshire regiment: M.L. CWT, 43-01-05, A Second Letter from the Right Honourable the Lord Fairfax, of his late prosperous proceedings against the Earl of Newcastle and his Popish Army in Yorkshire (London, 1643).
Inhabitants of the clothing districts were enlisting faster than he could arm or organise them.\textsuperscript{139} Denied transport of their cloth to Hull by the royalists, many of them would starve that winter if they could not secure foodstuffs from the more fertile royalist-occupied Vale of York. Sir Thomas Fairfax’s new army offered an opportunity to break this stranglehold, and it captured Leeds on 23 January.\textsuperscript{140}

Despite the superior size of Newcastle’s army, parliamentarians were still able to control large areas of the county during January 1643. On 22 January, Rotherham’s inhabitants emulated Bradford’s, successfully resisting a royalist attempt to capture the town. Lord Fairfax sent his Sergeant-Major-General, John Gifford, with six companies of foot to their support at nearby Doncaster.\textsuperscript{141} In expectation of the Queen’s imminent arrival, the royalists withdrew from all their garrisons south of York except Pontefract. Sir Hugh Cholmley even garrisoned Malton for a time, and defeated a larger party of royalists at Guisborough on 16 January, tightening his grip on Cleveland.\textsuperscript{142} Meanwhile, Sir Thomas Fairfax consolidated his control of the West Riding, garrisoning Howley Hall and Leeds, while recruiting further across the clothing districts.\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{139} Bell (ed), \textit{The Fairfax Correspondence}, vol. i, pp.33-4.

\textsuperscript{140} M.L. CWT, 43-01-24, \textit{The Rider of the White Horse and his Army: A True Relation of the passages at Leeds, on Munday the 23 of January, 1642} (London, 1643); Rushworth, \textit{Historical Collections}, part iii, vol. ii, pp.125-7; W. Scott (ed), \textit{The Original Memoirs Written During the Great Civil War being the Life of Sir Henry Slingsby and memoirs of Captain Hodgson with notes} (Edinburgh, 1806), p.97.


On 2 February, Lord Fairfax at last sent a declaration to all the village constables of the West, North and East Ridings requiring them to raise men and lead them to his planned musters at Aberford, Tollerton and Stamford Bridge. However, Lord Fairfax’s main force at Selby was still unable to challenge Newcastle’s army. Despite extending control over a growing area, the army remained unpaid and short of arms and ammunition, the very eventuality that Selby’s close river links to Hull should have prevented. Fairfax found himself obliged to attempt the seizing of enemy supplies, and recaptured Tadcaster in early February; but a detachment of Cholmley’s forces was crushed while intercepting a large royalist convoy at Yarm on 8 February, prompting him to withdraw his outlying garrison at Malton to Scarborough. By March, the county’s southern borders were also under threat, after the rout of the parliamentary besiegers of Newark. The Queen’s landing at Bridlington on 22 February occasioned the advance of much of Newcastle’s army into the East Riding to guarantee her safe passage to York with all the money, arms, ammunition and commanders she had brought. Not arriving in York until 7 March, her lengthy stay in the East Riding produced much discomfort for local parliamentarians, and indeed contributed to Sir Hugh Cholmley’s change of allegiance.

Far too late to hinder the Queen, Parliament ordered Lord Fairfax to send at least 1,000 men, half of his entire force, into the East Riding to aid the Hothams, thereby removing the only obstacle to Newcastle’s army marching south. However without support from Hull, his position in Selby was becoming untenable; he informed Parliament on 22 March that the Lincolnshire dragoons had deserted, and that if he was not immediately supplied with money, all his remaining soldiers would desert. Considering the comparatively frequent pay of Hotham’s garrison forces, Parliament’s subsequent vote
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149 B.L. Add. MS, 31,116, f.35.
of £1,000 for Fairfax’s army was insulting. In a decision in which dissatisfaction with Sir John Hotham played no small part, Lord Fairfax reluctantly abandoned his headquarters at Selby which he had spent three months fortifying. In a desperate retreat to reach more wholehearted support in the clothing districts, he exposed the eastern half of the West Riding to Newcastle, surrendering an open road to London. He marched his 1,500 men to Leeds on 30 March, but Sir Thomas Fairfax’s rearguard was cut to pieces on Seacroft Moor, with almost all its foot captured by Sir George Goring and his 20 troops of horse. Within a week, Captain Hotham evacuated his garrison from Cawood, leaving the Ainsty of York completely in royalist hands.

With Sir Hugh Cholmley’s change of allegiance on 26 March, parliamentary control of the northern parts of the East Riding also collapsed. The Hothams now held only Beverley and Hull, and Captain Hotham, campaigning unsuccessfully in Lincolnshire, was defeated at Ancaster Heath on 11 April. With the Queen safely in York, Newcastle could now move with a field army of over 10,000 men to finish the Fairfaxes. At their approach, Sir William Fairfax withdrew from blockading Pontefract to join Lord Fairfax in Leeds. To face the royalist onslaught, Lord Fairfax quartered six troops of horse and 800 foot in Leeds, with Sir Thomas Fairfax and three troops of horse and 800 foot in Bradford.

By 9 April, Newcastle’s forces were besieging Leeds, and with much skirmishing
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150 John Brearcliffe of Halifax noted that 688 men were captured at Seacroft: W.Y.R.O., Calderdale: Brearcliffe MS, MISC:182.


155 B.L. Add. MS, 31,116, f.46; Fairfax, ‘A Short Memorial of the Northern Actions’, p.16.

156 Green (ed), Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria, p.184.
in the suburbs, the town held out against these heavy odds for two weeks.\textsuperscript{157} Possibly remembering Fairfax’s stubborn defence of Tadcaster, Newcastle shrank from launching a full assault being further warned by James King, his Lieutenant-General, of the great slaughter it would entail. He decided to swing his army southward, capturing the parliamentary towns of Rotherham and Sheffield in swift succession on 4 and 9 May respectively.\textsuperscript{158} At last allowed some freedom of manoeuver, Fairfax’s army produced their most impressive victory of the war. Sir Thomas Fairfax took Wakefield by storm on 21 May with a force that was outnumbered three to one by the garrison it defeated.\textsuperscript{159} The victory provided them with 3,000 arms and over 1,500 prisoners to exchange for their comrades taken at Seacroft, and saved West Riding parliamentarians from despair.\textsuperscript{160} Unfortunately for them, it also inspired Parliament and the London press into placing unrealistically high expectations on the Fairfaxes. The royalist newsbook, \textit{Mercurius Aulicus}, correctly predicted this was a ‘lightning before death’ for the Fairfaxes’ army.\textsuperscript{161} Lord Fairfax warned Parliament: ‘This Overthrow hath much enraged the Enemy, who threaten a present Revenge, and are drawing all their forces this way to effect it.’\textsuperscript{162} Despite the victory at Wakefield, Fairfax still complained to Parliament of a shortage of powder and

\textsuperscript{157} B.L. TT E247(27), \textit{A Continuation of Certaine Speciall and Remarkable Passages, 13-20 April} (London, 1643); B.L. TT E247(30), \textit{A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament, 17-24 April} (London, 1643); B.L. TT E97(9), \textit{The Kingdom's Weekly Intelligencer, 11-18 April} (London, 1643), pp.124-8.

\textsuperscript{158} Shaw, ‘A Life of Master John Shaw’, p.136; C.H. Firth (ed), \textit{The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle to which is added the true relation of my birth and life by Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle} (London, 1906), preface, p.x.


\textsuperscript{160} The prisoners included 38 officers and Lieutenant-General Sir George Goring.

\textsuperscript{161} Thomas (ed), \textit{The English Revolution III, Newsbooks I, Oxford Royalist}, vol. i, p.289.

\textsuperscript{162} \textit{The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England}, vol. xii, p.272.
ammunition, warning them that 'if such succours come not timely to us, we cannot long subsist, but must be forced to accept of dishonourable conditions.' Even Mercurius Aulicus agreed with Lord Fairfax, declaring on 5 June, that his army was 'reduced to such extremities, that without seasonable helpe the whole game is lost.'

1:6 Disaster and recovery, June to October 1643

Newcastle began by capturing Howley Hall on 22 June. Howley had been the parliamentarians' rendezvous prior to their victory at Wakefield, and its governor, Sir John Savile, was now fortunate to be spared execution. Writing to his father in April 1643, Sir George Goring correctly predicted the way to defeat the Fairfaxes was to march into the clothing districts and force them to battle: 'wherefore if you can get between Bradford and Leeds, you will so annoy, divert and separate them in all their Designs.' By placing his army between Leeds and Bradford, Newcastle forced the Fairfaxes to battle by punishing the very areas most active in supporting them. In a failed surprise attack on Adwalton Moor, the Fairfaxes deployed 10 troops of horse, 2,500 foot from Leeds, Bradford, Halifax and the surrounding cloth districts, and an unknown number of local clubmen. They were supported by a further 3 troops of horse and 12 companies of foot recently arrived from Lancashire, which had been almost entirely free from royalist forces since the defeat of the
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163 By the time of the battle of Adwalton Moor, Lord Fairfax claimed he had received no powder from Hull in nineteen weeks, which was a likely factor in his defeat: J. Raymond (ed), Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England, 1641-60 (Moreton-in-Marsh, 1993), p.130.


166 G. Fox, The Three Sieges of Pontefract Castle, printed from the manuscript compiled and illustrated by George Fox (Leeds, 1987), p.6.


The immediate consequence of Fairfax’s defeat and the flight of his commanders to Hull, was a royalist military occupation of the clothing districts. Many local people, mindful of their parliamentarian reputation, or just plain fearful, fled into Lancashire. Thomas Stockdale remarked that: ‘Our loss of prisoners taken by the enemy was great, but the number is not equal to the fear and distraction it hath gotten in the country.’ By October, resentment of royalist excesses in Calderdale erupted into another anti-royalist insurrection. However in the summer of 1643, the people of the West Riding were not alone in believing Parliament were losing the war.

Within the next few weeks, Newcastle’s army advanced southward into the North Midlands. Sir William Waller’s parliamentarian army was decisively beaten at Roundway Down, the royalists captured Bristol, and in besieging Gloucester, the King looked close to controlling all western England and marching on London. Parliament became fearful of treachery as allegiances wavered. Parliament’s major-general in the west, James Chudleigh, deserted to the royalists, swiftly followed by his father. In June, a plot involving the M.P. Edmund Waller to seize the parliamentary leaders Wharton, Saye, Strode, Pym, Stapleton and the Lord Mayor was discovered in the heart of London itself. A plot was discovered


to surrender Plymouth, while the Hothams were arrested for conspiracy to surrender Beverley and Hull.

Given the bleak outlook for the parliamentary cause, Fairfax’s success in raising a new army in the East Riding was astonishing, as we shall see in the next chapter. Soldiers formerly under the Hothams were reorganised and reinforced. By August, Sir Thomas Fairfax threatened Stamford Bridge and raided within eight miles of York, instilling the Yorkshire elements of Newcastle’s command to force his return to besiege Hull. Lord Fairfax opened the sluices to flood the approaching besiegers, and was able to despatch his son’s cavalry across the Humber to Lincolnshire. With naval support and reinforcements from London, Hull withstood the siege. A successful sally on 11 October, coupled with the defeat of Newcastle’s Lincolnshire forces at Winceby, finally persuaded him that the siege was hopeless.

1:7 Epilogue

In January 1644, Newcastle was obliged to march most of his army northward to engage the Scots, who had invaded in support of Parliament. In his absence, the Fairfaxes could more freely campaign across Yorkshire. In command of detachments from Hull, Sir William Constable campaigned successfully in the East Riding. On 13 February, Newcastle informed the King that, ‘Sir Thomas Fairfax’s success in Cheshire hath made him capable of drawing from Lancashire a very great force into the West Riding of Yorkshire which he is ready to do.’ They soon recaptured Bradford and Leeds, Newcastle adding on 16 February: ‘Sir Thomas Fairfax very strong for the West Riding of Yorkshire, as they say,
and his father Master of the East Riding.  

Reunited, the Fairfaxes stormed Selby on 11 April, Sir Thomas informing a friend: ‘The blow has made us Masters of the Field in Yorkshire, God grant we may maintain it; and then nothing can hinder us to Tees-side.’

This victory forced Newcastle’s army’s hasty return to save York, and Lord Fairfax wrote to the Committee of Both Kingdoms, ‘I shall now, I hope be able to raise more forces in the country, and improve this Victory that God hath bestowed on us, to the best advantage.’

The ensuing siege of York and battle of Marston Moor witnessed five armies operating in Yorkshire, with perhaps as many as a total of 50,000 soldiers in the field armies alone. Parliament’s war effort in Yorkshire increasingly suffered from growing frustration and war weariness. The victory of Marston Moor did not finish Yorkshire royalism, and the burden of war upon the county’s population actually increased. Despite being vulnerable to plundering raids from royalist garrisons, Yorkshire inhabitants now had to support a Scottish army as well as an unpaid English one. On 23 August and 20 September 1644, Lord Fairfax warned the Committee of Both Kingdoms that his soldiers’ need of clothes and pay rendered them unserviceable, some of them disbanding themselves: ‘In a very few days they will moulder to nothing.’ Furthermore, attacks from midland-based royalist forces such as Sir Marmaduke Langdale’s ‘Northern Horse’, could still seriously defeat his army. There was further anxiety among parliamentary committeemen at York when soldiers’ pay mutinies coincided with Charles I’s arrival at Doncaster in August 1645. However, the
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royalists' castles eventually fell: Pontefract on 21 July, Scarborough on 25 July, Sandal on 1 October, Bolton on 5 November. With the defeat of the 'Northern Horse' at Sherburn-in-Elmet on 15 October, and the surrender of Skipton castle on 21 December, the First Civil War in Yorkshire finally ended.

---


CHAPTER TWO
THE MOBILISATION OF SUPPORT

Few of those involved in the crisis of 1642 would have realised that four years of civil warfare, and a longer period of political uncertainty, lay in front of them. But they were soon drawn into the business of recruiting, arming, and maintaining soldiers, and much of this chapter will be concerned with these matters. For the Yorkshire parliamentarians, the problem was not just the mobilisation of manpower: it was also the mobilisation of opinion, and the development of propaganda went hand in hand with the raising of Parliament’s army.

After the King found the Yorkshire trained bands reluctant and ineffective in his failed siege of Hull, news of his attempts to disarm them met with anxiety and distrust from a population concerned about self-defence in reaction to the Irish rebellion. There were complaints in Cleveland that local trained bands had been disarmed during the Second Bishops’ War, leaving the region dangerously vulnerable to local papists. Having disarmed the trained bands, the King’s response was to issue Commissions of Array to muster volunteers. These were committees of men drawn up in a similar fashion to the commissions of the peace, and were often manned by the same individuals. It was an old fashioned practice and one of dubious legality, but it at least allowed the King to raise soldiers who would serve outside their county, unlike the trained bands. Parliament’s initial method of raising forces was through the Militia Ordinance which employed the more conventional method of raising the trained bands through the Lord Lieutenants. After the King moved south to raise his standard at Nottingham on 22 August, local parliamentarians were more able to implement the Militia Ordinance, John Hotham being the first to formally do so when he published his declaration at Snaith on 22 September 1642.
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4 *Commons’ Journals*, vol. ii, p.785.
But Lord Fairfax soon found that he could not raise a strong army through the Militia Ordinance from among the trained bands and his tenants. Therefore, on 2 February 1643, he decided to make a public appeal to the entire county for support, sending a declaration to muster to all mayors, bailiffs, aldermen, magistrates and ministers, to be published and proclaimed in all the county’s churches and markets:

that all men of able bodies and well affected to the protestant religion are required with the best weapons and furniture for the warr that they have to assemble, come in and assist mee and the army under my Command in expelling and driving away out of this County of the Earle of Newcastle his Army of Papists and common enemies of the peace each man bringing with him necessarie victualls for four dayes onely.5

Parish constables were ordered to lead their men, many of whom one suspects were not volunteers, into the musters at Sherburn and Aberford for the West Riding, Tollerton and Aine for the North Riding, and Stamford Bridge for the East Riding. Rather than enlist themselves, many gentlemen, trained bandsmen and yeomen maintained and equipped a relative, neighbour or tenant in their place.6 Indeed, those failing to do so risked imprisonment.7

2:1 Reputation and personal influence

Uneasy with the idea of rebellion against their rightful monarch, parliamentarians placed great importance on legitimising their action by attracting men of status and reputation to recruit their forces in the localities. Although Lord Fairfax lacked the status of the royalist earls of Newcastle, Cumberland and Newport, he already had a sizeable following of gentry and middling sort from among his neighbours, while his Godly reputation and identification with the interests of the clothing districts attracted support into Leeds from 19 September. Resident at York in September 1642, Philip Ford reported of Fairfax that ‘the commonalty of the Town’ of Leeds were ‘wholly at his command.’8 Local gentlemen mustered small parties and led them into Leeds. One such group was headed by Sir John Savile of Lupset, who gathered twenty of his neighbours on 26 September, aiming to ride to Leeds to join

---

6 P.R.O., S.P. 23/223/284.
7 P.R.O., S.P. 19/118/52.
8 Y.A.S. MS, 1033, K.P., vol. 75, art. 27, Certaine Intelligence from Yorke, Concerning the Meeting of that Country, both for the Militia and Commission of Array (London, 1642).
Fairfax. Such early support was mobilised by written notes, word of mouth, and old ties of kinship and friendship, for unlike the royalists in York, Lord Fairfax lacked access to a local printing press at this early stage.

In contrast, Sir John Hotham had no need to identify with the interests of sub-gentry groups or Godly reformers to muster a following. He had one of the oldest lineages and largest fortunes in the entire county. His vast kinship network ensured that he was related to many of the region’s leading families, including the Andersons, Anlabies, Boyntons, Cholmleys, Legards, Norcliffes, Rodes’s, Thompsons, Whartons and Wrays. Many of these gentry recruited their own companies, but his testimony at his trial overlooked their efforts: ‘those that expected pay from me were 6 troopes of horse and dragoons, and 2,500 foot all which out of my single endeavours and assertion I had raysed in the countrey.’

During the First Bishops’ War in 1639, Sir Hugh Cholmley had raised four companies of his trained band regiment from Whitby Strand, Pickering Lythe, Ryedale and Scarborough. In August 1642, these were raised again by his brother Sir Henry and marched south as a field regiment for the earl of Essex’s parliamentary army. It is a measure of Sir Hugh’s local influence that despite this and earlier royalist recruitment in the area, he was still able to muster 400 militia at Scarborough by the end of October 1642.

Owing to the immense cost of equipping and paying soldiers, it was highly desirable for officers raising men to have the financial capital to at least establish their companies. Cavalry were especially expensive, and those minor West Riding gentry like George Gill who tried to raise troops of horse for Lord Fairfax would have to obtain crippling loans in an enterprise that was not for the faint-hearted.

Unsure whether to risk taking sides, sub-gentry groups were held to have looked to
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their social betters to see how far they were prepared to commit their lives and fortunes in an uncertain struggle. The Lincolnshire squire, Thomas Harrington of Boothby, was charged with delinquency for going to assist the royalists in December 1642, the sequestrators pointing out how grave a matter it was, 'he being an antient Justice of peace, and much in the eye of the Countye where he dwelt did by his ill example drawe many after him, and alieu the Affecccons of very many others in the said Countye from the Parliam[en]te.'

In 1642, the Yorkshire trained bands were particular about being led by Yorkshire gentlemen. One tract recorded with relish how the King tried to appoint an Irishman as one of their captains: 'they asked whether he were a Yorkshire man, and he saying no; they asked him what he had to do to command them, so beat him and sent him back again.' Although this was telling London what it wanted to hear, the strength of localist feeling makes the story feasible. The Fairfaxes appreciated the value of posing as defenders of the county from 'foreign' invasion, a device they justifiably employed after the earl of Newcastle's army invaded Yorkshire in December 1642.

Tom Cogswell has recently argued that England experienced something of a 'media revolution' in 1641-2, and the torrent of new printed material must have had some influence in the formation of allegiance, even if only to strengthen pre-existing preferences. John Hodgson of Coley recalled how in 1642 'papers flew up and down in every place', while Ralph Assheton of Kirkby Grange collected and transcribed such material for his book of current affairs.
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20 B.L. R.P. 57, Commonplace Book of Ralph Assheton.
To the Godly, the religious reputation of the leader appealing for support was of paramount importance, while rumours we would consider fantastical, evidently had some impact. Parliamentary troops in Wallingford in 1643 had heard rumours that the earl of Essex was John the Baptist, and therefore the harbinger of Christ’s Second Coming.\footnote{I.G. Philip (ed), \textit{The Journal of Sir Samuel Luke, vol. 1} (Oxfordshire Record Society, 29, 1947), p.76; C. Hill, \textit{The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution} (London, 1994), p.304.} When the preacher John Shaw hailed Lord Fairfax as ‘our Joshua of the North’ before the army at Selby in February 1643, it may be possible some listeners accepted this as literally true.\footnote{J. Shaw ‘The Life of Master John Shaw’, in C. Jackson (ed), \textit{Yorkshire Diaries and Autobiographies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries} (Surtees Society, 65, 1877), appendix, p.367.} The rhetoric of godliness was easily turned to the purposes of parliamentary propaganda.

\section*{2.2 Preaching of the Godly}

Conrad Russell has pointed out that twenty out of twenty-two towns where the parliamentarians first recruited were established centres of Godly preaching, some even with traditions of pre-Reformation heresy.\footnote{C. Russell, \textit{Causes of the English Civil War} (Oxford, 1990), p.22.} Bradford, Halifax and Hull shared these attributes and were all vital parliamentary recruiting grounds in 1642.\footnote{A.G. Dickens argued that Lollardy was strong in West Riding moorland, cloth manufacturing areas: A.G. Dickens, \textit{Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York, 1509-1558} (Oxford, 1959), pp.221,247; C. Hill, ‘From Lollards to Levellers’, in M. Comforth (ed), \textit{Rebels and their Causes} (London, 1978), p.54.} The vast size of many upland West Riding parishes had facilitated the introduction of Presbyterian practices in isolated chapelries.\footnote{Local curates were elected by the inhabitants and depended upon voluntary contributions for their living: J. Addy, ‘The Uncontrollable and Ungovernable Parish of Halifax in the Seventeenth Century’, \textit{Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society, new ser.}, 1 (1993), p.37.} In parishes such as Halifax and Leeds, there had been a succession of Godly preaching ministers for up to fifty years prior to the outbreak of war, while eighty Yorkshire benefices were under the control of Godly lay patrons.\footnote{J.T. Cliffe, \textit{The Yorkshire Gentry form the Reformation to the Civil War} (London, 1969), pp.264,268.} Likewise, the upper Calder valley,
stretching from Halifax into the eastern edge of Lancashire, produced a high yield of Godly clergy and parliamentarian recruits. Most curates of these remote chapelries were identified as defaulters during Archbishop Neile’s visitations of 1633 and 1635, and R.A. Marchant has noted the increasing ‘abandonment of the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer at all or most of these chapels, and in Birstall Church itself.’

Nonconformist preachers undermining respect for Charles I’s regime were key influences in communities likely to field mass recruits for Parliament. The preachers at Otley, the parish church of Lord Fairfax himself, openly criticised the King and let the perceived threat from Ireland dominate their sermons. W.J. Sheils has argued that they ‘prepared their congregation for armed resistance without publicly espousing that course, and the evidence of the exercise suggests that they understood precisely what they were doing.’ Without explicit exhortations to resist, it could be claimed the common people failed to understand the biblical images in the sermons, thus hardly affecting their later choice of allegiance. However this argument collapses when the simplicity of the language is examined. In his sermon at Otley of 27 April 1642, John Cooper left no doubt over whom he considered as responsible for the crisis: ‘God now shakes his sword; let us meet him in the way of judgement, with tears and repentance, our enemies plot to undermine all proceedings of Parliament, pray that he will be our safeguard and give them success.’

Beginning the very day Charles I arrived in York, an entire volume of these sermon notes survives which Sheils asserts was ‘almost certainly produced for a member of the Fairfax household... with a very specific purpose in mind.’ When it came to raising troops, the earl of Newcastle emphasized the absence of law or Scripture on the parliamentary side,
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declaring the rebels were ‘merely led by the persuasions of the Lord Fairfax and their seditious Preachers.’ ³²

Sheils has established that ‘the crisis of the summer of 1642 came to dominate the pulpits of the West Riding to the exclusion of almost everything else.’³³ On 13 July, the vicar of Batley, Roger Awdsley, preached a sermon at Calverley in favour of raising troops against the King, but his audience was a private one of fellow clergymen and leading lay sympathisers.³⁴ It has been alleged that nonconformist activity in the Morley chapelry of Batley parish was so extreme that the chapel was ordered to be closed in 1638.³⁵ In addition to a probable high yield of rank and file recruits, Batley was shortly to provide Lord Fairfax with a major and three captains from among its parochial gentry and yeomanry.³⁶

Some of the preachers were actually involved in the fighting. David Ellison was a master at Otley’s grammar school, the leading governor of which was Lord Fairfax himself.³⁷ Preaching at Otley and Bradford in 1642, he was probably in Bradford at the time of the club-law.³⁸ John Hodgson inferred that Andrew Latham, curate of Coley chapel, urged the congregation there to rise up and fight the royalists attacking Bradford.³⁹ Oliver Heywood recalled Latham to be ‘a plain and powerful preacher.’⁴⁰ Latham was sufficiently

³² M.L. CWT, 43-06-08, The Answer of His Excellency the Earle of Newcastle To a late Declaration of the Lord Fairfax: Dated the 8. of June, 1643 (York, 1643), p.24.
³⁴ Ibid., p.310.
³⁶ See Appendix II, pp.XXIII.
³⁷ F. Cobleys and L. Padgett, Chronicles of the Free Grammar School of Prince Henry at Otley (Otley, 1923), p.77.
worried about his reputation for encouraging Bradford’s activism to flee into Lancashire when Sir Francis Mackworth’s royalists arrived in Halifax.\(^{41}\) At the capture of Leeds on 23 January 1643, Jonathan Scholefield, curate of Croston chapel in Halifax parish, led one of the storming divisions, singing Psalm 68 with bible in hand.\(^{42}\) One newsbook claimed he was third through the breach, and that after taking command of twelve musketeers, he captured a demi-culverin.\(^{43}\) Thomas Crompton, chaplain to Sir William Fairfax’s regiment, was also present, and wrote an account of the fight.\(^{44}\) Thomas Smallwood, curate of Scammonden, was a preacher to Sir Thomas Fairfax’s regiment from 30 January 1643.\(^{45}\) The role of Godly ministers in exhorting and even leading men into the parliamentary forces was serious enough to attract the attention of the earl of Newcastle himself, who declared ten days after Fairfax captured Leeds: ‘Or if any of your Ministers have assumed a Plurality of Professions, and added the Sword to the Word, if my Officers should meet with him in such a Garb, might they not inquire an haec tunica Filii tui sit, and take him in his second Capacity.’\(^{46}\) Invoking a foreign Protestant tradition, one parliamentary tract countered: ‘think of Zwinglius, Charmier,\(^{47}\) and other such worthy divines, who were as famous for their Armes as arguments.’\(^{48}\) Newcastle was well aware of the violent nature of some of

\(^{41}\) T.W. Hanson, ‘Halifax Parish Church, 1640-1660, part i’, Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society (1915), p.51.

\(^{42}\) The psalm begins: ‘Let God arise and then his enemies shall be scattered, and those that hate him flee before him’: M.L. CWT, 43-01-24, A true Relation of the passages at Leeds, on Munday the 23. of January, 1642 (London, 1643), p.6.

\(^{43}\) Ibid.

\(^{44}\) A. Lawrence, Parliamentary Army Chaplains, 1642-1651 (Royal Historical Society Studies in History, 59, 1990), p.118

\(^{45}\) Ibid., p.174.


\(^{47}\) Ulrich Zwingli was killed in battle while serving the Zurich forces as a chaplain during the Second War of Kappel in 1531. Daniel Chamier was a leading Huguenot and Professor of Theology at the University of Montauban, in which town he was killed by a cannon ball during Louis XIII’s siege in 1621: D.C.A. Agnew, Protestant Exiles from France in the Reign of Louis XIV (Privately printed, 1866), p.338.

these preachers, arguing that they did ‘prostitute the Ordinance of God to the rebellious
designs of ambitious men.’ Lord Fairfax claimed that Newcastle banished the ministers of New Church Leeds, Holbeck, Hunslet, Ardsley and Ayworth. Although most probably fled of their own accord before the royalist advance, Fairfax could argue this amounted to the same.

Unpopular Arminian ministers, such as Francis Corker of Bradford and Richard Marsh of Halifax, may well have equally stimulated parliamentary recruitment. In 1633, High Commission acted against Bradford’s frequent Godly ‘exercises and conferences’, and in 1640 Archbishop Neile had enforced the appointment of Edward Hudson as vicar, a man they viewed as ‘prophane’ and unfit for the ministry. The subsequent appointment of Corker, unpopular for his royalism and alleged Roman Catholicism, did not appease the situation. Edward Hudson had employed an under-minister, possibly Corker, who had already caused trouble there by making the sign of the cross at baptisms. The churchwardens kept him from preaching, probably to avert a violent incident. Eventually Corker fled to the safety of royal garrisons, Sir Thomas Fairfax himself plundering and sequestering his estate.

Ralph Assheton recalled how when an order was issued in September 1642, commanding all the trained bands to appear at Leeds before Sir John Savile and Lord
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Fairfax, ‘Manie about Bradford went thither.’ One of Andrew Latham’s congregation who later joined Captain Nathaniel Bower’s company raised at Bradford, recalled: ‘Old Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax, comes to Bradford to strengthen his party, and gave an invitation for the country to come in; at which time many appeared, both horse and foot, and staid in the army.’ In January 1643, Lord Fairfax reported that the people from the country around Bradford ‘doe come in in a wonderous free manner’ to assist his son, while Bradford was again used as a rallying point for parliamentary supporters in March 1645.

Richard Marsh had succeeded to a vicarage which had maintained a long precedence of Godly preaching ministers, and in which his Arminian and royalist principles were unlikely to find a friendly reception. Famous for its staunch Protestantism, Halifax had attracted the unwelcome attentions of Archbishop Neile in the 1630s, and has been described by Ronald Marchant as ‘a notorious black spot for disobedience to the Church courts.’ Marsh was in a position to meddle with lay affairs as a justice of the peace, but like Corker, he too fled shortly after war broke out; the parliamentarians in Manchester captured and imprisoned him. The rents and profits of Halifax vicarage were then paid directly to Lord Fairfax for the upkeep of his forces. Godly ministers in the many chapelries of Halifax
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parish were maintained by the local populace, who even under the harsh conditions of the cloth trade depression were prepared to continue exceptional payment:‘out of zeal to God’s holy religion, do freely and voluntarily, at their own Charges, maintain and give wages to ten preachers, over and above the payment of all tithes and oblations... and by the special grace of God there is not one Popish recusant inhabiting in the said great and populous parish.’ This level of zeal is reflected in Jonathan Priestley’s recollection of his mother teaching him and his siblings psalms whenever snow prevented their journey to the chapel. In March 1642, nobody in Halifax or neighbouring Rochdale refused the Protestation.

Among the hearers of Nathaniel Rathband’s preaching at Sowerby were the Priestley family, of whom Samuel died serving as a parliamentary soldier, and Joseph was imprisoned at Halifax by Mackworth’s royalists, their house at Goodgreave being plundered ‘over and over again’ by them. One of Joseph’s fellow prisoners was a Joseph Briggs, probably his neighbour, Captain Joseph Briggs of Sowerby, who admired Priestley’s Godly prayers and psalms during their imprisonment, allegedly even declaring ‘there was scarce such a man in the world as Joseph Priestley.’ Jonathan Priestley noted that Colonel Bradshaw, the leader of the Calderdale insurgents of October 1643, was also held in high regard by the Godly, one old soldier reminiscing how he ‘heard many a sweet prayer from his mouth, in the field amongst the soldiers.’

On 5 April 1643, the people of Halifax signed their names to a declaration of their
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covenant with God to ‘rise in Armes’ to ‘pursue and destroy’ His enemies, the ‘Army of Atheists, papists, constreyned p[ro]testants & other ill affected persons’. This took courage, as should the royalists prevail they might obtain this list of all those who opposed them. With Dr. Marsh’s downfall, an independent tradition of hiring ministers was established, and in 1645, Henry Roote founded an Independent church at Sowerby. Within months of the outbreak of war, in one of the most aggressively parliamentarian parishes in England, the organisation of the Church of England had been abolished.

The petitioners of nearby Birstall claimed to have ‘deeply suffered by ye enormous violence of ye Enemy.’ By 1638, Edward Harrison, their vicar was attracting people from neighbouring Batley, Dewsbury and Morley to hear his sermons. He had been verbally abused and struck by a servant of Dr. Marsh, according to a presentment thrown out of court by Marsh’s intervention. Harrison suffered the plundering of his house after Newcastle’s army captured Howley Hall, and fled with his family into Cheshire. Also in Birstall, the chapelry of Cleckheaton claimed that they had ‘alwaies been reall to ye parliam[en]t & have suffered much for their good affections to the proceedings thereof.’ The Birstall parish registers for 1643 contain the note: ‘Memorandum that from about the 6 of April being this moneth untill the 20th day of Julie followinge the Earle of Newcastles armie did banish such ministers as tooke parte with the Kinge and Parliament.’

Likewise the inhabitants of West Ardsley petitioned Parliament, reminding them how they had shown their support and ‘suffered such great losses by the enemye in these warres.’ The parish had an established tradition of nonconformity; their minister of the
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1620s and 1630s refused to read set prayers and wear a surplice. In 1633, eight parishioners of neighbouring East Ardsley were each charged with being ‘a separatiste and for wilfully absenting himselfe from his Parish Church.’ They were also accused of refusing to receive Communion kneeling and of ‘vilifying the Book of Common Praier.’ Mr. Headcoat, minister at West Ardsley was removed by the royalists, and in 1648 Christopher Marshall established a new church there, which General John Lambert later called ‘a very sweet society of an Independent church.’ This locality was to provide many parliamentarian recruits, including the future Quaker James Nayler and his kinsmen. In another petition, Holmfirth claimed that they ‘did make and set forth a hundred musqueteers for the Parliament service’, and then related how they had suffered for it having ‘above thirty houses burnt by the army against the Parliament.’

William Dewsbury joined Fairfax’s army after he had heard Robert Todd preach Stephen Marshall’s sermon, ‘Meroz Cursed’, at St John’s Church, Leeds. Other soldiers later claimed they took up arms against the royalists after hearing this sermon, the text of which became so infamous that it earned Marshall the unwelcome title of ‘the great incendiary of this unhappy war.’ Ministers like Marshall and Todd were indeed endeavouring to transform the war into a religious struggle, quoting Psalm 138 in preaching how all people were either ‘blessed or cursed according as they join with or oppose the cause of God’, and ‘Blessed is the man that takes (Babylon’s) little ones and dasheth them
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against the stones.  

The other region where a strong pre-war tradition of Godly preaching had been established was in the parishes around Hull. The ministers in Hull had persisted in nonconformity during the 1630s, and had frequently been called before High Commission at York. Writing in the 1650s, John Hackett, chaplain to Archbishop Williams, attributed Hull’s resistance to royal authority ‘to their lecturers... the corrupters of that corporation, who had previously preached the people... from subjects to rebels.' In 1643, Robert Luddington established Yorkshire’s first Independent church in the town.

In 1638 the Reverend Ezekiel Rogers led some of his congregation at Rowley across the Atlantic to Massachusetts in response to Laudian church reforms, and Rowley has been described by Sheils as ‘the renowned centre of East Riding Puritanism.’ The local gentleman John Northend had previously granted Rogers lands in South Cave and named one of his sons after him, while his eldest son became an officer in the Hull garrison.

Few places were as conspicuous as nearby Cottingham, where Samuel Winter had been minister. Granted the parsonage for life by Lord Fairfax, Winter’s ministry was recalled by one observer as ‘very awakening and piercing, and with such a remarkable zeal’; he could often be heard to thunder that ‘The wicked shall be turned into Hell & all the
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Nations that forget God'. With the King drawing near Hull in April 1642, men from Hunsley Beacon and Cottingham were forward in coming to Hotham’s aid at only fourpence a day per man. In July 1643, Cottingham again provided recruits for Parliament, raising fifty horse at a time when the corporation of Hull observed ‘a gen’al averseness in the com’on people, who (following the stronger p’te,) come in very slackly to o[u]r assistance.’

Further east, deep in the low lying and possibly hostile region of Holderness, Easington was conspicuously parliamentarian. Its distance from Hull may have saved it from the worst of the flooding which had done little for the popularity of Hull’s parliamentary governors in the region, while the parochial gentry, John and Robert Overton, had raised some of the trained band and led them into Hull in April 1642. For this action, John Overton was to suffer twenty two weeks in prison, and his ‘whole personal estate violently taken’ from him by Sir Hugh Cholmley’s royalists. In a later petition to Parliament for relief, Easington was able to employ its reputation for parliamentarianism and attribute this to its Godly minister:

That yo[u]r pet[i]tione[r:s have done and suffered in the cause of the kingdome more than any Towne in this Countrey, and this next under God yo[u]r pet[i]tione[r:s were stirred upto by the constant paynes and godly instruccion[s of Mr. Kennington their Minister who lost all he had in the cause; being banished by the Earle of Newcastle, was placed amongst yo[u]r pet[i]tione[r:s by the Committee at Hull.

2:3 A new army at Hull

After their army’s total defeat at Adwalton Moor, the Fairfaxes’ success in raising a new army around Hull was a striking achievement. The corporation of Hull informed Speaker Lenthall on 26 July that Fairfax’s remaining forces were unwilling to recruit ‘wch (as we
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conceyve) is for lack of assurance of pay.' They requested money, arms, and assurances from Parliament for Fairfax's demoralised officers that they would be better cared for in future; Sir William Constable later remarked how Fairfax was 'not scanted of officers that have suffered much.' Fairfax's headlong flight into the town and his wounded son's subsequent arrival in rags was hardly going to inspire confidence of success among local inhabitants; the corporation noted: 'And truly when we observed the nature of his Lopp's retreat wch was wth such confusion as that they brought but very little or nothing wth them, wee could not choose, but lament their sad condition'. They even had to advance £1,200 of Sir John Hotham's confiscated money in order 'to preserve the remnant from scatering.'

Before raising new recruits, Fairfax would have to reorganise the forces formerly under the Hothams, and decide how far those officers could be trusted. The committee for the town's defence ordered on 4 July: 'The soldiers lately in Captaine Hotham’s Regiment, now in custody, be set at liberty and suffered to goe to Coronell Boynton, there to be by him either deteyned or imployed as he shall thinke fitt.' These men were to be the first additions to the nucleus of the new cavalry force assembling at Sutton and Stoneferry under Sir Thomas Fairfax and Sir Henry Foulis on 10 July. Within six weeks, the Fairfaxes had recruited over twenty troops, almost double the number of cavalry they deployed on Adwalton Moor. This recruiting success after such a major disaster was truly remarkable; illustrating not only the Fairfaxes' tenacity, but also the willingness and capacity of the people of the region to bolster a dying cause. Ever sensitive to public opinion, Fairfax reassured local constables on 7 July, that he was not like Sir John Hotham:
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He ordered them to lead to a muster at Beverley on 10 July, all horse, arms and men aged between 16 and 60 in their divisions.\textsuperscript{106} Robert Burton notified Sir Thomas Barrington that ‘after my Lord Ffairfax came to Hull & brought with him all the horse & foote w[hi]ch escaped out of the west, there were raised in the coutrye about us, as many horses as made upp in all about xx or xxii troops, our lordship [Cottingham] set forth fifty horse & other adjacent townes did sett forth likewise according to theire p[ro]porcon.’\textsuperscript{107} The achievement becomes even more impressive when considered that these cavalry were raised at harvest time, and especially if Mr. White, the minister of Rowley’s account of the region’s initial reception of the Fairfaxes is to be believed:

He hath beene here 10 dayes and was most well come here wth his thrice valiant son but he shines little now and the raising of the coutrye he is loath to force... they dare not come in (those that are willing) soe freely as they would: many waver, soe inexpressible is the disadvantage of playing an after game in warr that we are in a very p[er]plexed condition... the clouds are so exceeding darke and thicke.\textsuperscript{108}

White’s pessimistic forebodings shortly led him ‘to shelter himself under the protection of the wicked for the saving of his temporall estate’,\textsuperscript{109} and he was not alone. After Sir Thomas Fairfax was beaten out of Beverley, many of the new infantry recruits, unable to outpace their royalist pursuers and reach Hull, relinquished the struggle: ‘during which fight about 1000 of our new raised men, fresh water souldiers, tooke the opportunitle and left their Colours, some turned to the Enemie, others lurked in the Countrey, who afterwards repented too late.’\textsuperscript{110}

Yet during both sieges of Hull, Parliament could compensate for desertions by reinforcing the town with soldiers recruited in London and the south. At a critical stage

\textsuperscript{105} Letters were sent to the constables of ‘Sutton, Dripool, Southcoates, Marfleet, Bilton, Witon’ and probably several others as the bottom of this manuscript is missing: Hull City R.O., BRS/7/16.
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during the first siege, 400 London soldiers strengthened the garrison, 'although but raw young men.' Along with the arrival of the Scots professional soldier, Sir John Meldrum, this enabled the town's soldiers to launch the successful sally to Anlaby. On 7 October 1643, during the second siege, Meldrum again arrived in Hull by sea, this time with 1,000 men recruited in the south, and again played a key role in the garrison's decisive sally four days later. After his subsequent defeat at Newark, Meldrum retreated to Hull in March 1644, this time with 2,000 defeated men, most of whom were disarmed.

Sir William Constable was also active recruiting soldiers in the south-east, particularly Essex, for service in Yorkshire. In August and September 1643, he was raising and requisitioning men to relieve his brother-in-law, Lord Fairfax, beleaguered in Hull. On 26 August, he wrote that he hoped to send infantry by sea, and ride north through Lincolnshire with horse and dragoons, and secured 160 Essex dragoons for the enterprise on 2 September.

2:4 Impressment and Desertion

Lord Fairfax was initially reluctant to resort to impressment; it infringed upon the traditional liberties of the subject for which he was supposed to be engaged, and he had already accused Newcastle of pressing men in Cleveland churches. Yet unable to prevent endemic desertion due to its inability to pay its northern army, on 23 February 1644, Parliament finally passed an ordinance enabling Fairfax to raise men 'by the way of Imprest':
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have such Imprest Money, Coat and Conduct Money, Wages and Entertainment, and other necessary Charges and Allowances, as shall be fit and convenient, according to the Discretion of the Committees and Deputy Lieutenants, or any Two or more of them respectively. And if any Person or Persons shall wilfully refuse to be imprested for the said Service, that then it shall and may be lawful to and for the said Persons, authorized as aforesaid, to commit them to Prison, until they shall yield Obedience, or pay the Sum of Ten Pounds to the said Committees or Deputy Lieutenants, to be employed for the Supply of the said Service.  

However, there were exceptions to this ordinance; Lord Fairfax could not impress any clergy, scholars, students, mariners, seamen, fishermen, trained bandsmen, or anyone under 18 or over 50 years old. Those ranked as esquire or above and their sons were also exempt, along with members or officers of Parliament and their servants, and anyone rated at over £5 in goods or £3 in lands in the most recent parliamentary subsidy books.  

Until the intervention of the Scots, Yorkshire parliamentarians encountered difficulties maintaining new recruits’ morale in the face of the vast numerical superiority of Newcastle’s army. This was particularly true in the North Riding, where mass desertion after Newcastle’s victory at Piercebridge caused the collapse of the parliamentary forces, almost a thousand of their trained bandsmen returning home. Sir Henry Foulis lamented that under these conditions he could not raise a regiment from the trained bands:  

that it is yet impossible to raise it, 'besides if I had them up, one Musquets report would make them run away, witness Cleaveland Regiment under the command of Sir Matthew Boynton, when he (with the help of his friends) had at Yarum 500 of his Regiment, the enemy giving us but one Alarum, they all ran away save 200, and those are now run to 80. As for my part I intend to raise Volunteers.  

As the war continued, Sir Henry’s sentiments were echoed, one tract asserting in 1644 that ‘plentifull experience teacheth, that none but Volunteers doe the work on both sides.' Yet with war-weariness increasing, volunteers became scarce. Continued desertion, in spite of impressment, ensured Fairfax’s army at Marston Moor was smaller than the one he lost at
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Adwalton Moor twelve months earlier. 121

The State Papers provide a wealth of evidence dealing with men forced or tricked into enlistment. Although the evidence consists of charges made against suspected royalists with the aim of sequestering them, they do provide excellent examples of how unscrupulous officers were held to have behaved. Impressment could easily become a means to settle old scores. When the constable of Nidd, Robert Wilkes, came before the Commissioners of Array at Knaresborough with no recruits, Solomon Swale allegedly told them that Wilkes had caused his estates to be plundered by the rebels, and so Wilkes and his deputy were carried off to be arrayed. 122 Sampson Cooper, a Ripon alderman was accused of roaming the streets at night, breaking into houses and rounding up apprentices and servants to be arrayed before Sir Ralph Hansby, 123 while John Smith, constable of Sowerby, was charged with betraying to the Commissioners of Array Fairfax’s former soldiers in the township after their defeat on Adwalton Moor. 124

Few cases can rival the draconian tactics that Henry Cholmley of Tunstall was accused of employing, in order to recruit his son’s troop of royalist horse:

He desired most of his Neighbours in Tunstall to goe to his son as troops & grace him with their company at his Muster & said they should onely shew themselves & come home againe & that he would p[ro]tect them from the Array[,] the poor men to avoyd the Array consented and did go to his sons troop, listed themselves & come home, but he the said Henry Cholmley commanded them to go to his sons troop againe otherways he would have them hang’d, their houses plund[e]red & burned & not leave them worth a groat. 125

If informing on them as deserters was not threatening enough, he added that he would soon be made constable and would therefore shortly force them out anyway. Fear of the Array drove men into hiding; apart from warning his neighbours against it, Robert Hewes, a Sherburn yeoman, hid his neighbours including among them several royalist deserters, in his
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mill when the constables arrived.  

Parliamentary perceptions of royalist recruitment were reflected in the carefully managed testimony of John Cundy of Boston in Lincolnshire, who later claimed that it was as a young man at school near Newark that he 'by the evill encouragem[en]t of others, was ledd into the Kings Armie, but after he found ye mischievous intentions of yt p[ar]tie ye pet[itioner]; dislikeinge thems did p[ro]cure a p[ro]teccon under Collo[nel] Hatchers hand, then Governor of Boston, to repaire to Boston where ye Pet[itione]r smale estate... and freinds were.'  

Marmaduke Millner of Sutton attempted to excuse his royalist enlistment by reminding the sequestrators of Newcastle’s policy of impressment. He claimed that during the siege of Hull, Newcastle ordered that all men from the local parishes aged between 16 and 60, should appear before him on the Array upon pain of death.  

2:5 Self-interest and survival

For many, the safest route appeared to be to render support whenever it was called upon, if necessary to both sides. Despite maintaining his eldest son in Lord Fairfax’s lifeguard, William Man of Bramley Grange was a collector of royalist assessments. By surrendering himself to Colonel Charles Fairfax on 6 June 1644, and handing over 2 horses and 4 pistols, he acquired a certificate acquitting him of all charges that could be brought against him. Similarly, Robert Shaw of Ardishaw lent Sir Thomas Fairfax upon the propositions the handsome sum of £500 two days after Fairfax’s capture of Leeds. He had signed a royalist petition and may have been frightened into lending the money, but such contributions were of great value.

Obedience to both sides was nevertheless a dangerous undertaking. John Harrison of Leeds procured a certificate in 1642 that he had supplied Lord Fairfax with ninety pounds in money, along with a horse and arms worth twenty pounds. However, his later attempt
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to excuse his subsequent assistance of the royalists as being coerced by dire threats, left his neighbour, Adam Baynes, unimpressed. Baynes responded to a description of Harrison as timorous with: ‘Yea Mr. Harrison is a timorous man, for when my Lord Fairfax’s drums did beat in Leeds he was troubled and afraid, and went to Otley side. But when the Earl of Newcastle’s drums beat he was not then afraid but came to Leeds.’ His composition fine of £464/18/- was far from lenient.131

The royalist commanders Sir Edmund Duncombe and Robert Brandling both offered their services when surrendering to Lord Fairfax in 1644. The former assisted in the siege of York, while despite coming from a partly Roman Catholic family, the latter was actually commissioned by Fairfax as a colonel of horse. All charges against both men were dropped.132

The assurance of a pension in the event of unfortunate eventualities may have been a weighty consideration for some recruits. In October 1642, Parliament promised to take financial care of all its maimed soldiers and all widows of men slain in their service, while the King only pledged to provide for the former. Parliament even endeavoured to honour its promise, and of 310 individuals pensioned in the West Riding, 93 were women.133

Other materialistic considerations could play a part in recruitment. Thomas Thornhill of Fixby sent a tenant to serve in a royalist troop, promising him his farm if he returned alive.134 The shoemaker Percival Trewhitt served as a parliamentary soldier providing that his time in military service would count towards the expiry of his apprenticeship.135

The need to secure male lineage and landed estates were rarely minor considerations before military service was undertaken. In 1649, Robert Baynes wrote to his elder brother Adam advising him not to enlist with the army for Ireland, and urging him to look to his

134 P.R.O., S.P.19/17/129.
estate and to secure an heir. Robert offered to go instead, writing ‘provided I can any way satisfy my mother (or moderate those extraordinary passions of sorrow, which you know is incident to her upon such like occasions).’

Even younger brothers experienced difficulty escaping from motherly care to enlist for Fairfax, as Jonathan Priestley vividly recalls:

Soon after the civil wars began betwixt King and Parliament, insomuch as all trade and business was laid aside, Lord Fairfax, and Sir Thomas, his son came to Leeds and those parts to list soldiers; my brother Sam went among the rest, but he came over to Goodgreave to take his leave of my mother, uncles and friends. What entreaty and persuasions there was to keep him at home but could not prevail. My mother went along with him a quarter of a mile, and I with her as children used to do; she besought him with tears not to go; I remember his words, ‘Mother’, saith he ‘Pray be content; if I stay at home I can follow no employment, but be forced to hide myself in one hole or another, which I cannot endure; I had rather venture my life in the field, and if I die it is in a good cause.’

Jonathan remembered how Samuel’s subsequent death from a chill caught saving a drowning enemy soldier while defending Heptonstall ‘was a great affliction to my good mother.’

2:6 Clubmen and the crisis in the cloth trade

Samuel Priestley’s claim that he could find no other work than soldiering in 1642 is telling. His native clothing districts were in the grip of a biting recession, which in itself was an important factor in the recruitment of Sir Thomas Fairfax’s army in the first winter of war. The traditional consensus that the Fairfaxes recruited the majority of their men in the cloth manufacturing districts has never been thoroughly examined. The financially vulnerable smaller clothiers of the Halifax-Bradford area have traditionally been regarded as the most obvious parliamentarians. These manufacturers needed regular, small, affordable supplies of wool for their families to work on, often just making one kersey a week. They were therefore often dependent upon wool dealers to sell them the raw materials, and also on the larger clothiers to buy their products as merchants tended to buy from larger producers. These larger clothiers, dominating the Leeds area, had powers of regulation and control that the smaller clothiers further west resented. Indeed, the larger clothiers could compel the
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smaller ones to sell their cloth to them for less than it cost the smaller clothiers to make it, as they knew the smaller clothiers were often wholly dependent on their money to buy food and more wool for their families to work on for the next week. The small clothiers were also afraid of regulations and inspectors as all cloth had to bear an unilager’s seal; by 1642 there was a strong feeling that the Caroline government had subjected them to ‘illegal pressures and impositions.’ In addition, as small landowners, they were equally vulnerable to market forces and land tax. Financial innovations such as Ship Money could cost them dearly. Furthermore, they had found ways to make themselves heard before. Sir John Savile, posing as the defender of the rights and liberties of his cloth manufacturing employees, had won an election in 1597, defeating candidates supported by leading county gentry. Again in 1629, when there was no standing candidate acceptable to the smaller clothiers, they arranged for Sir Henry Savile to stand, and secured his eventual return. In 1625, Sir Thomas Wentworth, fearful of the level of Sir John Savile’s support among middling sort clothiers and freeholders, wrote that ‘it should be handsomely infused into the gentry how much it concerns them to maintain their own act,’ unless ‘Sir John be able to carry it against you and me’ and ‘all the gentlemen too besides.’ One of his supporters went on to describe the contest as more like ‘a rebellion than an election.’ Identical gentry fears of these groups would resurface more strongly in 1643.

The cloth trade had been declining for eighteen months before its collapse in January 1642. Leeds and Halifax petitioned Parliament and the King between January and March.
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On 14 April 1642, ‘The Humble Petition of the Clothiers’ complained to the King of the depression. By then, disruption of cloth exports through Hull was putting thousands of West Riding spinners out of work. In 1638, three quarters of all West Riding kerseys had been exported through Hull and other east coast ports. The size of a community as discontented as this would prove fertile recruiting ground for the resident Fairfaxes; in 1638, 22,000 people were engaged in the cloth trade in Bradford, Bingley, Shipley and Halifax.

In June 1642, Sir Thomas Fairfax petitioned the King on their behalf:

> the great Decay of all Commerce and industrious Courses for the Wealth and Prosperity of the Country, especially of Cloathing, which is the main Subsistence of this County; and which is, since your Majesty’s Residence with us, and the following Distractions thereupon, suddenly obstructed; insomuch that many thousand Families who are of, and have their livelihood by the Trade of Cloathing, are at the Point of utter Undoing; which inevitably will prove to be of dangerous Consequence, and will be the Inlet to our approaching and unavoidable Ruin, unless your Majesty graciously please to give Redress by removing the Causes which will remove these miserable Effects.

Fairfax here was presenting the King with a petition that smacked of diplomacy by fear. He was trying, perhaps inadvertently, to use fear of the masses of poorer sort to coerce the King into granting concessions. This was precisely the sort of behaviour that had driven the King from London, and he was not prepared to tolerate it in Yorkshire. It is hardly surprising that he felt the petition was organised and subscribed in London, ‘solicited by a few mean inconsiderable Persons.’ The King said that the number and quality of those who supported the refused petition ‘was not in Truth so considerable as is pretended’, and that it was avowed by no man but Sir Thomas Fairfax himself. In reference to the predicament of the clothing districts, he made it abundantly clear he had not been there, and had no idea of what they were enduring, saying ‘there would be no more Cause to complain of Decay
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of Trade and Commerce there, than is in this Place.\textsuperscript{151} This statement was unlikely to endear him to a potentially starving population who, though resident only thirty miles away, would not even receive the consideration of a visit. In the crisis ahead some may have remembered that it was Sir Thomas Fairfax, foremost among others, who took their case to the King. Sir Thomas was therefore later able to pose as the champion of local interests when writing to local constables requiring them to raise the country, notifying the constable of Mirfield on 19 January, 1643.

that by unanimous consent wee may through the helpe of God drive out the popish army, establish peace in this County & obtayne to the comfortable support of poore & rich. Let every man that is able bring with him 4 or 5 dayes p[ro]vision and let the poorer sort bee furnished by ye Constable out of ye Comon stocke for ye like time. Hereof faile y[ou]r not at y[ou]r p[e]rill as you tend yor owne good & the good of this bleeding & distressed country.\textsuperscript{152}

The outbreak of war would make trade still worse. Cloth was easy for soldiers to plunder, especially in transit on open roads.\textsuperscript{153} One Leeds clothier lamented that by the time of the battle of Adwalton Moor, all trade to London was completely obstructed.\textsuperscript{154} Necessities of survival promoted recruitment and dictated Fairfax strategy. From Bradford, on 9 January 1643, Sir Thomas Fairfax wrote to his father:

These parts grow very impatient of our delay in beating them out of Leeds and Wakefield, for by them all trade and provisions are stopped, so that the people in these parts are not able to subsist, and, indeed, so pressing are these wants as some have told me, if I would not stir with them, they must rise of necessity themselves in a thing of so great importance.\textsuperscript{155}

Such an increased level of disorder was not caused from within these communities, but from outside pressures.\textsuperscript{156} If eastward routes were blocked by hostile royalist troops, not only would cloth exports through Hull stop, but food supplies from the Vale of York also.\textsuperscript{157}

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{152} Y.A.S., MS, 205a, Letter of Sir Thomas Fairfax to the constable of Mirfield, written at Bradford, 19 January 1643.
\textsuperscript{154} P.R.O., S.P. 19/113/198.
\textsuperscript{155} Bell (ed), \textit{The Fairfax Correspondence}, vol. i, pp.32-4.
\textsuperscript{156} For a more general discussion see A.J. Fletcher and J. Stevenson (eds), \textit{Order and Disorder in Early Modern England} (Cambridge, 1985), p.157.
\textsuperscript{157} Leeds, Wakefield, Bradford and Halifax were all in some measure dependent upon the Vale of York for foodstuffs: H.P. Kendall, ‘Local Incidents in the Civil War, part i’, \textit{Transactions of the Halifax Antiquarian Society} (1909), pp.1-28.
Starvation would become a possibility. In a petition to the Court of Exchequer in 1638, the West Riding clothiers had complained that some of them could not even earn four pence a day, and that ‘the places they inhabit being soe mountainous and rough, soe barren and unfruitful, as it will not suffice to yield victuals for the third part of the inhabitants.’\textsuperscript{158} Parts of the clothing districts had suffered from plague in 1641.\textsuperscript{159} Hipperholme-cum-Brighouse and Shelf had to be assisted with a county rate, while the epidemic had so adversely affected trade at Dewsbury that over 270 of the parish poor were on weekly relief.\textsuperscript{160}

The Godly of the West Riding congregations were also likely to make a connection between the dearth, and the apparently sinful, idolatrous, religious policies of Charles I.\textsuperscript{161} Hungry men with grievances appear likely recruits, particularly if the Fairfaxes could offer them a measure of pay or sustenance. Few would be in Thomas Priestley’s fortunate position. He owned eight horses, and could attempt to continue trade through the war years.\textsuperscript{162} For many the war became a matter of survival; Lord Fairfax wrote to Speaker Lenthall on 23 May 1643:

\begin{quote}
Here about Leeds, Bradford and Halifax, being a mountainous barren Country, the people now begin to be sensible of want, their last year provisions being spent, and the enemies Garrisons stopping all provisions both of Corn and Flesh, and other necessaries that there wont to come from the more fruitfull Countries to them, their trade utterly taken away, their poor grow innumerable, and great scarcity of means to relieve them.\textsuperscript{163}
\end{quote}

The restless and economically depressed state of such a populous area as the cloth districts of the West Riding would contribute to the cautious and uncertain nature of some of the leading parliamentarians of the East Riding. By July 1642, West Riding clothiers had already complained to Parliament about Sir John Hotham detaining their trade at Hull, a man unlikely to respond favourably to criticism from his social inferiors.\textsuperscript{164} This climate of fear

\textsuperscript{158} W. Page (ed), \textit{The Victoria County History of Yorkshire} (London, 1912), vol. ii, p.415.
\textsuperscript{159} Heaton, \textit{The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries}, p.196.
\textsuperscript{162} Priestley, ‘Some Memoirs Concerning the family of the Priestleys’, p.23.
\textsuperscript{164} \textit{House of Lords MS}, H.M.C. 5\textsuperscript{th} Report, Appendix (London, 1876), p.38.
and mistrust was central to shaping the fractured nature of the emerging parliamentarian forces.

In the London press, the Fairfaxes grew famous for their poorly equipped following.\(^{165}\) One excited London pamphleteer reported wildly inflated claims that 10,000 clubmen would appear for Lord Fairfax at a single day's warning,\(^{166}\) while in April another observed that 'he hath as many Clubmen in the West Riding as can be desired.'\(^{167}\) However, they were a continuous presence in the Fairfaxes' army's campaigns prior to Adwalton Moor. Their numbers could run into thousands and at Sir Thomas Fairfax's capture of Leeds it is likely they composed the majority of his army.\(^{168}\) Oliver Heywood tells of one such man called William Critchlaw: 'In the warre time, though he was not a souldier, yet when he heard of a fight right at hand, or a town to be taken by the Parliament's army he used to take his musket, and run to the army to be the formost in any hazardous expedition.'\(^{169}\) Indeed, the West Riding Quarter Sessions records indicate that access to firearms was fairly widespread: even labourers were frequently indicted for poaching with them.\(^{170}\)

Prior to his victory at Leeds, Sir Thomas Fairfax sent out orders to local constables to assemble all their able bodied men between the ages of 16 and 60 with whatever weapons


\(^{166}\) B.L. TT E89(16), The Kingdom's Weekly Intelligencer, 7-14 February (London, 1643), p.55.

\(^{167}\) B.L. TT E94(29), Certaine Informations, 27 March- 3 April (London, 1643), p.81.

\(^{168}\) Reports of their numbers at Leeds range from 1,200 to 2,000: B.L TT E88(19), A true and plenary Relation Of the great defeat given by my Lord Fairfax Forces unto my Lord of Newcastles Forces in Yorkshire, January 23: Which was the absolutest and considerablist Victory obtained since the beginning of these unhappy Warres, 6 February (London, 1643), p.4; T. May, The History of the Parliament of England which began November 3, M.DC.XL (London, 1812), p.197.


they had and lead them to his muster at Almondbury on 29 January; one newsbook reported that 200 musketeers and 1,400 clubmen answered his call, entering Wakefield on 24 January. So overwhelming were some of these turnouts that he had to turn volunteers away:

Sir Thomas Fairfax at Bradsmith summoned the Country In upon Munday last, who came with such Courage and Valor, almost incredible, and with provision in their snappingacks for six dayes, Thanks only was given them for their readiness, and they were dismissed at that time, with information that they should be called a-gaine within 3. or 4. dayes.

In his analysis of the parliamentary army on Adwalton Moor, Thomas Stockdale does not quantify the clubmen on account of their military impotence: ‘and many clubmen followed us, who are fit to do execution upon a flying enemy, but unfit for other service, for I am sure they did us none.’ While there is little ground for doubting Stockdale’s opinion of their tactical capability, they at least had the courage to attend, probably again in thousands considering they were defending their homes and the battle was fought near Bradford.

Even after Adwalton Moor and without the Fairfaxes’ backing, local parliamentary activists in their heartland around Halifax were determined to continue recruiting support. John Brearcliffe recorded: ‘14 Oct. 1643: agreed at Manchester between Capt. Bradshaw & Yorkshiremen: he sh[u][o]uld be the cheif of the Yorkshiremen, so note issued, notes putt in 16 churches.’ The Yorkshiremen and women who had fled their habitations after the Fairfaxes’ defeat, and those suffering under the royalist occupation of Calderdale deliberately decided to use congregations to raise an uprising, in contrast to the Fairfaxes’ earlier use of constables and market places as recruiting devices. Well accustomed to maintaining and organising their own semi-independent chapelries, they now turned the focal point of their community towards military ends. The rendezvous for the rising was set for


174 Hanson, ‘Three Civil War Notes’, p.250.

19 and 20 October at the hilltop village of Heptonstall, but Brearcliffe relates that even by 17 October, ‘between 270-280 musketeers, 60 horse, 500 clubmen’ had been mustered. The people of this region had demonstrated en masse that they would continue the fight without the Fairfaxes’ assistance; they paid a heavy price for their insurrection when the royalists burned the villages of Heptonstall and Haworth in retaliation.177


177 P.R.O., S.P. 23/177/183.
CHAPTER THREE
THE PARLIAMENTARIAN GENTRY

The strength of gentry support for Parliament varied widely across the county, depending upon religious culture, geography, and military domination but especially upon kinship and patronage networks. In traditionally rural Richmondshire, gentry Roman Catholicism remained strong, and the few parliamentary squires felt more vulnerable than their more numerous allies in the south of the East Riding who enjoyed the safety of the fortress of Hull. Indeed in 1642, Hull became the focal point for the East Riding parliamentary gentry’s activism. A hinterland of gentry support stretched north-eastwards in a crescent through Beverley which contained the strongest concentration of support from well established gentry in the entire county.

Despite the Fairfaxes’ efforts, gentry support in the West Riding clothing districts was more limited, relying heavily on parochial gentry and especially upon minor urban elites who strictly speaking were not gentlemen at all. J.T. Cliffe has usefully noted that: ‘Among the gentry who were actually seated in the clothing area, the royalists heavily outnumbered the parliamentarians.’ Indeed, P.R. Newman asserts that more royalist colonels came from the West Riding than any other English or Welsh county. This paradox supports Ann Hughes’s hypothesis that wherever there was strong support for Parliament among the middling and poorer sorts, the gentry, fearful for the preservation of the social order, ‘were more inclined to an authoritarian politics.’ So at least in this part of Yorkshire, gentry influence was not the foremost determinant in dictating popular allegiance. Mark Stoyle has recognised parallels in north Devon, where the parliamentary gentry were weak despite the area being


'the very region of the county which provided them with the most fervent popular support.'

Religion was not the sole factor in instilling parliamentary loyalties among the Yorkshire gentry. Of the 138 families Cliffe denotes as Puritan, only 64 supported Parliament during the war, exactly half his county total of 128 parliamentary gentry families. Cliffe points to an 'intermixture' of idealism and self-interest, kinship ties and the situation of their estates as further factors in gentry allegiance. Attitudes to honour must also be added, for as John Morrill states: 'it was a time of intense status-consciousness, in which heads of families measured their standing by their position within the pecking order of county rankings.' By the outbreak of war, two rival conceptions of honour had emerged. The first and oldest stressed lineage and pedigree, while the more recent emphasized learning, virtue, Godly religion and public service. The former naturally biased the gentry towards a royalist allegiance, while the latter tended to lead towards parliamentarianism. While it remains difficult to generalise, Cliffe argues that on the whole parliamentarian gentry were inferior to their royalist counterparts in social status, ancestry and also predictably in numbers, mustering only 128 families to 242 royalist ones. It may have been a conscious reaction to this that led parliamentarian gentry into adopting these new ways of expressing honour, so strongly grounded in religion.

---


6 Ibid., p.360.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Royalists</th>
<th>Parliaments</th>
<th>Divided or changed</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Riding</td>
<td>East Riding</td>
<td>West Riding</td>
<td>City of York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Allegiance of Gentry Families

3:1 Kinship in allegiance and hostility

The largest parliamentarian kinship network in Yorkshire was headed by Sir John Hotham, an excellent choice for Governor of Hull as his local interests were massive. He had been married five times and had fathered sixteen children. His son-in-law was Sir Philip Stapleton, an influential moderate at Westminster and commander of the earl of Essex’s lifeguard at the outbreak of war. We observed the extent of the Hotham kinship network in the previous chapter, but Sir John was also exceptionally affluent. The gross annual rental of his estates in 1642 was £3,000. He had been Governor of Hull before, and a colonel of the East Riding trained bands, a regiment of which he raised around Beverley during the First Bishops’ War. Some of these he raised again in 1642, ascribing his

10 Ibid., p.338.


success therein to 'the strength of my interest with the gentry thereabouts.'

Indeed, local families such as the Alureds, Anlabys, Boyntons, Darleys, Goodrickes, Legards and Overtons all supported him, although they were hardly a representative sample of the East Riding gentry at large. In a letter to Parliament shortly after Sir Hugh Cholmley changed sides, Sir John Hotham drew attention to how his familial links were instrumental in preventing all the Scarborough forces defecting: 'Sir Thomas Norcliffe, a son in law of mine came from him to mee yester night with 30 good horse, and tells me he hopes, the rest will follow him. Cap. Froom and Cap. Lieutenant Vanderhurst came with him, Capt. Legard a kinsman of mine that I sent from thence, hath likewise left him.'

The few North Riding parliamentary gentry tended to be members of a close-knit kinship network, centred upon the Smelts of Kirkby Fleetham. The Dodsworths of Thornton-Watlas, the Robinsons of Rokesby, the Wastells of Scorton and the Conyers of Bowlbey had all married into the Smelts, while Thomas Strangways of Ugglebarnby married the daughter of the future recruiter M.P., Luke Robinson of Thornton-Riseborough. The reluctance of the majority of North Riding Puritan gentry to commit themselves to a parliamentarian allegiance can be explained by the geographical isolation of their estates from areas of parliamentary strength, and their vulnerability to the earl of Newcastle's army north of the Tees. Similarly, Sir John Reresby of Thrybergh near Rotherham hesitated in his loyalty to the King because many of his neighbouring gentry were accepting Parliament's commissions, as late as April 1643, Parliament still hoped to

---

16 M.L. CWT, 43-04-07, A True and exact Relation of all the proceedings of Sir Hugh Cholmley's Revolt, deserting the Parliament, and going to the Queen, with the regaining of Scarborough Castle, by the care of Sir John Hotham (London, 1643), p.7.
18 Ibid., pp.65,86.
appoint him a sequestrator for the West Riding.\textsuperscript{20}

Other networks of allegiance could both complement and transcend family and county boundaries. Sir John Bourchier, Sir Matthew Boynton, Sir Richard Darley, Henry Darley and Godfrey Bosvile were all involved in the Providence Island company,\textsuperscript{21} tying their commercial interests closely with this fraternity at Westminster which included John Pym. Furthermore, this group was connected with the two most radical peers in England for Bosvile was the step-brother of Lord Brooke, and Boynton’s eldest son Francis married Constance Fiennes, daughter of Lord Saye and Sele, with whom both he and Sir William Constable were involved in the Saybrook project to establish a Godly colony in Connecticut.\textsuperscript{22} This radical inclination is reflected in Henry Darley’s recommendation that the Queen be impeached for High Treason on 23 May 1643.\textsuperscript{23}

Royalists drew upon the alarming spectre of filial disobedience to stimulate gentry support. The royalist poet and pamphleteer, Thomas Jordan, wrote in 1642 reminding the people that ‘as it is inhumane and startles nature it self to see a sonne draw weapons against the father... so it should doe in the opposition of a Subject to his King.’\textsuperscript{24} A son disobeying his father was often considered blasphemous: ‘Filial obedience was not only required by honor, but by religion as well’.\textsuperscript{25} This traditional theory of sovereignty clearly militated against parliamentarian allegiance. Royalist sons could legitimise disobedience of their parliamentarian fathers by allegiance to the King as a higher father. Sons of parliamentarian gentry suffered conflicting pressures; the majority supported their fathers, but filial
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disobedience did occur. The radical parliamentarian, Sir Thomas Mauleverer, punished the disobedience of his royalist son Richard by withholding his annuity of £500, while Stephen Hutchinson of Wykeham Abbey disinherited his son for being ‘disaffected to the state.’26 Sir Richard Hawksworth supported his Fairfax neighbours despite the royalism of all his closest relations.27 Yet in Sir Richard’s case his relations were already estranged. In 1627, his wife Mary had claimed his brutal treatment of her had forced her to flee back to her family, the royalist Goodrickes of Ribston, where she brought up her son Walter, another future royalist.28 The Goodrickes claimed Sir Richard’s ‘servants of vulgar condition’ were likely to affect his children.29 Many legal conflicts followed, culminating in Sir John Goodricke sending troops to arrest Sir Richard in October 1642.30

The parliamentarian Nicholas Conyers of Bowlbey had two younger royalist brothers slain at Newark and Scarborough.31 Conyers Darcy of Ainderby, a royalist Commissioner of Array in 1642, suffered his son, heir and namesake siding with Parliament against him.32 Where families did divide, continuity of good relations, though strained, was not necessarily impossible. Sir John Goodricke remained on friendly terms with his parliamentarian cousins at Skidby,33 while the Fairfaxes showed lenience to their defeated royalist friends and

27 These neighbours included the Fairfaxes at Menston and Denton, the Dyneleys of Bramhope and the Stanhopes of Horsforth. Sir Richard had captained a company of Sir Ferdinando Fairfax’s regiment of trained bands in 1639 and was his fellow governor of the grammar school at Otley: G.W. Johnson (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence: Memorials of the reign of Charles I (London, 1848), vol. i, p.363; A. Laurence, A History of Menston and Hawksworth (Otley, 1991), pp.19-20; F. Cobley and L. Padgett, Chronicles of the Free Grammar School of Prince Henry at Otley (Otley, 1923), p.77.
30 Cliffe, Puritans in Conflict, p.92.
31 Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.340.
kinfolk.

As we have observed with Hawksworth and the Goodrickes, pre-war hostility often neatly translated into civil war enmity. The Lamberts of Calton and the Cliffords of Skipton had been old enemies in Tudor times, so in 1642 John Lambert appeared a natural choice to lead Craven’s opposition to Henry Clifford, earl of Cumberland’s royalists gathering at Skipton.\footnote{R.T. Spence, \textit{Skipton Castle in the Great Civil War, 1642-1645} (Skipton, 1991), p.9.} Lionel Copley and Thomas Bosvile clashed with Sir William Savile over their plans to build an ironworks near Conisborough.\footnote{Bruce and Hamilton (eds), \textit{Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1638-1639}, p.517.} On 3 April 1638, at the Pontefract Quarter Sessions, Copley had ‘uttered very disgraceful and uncivile speeches against Sir William Savile then present in open Cort.’\footnote{F. Barber, ‘The West Riding Sessions Rolls’, \textit{Yorkshire Archaeological Journal}, 5 (1879), p.372.} The previous year, Copley had been caught poaching accompanied by a common labourer at Rotherham.\footnote{J. Lister (ed), \textit{West Riding Sessions Records: Orders 1611-1642, Indictments 1637-1642} (Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Records Series, 53, 1915), p.39.} Sir William owned some of the most extensive parks in Yorkshire, and as a local gentleman, Copley’s example to his social inferiors was especially corrupting. As Roger Manning points out, such illegal hunting and subsequent court cases were likely to increase tension among West Riding gentry, and only the outbreak of war would be more dangerous to noble privilege than organised large scale poaching.\footnote{R.B. Manning, \textit{Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England, 1485-1640} (Oxford, 1988), pp.67,194.} One such case was that of Wortley Park, owned by the future royalist, Sir Francis Wortley. From 1637 to 1642 there had been 37 offenders, including yeomen and even a gentleman and a clergyman.\footnote{Ibid., p.159.} Apart from his residence in a heavily parliamentarian area, the parliamentary activism of Copley’s brother Christopher, and patronage from the earl of Essex himself, Lionel Copley may also have been inclined towards parliamentarianism by his grudge against the leading royalist, Sir William Savile.

Gentry families ranged on the same side could also clash as the Boyntons did with the Wrays of Lincolnshire, over the alleged incompetence of Lord Willoughby of Parham. On
3 February 1644, the Commons' Journals record:

Colonel Bointon being called in, informed the House, that being invited by Mr. William Wray, and Two other of the Wraies, to drink a Pint of Wine; who, questioning him for speaking against my Lord Willoughbie, Two of them held him, while the Third did strike him twice upon the Head: And one Mr. Bond, of Westminster, was called in; who testified he did see Two Gentlemen hold him while a Third beat him; but knows not their Names. Resolved, & c. That Mr. William Wray, Mr. Christopher Wray, and Mr. Theophilus Wray, be sent for, as Delinquents.40

Both Presbyterian in religion and conservative in their politics, the Wraies would not appreciate attacks on their county leader by the son of such a noted radical as Sir Matthew Boynton.

3:2 The Fairfax

Lord Fairfax had inclined himself to a Godly upbringing, perhaps not so preoccupied with his hunting rights as his social equals; it was held that 'in his younger yeares he was given to the study of Arts and Sciences, that must make him usefull and serviceable to his Countrey, and not to Dogs, Hawkes, & c.'41 His father, the first baron Fairfax, wrote in 1614, 'my greatest care... hath been and still is, to breed my son a scholar.'42 Ferdinando’s tireless industry on the Commission of the Peace widened the Fairfax network,43 as did his identification with the clothiers of his locality, later enabling him to rally their wartime support. A close friend of Ferdinando, Sir Henry Slingsby remarked how 'dearly belov’d' the West Riding was to him.44

As early as 1629, Ferdinando wrote to his father how 'the danger by the growth of Arminianism and countenancing of the professors' threatened the very 'subversion of the

40 Commons' Journals, vol. iii, p.387.


43 Ferdinando Fairfax was among the most active West Riding J.P.s: Lister (ed), The West Riding Sessions Records, passim.

religion now established.'45 He considered guarding against threats to religion to be 'the great business, and indeed the greatest that can concern this kingdom'.46 In February 1642, he brought Parliament's attention to fears of Catholic conspiracy in Sheffield.47 During the war's early days, Lord Fairfax, sufficiently far from London to retain an aura of mystery, became a beacon for the London Godly. One night Nehemiah Wallington dreamt that Lord Fairfax came to his house: 'if he were in my shop, what coming and looking there would be on him, saying this is the Lord Fairfax, this is he that won so many battles, and so what honor it would be to me to have such a person at my house.'48 On 23 April 1644, Joseph Caryl preached a thanksgiving sermon for Fairfax's victory at Selby, addressing him: 'Will not your late Victorie memoriz'd this day become the historie of Christs raigne? While I remember how that noble Northerne-light was insulted over in wanton-witted rimes, as burnt downe into the socket, yea as quite extinct.'49 A coranto celebrating Gustavus Adolphus's victories in Germany was published in London in 1632, entitled 'The New Starr of the North, shining upon the Victorious King of Sweden',50 and Mercurius Aulicus mocked endeavours of the London press to elevate Fairfax to similar adulation, writing on 23 September 1643, 'That the Lord Fairefax is the comfortable shining planet of the North

45 Johnson (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, p.155.
46 Ibid., vol. i, p.156.
49 M.L. CWT, 44-04-23, The Saints Thankfull Acclamation at Christs Resumption of His Great Power and the Initials of His Kingdome: A Sermon of thanksgiving preached by Joseph Caryl at Westminster before the House of Commons on 23 April, day of thanksgiving for the victory at Selby (London, 1644), p.35.
50 The coranto referred to him as the 'new risen Starr radiant in virtue and goodnesse, sparkeling with the beames of Martiiall Valour, the prosperous and admired Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, who by his manifold conquests is now made the spectacle of the Christian World.' This conception of honour rooted in Godly virtue and military success made him very attractive to the Fairfaxes, particularly Sir Thomas, who courted his father's and grandfather's blessing to join the Swedish army in 1632: A. Gill, The New Starr of the North, shining upon the Victorious King of Sweden (London, 1632. Reprinted by The English Experience, no.801, Amsterdam, 1976), p.22; Johnson (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, pp.165-7.
Lord Fairfax’s patronage of Godly ministers often included those troubled by ecclesiastical authorities. The rector of Guiseley approached Ferdinando in 1633, with ‘long experience of your godly and Christian care of the peaceable and happy estate of God’s Church in all places’, to assist the minister of Bradford who was bound to appear before High Commission by the Archbishop’s commissioners who had pulled down the church’s lofts and threatened him with fines and imprisonment. Samuel Winter, Richard Clarkson and David Ellison are just a few examples of Godly ministers enjoying Lord Fairfax’s confidence who had also been prosecuted by ecclesiastical courts in the 1630s. As lord of the manor of Otley, Archbishop Neile’s influence intruded onto the Fairfaxes’ estates, and

Plate 2: Lord Fairfax and Sir Thomas Fairfax.  

(truly he is a fixed starre in Hull).  

51 J. Vicars, England’s Worthies under whom all the Civill and Bloudy Warres since Anno 1642 to 1647 are related (London, 2nd edn., 1845), pp.34-5,40-41.


his resentment of the appointment of preaching ministers by local laymen, a practice that had been tolerated by Archbishop Matthew, led the Fairfaxes into direct conflict with him. His attempt to force his candidate into the employment of headmaster at Otley Grammar School aroused their opposition further as Ferdinando was the leading school governor.

Unlike most of their social equals, the Fairfaxes had no taste for elaborate and costly funerals. The Godly were very sensitive about such occasions promoting idolatry. Both Ferdinando and Thomas are commemorated respectively by simple tablets at Bolton Percy and Bilbrough. Ferdinando’s will stated ‘I give my body to be buried without much pomp or ceremony in what place it shall please God to call me out of this sinfull world.’ Likewise, Thomas hoped his funeral would be conducted ‘in such a manner as may be convenient and decent rather than pompous.’ Similarly, Ferdinando’s brother-in-law, Sir William Constable instructed that his funeral should be ‘without ostentation’; while Ferdinando’s close friend, Thomas Stockdale only set aside ten pounds for his funeral.

However, there were limits to Lord Fairfax’s zeal for further reformation. J.T. Cliffe has recognised that anxieties over major reforms in church government leading to social and political anarchy must have acted as a powerful moderating influence within the Puritan squirearchy. The close family friend, Sir Henry Slingsby, recognised this need to preserve the church hierarchy, despite the distaste in which he held Archbishop Neile, commenting: ‘The comon people judges not with things, as they are reason or against; but long usage with them is instead of all so that they would think themselves loose and absolv’d from all

---
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government when they should see that which they so much venerat'd so easily subvert'd."

Perhaps for this reason, Lord Fairfax expressed his concerns writing to his brother Henry, rector of Newton-Kyme, in March 1641: 'the next will be my Lord of Canterbury’s trial, and with that, Episcopacy and Church-government (I hope not the liturgy, which many shoot at).''

Normally tender to friends and relatives on the opposing side, Fairfax remembering his family’s friendship with the Cliffords, granted a safe conduct for a servant of the deceased fifth earl to carry news of his death to London. Fairfax was brother-in-law to Sir George Wentworth of Woolley, and left £10 in his will to Sir George’s son Michael. Despite giving evidence against Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford at his trial, Fairfax was held in high regard by the Wentworths for safeguarding their estates; Sir George assured him on 2 March 1645, that the earl’s heir bore him no ill-feeling and was ‘a person near in affections as in blood.’ Sir George thanked him for ‘The great nobleness you are pleased to use to that poor broken family at Woodhouse, is that for which we are bound, not alone in words, but in all other ways to acknowledge with all gratitude.’ Likewise, after his victory at Selby, Fairfax treated his captured royalist cousin, Lord John Belasyse, scrupulously ‘civilly’, while another royalist cousin, William Vavasour of Haslewood,
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expressed his gratitude to Fairfax for facilitating his chosen exile in the United Provinces, 'which I had not attained but that poor Fairfax was the civilest in the world to me.'

When the war ended, Fairfax only claimed his pay as General, forgoing his additional pay as colonel and captain of foot and horse, and as Governor of Hull. He deliberately stipulated that he would nominate which 'delinquents' would be fined to pay his arrears, in order that he was not embarrassed by profiting from his fellow Yorkshire gentry's misfortune.

Sir William Constable acted similarly, twice trying to prevent the House of Commons from confiscating the estates of his Roman Catholic cousin, Sir Philip Constable of Everingham. Sir Thomas Fairfax intervened on behalf of his royalist friend, Sir Thomas Gower, and went still further in showing no desire to profit from defeated enemies; he held the Duke of Buckingham's estates in trust for him, and payed the earl of Derby's sequestered Manx rents to the Countess, despite her discourtesies to him at the siege of Lathom.

Lord Fairfax's Godly preferences were shared by his family. Three of his brothers had died fighting for Frederick V's cause in Germany. Although modestly unpublished, Sir Thomas Fairfax translated the whole Psalter. Sir Thomas's wife, Lady Anne Fairfax had fiercely Presbyterian sympathies, uncharitably referred to by Clarendon:

Having been bred in Holland, she had not the reverence for the Church of England that she ought to have had, and so had unhappily concurred in her husband's entering into rebellion, never imagining what misery
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These were Peregnne, William and John Fairfax. The latter two were both slain defending Frankenthal in 1621: Johnson (ed), *The Fairfax Correspondence*, vol. i, p.l; Thoresby, *Ducatus Leodiensis*, p.66.

it would bring upon the kingdom, and now abhorred the work in hand as much as any body could, and did all she could to hinder her husband from acting any part in it.\textsuperscript{77}

The Fairfaxes prized the more recent tradition of honour, grounded in learning, Godly religion and virtue, and the notion of public service.\textsuperscript{78} In notifying the Committee of Both Kingdoms of the mortal wounds ‘of my dear nephew’, Sir William Fairfax, Lord Fairfax wrote stoically that ‘the victory obtained over our enemies doth abate my sorrow for any particular friends.’\textsuperscript{79} In a similar vein, shortly before his death, Sir William wrote to his wife that he was commanded to clear the Wirral of royalists for Sir William Brereton: ‘though I do itt, I am confident he will have the honor of itt, yet that shall not discourage me from doing what service I can for the public.’\textsuperscript{80} In 1647, Sir John Bourchier appealed to Lord Fairfax’s sense of service to enlist support for establishing a Godly ministry throughout the county: ‘There are many that have private aims in their public employment, but I must justify you and your ever-honoured son, that I never observed any of selfishness in you.’\textsuperscript{81} Linda Pollock has argued that modesty was a quality that was not innate and had to be taught to the gentry;\textsuperscript{82} Sir Thomas Fairfax certainly knew its value and displayed ‘a conscious striving for modesty to which he attached great importance.’\textsuperscript{83}


\textsuperscript{79} W.D. Hamilton (ed), Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1644-1645 (London, 1890), p.529.

\textsuperscript{80} C.R. Markham, The Life of Robert Fairfax of Steeton, 1666-1725 (London, 1885), pp.20-22.

\textsuperscript{81} Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, pp.337-8.

\textsuperscript{82} Heal and Holmes, The Gentry in England and Wales, p.250.

\textsuperscript{83} His son-in-law, the Duke of Buckingham wrote of him: ‘He never knew what envy was nor hate
His soul was filled with worth and honesty,
And with another thing quite out of date
Called modesty.’
The first baron Fairfax impressed upon his grandson, the future Sir Thomas, just before he rode north into the Bishops’ Wars, the value of a very different kind of honour to that espoused by the Hothams: ‘Avoid private quarrels as much as you can, and show your valour upon the common enemy; the first will but show your pride, and bring you hatred, the second give you honour and reputation.’ Despite nearing the age of eighty, the wily old lord was still acutely aware of how quickly any act could be interpreted as an affront in gentry and aristocratic circles: ‘I write this because amongst so many as you shall converse with, you shall meet with men of various humours.’

3:3 Cholmley and the Hothams

Men of very different ‘humours’ were the Hothams of Scrorborough. Sir John Hotham was very much attached to the Church of England, with little time for ‘Further Reformation’; Barbara English has argued that ‘The Hothams were something like ‘Anglican’, if such a word was not an anachronism: Protestant rather than Puritan.’ Even Clarendon conceded that Sir John was ‘not disturb’d by any fancies in Religion’. Sir Hugh Cholmley noted Sir John’s well known antipathy to Godly reforming ministers:

there being many of the preciser clergy come thither [to Hull] for sanctuary, they neither loved Sir John nor he them; of whom though he made use out of politic ends he did as much disrelish their humours and ways as any man living; and that they knew so well as they did not only give all the information they knew against him to the Parliament, but underhand fomented all sorts of people against him.

One such minister was John Shaw who fled to Hull at the outbreak of war. A friend of the
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notorious Stephen Marshall, he was excluded from preaching as an extremist. But when I came to Hull, and preached there, Sir John Hotham being the governor (for the parliament) in Hull (being privy to his own intentions, and conceiving, as he said, that I would oppose him) would not suffer me to tarry in Hull. The Hothams may also have objected to his lowly social origins; his father was only a yeoman, a social grouping John Hotham readily denigrated. However, Lord Fairfax had no such reservations and sponsored Shaw’s radical preaching to his army at Selby in early 1643. The turbulent rector of Heslerton, John Saltmarsh, came to Hull in the beginning of 1643, and was active in the Hothams’ downfall. Durand Hotham blamed Saltmarsh’s lies for the whole affair, writing to him when time was rapidly running out for his father and brother:

you know that in this last business concerning my Brother in which he trusted you how you grossly failed and laid ye plott to seise him sending ye paper to Moyer to raise ye mutiny at Hull against him whereby his bloud and the bloud of his family layes at your doore... I wonder you would avoid me as you did the last time you were in towne: Sir Itt will be as much your trial as my father, therefore speak truth.

Interestingly, Saltmarsh, despite being ‘a radical antinomian’, soon became a personal chaplain to Sir Thomas Fairfax. The royalist accusation that he ‘uttered the most seditious and rebellious doctrines’ was not unjustified; Henry Marten, M.P. was imprisoned by Parliament in August 1643 for supporting Saltmarsh’s assertion that the destruction of the
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Stuart monarchy was preferable to the destruction of the nation. Newsbooks frequently asserted that Saltmarsh had betrayed the Hothams, and scurrilously speculated on the price of his double-dealing.

With an unbroken lineage and direct succession from father to son stretching back to the twelfth century, 'a genealogical feat almost without parallel', the Hothams' concept of honour understandably stressed their noble blood and pedigree. Richard Cust has recently argued that for some gentry, the length of their lineage was 'a crucial gauge of honour', and the Hothams probably believed that the continuity of their lineage was a sign of divine favour which proved their virtue. Consequently, they were extremely sensitive to any act that could be interpreted as disrespectful towards them. As early as 1615, the future Sir John Hotham had fumed at the reordering of precedence on the Commission of the Peace which he felt had particularly demeaned him, and withdrawn to write a bitter account of the proceedings. This character trait became more extreme in later life, and was noticed by many observers. Sir John's speech upon the scaffold admitted: 'For other offences, as rash words, anger and such things, no man has been more guilty; I beseech God to forgive me.' Such scaffold speeches may have been conventional, but this acknowledgement would ring true to many. Bulstrode Whitelocke described him as 'high and morose', while Strafford commented that he was 'extreme sensible of honour, and discourtesies perhaps a little overmuch.' This is amply illustrated by his response to his
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son's arrest at Nottingham, writing indignantly to Parliament on 28 June:

There is nothing in the world, next to their duty to God Almighty, dearer to men of honour than their reputations; neither is there anything that falls out with more regret to them, than to have that violated by those whom they esteem their friends, and of whom, they conceive, they had just right to expect other dealings.104

At Sir John's execution, Hugh Peters informed the audience that Sir John wished to commend to them 'the vanity' of 'wit, parts, prowess, strength, friends, honour, or whatever else is merely of a terrestrial nature',105 for Sir John could not bring himself to express this calculated demolition of his self-regard, values and reputation.

Clarendon felt that Hotham's 'Pride and Contempt of the Lord Fairfax, upon whom the Country chiefly depended, hinder'd him from seconding, and assisting his Lordship.'106

By 24 April 1643, Geralamo Agostini, the Venetian secretary in London, was forwarding reports to the Doge and Senate that Fairfax blamed Sir John Hotham's failure to send reinforcements for his recent defeats.107 Indeed by the time of the battle of Adwalton Moor, Fairfax complained that he had not received gunpowder from Hull for nineteen weeks, a likely factor in his defeat.108

Seeking to portray his own change of allegiance in a more favourable light, Sir Hugh Cholmley alleged that during John Hotham's secret meeting with the Queen at Bridlington, he demanded £20,000 in money, a barony for himself, a viscountcy for his father who should also be confirmed as Governor of Hull for life, as payment for the Hothams to turn royalist. Continuing in this vein, Sir Hugh emphasized the self-interest motivating Sir John Hotham's allegiance, and correctly emphasized Sir John's concern over damage to his honour should he change sides without moral justification, a concern which was to leave him politically isolated:

he was a man that loved liberty, which was an occasion to make him join at first with the Puritan party, to whom after he became nearer linked merely for his own interest and security; for in more than concerned the civil liberty he did not approve of their ways. Some of his most intimate friends who often moved him to quit the Parliament and come to the King, found him very inclinable, making protestation, that he did but expect a treaty, when if the King should but offer that which was reasonable, and the Parliament not accept, he would desert them.  

Sir Hugh commented on Sir John Hotham’s temperament in later life as ‘so much wedded to his own humour, as his passion often over ballanced his judgement.’ However, Sir Hugh was hardly qualified to criticise on that account, for the Cholmley pew at Whitby ‘completely straddles the chancel arch’ in an ‘incredibly vulgar’ display of status. Cholmley’s father, Sir Richard, fought duels, quarrelling once over someone taking his stool in a theatre at Blackfriars, he also struck a gentleman in the court of Star Chamber. Sir Hugh, continuing this family tradition of violent assault in response to threats to family honour, struck down an insolent trained bandsman during the First Bishops’ War with his silver topped cane. He also claimed that he personally raised 350 horse for the earl of Newcastle, proudly boasting that they were the finest in Newcastle’s whole army.

During the 1630s, he had become the most influential man in north-east Yorkshire, with a large estate of 20,000 acres stretching from Whitby down the coast to Stoupe Brow, and as far inland as Littlebeck and Lilla Cross. Sir Hugh’s own description of his household indicates a man preoccupied with his status, and attached to the traditional values of charity at his gates, hospitality, and bell ringing for prayer. Writing before the Restoration, and hoping to protect the honour of his lineage, he carefully stressed that although his wife had been a parliamentary sympathiser, she died ‘a true daughter of the
Church of England. Like Sir John Hotham, Cholmley was a religious moderate who in November 1641 had disapproved of a clause in the Grand Remonstrance which declared that bishops had introduced idolatry into the church. During the 1630s, he had pursued his family’s conflict with the meddlesome Puritan, Sir Thomas Posthumous Hoby of Hackness, on one occasion openly arguing with him on the bench.

3:4 Religious radicals

Religious radicals were not influential in Yorkshire, but, predictably, they never hesitated in taking sides and five knights or baronets were conspicuous for their pre-war religious activism. John Alured of Sculcoates was among Yorkshire’s foremost religious radicals in 1642. In 1630, Thomas Shepard, a minister invited up from Essex felt Alured to be ‘a most profane young gentleman’, but after his marriage into the Darley family, his zeal for reform became evident. Becoming the patron of John Spofforth, curate of Sculcoates and later preacher to the parliamentary garrison in Hull, he allowed him a generous income. Alured had inherited radical connections as his uncle, Thomas Alured, was M.P. for Hedon with Sir Matthew Boynton in 1621 and 1628 consecutively, and had interceded for Boynton in his dispute with the Roman Catholic, Viscount Dunbar. In 1638, Alured was summoned to Whitehall to answer the charge of praising the Scots rebels in public, while his kinsman

117 Cliffe, Puritans in Conflict, p.45.
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122 Gervase Clifton testified on 9 July 1638 that Alured had said that the Scots ‘were brave boys, and would make us all quake... they would reform this land by a parliament as well as they have done theirs already, for the King would be forced to lay down his taxes by their coming into England’: J. Bruce (ed), Calendar of
Henry Darley was later to spend two months in York castle for plotting with them.\textsuperscript{123}

Despite his failure to take the sacrament, John Alured was tacitly permitted to attend the Long Parliament from 1 December 1640.\textsuperscript{124} Perhaps judgmental of the Hothams’ disregard for Godly reform, and resentful of their command over him, by 1643 he was noted for his distaste of them: Sir John recalled that Alured was ‘sufficiently disaffected to me’, and also ‘the first man that durst speak ill of mee publickly.’\textsuperscript{125} Alured’s religious radicalism was no barrier to Fairfax promoting him to colonel in the spring of 1643, a further sign of estrangement between the Fairfaxes and Hothams.\textsuperscript{126} Sir John Hotham was also unlikely to be impressed by the establishment of Yorkshire’s first Independent church in Hull that year, by Robert Luddington, vicar of Sculcoates, a kinsman of whom probably served in Christopher Alured’s troop of horse.\textsuperscript{127}

Perhaps Lord Fairfax’s closest confidant was his wartime secretary, Thomas Stockdale, a man with reason enough to resent Sir John Hotham before war had even broken out. He complained to Fairfax on 28 January 1641 of his maltreatment owing to Sir John’s ‘rigorous and undue proceedings’ in collecting Ship Money, although he conceded that ‘observing him now a zealous patriot of his country, both in point of religion and liberty, the edge of my quarrel to himwards is abated.’\textsuperscript{128} Yet Stockdale’s uncompromising Presbyterianism was detested by Sir John; Stockdale favoured the wholesale abolition of
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\textsuperscript{128} By then, Sir John Hotham had been committed to the Fleet for leading the East Riding’s opposition to Ship Money: Johnson (ed), \textit{The Fairfax Correspondence}, vol. ii, pp.226-7; Cliffe, \textit{The Yorkshire Gentry}, pp.316,318.
bishops, and the utilisation of their wealth to improve incomes for poorer clergy. Stockdale's Godly credentials won him selection to the Nominated Assembly of 1653. Sure enough, Sir John recalled during his trial that shortly after war broke out: 'I had uppon some discontent with the Ld ffairfax written a charge letter unto you against one Mr. Stockdail, by whom I conceive he was guided, and who I thought usurped more authoritie than either his estate or understanding in warre could challenge.' Subsequently, it is difficult to imagine Stockdale denying himself satisfaction at Lord Fairfax's appointing him to examine and inventory the Hothams' possessions after their arrests.

Sir Matthew Boynton and Sir William Constable were two sectarians very likely to support Parliament. Boynton had been summoned by Star Chamber in 1636 to answer charges that he had attended a conventicle at Colton, but showed his contempt by neglecting even to answer the summons. Owning the rectories of Barmston, Rudston and Bridlington, he sheltered nonconformist ministers in trouble with the church authorities, employed the ejected Independent Henry Jessey as a domestic chaplain, and in 1635, the Barmston churchwardens admitted that he had brought in Francis Pecke to preach there without a licence. In 1633, he named his newborn son Gustavus after the recently deceased King of Sweden and Protestant hero. The King subsequently granted him a licence to live overseas; so in 1640, both he and Constable were settled with their families
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in Thomas Goodwin's and Philip Nye's congregational church at Arnhem in the United Provinces. It is hardly surprising that the royalists snubbed him as a 'declared Anabaptist', but his influence and means should not be underestimated. In April 1642, he invested £1,000 in a scheme to recover Ireland, while his personal estate in money and bonds in 1645 was £2,600. Three of his sons became parliamentary officers, and his family led sizeable reinforcements into Lord Fairfax's army at crucially early times.

Boynton and Constable embodied the religious extremism that came to be so feared by the royalists. Constable became a regicide, and had he lived longer it is probable Boynton would also have been. Furthermore, they were dangerously closely connected to the Fairfaxes themselves; Boynton and Constable both supported Sir Thomas Fairfax's petition against the King raising a guard at York, while Boynton had attended a conventicle on Fairfax lands at Colton in 1636. Sir William Constable was married to Dorothy, the sister of Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax, who was not only a political ally, but on close enough terms to invite his 'brother and sister Constable' to spend the whole summer of 1641 with him in Yorkshire.

Sir John Bourchier, described as a separatist by Robert Ashton, had a father who was derided as a lunatic; and perhaps as a result of Sir John's extreme politics, many of his

139 Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, pp. 25-30; M.L. CWT, 43-01-05, A Second Letter of the Right Honourable the Lord Fairfax, of his late prosperous proceedings against the Earl of New-Castle and his Popish Army in Yorkshire (London, 1643). Sir Matthew Boynton reinforced Lord Fairfax with 130 foot before the battle at Tadcaster, and Francis Boynton brought in 40 horse and 500 foot shortly after; commission from Lord Fairfax to Lieutenant-Colonel [Matthew] Boynton, 18 July 1643, E.Y.R.O., DDCC/150/5; Colonel Francis Boynton, P.R.O., S.P. 28/7/473; Lieutenant-Colonel Matthew Boynton, P.R.O., S.P. 28/7/474; Major John Boynton, P.R.O., S.P. 28/265/369.
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141 Sir William Constable referred to Ferdinando as 'my honourable good brother', and also interceded in the negotiations for the marriage of Thomas Fairfax to Anne Vere: Johnson (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, pp.296-7, vol. ii, p.180.
fellow gentry viewed this condition as hereditary. Owed £2,200 by the Court of Wards, in 1633 he had the audacity to order the destruction of fences in a newly enclosed royal park, for which he was imprisoned for six months and fined £1,800. Strafford had resented Sir John’s ‘insolent carriage, it is his daily bread and the man is a little better than mad.’ Bourchier seemed to have a talent for making powerful enemies for ‘evil words and blows’ had passed between him and the wealthy Sir Arthur Ingram at Lincoln’s Inn. His striving for Godly reformation echoes through his letter to Lord Fairfax on 16 April 1647, pleading him ‘to stretch out the utmost of your power that the Gospel may flourish’ among the ‘ignorant and sottish people’ in ‘this your blind county’ of Yorkshire. He later joined Constable among the regicides. A cousin of Bourchier and another Yorkshire regicide was Sir Thomas Mauleverer of Allerton-Mauleverer, described by Thomas Gent as ‘one of those Black-Guards of Usurpation’, and more objectively by Cliffe as ‘one of the most zealous parliamentarians in Yorkshire.’ Mauleverer had worked with Lord Fairfax as a J.P., and had been prominent among Fairfax’s West Riding supporters in 1642, raising troops at an early stage.

A close neighbour and ally of these gentlemen was Sir William Strickland of Boynton, who also enjoyed close connections with the United Provinces through his Dutch wife. With a family tradition of campaign for church reform stretching back into the previous
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century, Strickland was remembered as 'a public professor of religion, and one that openly owned it, and that to the uttermost of his power sheltered and protected the strictest professors thereof.' Like Strickland, Sir Edward Rodes was among the more moderate Godly, committing no notable act of defiance before the war, despite his noted inclination to Puritans. Although brother-in-law to the earl of Strafford, he did not act against his Attainer. In 1642, he informed Lord Fairfax of how the people around Sheffield and Rotherham were 'specially apprehensive' of Catholic conspiracy, advising urgent action to allay their fears. Although he maintained close contacts with the Hothams, Sir Edward was held to have shielded persecuted clergymen, offering his house at Great Houghton as a sanctuary for them. His wife was later described by Oliver Heywood as 'a great upholder of meetings', and the family later became Presbyterians. In 1650, he procured the great friend of the Fairfaxes, Edward Bowles, to baptise his son in the new chapel he had built and maintained at Great Houghton.

3:5 Politically marginalised gentry
Parliament could also expect support from a pro-Scots faction. The royalist Sir William Pennyman referred to Sir David and Henry Foulis, Sir Thomas Layton, Sir John Bourchier, along with Thomas and James Chalenor of Guisborough, cousins to the Foulses, as 'the Scots faction'. Sir David Foulis, a Scot who had settled in Yorkshire during James I's reign, had been fined a staggering £5,000 and arbitrarily imprisoned for several years for his...
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disrespect of the earl of Strafford. Although according to Cliffe, the family were ‘never accounted inclined to the Puritans as such’, Sir David’s sons Henry, Robert and William were later all commissioned by Fairfax. Edward, Lord Loftus was another North Riding landowner who had suffered at the hands of Strafford, whose crippling decree had deprived Loftus of all his Irish estates. Under a commission from the earl of Essex himself, Loftus garrisoned Middleham castle for Parliament at a cost to himself of £1,500 a year. Sir John Meldrum, a Scottish officer instrumental in defending Hull during both sieges, replied to Charles I’s appeal for his support that ‘he had served him thirty six yeares, got nothing, and had spent two thousand pound.’ Sir John would be more canny with his money- and his allegiance- in the future.

Although Yorkshire’s Puritan gentry were never the foremost in pre-war opposition to Charles I and ‘Thorough’, as the war lengthened they grew increasingly committed to Parliament. As the war became more embittered in 1643, it was religious moderates such as the Hothams and Sir Hugh Cholmley that actually changed sides. Although there were suspicions about Sir Edward Rodes, there were no defections among the Puritan gentry. When Cholmley changed the allegiance of Scarborough’s garrison, Sir Thomas Norcliffe, brought up ‘a strong Puritan’ by Thomas Sugden, minister of Hayton, led his men out in
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disgust. Cliffe has commented that, 'To the extreme Puritan the parliamentary cause was a religious crusade or it was nothing.' The best illustration of this remains Sir William Fairfax's letter to his wife: 'For Thomas's part and mine, we rest neither night nor day, nor will willingly till we have done God some good service against His and our enemies.'
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CHAPTER FOUR
‘THE POPISH ARMY OF THE NORTH’:
THE ROLE OF ANTI-CATHOLICISM IN PARLIAMENTARY ALLEGIANCE

One suspects that if asked to list the enemies of God and the parliamentary cause, Sir William Fairfax would have put papists near the top. To many educated English Protestants, Roman Catholicism was an anti-religion; indeed, the Cambridge divine William Fulke went so far as to equate it with devil worship.\(^1\) This general attitude was widely shared in Yorkshire where English Catholics in positions of wealth and power attracted extreme hostility in moments of political crisis.\(^2\) Keith Lindley has emphasized English Catholics’ neutrality during the civil wars,\(^3\) and several recent historians, concerned to express distaste of religious prejudice, have portrayed the fears of parliamentarians as cynical propaganda. Michael Finlayson has condemned anti-Catholicism as ‘irrational paranoia’, to be compared with anti-Semitism.\(^4\) Yet despite John Morrill’s support for Lindley’s argument,\(^5\) significant Catholic gentry royalist activism has been established beyond doubt by P.R. Newman.\(^6\) Propaganda apart, anti-Catholicism expressed genuine and
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logical fears in Yorkshire, and its complicated manifestations require more serious analysis than that brought by impulsive condemnation. While even a fervent anti-Catholicism did not necessarily lead immediately to parliamentary allegiance, there can be no doubt that the parliamentary cause largely benefited from such prejudice, especially in Yorkshire. The location of anti-Catholic panics in 1641-2 at Halifax, Bradford, Pudsey, Bingley, Sheffield and Hull, all correspond to regions of strong subsequent parliamentarian activism.

4:1 The legacy of Archbishop Neile

One advantage for Yorkshire's parliamentarians when war broke out was that Richard Neile, the Arminian Archbishop of York, had introduced and enforced innovations which many felt leaned towards Roman Catholicism. Even future royalists like Sir Henry Slingsby felt Neile was drawing 'near to ye superstition of ye Church of Rome.' In 1629, Sir Ferdinando Fairfax felt England was already facing 'an insensible subversion of the religion now established.'9 Neile’s authoritarian church government provoked such resentment that episcopy itself was increasingly questioned, Lord Brooke remarking that episcopy was really the same as popery and that ‘Judas was the first bishop’.10 Neile had employed wandering commissioners to investigate churches suspected of dissent, with instructions to report directly to his Chancery Court, a marked departure from the more tolerant and relaxed tradition established by Archbishop Toby Matthew. Seventy out of the hundred churches so investigated coincide perfectly with parishes later known to have supplied substantial parliamentarian recruitment, either adjacent to Hull or in the clothing districts of the West Riding.11

Sheffield provides a striking example of opposition to Neile’s innovations. The

11 A. Foster, ‘Church Policies of the 1630s’, in Cust and Hughes (eds), Conflict in Early Stuart England, p.204.
churchwardens and Thomas Toller, the minister, had completely ignored virtually all of Neile’s directives to beautify aspects of the church building and service.\(^\text{12}\) This parish had one of the longest records of Godly preaching in Yorkshire, and in 1642 it furnished the local parliamentarian commanders, John Bright and Sir John Gell, with the support they expected. Again in March 1644, Bright wrote to Lord Fairfax imploring that if he were allowed to advance closer to the Sheffield area, ‘I doubt not to make a good addition to your strength.’\(^\text{13}\) In neighbouring Rotherham, another town later conspicuously parliamentarian, the vicar, John Shaw, wrote how Charles I’s bishops ‘deformed many churches with popish pictures and altars.’\(^\text{14}\) As early as 1617, John Crosse preached at Huddersfield that the sign of the cross in baptism was the mark of the beast in Revelation.\(^\text{15}\) The assertion made by Conrad Russell that long traditions of Godly preaching were common features in communities raising volunteers for Parliament certainly holds true in these cases.\(^\text{16}\)

By appointing the magistrates at Otley, and asserting the right to administer justice independent of the county institutions, Neile intruded onto the Fairfaxes’ estates.\(^\text{17}\) His attempts to gain more secular power for cathedral clergy in York alienated the city’s corporation. Not a single member of this body left a gift in their will to beautify the Minster, and yet many left money to support preaching in York’s parish churches.\(^\text{18}\) However, any chance of the corporation articulating these feelings into parliamentarian support was ruined by the King’s arrival in York, and later the earl of Newcastle, with the military power to

\(^{12}\) Ibid.

\(^{13}\) R. Bell (ed), *The Fairfax Correspondence: Memorials of the Civil War* (London, 1849), vol. i, p.83.


Tentative signs of disaffection from Neile's religious policies appear among sub-gentry groups. Oliver Heywood recalled, 'I can remember something of the warm spirit of prayer in those days... in the heat and height of the Bishops' tyranny over Godly Ministers.' On 13 March 1642, a riot in Selby church disturbed the minister, and soon afterwards, a local tanner called out: 'I care not for the King nor his Lawes.' By 1642, for many Yorkshire parliamentarians, the deceased Neile and his successor John Williams were firmly established confederates in a popish conspiracy: 'for it is apparent (to us here) the Bishops and loose Clergie, and papists, joyn all their estates, some openly, others underhand, to destroy our Religion, and to ingage a Civill Warre, and our Archbishop of Yorke is not the least guilty hereof.'

4:2 The Bishops’ Wars

Charles I’s failed attempt to force the English Prayer Book on the Scots intensified the religious mistrust from which parliamentarian forces would profit in Yorkshire. He appointed the earl of Arundel, widely perceived as the leader of English Catholicism, as royal general. There were Catholic priests observed openly living in the royal army’s camp as it lingered in Yorkshire. Even the King’s standard bearer, Sir Edmund Verney, believed that Arundel plotted to lead the army to disaster. A more distant observer, Gyorgy I Rakoczi, Prince of Transylvania, argued that Charles I’s religious policies caused the

20 Thomas Ayre, gentleman, William Parker, barber, and Thomas Grunnell, skinner were indicted. On 10 April, Paul Hammerton, clerk, and Henry Watson, cowper were also indicted: J. Lister (ed), West Riding Sessions Records: Orders 1611-1642, Indictments 1637-1642 (Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Records Series, 53, 1915), pp.364-5.
21 Ibid., p.367.
22 B.L. TT E107(30), Advertisements from Yorke and Beverley, 20 July (London, 1642), p.3.
23 The Catholic nobles Lord Herbert and the Marquess of Winchester were also present: C. Hibbard, Charles I and the Popish Plot (Chapel Hill, 1983), p.101.
24 Ibid., p.118.
conflict, and that the elevation of Archbishop Laud was a Jesuit strategy. If a Calvinist living two thousand miles away made this connection, it would not be difficult for Yorkshire Calvinists to do likewise.

The royal army grew unruly. Sir Jacob Astley refused to commit one Yorkshire contingent to the Newburn campaign, arguing they were unreliable to the point of mutiny. Two Yorkshire colonels were dismissed for lack of enthusiasm. Some officers dared not distribute arms to their men, while one allegedly Catholic lieutenant was murdered by his troops at Berwick. Secretary Thomas Windebank was nervous of the army's loyalty by June 1639: 'The generall voice proclaims peace... and nowe there is a strange doctrine spread in the campe and swallowed by the officers and soldiers so that it is time to make an ende of this worke.' Rumours that the northern trained bands in the royal army were mostly Catholic continued into the spring of 1641, and on 2 June three York aldermen were officially appointed to disarm any that they found to be papists. Sir Edmund Verney wrote despondently to his son Ralph that 'the poorest scab in Scotland will tell us to our faces that two parts of Ingland are on theyr sides, and trewly they behave as if all Ingland were soe.'

Lord Brooke and Viscount Saye and Sele were alone in refusing the oath of allegiance at York in 1639. Brooke questioned why English peers should take such an anti-Protestant oath and the following year he declared that the Personal Rule was an interregnum, secretly
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31 Ibid., p.180.
32 Fletcher, The Outbreak of the English Civil War, p.61.
33 Fissel, The Bishops’ Wars, p.33.
inviting rebel Scots to Warwick castle.\textsuperscript{34} David Scott has recently argued that the opposition of key Yorkshiremen to the war subverted the royal cause from within.\textsuperscript{35} At the centre of this opposition was Henry Darley, imprisoned by Strafford in York castle in 1640, rightly suspected of plotting with the Scots.\textsuperscript{36} Darley was particularly close to Brooke, and through his involvement in the Providence Island Company and Saybrook project he was linked with the earl of Warwick, Viscount Mandeville, and Viscount Saye and Sele.\textsuperscript{37} Darley’s brother-in-law, John Alured, was summoned to Whitehall in July 1638 to answer the charge that he had praised the Scots rebels in public.\textsuperscript{38} On 28 August 1640, the King was reduced to issuing Commissions of Array to raise forces in order to bypass Yorkshire’s militia colonels and deputy lieutenants whom he felt were in league with the Scots.\textsuperscript{39} A group of Yorkshire gentry were denounced as ‘the Scots faction’,\textsuperscript{40} and Scott points out that at least six Yorkshire gentry petitioners were closely linked to the twelve peers who on 2 September 1640, famously petitioned the King to call Parliament.\textsuperscript{41}

Conrad Russell's contention that attitudes towards the Scots during the First Bishops’ War are a useful indication of civil war allegiance has recently been questioned.\textsuperscript{42} There
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were 747 officers serving in 1640, and yet only 178 fought in the civil wars. The officers with higher ranks were more inclined towards royalism in 1642, but birth, patronage and comradeship in the Bishops' Wars were conceivably equally important determinants of officers' later allegiances as their religion and politics. Several future leading parliamentarians all exhibited anti-Scottish sentiment, and Scott concludes that hostility to the Scots is a surer indicator of future royalism, than sympathy to the Scots indicating subsequent parliamentarianism. Remarking that there was no connection between pro-Scotts activism and Godly zeal, Scott's otherwise excellent article neglects to assess the significance of growing anti-Catholicism in opposition to the King, a central factor when considered that the twelve peers protested about a 'great increase of popery.'

To stimulate support among the English population at large, the Scots distributed papers throughout Yorkshire declaring that Charles I was affected by his popish ministers who sought to bring back the Mass and break the power of Protestantism in England and Scotland. This propaganda exploited existing fears in Yorkshire, which had occasionally surfaced in legal prosecutions for seditious words. In 1629, John Maud of Wakefield was prosecuted in Star Chamber for saying that 'the King went to mass with the Queen; he would be provided with powder and shot; [and that there would be] another gunpowder blow.' In neighbouring Westmorland in 1639, Roger Moore was charged with saying that 'if the King should command him to turn Papist, or do a thing contrary to his conscience he would rise up against him and kill him.' John Troutbeck of Knaresborough was tried in the Assizes for claiming that the King could be deposed for breach of his coronation oath,
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and that they were 'as well without a king as with a king.' By the end of 1640, rumours circulated that Strafford had brought Irish soldiers to York to slaughter local Protestants. Such rumours were serious enough to prosecute those who spread them for sedition.

In January 1641, Thomas Stafford of Youlthorpe-on-the-Wolds, was charged with declaring at a local alehouse that 'the Kinge and the Queene was at Masse together and that such a Kinge was wourthy to be hang[e]d. Stafford was accused of singing 'God a-mercy, good Scot', a very well known pro-Scots ballad of the time:?

To play at boh pepe our Catholikes strive,  
Who lately with the Devill a bargaine did drive,  
The peace of the kingdome for ever to marre,  
To change our late plenty to famine and warre:  
But now 'tis believed theyle pay the whole shott  
When th'reckoning doth come, God a'mercy, good Scott.

Furthermore, it was alleged that he uttered that the 'souldgeares were all roges that came against the Scotes, and if it had not been for the Scotes, thirty thousand Irish had risen in armes and cut all our throtes. He hoped ere long Laslaye would be Kinge, for he was a better man then any was in England. Stafford's outburst not only illustrates distrust of the royal army but also the latent fear and hatred of the Irish in Yorkshire prior to the Irish
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rebellion. In less than a year, Stafford’s terror and hatred of the Irish was shown, in the eyes of British Protestants, to be well justified.

4.3 The impact of the Irish rebellion

By January 1642, the first Protestant refugees from Ireland arrived, spreading the panic with tales of horrific atrocities committed by Irish Catholics. Joad Raymond has emphasized that a shortage of reliable news of the rebellion stirred up powerful rumours and fervent imaginations, the impact of which through printing became immense. In this charged atmosphere, it is easy to see why Thomas Stockdale viewed the King’s attempt to arrest the Five Members as part of a Jesuit plot. A week later, Stockdale suggested to Lord Fairfax that a book should be published for the people detailing reports to Parliament of all the Irish rebels’ atrocities. Through anti-Catholicism, Stockdale aimed to instil popular support for Parliament in the event of conflict, writing to Fairfax: ‘I find that the daily resort of the distressed Protestants of Ireland who come hither driven from their habitations by the Papists, do animate the people here against the Popish party, and make them distaste them exceedingly, which is one good effect of many evils.’

Stockdale was right. The Hothams owed their success in raising the trained bands around Hull to widespread fears that because of the Irish rebellion, East Riding Catholics were arming themselves. Almost every existing account of members of Yorkshire’s middling sort expounding why they took up arms for Parliament use the Irish rebellion to legitimise their allegiance. Joining Fairfax’s army as an ensign, John Hodgson recalled ‘that
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noise of the dreadful massacre in Ireland startled many, and constrained them to whet their swords, and to prepare such instruments as they possibly could to defend themselves. Jonathan Priestley claimed that his brother Samuel went to war because of the Irish rebellion or ‘so most honest men thought in those times, when hundreds of Protestants were daily murdered in Ireland, and fearing the same tragedy would be enacted in England; so he went, and was with my Lord Fairfax about Selby and Tadcaster.’ Pamphlets highlighting the fate of Protestants in Ireland were abundant in York by March 1642, while the parliamentary fast days were linked to Irish events to bolster parliamentary support. Joseph Lister remembered the panic wrought when a man ran into Pudsey church crying that Irish rebels had landed and were already at Rochdale: ‘my pen is not able to describe the confusion and disorder of the whole congregation; some ran out in the greatest consternation, others began to talk to their friends, the women in general wrung their hands and wept, the children screamed aloud and clung to their parents.’ Predictably, this community later provided strong support for Parliament. Lister recalled his childhood expectations of being murdered by the Irish: ‘O what a sad and sorrowful going home had we that evening, for we must needs go to Bradford, and knew not but Incarnate Devils and Death would be there before us, and meet us there. What sad and strange conjectures, or rather conclusions, will surprise and fear make! Methinks I shall never forget this time.’ At nearby Otley, in the parish church of the Fairfaxes, David Ellison thundered out in defence of the needy Protestants in Ireland:

You christians in England, if you lend them not a lift under their burden you are never His friends nor any members of our Church forsaken: the feare of God’s church calls for it, and the state. In this the antichristian hierarchy are said to afflict England even more than Ireland and that, if the Church is not
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defended against them it will be deprived of public assemblies, bibles taken, children murdered and wives ravished.  

The threat from Ireland dominated the sermons at Otley, and Sheils has asserted the preachers there were soon preparing the congregation for armed resistance.  

The anxiety must have been excruciating for Walter Stanhope of Horsforth, who received a letter describing his son John's flight from his Irish estates at Lisnegarvey. A year later, the whole family were united in their support of Parliament, the younger Walter and his brother Richard both serving as captains under Lord Fairfax.  

In January 1642, a store of gunpowder was discovered in Bingley church in Derbyshire, allegedly laid by a group of four local Catholic gentry with the intention of detonating it while the congregation were within. The group immediately fled, and their houses were found to contain enough arms for one hundred men.  

Such episodes, however fictionalised, allowed Thomas Stockdale to muster local trained bands of the wapentake of Claro for his inspection and direction. He could now encourage local inhabitants to identify their interests with his, claiming the soldiers were necessary 'for suppressinge all unlawfull Assemblyes.' A week later, an uncompromising Yorkshire petition was framed in response to the Irish rebellion, requesting the disarming and 'securing' of all papists, the punishment of 'malicious delinquents', and the moving of the country into a state of defence, further declaring that those hindering relief to Ireland had 'reduced the former untainted Honour of this Nation to an Object of Scorn and Obloquy.'  

In this atmosphere, boisterous or drunken words could have grave consequences; during these events, another anti-Catholic panic occurred in Sheffield. On 11 February  
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1642, Sir Edward Rodes wrote to inform Lord Fairfax that Kellam Homer, armour dresser to the earl of Arundel himself, had been heard to say 'that before May day they should have such a peal rung in Sheffield as had not been heard these hundred years.' Homer was a known Catholic, so an inventory was made of all the arms in his charge, which were then removed to Sheffield castle. Although Homer pleaded his innocence, Sir Edward noted that local inhabitants were 'specially apprehensive' recommending urgent action to disarm recusants, and secure county magazines. Two months later on 13 April, public outcry against the Irish led to the execution at York of the Catholic priests, John Lockwood and Edmund Catterick.

The Irish rebellion was crucial for the parliamentary cause because it undermined potential royalist support. Richard Baxter wrote that 'the terrible massacres in Ireland, and the threatening of the rebels to invade England were the chief reasons why the nation moved to a state of war.' Both Clarendon and Baxter agreed that without the Irish rebellion there could have been no civil war, Clarendon feeling that Parliament would otherwise not have been able to raise many troops. The insistence of the Irish rebels that they were fighting for the King’s interests against a dangerous Puritan Parliament was terribly inconvenient for Charles I. Equally unfortunate was the escape of the Irish lords Dillon and Taaffe from London, and their swift appearance before the King at York shortly afterwards. Many royal advisers urged Charles to send them back to Parliament as ‘the parliament would press the scandal of sheltering them much to the King’s disadvantage; and any imputations of countenancing the rebels of Ireland found more credit, and found deeper impression with the people, than any other discourses of protecting malignants and delinquents.' Yet
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Dillon and Taaffe were allowed to remain. It is possible to see why the inhabitants of the clothing districts in the western extremities of Yorkshire were so fearful given the news that once Dublin had been captured, the rebels were 'resolved for Lankeyshire and have barks ready to waft over twenty thousand men.' These communities believed they were to be the first to suffer under the Irish sword, and soon displayed a new bitterness to English Catholics they perceived as secretly aiding the rebels.

4:4 ‘The Queen’s Army of French and Walloon Papists’

Despite his declaration of 13 August 1642, forbidding popish recusants from joining his army, the King wrote to the earl of Newcastle on 23 September:

This is to tell you that this rebellion has grown to that height, that I must not look what opinion men are who are at this time willing to serve me. Therefore, I do not only permit, but command you, to make use of all my loving subjects' services, without examining their consciences (more than their loyalty to me) as you shall find most to conduce to the upholding of my just regal power.

The King’s command to Newcastle to allow Catholics into his army was to be of crucial importance for that army’s developing character. One newsbook printed a report, dated 20 October 1642 at Doncaster, that Lord Fairfax had abandoned his treaty of neutrality and was once more raising men, ‘for his Lordship is certainly informed the King hath granted liberty to all Papists to raise Forces contrary to all his Majesties Protestations.’

With the Yorkshire royalist muster of 4 August 1642, local Catholics’ support for royalism first became blatant, especially in the mounted contingents. In his study of the Yorkshire gentry, J.T. Cliffe reckons 86 out of 242 Yorkshire royalist families had Catholic
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sympathies and connections. P.R. Newman has established that Catholics comprised a large part of the royalist command in the earl of Newcastle’s army. Identifying 97 out of 266 traceable northern royalist officers as Catholic, his findings support the claims of parliamentary propaganda. Referring to Yorkshire and the north as ‘the heartland of Catholic Royalism’, he points out that over forty per cent of royalist colonels in the northern counties were Catholic, and that the northern army employed 49 out of the total of 117 Catholic royalist colonels throughout the country. These Catholics were no ordinary soldiers, but held positions of power and trust, sometimes in command of thousands. The Catholic Lord John Belasyse was appointed Governor of York and commanded Yorkshire’s royalists from January to April 1644. Sir William Widdrington, the president of Newcastle’s council of war, was widely suspected of Catholicism. The first trained bands in Yorkshire to support the King were led by the well known Catholic, Sir Thomas Metham, and the suspected Catholic, Robert Strickland. By the end of 1642, Newcastle’s army was being described in monolithic terms as ‘the army of Papists.’

The Queen’s arrival at York in March 1643, with arms and soldiers from the continent deepened this Catholic flavour of Newcastle’s forces and broadly reinforced anti-Catholic prejudice, even directing it at a morally suspect Queen. Parliamentary newsbooks claimed she was forcing her co-religionists into commands held by Newcastle’s clients, one even declaring: ‘The Queen is the very president of the Council Table.’ In 1646, the dyer Thomas Beevers was tried for voicing such rumour; he had said that the king was a cuckold
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and that his wife had gone off to ‘Holland to play the whore.’ An anonymous letter among the Hotham papers referred to her lifeguards as ‘all of Walloon and Dutch’. Hatred in the West Riding for Henrietta Maria’s Catholicism outlasted the war. In August 1660, Richard Smith of Northowram was charged with uttering: ‘The King is a bastard and the sonne of a whore. I hope to see Lord Lambert Kinge.’ That same year, William Poole of Barkisland was tried for saying that ‘the King and Queen are now both come into England, and that wee should notheinge but Popery, as formerly hath beene, and that the Queen hath broughte a Pope with her from beyond the sea.’

A keen sense of their Protestant heritage, and their place in a wider struggle echoes through the uncompromising language of Yorkshire parliamentarians. John Shaw reminded his hearers of the ‘Egyptian darknesse of popery’, and how ‘God gave the beast a blow in King Henry the eighth his time; brought him on all foure in King Edward the sixth time; gave him a deadly blow in famous queene Elizabeth’s days, and still more and more doth (and I hope will) his head and homes and heart perish.’

We and all the world do know the Cruelty and Tyranny of that party that sideth with you, whose religion is founded upon blood, and holds it meritorious to destroy us... we adhere to your Parliament, rather than to You, seduced by Jesuiticall Counsell and Caveliers, and in these Resolves we will live and dye for Religions sake. And this lesson we learn’d of our fathers and Predecessours, who nobly and valiantly defended the good cause; and kept their Liberty of Conscience and exercised our Protestant Profession and religion, under the then Earl of Southampton, all the time of the Marian Persecution, when all the rest of this Kingdorne suffered Martyrdome by fire, under that Tyrannicall Queene, and Papisticall Bishops and Permitious Councellours: And we trust the same God who kept our forefathers from these dangers.

The most tentative comparison between their plight and that of the Marian Martyrs was high treason, and that these sentiments were even printed strongly demonstrates the breakdown
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of trust in Charles I’s religious regime. When William Styles, the vicar of Hull, was approached by Lady Bland to change his allegiance, he curtly reminded her that the royalists were an army of papists who would ‘without the immediate interdisposition of Providence, totally eradicate the Protestant religion in these Kingdoms and light up again those fires that had already consumed so many of its sincerest professors.’

The people of Halifax in their declaration of 5 April, 1643 defamed Newcastle’s army as an ‘Army of Atheists, papists, constreyned protestants & other ill affected p[er]sons’ who practice ‘such Cruelty, & barbarisme upon the well affected & religious Ministers & subjects as hath secretly beene observed to be used by the Turkes, & heathens.’ A further paper sent south to be printed in London impertinently suggested:

Wonder not dread sovereigne if wee partly believe that those come now to save us who in 88 & in the Powder plot would so cruelly have destroyed us... Blame us not wee beseech you to feare while we see noe contradiction appeare to Monsier de Chesu his booke sold openly for many years not in Paris onely but in London & read at Courte w[h]ich records your ma[jes]ties letter to the Pope promiseinge to venture Crowne & all to unite us to Rome again.

These were outrageously seditious remarks to make, providing further evidence of the collapse in trust of the King himself. Yet most of Bradford’s inhabitants would have sympathised, one resident reporting that the royalists’ ‘apparition was so terrible, as it affrighted many of the best affected persons out of the towne; and thereupon, out goes our Royalists to bring in the King’s Catholic army.’

Throughout the summer of 1642, tales of undisciplined cavalier raiding parties blackened the emerging royalist party’s reputation; the house of George Marwood at Nun Monkton, for example, was pillaged of plate and £120, and Mrs. Marwood was threatened with death and scorned as a ‘Protestant whore and Puritan whore.’ The capacity of Newcastle’s army to inspire absolute terror among Yorkshire Protestants should never be underestimated. Shortly after the Fairfaxes’ defeat, Nicholas Pearson, parish clerk of St.
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Mary's, Beverley, commented in the registers for July 1643: 'War in our gates... All our lives now at stake. Lord deliver us for Xt saike. Note this forever after to all ages to come.'

In June 1643, Sir Hugh Cholmley wrote to William Goodricke, a parliamentary captain at Wressle castle, advising him to quit the garrison as his father and Sir John Hotham had been taken. Goodricke's confident reply reflected his assurance that God was on his side, urging Cholmley 'to draw away with you those Protestants, whom you misled by fair and specious pretensions of being the KINGS friends, when indeed it is to be the popish parties friends; (with whom as this, all treacherous plots are hatched). The religious self-assurance that anti-Catholicism helped provide for some parliamentary officers could nurture in them the inner strength to fight pre-war friends. When the Fairfaxes' army took Wakefield by storm on 21 May 1643, a royalist regiment under the Catholic Colonel Lambton was trapped in the market place. A parliamentary officer present wrote to a friend in London: 'I was wea [sic: weak] at harte for a guid friend of ours Colonel Lambton and for his pretty Barnes, for he answered our Trumpeter he scorned Quarter.' Upon being ordered to attack, he recalled: 'In discharge of the imployment I undertooke, on my soul, I know it is mare for the guide of my dreade Sovereigne, than the Queen and all her Papists in her Army doe for him, I let drive at him [Lambton] and whewed [wounded] him soundly. In this case the Catholic Lambton, familiar to the writer, is an object of pity, and the writer's explanation for his ferocity illustrates how much easier it was to focus religious hatred upon strangers and distant figures, especially the Queen.
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4:5 Effects of propaganda

Lord Fairfax soon appreciated the value of condemning his antagonists as militant papists, answering Newcastle's declarations of 2 February 1643, with the allegation that there was 'more in them of the Jesuit than of the States-man or Lawyer.' He argued it was unlawful for Newcastle to arm recusants, never mind commission them as colonels. He informed Parliament on 26 January 1643, that among royalists recently captured at Malton and Guisborough, 'it is found that a great number are Papists; and indeed the Strength of the Enemies will be found to consist much of papists, and popishly affected; the Earl of Newcastle granting his Commissions for raising Men to Papists for the most Part.' In addition, he sent to Parliament a list of twelve commissioned Catholics in Newcastle's army, and claimed that mass was openly read in York streets. Parliament declared this letter 'shewed to the world...the raising of a Popish Army with an intention to subvert God's true Religion by Law established in this Kingdom and to introduce popish Idolatry, and Superstition, that it may appear that what was before an intention is now a matter of fact, and really put in Execution.' The declaration then referred to the royalists in absolute terms as 'Enemies of God, Piety, their Country and common Wealth.' With this judgement in mind, John Vicars readily praised Fairfax's forces for trapping twenty papists inside burning houses during the battle for Tadcaster. This propaganda was so worthwhile to radical parliamentarians because it enabled them to increasingly stress the war as a religious struggle, and so reinforce the allegiance of committed supporters. Even Clarendon had to acknowledge the power of such propaganda:

The imputation raised by Parliament upon the King, of an intention to bring in, or...of conniving at and tolerating, Popery, did make a deep impression upon the people generally...Their [the papists'] strength and number was then thought so vast within the kingdom...that if they should be drawn together and armed, under what pretence soever, they might not be willing to submit to the power which raised them, but be able
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to give the law both to King and Parliament.\textsuperscript{111}

Newcastle's honest admission of his employment of Catholics and his spirited defence thereof was unlikely to penetrate such prejudice. London newsbooks savaged Newcastle's arguments: 'This is your Lordship's ignorance or rather your Chaplain's malignity, for I read clergy Inke in all your paper... that an Army of Papists should fight for the Protestant Religion, and that to fight against a Parliament should bee the next way to defend the Lawes.' The author continued to demolish Newcastle's points:

That I have in my army some of the Romish Communion, I do not deny...
Of the Romish Communion, a very cleanly and neat expresse for so foul a businesse... the ever known enemies of our Religion and Lawes... what concord hath Christ with Baal?\textsuperscript{112}

Newcastle suffered much personal abuse from the London press. He was variously referred to as 'the Atheisticall Marquesse', a 'Semi papian and an Athisticall [sic] person, as was more declared afterward by that horrid crew he brought in with him.'\textsuperscript{113} Convinced by such opinion, John Hutchinson refused to surrender Nottingham castle to a 'papistical army led by an atheistical general', and his brother warned that if Newcastle wanted the castle, he 'must wade to it in blood.'\textsuperscript{114} Perhaps the Hutchinsons had read Francis Cheynell's recently published sermon which exhorted: 'And the Lord preserve this resolution in the hands of us, and all his people forever, that we may live like Saints, or die like Martyrs.'\textsuperscript{115} Newcastle was frequently charged with atheism, not just as effective propaganda, but also because many readily believed his arming of so many Catholics was so irreligious, that he must be an atheist.

According to Clarendon, parliamentary writers defamed Newcastle's army as the 'Queen's Army' or the 'Catholic Army' in order 'thereby to expose her Majesty the more

\textsuperscript{112} M.L. CWT, 43-02-28, Observations upon the Earl of New-Castle's Declaration (London, 1643), pp.6-7.
\textsuperscript{114} Trease, Portrait of a Cavalier, p.120.
\textsuperscript{115} B.L. TT E55(13), Sions Memento and Gods Alarum in a Sermon at Westminster before the Honourable House of Commons on 31. of May 1643. By Francis Cheynell (London, 1643), p.45.
to the rude Malice of the People, and the Army to their prejudice; persuading them that it consisted of none but profess'd Papists, who intended nothing but the extirpation of the Protestants, and establishing their own Profession."\(^{116}\) Clarendon was right. Joining parliamentary armies for anti-Catholic reasons rather than for the preservation of liberties and property appealed to those with little property to protect. With anti-Catholicism long inculcated in many of them by Gunpowder Treason Day celebrations,\(^{117}\) and with local Catholic personalities often likely to be their social superiors, the war appeared to offer them a possibility of bringing them down. Bulstrode Whitelocke reflected that the radical Yorkshire minister, John Saltmarsh, recommended to ‘cherish the war under the notion of Popery, as the surest means to engage the people.’\(^{118}\) Parliamentary anti-Catholic propaganda adopted a language that everyone could understand, and among a people who found the outbreak of civil war inexplicable, fantastical pamphlet literature found a ready audience. In ‘the Papists Petition to England’ of 1642, ‘the Devil’s Counsel to the Pope’ advised ‘to cut them off by some damnable plot, by your adherents among them confisicate their pernicious Parliament, destroy and put to the sword the principal men thereof, confound them in their devices by civil mutiny.’ Another boldly titled, ‘Trust a Papist and trust the Devill’, recounted news of a Roman priest’s failed attempt to force his lecherous intentions upon a Yorkshirewoman, whose forewarned husband and neighbours whipped and castrated him, the tract reflecting: ‘Were all Romish priests so handled they would say marriage were lawfull, and no more abuse other men’s Wives.’\(^{119}\) Propaganda such as this was far more likely to appeal to the uneducated than learned disputations over the controversy of episcopal government.\(^{120}\) In October 1642, in order that the people could be guided in discovering and legally prosecuting Catholics, a parliamentarian anti-popish
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\(^{118}\) Whitelocke, *Memorials of English Affairs*, p.68.

\(^{119}\) B.L. TT E135(20), *Trust a Papist and trust the Devill, or No wit to a Womans, February* (London, 1642), p.5.

handbook was produced in London, including special reference to the north. Indeed, Yorkshire was felt particularly vulnerable to the Catholic menace, especially the West Riding with its close proximity to expected Irish landings in Lancashire. Even without the Irish threat, Yorkshire Protestants could draw little comfort from the claim that there were more Catholics in Yorkshire and Lancashire than in the rest of England combined.

To stimulate support from anti-Catholicism, the London press could always rely upon the Irish. One pamphlet accused the royalists of Newcastle and Durham of harbouring Randall Macdonnell, earl of Antrim, and supporting his plans to raise an Irish army to invade Scotland. After falsely claiming that some of Newcastle’s regiments were entirely Catholic, the writer then reported that 500 soldiers from the royal army in Ireland, ‘many being papists’, had recently landed at Carlisle. A London newsbook of October 1642 announced of the Commission of Array in Yorkshire: ‘neither can it be expected unless their proceedings be curbed, that their cruelty and violence will be lesse, then the poore distressed Protestants have been sensible of from their barbarous and insolent persecutors in Ireland.’ London newsbooks increasingly focused on this perceived connection between Newcastle’s army and the Irish rebels: ‘our brethren of Ireland have suffered by the popish Rebells there, which we must also expect from these, if they be not timely and powerfully resisted.’

Cerlain Infornations of 17 July 1643, continued this tradition, detailing atrocities committed at the taking of Bradford by Newcastle’s ‘Popish Army’. They were accused of
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slaying women and children, throwing one child into a river, and not leaving a man in the
town under the age of sixty. This newsbook then reported ‘that most shamelessly they
stripped the women and maidens naked, and ravished and deflowered them.’ It called upon
the people for a ‘timely resisting of the perpetrators of these nefarious and abominable
actions.’

The London artisan, Nehemiah Wallington, viewed papists to be more barbarous
than Turks, recording with horror the story of the royalists capturing Leeds and raping to
death Lady Fairfax’s maid servant before slashing her body to pieces. Cavaliers came to
be known as ‘rutters’ in accordance with such perceived sexual excess, a characteristic so
closely associated with Roman priests that proposals had been made in Parliament to geld
them. In November 1642, one newsbook expounded in lurid detail how cavaliers
‘petronelled’ a kinsman of Lord Fairfax, then raped his two daughters and a dairymaid, ‘a
handsome lusty wench’, before the eyes of his widow while demanding she surrender all the
household’s money and plate. ‘God deliver us from the hands of such blood thirsty
Cannobals’, the tract reflected. This kind of propaganda appears identical to earlier
accusations against the Irish rebels; indeed, Nehemiah Wallington kept his account of the
‘most savage cruelties of Bradford and Leeds’ with an account of the ‘cruelties in
Ireland.’

Francis Cheynell’s sermon at Westminster on 31 May 1643 further appealed to
xenophobia: ‘let Papists have as little encouragement to stay in England, as strict Protestants
have had; let those men of iron entrailes, and brazen bowels, who are Spaniardized and
Italianated, I meane Jesuited, goe live in Spaine or Italy, such monsters are not fit for our
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Climate. A language of propaganda in which common images of brutality linking royalists with Roman Catholics and foreigners, and their behaviour with violence, rape and bestial conduct had become fully established. It was firmly rooted in 'the Black Legend' of English depictions of the Spanish from 1588 onwards as 'wolves, dragons and other malicious beasts', bent on infanticide, rape and cannibalism.

With the King’s cessation of hostilities in Ireland in October 1643, the identification of Newcastle’s royalists with Irish rebels was complete, occasionally instilling parliamentarian atrocities. When Cawood castle fell to Lord Fairfax and the Scots in 1644, the garrison ‘being mostly foreigners and papists’ were denied quarter. Lucy Hutchinson was chastised at Nottingham castle for tending a wounded royalist by the minister and parliamentary officer, Captain Palmer, whose ‘soule abhorr’d to see this favour to the enemies of God.’ Joshua Witton’s thanksgiving sermon in Hull for the victory of Marston Moor starkly illustrates the Black Legend’s presence in the demonisation of the royalists:

men of cruelty, men of bloud, men as yet not satiated with the bloud of the Saints, many of them forraign and savage beasts, in the shapes of men; others of them bloudy, obstinate and malicious Papists, who are glad to see the day when they are loosed out of their Collers, to worry such as have for many years kept them in by the power of good Lawes.

Witton was among Lord Fairfax’s favourite ministers, yet far from dehumanising them, the
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132 An influential text was that of the Spanish Dominican friar, Bartolome de Las Casas, first published as Brevissima Relacion de la Destruccion de las Indies. There were editions in English in 1583, 1656 and 1699. Outraged by the misconduct of the Conquistadores, he charged them with feeding live Indian babies to their dogs, along with many other atrocities: D. Cressy, Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England (London, 1989), p.122; W.S. Maltby, The Black Legend in England: The development of anti-Spanish sentiment, 1558-1660 (Durham, North Carolina, 1971), pp.17,48,54,78.


Fairfaxes strove to protect their Catholic friends, neighbours and relatives. Only as long as papists remained anonymous or distant, could such comments be made without reservation.

The high concentration of Catholics in Newcastle’s command could alienate royalist support. Lord Henry Spencer complained to his wife that whenever he urged the King towards peace he expected papists to threaten him, adding: ‘If the King, or rather the papists prevail, we are in a sad condition, for they will be insupportable to all.’ Propaganda appealing to the Protestant instincts of wavering royalist gentry was relentlessly intense:

in this miserable county of Yorkshire, where some not of the meanest Gentry have proved drunke with the Queen’s cup, full of Roman intoxicating spice, and have made a mad market-venture of their names, families, estates, bodies, souls only to preserve the Papists reliques, and the Prelates miters and damaske cassocks among us. 

William Bushell and Sir Edmund Duncombe both claimed they deserted Newcastle because of the Catholics in his command. Perhaps they believed Parliament would interpret their conversion more favourably if they explained it in this way. Apparently for similar reasons, Captain John Fenwick deserted Newcastle to join Fairfax. The motto on his standard read ‘For the King and the Protestant Religion’. Perhaps he felt these were no longer compatible with service in Newcastle’s army. One London newsbook enhanced the story by printing that Fenwick’s desertion was provoked by the boasting of Newcastle’s papist officers that they would have Mass established by Act of Parliament before they were ever disbanded. Given that the contribution Catholics were making to the King’s cause was extensive, there was naturally all manner of speculation on how they would be repaid, one tract predicting: ‘such are the ingagernents which the Papists boast they have laid upon him that a Toleration will not be recompense enough.’
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141 B.L. TT E250(6), The Reformed Malignants, Or A Discourse Upon the Present State of our Affaires, Betwixt a Cavalier and a Convert, 4 September (London, 1643), p.4.
However, anti-Catholicism did not always lead to parliamentarian allegiance, or even towards deserting the royal cause. Sir Henry Slingsby angrily condemned Archbishop Neile for edging too close to Popery, but never faltered in his loyalty to Newcastle’s ‘papist army’. Lord Savile, always declaring his loyalty to the crown, still condemned the papists in the royalist ranks: ‘I hate papists so much I would not have the King necessitated to use them for his own defence, nor owe anie obligation unto them.’ Even after his desertion to the royalists, Sir Hugh Cholmley did not soften his anti-Catholic temper; Jack Binns has commented on his ‘strong antipathy to papists’. William Vavasour, a Catholic royalist in flight from Marston Moor claimed Cholmley refused him and other Catholics sanctuary.

Similarly, not all Yorkshire parliamentarians were violently anti-Catholic. The missionary priest Edmund Catterick felt no danger in revealing his true vocation to the Protestant magistrate and future parliamentarian John Dodsworth of Watlas, who had married one of his relatives. Cross-confessional marriages were not unknown among parliamentary gentry. Captain Arthur Beckwith and Sir Philip Stapleton both married Catholics. Captain Edward Saltmarsh forsook his Godly background, married a Catholic and converted himself after the war. The parliamentary gentlemen, Christopher Percehay of Ryton and Henry Thomson of Esholt, both had pre-war Catholic backgrounds. Sir Thomas Norcliffe’s son and heir, Benjamin, married into the Catholic Fairfaxes of Gilling; a family enjoying the protection of Sir Thomas Fairfax himself, who even helped arrange a
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Catholic marriage for Viscount Fairfax's sister. After the war, Sir Thomas Fairfax's secretary, John Rushworth, was active negotiating loans to save Catholic gentry estates from ruin. Indeed, Barbara English has pointed to a general solidarity among Yorkshire landowning elites to protect the property rights of their recusant equals. After Newcastle's army was destroyed on Marston Moor, the threat of papists in arms began to lose its immediacy. Pre-existing ties of kinship and neighbourliness across the religious divide that were never entirely neglected in gentry circles, could now once more be fully re-established.

P.R. Newman has argued that the success of parliamentary anti-popery propaganda lay in the 'association of inherently seditious Catholicism with socially acceptable Laudian revisionism'. While the thrust of his argument is sound, it remains clear that there was a broad Protestant anti-prelatical consensus among contemporaries who would never consider Laud's reforms as 'socially acceptable'. Parliament was able to recruit mass armies not because people wanted to rebel, but because they were convinced the King no longer protected their religion. It is perhaps with the benefit of hindsight that Newman is able to comment that 'too many educated men, and not all of them Puritans or Parliamentarians, viewed the Catholic presence as a threat.' While parliamentary propaganda without doubt capitalised on anti-Catholic prejudice, it must be stressed how partial it would be to divorce ourselves from the very real fears and uncertainties felt by seventeenth-century people. Newman correctly stresses how the inexact usage of the insult 'papist' came to embrace and blacken the entire royalist party. Yet his moral judgement of anti-Catholic parliamentary attitudes as 'socially divisive, intolerant and verging on the genocidal', betrays a common tendency of those who wish to morally condemn anti-Catholicism to slip into language laden with twentieth-century overtones. The historians to whom J.F. Bosher refers as 'neo-Jacobite and Catholic', neglect to point out the shifting local contexts and determinants of anti-Catholic feeling. Particularly in Yorkshire, the survival of Protestantism was
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genuinely held by many to have been in doubt. Dominated by the greatest royalist army of the entire civil wars which was largely officered by Catholics, such fears begin to appear more understandable. It remains clear that Parliament, the London press and Lord Fairfax all agreed that anti-Catholic propaganda, especially about the Irish rebellion and Newcastle’s ‘Popish Army’, was extremely justified. Where Clarendon and Newcastle could agree with all three of the above, was that such propaganda was likely to win them widespread support among the middling and poorer sorts. The political and military cost of such support is the subject of the next chapter.
1: Anti-catholic panics and anti-royalist ‘club-law’ insurgency.

- Location of anti-Catholic panic in early 1642.
- Location of anti-royalist ‘club-law’ insurgency in 1642-3.
- Location of anti-Catholic panic in early 1642, followed by ‘club-law’ insurgency in late 1642.
CHAPTER FIVE:
‘THE RUDE MALICE OF THE PEOPLE’:
THE CLUB-LAW AND POPULAR ANTI-ROYALIST
INSURGENCY

Royalists and parliamentarians alike were well aware of the latent hostility to Charles I’s
government in the West Riding. Even before Lord Fairfax began recruiting there, it was
reported in London on 10 September that the earl of Cumberland was mustering horse to
defend against ‘any Insurrection in Yorkshire, and those multitude of Roundheads in the
West-riding.’ Already fearful of plunder and murder at the hands of Irish rebels, the
inhabitants of the clothing districts looked across the Pennines with fear as Manchester was
besieged by Lord Strange’s royalists. A letter from Manchester appeared in the London
newsbooks, alleging that Strange issued licences to plunder parliamentary sympathisers,
while sparing Roman Catholics. The alarm and rumours created by tracts reporting the
town’s plight would heighten anxiety further upon reaching the West Riding, one of which
exhorted: ‘O Englands Yeomen and Husbandmen looke to yourselves, for if you stand not
to it, as we of Manchester do, but be overcome, look forever to be slaves.’ Such
newsbooks were certainly available in the clothing districts; John Hodgson recalled how
‘Papers flew up and down in every place’, while Sir Marmaduke Langdale lamented to Sir
William Savile on 9 November 1642 that, ‘The Parliament is far too nimble for the King in
printing; the common people believe the first story which takes impression in their minds,
and it cannot be beaten out.’

Parliament responded to growing popular anxiety about Cavalier plunderers with a
declaration of 24 August, asserting that as the royalists were seizing trained band and
private arms in Yorkshire, ‘it shall be lawfull for any number of persons to Joyne together,

1 B.L. TT E116(32), A Private Letter, From an Eminent Cavalier, To his highly
2 B.L. TT E121(34), Weekly Intelligence from Severall parts of this Kingdome,
received from very good hands, 11 October (London, 1642), p.8.
Halifax (Brighouse, 1882), p.21.
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and to defend themselves and others from Rapine and Force.\textsuperscript{5} This was reiterated in a further parliamentary declaration of 10 December, which also claimed the royalists intended to ‘disarm the middle sort of people, who are the body of the Kingdome.’\textsuperscript{6} An argument to legitimise what was to happen at Bradford was established.

5:1 The defence of Bradford

On 18 December 1642, Sir William Savile led a large party of royalists to attack Bradford, and Lord Fairfax had the dilemma of how to raise an army solved for him. The royalist minister of Bradford, Francis Corker, had described the town as ‘a place very full and populous, soo verry factious and seditiory.’\textsuperscript{7} A long tradition of Godly preaching and the cruel effects of a biting economic crisis in the cloth trade had combined there to produce an environment exceedingly hostile to Charles I’s church and state. The inhabitants of Bradford had been molested by ‘the sudden conceits of the Archbishop’s commissioners’ as early as 1633,\textsuperscript{8} and during the service on 2 March 1642, twelve of the Bradford congregation assaulted the clerk.\textsuperscript{9} This potentially explosive atmosphere had merited the intentions of the vigilant Thomas Stockdale, writing to Lord Fairfax on 11 March:

\begin{quote}
I am sure you hear how they challenge the under-minister at Bradford to have violated it\textsuperscript{10}, because he useth the sign of the cross at baptism... but there the people dislike the minister. And lately, the churchwardens have with strong hand kept him out of the reading pew and pulpit, and will suffer him neither to preach nor pray, but put others to officiate in his place.\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

Perceptions of a popish plot among sub-gentry groups in this town, as recounted by Joseph Lister, extended to opinions that most Yorkshire parliamentary gentry would abhor:

\begin{itemize}
\item B.L. TT E114(7), A Declaration of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, 24 August (London, 1642), pp.4-5.
\item B.L. TT E129(26), Two Declarations of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament, 10 December (London, 1642).
\item G.W. Johnson (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence: Memorials of the reign of Charles I (London, 1848), vol. i, p.335.
\item The Protestation.
\item Johnson (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. ii, p.381.
\end{itemize}
King Charles the first... to say nothing of his own wicked disposition, did by the constant solicitation of the bloodie queen, together with the swarms of Jesuits and evil affected councillors, bishops, and men of great estate, place and trust, all put their heads together to destroy Christ's interest in this nation, and betray their trust everyway to the utter ruin and overthrow of religion, and to cut off the lives of the protestants, and so have enslaved this land to Rome, the mother of harlots; whose kingdom is established by blood. These things being so plain to be seen that he must be blind that did not see it. 12

There is a definite sense in this vituperative language that the crisis had been caused by public figures and wealthy men who the common people had been instilled to trust. Newsbooks detailing notions of clerical and papist conspiracies were already widespread in Yorkshire in the summer of 1642, and the opinions they nurtured were given final confirmation when local Catholic gentry began raising troops. 13

Royalist soldiers had been quartered in Bradford once before, and the townsfolk were uneager to repeat the experience. 14 They had recently witnessed Lord Fairfax's successful defence of their town against superior odds on 21 October, 15 so they built improvised bulwarks and earthworks around the town, and brought themselves into a state of readiness.

As the royalists approached the town, one observer recalled how the wealthier inhabitants fled, leaving 'not a gentleman to command us.' 16 An anonymous pamphlet published in London states that 'some religious persons of the parish, considering what danger might result from such cowardize and treachery... resolved to stand upon their guard.' 17 The royalists found the townsmen forewarned by their scouts: 'We blocked up every avenue leading into the town, sent out spies, and watched every move of the enemy, some of which lay at Leeds.' 18 This would indicate that the uprising was not completely spontaneous, but had been a contingency plan for some time. Eighty men armed with 'muskets and long guns' defended the church, where sheets of wool had been hung out to

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
protect the steeple. Other defenders were armed with 'clubs, scythes, spits, flails, halberts, sickles laid in long poles and such like rustic weapons... every man that was able to make any defence, provided himself with such weapons as they could best procure.'19 Three days after the rising, a letter was written at Bradford for the London press describing the episode, much of which was echoed later in the eye-witness accounts of John Hodgson and Joseph Lister:

The last Lords day 13. Colours came against us, under the command of Col: Goring, Col. Evers a Papist, Sir William Savill, Sir Marmad: Langdale, and Sir John Gothricke, a Papist, & c. They appeared in Barker End about 9. a clocke, when we had not in towne above 40. Musquetiers; planted their Ordnance in William Cookes Bame, marched down the Causey with their foote, whilst their horse coasted about the towne to hinder ayde from comming in, possessst themselves of those houses under the Church, and from thence played botly upon our Musquetiers in the Church till 11. a clock, about which time Hallifax men, and other neighbours came in to our help; the Fight before hot, was then hotter: our men impatient to be coopt up in the Church, rusht out, forced a passage into the foresaid houses, and there our Club-men did good execution upon them: thereabouts the Fight continued till it was darke... praised be God, who hath delivered those that were ordained to death.20

In attacking Bradford, the royalists ignited a larger insurrection which included men from Halifax, Bingley and the local townships. Isaac Baume brought the news to Coley chapel where John Hodgson was among the congregation at prayer. At the urging of the minister, Andrew Latham, the congregation took up arms and marched to Bradford as Hodgson recalled: 'many of us put our hands to the plough with much resolution.' At about noon, 'the firemen and clubmen' from Halifax arrived, and helped their Bradford neighbours clear the houses in which the royalists had gained a foothold.21 A party of clubmen from Bingley also arrived during the fight.22 Hodgson gives us an idea of the nature of the fighting: 'But we gave them no time; but with a party of club-men, or such as had scythes laid in poles, fell upon their horse on one side, and the musketeers on the houses... and had taken their guns but that we wanted a scattering of horse.'23 The violence reached frenzied
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20 M.L. CWT, 42-12-30, Brave Newes Of the taking of the City of Chichester by the Parliaments Forces under The Command of Sir William Waller... and of the maintaining of Bradford in Yorkshire by 40. Musquetiers against 1300. Cavaliers (London, 1642).
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23 W. Scott (ed), The Original Memoirs Written During the Great Civil War, being the Life of Sir Henry Slingsby and the memoirs of Captain John Hodgson with notes (London, 1806), pp.93-4.
levels in its intensity: 'Sir John Gothericke got a bastinado,' had his Horse killed with a
Syth.' Given that Bradford's townspeople were defending their homes, they were unlikely
to be in a forgiving mood. Ralph Atkinson butchered a surrendering royalist officer, thought
to be the earl of Newport's son, screaming he would 'give him Bradford quarter.' When
the royalists finally captured the town the following July, the earl of Newcastle initially
issued orders for the whole town to be sacked in retaliation for this episode, which
Parliament feebly alleged had only occurred due to Atkinson's ignorance of military
language.

The attack on Bradford occurred when all the town's trained bands and volunteers had
already left with their weapons to join Lord Fairfax. The royalists were repelled by a
civilian community, prepared to attack cavalier horsemen on foot, with no pikes and no
gentlemen leading them. Once a party of royalists routed, they even conducted a limited
pursuit. According to Joseph Lister, one royalist said afterwards 'no fifty men in the world,
except they were mad or drunk, would have pursued a thousand.' The parliamentary
propagandist John Vicars was not alone in perceiving the hand of God to be at work,
remarking that 'Our men indeed shott and fought as if they had been mad, and the enemies
truly fell as if they had been drunke... Was not the Lord Jehovah most mightily seen in the
Mount of mercies, to us and for us?'

24 A severe beating.

25 M.L. CWT, 43-01-24, The Rider of the White Horse and His Army (London,
1643).

26 J. Lister, 'A Genuine Account of the Sore Calamities that befell Bradford in the
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Parliament on behalf of the town, appealing to the religious sensitivity of many of the members, stressing how 'in which victory the hand and power of GOD was most evident, the Town being open on all sides, and of itself not defensible.'

5:2 The significance of club-law

Bradford swiftly became a national symbol for popular defiance of the royalists. With a dearth of other good news at this time, Bradford's resistance was invested with herculean status. The London press celebrated that 'the inhabitants of Bradforth and Halifax have united themselves and raised some thousands of men, whereof many of them are for the old Club Law,' and that they doe so hunt and pursue the Earle of Newcastle's Souldiers, and so intrap them in every corner that they have no quiet or safety in any place.' The same tract reported that in Berkshire the royalists returned cloth they had plundered from the western clothiers only in order 'to keepe thousands of poore People that have no other lively-hood but by clothing, from rising against the Cavahers in those parts, and giving them such club Law as their fellows received in Yorkshire.' Another London newsbook even proposed that the entire kingdom should rise up and execute 'Bradford Club Law' upon the cavaliers:

that when the Kingdome may know it, and be animated presently to rise and execute Bradford Club Law upon the Cavaliers, and every county adjacent to send their young men with Clubs, Sythes, Forkes, Flayles, to assist the Army and the Trained Bands, and to march to Oxford, or elsewhere, and all the counties that environ it, and there to demand of the Cavaliers to deliver his Majestie or not to spare a man of them.

This was a daring declaration indeed as it set the dangerous precedent of the common people being foremost in executing judgement upon their social betters. The people of Bradford, Halifax and Bingley had risen without gentry leadership, and it was well known

31 M.L. CWT, 43-01-05, A Second Letter from the Right Honourable the Lord Fairfax, of his late prosperous proceedings against the Earl of New-Castle and his Popish Army in Yorkshire (London, 1643); Lords Journals, vol. v, p.527.

32 The dictionary definition of club-law is: 'The use of a club to enforce obedience; physical force as contrasted with argument; law or rule of the physically stronger.' The term was in print as early as 1597 and 1612: J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner (eds), The Oxford English Dictionary (2nd edn., Oxford, 1991), vol. iii, p.369.


that trade in these towns was so seriously depressed that a subsistence crisis was developing. The same newsbook went on to calculate that 31,000 clubmen could be raised in southern England, and that by supplementing Parliament's field armies they would render them numerically unstoppable. Another entertained unrealistic expectation that similar 'club' forces to those that had forced Prince Rupert's temporary retreat before Cirencester could actually win the war for Parliament. John Vicars gave more attention to the fighting at Bradford than the battle of Edgehill, and when Devon clubmen defeated Cornish royalists at Modbury, he hailed them as 'imitating their brave Bradfordian brethren in the North.'

The people were repeatedly exhorted to rebel against their social betters in contemporary newsbooks and sermons, provided that these social betters were identified as royalists. A tract reporting the siege of Manchester pointed out how 'many of the chiefe of our Towne' had deserted to the royalists, just as those at Bradford had done, boldly declaring:

For encouragement rested onely in the breasts of a company of poore despised Christians, who with our Towne, our poore Manchester, ingaged themselves against the mightie ones of our Countie; For, ought I can learne there was not one Gentleman of Eminancy, Knight or Lord, throughout our Shire, nor any eminent man of note, but either in person or best assistance he was against us.

This rhetoric betrays the language of Stephen Marshall's influential sermon 'Meroz Cursed'; frequently preached in 1642, it detailed how the 'mighty do frequently oppose the Lord... The Lamb's followers and servants are often poor and off scouring of the world, when Kings and captains, merchants and wise men, give all their strength to the Beast.' The future Quaker, William Dewsbury, joined Fairfax's army in 1642 after hearing Robert Todd thunder 'Curse ye meroz, because they came not to the help of the Lord against the mighty', at Saint

---

39 B.L. E121(45), *A true and exact Relation of the several passages at the Siege of Manchester, 25 September- 4 October* (London, 1642), p.9.
It was not long before ‘Bradford club-law’ became a slogan for bellicose parliamentarians, and the pivotal issue in the emergence of the army of the Fairfaxes. Bradford’s success put Lord Fairfax in a dilemma; could he afford to be identified with what was now without doubt, an armed rising precipitated by sub-gentry groups? In a world where the gentry had long since withdrawn from armed political demonstration in alliance with the common people, it would be very difficult for him to continue his allegiance to Parliament. Earlier that year, John Hutchinson had attracted enough criticism through using mob violence to defeat royalist attempts to secure the powder magazine at Nottingham. If Fairfax were to encourage this more serious popular rising, he would risk alienating his social peers, and in the event of Parliament’s ultimate defeat he would undoubtedly suffer as one of the crown’s most dangerous enemies. A letter of Lord Fairfax’s, dated 29 December 1642, indicates he had little time to deliberate his course of action: ‘With this defeat the enemies are so enraged, as they threaten revenge to Bradford; whereupon the Bradford men sent to me for succour, of men and armes; and I have sent my son and Sir Henry Fowles to meet them with three Troops of Horse, and 120 Dragooners.’ He probably sent Sir Thomas with instructions to assess the demeanour of these recent allies before making any decisions.

Sir Thomas Fairfax’s arrival in Bradford inspired people to join the club-law insurgents, and was the cause of increasing discomfort to royalist sympathising gentlemen in Leeds. Among them was Richard Richardson of North Bierley, who owned several houses in Bradford and was understandably fearful for his property. He was later charged with lamenting in a Leeds alehouse that ‘he feared all yt were of the King’s p[ar]ty would

---


43 M.L. CWT, 43-01-05, A Second Letter from the Right Honourable the Lord Fairfax, of his late prosperous proceedings against the Earl of New-Castle and his Popish Army in Yorkshire (London, 1643).

be undone'. He had already paid Sir Thomas Fairfax fifty pounds for his release from confinement in Cawood castle, when it was later alleged that he 'acquainted Sir Wm Savile in what danger his & all the King's friends were by the parliamentary forces in Bradford & desiring him to rise up with his forces to Bradford'. Sir William did indeed have cause to worry; between 1619 and 1651 there was a four-fold increase in the rents demanded on his family's twelve Yorkshire manors, and from 1640 to 1642, his deer parks at Bradfield and Brearley both suffered from well armed plebeian poachers. His house at Thornhill was soon to be razed by the clubmen to wreak vengeance on him. On 31 December, under the supervision of Sir Henry Foulis, they paid an uninvited visit to another of his manors, Robert Page's house at Emley, 'whence they took away rich hangings, Carpetts, furniture for beds it belonging to Sir William Savile worth 1000li pillaged most of these goods in the house, that night retreated back to Almondburie, and after towards Bradford.' The forces unleashed by the club-law were challenging law and order in a way perceived by the majority of gentry as far more dangerous than cavalier gentlemen plundering their social inferiors. Allowing sub-gentry groups to plunder their betters like this undermined respect for an ordered society; the parliamentary activists at Halifax even granted themselves the right to confiscate the property of anyone who disagreed with them, declaring on 5 April, 1643:

And because our poverty cannot support an Army with pay to effect this religious and loyal act, Wee do further declare that whosoever shall adhere to theise or enemies, or shall give them any manner of assistance, or shall refuse to associate, & joyn with us in this our religious designe, Our resolution is to make use of their estate to satisfy & pay our soldiers.

One such episode occurred at Emley on 21 January when 1,000 newly raised clubmen and soldiers came to plunder the parson Mr. Farrington of 55 sheep, his books and many other goods. Ralph Assheton recorded how his neighbour Robert Hare 'suffered most losse his bonds and evidences were torn in pieces et many deere kil[le]d in the parke'. Although far

45 P.R.O., S.P. 28/249.
from an active royalist, Assheton himself was molested by 200 men of this party led by the professional soldiers Captains Birkett and Bamford, who had recently arrived from London and Ireland respectively. Promising only to take arms, they nevertheless requisitioned all his horses, seized much of his plate and carried him prisoner back to Emley.  

Ann Hughes points out that 'gentlemen were not accustomed to being ordered to relinquish their property in this fashion.' Even after a friend had interceded with Sir Thomas Fairfax himself, the soldiers could only be prevailed upon to restore a fraction of his losses. Gentry discomfort grew still further when 300 royalist cavalry sent out from Wakefield to subdue these men were humiliatingly repelled. On 25 January, two days after the recapture of Leeds, Robert Shaw, a gentleman of Ardishaw, was frightened into overcoming his royalist sympathies to lend £500 upon the propositions to Sir Thomas Fairfax.

Sir Thomas Fairfax soon recognised the potential for massive recruitment from the inhabitants of the populous West Riding cloth towns, some of whom claimed in one petition that the King’s followers advised him to ‘tread downe your poor people, & judge us as your enemies’. The majority of the wealth of parliamentary sympathisers lay in the towns of Leeds and Wakefield which were currently being drained by the royalists, and the younger Fairfax’s ambition to capture them with his new allies reverberates through the letter that was to change the entire character of the Fairfaxes’ army:

These parts grow very impatient of our delay in beating them out of Leeds and Wakefield, for by them all trade and provisions are stopped, so that the people in these parts are not able to subsist, and indeed, so pressing are these wants, as some have told me, if I would not stir with them, they must rise of necessity themselves... and to raise the country to assault the enemy, I would not do it without your Lordship’s consent, being only commanded to defend the parts from them. I desire, with all speed, this bearer may bring us your Lordship’s resolution. I am sure I shall have above six hundred muskets, if I summons the country to come in, besides 3000 and more with other weapons, that would rise with us. If your Lordship please to give to me the power to join with the readiness of the people, I doubt not but, by God’s assistance

---

Lord Fairfax responded within a week by sending Sir William Fairfax with officers, arms, horse and dragoons to recruit for his regiment in the clothing districts. Sir Thomas Fairfax’s estimates of muster strengths were not wildly optimistic. Anti-royalist insurgency spread through the West Riding; parochial gentlemen and members of the middling sort led small groups to join him. On 17 January, one such group came to Howley; Elizabeth Cade of Woodkirk recalled:

Last night about twylight 250 foot and horse came to Howley, Lord Savile’s house, and that William Birkby and Michael Middlebrow, my Lord’s chief servants, did entertain them, and the three principal men that came with them were the Greatheads, and they that went to fetch them were Richard Burnely, William Sparlinge, and Richard Scott, all being my Lord Savile’s tenants; and Nicholas Greathead said to one Rose, an old servant to the house, that my Lord was now turned to their side. Savile could well complain that it was ‘well known to all Yorkshire that many of his tenannts and of other men’s are favourers of that cause, and doe pay even his rents to the enmyes, which surely none will believe to be done with his consent; but to say the truth, there are few in the West Riding (my Lord of Cumberland’s tenants not excepted) who doe not in this case play the knaves.’ Lord Savile had invited unpopularity in 1638 when he attempted to enclose land on the highway from West Ardsley to the clothing towns of Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield and Birstall; he subsequently suffered plebeian poaching and robbery on his estates at Lindle Hill and New Park, Wakefield. His mansion at Howley was turned into a parliamentary garrison by Sir John Savile of Lupset, the majority of whose men ‘were raw soldiers, menial servants, and volunteers out of the clothing district... without cannon and

56 R. Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence: Memorials of the Civil War (London, 1849), vol. i, p.33.


Joseph Bannister, a Halifax bailiff, probably led men into Sir Thomas Fairfax’s army at this stage also, and was later captured at Seacroft Moor. James Nayler, famous for his central role in a blasphemy trial of 1656, but in 1643 merely a yeoman of Woodkirk, rode in with his brothers and played a prominent role as a dragoon in the subsequent ‘liberation’ of Leeds on 23 January. The role of the clubmen in this action was enthusiastically reported: ‘so resolute and valiant were the Bradford men, with their Clubs and Forks, that they stormed the Town on the one side, whilst Sir Thomas Fairfax and his Musketeers stormed the other side, which as soon as the Popish Cavilleers perceived, and felt the sadness of the Club, cryed for quarter: the Townsmen crying a Fairfax, a Fairfax.’

The day before the recapture of Leeds, the club-law broke out in Rotherham. The townsfolk had already been frightened at the prospect of being plundered when Sir Edward Rodes’s house at nearby Great Houghton had been sacked by royalists the previous September; their vicar, the staunchly parliamentarian John Shaw, reminded them ‘how God threatened us Sep 11th, 1642: what a heavie Sabbath wee then kept’. The royalist horse and dragoons encountered similar resistance here to that at Bradford, described in the London press as an ‘Ambuscado of 60 Musquettiers who fired upon them so that divers fell and the rest run away.’ John Shaw recalled the episode, ever reminding listeners ‘what God did for us, Jan. 22nd, 1642’: On the two and twentieth of January, being the Lord’s day, the people being at church... betwixt ten and eleven of clock, about the middle of the sermon, suddenly came betwixt six and seven hundred cavaleers,

62 P.R.O., ASSI 45, 2/2/22.
63 The meaning of ‘sadness’ in this context is likely to be ‘firmness, hardness, solidity’: Simpson and Weiner (eds), The Oxford English Dictionary, vol. xiv, p.353.
with muskets, dragoons, & c... but being through God's mercy discerned ere they got to the towne end, and with the rumour of it the people in the church much affrighted... about 24 or 25 men got muskets, and without order, rank, file, or almost any skill (save only that God taught their hands to war and their fingers to fight), these few boldly and courageously resisted all that great company a full houre and halfe, so that bullets flew exceeding sharply and thick in the streets and in the end (though scarce any powder left) slew and wounded many, and drove the rest away.68

Once again the royals tried to ride into a parliamentarian sympathising town on the Sabbath, and once more they were defeated by poorly armed civilians rallying to their church and defending their homes from the threat of plunder. The town only surrendered in May, after all its powder had been spent, and its inhabitants, including schoolboys, had been drawn into the defence.69

A similar process of insurgency occurred at Penistone. After having been refused aid by Sir Thomas Fairfax,70 the inhabitants of the area had risen in arms regardless. The royalist Sir Francis Wortley was the detested figure of this locality.71 Most of the cases of deer stealing in the West Riding centred on Wortley Park, and he had suffered much verbal abuse in the Quarter Sessions from a wide cross section of sub-gentry social strata.72

---

68 Ibid., pp.127-8.
69 Ibid., p.27n.
70 Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, p.44.
72 Areas most affected by poaching were all owned by later royalists: the Queen's forest at Knaresborough, the earl of Cumberland's Girswood Park, the Archbishop of York's park at Sherburn, Sir William Savile's parks at Brearley and Bradfield, Sir John Reresby's park at Thrybergh, and most notorious of all, Sir Francis Wortley's New Park at Wortley. A town was levelled in the reign of Henry VIII by Sir Thomas Wortley to make way for this park, an act well remembered by local people a century later, whose sentiments the pedlar Thomas Beale voiced at the Quarter Sessions, declaring he 'cared not a fart for Sir Francis Wortley'. The yeoman James Parkin added at Rotherham: 'I scome Sir Francis Wortley's proposition with my arse, and I worshipp him with my arse.' Considering the scale of removal of deer from his park by organised gangs, Sir Francis Wortley can hardly have been popular with the local people, whose deliberate destruction of his property could be regarded as an act of 'havoc'. Roger Manning has concluded that deer stealing and organised poaching can be seen as a 'less confrontational and more controlled alternative to full scale rebellion', so therefore, when war broke out some parliamentary sympathisers in this area would have a background of 'martial values and habits of organized violence which must have made the transition to war and the resort to arms more acceptable in 1642': Lister (ed), West
Already infamous for having plundered the Moorlanders of north Staffordshire in November 1642, a locality which Ronald Hutton points out 'harboured a thriving plebeian population', it was feared he intended to visit Penistone next. Led by three of their parochial gentry, they even procured artillery, using their church as a garrisoned strongpoint just as at Bradford and Rotherham. One of their number, described as a husbandman as recently as 1641 at the Wakefield Quarter Sessions, was even commissioned as a lieutenant, while another was to travel to London to witness the King's execution. The striking capacity of the Godly to organise such sub-gentry support in so remote and desolate a region was reflected in their impressive petition they forwarded to the Committee for Compounding; they condemned their minister for his royalist sympathies and boring sermons, and established trustees to receive sequestration money to support their new minister. Indeed, the neighbouring inhabitants of Almondbury and Kirkburton as well as Penistone were held to favour Parliament so hotly that the earl of Newcastle was compelled to send detachments from Wakefield to keep law and order. In response to an order from Lord Fairfax, the township of Holmfirth provided 100 musketeers for Parliament's service, and later claimed to have suffered the plunder and burning of their homes in retribution.
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74 William Rich of Bullhouse, Adam Eyre of Haslehead, George Shirt of Cawthorne, men of known Godly reputations, were later all commissioned as captains by Lord Fairfax.


78 Eyre, 'A Dyurnall or Catalogue of all my Accions', p.19.

79 D.F.E. Sykes, Huddersfield and Its Vicinity (Huddersfield, 1898), p.175; T. Dyson, The History of Huddersfield and District (Huddersfield, 1932), pp.331,335;
The resistance of these West Riding towns, inspired by the successful defence of Manchester, all indicate how strongly the frame of mind of the inhabitants identified cavaliers as plunderers. Anti-royalist activism and defence of their property were perceived as the same thing. Parliamentary newsbooks were sensitive to these feelings, reporting a week after the club-law at Bradford that the towns around Halifax:

stand upon their guard to defend each other, so that there is no doubt that County will hold together better than it has done, for they daily said, that if they submit to the merciless cruelty of the Popish Army, they shall not only lose their Religion, which is to be prized in the first place, but all they have besides.  

'Bradford club-law' had provided the Fairfax leadership with a fait accompli that dictated their next move. At the end of March, Lord Fairfax decided to abandon his quarters at Selby, a place he had spent months fortifying, to march to Leeds to join with 'the readiness of the people'. Considering that the clubmen would not leave their homes unguarded from punitive royalist raids, they were unlikely to join him at Selby. Fairfax's decision was even more controversial because he deliberately disobeyed Parliament's order of 9 March, which commanded him to march into the East Riding to the aid of John Hotham. Parliament's majority apparently desired Fairfax to prosecute a limited defence of the East Riding. Significantly, this order was not sent by the earl of Essex, but by the Committee of Safety, a body perhaps more supportive than Essex had been towards Fairfax over disputes with the Hothams. Perhaps there was misplaced confidence that Fairfax would more readily obey the committee's order, but in any case he disobeyed the order, choosing to act on his own, or rather the people's initiative.

That Lord Fairfax gave Sir Thomas his approbation was vital for the whole parliamentary party in Yorkshire. The family could now give their name, status, wealth and power to a campaign with maximum popular backing. As a consequence of this decision, their army would achieve some fame and success early in 1643, contrasting sharply with other popular anti-royalist insurgency elsewhere in the kingdom. Gloucestershire's leading parliamentary gentry failed to support their countrymen's spontaneous uprising after Prince

---


Rupert sacked Cirencester. Rupert sacked Cirencester. The parliamentarian common soldiers captured in the town lamented that their gentry and ministers had 'undone them.' The Mooralanders of Staffordshire, again with no gentry leaders, were forced to abandon their attempt to capture Stafford after both Sir William Brereton and Sir John Gell refused them aid. A rising at Lewes of up to 400 men also crumbled because no gentleman would lead them. Yet the radical nature of the Fairfaxes' activities is once again set in context by the zealous Lord Brooke who at this time was prosecuting the parliamentary cause in Warwickshire with policies that would probably have made even them hesitate.

In September 1642, the royalist earl of Cumberland had failed to raise the trained bands of Halifax, being greeted with acclamations of 'A Fairfax, a Fairfax, they would live and die with a Fairfax!' This ready identification of common people with the family name was highly unusual and dangerous. Outbreaks of popular violence against royalists such as occurred at Bradford, and in the Stour Valley in Essex, were almost universally frowned upon. The agent of the earl of Warwick, himself a staunch parliamentarian, commented on the Stour valley riots: 'so monstrous is the beast when it holds the bridle in its teeth... spoile and plunder was their ayme', adding that they had acted as if 'theire had been a desolution of all government.' The violence in Essex enabled parliamentary partisans to raise soldiers with the excuse that armed force was required to uphold order in the event of future

84 D.H. Pennington and I.A. Roots (eds), The Committee at Stafford (Manchester, 1957), p.lxii.
86 Brooke had held rallies for volunteers, with music and feasting. He allowed the rank and file to elect their company officers. In a county with an even smaller basis of gentry support for Parliament, he 'preferred militants of lower social origins to half-hearted gentry support'. A. Hughes, Politics, Society and the Civil War in Warwickshire, 1620-1660 (Cambridge, 1987), pp.125,140,149,152-3,168,228, 336,343.
outbreaks. In direct contrast, Sir Thomas Fairfax viewed the insurgents at Bradford not as a riot or menace, but as future parliamentarian soldiers. This is so important because constant royalist depictions of such uprisings as riots were very persuasive, especially to a gentry audience. After Birmingham's similar anti-royalist insurrection, the royalists derided the eventual commander of the town's satellite garrisons so successfully that even today historians refer to him as 'Tinker' Fox without any sound evidence of his real social background.89

All through January Sir Thomas Fairfax armed the common people, no matter what their status. Almondbury township was surrounded and dominated by royalist landowners,90 a consideration perhaps prompting Sir Thomas to instruct local constables to lead recruits to his muster there by 29 January.91 He must have looked forward to their imminent subjugation after his recent victory at Leeds. Among them was the distressed Lord Savile, who now faced financial ruin from the complete collapse of loyalty in his tenants.92 Considering that 11 out of 25 Halifax townships were Savile lordships, such widespread disaffection was a gift for the Fairfaxes.93 In October 1642, Savile paid John Hotham £1,000 for Howley House to be spared the pillage of parliamentary troops.94 It is easy to imagine his despair at the arrival just three months later of the Greatheads' motley array of vengeful clubmen from the districts around Bradford. Furthermore, his tenants profited

from such misfortunes and wasted his estate. It is hardly surprising he claimed many of them favoured the parliamentarians.

Prior to the capture of Leeds, Sir Thomas Fairfax even promised the entire town of Bradford ‘I shall furnish every man with armes befitting him that is unprovided for.’ The West Riding Quarter Sessions records indicate that access to handguns was quite widespread; even labourers were often indicted for poaching with them. However, Sir Thomas wanted more, and was prepared to use the danger of riot as leverage over his father in a letter of 27 January requesting ‘if your Lordship could send us more arms we could arm the country with them, for strangers being very restrained of their will are very mutinous.’ So even after the victory at Leeds, he had more men than he could arm, and he grew impatient for arms and action for his raw soldiery, recalling how ‘most of them were but inexperienced fresh water men, taken up about Bradford and Halifax, but upon the Saturday before.’

5:3 ‘The Rider of the White Horse’ and London polemic

The deeds of Sir Thomas Fairfax and his new army soon acquired a national audience. Yorkshire events were sufficiently far from London to retain an air of mystery, while stunning deeds such as ‘Bradford club-law’, and the storming of Leeds and Wakefield inspired exaltation from the London press. Published in response to the Bradford club-law, and the day after Leeds was taken, one tract hailed Sir Thomas as the ‘Knave of Clubs’, declaring, ‘If you will have the truth of it it is tom the Fencer, that comes cracking with his Club, as if he would knock downe all before him.’ The writer continued to extol the three Fairfaxes:

---

95 Ibid., p.425.
97 Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, p.36.
99 B.L. TT E245(18), The Knave of Clubs. Otherwise called, A Game at Cards, and Clubs Trump. Doe you not see the Knave turn’d up, 24 January (London, 1643), p.2.
Often ill informed, the London press placed ever greater and unrealistic expectations upon them. On 4 October 1642, when Lord Fairfax had scarcely 500 men, one newsbook claimed that he relieved Cawood with 10,000 foot and eight troops of horse. Another completely manufactured a major Fairfax victory just outside York in June 1643. Yet another referred to 'that famous and wonderful victory' at Bradford, adding 'Let us and our enemies both see it, that they may feare and shame, that we may trust and praise our God, who hath manifested himselfe to be the Lord of Hosts.' That this same publication elevated Sir Thomas Fairfax to the awe-inspiring 'Rider of the White Horse' in its title is perhaps an indicator of the possible apocalyptic expectations of some parliamentary sympathisers. One imagines that the Book of Revelations, chapter nineteen, verse eleven did not go unnoticed among the preachers and people of Bradford: 'And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war.' Francis Cheynell took up this theme, preaching from chapter nineteen of Revelations to the House of Commons in celebration of Sir Thomas Fairfax's victory at Wakefield: 'And I saw the Beast and the Kings of the earth, and their armies gathered together to make war against him that sate on the Horse, and against his army. And the Beast was taken, and with him the false Prophet.' The sermon was swiftly printed, with this quotation on its title page.

100 Ibid. Lord Ferdinando Fairfax, Sir Thomas Fairfax, and Sir William Fairfax, who was the son of Ferdinando’s cousin, but referred to by Lord Fairfax as his nephew.

101 M.L. CWT, 42-11-03, Most Joyfull News by Sea and Land, Being the true Relation of a glorious victory obtained by the Lord Fairfax and Captain Hotham (London, 1642).

102 M.L. CWT, 43-06-12, Another miraculous victorie obtained by The Lord Fairfax against the Earl of Newcastle at Barnham-Moore (London, 1643).

103 The Rider on the White Horse was a symbol of Christ’s victorious power, or even of Christ himself: F. Cook (ed), The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611), New Testament, (London, 1881), vol. iv, esp. p.572n.

104 B.L. TT E55(13), Sions Memento and Gods Alarum in a Sermon at Westminster before the Honourable House of Commons on 31. of May 1643. By Francis Cheynell (London, 1643), title page.
The contemporary attempt to market Sir Thomas Fairfax as the Godly’s answer to Prince Rupert survives in the popular perception of Fairfax today. It is such an attractive image that even some twentieth-century historians have been entranced by it, producing statements like: ‘He was quickly credited with almost supernatural powers... It was this spirit, this legend almost, which kept Yorkshire from falling during the early part of 1643.’

In an equally spectacular vein, Thomas May, a contemporary at Westminster wrote in reference to Sir Thomas Fairfax’s capture of Leeds in a snowstorm: ‘no season of the yeare, nor stormes of winter, could quench the rage of this Civill Fire.’ Such exaltation reinforced Fairfax’s conviction that he was God’s instrument of war. His constant modesty and humility made him very attractive to the Godly. He became so famous for these values that Mercurius Aulicus made him a target for their satire: ‘That Sir Thomas Fairfax has 20 Troopes of Horse and some Dragoones, but intreats supplyes of Money and Ammunition in such an humble way, and so reasonable are his demands, that it would move any heart to his supply.’ The New Model Army chaplain, Joshua Sprigge, wrote that Fairfax was a man ‘esteenýing nothing unfeasible for God and for man to doe in God’s strength.’ Fairfax himself attributed the most spectacular victory of his military career, at Wakefield,
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105 M.A. Gibb, *The Lord General* (London, 1938), p.40; C.R. Markham, *A Life of the Great Lord Fairfax* (London, 1870); J. Wilson, *Fairfax* (London, 1985); H.N. Brailsford *The Levellers and the English Revolution* (Stanford, 1961), pp.153,292. Brailsford referred to Fairfax’s ‘legendary bravery’, hailing him as an ‘Olympian figure... round whose name blazed a legend of invincible courage.’ A scholarly examination of the character, significance and politics of Fairfax has yet to be written because all three biographies produced to date have concentrated on his military exploits and gentlemanly conduct. Nowhere is there to be found so much as one substantial criticism of any unpleasant traits.


108 Sprigge too became obsessed with Fairfax’s image as a lowly and Godly general. He wrote that in combat, Fairfax appeared ‘more like an Angell then a man’, and that nothing promised the nation more happiness than ‘GOD’s giving us such a General, and so giving out himself to our General’: J. Sprigge, *Anglia Rediviva; Englands Recovery: Being The History Of the Motions, Actions, and Successes of the Army under the Immediate Conduct of His Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax, Kt. Captain General Of all the Parliaments Forces in England* (London, 1647), pp.42-3,321-2.
more 'to the effects of God’s divine power than humaine force.'\footnote{109} The London press thrived on such statements, quickly declaring that the parliamentary forces that stormed Wakefield had learnt 'to walk by Faith and not by Sight.'\footnote{110} Public thanksgivings were ordered, and narratives of the battle read in London churches.\footnote{111} In April 1645, many moderates were uneasy with his elevation to General of the New Model Army, and the House of Lords objected to 30 per cent of the officers he recommended for command. Despite not being personally involved in the bitter acrimony between the southern commanders, he was still identified as 'a man of known radical connections, who was regarded with suspicion by many', and 'imposed as the war party’s choice for commander-in-chief.'\footnote{112}

By 1646, Sir Thomas Fairfax was depicted as the 'Champion of England' in a broadsheet portrait showing him dressed in obsolete tilting armour, riding a horse prepared for the joust. He had now been romanticised in the same way as the earl of Essex had been four years earlier as the Protestant hero of the joust who stood against evil royal advisers in a Godly campaign against Antichrist.\footnote{113} Such a depiction of Sir Thomas was clearly nostalgic for the supposed glory days of Elizabeth I's aggressive Protestant foreign policy. The constant assumption in the letters of Sir Thomas is that God is responsible for all of his army's victories and in this he echoes Oliver Cromwell.\footnote{114}

The first parliamentary commander to base his power on popular appeal was Lord Brooke, and so it comes as no coincidence that on 8 November 1642, he was appointed to rally the citizens of London before the ominous royalist offensive. He told the people that the earl of Essex 'was not only General, but Common Soldier; for he led up his own

\footnotesize

\footnote{109} Fairfax, 'A Short Memorial of the Northern Actions', p.17.  
\footnote{110} *The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England*, vol. xii, pp.268-9.  
Regiment, he led up his own Troop in his own Person,' adding 'say not, I beseech you, I am not of the Train’d Band, nor this, nor that, nor t’other, but doubt not to go out to the Work, and fight courageously, and this shall be the Day of your Deliverance.' Brooke even issued challenges to trial by battle and invitations to personal combat to the royalist earl of Northampton. This strand of chivalric tradition would have appealed to Sir Thomas’s soldierly aspirations more than his father’s sensible refusal of Newcastle’s challenges to battle and personal combat. Sir Thomas was unlikely to shy away from a fight, and although his father’s refusal of Newcastle’s challenge was articulated in chivalric terms, there can be little doubt that Brooke and Newcastle’s bellicose confidence made more of an impression upon him.116

With the assassination of Brooke at Lichfield on 2 March 1643, this lord acquired the status of a hero, even Clarendon conceded that his death ‘was exceeding lamented by His Party; which had scarce a more absolute confidence in any Man than Him.’ So it is quite probable that to some extent Sir Thomas sought to emulate his style. Even before the storming of Wakefield, on 4 April, Sir Edward Nicholas wrote to Prince Rupert describing Sir Thomas Fairfax as ‘the man most beloved and relied upon by the rebels in the north.’ There was no shortage of publicity opportunities as it is certain that Fairfax’s club army received extensive coverage from the London printers. Mercurius Aulicus gives some indication of this fashion, scoffing ‘their Club-men (whereof we hear such notable Romances in the London Newesbooks),’ and later on, ‘the so much celebrated Club-men being

118 G. Fox, The Three Sieges of Pontefract Castle, printed from the manuscript compiled and illustrated by George Fox (Leeds, 1987), p.8.
strangely shrunke up and now unable to relieve his Lordship. The predictable derogation followed in a comparison with the Moorlanders of the Pennine region of north Staffordshire, who had also risen without gentry leadership: ‘for the Moorlanders and the Club-men are Brethren well basted.’ The royalists understandably reserved their greatest sarcasm and ridicule for those they feared most. It was not the construction of Sir Thomas Fairfax’s ‘invincible’ reputation that worried them. What they feared was their uncertainty about the potential revolutionary nature of some of the forces under his command.

5:4 Gentry fears of the ‘popularity’

It was this fear that so preoccupied Lord Goring, the later earl of Norwich, when he pathetically treated with Lord Fairfax for the release of his son, the royalist Lieutenant-General Sir George Goring, who had been taken at the capture of Wakefield. Sir George was identified by many of Fairfax’s soldiers as the instrument of their comrades’ deaths upon Seacroft Moor, and Lord Fairfax let it be known that he held Sir George personally responsible for the mortality in captivity of many of the prisoners taken there into his charge. On 31 May 1643, Lord Goring pleaded to Fairfax that his son was ‘ever most willing to release them upon any indifferent termes’, and offered the prospect of the release of all providing that ‘my sonne, my unfortunat [sic] sick sonne, may be treated for and released at ye same time, upon such termes as ye commissioners equally chosen for that
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120 Thomas (ed), The English Revolution III, Newsbooks I, Oxford Royalist, vol. i, p.357. After their defeat at Adwalton Moor they were easier to mock.

121 B.L. TT E246(30), Mercurius Aulicus, 20-27 February (Oxford, 1643); B.L. TT E246(44), A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament, 6-13 March (London, 1643).


123 Joseph Bannister, a locksmith of Halifax, claimed that he was imprisoned in York for over 19 weeks and almost starved to death, adding that many of his comrades died from ‘hard usage in prison’: J. Raine (ed), Depositions from the Castle of York Relating to Offences Committed in the Northern Counties in the Seventeenth Century (Surtees Society, 40, 1861), p.11; M.L. CWT, 43-06-08, The Answer of His Excellency the Earle of Newcastle To a late Declaration of the Lord Fairfax: Dated the 8. of June, 1643 (York, 1643), pp.6-15; B.L. TT E56(7), The Parliament Scout, 20-27 June (London, 1643).
end shall agree." 124 Well might Lord Goring be worried. His son had changed sides twice before. 125 In August 1642, royalist peers allegedly pledged 'they will have him out by head and shoulders; for that he betrayed the King before, and the trust of the Parliament, will be true to neither King nor Parliament, but turne like a Weather-cocke." 126 Six days after his capture, the House of Commons ordered:

That my Lord General be desired to give Directions to my Lord Fairefax to proceed effectually against General Goring, according to the Law of Arms; his Case differing from those taken in open War, he having perfidiously broken his Trust and Promise in that Business of Portsmouth: And that Mr. Marten do write a letter to my Lord General to this Purpose: And that Mr. Darley do write to my Lord Fairefax to keep Colonel Goring in strict and safe custody. 127

Lawrence Whitacre hoped that the earl of Essex would grant permission for a court martial, 128 and Lord Goring knew that this would be a distinctly unpleasant prospect for his son considering Parliament’s increasing preoccuption with traitors and turncoats in their midst.

Francis Bacon wrote that sedition’s origin lay in the poverty of the common people and discontent in their superiors: ‘If poverty and broken estate in the better sort be joined with a want and necessity in the mean people, the danger is imminent and great: for rebellions of the belly are the worst.’ 129 The West Riding landowner Sir John Savile warned Parliament of just such a danger in 1626, informing them that there were 30,000 men within ten miles of his house ‘who, if they have not relief shortly, will take it where they can get

124 B.L. Sloane MS, 1,519, f.12; M.L. CWT, 43-06-08, The Answer of His Excellency the Earle of Newcastle To a late Declaration of the Lord Fairefax: Dated the 8. of June, 1643 (York, 1643), p.14.

125 Geralamo Agostini reported Goring’s capture to the Doge and Senate on 12 June 1643, noting that: ‘His life is in danger as he betrayed the king and then the parliament in the defence of Portsmouth.’ A.B. Hinds (ed), The Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1642-1643 (London, 1925), vol. 26, p.283.
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Sir Thomas Fairfax’s pliability to the demands of his social inferiors, so relished in the London news, tacitly sanctioned by Parliament, and presented with the neat catch phrase ‘club-law’, was an issue of the gravest nature for the gentry community as a whole. Sir Thomas’s pursuit of Sir William Savile’s royalists to Wakefield after the storming of Leeds was achieved with a frightening speed to the delight of one London newsbook reporting: ‘hee [Savile] had not been three hours in bed; but they had an Allarme, Sir Thomas Fairfaxe with Bradford Clubs were marching thither: which so terrified the Popish Cavilleers there.’

The royalists’ disturbed state of mind about Bradford is well illustrated by Sir Henry Slingsby’s recollection: ‘Strange fortune we have had at this Town, for untill his excellency took it after the battle upon Allerton [Atherton] Moor, we never attempt’d any thing upon it but receiv’d an affront, once by Sir Tho. Glemham, once by my Ld Goring & now by Coll. Belasyse’. Royalists in York in 1643 were sufficiently anxious to publish a history of the Anabaptists, recalling how Thomas Muntzer during the German Peasants’ War had raised up ‘the meane People leaving their loome and their plough, to turne venturers in this holy war’, no doubt expecting close comparisons would be drawn with the nature of the Fairfaxes’ forces in the West Riding:

At the same time in Suevia, and Franconia, 40000 boores and tradesmen rose up in armes, killed and ransacked great part of the Nobles; tooke, pillaged and burnt many Forts and Castles, overthrowing all in their way like a sudden inundation; for when the bankes of authority are once beaten down, nothing can stop the popular fury, till they lose themselves in their confusion.

By implication, the book stigmatised the Fairfaxes’ supporters in the West Riding as the natural successors of these Anabaptists:

They have long been looking upon their neighbours lives and estates with such an eye as the Anabaptists cast upon Munster when they first came unto it, a malignant and covetous eye, designing their prey, and marking the rich to slaughter and pillage... And now they are executing their long projected designes, with

---
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the like fury as Muncer and John of Leyden; shaking off all authority... with an especiall malice against the Nobles, and Gentlemen, and Gods Ministers.134

Royalist relief at the destruction of the Fairfaxes’ army on Adwalton Moor was heightened by the sermon preached to celebrate the victory in York Minster, in which the Fairfaxes’ supporters were scorned as ‘dreggs elevated out of the bottome of a Vessell’, who sought to sheath ‘the Magistrate’s sword in his own Bowells’.135 The sermon then raised the ugly prospect of what would have occurred if Fairfax’s clubmen had prevailed: ‘Or if that day had succeeded ill, God knowes what had become of all us here present, for our Estates we had been reduced to Beggery, for our Bodyes and Posterityes to slavery, for our Soules to Heresy, Brownisme, Anabaptisme, or Familisme, or some other newly upstart vanity.’136 This was no propaganda, the royalists were genuinely fearful that popular anti-royalist enthusiasm would spurn its parliamentary leadership and enlarge into an attack upon the entire gentry and hierarchy. David Wootton has noted that in December 1642, Jeremiah Burroughs preached that all Englishmen, and not just freeholders, could all claim the basic freedoms of a right to property, government by consent, liberty of conscience and reliable, fair justice, aspirations that were all strongly echoed in the Leveller movement four years later.137 Amidst fears that Parliament was close to surrendering on the King’s terms, a tract entitled ‘Plaine English’ was published in January 1643, exclaiming ‘let no man be dismayed by the dream of impossibility’.138 Inspired by the recent success of sub-gentry anti-royalist insurgency, it urged people to look to these successes in Yorkshire and Lancashire, even arguing for an ‘Association’ to be established that would continue to fight the royalists if

134 Ibid., p.63.
135 M.L. CWT, 43-07-18, A Sermon Preached in the Cathedrall Church of York: Before his Excellence the Earle of Newcastle, and Many of the Prime Nobility and Gentry of the Northerne Counties. At the Publique Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the late great Victory upon Fryday, June 30, 1643, And the reducement of the West Parts of Yorkshire to Obedience (York, 1643), pp.3,10.
136 Ibid., p.23.
138 Wootton points to Edward Bowles, a subsequent chaplain to Lord Fairfax as the likeliest author: B.L. TT E84(42), Plaine English: Or A Discourse Concerning The Accomodation, The Armie, The Association. Si populus vult decipi, decipiatur. Printed (unlesse men be the more carefull, and God the more mercifull) the last of Liberty. 1643, 12 January (London, 1643), p.26.
Parliament signed such a premature peace. The possibility of a decisive military victory for such an 'Association' would raise uncomfortable questions for the gentry as a whole, especially concerning the nature of the settlement it might impose. Millenarian preachers such as Jeremiah Whittaker hardly mitigated such fears preaching at the time Fairfax's clubmen captured Leeds that these were 'the daies of shaking', and 'come Lord Jesus Christ, come quickly.' Furthermore, Whittaker even dared lecture the House of Commons with Jeremiah 13: 18, ominously stating: 'Say to the King and to the Queene, humble yourselves, sit downe for your Principalities shall come downe even the Crowne of your Glory.'

After the Restoration, the Duke of Newcastle remarked retrospectively that the 'Bible in English under every weaver's and chambermaid's arm hath done much harm... For controversy is a civil war with the pen which pulls out the sword soon afterwards.' As the civil war continued, the English nobility and gentry increasingly came to share this view. In December 1644, the earl of Essex feared how 'our posterity will say that to deliver them from the yoke of the King we have subjected them to that of the common people', pledging that he would now 'devote his life to redressing the audacity of the common people.' With the exception of Lord Brooke, the second and third Lord Fairfaxes were unique among the peerage in not being afraid to capitalise upon violent sub-gentry initiative. With the backing of their gentry supporters, they felt they could control and direct it. Perhaps this is why the King referred to Sir Thomas Fairfax in a letter to his wife of 4 May 1645, as 'the
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139 Wootton, 'From Rebellion to Revolution', pp.663-4. Wootton asserts that 'Plaine English' raised the possibility of a peace without the consent of King or Parliament, and it was denounced by moderate parliamentarians upon the same grounds as the Grandees attacked Leveller arguments during the Putney debates.
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rebels' new brutish general'. It is striking that the Fairfaxes did not stand for the widely perceived interests of their fellow nobility. Their allegiance was rather to their faith that Godly Reformation would educate and better their social inferiors, and to the interests of their home region and their neighbours. It was there that their trust and their loyalties lay.

CHAPTER SIX
‘FITTED FOR DESPERATION’:
HONOUR AND THE DILEMMA OF ALLEGIANCE IN THE YORKSHIRE PARLIAMENTARY COMMAND.

Given historians’ interest in allegiance during the civil wars, it is surprising that the proliferation of changes in allegiance in Yorkshire in early 1643 have not yet been properly addressed. There has been no scholarly analysis of the reasons why so many important parliamentarians deserted their comrades. At the outbreak of war, Yorkshire’s three leading parliamentarians were Lord Ferdinando Fairfax, Sir John Hotham and Sir Hugh Cholmley. Within under a year, in a striking shift of gentry opinion in favour of royalism, the latter two had deserted Parliament’s service, accompanied by many lesser figures. This drift towards royalism reflected something more than a desire to ally with the winning side. It was no minor undertaking for an honourable English gentleman to change sides. Therefore, nearly all those considering changing allegiance sought to justify their actions with principle: that is with assertions, probably for the most part genuine, that they were motivated to desert their comrades more from fear of the direction in which they perceived the war to be leading, than by ambitions of personal advancement. Apprehension among Yorkshire’s committed parliamentarians over the potential for treachery in their lukewarm colleagues would become their paramount concern, arguably even dictating their strategy.

Parliamentarian prospects appeared bleak with the arrival of the earl of Newcastle’s army in Yorkshire in December 1642. The outnumbered parliamentarians were widely dispersed in quarters at Scarborough, Hull, Beverley, Cawood, Wetherby and Tadcaster. Hotham and Cholmley were able to prevent Fairfax from exercising a unified command, and quickly resigned themselves to merely protecting their garrisons and towns. Even after his one success at Guisborough on 16 January 1643, Sir Hugh Cholmley wrote to Parliament urging a negotiated peace.1 Sir John Hotham refrained from field operations by 1643, and had reached a secret agreement with Newcastle by 22 March to spare his region from royalist activity, writing: ‘For the prejudice you undergo for not spoiling the East Rideing,
truly you have put an obligation upon me by sparing it this long.¹²

The activism of sub-gentry groups in the clothing districts encompassed in the club-law incidents forced these cautious parliamentarians into reconsidering their position. London newsbooks seized upon Bradford’s example, exhorting the entire nation to emulate it, setting the dangerous precedent of the common people being foremost in the prosecution of war upon their social betters, including the King.³ Not only had these clubmen overshadowed most of Yorkshire’s parliamentary gentry in the adulation of the newsbooks, they also began to strongly influence Sir Thomas Fairfax himself.⁴ Gentlemen who had engaged for Parliament principally to defend their estates and fortunes from arbitrary power began to doubt if victories for Fairfax’s rabble were preferable. John Hotham voiced such forebodings in a prophetic letter to the earl of Newcastle on 9 January:

My Lord there is one thing which I fear much: that if the honourable endeavours of such powerful men as yourself do not take place for a happy peace, the necessitous people of the whole kingdom, will presently rise in mighty numbers and whosoever they pretend for at first, within a while they will set up for themselves, to the utter ruin of all the nobility and gentry of the kingdom. I speak not merely at random, the west part of this county affords mighty numbers of them, which I am very confident you will see necessitated and urged to rise in far greater bodies than thrice the Armies that are already gathered here. My Lord, necessity teaches to seek subsistence; and if this unruly rout have once cast the Rider, it will run like wild fire in ye example through all the Counties of England.⁵

Within two weeks of writing this letter, club-law had broken out at Rotherham, while Leeds and Wakefield had fallen to its fury.⁶ By 2 March, Hotham’s concern over these
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² B.L. Add. MS, 32,096, ff.250-51.
⁴ The clubmen, many of them clothiers, pressed Sir Thomas Fairfax to storm Leeds in order to open trade routes to Hull. They influenced him into destroying the royalist defences at Tadcaster and also forced his assault on Wakefield in order to acquire captives to exchange for their comrades taken at Seacroft: H. Heaton, The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries (2nd edn., Oxford, 1965), pp.208-9; T. Fairfax, ‘A Short Memorial of the Northern Actions during ye warre there, 1642 till 1644’, in F. Grose and T. Astle (eds), Antiquarian Repertory, 3 (1808), pp.13,16; W. Scott (ed), The Original Memoirs Written During the Great Civil War being the Life of Sir Henry Slingsby and memoirs of Captain Hodgson with notes (Edinburgh, 1806), p.97.
⁵ B.L. Add. MS, 32,096, f.248.
developments had intensified into a sense of panic in a further letter to Newcastle: ‘For myself and friends nothing can be of that bad consequence to us, as the utter ruin of all our friends, tenants and neighbours, we can then be no worse, we are fitted for desperation.’

6:1 The disaffection of John Hotham

John Hotham had witnessed this campaign personally; Sir Thomas complained of his conduct to Lord Fairfax on 27 January: ‘When he saw your lordship’s order, he called for pen and ink to copy it out, it seemed by his peevish humour to have taken some advantage by it, but he did not. No order will be observed by him but what he please.’ The previous September, the Hothams had asserted their autonomy from the Fairfaxes, declaring, ‘it is a strange command they should assume over Captaine Hotham, that oweth them no such obedience.’ Sir John Hotham had even warned them to ‘give not law to those from whom you ought to receive.’

John Hotham had been campaigning months before the Fairfaxes took up arms. He had frustrated their attempt to turn neutral, and had been praised in London above any other Yorkshireman. As late as 17 December, Sir Henry Foulis referred to him in a letter to a friend as ‘Ever Gallant Hotham.’ The order to Lord Fairfax from the earl of Essex on 1 February creating Hotham Lieutenant-General did little to soothe his resentment. Lord Fairfax remained General and Sir Thomas Fairfax was now General of the Horse. Sir Hugh
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8 Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, p.36.
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Cholmley wrote that Hotham was dissatisfied with his new rank, "thinking himself not so absolute as before for his father keeping Hull, he commanded in chief in that field, and ranged the country without control." The Hothams were affronted further by Lord Fairfax's promotion of the religious radical Captain John Alured to a colonelcy, in the spring of 1643; Alured had formerly been their subordinate and his distaste of them was well known.

For all these reasons, the day after the Bradford club-law, on 19 December John Hotham entered into personal correspondence with the earl of Newcastle, suggesting a meeting with him upon pretext of an exchange of prisoners, to discuss "the condition we now stand in." He added "not to bring suspicion upon it", indicating that he possibly already had dealings to hide, and hints at his growing alienation with the parliamentary command, commenting that "I have some odd people to please here." He raised Newcastle's hopes further by reminding him of their pre-war friendship: "My Lord I take it as a great favour that these differences that I hope God in his good time will make up againe causes you not to forget anctient friendship, I wish I could always light upon such friends, however this nobleness of yours will I am sure engage to serve you."

A week later he implied to Newcastle that he had discussed changing allegiance with his father, but that Sir John required time to "consider with himself." On 2 January he sent a secret messenger to Newcastle, "Since I could not be so happy as to attend you myself without a whole country's talking." He began to vilify the parliamentary command to Newcastle, first snubbing the very man who advocated to Fairfax the beneficial use of
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uprisings of 'ungoverned multitudes', Thomas Stockdale:¹⁹ 'our Secretary Stockdale thinks he knows all as he directs all to our General.'²⁰ Writing again on 15 January, he scorned his comrades: 'Our senators here think of saving themselves, as you may well see, we are now so quiet.'²¹ He also informed Newcastle that Holles and Pierrepont were converting to their cause in Parliament and that Lord Fairfax 'thinks you raise men as the sand.'²² Again on 30 March, he delighted in ridiculing the Fairfaxes for their retreat from Selby towards Leeds and the clothing districts:

I shall entreat your Lordship to laugh as heartely att our valient captaynes of the West that have quitt all their strong quarters without a shott as ever they did att others; hie talking and strong drinking is not that that kills Sconderbag.²³ I confesse when I heard itt first I did not much marvel att itt, as some did, well knowing that if itt had not been for some they had never shott shott att Tadcaster when you came first, but I shamed them into itt.²⁴

John Hotham realised there was no comfortable place for him in the Fairfaxes' emerging army. His defensive response was therefore to ridicule it. The army identity Lord Fairfax strove to create echoes through the sermon preached to his army by John Shaw at Selby, on 5 February. Shaw referred to Fairfax as 'our Joshua of the north', and claimed that his army were the people of God 'scorned and nicknamed' just as the Hussites, Lollards, Waldenses and Huguenots had been.²⁵ He preached further that 'the word Puritan, in the mouth of an Arminian, signifies an orthodox divine; in the mouth of a drunkard signifies a sober man, in the mouth of a papist signifies a protestant.' After informing Lord Fairfax that he was more in awe of his humility than of his army, he continued to praise the
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²³ John Hotham was seeking to flatter Newcastle here by comparing him to Alexander the Great.
²⁵ Anthony Milton asserts that it had been Jacobean orthodoxy to regard mediaeval heretical movements as predecessors of Protestantism, thereby 'the tiny spurned church of God's elect' being persecuted by 'the false church of Antichrist': A. Milton, 'The Church of England, Rome and the True Church: The Demise of a Jacobean Consensus', in K. Fincham (ed), The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642 (Basingstoke, 1993), p.191.
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Rotherham club-law of 22 January, claiming for the townsfolk that ‘God had taught their hands to war and their fingers to fight.’ Aware that Fairfax’s army could be perceived as religiously extreme, he declared: ‘Did I ever think I should have lived to see those dayes wherein it should by many have been a discerning Shiboleth, or signe of one that is not the King’s friend, viz., if he do not banne and swear? Turks call madde men saints (because they conceive their thoughts are abstracted from the world), but we here call saints madd men.’ All through the sermon, Shaw constructed the image of Fairfax’s soldiers as a desperately outnumbered, persecuted army of saints. He orated biblical extracts to the soldiers illustrating how vast armies were worthless without faith in God and prophesized that ‘God will restore His outcasts, and that as the high and honourable assembly spoke of that wonderful successe at Leeds, that God hath heard prayers, so still He will till his temple bee finished, His servants cleared who have long suffered.’

John Hotham did not share this religious inspiration. To him, these men were no saints in peril but an unbridled multitude, and the foremost danger to the order of his estates. Parliamentarian gentry elsewhere shared his views. Sergeant-Major Robert Kirle, the commander of the earl of Stamford’s regiment in Herefordshire, changed his allegiance at this time because of the regiment’s chaplain Mr. Sedgwick, the preaching of whom he felt instilled a ‘spirit of fury and madness’ tending to ‘Atheisme, Anarchy, arbytrary government and confusion.’ He believed ‘that all the Officers of no one Company were of the same Opinion what Religion they fought for... Some liked the Chaplain of the Regiment, another thought his corporall preached better... and one would thinke, that every Company had been raised out of the severall congregations of Amsterdam.’

Parliament failed to settle the dispute between the Hothams and Fairfaxes, for on 31 January, the earl of Essex granted the Hothams autonomy from Fairfax’s command to defend their garrisons at Hull and Cawood castle. One London newsbook dismissed
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allegations of antipathy between them, there being no chance ‘whereby the cause might be deserted’,30 but *Mercurius Aulicus* proved better informed in claiming that Sir John Hotham had sent a letter to Parliament urging a speedy peace, identifying the Fairfax-Hotham split on 17 January.31

According to Sir Hugh Cholmley writing some years after the events, John Hotham and the earl of Newcastle were already in direct collusion as early as February, itself no small factor in Cholmley’s deliberations that March. The daily threat of royalists converting Hull’s wavering leadership would, if successful, leave him completely isolated.

His position was further endangered by the landing of the Queen at nearby Bridlington on 22 February, where using their mutual friend, the royalist Sir Marmaduke Langdale as an intermediary, John Hotham and Newcastle met to seal a secret treaty:

Both parties made this advantage by the treaty, that as the Lord Newcastle forbore to come near Hull or Beverley, where the Hothams’ estate laid and which was their prime quarters, so young Hotham though he had above a thousand horse and dragoons did not interrupt the Lord Newcastle’s march from Bridlington; which might easily have been done, his army being overcharged with baggage, and the season so tempestuous that his forces were very much dispersed.32

John Hotham further sought to ingratiate himself by providing Newcastle with intelligence of royalists who slandered him. On 3 April, he alleged that Lady Cornwallis had said ‘that you were a sweet General, lay in bed until eleven o’clock and combed till 12, then came to the Queen, and so the work was done, and that General King33 did all the business.’ Hotham pledged his loyalty directly to the earl, regardless of such ‘Court tricks’34, urging him to ‘strengthen yourself with such friends as will not forsake you upon any frowne of the Court, the Papists will for their dependence is meerly that way... chuse out some that will be yours in despight of your Enemies.’35 He added that ‘You can expect nothing at court,
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truly the women rule all.' Hotham’s claim of the inversion of gender roles at court shrewdly appealed to Newcastle’s frustration with the gossips jealous of his achievement in raising so large an army. The notion of women in control, traditionally regarded as unnatural and disastrous,\(^{36}\) legitimised Hotham’s insinuation to Newcastle that together they could frustrate these courtiers. Two days earlier he had warned Newcastle that the Queen’s favourites mocked him and sought his replacement: ‘This is not fiction, and further such offers of grace and favour and honour have been made within this few days to your servants here with a very great undervaluing of you as may be you will not believe.’\(^{37}\)

Indeed, John Hotham was thinking in broader terms than his and his father’s change of allegiance. These words were written at Beverley and imply he had confederates. His friend Sir Edward Rodes, later arrested under suspicion of attempting to surrender the town, was present there at this time.\(^{38}\) By 14 April, Hotham was in Lincoln, and wrote to Newcastle claiming that he had persuaded Sir Christopher Wray and Sir Edward Ayscough to turn neutral on a promise he gave of His Majesty’s pardon, saying that if the above two did this, ‘there shall not be a man here to hold up his hand against his Majesty.’\(^{39}\) On 5 May, these knights protested to Parliament that they were doing all within their power to prosecute the war in their locality,\(^{40}\) yet Clive Holmes has noted how both secretly sought royal forgiveness.\(^{41}\) On 18 April, Hotham wrote that he hoped to convert Lord Willoughby of Parham, Parliament’s Lord Lieutenant of Lincolnshire, ‘and all those that have either power or reputation.’\(^{42}\) In a letter three days earlier he requested that Newcastle write to him with ‘a word what my L. Fairfax hath done, I could make great advantage of it in this businesse, for I thinke you will see such a considerable party brought to the King; as hath
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not been yet. By 28 April, there were suspicions of treachery voiced in Parliament against Sergeant-Major Purfrey, Governor of Lincoln, whose brother, Captain Purfrey, had previously served under Hotham. Both were later arrested for conspiracy to betray the town on 2 July. The correspondence of Sir John Hotham captured at his arrest included letters to Cholmley, Digby, and others that revealed the Purfreys' complicity in his plan to betray Lincoln to the royalists.

The London press, which had hitherto shown John Hotham such adulation, now began to condemn him. He was blamed for the recent defeat on Ancaster Heath, and for the blockade of Lord Fairfax in Leeds. Hotham retaliated on 2 June by encouraging the commanders gathering at Nottingham not to reinforce Fairfax's imperilled army, procuring the assent of Lord Grey, Sir John Gell, Sir Miles Hobart, and even Oliver Cromwell. He was able to prevent the Fairfaxes receiving a reinforcement of up to 6,000 men, while his father ensured their army was starved of gunpowder. The Committee of Safety at last sent a warrant for John Hotham's arrest after he had offered battle over Lord Grey's refusal to supply his horses' oats, threatened to turn his artillery on Cromwell, and allegedly remarked to Colonel Hutchinson, 'I fight for liberty and expect it in all things.' The disunity which Hotham incited was even known to Sir Edward Nicholas at Oxford, who noted 'there are so many differences in the rebels' army near Nottingham as that Hotham and Cromwell are
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ready to cut each others’ throats.\textsuperscript{50} Hotham was dragged from his bed and roughly treated before he was able to smuggle a letter to the Queen begging her to arrange his rescue. Shortly afterwards, and in suspicious circumstances, Lord Grey’s soldiers allowed him to escape.\textsuperscript{51}

He fled to Lincoln, the surrender of which he had offered to arrange for the Queen, in addition to Hull.\textsuperscript{52} On 25 June, she wrote to Newcastle: ‘Hotham has escaped, and is at Lincoln. I do not know whether his man is with you. I hope now that he will be prudent: better late than never.’\textsuperscript{53} There Hotham discoursed with Lord Willoughby and the Governor, claiming that an Anabaptist of the town called Watson had worked with Cromwell to secure his arrest. He wrote to Parliament that these men were ‘rogues, rascals and Anabaptist dogs’, and that ‘It was very hard to be esteem’d Traytors, by the King, for the sake of others; who should endeavour to dig a Pit for them.’\textsuperscript{54} He held Cromwell’s tendency to promote freeholders and yeomen to captaincies in such distaste that he announced if any came into his territory he would shoot them.\textsuperscript{55} In a letter, dated 24 June at Lincoln, he wrote indignantly to the Speaker complaining of his ordeal:

\begin{quote}
That Colonel Cromwell had imployed an Anabaptist to accuse him, and that one Captaine White had been imployed against him who was latelie but a yeoman. That so much injustice had not been exercised on any gentleman in any time when arbitrarie power was at the highest. That the valour of these men had onlie yet appeared in their defacing of churches.
\end{quote}

Now he was sounding like a royalist, and began to talk openly against the Parliament, warning Colonel Rossiter that ‘You shall see in a short time there will never be a gentleman

\textsuperscript{52} M.A.E. Green (ed), \textit{The Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria} (London, 1857), pp.221-2.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., pp.220-21.
\textsuperscript{54} T. Gent, \textit{Gent’s History of Hull reprinted in fac-simile of the original of 1735} (Hull, 1869), p.154.
\textsuperscript{56} B.L. Harl. MS, 164, f.234.
but will be gone to the King.' 57 Within a year, his friend and possible confederate Lord Willoughby echoed this fear in his belief that the 'nobility and gentry are going down apace... I thought it a crime to be a nobleman.' 58 Three months later a detachment of Willoughby's troops fled before a party of royalists and neglected to alert Cromwell's sleeping troopers, for which an investigation into treachery was later demanded by council of war, William Harlakenden writing of this that 'it's much feared that treachery is among them that seem for us.' 59 Outraged by his arrest, John Hotham pledged his change of allegiance in true royalist language to Newcastle on 28 June:

> The malice of my enemies hath been so violent against me, but God hath delivered me out of their hands; I never expected better from the popularity; for none of these ever reward their best citizens with anything but death or banishment; as I resolved I never would forsake the party I had undertaken until they had (without cause given by me) so disobliged me that no man can think that my honour or honesty is further engaged to serve them. I confess I now think myself a freeman from them and resolve by the grace of God never to serve them more. As soon as I have dispatched here, I shall attend you to know your commands. 60

6:2 The conspiracy to betray Hull

On 28 June, he was reunited with his father and called a council of war in Hull, attended by Sir Edward Rodes, Sir Thomas Remington, Lieutenant-Colonel Christopher Legard, Sergeant-Major Goodricke and Captains Billops, Anlaby, Moyer and Overton. He secured the agreement of all except Moyer, to complain to Parliament about Cromwell. 61 For some time after the Hothams' downfall, uncertainty remained over the loyalty of these men; 62 the emergency committee that replaced Sir John's government of the town included none of


61 According to Moyer, the Hothams had already drafted this letter before their council of war met: Gent, Gent's History of Hull, p.153; J. Tickell, History of the Town and County of Kingston-upon-Hull (Hull, 1798), p.468.

62 Although not arrested, Anlaby, Billops and Overton were not confirmed in their commands until 6 July: T.T. Wildridge (ed), The Hull Letters: Documents from the Hull records, 1625-46 (Hull, 1888), p.159.
these officers, but was composed of gentlemen of more extreme religious leanings, along with the aldermen Roper, Denman, and Barnard, and Godly ministers Styles and Johnson. Kinsmen of the Governor, Legard and Remington even had the nerve to defend him in his trial eighteen months later. Legard attempted to resist the coup, and Sir Edward Rodes was also arrested under suspicion of plotting to surrender Beverley. Thomas Coatsforth, the officer in command of Hull castle’s artillery, had been part of the garrison since March 1642, and he testified against these gentlemen under oath on 10 July, 1643:

And this examinant further saith that about twenty days ago, sir Edward Rhodes and lieutenant colonel Legard were at the north blockhouse, where this examinant dwelleth, and had there viewed the same (as this examinant was informed, and from thence they went presently to the castle, this examinant and lieutenant Baron being then also there) and he saith that sir Edward Rhodes and lieutenant colonel Legard, after viewing the same and country round, withdrew themselves from this examinant and lieutenant Baron, and had some private conference together, and in that conference, he, this examinant, heard sir Edward Rhodes ask lieutenant colonel Legard, ‘which way they could come in?’ To whom the lieutenant colonel answered, ‘That way’, pointing his finger towards the north east or thereabout.

In addition to Sir John’s failure to maintain the artillery platforms upon the town walls, Coatsforth resented his tardiness over pay, claiming he suspected the actions of the Hothams for some time. His evidence for the prosecution of Rodes and Legard was probably based on the accurate view that if the Hothams were prepared to trust anyone, it would be them.

The Rodes and Legard families were related to the Hothams, and Christopher Legard was on 28 July summoned before the same tribunal in London as Sir John. Considering Sir John was clearly the leading local magnate, and that his five wives and sixteen children rendered his kinship network among the largest in the county, it is understandable that doubts over his allegiance would gravely concern his kinsmen and subordinates, forcing

64 Gent, Gent’s History of Hull, p.156.
67 Tickell, The History of the Town and County of Kingston-upon-Hull, p.466.
them to reconsider their position.  

Suspicion mounted upon Sir John Hotham for his refusal to allow the departure from Hull of the parliamentarian Sir William Allenson, and his discharging of Captain Browne Bushell from confinement. Coatsforth’s testimony indicates that John Hotham’s kissing of the Queen’s hand at Bridlington was known to people in Hull, while the fortification of the Hotham residence at Scorborough, and Sir John’s redeployment of his heaviest artillery so that it was aimed towards the town and docks, had already excited rumour and suspicion.  

The vigilance of Captain Lawrence Moyer of the garrison’s warship the Hercules precipitated the Hothams’ undoing. When on 28 June Sir John ordered the ship to leave, Moyer’s suspicions of Hotham, previously instilled by a letter from Parliament, were confirmed. Moyer warned the Mayor, while Sir Matthew Boynton was notified and the word spread that night until 1,500 men were ready to arrest the Hothams. Early on the morning of the 29 June, Moyer’s seamen led companies of organised townsmen into the blockhouses to seize the soldiers’ arms. The insurgents soon captured John Hotham, while the Governor was clubbed down at Beverley and arrested on the orders of Colonel Francis Boynton. John Vicars claimed Boynton had found Sir Edward Rodes ‘putting foot in his stirrup to take horse and begone, whom he presently arrested, who lookt as white as a clout upon this his so sodain apprehension.’ Hours later, Sir Hugh Chohnley’s royalists assaulted Beverley, but were surprised and frustrated by Boynton’s stout defence. The

69 Apart from Lieutenant-Colonel Christopher Legard, there were three other Legard captains, John, Robert and William serving at various times within the garrison, P.R.O., S.P. 28/7/168,228,478.

70 Bushell had returned Scarborough castle to the royalists after he had briefly recaptured it for Parliament B.L. TT E249(24), A Perfect Diurnall of Some Passages in Parliament, 3-10 July (London, 1643), p.10.


74 Gent, Gent’s History of Hull, p.155.

75 Vicars unreservedly proclaimed that Sir Edward Rodes was guilty, despite his Godly background: Jehovah-Jireh, p.370.
mayor and some aldermen of Beverley were also later accused of conspiracy to betray the
town. Rodes, Bushell and the Hothams were despatched to London onboard the
Hercules.

John Hotham revealed he had confederates in his last letter to Newcastle, and a letter
of Henry Jermyn’s suggests that the Dutch Captain Lowinger was involved. Lowinger had
been part of the garrison since March 1642, and had previously been offered £1,000 to
betray Hull. He accompanied Hotham into Lincolnshire, but was back in Hull by June 1643
and his arrest was ordered on 6 July. John Hotham’s cavalry officers may also have been
implicated; by 3 July most of his cavalry force were in custody. Although it was feared it
might be a ‘matter of policie to procrastinate his triall’, John Hotham later petitioned
Parliament with the tantalising promise that he would unmask traitors still active in
Yorkshire. Several other officers were arrested by the town’s fledgling committee of
defence in early July, while John Bourdenand, gentleman servant to Sir John Hotham,
found his house at Scorton ransacked by ‘the Countrie people’, animated by some of
‘the worst sort of the soldiers’ at Beverley. Younger brothers of John Hotham were also
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83 On 30 June 1643, Arthur Stringer, Cornet to Robert Legard’s troop was arrested
and a warrant was sent to Beverley to apprehend Mr. John Bourdenand. Robert
Spavan, the clerk to John Legard was already in custody. Robert Smedley,
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84 Hull City, R.O., BRS/7/29.
questioned by the House of Commons. Suspicions of treachery led to obsessive vigilance, especially over the security of John Hotham’s confinement, reflecting the fear and deference his personality was capable of inspiring. People were examined by the committee on matters of hearsay, new guards were set, and the Hothams’ garrison officers were replaced by townsmen and those untainted by the Hotham interest. A special guard against treachery was placed upon the North gate, not by the military, but by ‘sufficient and knowing men’ selected by local gentlemen.

6:3 The betrayal of Scarborough

On 25 March, Sir Hugh Cholmley was the first leading Yorkshire parliamentarian to actually turn royalist, doing so with relative ease due to his independent command at Scarborough. Influenced by the Queen’s arrival in February, he secured the support of Lancelot Alured, his lieutenant-colonel, and tried to convert Captain John Legard, belittling Lord Fairfax and declaring that Parliament had slighted him by not sending sufficient supplies. Like Sir John Hotham, Cholmley viewed himself as Lord Fairfax’s equal, possibly even his social better. As a religious moderate, Cholmley had taken offence to a clause in the Grand Remonstrance declaring that bishops had introduced idolatry into the church. When
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90 According to Sir John Hotham, Lancelot Alured was Sir Hugh’s principal confederate: M.L. CWT, 43-04-07, A true and exact Relation of all the proceedings of Sir Hugh Cholmley’s Revolt (London, 1643), p.1.
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92 Within the context of Yorkshire society, well established baronetcies like those of Hotham and Cholmley were probably viewed as superior to Fairfax’s Scottish peerage. I am grateful to Dr. P.R. Newman for raising this point.

blamed in London for neglect, and not reinforcing Fairfax, he retorted ‘I did not seeke the
imployment’. He plainly revealed to Parliament his growing dissatisfaction with his own
prestige in London, and the direction in which the war was leading:

I hope my diligence and other carriage in these affairs will shew my former actions did never deserve those
representations of them which were in print, nor any belief of them... I am forced to draw my sword not
only against my countrymen but many near friends and allies some of which I know both to be well
affected in religion and lovers of their liberties.

He urged Parliament to make peace, remarking that unless ‘these unhappy distractions may
be composed, to my judgement the Kingdome is in danger to be ruined.’ Upon receipt of
this letter, Parliament ordered him to quit Scarborough as ‘a place unuseful’, but he
refused. Parliament allowed him to continue in command for a further two months prior
to his defection, indicating their growing need for the legitimacy his status carried in the
region. Like his cousin, John Hotham, Sir Hugh Cholmley would have observed the West
Riding clubmen forces with growing unease. His brother Sir Henry Cholmley was later to
urge Speaker Lenthall to tend to ‘the settlement and peace of the kingdom; for otherwise
(I fear) clubs and clouted shoes will in the end be too hard for them both.’

Sir Hugh claimed that only Captain John Legard, two Dutch lieutenants and twenty
soldiers left in objection to his decision, and that ‘the Garrison was immediatly settled for
the King without the least mutiny or dissturbance.’ Yet far more soldiers deserted him
than he admitted. Among them were Sir Thomas Norcliffe and his officers, Captains Froom,
Vanderhurst and Legard, Lieutenant Thomas Strangways, and a further 85 horsemen,
perhaps as much as a quarter of the garrison. Sir John Hotham suspected Cholmley and
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had ordered Sir Hugh's deputy, Captain John Legard to stop him. Eventually, Cholmley had to arrest Legard who had spread alarm through the garrison that Newcastle's men were to be admitted in secret to cut all their throats. Legard recounted Sir Hugh 'calling for a halfe a score muskettires [he] said he would teach me to rule my tongue.' Sir Hugh even had to imprison his own personal standard bearer, Cornet Henry Wilkinson. The Dutchmen Froom and Vanderhurst had their reputations as professional soldiers to protect, Legard recalling Froom's defiance of Cholmley: 'Froom told him he would be ready to serve him in an honest way, but never used to be of the Traytours Company.' Despite anxieties in Boston over his allegiance, Froom gave his life in Parliament's service later that year. Apart from Lancelot Alured, the only senior officers not to leave Sir Hugh were his cousins James Cholmley, Browne Bushell and Henry Bushell.

In justification of his change of allegiance, he wrote to his sons that he had only taken command in Scarborough because he felt there would soon be a treaty, which he felt he could advance more as governor in the field than as voter at Westminster:

I did not forsake the Parliament till they did fail in performing those particulars they made the grounds of war when I was first engaged, viz. the preservation of religion, protection of the King's person, and liberties of the subject; nor did I quit them for any particular ends of my own, but merely to perform the duty and allegiance I owed my Sovereign, and which I did in such a way as without any diminution to my honour either as a gentleman or a soldier.

Yet Cholmley's honour was in question, and he feared arrest or murder if stripped of his independent command. As a condition of his support in his treaty with the Queen, he had

101 Firth (ed), 'Sir Hugh Cholmley's Memorials Touching Scarborough', p.571.
102 Ibid., pp.571-2.
104 P.R.O., S.P. 28/129/6, f.9.
106 Allegedly a notorious plunderer, and 'a desperate rude man', Froom became Captain-Lieutenant to John Hotham's troop of horse, and was accused of pistolling in the back an officer on his own side: P.R.O., S.P. 28/265/171-6.
107 Binns, 'A Place of Great Importance', p.95.
to insist upon remaining Scarborough's governor. Over the next two years, several London newsbooks persisted in calling for his execution.\textsuperscript{109} Parliament had a long memory; in 1651, Browne Bushell was executed for complicity in the betrayal of Scarborough, and Cholmley was fortunate not to suffer likewise.\textsuperscript{110} When John Legard tried to dissuade Sir Hugh Cholmley from changing sides, he did not present political or religious arguments, but plainly warned him 'what a dishonour it would be to himselfe, and what a stain to his posterity'.\textsuperscript{111} Legard was right; one London newsbook soon accused him of putting civilians in Whitby to the sword,\textsuperscript{112} while others defamed him as 'Judas Cholmley'\textsuperscript{113} and that 'base treacherous (Apostate)... he deserves not the name of a gentleman', further detailing the stony welcome he could expect from the royalists:

as soon as he had kissed the Queen's hand, she turned her backside upon him before he could rise, as if she had taken his perfidiosness in some: And the Cumberland men in that Popish Army do all vow (for that he hath been the death of some Gentlemen of that County) he shall be put in the forefront of the forelorn hope upon any designe, for they take him to be such an unfaithfull wretch, as is not fit to be tursted\textsuperscript{sic} either by King, Queene or Parliament.\textsuperscript{114}

Captain William Goodricke informed Cholmley his defection had 'left so ill a sent [sic] behinde, in the opinion of the County',\textsuperscript{115} and by the time of Scarborough's surrender to Parliament in 1645, life in England was no longer possible for him. Any hopes of a quiet withdrawal from public life had been dismayed by the publication of \textit{The King's Cabinet Opened} that year:

\begin{quote}
Alas! poor Hugh Cholmley, that could turn traitor, and sell his honour for the kiss of a lady's hand! See what a toy took the man in the head, the love of a little court idolatry put him quite out of his wits, and religion too! And so Hugh Cholmley, when he was not himself, became wholly theirs, as did the rest of the
\end{quote}
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Yet ‘a little court idolatry’ was something that Cholmley’s and the Hothams’ conceptions of honour greatly valued; Cholmley waited upon the Queen at York, and from 16 June 1643, John Hotham conducted a private treaty with her, sending and receiving trumpeters daily. A handkerchief richly embroidered with an image of the Queen was found among the Hothams’ possessions at their arrest.117

Another local parliamentary leader that changed sides was John Hotham’s father-in-law, Sir Henry Anderson. After having raised parliamentary recruits in Cleveland at the outbreak of war, he was in Oxford by September 1643, for which he was expelled from Parliament, charged with ‘deserting the Service of the House, and repairing to the Army against the Parliament.’118 He claimed that he was only there to procure the release of his imprisoned son, and to arrange a pardon for his friends, lamenting that the bloodshed ‘might be much better concluded by an agreement than by war.’ He courted the peace party in Parliament, assuring its leader, Denzil Holles, that both he and Sir Philip Stapleton were ‘well thought of’ in Oxford.119 A close friend of Sir John Hotham who successfully changed sides was Michael Wharton, his fellow M.P. for Beverley. Wharton had been on the parliamentary commission sent to Hull in the spring of 1642, but drifted towards royalism and died fighting for the King in 1645.120

6:4 Honour and the dilemma of the Hothams

It is essential to appreciate that Sir John Hotham chose his allegiance at a very early stage, when it was still widely believed that the King could not raise an army and that any fighting would be short-lived. His outlook was therefore less suited to accept the turmoil of a more lengthy and embittered war than that of those choosing sides later. Sir John clearly grew

116 Green (ed), The Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria, p.176.
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antagonistic towards the religious reformers in his midst; Sir Henry Slingsby commented that Hotham was 'not at all for their new opinions in church government.' Sir Henry Slingsby believed much was due to the influence of his son: 'I rather think it was his son & his sons jeering & disagreeing with my Ld Fairfax, which made him weary of being on one side, & more easily drawn to hearken to reason.' Aside from revealing his misjudgement of the 'rebel' cause, Clarendon's sympathetic explanation of Sir John's dilemma reveals his theory of why Hotham tried to change sides:

It was the more wonderful, that a Person of a full and ample Fortune who was not disturb'd by any Fancies in Religion, had unquest'ned duty to the Crown, and reverence for the government both of Church and State should so foolishly expose Himself, and his Family, of great Antiquity, to comply with the humours of those men whose Persons he did not much esteem, and whose designs he perfectly detested. But, as his particular Animosity against the Earl of Strafford, first engaged him in that Company, so his Vanity and Ambition, and the Concessions the King had made to their unreasonable demands, made him concur farther with them, than his own judgement disposed him to. He had taken upon him the government of Hull, without any apprehension, or imagination that it would ever make him accessory to Rebellion; but believ'd, that, when the King and Parliament should be reconciled, the eminence of that Charge would promote him to some of those rewards and honours, which that Party resolv'd to divide among themselves. When he found himself more dangerously and desperately Embarked than he ever intended to be, he bethought himself of all probable ways to disentangle himself, and to win himself out of the Labyrinth he was in.

Sir John Hotham's fears, hinted at by Clarendon in this last sentence provide the most convincing explanation. Content to remain an inactive observer of the war in Hull until this was no longer possible, anxiety over personal safety was instrumental in his decision to turn royalist. Even royalists knew Parliament was considering his removal, and Bulstrode Whitelocke confirmed Sir John discovered that Parliament intended to replace him, inclining him to 'have new designs.' Such a dismissal would not only entail the loss of a fortune

123 Parsons (ed), The Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby, p.92.
in wealth, it might also cost him his life. For his refusal to admit the King into Hull in 1642, Sir John Hotham was still regarded as the immediate cause of war by many royalists. A seditious picture of Sir John had been published by June 1642, which appeared to suggest he was the King's superior. Denied the protection of Hull, he would fall easy victim to royalist assassins. In April 1642, provision was swiftly made for his son's appointment as governor in the event of his death, while Sir John endeavoured to ensure otherwise by his employment of specialist bodyguards. A letter from Margaret Eure that May indicates the Governor's apprehension: 'I hear poor Sir John Hotham is so affrighted if anything comes but near him.' Royalist attempts to kidnap him were reported in London, one assassination attempt had already been made, and by 13 August 1643, he was reported dead with suspicion of poison. Two attempts to murder his eldest son were reported, and the
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Plate 3: Anonymous engraving of Sir John Hotham in 1642.\textsuperscript{132}
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House of Commons was informed that the King intended to hang him in 1642. His son’s negotiations with Newcastle were partly intended to safeguard against his execution being a royalist precondition of a negotiated settlement. After Sir John’s arrest, a letter was discovered in his trunk, from his son Durand in London, warning him of John Hotham’s arrest and urging him to ‘looke to his owne safetie’. By 25 June 1643, he appears as resolute as his son to reverse his allegiance, summoning him to Hull: ‘I would see you here: we have a great game to play’, adding just how glad he was ‘that you have freed yourself from those false villaines.’

It should be emphasized that both Hothams made their decisions to turn royalist before Fairfax’s army was crushed on Adwalton Moor. Their defection was no simple or frivolous desire to be on the winning side. Honour dictated they could not change sides without good reason. The war had hardly broken out when Sir Philip Musgrave was blackened in London as a ‘turncoat Parliamentier’. Aware of further slanders against Cholmley, John Hotham sought to prove to Newcastle his principled motivations, only pledging to change sides if Parliament’s forthcoming peace terms were unreasonable:

but otherwise, to leave my party that I had set up with & no real cause given that an honest man may justify himself for so doing, before God and the world, I never would do it, although I endured all the extremity in the world. For I well know no man of honour or worth will ever think such a man worthy of friendship or trust.

So John Hotham acclaimed the virtue of constancy to Newcastle in his belief that, when their defection came, Newcastle would value them more for this. On 11 February he wrote to him:

For Ralph Hopton’s miracles or Sir Hugh Cholmley’s defeat they are no motives to me... I should as soon do what I think is fit for an honest man to doe after my Lord of Essex had got a victory, as before. I confess I pin my faith on no man’s sleeve... I wish with all my heart, that which side soever will not condescend to waive trifles for the settlement of Church & State, that his own side may leave him. For my
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own part, rather than be a slave to either, I w[oul]d live on bread and water in another kingdom. 137

Three months later he persisted: ‘For myself, I am as much your servant as ever, and twenty such businesses as Reading shall make no alteration.’ 138 Ever fearful of falling under ‘the odious name of knavery’, 139 he would change sides as soon as his honour allowed it:

I confesse I am very tender of my honor, for I know it is like a woman’s honesty, not to be repayred if once toucht, and to forsake my party when I can say nothing for it but to please my ambition or lightnesse is to me a terrible thing. I know you would not desire to see it in any man you esteemed worthy of your friendship, although for the present itt may disadvantage your affayres. 140

Once Sir Hugh Cholmley had changed sides, his efforts to ensure the Hothams rapidly did likewise came to annoy them as they sought to be more cunning and achieve more in their change of allegiance. So denigrating Cholmley was another device John Hotham used to court Newcastle’s attentions:

You have gotton by Sir Hugh Cholmley’s turning when he could give noe reason for it but an old castle, which will cost you more keeping than it is worth, his captaynes and soldiers are all here and have left him naked enough, we say not sixty men... For what Sir Hugh Cholmley says it is no matter, it is not the first time he hath scandall’d his friends, and then denied it. 141

Sir John referred to Cholmley in a letter to his son as ‘a foole beyond measure’ 142, while John Hotham further indicated his frustration at Cholmley’s defection to Newcastle: ‘S[i]r Hugh Cholmle[y]s businesse hath drawne such a jealousy upon me and our people talk at large.’ 143 However, where Cholmley’s more forthright royalism achieved a successful defection, the calculating delay and reluctance of the Hothams cost them their lives.

The earl of Newcastle’s declaration of 2 February, 1643 was calculated to instil fear of Fairfax and the club-law into the gentry community, and especially to increase royalist sympathies among those reconsidering their allegiance. He proclaimed that: ‘the Badges
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and Monuments of ancient Gentry in Windows, and Pedigrees have been by them defaced; Old Evidences, the Records of private Families, the Pledges of Possessions, the boundaries of mens Properties have been by them burned, torn in pieces, and the Seals trampled under their feet. These fears were not just propaganda. Wherever parliamentary troops were unruly or commanded by particularly radical officers, actions such as the murder of surrendering royalist gentlemen, or the defacing of memorials of the dead by Sir Thomas Mauleverer’s soldiers in the collegiate church at Ripon could become real possibilities. Gentry concerns for the traditional honour of their lineage and blood succession and the preservation of their estates are clearly evident in an anonymous letter complaining about the war among the Hotham manuscripts, which feared ‘the wounds of dissension made wider, and strangers brought in by degrees amongst us to possess our Inheritances.’

Robert Kirle had similar reservations about his comrades at the same time, warning that ‘if they cannot prove any of quality to be a Papist, yet as he is a Gentleman, he shall want grace; and that is title enough to possesse the estates of all that are more richer than themselves.’ Preaching in 1644, the royalist minister Edward Symmons clearly demonstrated what these men believed justified their reversal of allegiance: ‘A compleat cavalier is a child of honour... because of a more loyal heart... He is the only reserve of English gentility and ancient valour, and hath chosen to bury himself in the tomb of honour [rather] than to see the nobility of this nation vassalaged.’

Cholmley and the Hothams were receptive to such fears because they were so circumspect in their self-regard. In 1638, Strafford had written that Sir John was ‘extremely sensible of honour and discourtesies, perhaps a little overmuch.’ After John Hotham’s
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escape from his first arrest at Nottingham, Sir John wrote to him that ‘I will live and die with your honor.' In 1642, Sir John pleaded with Parliament to punish the member for Hull, Peregrine Pelham, for affronts to his good name. John Hampden had to send several placatory letters reassuring him of ‘that Judgement and honesty which is in you: shall never be called into question by mee upon slight grounds.' His son inherited this trait, imparting to Newcastle that ‘I have neither hopes nor feares that can remove me from what befitts a Gentleman,’ while indicating his concern that he would be treated by Newcastle’s envoy ‘in such away as is fitt for Gentlemen that value their honor above anything, for he is a knave that desires to outlive it.’ Yet from Newcastle’s point of view, John Hotham’s incessant, temperamental references to his honour while he remained in rebellion, would only serve to devalue it.

The letter produced at the Hothams’ last council of war, illustrates that despite their fears that Parliament doubted their loyalty, their honour even compelled them to demand Cromwell’s blood and threaten Parliament:

There is nothing in this world, next to their duty to God Almighty, dearer to men of honour than their reputations; neither is there any thing that falls out with more regret to them, than to have that violated by those whom they esteem their friends, and of whom, they conceive, they have had just right to expect other dealings. This letter is occasioned by the most unjust and perfidious wrong offered to one of our society here, which, as we conceive, was ever put on any man; and we are further persuaded that no age or history can produce the like example: and truly it gives us all just cause to look to our own conditions, who are by the King esteemed traitors; and if we shall be subject to be abused by such mischievous instruments as these are, [Cromwell and his agents] who have been the cause of this gentleman’s wrong, we certainly remain in a sad condition; and, we think, we shall be excused both before God and man, to do the best we can for our own preservation... This is a business not done in a corner, and is like to go further than is this protest. Our request, therefore, is, that if this be the act of Cromwell only, he may be delivered to justice.

Rather than Parliament being the plaintiff, the Hothams declared they were ‘bold to demand justice against any’ as they are no longer ‘able to lie long under so great an injury and burthen.'
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6:5 The danger from treachery

Had those Yorkshire parliamentarians who transferred their loyalty from Parliament to King in 1643 been more inclined to co-ordinate their plans, the effect of their desertion could have proved fatal to the entire parliamentary cause. Barely within a month that summer, the parliamentary armies of Fairfax and Waller had been crushed and then, after an abortive attempt to betray the city to Prince Rupert, Bristol had been taken by storm and Nathaniel Fiennes, its governor, accused of treachery and cowardice. Three months earlier, Fiennes had arrested the previous governor, Colonel Essex, on similar charges. Parliament’s major-general in the west, James Chudleigh, had deserted to the royalists, swiftly followed by his father. The earl of Peterborough defected, and Parliament’s General of Horse at Edgehill, William, fifth earl of Bedford, also deserted to fight for the royalists at Newbury that September. Sir Alexander Carew, the parliamentary governor of the fortress in Plymouth harbour, fearing for the safety of his person and estates had been arrested for planning to turn the town over to Prince Maurice. That June, a plot involving the M.P. Edmund Waller to seize the parliamentary leaders Wharton, Saye, Strode, Pym, Stapleton and the Lord Mayor had been discovered in the heart of London itself. The danger the cause was perceived to be in from treachery was producing a climate of near panic in Westminster. William Prynne urgently repeated the earl of Essex’s ‘Laws and Ordinances of War’ in a tract later that year:

WHOSOEVER yeeldeth up ANY TOWNE, FORT, MAGAZINE, VICTUALL, ARMES, AMMUNTION or that MENTIONETH, any such thing, BUT UPON GREAT EXTREMITY, and that to the Governour, or in Councell SHALL BE EXECUTED AS A TRAITOR.
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Colonel John Hutchinson, Governor of Nottingham, along with George Hutchinson and Thomas Poulton, were approached to change their allegiance in letters from the royalist Colonel Dacre, operating at Newcastle’s instigation. When Sir Marmaduke Langdale intercepted their negative reply he wrote to them on 18 December: ‘For his excellency the Marquess of Newcastle, you are much mistaken in his desire to corrupt any man. I rather believe it was his affection to you, having known two of your fathers, and his desire to preserve your estates that are now in a lost condition by your own follies.’

Langdale’s remarks reveal how gentry social networks and a landed gentleman’s natural concern for his estates were to become far more potent weapons in royalist arguments than parliamentary ones.

At the time of the arrest of the Hothams at Hull, Sir Hugh Cholmley wrote to Captain William Goodricke, an officer in the parliamentary garrison at Wressle castle, informing him that his father Major Goodricke had been arrested in Hull along with the Hothams. Threatening Wressle with his larger force in nearby Market Weighton, Cholmley advised Goodricke to either quit the garrison there, or ‘secure’ its commander, Captain Carter. Given that parliamentary fortunes were at such a low ebb, Cholmley probably felt with good reason that the uncertainty his letter would create might encourage Goodricke to abandon his allegiance.

Sir Thomas Fairfax did not know how many of his officers were receiving letters of this kind. In March 1643, the design for him to reinforce Major-General Thomas Ballard’s parliamentary besiegers of Newark was fortunately aborted, as the conspicuously ineffective Ballard changed his allegiance shortly after. His uncertainty grew so strong that fears of treachery among his colleagues came to adversely affect him. On 20 April, he wrote to his father explaining how Captain Ratcliffe, together with most of his company had deserted to
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the royalists. His uncertainty grew so strong that he arrested the highest ranking soldier in his army outside his family. Sergeant-Major-General John Gifford was imprisoned by him merely for having received letters from a Captain Willys which attempted to persuade him to change sides; Gifford’s service as a sergeant-major among Hothams’ forces in 1642 prior to his commission with the Fairfaxes was unlikely to mitigate suspicion. Cuttingly described by the royalists as the only soldier the Fairfaxes had, Gifford was accused of treachery, and sent to the Tower of London. He was still awaiting trial a full year later. There was no substance in these charges for Lord Fairfax himself later supported Gifford’s arrears claim of £1,280 for service from November 1642 until 3 October 1643 when he was unfairly dismissed from his commands.

Sir Thomas Fairfax neglected to mention this when writing his ‘Short Memorials’ twenty years later, choosing instead to blame his defeat at Adwalton Moor on ‘some ill-affected Officers, chiefly Major General Gifford.’ Even then, he sacrificed Gifford’s honour, branding him treacherous in order to maintain his military reputation in explaining away his greatest defeat. In addition, he blamed Colonel Rogers for failing to extricate the infantry from Bradford after the battle, accusing him of ‘a cowardly fear.’ The failure of his officers in these actions is surely better ascribed to the colossal odds ranged against them than any treacherous intent. Given that Fairfax had just abandoned Bradford, his permanent headquarters for three months, whose inhabitants had endured extremity to provide for his army and transformed him into the apocalyptic ‘Rider of the White Horse’, he sought others to blame to ease his guilt. In reference to similar charges made by the royalists against Sir John Urry’s conduct at Marston Moor, P.R. Newman rightly points out that ‘stories such
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as this should always be treated with the gravest suspicion as indicating less a reality than
a frame of mind amongst the defeated.173 Nevertheless, at his arrival in Hull, Sir Thomas
Fairfax headed his father’s committee of sixteen officers working with the town corporation
to hunt out traitors and turncoats.174 The atmosphere of distrust grew to such proportion
that even an officer of this trusted committee was accused of treachery.175 During the
ensuing siege, when a careless gunner ignited a powder magazine, it was treachery and not
negligence that was immediately suspected.176

S.R. Gardiner only partly identified the cause of the disintegration of the northern
parliamentary command in his analysis: ‘Among its commanders, too, there were some who
had taken up arms from political rather than religious motives, and who therefore felt
themselves ill at ease as the cause for which they fought showed itself as more distinctly
Puritan.’177 Those Yorkshire parliamentarians who were immovable did tend to be more
extreme in their religion, and usually more vehemently anti-Catholic, but the disaffection of
their colleagues was less due to revulsion at these tendencies themselves than the forces
which they came to unleash. Apart from playing the central role in enabling the Fairfaxes
to field a sizeable army, the activism of sub-gentry groups encompassed in the club-law
incidents brought with it a heavy cost in allegiance among Yorkshire’s leading parliamentary
gentry. Some parliamentarians were aware of this backwardness in their less fervent
colleagues; before the defections actually began, one writer prophetically noted:

I guesse at such thoughts by some expressions I have heard from them, who say they doubt the people aim
at some infandum, something too big for their mouthes though not for their hearts, which they are so
horribly afraid of being serviceable to, that they many times doubt whether themselves should doe their own
duty, because they suspect other men forget theirs. Not considering that this is the way to beget a counter-
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jealousie which may undoe all, but the Parliament first.\textsuperscript{178}

Rather than acting in isolation, the Hothams were merely the most striking example of this process. Clarendon wrote how Parliament ‘discover’d some alteration in the Son’s behaviour and that the Pride and Stubborness of his Nature would not suffer him to submit to the Command of the Lord Fairfax.’\textsuperscript{179} John Hotham may have been proud and stubborn, but the route to his disaffection was grounded more in his fear for the safety of his estates and position. The Fairfaxes were less sensitive to such fears, reflecting their greater willingness to trust their social inferiors and a deeper religious commitment to the prosecution of their war for the survival of the Godly religion.

Ultimately then, the actual motivations which led Yorkshiremen to forsake the parliamentary cause are neither as base nor as noble as is often pretended. Peter Roebuck has argued of the Hothams that, ‘Unlike most of those who shifted their allegiance during the war, who acted purely out of self-interest, their strategy represented a brave, honourable, but distinctly naive attempt to identify the middle ground and bring the warring sides together.’\textsuperscript{180} Yet the Hothams were neither naive nor pacifists, nor were they genuinely seeking ‘middle ground’. Through turning royalist, denying the Fairfaxes refuge, and delivering Beverley, Hull and Lincoln to the King, they were likely to have destroyed the entire parliamentary cause. No snap decisions in the summer of 1642,\textsuperscript{181} civil war allegiance dilemmas constitute interesting microcosms of broader notions of aristocratic honour, the shifting conceptions of which continued the self-legitimation of their social superiority throughout Europe.\textsuperscript{182} A key factor in their ruin, the Hothams were among the
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most status-obsessed of gentry families. As with most seventeenth-century gentlemen, they were unable to see distinctions between their private interests and the country’s general welfare. They felt they were the country, and that the social strata below them were of no consequence. Many of their fellows held similar views, pleading for an end to the war on the basis that they personally, and therefore the country also, only stood to suffer from it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading Parliamentarians who turned Royalist</th>
<th>Those suspected of turning Royalist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Hotham, bart., M.P.</td>
<td>Sir Edward Rodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Hugh Cholmley, bart., M.P.</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Remington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Henry Anderson, M.P.</td>
<td>Major-General John Gifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-General John Hotham, M.P.</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel Christopher Legard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel Lancelot Alured</td>
<td>Captain Henry Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wharton, M.P.</td>
<td>Captain Matthias Froom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Ratcliffe</td>
<td>Captain Lowinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne Bushell</td>
<td>Captain Bladen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Bushell</td>
<td>Durand Hotham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cholmley</td>
<td>William Hotham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Bourdenand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Stockdale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Deserters of the Parliamentary Command in Yorkshire in 1643.
CONCLUSION

The tendency among ‘revisionist’ historians to concentrate on high politics and events at the centre has tended to minimise the role of ordinary people in the Civil Wars. John Adamson’s contention that the outbreak of war was dominated by baronial faction has little relevance in Yorkshire.¹ His interpretation of the First Civil War as merely the second rebellion of the earls of Essex has been convincingly rebutted by Mark Kishlansky.² Through the work of David Underdown, Ann Hughes and Mark Stoyle, it has become increasingly accepted that many ordinary English people chose their allegiance for themselves. Ann Hughes has argued of the outbreak of the civil war that: ‘Gradually the whole of England was drawn, willy-nilly, into the war, but allegiance was determined largely by military factors: the proximity of London or of the King’s army, or the relative effectiveness of the small number of local partisans.’³ Yet this last point might be viewed as more of an effect than a determinant of allegiance. The question of who these local partisans were, and from where they drew their support must be central to explaining why there was a war at all. This is where David Underdown’s cultural dichotomy of allegiance has provided a new framework for evaluation. Underdown held that popular allegiance was affected by the ecology, social structure and culture of the locality. He asserted that popular royalism was most prevalent in arable regions dominated by nucleated villages and single resident landlords, with a very settled and traditional way of life. He argued that woodland and upland areas concentrating on pasture, dairying and emerging rural industries, with scattered patterns of settlement and multiple or absentee landlords, were more likely to support Parliament.⁴ His ‘chalk and cheese country’ of north Somerset and north Wiltshire broadly fits into this second category, and correlates closely with the western half of the West Riding. Both regions were heavily engaged in cloth manufacture and shared strong
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commitments to Godly reformation in a significant proportion of their inhabitants. The clothing districts of the West Riding, and south to the area around Sheffield also conform to Underdown’s cultural analysis in that they were predominantly upland and pastoral regions, with scattered patterns of settlement, and engaged in industry as well as agriculture. Townships and chapelrys proliferated to such an extent that the traditional nucleated village with a single resident landlord had become comparatively rare. Andrew Warmington points to the south western parishes of Gloucestershire sharing similar features of weak manorial control and dispersed pastoral settlements, with rising populations dominated by the cloth industry. In places like Halifax a new Godly parish elite was emerging, consisting of parochial gentlemen, yeomen and cloth dealers, the social distinctions between which had become irretrievably blurred.

All these regions were conspicuous for aggressive popular parliamentarianism, yet John Morrill has questioned Underdown’s theory. He argues that cloth regions, areas with strong Godly discipline and towns with trade routes and close contact with London were all features which explain parliamentarian allegiance without recourse to Underdown’s ‘broader cultural analysis.’ Indeed, Underdown’s hypothesis is questionable in explaining the committed parliamentarianism of East Riding parishes such as Cottingham, Etton, Hesse, and Sculcoates. Surely such lowland, arable and nucleated villages clearly conform to Underdown’s criteria for a royalist locality. Perhaps there is room for more traditional explanations of allegiance here. These parishes were dominated by the military presence of the fortress of Hull, and the local gentry were overwhelmingly parliamentarian. In the preceding century, Hull had become increasingly exposed to Reformed ideas through its status as a great trading port supplying cloth to Protestant northern Europe, and the influence of this atmosphere of commerce and religious reform surely extended to include these neighbouring parishes.

More work examining areas of popular royalism in the county is necessary to establish where Underdown’s areas of old-fashioned paternalism, good neighbourhood and traditional festivities existed; Holderness, Craven, the Yorkshire Dales and the adjoining districts around Ripon and Skipton might be worthwhile starting points. If popular royalism was indeed strong in areas where the population was sparse, in poorer regions where the old festive culture still lingered, then perhaps remote areas of the North Riding would also reward investigation. An explanation of popular royalism, well supported by evidence would be a challenging task, but one that should not be confined to notions of deference and obedience to royalist landlords. Popular royalism might be found in groups opposed to further reformation, and defending a traditional way of life. There seems no reason why non-gentry royalists should be any less capable of making principled moral choices of allegiance than their parliamentarian counterparts.8

Attempts had been made to explain the aggressively parliamentarian characteristics of clothing districts long before Underdown produced his cultural analysis. Clarendon commented that the West Riding cloth towns were ‘so notoriously disaffected, especially in matters relating to the Church, that they wanted only conductors to carry them into rebellion’.9 His descriptions of how these urban populations had been stirred up by ‘factious lecturers’10, betray his prejudice against towns, yet they provide a representative and vivid insight into how much of the gentry community were likely to resent ‘the fury and license of the common people, who were in all places grown to that barbarity and rage against the nobility and gentry.’11 While far from being an absolute rule,12 historians generally recognise that there was some link between clothworkers, radical religion and rebellion, that it was a tradition not confined to the British Civil Wars, and that it was a phenomenon recognised

8 It is disappointing that the works of P.R. Newman do not fully engage with the problem of popular royalism.
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at the time by contemporaries. Keith Wrightson has pointed out how clothworkers were viewed as 'of worse condition to be quietly governed than husbandmen.'13 Even Gerolamo Agostini, the Venetian secretary in London, noted that the common people of Yorkshire's clothing districts supported the Fairfaxes, commenting how they assisted him in ambushing the earl of Newcastle's forces near Leeds.14 David Underdown neatly summarises:

"The connection between Puritanism and the clothing districts is wearisomely familiar, and although historians have differed widely about its causes... It is enough to conclude that, for whatever reasons, industrial development and the kind of society it produced can be associated with parliamentarian loyalties."

Protestant nonconformity was likely to have spread into the clothing districts along trade routes and connections with Reformed Europe through Hull and London. Employment in the indoor activities of spinning and weaving, allowed families more time to listen to tract, catechism and Bible reading. Margaret Spufford has recently argued: "The elusive connection between dissent and cloth becomes more comprehensible set in a general context of trade relationships. The great interest shown by clothiers, who traded with Reformed Europe, in books becomes highly significant."15 David Rollinson's examination of inventories in Gloucestershire from 1660 to 1680 points out that clothiers and cloth workers 'were much more likely to own books than any other sector', and Spufford urges a similar exercise be undertaken for the West Riding, which she argues would probably yield similar results.17 Adam Eyre, a minor gentleman clothier of Penistone parish, was a regular borrower and lender of books. His extensive collection, mostly on religious subjects, included a copy of the radical Independent, John Saltmarsh's, 'Smoke in the Temple', and the republican astrologer,18 William Lilly's, 'Prophecies of the White King and the Dreadful

17 Ibid., p.52.
dead man'.

In the West Riding clothing districts, the explosive combination of popular anti-Catholicism and a severe economic depression blended to produce an environment receptive to popular anti-royalist extremism. Andrew Warmington has found that in Gloucestershire, clothiers were presumed rebels by royalist officers and indiscriminately plundered. Mark Stoyle comments on identical gentry fears of popular insurrection among the economically depressed clothing districts of north Devon. When Parliament appealed to the people of north Devon to take up arms there was a similar enthusiastic response from cloth towns like Barnstaple, Halberton and Tiverton to that experienced by Sir Thomas Fairfax from Bradford and Halifax. In September 1645, clubmen groups of north Devon cried out 'a Fairfax, a Fairfax' to demonstrate their allegiance to Parliament, just as the people of Halifax had done three years earlier. Such areas of popular parliamentarianism and rural industry tended to be populous, and Margaret Cavendish, wife of the Duke of Newcastle, seemed aware of this at the time, perceiving a direct link between populous and rebellious places. She noted in particular, that the people of Sheffield were 'most of them rebelliously affected.'

Ann Hughes has found parallels in the wood-pasture and metalworking Arden districts of north Warwickshire. In these scattered settlements, the greater gentry tended towards royalism as 'they lived in a society where social subordination was more precarious than in the settled communities of south Warwickshire; and in 1642 they were the closest witnesses of the support Brooke obtained from lesser men.' They were fearful social hierarchies would crumble if they acted against the King. A similar process occurred in Devon, Mark
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Stoyle recently supporting Ann Hughes’s hypothesis that in regions where the middling and poorer sorts supported Parliament, the gentry elite became fearful for the social order and hierarchy, and therefore ‘more inclined to an authoritarian politics.’ This pattern recurs in Yorkshire. Where parliamentarianism was strongest among the common people, a high yield of royalist gentry was to be found. In the West Riding, this was certainly the case. There were more royalist gentry families there than in the rest of the county combined, and they outnumbered their parliamentarian counterparts by well over two to one. P.R. Newman’s study of royalist colonels, as we have noted, asserts that more royalist colonels came from the West Riding of Yorkshire than any other English or Welsh county. So if, as Warmington argues, ‘The fit between areas of popular and gentry Parliamentarianism is not identical’; then this helps explain the far stronger show of parliamentarian gentry families in the East Riding, forming 26 per cent of the Riding’s total number of gentry families, compared to the West Riding’s 17 per cent. Yet considering how blurred social distinctions had become in the clothing districts, the problem of qualification for gentry status must be addressed in relation to Cliffe’s figures. Fairfax drew more of his West Riding support from Godly individuals on the margins of gentry status, than from the established county squires and gentlemen of Cliffe’s study. ‘Parochial’ gentlemen clothiers such as Adam and Joseph Eyre, William Rich, John Hodgson, Thomas Oates, Nathaniel Bower, Joseph Briggs, and Joshua, Thomas and Nicholas Greathead were likely to have been largely unknown out of their locality, yet it was captains such as these that were the very backbone of Fairfax’s forces.

Ronan Bennett’s research confirms this view of the allegiance divide at its most socially pronounced, commenting: ‘In Halifax itself, the gentry-people split could hardly have been more clean-cut. While the freeholders, clothiers and artisans rallied to the
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Fairfaxes, local gentlemen joined the King. When the divide in allegiance was as socially visible as this, all but the most radical and committed parliamentarian gentry would hesitate. Already by February 1643, one London tract was concerned that Parliament was so active in soliciting the support of the yeomanry and middling sort, that it neglected the gentry, leaving some parliamentarians fearful that their cause was beginning to threaten the social distinction between yeoman and gentleman. ‘It hath been observed, the Parliament hath made little difference, (or not the right) between the Gentry and the Yeomanry, rather complying and winning upon the latter, than regarding or applying themselves at all to the former.’ It continued to declare of the common people that ‘they are almost always heady and violent, seldom are lasting and constant in their opinions.’ As we have seen earlier, John Hotham voiced exactly these sentiments, complaining that one of Cromwell’s captains ‘was late but a yeoman.’ Hotham and those like him would have drawn little comfort from the dangerous manner in which one newsbook reported the Fairfaxes’ spectacular capture of Wakefield on Whitsunday on 21 May 1643:

Sall I tell you the Story of an awde wife in Wakefield as she was sitting on the midding wringing her hands and greeting after the feight was done, that she had lived sea lang, and she had heard of the Pindar of Wakefield, Geordy Greene, and Little John, but never thought sike doings had been in the world, and never since was borne did she, and she thinks nene else in the Towne observe the Song of Geordy Greene before now, And not shift themselves till Munday, and repeated these auide Verses following;

In Wakefield on a Greene, upon a Whitsunday,
The Maids in Wakefield would go dance,
Put on your smocke on Munday.

---


31 B.L. TT E89(21), The Moderator Expecting Sudden Peace, or Certaine Ruine, 16 February (London, 1643), pp.15-16.

32 B.L. Harl. MS, 164, f.234.
She swore that Mother Shipdon was a Witch, for she prophesied of these times.

Geordy Green, the Pindar of Wakefield was a hero comparable to Robin Hood, a champion of the town’s freemen and yeomanry guarding against the foul designs of a corrupt nobility. A ballad and a play celebrating his heroic deeds had existed for fifty years, and the mental connection the old woman made between Geordy’s exploits and the Fairfaxes’ army capturing Wakefield is tantalising.

Of course the royalist army also included a great many drawn from the yeomanry and middling sort. A few non-gentry even became royalist officers, but overwhelmingly officered and led by the traditional landed gentry they were not prey to the same worried introspection so characteristic of all but the most radical parliamentary gentry. The consciences of royalist gentlemen in Yorkshire did not have to wrestle with justifying their rebellion, or with arming the common people to make war on the county’s aristocracy.

At the outbreak of war, the earl of Dorset complained to the Countess of Pembroke: ‘I would... my children had never binn borne, to live under the dominion of soe many Cades and Ketts, as threaten by there multitudes and insurrections to drowne all memory of monarchy, nobility, gentry in this land.’ The earl of Pembroke voiced identical fears in his

33 D.N.B., Mother Shipton. Most probably a mythical figure, her prophecies were published in London in 1641 by an anonymous tract entitled: The Prophecie of Mother Shipton in the Raigne of King Henry 8th foretelling the death of Cardinall Wolsey, the Lord Percy, and others, as also what should happen in ensuing Times.

34 Worcester College, Oxford: Wing 2251A, The Pindar of Wakefield, Or A True Narration of the unparallell’d Victory obtained against the Popish Army at the taking in of Wakefield in Yorkshire by the Lord Fairfaxe his Forces, May 20. 1643. As it was sent in a Letter from one in that Army to his friend here in London, not altering it from his native tone, more like Chaucer’s English, then ours here (London, 1643), p.5.


reported speech to the House of Lords pleading for peace: ‘Wee heare every base fellow say
in the street as we pass by in our Coaches, that they hope to see us on foot shortly, and to
be as good men as the lords’. Such fears could weigh heavily upon wealthy
parliamentarians troubled over their allegiance. It was a measure of their fear of
uncontrolled popular support swelling beneath the Fairfaxs that Sir John Hotham and Sir
Hugh Cholmley embraced royalism, despite the King’s earlier threats against their lives in
1640.38

Ronan Bennett’s argument concerning the motivations of sub-gentry groups
supporting Parliament in Yorkshire reinforces the observation that such gentry fears of their
social inferiors were not wholly unfounded:

The position of the manor court in policing the village received fatal blows during and after the Civil War.
This was mainly the result of the divergence in the political allegiances of the gentry and the people. The
more prosperous and ambitious freeholders and tenants who sided with Parliament and who had long
resented the resurgent and aggressive manorialism characteristic of late sixteenth and early seventeenth-
century Yorkshire took the opportunity provided by the temporary displacement of the Royalist gentry to
undermine manorial jurisdiction and the structures of local policing.39

It was events such as the successive club-law episodes in the first year of war that gave birth
to this process. Theories of freeborn Englishmen and the Norman yoke grew from it. The
libellous words that the royalist squire, Solomon Swale, was charged with uttering,
encapsulate the gentry resentment that the Fairfaxs had facilitated these dreadful
occurrences: ‘Sir Tho[mas]: Fairfax was dead and gone to the devill, and my lord would
presently follow him, for how could it be otherwise for he had raised Armes ag[ains]t the
King.’40 After the Restoration, even former parliamentarians were pre-occupied with an
anxiety that such events should never be allowed to happen again. In 1664, Lionel Copley41

37 B.L. R.P. 57, The Commonplace Book of Ralph Assheton of Kirkby Grange; J.
Morrill, The Revolt in the Provinces: The People of England and the Tragedies of
War, 1630-1648 (2nd edn., London, 1999), p.54. Morrill points out that Pembroke
never made the speech, and probably never even wrote it, but this was unlikely to
be known by anxious provincial readers like Ralph Assheton.

38 Cliffe, The Yorkshire Gentry, p.322.


40 P.R.O., S.P. 23/172/281.

41 Copley had been a noted moderate, Muster-Master-General to the earl of Essex,
and repeatedly imprisoned at the instigation of parliamentary radicals: M.A.E.
Green (ed), Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1651 (London, 1877), p.81; J.R.
MacCormack, Revolutionary Politics in the Long Parliament (Cambridge,
was indicted for a vulgar display of his opinions concerning the rights of the freeborn Englishmen of Rotherham, having 'beaten one Richard Firth, put a bridle in his mouth, got on his back, and ridden him about for half an hour, kicking him to make him move.'\textsuperscript{42} David Underdown has pointed out that this was certainly a response to the Leveller saying that no man was born with a saddle on his back, with others born booted and spurred to ride upon him.\textsuperscript{43} It is significant that Copley chose such a politically-charged demonstration to express his private quarrel.

Copley would have witnessed, or at least heard of, the deer’s head fixed to the market cross at Sheffield in 1658 by three local poachers, with the attached note that read: ‘For I thinke I may speake my mind freely there was once a Parliament engaged to root out & suppress all the Lords of the Mannors w[i]th all the Norman Blood.’\textsuperscript{44} In furthering their unpoltical demands, these outlaws clearly understood the value of levelling rhetoric for intimidating and infuriating local magistrates. They were tapping resentful feelings among some members of the parliamentary middling sort that after the war, the House of Commons had betrayed them. Andy Wood has revealed similar sentiments in the Derbyshire lead miners’ petition to Parliament of 1649. When rights of free mining were under threat from resurgent landowning magnates, the language of the free miners’ petitioning smacked of Leveller rhetoric, and even explicitly declared support for the Agreement of the People.\textsuperscript{45} Interesting parallels can be found among middling sort clothiers at Leeds. Fearful of their trade being dominated by their social superiors, they urged the incorporation of the whole Yorkshire broadcloth trade into ‘one bodie politick’, with officers elected by all the clothiers. Led by the former parliamentarian captain, Nicholas Greathead, they petitioned their M.P. on 28 August 1654:

\begin{verbatim}
Massachusetts, 1973), p.73.
\end{verbatim}


\textsuperscript{44} W.Y.R.O., Wakefield: QS 4/5/93.

yett Sertan we are to meete with opposition from those hoe have, and still desire to Tiranise over a fre[e] borne peopell, but we hope our Candid Resolutions will soe evidently appeare, in the making out our desires, that every unbiased Rationall Spirit will be satisfied, that we Run not from one upstrame to another, but Clearly Act fforth[e] good of all, in order to atherowe Reformaition.46

Others were still more explicit. Captain William Siddall of Tadcaster wrote to his cousin, Captain Adam Baynes, absent in London on 22 January 1650: 'How lives John Lilborne now & what does he any thinge for ye Common wealth or is he silent. [sic] you forgott as yet to send me a booke of newes and we desire to hear how affaires goe: surelye the Lord will arise And let some be ashamed off their under hande dealinge.'47 That parochial gentlemen and yeomen who held commissions in Fairfax's Yorkshire army openly used such Leveller rhetoric, indicates the possibility of an undercurrent of extremely radical sentiment in Yorkshire, about which very little is known.

Religion has been the traditional line of inquiry in highlighting the radical parliamentarians within the movement who were dedicated to a total victory. In recent years, such arguments have enjoyed something of a rebirth and are increasingly accepted. D.L. Smith has argued:

Those who gravitated towards the political extremes, especially among the Parliamentarians, were those whose religious beliefs operated rather like an 'override key', those who felt such imperatives so deeply and intensely as to let them dictate their political agendas. Religion often forced such people to jettison conventional seventeenth-century assumptions about an innate symbiosis between Crown and Parliament.48

Indeed, contemporary evidence to support such views is in no way lacking, and Yorkshire is no exception. In justifying his decision to rebel, John Hodgson wrote of his community in Halifax parish:

Parliament had declared their fears and jealousies that there was a popish party about the King, carrying on a design to alter religion; that the war with Scotland was procured for to make way for it; that the rebellion in Ireland was framed in England, and should have been acted here. These things were scattered amongst us and made us closer to ourselves.49

John Morrill hits this religious note once more in his contention that the main division within the parliamentarian side in many counties was 'between those who had only joined the cause to preserve existing values and structures, to conserve their own power and influence, and those who saw the war as preparing for a transformed world... While the great majority of

47 B.L. Add. MS, 21,418, f.286.
48 Smith, 'Catholic, Anglican or Puritan?', p.123.
men dithered or wrote petitions and talked of raising a third force for peace, it was the men who felt most strongly about religion who began the war.50 Yet in Yorkshire in 1642, it was the anti-Puritan Hothams who sought war, while the Godly Fairfaxes negotiated for peace. However, within a year this situation had admittedly transformed, owing largely to the uncomfortable question soon faced by the parliamentarian clergy and gentry. In a county such as Yorkshire where they were so heavily outnumbered and overawed, this was a vital question, and one perhaps only partly determined by religious inclination. How far were they prepared to empower and entrust sub-gentry social strata in a war largely directed against their social superiors?

The difference between a moderate and a truly radical parliamentarian was not exclusively a matter of religious division; it lay within the answer to this question, an answer in which an individual’s upbringing and temperament would also play a part. The future royalist Lord Conway declared in May 1640: ‘There is no trust to be put in the common people; they have neither constancy nor gratitude.’51 With the unrest unleashed by the first twelve months of war, parliamentarian peers and gentry increasingly came to share his view. Among the very few peers to reject this argument was Lord Brooke who, in his speech against making peace in December 1642, addressed the House of Lords:

Wee doe not find that among the actes of Creation, the Almightye ever made an Earle or a Lord... surelie if wee shall be contended for the setting forward of a good cause to mingle ourselves with the meanest of the people for procuring a partie in the Church, to consent to a partie in the state; and for the subduing the pride of Kings for a tyme, to part w[i]th the power of noble men; I doubt not but when the good work in hand shall be finished, wee shall be agayne advanced, above our brethren, according to our severall talents and governe them accordingly to that rule w[i]hich shall most advantage God's cause.”52

Brooke was not advocating the abolition of the peerage or gentry, but he was stressing the need to banish fears of social levelling and to trust the common people in the coming struggle. Fairfax was among the handful of peers who shared his confidence. A copy of Brooke’s speech was transcribed into Ralph Assheton’s commonplace book, indicating that such rhetoric did reach a Yorkshire audience. Indeed, there is further reason to believe that Brooke’s militancy was known to the people of the West Riding. Adjacent to the moor that was a landmark of their bloodiest defeat, the inn at Adwalton was named “The Lord

50 Morrill, The Revolt in the Provinces: The People of England and the Tragedies of War, pp.73,164.

51 Underdown, Revel, Riot and Rebellion, p.137.

Brook's', and was visited by the parliamentary captains John Hodgson and Adam Eyre after the war.53 Underdown's assertion holds true, that the 'radical forces unleashed by the war destroyed the gentry's confidence that their inferiors shared their priorities',54 but in the early years of the war it was men like Brooke and the Fairfaxes who were most resolute in struggling against this realisation.

Thomas Stockdale had questioned if monarchs should be entitled to rule 'according to their own fancies, or their flattering favourites' malevolent affections'.55 As early as August 1643, John Saltmarsh, the rector of Heslerton in the East Riding, was the first Englishman known to have called for regicide. Bulstrode Whitelocke commented that Saltmarsh had argued that 'if the King would not grant their Demands, then to root him out, and the Royal Line' was the wisest course of action.56 Yorkshire made a significant contribution to what David Wootton has identified as the 'rapid emergence of radicalism at the beginning of the civil war', and thus 'cast[s] in doubt the revisionist thesis that there was unquestioning agreement amongst the educated in early Stuart England on the need to preserve hierarchy and tradition, and suggests that earlier royalist fears of "popularity" were not entirely misplaced.57 Saltmarsh's conviction that 'all means should be used to keep the King and his People from a sudden union',58 supports such arguments. The experience of Charles I's misgovernment had hardened and radicalised the political views of sections of Yorkshire's population. Shortly after the supposed 'Rye House Plot' of 1683, in politically charged terms indeed, John Hodgson wrote, 'whether the Government hath been monarchy,

53 Eyre, 'A Dyurnall or Catalogue of all my Accions', p.82; Turner (ed), The Autobiography of Captain John Hodgson, p.54.
54 Underdown, A Freeborn People, p.10
56 The republican M.P. Henry Marten was briefly imprisoned in the Tower for defending Saltmarsh: B. Whitelocke, Memorials of English Affairs: or an Historical Account of What passed from the beginning of the Reign of King Charles the First, to King Charles the Second His Happy Restauration (London, 1682), p.68; Commons' Journals, vol. iii, p.206n.,212,226.
57 Wootton, 'From Rebellion to Revolution', p.668.
58 Whitelocke, Memorials of English Affairs, p.68.
aristocracy, or democracy: the fountain hath been the agreement of the people’,\textsuperscript{59} and he was unlikely to be alone in this opinion.

Anti-royalist feeling in areas of vociferous sub-gentry parliamentarianism did not die with the Restoration. The anxious authorities knew where to look for sedition. The very areas which had shown such strong support for the Fairfaxes continued to trouble the Restoration government. Coley Hall was constantly suspected to be a nest of conspirators,\textsuperscript{60} and John Hodgson was arrested for the alleged seditious curse: ‘Your Kinge, your Kinge ere long will have notheinge left to sett his crowne upon.’\textsuperscript{61} William Lawson, a labourer of Leeds, was tried for hoping that ‘the phanaticks will disperse his Majesties trained bands like the chafe before the wind. It was justly done that the late King was beheaded.’\textsuperscript{62} On the eve of the Northern Risings of 1663,\textsuperscript{63} Jonathan Shackleton of Bingley was tried for his seditious claim that ‘the Kinge is a bloody Papist, or else he would never have give consent to the putting to death of so many honest men as he hath.’\textsuperscript{64} Similar revulsion after the execution of the northern rebels of 1663 was expressed in Jeremy Bower’s house at Bradford, where John Lyley was charged with saying that ‘the King had a fair trial & just witnesses, unlike the persons condemned at the last Gaol delivery at York whom he called martyrs.’\textsuperscript{65} Families of key radicals were harassed, in Thomas Stockdale’s case after his death; his son William, and his son-in-law Colonel Robert Walters, were arrested for alleged complicity in the Farnley wood conspiracy.\textsuperscript{66} Richard Walker, Henry Bradshaw, Jeremy Booth, John Lowcock and Mr. Waterhouse, saddlers and blacksmiths of Bradford were all implicated in

\textsuperscript{61} Raine (ed), \textit{Depositions from the Castle of York}, p.87.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., p.88.
\textsuperscript{63} For studies of the Northern Risings see Greaves, \textit{‘Deliver Us From Evil’}, pp.159-206, and S.J. Chadwick, \textit{‘The Farnley Wood Plot’}, in \textit{Miscellanea} (Publications of the Thoresby Society, 15, 1909), pp.122-6.
\textsuperscript{64} Raine (ed), \textit{Depositions from the Castle of York}, p.100.
\textsuperscript{65} P.R.O., ASSI 45, 7/1/135.
the 1663 rebellion. 67 George Blackburne, a wealthy clothier from Huddersfield, committed suicide rather than face trial. He lamented that ‘the Gentry were insupportable to the People.’ 68 The two 1663 risings that had the largest turnouts were at Farnley wood near Leeds, and on Bradford moor, two old Fairfax strongholds. 69 Many that were tried for participation in these risings were from the cloth towns. The lists of the condemned include clothworkers, clothdressers, linen weavers, yeomen, maltsters, grocers, weavers, cordwainers, clothiers and locksmiths, strongly representative of the broad alliance of middling sort that had provided the Fairfaxes with their first army. 70

Deliberate support for Parliament among the middling and poorer sorts in 1642-3 was never automatic, but neither was it insignificant. Although the issue requires wider comparisons with other regions, this study supports the contention that sub-gentry social strata in seventeenth-century England were capable of thinking for themselves, and when presented with a free choice in 1642 were on the whole more likely to support Parliament. John Hodgson, for example, believed these strata had been the salvation of the kingdom, and was so disdainful of the Scots in 1650 because he felt: ‘The gentry of the nation have such influence over the commonalty, that they can lead them what way they please.’ 71 Hodgson had become accustomed to the independent spirit of his native clothing districts, a characteristic held to be common among the locality’s artisans and yeomen. 72 Such assertions are further supported by William Coster’s argument that in contrast to Ainsty and lowland parishes, the families of nearby Almondbury rarely considered the patronage of

69 Ibid., p.190.
70 Raine (ed), Depositions from the Castle of York, p.xix.
71 W. Scott (ed), Original Memoirs Written During the Great Civil War being the Life of Sir Henry Slingsby and memoirs of Captain Hodgson with notes (Edinburgh, 1806), p.124.
local gentry as Godparents to be important.\textsuperscript{73}

Widespread enthusiasm for the parliamentary cause in the clothing districts of the West Riding among sub-gentry groups was echoed in Pennine regions of neighbouring counties. The parliamentary strength in Lancashire lay in the Pennine areas on the eastern fringes of the county, around Manchester, Bolton and Burnley. R.C. Richardson connected Puritanism with pastoral areas in east Lancashire, south of the River Ribble,\textsuperscript{74} while Spufford asserts that commercial and religious ties to Manchester dominated the area.\textsuperscript{75} It is likely that Leeds enjoyed a similar position at the other end of this trans-Pennine cloth manufacturing corridor.

There are further Pennine connections. Sir John Gell was able to raise parliamentary troops in the wapentake of Wirksworth in north-west Derbyshire. The crown had been particularly aggressive against the interests of local free miners in the 1630s, and in 1642, Sir Francis Wortley’s royalist horsemen inspired further resentment, plundering Wirksworth town.\textsuperscript{76} Further victims of Wortley’s plundering in 1642 were the neighbouring yeomen farmers of the north Staffordshire Pennines. ‘The Moorlanders’, as they came to be known, subsequently mustered for Parliament with no gentry leadership, and led by ‘The Grand Juryman’, a phrase perhaps used as some sort of political slogan,\textsuperscript{77} they assaulted Stafford in February, 1643. The royalist sheriff described them as ‘a great rabble... some with birding guns, others only with clubs, others with pieces of scythes, very few with muskets, and I believe as slenderly provided with ammunition.’ He was apprehensive that they would ‘prove such a shower as will drown all this county’, and feared they had invited Lord


\textsuperscript{74} R.C. Richardson, Puritanism in North-West England: A Regional Study of the Diocese of Chester to 1642 (Manchester, 1972), pp.3-10.

\textsuperscript{75} Spufford, ‘The Importance of Religion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’, pp.42n.,48.


Brooke to join them, who allegedly hoped 'to find a considerable party in those parts.' The alarm such movements could cause among royalist gentlemen is aptly illustrated by a letter to the royalist Colonel Henry Hastings, begging for aid against the 'moorland rebels': 'If they be not speedily opposed this county is lost. For God's sake send what forces you can spare with what speed you can.'

However, Andy Wood has recently questioned this model of allegiance, warning of the dangers of generalising about plebeian allegiance. He uses the example of the royalist miners of Derbyshire's High Peak to argue that independent small producers living in upland, pastoral and emerging industrial areas were not necessarily automatically parliamentarians. Yet Wood himself points out how the miners were swayed by a royal offer of exemption from lead tithe for all recruits. He demonstrates the need to be conscious of local issues and temporary expedient in the formation of plebeian allegiance. Yet in our case, no similar royal offer appears to have been made to the West Riding clothiers, many of whom as we have seen, were far more likely to view the Fairfaxes as champions of their interests.

Even with Wood's exception, it remains that sub-gentry groups across the southern Pennines as a whole were far more conspicuous for their parliamentarian than their royalist allegiance. It is therefore likely that sub-gentry parliamentary supporters in these regions shared a more similar social and cultural environment with each other, than with the rest of their respective counties, where popular parliamentary support was weaker. Regardless of the county boundary, William Coster has pointed out that the parliamentarian towns of Bradford, Bingley, Huddersfield, Bolton and Manchester were all 'well within the social sphere of the parish of Almondbury', and indeed it would be unwise to assume any different for other parishes of this trans-Pennine region.

Ann Hughes has discovered parallels in Warwickshire, where she has found in opposition to the 'county community theory' that there was often a striking lack of correlation between the jurisdictional and economic boundaries of a county. Indeed, regions

79 Ibid., p.89.
81 Coster, 'Kinship and Community in Yorkshire, 1500-1700', pp.74-5.
within a county could display sharp contrasts in both agriculture and industry. When coupled with an inclination towards religious radicalism, this distinctive south Pennine environment tended towards a militant popular parliamentary allegiance regardless of the nature of prevailing local gentry feeling. Considering the dominance of local concerns in strategic decision making and the absence of a unified parliamentary war effort for the northern counties, the co-ordination of this Pennine belt of supporters into an effective field force was nearly impossible. The Fairfaxes came closest by being able to produce a sizeable, if ill-equipped army at Adwalton Moor, but it was still a local force insufficient to defeat Newcastle’s army, drawn as it was from across the entire north of England, and the largest royalist army of the Civil Wars.

In Yorkshire no single peer exercised the kind of dominance enjoyed by the earl of Warwick in Essex, or Lord Brooke in Warwickshire. Massive recruitment through pre-war local domination was not a possibility. With the arrival of the earl of Newcastle’s large army dominating the centre of the county, followed by the Fairfaxes’ westward retreat towards their natural supporters in the clothing districts, the polarisation of Yorkshire was complete. The battle for Bradford on 18 December 1642 and Sir John Hotham’s defection to the royalists have been well known for a long time, but until now their significance and the connection between them have not been adequately appreciated. Lacking the royalists’ level of support from among the county gentry, the Fairfaxes were compelled to conspicuously encourage unparalleled activism from humbler social strata, and in so doing deeply disturbed royalist and parliamentarian gentry alike. For many, the opposing forces came to represent the extremes of the parties for which they had engaged. Indeed, ‘The Popish Army’ faced the ‘rude Malice of the People’, ensuring that for the people of Yorkshire, the First Civil War would be particularly bitter.
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APPENDIX I

THE RECRUITMENT OF COPLEY’S TROOP OF HORSE, 1642-6

Places of origin of the under-officers and troopers of Colonel Christopher Copley’s troop recruited in 1643-6, given in Worcester College: Clarke MS, 4/2:

**Recruitment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Riding</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Riding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Riding</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kinship patterns:**

25 out of 92 share surnames with comrades in the troop:

- Nayler-5
- Birkbeck-2
- Harrison-2
- Watter-2
- Fox-3
- Blackburne-2
- Hill-2
- Ellis-3
- Dungworth-2
- Leighton-2

**Earliest known recruitment:**

7 troopers from the Sheffield area all date their service back to 22 February 1643.

There follows overleaf a table of the residences of Copley’s 61 West Riding recruits. The parish is given in the first column, and the townships within that parish in the following ones. There follows a map of Copley’s West Riding recruits which indicates that most of them were drawn from the clothing districts in the centre of the Riding, and not from the locality of Copley’s residence and estates at Wadworth, which were well to the south-east.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Townships</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alborough</td>
<td>Dunsforth-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arksey</td>
<td>Bentley-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arncliffe</td>
<td>Buckden-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwick-in-Elmet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batley-1</td>
<td>Morley-4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birstall-1</td>
<td>Adwalton-1, Liversedge-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Heaton-Royds-1, Manningham-1, Shipley-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapham-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darfield</td>
<td>Ardsey-1, Billingley-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewsbury</td>
<td>Ossett-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ardsley-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesfield</td>
<td>Bradfield-4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishlake-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>Rastrick-1, Shelf-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemsworth-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk-Hammerton</td>
<td>Wilstrop-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkheaton-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knaresborough-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds-3</td>
<td>Farnley-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methley-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton</td>
<td>Altofts-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun Monkton-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawmarsh-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>Pateley-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royston-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snaith</td>
<td>Hooke-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield-2</td>
<td>Attercliffe-2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td>Hazelwood-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadworth-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield-2</td>
<td>Horbury-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodkirk-1</td>
<td>Topcliffe-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The recruitment of Christopher Copley’s troop of horse.
Map 2: The recruitment of Christopher Copley's troop of horse.

- residence of under-officer or trooper.
APPENDIX II

A DIRECTORY OF YORKSHIRE PARLIAMENTARIANS

Here follows a directory of parliamentary supporters whose places of residence have been ascertained beyond reasonable doubt. Wherever possible their Yorkshire residence of 1642 has been given, even if they were employed outside the county. Outside the military itself, only those that can be identified as being active supporters have been included. Constables, collectors or commissioners who may have been forced to act against their will have been omitted, while those that changed sides during the conflict have been marked with an asterisk. It is therefore hoped that the danger of imposing a collective analysis upon such a heterogenous range of support has been minimised. The directory therefore does not seek to analyse varying levels of commitment or classify the nature of support, merely to illustrate its geographical basis.

The list provides sources of evidence and indicates the entries’ occupation, any public offices they held, and in the case of the military, their highest known rank. The entry, soldier, indicates a common soldier, while the entry trooper indicates a cavalry soldier. While such a survey can never hope to be exhaustive, it is hoped that in conjunction with the accompanying maps, it will illustrate the location of the broad areas of known parliamentarian strength in the county.

Only towns with a pre-war population that was likely to be over 2,000 inhabitants have been shown on the maps.
Map 3: Parliamentarian allegiance in the East Riding and the City of York.

- residence of parliamentarian gentlemen, army officers, sequestrators, commissioners, aldermen and burgesses.
- residence of parliamentarian under-officers, troopers, soldiers, supporters from the middling and poorer sorts.
+ residence of parliamentarian clergyman.
Map 4: Parliamentarian allegiance in the North Riding.

- residence of parliamentarian gentlemen, army officers, sequestrators, commissioners, aldermen and burgesses.
- residence of parliamentarian under-officers, troopers, soldiers, supporters from the middling and poorer sorts.
+ residence of parliamentarian clergyman.
Map 5: Parliamentarian allegiance in the West Riding.

- residence of parliamentarian gentlemen, army officers, sequestrators, commissioners, aldermen and burgesses.
- residence of parliamentarian under-officers, troopers, soldiers, supporters from the middling and poorer sorts.
+ residence of parliamentarian clergyman.
1. THE CITY OF YORK-9

Sir William Allanson, alderman, M.P.

Joseph Beverley, sequestrator

John Coole, seaman

Thomas Dickinson, commissioner, later J.P.

Thomas Hodgson, commissioner

Thomas Hoyle, alderman, M.P.

Captain Francis Swaine
P.R.O., S.P. 16/513/141; S.P. 19/121/20b; S.P. 19/126/9; S.P. 28/249.

Samuel Winter, rector of St. Michael, Ousebridge, formerly of Cottingham

John Vaux, alderman
2. THE TOWN AND COUNTY OF KINGSTON UPON HULL-49

John Barnard, alderman

Henry Barnard, alderman
P.R.O., S.P. 28/189; Hall, *A History of South Cave*, p.32.

Leonard Barnard, alderman, captain of the watch

Joseph Blaide, alderman
P.R.O., S.P. 28/189.

Captain Robert Billops

William Carlei
Hull City R.O., BRS/7/30.

John Chambers, alderman

Thomas Coatesworth, artillery captain

Nicholas Denman, alderman, and mayor in 1645

Francis Dewicke, alderman

Lancelot Fox, alderman
P.R.O., S.P. 28/189.

Mr. Foxley, senior

Joshua Fugell

Captain William Fugill, bookseller

Lieutenant-Colonel Jeffrey Gaites

John Gouge, curate

Major Edward Hardstaffe
P.R.O., S.P. 19/144/54-5.

Joshua Hall, sequestrator
*The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England*, vol. xii, p.237.

Maccabeus Hollys, alderman and merchant, lieutenant of the watch

Martin Jefferson, alderman

Robert Johnson, clerk

Mr. Lawrence, alderman

Maurice Lincombe, alderman, lieutenant of the watch
Wildridge (ed), *The Hull Letters*, pp.152,158.

Mr. Lupton, alderman

Henry Metcalfe, alderman
Robert Morton, alderman

Philip Nye, minister
Wildridge (ed), *The Hull Letters*, p.38; Hotham MS, DDHO/1/35 and DDHO/1/41.

Captain Edward Orton
P.R.O., S.P. 28/265/217,222.

Peregrine Pelham, M.P., regicide

William Popple, alderman

John Penrose, alderman

Thomas Raikes, mayor, 1643-4

Captain Andrew Raikes
Hull City R.O., BRS/7/67.

Robert Raikes, alderman

William Raikes, alderman

Lancelot Roper, alderman

Captain Edward Salmon
Greaves and Zaller (eds), *A biographical dictionary of British Radicals*, vol. iii, pp.133-4.

Richard Wood, sheriff
Hull City R.O., BRS/7/19; Wildridge (ed), *The Hull Letters*, p.156.

Mr. Wrightinton, alderman
3. THE NORTH RIDING

AINDERBY-STEEPLE

Matthew Rymer

ARNCLIFFE

Colonel James Mauleverer

AYSGARTH

John Atkinson

BEDALE

Lasenby
John Peirse
N.Y.R.O., Northallerton: Peirse MS, ZBA 18/1/2; P.R.O., S.P. 19/6/42 and 19/118/46-8.

BOSSALL

Buttercrambe
Sir Richard Darley

Henry Darley, M.P.

Captain Richard Darley, later M.P.

James Stevenson, soldier

BURNESTON

Swainby-with-Allerthorpe township:
Allerthorpe
Thomas Harrison, later M.P., later J.P.

CATTERICK

Scorton township:
Colonel John Wastell, M.P., later J.P.

EASBY

EASINGTON

Boulby

Captain Nicholas Conyers


FARLINGTON

William Readsley, soldier


FYLINGDALE

Fyling

William Leedall, soldier, rank unknown

Atkinson (ed), Quarter Sessions Records, p.12.

GILLING

Barton township:

Lieutenant Francis Wilkinson


GREAT THIRKLEBY

Sir Henry Frankland


GUISBOROUGH

Thomas Chaloner, later M.P., regicide


James Chaloner, later M.P.


HELMSEY

Bilsdale township:

Major Robert Dent


HINDERSKELFE TOWNSHIP (EXTRA-PAROCHIAL)

Ralph Rymer, esq. later J.P.

Atkinson (ed), Quarter Sessions Records, p.42.

INGLEBY

William Ripley, soldier

Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.159.

Ingleby Manor

Commissary General Sir Henry Foulis


Colonel Robert Foulis

KIRBY-MISPERTON

Ryton township:
Christopher Perccehay, esq., later J.P.

KIRKBY-FLEETHAM

Captain Thomas Davile
B.L. Add. MS, 21,418, f.17; P.R.O., E121/4/1, n.30.
Matthew Smelt, committeeman

KIRKBY-RAVENSWORTH

Captain Leonard Robinson
Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.91.

LONG COWTON

* Sir Henry Anderson, M.P

* Captain Henry Anderson

MARTON

Marton-with-Moxby township:
Captain William Clarke, junior
P.R.O., E121/3/3, n.43.

MELSONBY

Captain Henry Wilkinson
P.R.O., E121/4/8 and S.P. 28/129/6, f.9; Clay (ed), Abstracts of Yorkshire Wills, p.46.

MIDDLETON-TYAS

Moulton township:
Major George Smithson, later M.P, later J.P.

NEWTON-UPON- OUSE

Beningbrough Hall:
Sir John Bourchier, regicide, later J.P.
NORMANBY
Luke Robinson, later M.P., later J.P.

BROMPTON
Cornet Henry Nixon
P.R.O., S.P. 24/66

ROKEBY
Captain Thomas Robinson

ROKEBY

SCARBOROUGH
John Harrison, bailiff
Binns, ‘A Place of Great Importance’.
Captain John Lawson
William Farthing, Commonwealth soldier
Atkinson (ed), *Quarter Sessions Records*, p.110.

Skelton castle
George Trotter, committeeman

STOKESLEY
Lieutenant Colonel Peregrine Lascelles, later of Lythe

STOKESLEY

TANFIELD
Captain Matthew Beckwith, later J.P. (also of Aldborough)
THORNTON-IN-PICKERING LYTE

Farmanby
Robert Dawson, soldier
Atkinson (ed), Quarter Sessions Records, pp.16,30.

Richard Marshall, soldier
Atkinson (ed), Quarter Sessions Records, p.34.

THORNTON-WATLAS

Captain John Dodsworth
B.L. Add. MS, 15,858, f.215; P.R.O., S.P. 19/10/308 and 19/120/120-28.

John Farman, soldier
Lumb (ed), Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.160.

WHITBY

* Captain Browne Bushell

Mr. William Bushell

* Sir Hugh Cholmley, bart.

* James Cholmley, esq.
Binns, ‘Captain Browne Bushell’, p.95; B.L. TT E95(2), The Kingdom’s Weekly Intelligencer (London, 1643).

Luke Robinson, later M.P.

Bagdale Old Hall, Ruswarpe
Captain Isaac Newton, later J.P.

Ugglebamby township:

Lieutenant Thomas Strangways, later of South-House, Pickering-Lythe
P.R.O., E121/1/7, n.57; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.86.
4. THE EAST RIDING

ALDBROUGH

West Newton-in-Holderness township:
Charles Lilliewhite, trooper
Worcester College Library: Clarke MS, 4/2.

BARMSTON

Sir Matthew Boynton, bart.

Colonel Francis Boynton

* Colonel Matthew Boynton
E.Y.R.O., Beverley, DDCC/150/5; P.R.O., S.P. 28/138/3; Binns, 'A Place of Great Importance'; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.126.

Major John Boynton
C.V. Collier, 'Some Further Gleanings From Old Burlington', Transactions of the East Riding Antiquarian Society, 9 (1901), p.82; P.R.O., S.P. 28/265/369; S.P. 23/188/322; P.R.O., E121/4/8, n.5; E121/5/6, n.15.

Martin Briggs, minister

Robert Kidson, parson

BEVERLEY

George Firbanck
C.C.C.D., p.389.

Captain Henry Fotherby
Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.65; C.S.P.D. 1650, p.506; P.R.O., S.P. 28/129/6, f.3; P.R.O., E121/5/5, n.6.

Matthew Leake, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Captain William Legard, alderman

James Nelthorp, mayor, later M.P.

Captain John Nelthorp, later M.P.
P.R.O., E121/3/3, n.93,113; Forster, 'Beverley in the Seventeenth Century', p.94; Bean, Parliamentary Representation of the Six Northern Counties, p.740.

Nicholas Pearson, parish clerk

Mr. Christopher Ridley

Corporal Robert Smeadly, painter

Captain John Wittie

XVI
Beverley Park
* Michael Wharton, M.P.

**BISHOP BURTON**

William Legard, minister

**BOYNTON**

Sir William Strickland, bart., M.P.

Walter Strickland, later M.P.
Bean, Parliamentary Representation of the Six Northern Counties, p.709.

**BURTON AGNES**

Captain John Pockley
P.R.O., E121/4/8, n.30; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.15.

Harpham township:
Sir William St. Quintin, bart., later High Sheriff
Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.185; Clay (ed), Abstracts of Yorkshire Wills, p.39; Hull City R.O., BRS/7/19; Atkinson (ed), Quarter Sessions Records, p.17.

**CARNABY**

Fraisthorpe township:
Sergeant-Major Henry Vickerman

**CHERRY BURTON**

Thomas Micklethwaite, rector
G. Oliver, The History and Antiquities of the Town and Minster of Beverley (Beverley, 1829), p.496.

**COTTINGHAM**

Thomas Almond
Hull City R.O., BRS/7/13.

Robert Colston
P.R.O., S.P. 24/71.

Colonel Thomas Rooseby, also of Burnby

Mr. Richard Smyth
Hull City R.O., BRS/7/13.

Skidby township:
Lieutenant-Colonel William Goodricke, senior (also of Walton Head)

Major William Goodricke, junior
P.R.O., E121/4/8, n.37; S.P. 28/138/3; M.L. CWT, 43-07-12, Two Letters, the one Being Intercepted by the Parliament’s Forces which was sent from Sir Hugh Cholmley to Captain Gotherick (London, 1643); C.S.P.D. 1641-1643, p.465; Goodricke, History of the Goodricke Family, p.47.

Captain Henry Goodricke
B.L. Add. MS, 21,417, f.271; Goodricke, History of the Goodricke Family, p.50.

Newland
Edward Thompson
Hull City R.O., BRS/7/13.
EASINGTON

Sergeant-Major John Overton
P.R.O., E121/5/5, n.39 and E121/5/7, n.29; Clay (ed), Abstracts of Yorkshire Wills, p.68; Wildridge (ed), The Hull Letters, p.156.

Major-General Robert Overton

Thomas Kennington, minister
P.R.O., S.P. 23/177/745; Clay (ed), Abstracts of Yorkshire Wills, p.69.

ELLERTON

Captain Walter Bethell
P.R.O., E121/4/8, n.29; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.155.

ELLERTON

Captain John Anlaby, later M.P.

ETTON

Swanland township:
William Seaman, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

FERRIBY


FLAMBOURGH

Captain John Legard
M.L. CWT, 43-01-18, Newes From Yorke. Being a true relation of the proceedings of Sir Hugh Cholmley (London,1643); B.L. TT E95(9), A true and exact Relation of all the proceedings of Sir Hugh Cholmley's Revolt (London, 1643); Legard, The Legards of Anlaby and Ganton, pp.83-5; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.111.

* Captain Richard Legard
P.R.O., S.P. 23/135/394; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.111.

GANTON

Brackenholme-with-Woodhall township:
Balthorpe

Sergeant-Major Charles Fenwick

HEMINGBOROUGH

John Saltmarsh, vicar

HESLERTON

John Saltmarsh, vicar

XVIII
HESSLE
William Rowton, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Anlaby
Colonel Christopher Legard

Captain Robert Legard
P.R.O., E121/4/7, n.48; Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, p.24; Hull City R.O., BRS/7/2, BRS/7/10; Wildridge (ed), The Hull Letters, p.153.

Captain Charles Legard
P.R.O., E121/4/1, n.38.

HOLLYM
Charles Hotham, rector

HOLME-ON-SPALDING-MOOR
Captain William Bradford
P.R.O., S.P. 28/7/19, ff.19-20; P.R.O., E121/5/5, n.8 and E121/3/3, n.22; Johnson (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, p.299.

Captain Thomas Sotheron
Clay (ed), Abstracts of Yorkshire Wills, p.131.

HORNSEA
Major Peter Acklom

HORNSEA
Saltmarshe township:
Mr. Philip Saltmarshe
Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.94.

Captain Edward Saltmarsh (also of North Kilvington)

HUGGATE-ON-THE-WOLDS
Lieutenant-Colonel John Cotterill
P.R.O., S.P. 28/253a/part i/14; Binns, 'A Place of Great Importance', p.239; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.84.

LANGTON
Colonel Sir Thomas Norcliffe
P.R.O., S.P. 28/138/3; S.P. 28/299/768; S.P. 28/253a/part i/42; Hotham MS, DDHO/I/64; Cliffe, The Yorkshire Gentry, p.266; Y.A.S., MS 735; Commons’ Journals, vol. iii, p.293; B.L. TT E121(45), An Exact Relation of the Several Passages, p.14; B.L. TT E95(9), A true and exact Relation of all the proceedings of Sir Hugh Cholmley’s Revolt; B.L. TT E86(40), The Kingdom’s Weekly Intelligencer (London, 1643), p.40; B.L. TT E93(19), The Kingdom’s Weekly Intelligencer (London, 1643), p.91.

LUND
Richard Remington, esq.

Captain Sir Thomas Remington

XIX
KIRKBY OVERBLOW

William Bethell, rector
Dugdale, *The Visitation of the County of Yorke*, p.155.

NORTH CAVE

William Brearcliffe, vicar

Captain Coppendale
B.L. Birch MS, 4,460, f.34.

RISE

Colonel Hugh Bethell

ROWLEY

T. White, minister

Hunsley:

Captain John Northend

RUDSTON

* Lieutenant-Colonel Lancelot Alured


SCORBOURGH

John Bourdenden, secretary to Sir John Hotham

* Sir John Hotham, Governor of Hull


* Lieutenant-General John Hotham, M.P.


Captain William Hotham

Durand Hotham, lawyer
Hotham MS, DDHO/I/62-4; Commons’ *Journals*, vol. iii, pp.153-4.

SCULCOATES

Colonel John Alured, M.P., regicide

Lieutenant-Colonel Christopher Alured

Colonel Matthew Alured, later of Walkington and later M.P.
B.L. Add. MS, 25,347; P.R.O., E121/5/5, n.6,16; P.R.O., S.P. 28/252/178; T. May, *The History of the Parliament*

Robert Luddington, vicar

SWINE

Captain Joseph Micklethwaite
Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.281.

Captain Elias Micklethwaite
P.R.O., E121/4/8, n.30; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.281.

Skirlaugh township:
Captain John Bethell
P.R.O., E121/4/8, n.30.

THWING

Captain Robert Stafford
S.P. 28/253a/part i/17; C.C.C.D., p.669; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.xiv.

WARTER

Sir Philip Stapleton, also of Wighill

WELTON

John Norton, vicar

WINTERINGHAM

Linton-on-the-Wolds
John Lister, esq.
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ACASTER
Lieutenant-Colonel Francis Fairfax

ADEL
Arthington
Henry Arthington, J.P., later M.P.

ALDBOROUGH
Captain Arthur Beckwith
Aveling, Northern Catholics, p.305; Ducatus, p131; B.L. TT E121(45), An Exact Relation of the Several Passages, p.14.
Dunsforth
Richard Watter, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.
William Watter, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

ALLERTON-MAULEVERER
Sir Thomas Mauleverer, bart, J.P., M.P., regicide

ALMONDBURY
Captain Richard Stanhope

ARKSEY
Bentley
William Broughton, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.
Thomas Rawson, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.163.

ARNCLIFF
Buckden township:
Hubbram or Hubberholme
John Jacques, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

BARWICK-IN-ELMET
John Nicholson, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

BATLEY
Roger Audsley, vicar

XXII
John Nayler, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Gildersome township
Isaac Balm
Greaves, 'Deliver Us From Evil', pp.179,188; The Original Memoirs Written During the Great Civil War being the life of Sir Henry Slingsby and memoirs of Captain Hodgson with notes (Edinburgh, 1806), p.93. Hereafter Hodgson.

Major Joshua Greathead

Morley township:
Edward Birkhead

Trumpeter John Ellis

Trumpeter Joseph Ellis
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Trumpeter Samuel Ellis
Clarke MS, 4/2.

John Fozzard, trooper
Wood, The Story of Morley, pp.127-8; Smith, History of Morley, p.138

Peter Greathead, sequestrator

Captain Thomas Greathead

Captain John Pickering, later of J.P., later of Tingley, Woodkirk.

John Ward, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

John Taylor, trooper
Y.A.S., NIS 1263; B.L. Add. MS, 25,463, f.167.

William Sawley, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.186.

John Taylor, trooper
Y.A.S., MS 1263; B.L. Add. MS, 25,463, f.167.

William Sawley, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.186.

Bingley

William Sawley, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.186.

John Taylor, trooper
Y.A.S., MS 1263; B.L. Add. MS, 25,463, f.167.

William Sawley, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.186.

BIRKIN

Temple-Hirst
Nicholas Girlington
Cliffe, The Yorkshire Gentry, p.353.
BIRSTALL

Robert Cooper, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Edward Harrison, vicar

John Reyner

Cleckheaton township:
Okenshaw
Captain John Clayton

Drighlington township:
Adwalton
William Revell, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Gomersall township:
Lieutenant James Naylor

Heckmondwike township:
Robert Oldroyd, trooper, clothier

Liversedge township:
James Gleadhall, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Lieutenant Thomas Mitchell
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Tong township:
Henry Tempest, esq. later M.P.

BOLTON-PERCY

Appleton-Roebuck township:
Captain Francis Talbot

Sir Thomas Fairfax, J.P., later 3rd Lord Fairfax, General of the Horse
Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence; T. Fairfax, 'A Short Memorial of the Northern Actions ye warre there, 1642 till 1644', in F. Grose and T. Astle (eds), Antiquarian Repertory, 3 (1808); J. Wilson, Fairfax (London, 1985); M.A. Gibb, The Lord General (London, 1938); C.R. Markham, A Life of the Great Lord Fairfax (London, 1870).

Francis Thickell, gentleman lifeguard to Sir Thomas Fairfax
P.R.O., E121/1/7, n.57; E121/5/7, n.2; P.R.O., S.P. 28/195; S.P. 28/3a/246.

Cornet John Thickell, quartermaster to Sir William Fairfax

XXIV
Steeton
Colonel Sir William Fairfax

BRADFORD-20

Ralph Atkinson

Robert Blease, minister

Jeremy Bower, clothier

Captain Nathaniel Bower

David Clarkson
Lister, p.52; W.Y.R.O., Calderdale: PB/B:130/1

William Clarkson, chaplain to Lord Fairfax (also of Bingley)

Isaac Elleston, clothier

David Ellison, curate and schoolmaster (also at Otley)

John Judson, soldier

John Thomas Sharpe of Ivecage, clothier and secretary to Sir Thomas Fairfax

John Smithies
Hird, Bradford in History, p.61.

Haworth township:
Christopher Holmes
P.R.O., S.P. 24/55.

Nicholas Whittaker
P.R.O., S.P. 24/55.

Heaton township:
Heaton-Royds
Ambrose Blackburne, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Manningham township:
Captain Bradshaw
W.Y.R.O., Calderdale: PB/B:130/1.

Captain Lister
W.Y.R.O., Calderdale: PB/B:130/1.
Robert Rushforth, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Shipley township:
George Blackburne, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Wilsden township:
John Jowett
Hird, Bradford in History, p.61

BRODSWORTH

Darcy Wentworth, esq.
Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.3.

CALVERLEY

Pudsey Township:
Elkanah Wales, curate

Timothy Wood, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds p.162.

Tversall
Colonel Richard Thronton

CARLTON

Edward Price, minister

CAWTHORNE

Rowroyd
Captain George Shirte

John Shirte, sequestrator

CHURCH FENTON

Joseph Birdsall, yeoman and sequestrator
P.R.O., S.P. 19/128/123.

CLAPHAM

John Car, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

DARFIELD

Ardsley township:
Anthony Awtie, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Billingley township:
Robert Nayler, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.
Great Houghton township:

Sir Edward Rodes, J.P., later High Sheriff

DEWSBURY

Richard Oldroyd, trooper, ‘The Devil of Dewsbury’
Sheard (ed), Records of the Parish of Batley, p.265; Greaves, Deliver Us From Evil, p.98.

Samuel Pearson, minister

Ossett township:

Jonas Fox, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Rodger Fox, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

DONCASTER

Stephen Cuttell, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

EAST ARDSLEY

William Anderton, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Edward Brooke, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

William Nayler, senior, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

ECCLESFIELD

Bradfield township:

William Jackson, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

George Stones, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Dungworth

Henry Dungworth, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Robert Hartley, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Fullwood Hall

Major William Fox

Ecclesfield township:

Whitley

Thomas Shircliffe
P.R.O., S.P. 23/189/553.

EDLINGTON

Samuel Kendal, minister
Rushworth, Historical Collections, part iii, vol. ii, p.140.

FIRBECK

William West, esq. J.P.

XXVII
FISHLAKE

Thomas Hill, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Sykehouse township:
Captain Joseph Thoresby
Clarke MS, 4/2; P.R.O., E121/4/8, n.37; D.H. Atkinson, Ralph Thoresby, the Topographer; His Town and Times (Leeds, 1885), vol. i, p.22; W.Y.R.O., Wakefield: C469.

GARGRAVE

John Waite, vicar

Francis Proctor, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.183.

Eshton
Lieutenant George Watkinson
P.R.O., E121/5/5, n.8; E121/4/8, n.12.

GIGGLESWICK

Stainforth
Lieutenant Christopher Dawson
C.C.C.D., p.1762.

GISBURN

Gisburn township:
Lower Hall, Westby
Captain Thomas Lister, esq.

GUISELEY

Esholt township:
Henry Thompson, esq.
Robertshaw (ed), 'A Local Civil War Warrant', p.44; Cliffe, The Yorkshire Gentry, p.345

Horsforth township:
Walter Stanhope esq., senior
Owen, Stanhope, Atkinson, Haddon and Shaw, pp.17,19; Robertshaw (ed), 'A Local Civil War Warrant', p.44; Ducatus, p.168

Captain Walter Stanhope, junior
P.R.O., E121/3/4, n.41; Owen, Stanhope, Atkinson, Haddon and Shaw, pp.16,19; Robertshaw (ed), 'A Local Civil War Warrant', p.44.

Yeadon township:
Thomas Prat, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.184.

HALIFAX-48

Halifax Town and Parish
Joseph Bannister, locksmith

John Brearcliffe, apothecary

John Fowler
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Lieutenant Abraham Holmes
P.R.O., S.P. 28/1387, f.3; P.R.O., E121/5/7, n.23; ‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.14; Firth, Cromwell’s Army, p.52:

Timothy Hoult, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.198.

Thomas Leake
P.R.O., S.P. 28/300/375.

John Lister, soldier

Abraham Longbothome, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds p.160.

John Milnes
Hird, Bradford in History, p.61

Henry Root, minister

Thomas Smith
P.R.O., S.P. 24/36.

Michael Woodhead, soldier

Barkisland township:
Mr. Joshua Horton (also of Sowerby)
‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.12; Bennett, ‘Enforcing the Law in Revolutionary England’, p.111.

James Wilson, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.162

Elland township:
Jeremy Bentley, collector-general, later M.P.

Heptonstall township:
Leonard Burton, curate

Hipperholme township:
Samuel Broadley

Coley
Captain John Hodgson
Hodgson; P.R.O., E121/5/5, n.41 and E121/4/1, n.30.

Andrew Latham, curate

Edward Watson, soldier
‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.16.

Hipperholme-with-Brighouse township:
Michael Hasleden
P.R.O., S.P. 24/2/268; S.P. 24/52.

Captain Thomas Taylor
Illingworth township:

Richard Clarkson, curate, also preaching at Bingley in 1642


Midgely township:

Henry Wadsworth, sequestator

P. R. O., S. P. 28/249.

Ewood Hall

Lieutenant Henry Farrer

P. R. O., E121/3/4, n.41.

Captain John Farrer, J.P.


Captain William Farrer


Luddenden

Nathaniel Welsh, curate


Northowram township:

Edward Bairstowe, soldier

‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.16.

Jonas Crowther, soldier

‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.16.

Jeremy Houldsworth, soldier

Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.160; ‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.16.

John Lumme, sequestator

P. R. O., S. P. 28/249; ‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.39; pp.53,57; Hanson, ‘Halifax Parish Church, part i’, p.53; Bennett, ‘Enforcing the Law in Revolutionary England’, p.111.

Ovenden township:

John Bairstowe, sequestator


Captain Edmond Hoyle, clothier


Ovenden Hall

Joseph Fourness, clothier

Hanson, ‘Halifax Parish Church, part i’, pp.53,57.

Rastrick township:

William Wilson, trooper

Clarke MS, 4/2.

Shelf township:

John Ambler, trooper

Clarke MS, 4/2.

Lieutenant Joseph Whiteley


Southowram township:

Shibden

Isaac Lilly

‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.20.
Stansfield township:
Underbank
Lieutenant Horsfall

Cross-Stone
Jonathan Scholefield, curate

Sowerby township:
Captain Joseph Briggs, clothier
John Crabtree, soldier
‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.16.
Nathaniel Rathband, curate
Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York*, p.239.
The Pond, Triangle
Captain Joshua Stansfield
‘Our Local Portfolio’, p.19; Kendall, ‘Local Incidents in the Civil War, part i’, p.28.

Sowerby Bridge township:
Robert Booth, curate

Soyland township:
Googreave
Joseph Priestley
*Priestley*, p.18.
Samuel Priestley, soldier (rank unknown)

HATFIELD
Captain John Hatfield

HEMSWORTH
Thomas Collin, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

HUDDERSFIELD
Edward Hill, minister

Scammonden township:
Thomas Smallwood, curate

ILKLEY
Holling-hall township:
Mr. John Heber
Dugdale, *The Visitation of the County of Yorke*, p.54.
KELLINGTON

Captain Edward Wingate
P.R.O. S.P. 23/172/519; P.R.O., E121/1/6, n.20 and E134/1653/East 1.

KILDWICK

Lieutenant-Colonel Henry Currer

KIRBY-MALHAMDALE

Calton township:
General John Lambert

KIRKBY-HEATON

Thomas Hill, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

KIRKBY MALZEARD

Fountain’s Earth township:
Mr. Robert Inman, ‘Bold Robin of Bouthwaite’
Lieutenant Owen Inman
Speight, Nidderdale from Nun-Monkton to Whernside, pp.xii-xiv.
Robert Inman, soldier
Speight, Nidderdale from Nun-Monkton to Whernside, pp.xii-xiv.

KIRK HAMMERTON

Oswald Gray, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

KIRKHEATON

Thomas Hill, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.
John Stafford, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

KNARESBOROUGH

Roger Atey, minister
Rushworth, Historical Collections, part iii, vol. ii, p.140.
Thomas Norfolk, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Bilton-with-Harrogate township:
Captain Thomas Waid
P.R.O., S.P. 23/172/203.
Bilton-Park
Thomas Stockdale, J.P., later M.P., secretary to Lord Fairfax

XXXII
LAUGHTON-EN-LE-MORTHEN

Letwell township:
Colonel John Mauleverer, J.P.

Langold
Major Ralph Knight
P.R.O., E121/5/5, n.6; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.272.

LEATHLEY

*Colonel Robert Brandling

LEEDS-46

Leeds Parish:
Captain John Askwith

Samuel Cattan, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Robert Heales, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Robert Hurst
B.L. Add. MS, 21,427, f.8.

Martin Iles, sequestrator
B.L. Add. MS, 21,417, f.46; P.R.O., S.P. 23/187/757.

William Kitchinge, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Cornet Henry Laidman, also of Kirkstall
B.L. Add. MS, 21,417, f.7; B.L. Add. MS, 21,427, f.190,203,211; Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds. pp.10,101,137.

Matthew Langsker, trooper, clothier

William Marshall, burgess

Captain Robert Matthew, clothier

Richard Milner
Markham, A Life of the Great Lord Fairfax, p.60.

John Myers
P.R.O., S.P. 19/122/41-45.

Richard Sykes, merchant (also of Hull)

William Sykes, merchant (also of Hull)
B.L. Add. MS, 4,275, f143-50; B.L. Add. MS, 37,236, f.27; P.R.O., S.P. 19/123/2-12; S.P. 28/250/part ii/311-313; S.P. 28/298/222,232,365-6,848,864; Ducatus, p.3; Wildridge (ed), The Hull Letters, p.159.

Wiggins, trooper
B.L. Add. MS, 21,417, f.60.

Leeds Town:
Briggate
Thomas Haman
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.162.

Captain Saunders
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.191.

Headrow
Robert Pease, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.158.
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Kirkgate
William Atkinson, gunsmith
Atkinson, Ralph Thoresby, vol. i, p.165.

John Thoresby, sequestrator

Peter Saxton, vicar
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.216; Atkinson, Ralph Thoresby, vol. i, p.23

Captain Poole
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.213.

Ensign Ralph Thoresby
Ducatus, p.viii; Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.162.

New Church (St John’s)
Robert Todd, curate

Vicar Lane
Christopher Bonefang
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.216

Beeston township:
Ralph Atkinson, servant to John Askwith
P.R.O., S.P. 23/135/539; P.R.O., E134/1658/East 25

Colonel George Gill
P.R.O., S.P. 23/135/539; S.P. 28/253a/part i/70; P.R.O., E134/1658/East25; P.R.O., E134/Chas2/Mich43; Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, pp.81-2; C.S.P.D. 1650, p.506; Commons’ Journals, vol. vi, p.450; Hatfield (ed), Historical Notices of Doncaster, p.184; B.L. Add. MS, 18,979, f.149.

Bramley township:
Captain Simon Askwith

Bramley Grange
Mr. Man

Farnley township:
Wilfrid Danbrough
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.200.
William Ethrington, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Great Woodhouse township:
Thomas Horne, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.178

Holbeck township:
William Dewsbury, soldier

Captain Nicholas Greathead

John Nalson, curate
Rushworth, Historical Collections, part iii, vol. ii, p.140; Ducatus, p.37; Cross, Urban Magistrates and Ministers, p.22.
Hunslet township:

Thomas Hawksworth, curate

Edward Wilkinson
Greaves, 'Deliver Us From Evil', p.183.

Knowsthorpe township:

Captain Adam Baynes, attorney
*Ducatus*, p.101; B.L. Add. MS, 21,417-21,427; P.R.O., E121/5/5, n.18,28.

Cornet John Baynes
B.L. Add. MS, 21,417-21,427.

Robert Baynes, trooper
B.L. Add. MS, 21,417-21,427.

Robert Burley, trooper
B.L. Add. MS, 21,418, ff.58,114; B.L. Add. MS, 21,427, f.9.

Lieutenant Cowper
B.L. Add. MS, 21,418, f.354; B.L. Add. MS, 21,427, ff.9,159; Lumb (ed), *The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds*, p.391.

William Feasand, trooper
B.L. Add. MS, 21,418, ff.58,114; B.L. Add. MS, 21,427, f.9.

Lieutenant John Leavens
B.L. Add. MS, 21,427, f.186; Lumb (ed), *The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds*, p.386.

Mr. William Stable

Mr. Seth Stable
B.L. Add. MS, 21,417, f.3; B.L. Add. MS, 21,427, f.9; P.R.O., E121/5/5, n.23.

MALTBY

Ewe
Lieutenant Nicholas Saunderson

METHLEY

Thomas Clarkson, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

John Savile esq.

MITTON

Bashall
Colonel William White, later M.P., agent to Lord Fairfax in London

MONK-FRYSTON

Charles Fletcher, soldier

NEWTON-KYME

Sir Robert Barwick of Towlston, J.P.
P.R.O., S.P. 19/121/20b.

Henry Fairfax, rector
Bell (ed), *The Fairfax Correspondence*, vol. i, p.321.
Altofts
William Nayler, junior, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

NUN-MONKTON

Thomas Kettlewell, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.
George Marwood, esq., J.P.

OTLEY

Captain O'Neale
Richard Parker, soldier

Burley-in-Wharfedale

John Cooper, curate

Mr. John Maude
Speight, Upper Wharfedale, pp.146-7.
Burley Woodhead

Samuel Walker, soldier

Denton

Thomas Chapman, curate

Ferdinando, 2nd Lord Fairfax, J.P., Lord General of the Northern Counties

Colonel Charles Fairfax, esq.

Menston

Colonel Charles Fairfax, esq., J.P.
Bell (ed), The Fairfax Correspondence, vol. i, pp.241-3,303-4,310-1; Ducatus, appendix, p.146.

Hawksworth

Sir Richard Hawksworth

Bramhope township:

Captain Robert Dyneley
PENISTONE

Gunthwaite township:
Colonel Godfrey Bosvile

Captain William Bosvile

Penistone township:
New-Chapel
Captain William Cooke

Thurston township:
Haslehead
Captain Adam Eyre
Eyre, 'A Dyurnall or Catalogue of all my Accions', pp.352-3; Boyle (ed), Memoirs of Master John Shawe, p.87; Dransfield, History of Penistone, p.65; B.L. Add. MS, 21,427, f.177; B.L. Add. MS, 25,463, ff.95-111; Lister (ed), West Riding Sessions Records, vol. ii, p.200.

Captian Joseph Eyre
Eyre, 'A Dyurnall or Catalogue of all my Accions', pp.352-3.

Lieutenant Edward Mitchell

Bull-House
Captain William Rich

PONTEFRACT

John Cowper

Joseph Ferret, minister from 1644

William Styles, vicar until 1642, then of Hessle-cum-Hull

Lieutenant Leonard Ward, alderman

Tanshelf Court
Captain John Ward
C.S.P.D. 1650, p.506; Carroll, ‘Yorkshire Parliamentary Boroughs in the Seventeenth Century’, p.94

RAVENFIELD

Mr. Thomas Westby

RAWMARSH

Thomas Wood, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

RIPON

Dacre-with-Bewerley township:
Captain Anthony Beckwith
P.R.O., S.P. 24/2/349; Speight, Nidderdale from Nun-Monkton to Whernside, p.xv.
High and Low-Bishopside township:

Pateley

John Gill, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

ROTHBURY

Commissary Lionel Copley

William Lambert, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Norman Nelson
P.R.O., S.P. 24/66.

John Shaw, vicar

Captain Henry Westby
B.L. Add. MS, 21,417, f.313; B.L. Add. MS, 21,418, f.199; Shaw, 'The Life of Master John Shaw', pp.136-7.

Greasborough township:

Carhouse

Captain Edward Gill
Ducatus, p.75; Boyle (ed), Memoirs of Master John Shawe, p.130; Gooder (ed), The Parliamentary Representation of the County of York, vol. 2, p.57.

ROTHWELL

John Hargraves, soldier
W.Y.R.O., Wakefield, QS 10/2/225.

ROYSTON

George Wilson, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

SANDAL-MAGNA

Criggleston township:

Blacker Hall

Captain-Lieutenant Ferdinand Blacker

Captain-Lieutenant George Blacker
P.R.O., E121/2/5, n.35.

Centinel Valentine Blacker
P.R.O., E121/2/5, n.35; P.R.O., E134/13and14Chasl/lbll I.

SELBY

William Pothan, wagonmaster

SHEFFIELD

George Bulloes, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

George Harrison, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Thomas Toller, curate

Robert Trippett, soldier
P.R.O., S.P. 24/81.
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Attercliffe-with-Darnall township:

Carbrook

Colonel John Bright, later M.P. (also of Badsworth)

William Bagshaw, curate

Cliffe, The Yorkshire Gentry, p.271.

Richard Leighton, trooper

Clarke MS, 4/2.

Colonel William Spenser, esq.


Captain John Spenser

P.R.O., E121/4/1; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.12.

William Turner, trooper

Clarke MS, 4/2.

SHERBURN

Robert Hewes, yeoman

SILKSTON

John Spofford, vicar

Lawrence, Parliamentary Army Chaplains, p.46,175.

SNAITH

J. Noble, minister

Lawrence, Parliamentary Army Chaplains, pp.46,156.

Hook township:

John Birkby, trooper

Clarke MS, 4/2.

Rawcliffe township:

Major John Boynton

Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.127.

SOUTH KIRKBY

North Elmsall township:

* Colonel John Morris

SPOFFORTH

Brayne, Braim, or Braham-Hall

Colonel John Cholmley


TADCASTER

Francis Burton, farrier to Sir William Fairfax's troop
P.R.O., S.P. 19/128/123.

Captain William Siddall, later of York

B.L. Add. MS, 21,417, ff.33,281; B.L. Add. MS, 21,418, ff.101,286; P.R.O. E121/5/7, n.79.

XXXIX
John Watsone, soldier

Stutton-with Hazelwood township:
Hazelwood
Arthur Reyner, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

THORNHILL
Joshua Witton, vicar, chaplain to Lord Fairfax
Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.250

THORNTON-IN-CRAVEN
Sir William Lister, J.P.
P.R.O., S.P. 23/1/112; Dawson, Cromwell’s Understudy, p.17; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.178.

Captain Christopher Lister
Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.178.

Captain William Lister
Dawson, Cromwell’s Understudy, p.17; Ricraft, A Survey of England’s Champions, p.156.

WADWORTH
George Bex, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Colonel Christopher Copley

WAKEFIELD
Robert Baines, soldier
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.163.

William Browne, soldier
Greaves, Deliver Us From Evil, p.84.

John Hoole, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Josiah Shittleworth, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Thomas Wightman
Lumb (ed), The Registers of the Parish Church of Leeds, p.181

Lieutenant Roper
B.L. Add. MS, 4,276, f.132; Allott, ‘Leeds Quaker Meeting’, p.4.

Alverthorpe township:
Lunset-Hall
Sir John Savile, J.P., later High Sheriff

Horbury township:
Henry Issatt, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

WHISTON
Whiston township:
Gilthwaite
Captain George Westby
Morthen
Captain William Mitchell, esq.
P.R.O., E121/5/7, n.79.

WISTOW
Captain John Hewley, later of York
P.R.O., S.P. 28/253a/part i/42; Dugdale, The Visitation of the County of Yorke, p.161.

WOODKIRK

West Ardsley township:
Mr. Headcoat, minister
Rushworth, Historical Collections, part iii, vol. ii, p.140.

Quartermaster James Nayler

Richard Reyner
S.P. 24/71.

John Walker, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.

Topcliffe

John Causten, trooper
Clarke MS, 4/2.