

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

**Charlotte Kate Brownhill**

**Submitted for the degree of PhD**

**Department of History, University of Sheffield**

**February 2004**

**Volume II**

## **Chapter 6: Irish Policy I – Politics, financial planning, Parliament and plantation.**

Having established the foundations of his administration, complete with his own secretariat and advisors, Wentworth now needed to begin the process of policymaking. In reality, Wentworth had been planning the policies he might impose prior to the summer of 1633. But once he arrived in Ireland, the long-term implications of his rather detached planning in England would become apparent. Wentworth saw at first hand the dire need for financial assistance that the Irish government faced. Financing the army was the most crucial government expense and currently, it was poorly equipped and had poorly trained personnel. Although the army was expensive to support, it was essential in order to exert strong government within Ireland and consolidate peace. Wentworth could now, with the help of his advisors, and particularly George Radcliffe who had a six month head start in Ireland on Wentworth, begin to formulate his policies, firstly tackling the interrelated issues of finances, Parliament and plantation.

### **The financial planning of Wentworth's Irish administration.**

Thomas Wentworth's first political action in Ireland was to inspect the condition of the Irish finances. Prior to his arrival, Wentworth had received information from Mountnorris and had been juggling the Irish revenues from England since his appointment as Lord Deputy. Now he needed to look in detail at the Irish financial situation and face up to the primary challenge of his deputyship – preventing Ireland from being a drain on English resources. The series of concessions to the Irish, the Graces, which were presented in 1626 although not formally ratified by Charles I until 1628,<sup>1</sup> generated supply for the Crown of £20,000 per year for five years. At a time when the government income was £40,000 per annum and the expenditure £60,000, this income filled the gap.<sup>2</sup> This contribution was due to have finished by the autumn of 1632 but Wentworth had managed to negotiate a one-year extension with the Catholics led by the Earl of Westmeath which meant that the contributions would continue until December 1633.<sup>3</sup> Although the need for

---

<sup>1</sup> Kelly defines the Graces as “very crudely the Irish equivalent of the Petition of Right.” Kelly, W.P. ‘Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?’ *Journal of the Butler Society* 4, no. 1, (1997), p. 92. For a list of the Graces, see Clarke, A. *The Old English in Ireland 1625 – 42* (London, 1966). Appendix II, pp. 238 – 254.  
<sup>2</sup> Clarke, A. ‘The Government of Wentworth, 1632 – 40.’ in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (eds). *A New History of Ireland* (Oxford, 1976), vol. III, p. 244.  
<sup>3</sup> Kearney, H.F. *Strafford in Ireland 1633-1641* (Manchester, 1989), p. 42.

money was now less pressing, Wentworth still had to make some quick decisions on how he intended to augment the Irish coffers.<sup>4</sup>

The important task of auditing the Irish finances was performed by Wentworth, ably assisted by his brother George Wentworth, George Radcliffe, the Vice Treasurer Mountnorris and Robert Cogan, one of the farmers of the Irish customs and a cousin of Sir Arthur Ingram.<sup>5</sup> Although the financial situation was Wentworth's most pressing issue, he found it to be inextricably linked with political choices. We cannot isolate a study of financial planning from Wentworth's wider political considerations, such as calling a Parliament. His financial policy would clearly impact upon his relations with Parliament. Furthermore, if he was able to maintain favourable relations with the political nation, he may also be able to manipulate a potential Parliament into providing continued financial assistance to the government.

Wentworth faced these problems with Radcliffe who was already an important advisor in the Irish finances. Radcliffe had already gained some financial experience, being appointed as a customs farmer in 1632 and was advising Wentworth even in the early stages of the Irish administration. Wentworth described to Ingram in a letter of September 1633 the problem he faced with deciding the path of his administration. He acknowledged Radcliffe's advice against fining the Irish Catholics for their recusancy as a long-term solution to the government's financial crisis. Radcliffe had warned Wentworth that if he did enforce recusancy fines, he might jeopardise relations with a future Irish Parliament due to the potential disharmony that this could create.<sup>6</sup> Proceeding against Catholics would create huge divisions within Ireland, an obstacle that would make controlling a Parliament even more difficult. Radcliffe's warning however ran contrary to the opinion of the majority of the Irish Government that saw recusancy fines as a way to plug the immediate financial gap

---

<sup>4</sup> As Clarke points out, although Wentworth had some respite, he still faced the problem of filling the £20,000 deficit for the financial year 1633 – 34 and “the more general necessity to place the revenue upon a less uncertain footing.” Clarke, ‘The Government of Wentworth,’ p. 244.

<sup>5</sup> Cogan noted that financial decisions were important to Wentworth stating that: “The Lord Deputy arrived Tuesday July 23. and had since, in the presence of Lord Mountnorris, the Lord Deputy's brother, Mr Radcliffe and myself, examined the accounts, but has not yet concluded.” Robert Cogan to Sir Arthur Ingram the elder, 5 September 1633, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 40. Radcliffe and Mountnorris are identified as contributors to this “preliminary examination of the problems of [Wentworth's] office in Ireland” in Clarke, ‘The Government of Wentworth,’ p. 244.

<sup>6</sup> Radcliffe had advised Wentworth that it would be “very hazardous to adventure on it, as a thing which will be subject to misconstruction in a Parliament...” Wentworth to Ingram, 30 September 1633, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 40. Clearly the possibility of calling an Irish Parliament had already been discussed and viewed as a clear consideration prior to summer 1633. Wentworth's policies would have been tempered by this agenda.

as well as being a suitable long-term policy.<sup>7</sup> However, Wentworth had already experienced the exaction of recusancy fines whilst President of the Council in the North. This had not been a positive experience as, although ultimately revenues had improved, it was time-consuming and difficult to increase the amount of money raised.<sup>8</sup> This exercise was made even more cumbersome as Wentworth had accused his predecessor in the recusancy farm, Sir John Savile, of accepting bribes from recusants. Therefore Wentworth had to be extra careful to ensure that the farm was run with all propriety.<sup>9</sup>

At his first meeting with the Irish Privy Council, Wentworth presented the financial problems to the councillors. Although he had his own pre-planned agenda, he wanted to at least appear as though he was prepared to listen to the experienced Irish Councillors advice.<sup>10</sup> He informed Secretary Coke on 3 August 1633 that he had highlighted to the Councillors “how fast this Year’s Contribution drew to an End” and how much it was a concern to the Irish government “to foresee the great Confusion the failing of these Payments would bring upon the Army, if they were not either continued or some other way supplied.” He asked them to think of potential solutions before the second meeting of the Council.<sup>11</sup> At the second meeting of the Irish Privy Council, the propositions presented by the majority of the Irish Privy Councillors were not in line with Wentworth’s agenda. Lord Chancellor Loftus, Mountnorris and Sir Adam Loftus supported his view that the contribution should be continued for a further year, suggesting that the Protestants in Ireland pay the contributions the following year.<sup>12</sup> However, most of the Council were against this policy. In particular, Boyle, the Earl of Cork and Sir William Parsons displayed passive opposition by remaining largely silent.<sup>13</sup> The policy was of course unlikely to be popular amongst Protestant Councillors. Although there was a marked division between the

---

<sup>7</sup> Clarke, ‘The Government of Wentworth,’ p. 244.

<sup>8</sup> Ingram had an effective way of improving the money raised from the recusancy fines. Rather than accepting bribes from the recusants as in Sir John Savile’s policy, Ingram was part of a commission established to reassess how much the recusants should pay, putting pressure on them also to backdate payments on the fines they had evaded. Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram c 1565 – 1642* (Oxford, 1961), p. 215.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid*, p. 215.

<sup>10</sup> Rather than imposing his policy upon them, Wentworth was keen to impress upon his councillors, and also to demonstrate to the Crown, that he would consider their advice upon the most sensible and effective policy to ensure that the Army would continue to be paid for. Wentworth informed Secretary Coke that he was anxious to “take their Counsel, how these yearly Payments might be for a Time continued or supplied, till some other fit Expedient might be found out to provide for the Army forth of the Revenues of this Crown.” Wentworth to Secretary Coke, 3 August 1633, Str. P. 5 / 9, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 98.

<sup>11</sup> Wentworth asked them to seriously considered the matter and be ready to present “their severall Opinions, such as I might represent from them to his Majesty.” Str. P. 5 / 9, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 98.

<sup>12</sup> Clarke, ‘The Government of Wentworth,’ p. 246.

<sup>13</sup> Kearney has helpfully described their behaviour as “not direct opposition to the wishes of the deputy, but a marked disinclination to be helpful.” Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 43.

Councillors on this issue, as we saw in Chapter 5, the manipulation of these divisions was the key to Wentworth's success. Wentworth reported to Secretary Coke on 3 August 1633 that the Privy Councillors were "so horribly affrayd that the Contribution money should be sett as an annuall Charge upon their inheritance" and therefore he had been able to tempt the councillors into supporting his policy by offering them a Parliament in return.<sup>14</sup> Only then was the Earl of Cork convinced of the benefit of raising the contribution for another year, but he argued that Parliament should sit before the year ran out in order to settle a more long-term solution.<sup>15</sup> Cork may have believed that Parliament would have the advantage over the Lord Deputy who would be so in need of parliamentary supply that they would be able to negotiate and bargain to their own advantage. Wentworth was keen to press the policy of continuing the Contributions in the short-term as it would give him time to find his feet.<sup>16</sup>

Wentworth's early dealings with the Irish Privy Council were not as easy as he might have anticipated. He had to play a game with them, trying to manipulate their opposition to his benefit. Brady has suggested that Wentworth was playing a political game with his Privy Council concerning the issue of revenue raising, intending from the start to call Parliament and these conciliar debates served to manipulate them in order to exact his own ends.<sup>17</sup> The awkwardness of the Privy Council in these first two meetings certainly convinced Wentworth of the need to form his own party that would be dominated by his cabal in order to balance Catholic and Protestant agendas within the Privy Council. This group would also serve to facilitate the passage of favourable bills and debates in Parliament. Wentworth obviously anticipated that he would meet with difficulties from both ends of the political spectrum in Ireland.<sup>18</sup> Wentworth also needed to stamp his authority upon the existing Privy Council over which he had to preside. He was keen that the Irish Privy Council should follow the protocol of the English Council and asked that the orders for the conduct of the English Privy Council to be sent to Ireland so that he could impose

---

<sup>14</sup> He commented to Coke that "as upon the name of a Parliam[en]t thus proposed it was something strang to see how instantly they gaue a Consent to this Proposition, w[i]th all the Chearfullnes possible." Wentworth to Coke, 3 August 1633, Str. P. 5 / 9, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 99, Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth,' p. 246.

<sup>15</sup> Cork may have believed that Wentworth would be unable to control an assertive Parliament. In this case, Wentworth's regime might be weakened and he would perhaps be forced to "make concessions in the direction of the Boyle group." Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 43.

<sup>16</sup> Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth,' p. 244.

<sup>17</sup> Brady, C. 'England's Defence and Ireland's Reform: The Dilemma of the Irish Viceroy, 1541 – 1641,' in B. Bradshaw and J. Morrill, (eds.) *The British Problem, c. 1534 – 1707* (Basingstoke, 1996). p. 114.

<sup>18</sup> Kearney has also described Wentworth's deliberate establishment of a 'deputy's party' to influence the parliamentary elections. Through this, he ensured that his supporters would be elected. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 43.

some civility upon the Council.<sup>19</sup> This protocol would serve to reinforce his own status as Lord Deputy as well as his power and authority over the Councillors.

Although Wentworth had settled a short-term solution to the most pressing financial deficit, both he and Radcliffe considered that the best solution to the long-term financial shortfall was through the effective farming of the Irish customs. The improvement of the customs would also be of personal benefit to Wentworth and Radcliffe in their positions as farmers of the Irish customs. In this policy, they had both the interests of the government as well as personal gain in mind. The control of the Irish customs became the new focus of the Irish financial system. The customs farm was a safe policy for the Irish administration if it was successful as in the long term, the Lord Deputy would not be reliant on the grace of Parliament to provide supply. If the government had access to funds separate from parliamentary supply, the need to negotiate and bargain with Parliament in order to obtain money for essential governmental expenses could be minimised. Although parliamentary grants would still be useful, they would be a supplement to, rather than the primary source of, monies raised by the government. A strong customs system would allow Wentworth to adjust his power base away from reliance upon the goodwill of the Irish subjects who ultimately could decide not to grant supply if they were dissatisfied with his regime. However, the system was a long-term investment for the administration as it would take some time to yield positive results. Therefore, at this early stage of his administration, Wentworth still had to play a juggling game with the Privy Council and Parliament in order to ensure that enough funds were available to him until the customs farm was profitable enough for his reliance upon the Irish to be minimised. The success of the farm would also enable the Irish government to raise loans from English financiers upon the security of future customs income.<sup>20</sup> Wentworth's plan for the integral nature that customs could play in augmenting the King's revenues from Ireland led him to press ahead with an investigation of existing custom levies and monopolies which might limit the amount of revenue he could extract from Ireland.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> He informed the English government that the "Meetings and Proceedings of this Counsell, Allbeit much to the better since I came, yet are not w[i]th the Ciuility and Dignity" fit for the conduct of the King's Privy Council in Ireland." He asked that it should be ordered that "no man speake Couered saue the Deputy... their Speech may not be directed one to another but only to the Deputy" and they were to attend committee meetings, which many Councillors were neglecting. Wentworth to unknown recipient, but presumably Secretary Coke, 31 January 1634, Str. P. 5 / 45.

<sup>20</sup> Newton, P. 'The establishment of the great farm of the English customs,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* Fourth series, I, (1918), p. 155.

<sup>21</sup> Wentworth continually kept a check upon levies and monopolies that might have an adverse effect upon the potential revenue to be raised in Ireland. One such levy was the "impost of five shillings per chaldron" to be levied on English coal being brought into Ireland. The Irish Privy Council had already expressed their concern

Wentworth's financial policy was closely connected to wider shipping issues. As Ireland would be primarily reliant upon the import and export of commodities and the customs duties that this provided, Wentworth needed to tackle the issue of piracy that was a severe problem around the Irish coast. If stronger shipping could be encouraged in order to improve customs revenues and minimise piracy, revenue would increase as fewer goods would be lost and more investors might be attracted. To do this effectively, he had to ensure that the Navy was operating to its full potential. Previous Lord Deputies had not exploited the Navy fully, and Wentworth and the Privy Council were determined to improve the quality of the Navy to give the customs policy the best chance possible. In a letter to the English Lords of the Admiralty, the Irish Privy Councillors represented by Mountnorris, Christopher Wandesford, William Parsons, James Ware and George Radcliffe explained that the Navy had to become more accountable. The system was to be tightened up to ensure that the Navy was working with the Irish government rather than owing their allegiance elsewhere. Wentworth and the Irish Privy Council believed that this could best be achieved with a "decentralized Naval administration in Ireland." Wentworth was frustrated by the Navy's unwillingness to explain how much naval officers were being paid and how slowly financial transactions were being completed.<sup>22</sup>

---

about this tax in May 1635 and Wentworth complained that the levy "was then taken off, but is now to be renewed," just one year after Wentworth's initial complaint. Due to this levy, no coal had been imported into Ireland and Wentworth feared that a shortage of coal would lead to huge price increases. He argued that "Shipping will be decreased if coal is not to be carried and the King's customs will be diminished upon both sides far beyond anything that will be gained by the impost." Wentworth used the Irish Privy Councillors to present this objection and warned "if the imposition continue, it will be a heavier yearly charge and burden to the subjects here all along the coast than the payment of two subsidies." Lord Deputy and Irish Privy Council to English Privy Council, 30 May 1636, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 255, 125, 126, *CSPI 1633 – 47* p. 130. We must consider also that perhaps Wentworth's true motivation was a personal one in that he was attempting to legitimately wrestle control away from the Irish customs farmers. In addition to customs levies, Wentworth also had to address objectionable monopolies. In particular, he highlighted the "extreame distastfull" restraint upon Irish tallow implemented by the Corporation of Soapers. Although he may have had more personal concerns, Wentworth made it appear that this policy would affect the King's revenue from the customs as tallow was "the greatest Native Commodity they haue." He was also concerned that this monopoly would be "a mighty losse to the King in his Customes, the destruction of Trade, And consequently an impouerishm[en]t in a very remarkable degree to the Irish." Wentworth to Cottington, 26 August 1633, Str. P. 3a / 12. Wentworth was successful in removing the restraint, informing Laud on 18 May 1635 that the removal of that monopoly "giues a universall Contentment to this People..." Furthermore, he professed that regarding the "Sope businesse I was euer of opinion it would come to nothing, haueing noe beleefe at all in the Goodnesse of the Commodity..." He had told the Lord Treasurer of England on numerous occasions that "It were noe difficult matter to drawe, the old Sopeboylers to as good a Profitt for the King, w[i]th farr more Certainly and quietnesse, then could be effected by the New Corporation..." However it appeared that the Lord Treasurer had some personal interest in the business. Wentworth explained that "something... made him deafe on that eare, and highly offended w[i]th any man; that spake any thing in Contrary of the New Sopers." However, the new Soaper Corporation had been proven "not feasible" and therefore Wentworth had got his own way. Wentworth to Laud, 18 May 1635, *ibid.* 6 / 178.

<sup>22</sup> Wentworth and the Irish Privy Council wrote to the Lords of the Admiralty in December 1634 demanding that "Irish provisions returned to England in the ships shall be paid for... We cannot wait till December 1635 for money really due in 1633. This is what the officers of the Navy want, but it would immensely complicate

Piracy also had to be tackled in order to minimise disruption to Irish shipping and improve the chances of profiting from the developing customs farm. Wentworth recognised the potential danger of leaving the piracy issue unresolved early on in his Deputyship, believing that it was having a significant impact upon Irish trade.<sup>23</sup> Wentworth began negotiations with the Spanish, the primary offenders in the disruption to Irish trade, through Captain Bromfield, an agent employed to negotiate with the King of Spain. Bromfield was to inform the King of Spain “of the great disorders his subjects under pretense of his Comission Comitt dayly upon these coasts.” Wentworth complained that the Spanish pirates were “takeing the goods of my Maisters subiects as good prize whereuer they meet them att sea, as well w[i]thin Harbour as w[i]thout Distemping and Ruyning the trade of his kingdoms...”<sup>24</sup> Wentworth had to act quickly as the activities of the pirates appeared to be becoming even more daring. The Spanish had recently entered Dublin harbour and set fire to a ship moored by the Castle.<sup>25</sup> Wentworth was hoping that if Bromfield conveyed his distress that the behaviour of the pirates would “Shake the good peace” between the two Crowns, he might be able to negotiate a beneficial deal with Spain. He offered the Spanish the opportunity to victual their ships in Ireland, on the condition that they do not “prophane the sanctuary of my great Maisters ports, in this rude bould man[n]er.”<sup>26</sup> Wentworth was willing to negotiate with the Spanish as their activities might severely impair his profit-making abilities in the customs farm. This would not only affect his personal revenue, but more significantly, the income of the King. Once these shipping issues had been resolved, Wentworth could focus his attention onto increasing revenue through the Irish customs farm.

### **The establishment of the customs farm.**

Wentworth’s involvement in the Irish customs farm began prior to the official confirmation of his promotion to the Lord Deputyship of Ireland. An old associate, Sir Arthur Ingram, brought him into the scheme. The relationship between Ingram and Wentworth originated from their shared Yorkshire background and common interests in the

---

matters. They are not dealing fairly with us....” Lord Deputy and Irish Privy Council to the Lords of the Admiralty, 20 December 1634, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 254, 184, *CSPI 1633 – 47* pp. 86 – 87.

<sup>23</sup> He informed Sir Arthur Ingram of his belief that “the customs will increase still, if these Biskaners do not disturb the trade...” Wentworth to Ingram, 30 Sept 1633, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 40.

<sup>24</sup> Wentworth to Captain Bromfyld, 4 October 1633, Isle of Wight Record Office, OG 85 / 236.

<sup>25</sup> *ibid.*, OG 85 / 236.

<sup>26</sup> Wentworth proposed that if this behaviour was to stop, the Spanish ships would be welcome in Irish ports to obtain “fresh victuall or whateuer els w[hi]ch att sea may haue receaued preiudise And require a present cure before they can goe so farr as into Spaine.” *ibid.*, OG 85 / 236.

1620s, but Ingram remained an associate rather than a close friend like Radcliffe or Wandesford.<sup>27</sup> Their working relationship began during Wentworth's Lord Presidency of the Council in the North. Ingram participated in the administration of the recusancy fines in the North and the collection of knighthood fines in 1630. Ingram was also able to further Wentworth's personal interests, assisting in the long-term negotiations from 1630 to enable Wentworth to obtain the alum farm when it became available in 1637.<sup>28</sup>

Ingram's main involvement with the concerns of the Wentworth administration was in his involvement in the Irish customs farm from 1631. After the death of the Duke of Buckingham, his widow, Katherine Villiers, had inherited the farm. However, in return for financial compensation, she was willing to give up the farm.<sup>29</sup> Ingram had had a small share in an earlier syndicate of 1613 which had administered the customs farm but felt that the new proposal for the farm could be exploited more effectively under the management of his relative, Robert Cogan. Lord Mountnorris, the Vice-Treasurer of Ireland and George Radcliffe were also involved and Ingram's own share was concealed under the name of his son, Sir Arthur Ingram the younger. The syndicate's proposal was officially accepted in 1632.<sup>30</sup> Ingram owned the largest share (three-eighths), Wentworth had a share of one-quarter, with George Radcliffe, Mountnorris and Cogan having an eighth share each.<sup>31</sup> Initially, Wentworth may have been wary of Sir Arthur Ingram's proposal that he become involved in the farm, as he was aware that his involvement might appear to be inappropriate in his capacity as Lord Deputy and therefore he was at first unwilling to officially commit himself to the farm.<sup>32</sup>

The relationship with Ingram is especially important as it enables us to understand Radcliffe's involvement in the Irish finances from early in Wentworth's Deputyship, through his correspondence with Sir Arthur Ingram. The customs farm accounts sent to

---

<sup>27</sup> During the 1620s, Ingram and Wentworth had both been disgraced by the Duke of Buckingham and whilst this made Wentworth more oppositional to the King's favourite, Ingram hoped that his relationship with Buckingham might be restored and therefore attempted to ingratiate himself to the Crown again. However, he did support Wentworth's actions, consoling Wentworth when he was chosen to act as sheriff in 1625, which prevented him from sitting in the Parliament of 1626. Although Ingram paid the forced loan, he congratulated Wentworth for making a stand against the extra-parliamentary levy. Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram* pp. 212 – 213.

<sup>28</sup> *ibid*, p. 216.

<sup>29</sup> Katherine Villiers profited quite handsomely from the customs farmers in the 1630s. She received a rent of £2275 a year. The King received £5525 and the remaining profit was divided amongst the farmers. For the half year ending on Lady's Day 1634, this amounted to £3423, 1s, 9d. By Lady's Day 1635, this had increased to £9759, 17s, 10d. 'Papers relating to the Customs of England and Ireland,' *HMC Various Collections VIII*, pp. 194 – 195.

<sup>30</sup> The Indentures and confirmation of the Irish customs farm to George Radcliffe, Mountnorris, Sir Arthur Ingram the younger and Robert Cogan, are dated March and April 1632. Str. P. 12 / 289.

<sup>31</sup> Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth,' p. 244. Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram* pp. 218 – 220.

<sup>32</sup> *ibid*, p. 220.

Ingram reveal that Radcliffe was acting in the capacity of accountant as well as an administrator of the system at a local level.<sup>33</sup> Within the first six months after Wentworth's arrival in Ireland, the customs farm was proving its potential to be a highly successful policy. Radcliffe claimed that already the customs had "improved about what they were before."<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, Radcliffe was very hopeful that through the physical presence of the Lord Deputy, "our customs will be put into a better order than hitherto they have been."<sup>35</sup>

Radcliffe worked extremely closely with Vice Treasurer Mountnorris in the handling of the customs farm. Mountnorris was a high profile figure in the Irish administration and it is intriguing that Radcliffe, despite being a newcomer to the Irish administration, was nevertheless given the great responsibility of co-ordinating this integral element of the Irish finances. His relatively lowly status was reinforced by his close connection with Wentworth. Radcliffe and Mountnorris were initially jointly responsible for the day-to-day running of the customs farm in Ireland. For example, he reported in October 1633 that despite attempting to complete the accounts, he was unable to proceed any further with the work "till my lord Mountnorris & I have cleared our reckonings w[hi]ch I hope I shall do the next weeke, for his lordship is out of the Towne, and hath been much abroad..."<sup>36</sup> However by 1634, Radcliffe had taken the main responsibility for the farm from Mountnorris. Having sole control over the farm would enable Radcliffe to dramatically improve the administration and therefore the profitability of the customs.<sup>37</sup> He revealed that he was to introduce a new system in which he would "perfect myne accounts halfe yearly..." Now that Radcliffe was responsible for the accounts, he wanted to be more meticulous in his dealings, and therefore asked Ingram to appoint someone with whom Radcliffe could deposit any profits – "For I have no desire to keepe any money in myne hands."<sup>38</sup> In his correspondence with Ingram, Radcliffe continually presented himself as a selfless, honest and hardworking servant of the Crown. His declarations of endeavouring to serve the Crown remind us of Wentworth's self-representation, in which he projects himself

---

<sup>33</sup> Radcliffe's account details Ingram's three-eighths share of the profits from 1632, amounting to 1856*l* 13*s* 5½*s*. The account was sent to Ingram on 20 October 1634. Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 I 21 a.

<sup>34</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 31 December 1633, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 13.

<sup>35</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 29 July 1633, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 14.

<sup>36</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 10 October 1633, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 15.

<sup>37</sup> He explained to Ingram that "The moneys hitherto have been received by my lord mountnorris till since Michaelmas last, & now the collectors are to be accountable unto me from Michaelmas forwards. So hereby I shall be able to make the payments better than I have or could do, for I have received of my lord mountnorris onely 1500*l*. and a little odder money." Radcliffe to Ingram, 31 December 1633, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 13.

<sup>38</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 21 August 1634, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 16, *HMC Various Collections VIII*, pp. 43 - 44.

as an altruistic, dedicated and loyal servant.<sup>39</sup> Radcliffe continued this theme in his letters to Ingram when justifying his inactivity on Ingram's behalf or lack of responses to his letters. "In truth I cannot say that I haue had an houer at my owne disposinge this many weekes. the busines of Parliament & councell board, Kinges affaires haue so ouerloaded me."<sup>40</sup>

Radcliffe was integral to the day-to-day running of the customs farm and therefore had in-depth knowledge of the system's flaws. His involvement was so complete that he was able to advise Ingram why a minor official of the customs farm, a waiter, had been sacked.<sup>41</sup> Radcliffe needed to ensure that only dedicated, honest and effective workers were employed within the customs farm as this would enable the whole system to function more efficiently.<sup>42</sup> Radcliffe's agenda included rooting out corruption at all levels of the customs farm in order to improve the profits for the Crown and the farmers. Writing to Ingram in August 1634, he commented that he had discovered "dayly abuses in the Ports. & for that cause, I am just now goeing to Waterford to finde out a packe of knauery." He felt sure that this investigation would annually generate an extra £500 for the farm.<sup>43</sup> The potential for corruption was great within the system as so much money was changing hands and at various ports across Ireland, so it was very difficult to locate missing money. Radcliffe was

---

<sup>39</sup> For example, Wentworth informed Laud that his hardwork with the Parliament would "set this Crowne out of Debt, and Settle the Constant Payment of the Army... if in all this I make one penny of Benefitt to my Selfe in the Course of these Payment, Let my Maister take my head upon my Returne." Wentworth to Laud, 19 July 1634, Str. P. 6 / 81.

<sup>40</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 21 August 1634, Leeds District Archives, TN/ PO 7 II 16, *HMC Various Collections VIII*, pp. 43 – 44. On another occasion he asked for Ingram's pardon for replying to four of his letters in one. He protested "if y[o]u knew my occasions, how I haue bene beset this yeare y[o]u would not onely pardon but perhaps pittie me: who yet will neuer want leysure to expresse my selfe." He professed that his friends were always at the forefront of his mind, but that he had not had time to work on their business for them, being so overloaded with matters of state. He claimed that his "...occasions haue bene such and so pressinge, besides the continuall importunity of suitors, as that I cannot possibly write a letter in any quiet. My desire is to doe any thinge in busenes (so farre as I can) that my friendes require and then, I thinke they will the rather excuse me, though I faile in a complement; especially necessitated to it, by the exigence of my occasions." George Radcliffe to Ingram, 4 November 1635 and 7 August 1637, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 II 20, 22.

<sup>41</sup> The waiters were expected to attend the customs regularly in order to ensure the smooth running of the business and the administration of the money changing hands. One Mr Trotte, employed by Ingram as a letter carrier appears to have been recommended by Ingram for employment as a waiter. However, the customs farmers had refused him work as over the previous six months as his attendence had been irregular. This was despite the fact that Trotte had a legitimate excuse for his absence as "the sicknesse of his wife who not hauinge her health in Dublin, forced him to take a house and farme some 10 miles of in the Country." Although Trotte was "Ciuil & orderly." Radcliffe was forced to admit that "this is a Port of good consequence, & requires much diligence in the wayters, and yet for all they doe or can doe we are notably cosined..." This ensured that the farmers would only employ the most diligent waiters and would "looke more strickly" to their employees. Radcliffe to Ingram, 10 October 1633, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 15.

<sup>42</sup> Radcliffe was concerned that the system was being let down by inefficient and dishonest workers. Ingram had obtained employment for his servant, Barbon, as a waiter in Ireland and Radcliffe had to inform Ingram that he had recently died. Radcliffe assured him that although "wee cann haue waiters enough," men who were "honest and trustie are rare to bee found." The potential for corruption must have been a worry within this developing customs farm and therefore men who were recommended by a patron and assured to be highly trustworthy were more likely to be employed. George Radcliffe to Ingram, 15 July 1635, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 19.

<sup>43</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 21 August 1634. *ibid*, TN/ PO 7 II 16, *HMC Various Collections VIII*, pp. 43 – 44.

keen to pursue cases of fraud within the ports in order to improve revenue and to deter other workers from similar action.<sup>44</sup> Radcliffe realised that customs farm officials were in a position of trust and could easily misappropriate a portion of any income for themselves.<sup>45</sup>

Radcliffe commented upon the concern that paper rather than coinage should be used to exchange money between England and Ireland. Radcliffe stated that “some wise men doe much suspect it wilbe a great hindrance of trade here; and a way to carry out much money in specie, w[hi]ch otherwise of necessity must be layed out in commodities, to answeere payments there.” Presumably Radcliffe counted himself amongst these “wise men” and perhaps he was testing the water with Ingram before committing himself to declaring his own opinion. He believed, however, that the peculiarities of Ireland should be considered before proceeding with the policy, explaining that

For this Kingdome differs much from other p[ar]ts, in that the Outgates here farre exceed the Ingates: w[hi]ch bringes in mony & enriches the Kingdome, whereas by the exchange instead of money we shall haue nothings but paper. So as it is conceiued that it may be a greater hindrance to the Customes, then at the first view it can be imagined.<sup>46</sup>

Radcliffe appears to be frequently frustrated by the lack of competence within the customs farming system, which he tried to make as accountable and efficient as possible. On a number of occasions he commented to Ingram that he was waiting for others to fulfil their accounts before he was able to settle the accounts as a whole. The non-arrival of accounts delayed his analysis and he hoped that he could reform the system as soon as possible. The system was being greatly impaired by the staff that it employed, and Radcliffe commented in December 1633 that “My Lord Mountnorris complains of the Slownes of Collectors; & indeed we Suffer by ill officers, w[hi]ch we shall reforme as well

---

<sup>44</sup> Radcliffe informed Ingram about one particular case of fraud involving Richard Hatton who worked occasionally as a letter carrier for Ingram. The first “stronge suspition of a miscarriage” surrounding Hatton could not be proved as the appropriate page of the customs record had been removed. However, Hatton later confessed to another impropriety that had been reported by another waiter – “the landinge of a merchants goods of another value, at a prohibited place, & after 9 at clocke in the night, in december.” Radcliffe had to clamp down on such behaviour, as it “was such a fraud in our owne officers, as if it should be past by, we should not expect for any fair dealinge amongst them.” The waiters were in a position of trust and Radcliffe reminded Ingram just “how much they may deceiue us; & how strictly they are to be looked to. And therefore I did for this displace him & Shalbe fearefull to trust him any more.” Radcliffe to Ingram, 4 November 1635, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO7 II 20.

<sup>45</sup> One such worker Farrington, was accused by Wentworth and Radcliffe of taking £200 of “the Kings moneys and none of Farringtons, but fraudulently employed and detayned by him, w[i]thout giueing any manner of Accompt either of that, or much greater Summes in his hands....” Farrington had deposited the money with Ingram and Wentworth suggested that he “reserue it in yo[u]r owne handes. untill you receiue further order therabouts from the Court of Excheq[ue]r.” Wentworth was anxious to ensure that the customs farm was seen as scrupulously uncorrupted so that he and those involved in the farm at a higher level could not be accused of impropriety. A scandal such of this would clearly damage the Lord Deputy’s reputation. Wentworth to Ingram regarding money returned by Farrington, 30 December 1636, *ibid.* TN / PO 7 IV.

<sup>46</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 28 October 1634, *ibid.* TN / PO 7 II 17, *HMC Various Collections VIII* pp. 44 – 45.

and Speedily as we can.<sup>47</sup> Once the accounts books began arriving one by one from the Irish ports, Radcliffe could begin the process of compiling the figures. He was working on the previous half year accounts in May 1635 and confessed to Ingram that he still could not “tell what this last halfe yeare comes too; the bookes now come in daily.” The success of the ports could vary dramatically; in the same month, he reported that “Dublin holds as good or better then it was the former halfe yeare; other Ports are not so good.”<sup>48</sup> Even the system of collating the customs books from the ports could not be relied upon. In October 1634, Radcliffe told Ingram that the figures could not yet be settled as “The receipts of money for the Customes haue gone through, so, many handes, and some bookes amongst them miscarried...” Equally, he was sure that “some moneyes are yet in marchants handes not receiued, & some in our collectors not payd ouer hither.”<sup>49</sup>

The success of the customs farming scheme could be drastically affected by natural phenomena, which were out of the control of even the most efficient farmers. In October 1634, Radcliffe explained to Ingram that the six months customs accounts of winter 1633 – 34 was less than the half-year accounts from the summer of 1633. He considered this to be “some marueill consideringe the wines w[hi]ch come in winter more then Summer, & the exportations of hide & tallow are most in winter...” He could not think of any explanation except for “a longe westerly winde w[hi]ch we had almost all the winter, w[hi]ch Stopped all trade in a manner.”<sup>50</sup> Radcliffe was hoping that the summer 1634 accounts “wilbe as good this yeare as it was formerly because wee haue had no hurt by Pyrats: and the Pikehard fishinge was very good; though the herringes failed, w[hi]ch used to bringe good commerce.”<sup>51</sup> It seems that Wentworth’s negotiations with the Spanish had had the desired effect. Despite the limitations upon the customs farm, it was yielding profit for all of the

<sup>47</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 31 December 1633, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 II 13.

<sup>48</sup> George Radcliffe to Ingram, 9 May 1635, *ibid*, TN / PO7 II 18, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 47.

<sup>49</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 10 October 1633, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 II 15. On 28 October 1634, Radcliffe complained again that “the profits of this summer are not accounted for, because the bookes nor money is comen in and the first summe is not paid, but part of it in my lord mountnorris or mr Cogans hands, & not accounted for.” Radcliffe’s frustration with the inability of the farmers to complete their accounts continued. In July 1635, he announced “I could not gett the accompt of the Customes perfected before I came from Dublin for want of some of the bookes in the remote Ports...” Radcliffe to Ingram, 28 October 1634 and 15 July 1635, *ibid*, TN/ PO 7 I 21a, II 19.

<sup>50</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 21 August 1634, *ibid*, TN/ PO 7 II 16, *HMC Various Collections VIII*, pp. 43 – 44. The profits in December 1633 had been particularly good. Radcliffe had asked Ingram what New Year gift the farmers should buy Wentworth with some of the profits from the farm. He commented that “The farmers haue alwayes giuen the deputy 200/ for a new yeares guift. I would giue him no money, but I haue giuen order to lay him in 10 tunne of French wines... I was the bolder to doe it, because I see this last halfe yeare will beare it.” This buoyancy of profit was not always consistent however. Radcliffe reported to Ingram that he feared that the profits from summer 1635 “wilbe a good deale Short of the last yeares profit: w[hi]ch was such a yeare as I shall not expect againe in hast.” Radcliffe to Ingram, 31 December 1633, 4 November 1635, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO7 II 13, 20.

<sup>51</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 28 October 1634, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 17, *HMC Various Collections VIII* pp. 44 – 45.

shareholders. Radcliffe was responsible for handling the monies received, which amounted to huge sums of money. By the summer of 1635, the amounts of money being handled were so large that Radcliffe asked Ingram to send “some bodie hither to perfect the accompts which in respect the Somes now growe bigger and bigger are not fitt to bee deferred too long.”<sup>52</sup> In January 1637, Radcliffe reported that he had received £7000, which was in the care of the Vice Treasurer until he called it for counting.<sup>53</sup> The profits from the customs farm could of course fluctuate, yet although Radcliffe described the income as “bad,” the yield in January 1637 would still provide Ingram with £3000.<sup>54</sup>

Radcliffe’s letters to Ingram were not purely business transactions and occasionally Radcliffe makes reference to their friendship. On one occasion, Radcliffe thanked Ingram for his gift sent to himself and Wentworth of “good ale & mushadine, when they come wee will drinke y[ou]r health, & make the welkin roare. And singe old Jasper Blithman songe.”<sup>55</sup> Radcliffe also offered legal advice to Ingram and this was conducted through their correspondence once Radcliffe had settled in Ireland.<sup>56</sup>

Radcliffe acted as an intermediary between Thomas Wentworth and Ingram concerning the customs farm. This was important because almost immediately upon Wentworth’s arrival in Ireland, tensions began to emerge amongst the shareholders. Wentworth assured Ingram in a letter dated 30 September 1633 that Mountnorris would not be able to do Ingram any disservice in the customs farm.<sup>57</sup> Ingram’s dislike of Mountnorris might simply be due to Ingram’s insecurity as the only share-holder not on hand in

---

<sup>52</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 15 July 1635, *ibid*, TN / PO7 II 19.

<sup>53</sup> Radcliffe informed Ingram that the money was being looked after by Mountnorris who “onely keepes it for me; he hath his warrant and myne acquittance for it; and it is now in my power, as I shall call for it.” Radcliffe to Ingram, 2 January 1637, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 21.

<sup>54</sup> Although Radcliffe was fairly disappointed with the revenue raised, he told Ingram that the accounts would reveal “what a masse of money here is for y[o]u.” Radcliffe asked Ingram to “thinke of some course how y[o]u may gett exchange...” *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 21.

<sup>55</sup> *ibid*, TN / PO7 II 21. However, Wentworth’s relationship with Ingram had already begun to deteriorate and he wished to return the gift to him. Wentworth professed “I would not haue had you, to haue troubled yo[u]r selfe soe farr w[i]th mee, as to haue presented me w[i]th any thing, much lesse w[i]th any thing of price. Soe as indeed I had returned yo[u]r Muskadine back to you againe, had it come at such distance, as I might haue done it w[i]th any Conueniency, For although Esculenta & Poculenta be not held Bribamenta, yet I doe not use to take any thing of that nature. and must therefore by all meanes repay it you soe soone as I Can find any opotunity thirunto.” Wentworth to Ingram, 30 December 1636, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 IV.

<sup>56</sup> For example, in August 1637, Radcliffe wrote to Ingram that “I send y[o]u now againe the assurance fro[m] y[ou]r sonne to the Kinge, and a comission to take his acknowledgment at Yorke. I thinke to the best of myne understanding that there are no clauses in, w[hi]ch are any way preiudiciall unto y[o]u. I doubt not but that very shortly, I shall gett in all y[ou]r securities, w[hi]ch I shall endeouour the best I can.” Radcliffe to Ingram, 7 August 1637, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 22.

<sup>57</sup> Wentworth promised Ingram “...my Lord Mountnorris and you will better understand one another. It shall not be in his power to do you any prejudice in the farm: I will be accountable to you for that...” Wentworth to Ingram, 30 September 1633, *HMC Various Collections VIII* pp. 40 - 41.

Ireland.<sup>58</sup> More serious disagreements arose concerning Wentworth's plans for the customs farm, and Robert Cogan was initially at the root of the concerns. He appears to have been a disgruntled participant in the farm, being overruled by Radcliffe and Wentworth. In a letter to his relative Ingram dated 20 December 1633, Cogan complained that he had not been awarded his share of the customs profit. He protested that

when I came to demaunde my diuident parte Sir George Ratcliffe made a stoppe thereof and tould me that you had giuen him order to deteyne tooe houndred and fivete y pounds which I had charged in your accomt which you did not alowe of...<sup>59</sup>

Despite the fact that the customs profits were increasing, the relationship between Wentworth and Ingram was deteriorating. Radcliffe's negotiating skills had been tested for many years as he struggled to pacify both Wentworth and Ingram. Radcliffe often negotiated on Ingram's behalf to settle his customs farm accounts with Thomas Wentworth.<sup>60</sup> Wentworth also used George Radcliffe as a go-between to ensure that Ingram continued to negotiate on his behalf for the alum farm. Often we find that George Radcliffe had to put Ingram off, explaining that he had not had chance to discuss his business with the Lord Deputy. This may have been due to the fact that they were too busy with governmental matters, or perhaps Radcliffe judged it to be an inopportune moment, or alternatively was siding with Wentworth to delay a decision for Ingram. Radcliffe often protested that he had just been too busy. Since Ingram's last letter in January 1637, Radcliffe professed that he "had not since an opportunity to Speake w[i]th my lord... but at a fitt tyme, I will know his minde fully, then y[o]u shall heare more."<sup>61</sup>

Radcliffe often seemed to be torn between Wentworth and Ingram, (at least this was the image he presented in his correspondence with Ingram), but we can assume that his true loyalties lay with Wentworth.<sup>62</sup> Radcliffe cleverly appeared to support Ingram's businesses

---

<sup>58</sup> However, we should remember that despite the fact he was not in Ireland, Ingram still had a vital role to play in the Irish customs farm, by exploiting his location in England. He was expected to "beate downe" propositions that would affect the revenue of the Irish customs farm. For example, in May 1635, Radcliffe asked Ingram to stop a licence being granted to Mr Lisset to have the monopoly on the export of butter. Radcliffe argued that "If we should giue way to Such courses; the inconveniences would Soone be found in the Customes." Radcliffe to Ingram, 9 May 1635, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO7 II 18, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 47.

<sup>59</sup> Robert Cogan to Sir Arthur Ingram at Westminster from Dublin, 20 December 1633, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 II 7.

<sup>60</sup> For example, in July 1633, Radcliffe assured Ingram that although he had "yet no tyme to moue my lord Deputy to settle y[ou]r 1000*/i* but I shall at his a little better leysure, and in the meane tyme it is Safe enough from any doubtfull handes; for it is not allowed in the Exchequer." Radcliffe to Ingram, 29 July 1633, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 14.

<sup>61</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 2 January 1637, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 21.

<sup>62</sup> For example, Radcliffe acknowledged that Ingram's letter of 20 August 1635 concerning the demands of one Mr Brand, had "troubled me very much. My lord Deputy thinkes his honor is ingaged, & that if Brand be

whereas in reality he was protecting Wentworth. However, he was careful to make it appear that he had Ingram's best interests at heart. In May 1635, Radcliffe told Ingram that he had approached Wentworth about "the recusants receipts for the new compositions as y[o]u writ unto me." However, he stated that he could "doe y[o]u little good in it" as Wentworth was unwilling to allow Ingram to participate in the collection of the compositions "as yet it Standes." Radcliffe warned Ingram not to get overly optimistic, as he knew that this was a matter of "some former distast" to Wentworth and although he hoped "in tyme to sett right betwixt y[o]u... in the meane tyme my advise is that y[o]u should not much endeauour in it." Thus Radcliffe appeared to be serving Ingram without having to jeopardise his personal relationship with Wentworth, with whom he had much more invested. Radcliffe insisted that he would do everything he could for Ingram, but that his own position was equally awkward. Radcliffe told Ingram that he feared that if he pushed the issue too far with Wentworth, it "may hinder me to doe some good office, w[hi]ch I much desire to effect betwixt y[o]u."<sup>63</sup> Ingram's use of Radcliffe to get close to Wentworth and press matters of concern, indicates how close and influential Radcliffe was thought to be to Wentworth. However, Ingram may not have calculated the extent to which Radcliffe would have Wentworth's best interests at heart.

Radcliffe needed to ensure that the relationship between Wentworth and Ingram was at least workable, although Ingram made this job more difficult by creating wider divisions between them. Radcliffe needed to maintain this fragile friendship due to Ingram's involvement in the customs farm and also because Wentworth needed friends in England whilst absent in Ireland. Ingram could be a useful contact in England to handle issues on Wentworth's behalf. However, Ingram's attitude on a number of occasions did rankle with the Lord Deputy. On one occasion, rumours reached Wentworth that Ingram claimed credit for Wentworth's meteoric rise to political prominence. Although this might at first sight appear to be a fairly minor issue, it became very damaging to their relationship. Radcliffe wrote to Ingram clearly warning him to detach himself quickly from such a rumour, adding that he could not possibly believe that Ingram had actually said such a thing. Radcliffe

---

not payd at his dayes, he must see him payde: and bids me pay it out of the moneyes." However, Ingram had already warned Radcliffe that he was not to pay Brand without his consent. Radcliffe felt that he was torn between them both and pleaded "What shall I doe? I am trusted by y[o]u by a le[t]tre of attorney, w[hi]ch trust I may not breake..." Radcliffe felt unable to deal with this issue any further, stating that he intended to "quit my handes of that account, & leaue the money accordinge to the agreement w[i]th my lord Deputy, for to me it belonges not." He protested that in "money matters I will not medle betwixt y[o]u: it beinge a matter about my pitch & reach. Other way then thus, to secure my Selfe; I know not." Radcliffe to Ingram, 4 November 1635, *ibid.* TN / PO7 II 20.

<sup>63</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 9 May 1635, *ibid.* TN / PO7 II 18, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 47.

warned Ingram that Wentworth was dissatisfied with Ingram's behaviour. although he was convinced that the Lord Deputy was "farre fro[m] malice or irreconciablenes, towards y[o]u." Radcliffe reminded Ingram of Wentworth's emphasis upon the value of long-standing relationships, pointing out that their "acquaintance and familiarity hath bene great & longe; w[hi]ch he is not apt to forgett."<sup>64</sup> Radcliffe maintained his own friendship with Ingram by stating that as he considered himself to be a true friend, he was able to express himself with "plainesse and freedome, w[hi]ch I loue in a friend..." He asked Ingram to be "very wary how any thinge in this kinde comes from y[o]u Least it breed yet worse blood betwixt y[o]u & make a greater distance then is, and I hope wilbe betwixt y[o]u."<sup>65</sup>

The final catalyst in the breakdown of Wentworth and Ingram's now stormy relationship was a disagreement over the collection of recusancy fines in the North, which in Wentworth's absence was overseen by his Vice-President, Sir Edward Osborne. In 1633, it was agreed that a new levy of £3000 per annum should be raised from the fines and Ingram arranged, without asking Wentworth's permission, to handle the increased profits until he had raised enough money to cover a £2000 debt owed to him by the Crown.<sup>66</sup> Radcliffe wrote to warn Ingram in October 1634 that Wentworth could prove that Ingram was "aduised not to meddle in [the recusancy business] ... w[i]thout my lords priuity." Radcliffe could not understand why Ingram had not checked with Wentworth first;

...was it not a part of that respect w[hi]ch my lo[rd] Deputy might challenge from y[o]u; not to haue dealt therew[i]th w[i]thout first acquaintinge him w[i]thall? it bringe a matter which my lord Deputy had brought to that it was, & was so deeply engaged in?<sup>67</sup>

Wentworth was enraged by Ingram's apparent disregard of his authority and wrote to Ingram stating that firstly, his profits as a fine collector had been undermined and secondly,

---

<sup>64</sup> Radcliffe was clearly trying to ward off a greater storm in the relationship between Wentworth and Ingram. He had heard of further rumours that had not yet "comen to my lordes eare." Radcliffe had heard that Ingram had been bragging that he had used his influence to obtain for Wentworth his positions of Lord President of the Council of the North, alloms and customs farmer, Lord Deputyship of Ireland and the honours of his Viscounty and the Lordship of Tankersley Manor in Yorkshire. "These or most of these they say y[o]u attribute to y[ou]r selfe." Radcliffe admitted that Ingram "wished my lord well in them all I thinke no man will deny... But for procuringe them y[o]u know that the Presidentship, Vicecountship & Deputyship were granted him I thinke before y[o]u knew of them, and in a manner before himselfe well knew of them: or thought to haue them, except onely the vicecountship. So as I cannot belieue that y[o]u will claime any p[ar]tes in them." Radcliffe acknowledged that Ingram had "enformed him of the Allomes & the values or expected profit thereof: But y[o]u know w[i]th what difficultye, & by what meanes that lease was obtained. & how little helpe y[o]u could make him then to effect it." Radcliffe to Ingram, 28 October 1634. Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 II 17, *HMC Various Collections VIII* pp. 44 – 45.

<sup>65</sup> *ibid.* TN / PO 7 II 17.

<sup>66</sup> Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram* pp. 224 – 225.

<sup>67</sup> Radcliffe to Ingram, 28 October 1634. Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 II 17, *HMC Various Collections VIII* pp. 44 – 45.

Ingram's actions had implied that he could do a more efficient job in managing the revenue than Wentworth.<sup>68</sup> This breach was never really settled despite Radcliffe's attempts to patch up their relationship, and eventually resulted in Wentworth forcing Ingram to sell his share of the Irish customs farm for £7000.<sup>69</sup>

In reality, the customs farm may not have been as profitable to the Crown as the Irish administration was keen to suggest. Although profits had risen from £22,500 in the first year to £38,000 by spring 1635, a recent historian has suggested that although the farmers earned profit, much less was gained by the Crown. To rectify this, Wentworth wished to buy the shares of all the customs farmers except himself and Radcliffe, which would free up a greater share for the Crown.<sup>70</sup> This proposition smacked of self-interest for Wentworth and his right-hand man as they maintained their personal income whilst augmenting that of the King. This suggests that Wentworth and Radcliffe favoured the customs farm policy as it would not only generate income for the government, but that it had a clear personal motivation as well.<sup>71</sup> Despite his potentially dangerous personal involvement in the Irish financial policy, Archbishop Laud praised Wentworth's handling of the customs farm stating that "'tis apparent that all the improvement of them comes to the King, saving your Lordship's two parts and Sir George Radcliffe's one." He also pointed out that the accounts were very transparent, which removed the potential of Wentworth and Radcliffe being accused of corruption. It was clear to all what profits were being accrued "since the books and accounts are upon record, that 'tis not possible for you to hide your profit, were you minded to do so..."<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram* p. 227. See Wentworth to Sir Arthur Ingram, 22 August 1634, Str. P. 8 / 136 – 9.

<sup>69</sup> Wentworth had sought permission from the King to remove Ingram from the customs business as early as July 1636. He wrote to Wandesford from England in July 1636 stating that the King was pleased to agree to his proposition as "it was for his Honour, and a Means to sharpen the Edge of other Men's Endeavours in his Service..." Wentworth and Radcliffe were to be 'preserved, and to have the managing of the Farms to all Intents and Purposes as formerly, Ingram compounded out for 7000l Norton for 300l and both of them to assign their Parts to Sir Adam Loftus and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in trust of his Majesty's Use..." Wentworth to Wandesford, 25 July 1636, Knowler, vol. II, pp. 16, 21. However, Ingram had profited quite substantially from the customs farm. His first year's profit was £5000, the half year ending March 1635. £3659 and in his last year as shareholder he made £11, 347. Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram* p. 232, Radcliffe to Ingram, 2 January 1637, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO7 II 21.

<sup>70</sup> Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth,' p. 252.

<sup>71</sup> Other members of Wentworth's cabal were also working within and profiting from the customs farm. Thomas Little, Wentworth's secretary, carried customs money to pay to Ingram. This letter revealed the amount owed to Ingram for the 6 months ending on Lady Day 1636. "Paid unto Sir Arthur at Oxford by Tho: Littell 5*li*." In October 1633, Radcliffe had estimated how much money was yet to be accounted for, and had paid Christopher Wandesford his 'cosin.' £60 as his profit. Radcliffe to Ingram, 10 October 1633 and 20 February 1637, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 II 15, I 21c.

<sup>72</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 19 December 1637, Bliss, J. (ed). *The works of the most reverend father in God, William Laud, D.D.* (7 vols. London, 1847 – 1860), vol. VII, p. 396.

Wentworth's financial policies were restrained to some extent by his need to pacify the Parliament that he intended to call. He had to consider the long-term implications of his early policies, such as the continuation of the Contributions, in order to ensure that the members of Parliament were willing to support the King through parliamentary supply. The Irish Parliament was a very different experience from the English Parliament and therefore Wentworth would be able to use the peculiarities of the Irish system to obtain supply and limit legislation that would adversely affect his plans as Lord Deputy. Wentworth would rely heavily upon his associates to support him during parliamentary preparations and within Parliament itself.

### **Background to the Irish Parliament**

The Irish Parliament was in decline in the fifteenth century and during the sixteenth century, it fared no better, being called more infrequently, with only four Parliaments being held between 1543 and 1613.<sup>73</sup> The declining importance of the Irish Parliament under the Tudor monarchs was a deliberate policy in order to minimise the influence of the Parliament and therefore the potential that it might exert independence from the English Crown.<sup>74</sup> As English legislation applied in Ireland, the Irish Parliament in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had a more limited role passing legislation of local concern and dealing with executive and judicial business.<sup>75</sup> This substantial difference between the powers of the English and Irish parliaments was reinforced by the use of Poyning's Law, which was primarily concerned with maintaining the dominance of the English Parliament over the Irish. This act served to limit the constitutional development of the Irish Parliament, making it subservient to the English Crown and Parliament. Poyning's Law ordered that before a Parliament in Ireland could be called, permission must be obtained from the English monarch. The Lord Deputy and Council of Ireland had to set out their reasons for calling a Parliament, and along with draft copies of the legislation that they intended to pass, send them to the English Privy Council and King. The Parliament could only begin once the Lord Deputy had received licence under the great seal of England and

---

<sup>73</sup> Ellis, S.G. 'Parliament and community in Yorkist and Tudor Ireland,' in A. Cosgrove & J.I. McGuire, (eds). *Parliament and Community Historical Studies XIV Papers read before the Irish Conference of Historians*. Dublin (Dublin, 1983), pp. 43, 56.

<sup>74</sup> *ibid*, p. 58.

<sup>75</sup> Sir John Davies commented that the Irish Parliament dealt with an extraordinary amount of petitions and private bills which "for want of other business, were not fit to be handled in so high a court." Davies, J. *Historical tracts* (Dublin, 1787), pp. 297 – 8 in *ibid*, pp. 44 - 45.

permission to enact bills that the King had approved.<sup>76</sup> Prior to Wentworth's regime, Poynings' Law was felt to be of advantage to the Irish Members of Parliament who felt that it protected their rights and in contrast the Irish administration found that it constrained them.<sup>77</sup> However, Wentworth manipulated the act for his own purposes and applied it to ensure that Parliament could not become overly assertive. Clarke has described Wentworth as the first to see that Poynings' Law "could be used to obstruct parliamentary actions rather than to limit government initiative." In effect, Wentworth turned the "traditional understanding" of Poynings' Law on its head which enabled his government to carefully control parliamentary activities in order to gain what he wanted from the Parliament, without jeopardising the King's prerogative.<sup>78</sup>

An example of Wentworth use of Poynings' Law in the Parliament of 1634 was his blocking of the attempt by the Committee of Grievances within the House of Lords to "initiate legislation." Their agenda would have made Wentworth's intended plantation of Connacht and the work of the Commission of Defective Titles "legally impossible." The Committee attempted to create a bill that would prevent the Crown from claiming ambiguous title of land that was more than sixty years old.<sup>79</sup> This was a complaint within the Graces that sought to prevent the plantation of Connacht. Wentworth offered his rebuke to the House of Lords and made it clear that "the framing or drawing up any acts to pass in Parliament... solely belongs to us the lord deputy and council."<sup>80</sup> The Protestant Lord Ranelagh (the son-in-law of the Earl of Cork) loudly voiced a demand that the Graces should be confirmed by statute<sup>81</sup> as this would prevent Wentworth's plantation policy from

---

<sup>76</sup> Dudley Edwards, R. & Moody, T.W. 'Historical Revision. The History of Poynings' Law: Part I, 1494 – 1615,' *Irish Historical Studies* 2 (1941), pp. 415 – 416.

<sup>77</sup> Dudley Edwards & Moody, 'History of Poynings' Law,' p. 415, Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 55 - 56.

<sup>78</sup> Clarke, A. 'Historical revision. The History of Poynings' Law, 1615 – 41,' *Irish Historical Studies* 18 (1972-3), pp. 207, 211.

<sup>79</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 56.

<sup>80</sup> 'Wentworth's Rebuke to the House of Lords, 2 August 1634. Protestation of the Lord Deputy,' in Curtis, E & McDowell, R.B. (eds). *Irish Historical Documents* (London, 1943), p. 140.

<sup>81</sup> Beckett, J.C. *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603 – 1923* (London. 1966), p. 66. The issue of the Graces was a complaint levied against Wentworth throughout his regime. Although published after Wentworth's execution, an anonymous pamphlet entitled *A Discourse between two councillors of State, the one of England, and the other of Ireland* (1642), which now survives only in manuscript form, reveals much about the discontent within the Parliament of 1634. Although anonymous, the opinions of the author do suggest an Old English identity and Clarke has argued that he probably had a connection to Connacht due to the information he presents. The Irish Councillor believed that what made him "more odious" to the Irish was the way in which he led them to believe that the Graces would be enacted. The Irish Councillor complained that Wentworth had retracted "the promises he had made to both houses of Parliament in the first session of the confirmation of those graces... in a scoffing and jeering manner..." Wentworth had clearly given the impression that the Graces would be settled if supply was granted, but had done this cleverly without making any promises to the members of the House. Clarke, A. 'A Discourse between two Councillors of State, the one of England, and the other of Ireland (1642) From B.M. Egerton MS 917,' *Analecta Hibernica* 26 (1970), p. 161.

proceeding. But Wentworth was quick to ward off this danger, as the Graces would be severely detrimental to the agenda of the Lord Deputyship and the Crown in Ireland. He warned that the Lords that their powers extended only to offering a remonstrance or petition outlining to the Lord Deputy and Privy Council “such public considerations as they shall think fit and good for the commonwealth.”<sup>82</sup> In this instance, it was in Wentworth’s interest to exploit Poyning’s Law to his own ends and to reassert his authority over Parliament, and the House of Lords in particular. However in reality, as Kearney has indicated Wentworth’s authority was actually not in much danger from this threat by the Lords as he controlled the proxy votes of the absentee lords.<sup>83</sup> However, by appealing to Poyning’s Law, he was able to refrain from alienating the Lords by directly attacking them, as this could prove detrimental to the image of co-operation he was trying to project.

### **Parliamentary preparations and motivations**

The Parliament of 1634 was only undertaken with the most detailed of planning and negotiation with King Charles I and the English Privy Council. Under the rules of Poyning’s Law, Wentworth sought permission from the English Crown to hold a Parliament and also had to convince the English administration that a Parliament in Ireland would be successful and could be manipulated for the benefit of the Crown. Wentworth’s application to the King and English Privy Council, carried by his brother Sir George Wentworth “for more safety and speed,”<sup>84</sup> reveals a meticulous exploration of the eventualities of holding a Parliament in Ireland to convince the King that a Parliament could be successful. This document, consisting of a numbered list of arguments, reveals much about Wentworth’s intentions and reasons for a Parliament and therefore it is worth exploring this lengthy document in detail. Wentworth boldly stated, “the calling of Parliament is at noe time of soe much hazard” and demonstrated that he had considered at length the policies that he intended, with the King’s permission, to pursue. He emphasised

---

<sup>82</sup> ‘Wentworth’s Rebuke to the House of Lords,’ in Curtis & McDowell *Irish Historical Documents* p. 140. See also Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 56, Mountmorres, Lord H.R. *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament, from the year 1634 to 1666* (2 vols, London, 1792), vol. I, pp. 323 – 324.

<sup>83</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 56. Wentworth was well aware of the potential value of these proxy votes. Prior to the beginning of Parliament, he asked Secretary Coke that any Irish Lords in England should be encouraged to vote by proxy rather than press them to attend the meeting “for if I be not mistaken we may haue more helpe by those then these.” Wentworth to Coke, 29 April 1634, Str. P. 5 / 71. Wentworth promised the King in his proposals for the Parliament that “The titular lords... will putt their Proxies into such safe hands, as may be thought of, on this side.” The King agreed to Wentworth’s proposal and asked him to quickly nominate those men “in whom you repose special trust.” *ibid.*, 14 / 19, point 26.

<sup>84</sup> *ibid.*, 14 / 19.

that he had considered the potential consequences of a failed Parliament, but that “after a serious discourse w[i]th my self, my reason perswades me for the assembling thereof.”<sup>85</sup> The King’s annotated response to Wentworth’s letter appears on one half of the page, and the King remarked that Wentworth had convinced him of the benefits of a Parliament, being able to rely on his “faith, & dexteritie, in managing so great a woorke for the good of our Service.” Anthony Milton has suggested that Wentworth was not simply holding the Parliament for the King’s benefit – he also believed that holding a successful Parliament in Ireland could serve to strengthen his personal regime.<sup>86</sup> Indeed, if he could demonstrate to the Irish that he could manage a productive Parliament in which the natives benefited (although less than the King) he would be held in high esteem.

In his plans for an Irish Parliament, Wentworth was primarily motivated by the need to raise revenue in Ireland. He explained to the King that as the Contributions would be ending the following December, the country’s income would fall short by £20,000. Wentworth considered that it would be “impossible by any other ordinary way to be in time supplied, but by the Subject in Parliament.”<sup>87</sup> Furthermore, Wentworth believed that the Irish would be gracious towards Charles I in supplying him with money as the country had continued to grow “very much more civill and rich.” However, Wentworth had another trick up his sleeve – if supply was not forthcoming, he could exploit the “frighfull apprehension, w[hi]ch at this time makes their harts beate” – the fear that the quarterly payments which they currently made towards the upkeep of the army might be altered into “an hereditary Charge upon their lands” which he felt “inclines them to give any reasonable thing in present.”<sup>88</sup>

Wentworth next turned his attention to the mechanics of his proposed Parliament. He felt that time was limited and asked that the Parliament be called before Trinity Term at the latest. He felt that if Parliament was unsuccessful, he would still have “at the worst sixe moneths to turne our eyes about” for a solution to the issue of supply.<sup>89</sup> Wentworth had also considered the best ways in which to maximise the profits for the Crown without risking prejudice to the King’s authority. He presented the case for having two sessions of Parliament. The first session would provide supply and the second would “inact soe many

---

<sup>85</sup> *ibid.*, 14 / 19, point 1.

<sup>86</sup> Milton, A. ‘Thomas Wentworth and the political thought of the Personal Rule.’ in J. Merritt, (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 143.

<sup>87</sup> *ibid.*, 14 / 19, point 2.

<sup>88</sup> *ibid.*, 14 / 19, point 4.

<sup>89</sup> *ibid.*, 14 / 19, points 6 and 8. Charles I agreed that Trinity Term appeared to be the best time to call the Parliament.

of those Graces as in honor and wisdom should be judged equally, when the putting aside of the rest, might be of no consequence to other yo[u]r Royall purposes.”<sup>90</sup> Anthony Milton has suggested that separating the sessions to deal with distinct and different business would help to prevent bargaining.<sup>91</sup> Wentworth would thus ensure that the King was in the best position to avoid parliamentary bartering, fearing that the Irish would attempt to force through the Graces by withholding supply. The King noted that he agreed with the two-session principle of Parliament but was eager to impress upon Wentworth that he thought that this information was “not fit to be imparted to any, till the Parliament be set” in order to avoid annoying the members of Parliament before they sat.<sup>92</sup> Wentworth was well aware that the Graces would become an issue at the Parliament, fearing that if the Graces were forced through, “it might render fruitless the intended improvement upon the Concealments; and prejudice the Plantations of Conaght and Ormond.”<sup>93</sup> But Wentworth felt that this could be avoided if he offered what looked like a bargain to the members of Parliament. He intended to declare at the opening of Parliament that the King would allow two sessions of Parliament, the first of which was to “ascertain the payments of yo[u]r Army, and to strike off, the debt of yo[u]r Crowne...” In return, Wentworth would suggest that they could expect the “inacting of all such profitable and wholesome lawes...”<sup>94</sup> Although Wentworth expected the Parliament to grant three subsidies to “disengage their Crowne of fourscore thousand pounds debt” and continue their Contributions to pay for the Army for a further four years, Wentworth in return could offer them hope that in the meantime, “some other expedient might be found out, to maintain the Army, w[i]thout further Charge to them at all.”<sup>95</sup> This proposition would have seemed very attractive to the Irish who were paying for an army that was effectively supposed to control the very people who were paying for it. Although this appeared to be an ambitious plan, Wentworth was careful not to “raise any hope on that side, that all this should be granted” but nevertheless hoped that by threatening Parliament with the continuance of payments for the army “w[hi]ch they dread above any earthly thing,” and offering them hope that the Contributions would be “lay a sleep”, Wentworth was sure that the Parliament would “be drawn to a present gift

---

<sup>90</sup> *ibid.*, 14 / 19, point 10.

<sup>91</sup> Milton, ‘Wentworth and the political thought of the Personal Rule,’ p. 143. See Wentworth to King Charles I, 22 January 1634, Str. P. 3a / 47, Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols. London, 1739), vol. I, p. 185.

<sup>92</sup> Str.P. 14 / 19, point 10.

<sup>93</sup> *ibid.*, 14 / 19, point 11.

<sup>94</sup> *ibid.*, 14 / 19, point 13.

<sup>95</sup> *ibid.*, 14 / 19, point 16.

of three Subsidies...”<sup>96</sup> What was more, Wentworth was sure that despite the current Contributions being £20,000, each subsidy could raise £30,000.<sup>97</sup>

In the planning stages of the Parliament, in order to avoid the potential problem of bills being discussed and prepared without the government’s knowledge. Wentworth proposed to choose a committee;

to take into consideration all the Bills intended... such as shalbe iudged beneficiall, to make them ready; such as may be of too much preiudice to the Crowne, to lay them aside; and to draw up others w[hi]ch may chance to have ben then omitted.<sup>98</sup>

Wentworth almost certainly intended that members of the cabal would feature prominently in this committee, which might help to prevent dangerous bills from proceeding through the House. Wentworth was clearly hoping to maintain a strict control over the Parliament’s activities as any problems with the Parliament could severely jeopardise his favour with the King and potentially his long-term career.

Wentworth’s meticulous planning of the Parliament and policies that he intended to pursue,<sup>99</sup> reveals a desire to ensure that the Irish administration was run for the King as

---

<sup>96</sup> *ibid*, 14 / 19, point 17.

<sup>97</sup> *ibid*, 14 / 19, point 18. This proposition outlined Wentworth’s main purpose in holding the Irish Parliament: to gain supply for the King. He made this clear to the House in his opening speech on 15 July 1634. He assured them that if they did their duty to the King in granting supply, a second session would be allowed in which the King would listen to their proposals and grievances. However, although Wentworth may have given the impression that the Graces would be granted, he made it apparent that Parliaments did not have the right “to give direction to government policy or to exercise control over state administration.” Milton, ‘Wentworth and the political thought of the Personal Rule,’ p. 145. In spite of this, the Commons unanimously voted six subsidies and the bills passed through both Houses by 2 August. Beckett, *Making of Modern Ireland* p. 66, *Journal of the House of Lords of Ireland from 10 Car I 1634 to 10 Guil III 1698* (Dublin, 1779 - 1800), vol. I, p. 24.

<sup>98</sup> The King was pleased with this plan and additionally suggested that the Attorney General of England would reassess the Graces to ensure that “nothing pass by law w[hi]ch may p[re]iudice our crown.” Str. P. 14 / 19, point 21.

<sup>99</sup> The letter attached to Wentworth’s survey of the benefits of the Parliament and the ways in which he proposed to manage it, which also takes the form of a numbered list, reveals his concerns about the Irish military. This is intertwined with his desire for a Parliament, as either Parliamentary supply or the Contributions needed to be used to pay for the continued maintenance of the army. Wentworth was rather despairing of the state of the army, writing that “a vigilant Enemy might indanger to cutt them all to peeces, before they should be able to draw together.” Wentworth presented a number of ways in which he intended to tackle the shabby army, and reform them into a decent force. Firstly, he would inform every Captain “of his defects, requiring him to see them supplied and made perfect w[i]thin sixe months, when I purpose to take a second view of all the Army...” Through the “severe punishment of a few” he hoped that other Captains would witness the importance of supplying and exercising their troops in a manner “befitting Souldiers.” Wentworth intended that the soldiers would be properly trained. He would order that the troops should be exercised once a week and each troop was to come to Dublin for a month in turn to “passe under the view of the Generall.” Wentworth was also appalled at the state of the stores. Ireland was suffering from a lack of military resources and he estimated that it would cost £1500 to equip the horse and foot soldiers and £2000 to fill the stores. He was also not impressed at the military personnel. In particular, the high profile Master of the Ordnance, Lord Caulfield, was inexperienced, often absent and too old to perform his duties effectively. Wentworth proposed to replace him with Sir John Borlase and this proposal was seconded by the King. *ibid*, 14 / 19, points 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15. This letter also surveys the plantation. Wentworth had informed himself of “the number of

smoothly and as profitably as possible. In the planning stages, Radcliffe and Wandesford played a prominent role, at the very least acting a sounding board for Wentworth's ideas. The idea of holding an Irish Parliament was being debated by the cabal from at least the summer of 1633. Wentworth wrote to Coke on 3 August 1633 describing the careful considerations that contemplating a Parliament involved. He believed that the summoning of an Irish Parliament "is w[i]thout all doubt very fitt to be waightly Considered so as I purpose not to giue any suddaine Opinion in it." Wentworth wanted to "seriously thinke upon it and debate it" with Christopher Wandesford and George Radcliffe, "whom only I trust on this side."<sup>100</sup> Clearly Wentworth allowed his cabal to contribute to the making of important decisions, such as the planning of the Parliament. Certainly we know that Radcliffe played a prominent role in managing the Parliament and its activities so it would be natural that he should have known Wentworth's intentions and the King's responses to them before Parliament began. Radcliffe was certainly keen to give Sir Arthur Ingram the impression that his involvement in the run up to the Irish Parliament had been extremely time-consuming. Radcliffe hoped that he would never "runne into the like arreres till we haue another Parliament, or some other businesse of like trouble & importance." Radcliffe admitted that the run up to the Parliament was "exceedinge cumbersome unto me; for much lay on my handes, so as I could not be spared nether forenoone nor afternoone for a great while together." He modestly stated that he was unsure "Whether I haue bene able to doe the Kinge any seruice or noe... onely I know that neither faith, nor diligence nor care was wantinge in me."<sup>101</sup>

Wentworth was already aware that policies that he was planning might not be very popular and therefore he had to be careful not to release information about the plantation policy in particular prior to the calling of a Parliament. He intended to ensure that the planters were fulfilling their obligations on the plantations. This policy would inevitably "putt the Planters to a very great Chardge and draine their Purses, and breed a Grudging in

---

men to be found by the Planters in every Province." However, he did not feel in a position to comment fully upon the state of plantation as he had not been able to obtain very accurate figure to date and felt that as it was the "greatest [Affaire] of the Kingdome," he could not offer advice on it until he was fully informed. Equally he wanted to be careful not to advertise policies that might not be accepted with good grace, until he was sure of the detail. Premature revelations would only serve to ally the planters and the natives with each other. Wentworth commented that "wee must there [in the plantations in Ulster] bow and governe the Native by the Planter, and the Planter by the Native." Exploiting divisions might give Wentworth the advantage over the Irish. Wentworth to unstated recipient, 31 January 1634, *ibid.*, 5 / 44.

<sup>100</sup> Wentworth to Coke, 3 August 1633, *ibid.*, 5 / 10.

<sup>101</sup> However, we must consider that this may have been an excuse for his slow response to Ingram's correspondence. Radcliffe professed that he was "behind w[i]th y[o]u for so many le[tu]res lately received from y[o]u, as in trueth I am extreemely ashamed..." Radcliffe to Ingram, 9 May 1635, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO7 II 18, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 47.

their minds, w[hi]ch would be a very ill Preparatiue to that Meeting of Parliament.<sup>102</sup> If news of how the administration intended to deal with Parliament escaped, it could severely affect Wentworth's chances of holding a successful Parliament. Therefore, Wentworth could only debate parliamentary policies with men he knew he could trust completely. Once he had received the King's permission to hold a Parliament, Wentworth conveyed the King's instructions to a small Committee of the Privy Council. He did not want them to debate parliamentary proceedings more than to consider how the summons should be issued. He then appointed a committee to "Consider what was to be p[re]pared in Conformity to Poynings Act, and other Statutes of this Realme." Radcliffe and the three Chief Justices formed this Committee and "after their Reading and mature advise taken upon the lawe themselues & presidents of former tymes," Wentworth was able to send an express letter back to England with their recommendations.<sup>103</sup>

Wentworth then informed the whole Privy Council of his planned Parliament who "at first... seemed to feare the Parliament could not be called in soe short a tyme." However, once they had seen Wentworth's pre-arranged statutes for the Parliament, they realised that it was possible. Wentworth's cabal proved their worth when Radcliffe and Wandesford informed him that the Privy Councillors "Grounded their Counsells much upon pleasing the people," whilst Wentworth's priority was to gain supply for the King. The Privy Council differed to Wentworth to such an extent that they believed the proposed Bill of Graces should finally go over to England with the Bill of Subsidies for the King's perusal. Wentworth also wanted to leave blanks for the amount of subsidies to be inserted into the Bill later, but the Councillors wished to "grant two in Certaine" which would amount to more than the current Contributions. However, Wentworth ignored their proposal to "set downe a Certaine Number" of Subsidies, arguing that the Privy Council should not "seeme to put any Constraint, upon the free and Cheerful harts of a People."<sup>104</sup> Wentworth was concerned that the Councillors had the wrong attitude towards pleasing the people and told them at the Council Board that "I feared they begun at the wronge end, Thus Consulting what might please the People in a Parliament, when it would better become a

---

<sup>102</sup> Thomas Wentworth to unstated recipient, 31 January 1634, Str. P. 5 / 44.

<sup>103</sup> Wentworth to Coke, 29 April 1634, *ibid.* 5 / 64. The English Privy Council objected to the Acts "in preparation towards a Parliament" prepared by Radcliffe and the three chief barons. But Wentworth reassured them that George Radcliffe and the judges were "all very confident there is not therein any omission at all, haueing been very circumspect therein before they let it goe out of their handes and diligently comparing it w[i]th former Presidents, w[hi]ch they take of all other to be the safest and best to be followed in Cases of this nature, But I must referr this, as out of my Element, to their owne letter, w[hi]ch they purpose to send you by the next Pacquett." Wentworth to Coke, 31 May 1634, *ibid.* 5 / 85.

<sup>104</sup> Wentworth to Coke, 29 April 1634, *ibid.* 5 / 65 - 66.

Priuy Councell to Consider what might please the King...<sup>105</sup> He plainly informed the Councillors that the Parliament had to be on the King's terms and that he would not bargain with the House.<sup>106</sup> Wentworth had to reassure Archbishop Laud that his dealing with the Irish Privy Council on this occasion had "nothing of force in it." Wentworth felt that he had to act upon information given to him by George Radcliffe that the Councillors "grew to touch upon things w[hi]ch might haue drawn ill consequences upon us."<sup>107</sup> This clearly illustrates how invaluable having Radcliffe as an insider on the Privy Council could be. He would be able to prevent ill-advised debates from going too far by informing the Lord Deputy about the Councillors' discussions. Wentworth's speech to the Privy Councillors should have given them some indication of how ruthlessly Wentworth would deal with the Parliament if it were not fulfilling the King's interests. Wentworth knew that his Councillors were aware of the problems that Charles had had with his English Parliaments and warned them "not to strike their fate upon the same stone of distrust w[hi]ch had so often broken them."<sup>108</sup> Wentworth boasted that after his dressing down of the Irish Privy Councillors, they became very pliable to his commands and agreed that "they would send ouer no other lawes but such as I should like, Nay if I pleased they would send ouer the Bill of Subsidy alone."<sup>109</sup>

### **Parliamentary preparations – elections and packing of Parliament**

The cabal played an integral role in the parliamentary preparations. Wentworth also planned to use his influence as Lord Deputy to obtain seats for the members of the cabal so that they could report back to him fully upon the events of the House, predict any potential disgruntlements emerging within the House and also potentially guide parliamentary and committee debates towards Wentworth's own ends. Wentworth was able to manipulate important Irish figures in order to obtain seats for men he could trust. The Earl of Cork was sent six letters asking him to influence the elections of six of Wentworth's candidates into borough seats over which he had control.<sup>110</sup> Only three of these official candidates were

<sup>105</sup> Wentworth to Coke, 29 April 1634, *ibid*, 5 / 65.

<sup>106</sup> Wentworth argued that according to the "Order of Reason, Nature and Conscience," the King would put "Himselfe first, his People afterwards." *ibid*, 5 / 66.

<sup>107</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 3 June 1634, *ibid*, 6 / 77.

<sup>108</sup> Wentworth to Coke, 29 April 1634, *ibid*, 5 / 69.

<sup>109</sup> *ibid*, 5 / 70.

<sup>110</sup> These seats were Bandon, Tallagh, Clonakilty and Lismore. Askeaton and Dingle appear to have a more tenuous link for the Earl. Kearney, p. 47. See Boyle, R. Earl of Cork. *The Lismore Papers* Grosart, A. (ed). (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> series, each 5 vols, London, 1886 - 1888). series I, iv, p. 30 for a diary entry recording the receipt of six letters from Wentworth to the Earl of Cork dated 30 May 1634. See Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*

returned, which either indicates Cork's determination to demonstrate his independence from the Deputy, or that the task Thomas Wentworth had set him was impossible. Wentworth's three successes under Cork's influence were his brother, Sir George Wentworth, elected for Bandon, his physician Maurice Williams for Askeaton and Philip Mainwaring for Clonakilty. Cork had also been asked to obtain a seat at Lismore for Thomas Little, Wentworth's secretary, but he eventually sat for Cashel.<sup>111</sup> George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford were found seats through the influence of the Lord Deputy alone.<sup>112</sup> Radcliffe sat for Armagh (although it is unclear whether he sat for the borough or county of Armagh) after first being elected for Tralee in County Kerry. Wandesford sat for the borough of Kildare. Neither Radcliffe nor Wandesford had any connection with their parliamentary constituencies and therefore they must have gained seats thanks to their Wentworth connection.<sup>113</sup>

Wentworth also had other plans to control the membership of the House of Commons and in his proposal to the King explained that he would 'pack' Parliament in order to improve the extent to which it would work for the King's benefit. He proposed "the lower house may be soe composed as that neither the Recusants, nor yet the Protestants

---

Appendix 1 for a list of all the MPs, their constituencies and biographies, "Names of the knights, citizens and burgesses of the Parliament in Dublin, 14 July 1634," *CSPI 1633 – 47*, pp. 62 – 67.

<sup>111</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 47. Although this chapter refers to the parliamentary influence that Wentworth's cabal exerted, the bulk of the work was carried out by Wandesford and Radcliffe. Philip Mainwaring appeared on a number of committees. On 10 November 1634, he sat on a committee to discuss the bill for Act for "the erecting of Houses of Correction," on 18 November 1634 to debate an Act regarding Wills and Enrollment of Deeds, on 26 February 1635 to discuss the bill for an Act for "Preservation of the Inheritance of the Rights and Profits of Lands, belonging to the Church and Persons ecclesiastical" and on 11 April 1635, he attended a committee to enact a bill called "Act concerning By-laws and Ordinances to be made by Corporations and Fraternities." *Journal of the House of Commons of the Kingdom of Ireland 1613 – 1666* (Dublin, 1796), vol. I, pp. 78, 81, 101, 116, Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. II, p. 18. Another minor figure of Wentworth's administration, Thomas Edmonds, did appear in committees but on only two occasions. On 13 April 1635, he was involved in the Petition of Remonstrance to be drawn up to be exhibited to the Lord Deputy "setting forth the mischievous Inconveniencies that are in this Kingdom, by Ingrossers Forestallers, and Regraders of Corn in Cities, Boroughs, and other Places..." On 15 April 1635, the committee was to present the petition to Thomas Wentworth. *Commons Journal of Ireland* pp. 116, 117. He did however appear as a servant for the Lord Deputy on 25 July 1634. The Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords was informed that Thomas Edmonds, Wentworth's secretary, was waiting outside to speak to him. When called in Edmonds delivered a letter from the King which ordered that the absentee Irish nobility living in England should be allowed to vote by proxy. *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 10. Mountmorres noted that each lord had four or five proxies. This was soon after corrected however by an order that no more than two proxies should be given to a single lord. Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. I, p. 320. This is worth noting as Wentworth was able to offer these proxy votes to Lords whom he knew would use them in favour of the government. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 56.

<sup>112</sup> Wedgwood, C.V. *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford: A Revaluation* (London, 1961), p. 150. Kearney indicates that although evidence is limited to suggest how practical Wentworth's influence in the elections actually was, we know that Wentworth's success was patchy. In some places, his candidates were elected, but in others, they were rejected. Kearney *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 46 – 48 and Appendix 1

<sup>113</sup> *ibid*, pp. 229 – 230, 245, 257.

shall appeare considerable more one then the other...” He felt that it was important to gain “an equall balance, for they will prove thus, easier to governe, then if either Partie were absolute.” Clearly, divide and rule was a maxim by which Wentworth felt he could maintain the greatest control over his Irish Parliament. However, he was not only going to rely upon exploiting the divisions between the Catholic and Protestant factions. He also proposed to make as many “Captaines & officers Burgesses as possibly I can...” He felt that these men had “im[m]ediate dependence upon the Crowne” and therefore would demonstrate allegiance to the Crown.<sup>114</sup> However, combining military and civilian posts was often frowned upon and soon after Wentworth’s arrival in Ireland, an open letter had circulated which complained that “Almost all our Governors and Privy Councillors are captains of bands, and so upon the matter every soldier may oppress and no man dare find fault.”<sup>115</sup> The King also did not agree with this particular proposal believing that the Captains and Officers were needed to “attend there charges at that time.” Charles I recommended that instead Wentworth should select men “by particular knowledge of mens interests, & good affections to our Service.”<sup>116</sup> However, there were a significant number of officers who held seats in the Parliament of 1634. This was even noticed in London, from whence Sir William Robinson wrote to Wentworth, commenting that;

We all magnify you extremely, and yet some begin to devise mischievous jealousies, as that you begin to make all the captains and officers of the army your creatures, and so in small time will wholly possess the hearts of the army, as you have already almost of the Commons.<sup>117</sup>

As Lord Deputy, Wentworth was unable to be actively involved in the Parliament in the sense of taking a seat in the House. This meant that he was even more reliant upon his cabal to act as conduits of information. More importantly, they could act as controllers of parliamentary debate and reporters of the activities there. Unfortunately, evidence for the activities of Wentworth’s advisors within the Parliament of Ireland in 1634 – 5 is limited. The *Journal of the House of Commons of the Kingdom of Ireland 1613 – 1666* (1796) lacks detailed information and is incomplete in places. For example, the names of members are

---

<sup>114</sup> Str. P. 14 / 19, point 25. See also Wentworth to King Charles I, 22 January 1634, Str. P. 3a / 47, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 187.

<sup>115</sup> The number of these ‘civil/military’ personnel was quite substantial. Hardacre notes that in 1629, out of nine captains of horse, seven were also Privy Councillors as were 19 of the 40 captains of foot. There were also other crossovers such as the office holders who also held provincial vice-admiralties. CSPI 1647 – 60 p. 183, Hardacre, P.H. ‘Patronage and Purchase in the Irish Standing Army under Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1632 – 1640,’ *Journal of Army Historical Research* 27, no. 270, (1989), p. 96.

<sup>116</sup> Str. P. 14 / 19, point 25.

<sup>117</sup> Hardacre, ‘Patronage and Purchase,’ p. 96. Sir William Robinson to Wentworth, 2 November 1634, *ibid.* 14 / 202.

often missing from the reports.<sup>118</sup> However, it is possible gain glimpses of Wentworth's cabal playing a prominent role in the Parliament of 1634, as he had planned. Each of them appeared in many committees. Supply was the key issue of this Parliament from Wentworth's point of view and therefore he needed his cabal at ground level to maximise the amount of money raised and to ensure that the potential for parliamentary bargaining was minimised.

Christopher Wandesford, in his capacity of Master of the Rolls, played a prominent role in the official opening of the House of Lords on 14 July 1634. In the Lord Chancellor's speech, Wandesford was asked to read the King's Commission for holding the Irish Parliament "which accordingly the Master of the Rolls did, standing by the wool-sack among the Judges."<sup>119</sup> In the first session of Parliament, which was specifically to raise supply for the King, the Commons only sat for eighteen days. The Houses met on 14 July and were prorogued on 2 August until 4 November 1634.<sup>120</sup> The first session was not very eventful in terms of cabal activity. On 26 July 1634, Lord Dillon, the Lord President of Munster and Christopher Wandesford as the Master of the Rolls, took an act for four subsidies from the House of Commons to the Lords.<sup>121</sup> This grant was later altered to six subsidies, to be paid over the following four years.

In the second session of Parliament, the Members were expecting the enacting of the Graces in return for their generous granting of supply for the King. On 11 November, the Commons wished to attend Thomas Wentworth "to desire his Lordship's Answer to the Petition of Remonstrances and Graces, formerly presented to his Lordship, either in Writing, or otherwise, as his Lordship shall think fit." Prominent members of the Parliament, including Christopher Wandesford, George Radcliffe and Philip Mainwaring, were nominated to carry a message to the Deputy to determine an appointed time and place for Wentworth to receive the official message from the Commons and Speaker.<sup>122</sup> On November 12, Christopher Wandesford reported to the House that the Lord Deputy would receive the House and Speaker the following morning.<sup>123</sup> Why should the House of Commons have nominated Wentworth's cabal to treat with him when it was known that they had the interests of the administration at heart rather than the protection of

---

<sup>118</sup> Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. II, p. 18.

<sup>119</sup> *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 2, Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. II, p. 314.

<sup>120</sup> *ibid*, vol. II, p. 9, Carte, T. *The Life of James, Duke of Ormonde* (6 vols, Oxford, 1851), vol. I, p. 127.

<sup>121</sup> *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 11.

<sup>122</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 79.

<sup>123</sup> *ibid*, p. 79.

parliamentary privilege? It may be that Wentworth's cabal had such control over the House that they were able to ensure their nomination. However, it seems more likely that the Parliament was using Wentworth's cabal as a means to gain easy access to the Deputy. After all, these were only preliminary negotiations and therefore Wentworth's cabal could not have any detrimental influence upon the Commons' agenda at this stage.

The cabal was also collectively involved in important committees. On 13 November 1634, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, and George Radcliffe were part of a committee of twelve appointed to meet with a committee of six from the House of Lords to discuss and debate "any Bill sent from this House."<sup>124</sup> This committee was to exploit Poyning's Law to ensure that the House of Commons was not trying to push through bills that had not been presented to the King and Privy Council of England at the approval stage of Parliament. A similar committee was appointed on 28 July 1634, including Wandesford and Radcliffe, which was to meet at least twice a week "for drawing and perusing of such Acts as are necessary to be transmitted into England, before the next Session of this Parliament."<sup>125</sup> This would ensure that Parliament was fully controlled and could not pass any acts that might jeopardise the King's position or Wentworth's authority in Ireland. This committee was essentially Wentworth's barrier against improper acts slipping through the net. Radcliffe's legal expertise was recognised in this Parliament and he was often found on committees with a legal agenda. He participated in a committee that required the Lord Primate of Ireland to allow the committee members to search through The Statutes of Kilkenny.<sup>126</sup> This is significant due to Wentworth's plans to plant areas of Connacht, Tipperary and Kilkenny.

Wentworth's cabal appear to have successfully controlled the debates in parliamentary committees, ensuring that the committees were not working against Wentworth's policies and also reporting back to him where potential dangers were emerging. On 19 November 1634, the power of the committees was increased "for the Ease of this House." This demonstrates that this system was working well and Wentworth was not threatened by their discussions. Committees now had full power to call witnesses before them, debate and vote upon issues.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> *ibid*, pp. 79 – 80.

<sup>125</sup> *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 13.

<sup>126</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 85.

<sup>127</sup> *ibid*, p. 82.

Wentworth's cabal often acted as representatives of the Commons to the Lord Deputy. They were probably seen as experienced Members of Parliament and must have been nominated by other members who were supporters of Wentworth's regime. For example, on 5 March 1635, the Commons asked Wentworth's permission to allow a committee, including Radcliffe and Mainwaring, to discuss the "proportioning of the Subsidies so as might best serve his Majesty's Occasions, with Ease and Equality to the Subject."<sup>128</sup> Tied in with the issue of supply was the amount of money that was needed to settle the King's debts. On 13 December 1634, the House of Commons asked that "a List of his Majesty's Debts may be brought into this House, that thereupon this House may take into Consideration a fit and convenient Way for the discharging of such..." The committee that included George Radcliffe, Christopher Wandesford and Philip Mainwaring was to report back to the House with the list.<sup>129</sup> An advantage for Wentworth of having his cabal closely involved in such a committee is that he could have more control over the recommendations begin presented by the committee. His cabal could ensure that the recommendations of the committee followed, as far as possible, Wentworth's plans.<sup>130</sup>

Finances, and how to improve them, were of key importance during this Parliament. One proposition was that if Ireland had its own mint, its economy could be made much

---

<sup>128</sup> Supply was a reoccurring issue in the Parliament of 1634 – 35 and members of the cabal repeatedly sat on such committees. The concern about the distribution of supply was raised again on 7 March 1635 when committees representing Leinster, Connaught, Munster and Ulster wished to inform Wentworth that the Subsidies "may be proportioned unto forty thousand Pounds Sterling, each Subsidy, and that to be levied in a parliamentary way." As member for Armagh, George Radcliffe was part of the committee representing Ulster. George Radcliffe was chosen to present the names of the Commissioners who were to assess the subsidies to Wentworth on 26 March 1635. The areas that had not yet selected their commissioners were ordered to send their names to the clerk of the House of Commons "who is to attend with them upon Sir George Radcliffe, and he to present them to the Lord Deputy, with the rest of the Commissioners." Radcliffe was clearly in a position of trust and recognised as being capable of administrating this important task. Radcliffe continued to be included in committees that dealt with the assessment of the subsidies. On 14 April 1635, he sat on a committee that also included Wandesford and Mainwaring, appointed to draw up instructions to direct Commissioners in assessing Subsidies. The committee was to report their suggestions back to the Commons. *ibid*, pp. 103, 113, 117.

<sup>129</sup> *ibid*, p. 90.

<sup>130</sup> On 14 December 1634, another committee, again including Radcliffe, Wandesford and Mainwaring, were chosen to attend Wentworth for "his answer, concerning the List of his Majesty's Debts, some Time this Vacation." They were to make a report and inform the House of their findings on the first day that Parliament sat after the vacation. The parliamentary committee continued to work on the issue of the King's debt until 10 April 1635 when a committee of important figures, Radcliffe, Lord Dillon, Lord Brabazon, Sir William Sarsfeild, the Master of the Ordnance and Mainwaring were chosen to "present the List of his Majesty's Debts, and the humble advice of this House thereupon, to the Right Honourable the Lord Deputy." The cabal were also involved in the committees concerned with the Book of Orders and on 20 March 1635, Wandesford, Mainwaring and Radcliffe sat on a committee appointed to "peruse the Book of Orders, conceived in this House from the Beginning of this Parliament, and to see that they agree to the true Meaning and Sense of this House." On 17 April 1635, the same committee again studied the Book of Orders that was to be authorised at the end of the parliamentary session "to make them agree to the Sense of the House." *ibid*, pp. 91, 106, 116, 119.

stronger.<sup>131</sup> Wentworth cleverly used the House of Commons in this matter. The Commons appeared to be pushing the need for a Mint but Radcliffe was actually behind it with Wentworth's backing.<sup>132</sup> Wentworth and Radcliffe believed that an Irish Mint would significantly improve the Irish economy and could also augment their personal profits from the Irish customs.<sup>133</sup> They used Parliament to make it appear that the House of Commons was presenting the case for the Mint although Radcliffe was actually steering the proposition through Parliament. Therefore, if the King disliked the scheme, the administration could disassociate themselves with it. Equally, Wentworth could use this issue to appear generous by seemingly conceding to the Commons' desire for an Irish Mint, although being unable to allow the Graces to pass into law.

The proposition for a Mint came from the Commons to the Lords on 24 November 1634 and the Lords consented to a free conference on the matter.<sup>134</sup> On 3 December, Radcliffe and other members of the Commons met with the Lords to discuss the proposed Mint and Radcliffe made "a learned and eloquent Discourse..." In this speech, he described the history of the Mint in Ireland and presented the case that "for many weighty reasons conducing to the Honour and Profit of the King and this Kingdom," the Commons wished to join with the Lords to request that the King should allow them to establish a Mint in

---

<sup>131</sup> The idea of an Irish Mint was not new: there had been a mint in Ireland at times during the middle ages, the coinage of which was of a lower standard than in England. If the mint was properly controlled, it could be used to reduce the drain on English resources, yet it could also be a political risk if the monarchy was unable to maintain a tight check on it. The issue re-emerged on numerous occasions. For example, in 1619, a Galway alderman, Peter French, petitioned the Crown to re-establish the Irish mint. He felt that even though Irish trade was burgeoning, the Irish were still experiencing poverty, and in his opinion this was due to a "severe deficit in the balance of capital flows, and hence a shortage of coin." Gillespie, R. 'Peter French's petition for an Irish mint, 1619,' *Irish Historical Studies* 25, no. 100 (1987), p. 413, Ellis, S.G. 'The Struggle for Control of the Irish Mint, 1460 – c. 1506,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* Section C, 78 (1978), pp. 17, 19.

<sup>132</sup> Wentworth's plan for a mint in Ireland originated even before he arrived in Ireland. Wentworth proposed to the King that Ireland could be used as a victualling station for the Spanish and if this were successful, it would provide money for establishing a mint in Ireland. Wentworth argued "there is an extream Scarcity of Coin current amongst your People, which needs must be a great Mischief and Stop of Commerce within themselves..." An increase in coin would also enable Charles' Irish subjects to "increase the Growth and set up the Manufactory of Hemp and Flax..." Wentworth believed that the Irish government had to aim to enrich the Irish population, but at the same time "make sure still to hold them dependant upon the Crown, and not able to subsist without us..." Wentworth to King Charles I, 16 July 1633, Str. P. 3a / 5 – 6, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 93 – 94.

<sup>133</sup> Parliament could potentially affect Wentworth and Radcliffe's profit from the customs farm policy and therefore they had a vested interest in Parliament's pursuit of financial issues. For example, in May 1635, Radcliffe reported to Sir Arthur Ingram that Lord Carlisle's impost of wines "was one of those thinges w[hi]ch the Parliament desired might be bought out for his maj[es]ties use." Radcliffe reported that the impost was not worth more than £1000 a year to Wentworth (after the King's portion) and that he "would be loath to take it at that rate." Radcliffe would allow Ingram to "ouer value" the impost at a further £500 a year "if y[o]u thinke it worth 1500/ p[er] an[um]. I know not what assignements my lord of Carlile hath made of it: but I heare of some; how true god knowes." Radcliffe to Ingram, 9 May 1635, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO7 II 18, *HMC Various Collections VIII* p. 47.

<sup>134</sup> *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 34, Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. I, p. 329.

Ireland.<sup>135</sup> The following day, the Lords, who were clearly influenced by Radcliffe's argument "wherein many particular Reasons were exquisitely set forth" decided that it would be in the best interests of Ireland for a Mint to be established of the "same Standard as in England."<sup>136</sup> Radcliffe, who had been in charge of this proposition from the outset, and Patrick Darcy, an Irish lawyer, were chosen to draw up a petition from the Houses of Lords and Commons on 10 December 1634.<sup>137</sup> This was completed by 14 December 1634 and was ready to be taken to the Lords the following day by Radcliffe.<sup>138</sup> It was agreed by the Lords that a petition might be presented to Lord Deputy as an Act of both Houses.<sup>139</sup> Thomas Wentworth entered the House of Lords that day and the Chancellor presented to him the petition regarding the Mint. Wentworth approved the bill and promised to "give it the best furtherance he may."<sup>140</sup> However, ultimately, the Mint was not established in Ireland during Wentworth's Lord Deputyship.

Following parliamentary activities closely could also benefit the cabal's administrative roles and personal business in Ireland. For example, Radcliffe reported to Ingram how Parliament could benefit the customs farm. Radcliffe was able to press his objections against the monopoly upon tallow by the London Company of Soapers through the parliamentary forum. Radcliffe was concerned that if this monopoly were allowed to go ahead, it would destroy Irish trade with Dutch merchants who bought much Irish tallow. Radcliffe believed that as much as one third of Irish trade passed through these merchants hands. He feared that "If this tallow be taken from them, wee shall loose at least (as the old officers here tell me) 4000/ p[er] an[um]." However, Radcliffe was able to report that "The Parlament hath bene very Sensible of this for the good of the Kingdome" and had presented petitions against the monopoly. In this instance, Parliament was willing to help the customs farmers, (although we should not assume that they pursued this issue for the benefit of the farmers; increase in trade would directly benefit the standards of living in Ireland and possibly decrease the need to provide money for the expenses of the kingdom). Radcliffe was very hopeful that this monopoly could be avoided as "we haue the Kinges Couenant that this and all other com[m]odityes shalbe free." He did however ask Ingram to

---

<sup>135</sup> Radcliffe stated that "in the time of Edwards Ist the King had three thousand Pounds *per Annum* Profit by the Mint, which is nine thousand Pounds in Value at this Day: that the Mint continued till about the time of the Reign of King Edward VIth." *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 41.

<sup>136</sup> The Lords decided officially to join with the Commons to obtain a Mint on 9 December 1634 *ibid.* pp. 41-45.

<sup>137</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 89.

<sup>138</sup> *ibid.* pp. 90 - 91.

<sup>139</sup> *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 47.

<sup>140</sup> *ibid.* pp. 47 - 8.

“take this into y[ou]r care” and speak with the Duchess of Buckingham about it.<sup>141</sup> The cabal was also involved in committees that had a clear link to the customs farm. For example, on 4 April 1635, George Radcliffe, Christopher Wandesford and Philip Mainwaring sat on the committee to look at a bill that had had two readings in the House for an “Act for Payment of the Subsidy of Poundage, in the Cities of Dublin and Waterford and Towns of Drogheda and Galway.”<sup>142</sup> On 9 April 1635, Radcliffe and Mainwaring discussed the bill for an act for “limiting the Times for loading and landing of Merchandise.”<sup>143</sup> On 3 April 1635, Wandesford, Mainwaring and Radcliffe were added to the members of an earlier committee to discuss the bill for an “Act against unreasonable Customs of Tythings, Mortuaries, and other Obveritions.”<sup>144</sup>

As men of considerable experience and status as Privy Councillors and Wentworth’s confidants, the members of the cabal were prominent in delivering messages from the Commons to the Lords. Wandesford, Radcliffe and Mainwaring carried bills on a number of occasions.<sup>145</sup> On one occasion Radcliffe carried a message of apology from the House of Commons to the Lords. The Lords were offended that after arranging to meet with a committee of forty members of the Commons and twenty members of the Lords, the

---

<sup>141</sup> George Radcliffe to Ingram, 28 October 1634, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 II 17, *HMC Various Collections VIII* pp. 44 – 45. The Duchess of Buckingham was paid a pension from the profits of the Irish customs of £4,550 a year. She had inherited the farm from her deceased husband. In July 1636, the Irish committee of the English Privy Council decided to buy in the rights of Duchess of Buckinham. However, this fell through in July 1638. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 163, 166 – 167, *CSPI 1633 – 47*, p. 136. Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 8.

<sup>142</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 114.

<sup>143</sup> *ibid*, p. 115.

<sup>144</sup> *ibid*, p. 114

<sup>145</sup> On 29 July 1634, Wandesford and Mainwaring carried to the Lords “the original Bills which came out of England, the Commissions for the Parliament, and Acts thereunto annexed.” *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 13. Wandesford carried an Act against usury, an Act entitled “like Process shall be had in every Writ of Annuity, and certain other Actions, as in an Action of Debt” and an Act for the Trial of Murders and Felonies on 24 November 1634, an Act for “granting eight entire Subsidies by the Prelates and Clergy of Ireland” on 21 March 1635, and an Act “expressing order for Uses, Wills and Enrollments” and an Act “how lands, Tenements etc may be disposed by will or otherwise, concerning wards and Premier Seisin.” These final two bills were passed and returned to the Commons by Christopher Wandesford along with an Act for “restraining all Persons from Marriage until their former Wives and former Husbands be dead” and an Act that “wrongful Disseisin is no Discent in Law” on 10 December 1634. *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 83, 89, 107, *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 45. Radcliffe carried an Act, that “where the plaintiff is non-suited, the Defendant shall recover Costs,” an Act concerning “Grantees of Reversion to take advantage of Breaches of Condition,” an Act for “expedition of Justice in Cases of Demurrers,” an Act “for Recovery of Arrearages of Rents by Executors of Tenants in Fee Simple” and an Act for “appointing an Order to Justices of Peace, touching Bailement and Examinations of Prisoners” on 2 December 1634, and on 21 March 1634 an Act for “confirmation of Leaves made by Lord Primate and other Bishops in Ulster” (appropriate as he sat for Armagh in the province of Ulster) and an Act to eplain a Statute made in the current Parliament called an “act for Confirmation of Letters Patents, hereafter to be passed upon his Majesty’s Commission of Grace, for the Remedy of defective Titles.” On 4 December 1634, Mainwaring delivered the following bills to the Lords: an Act for “Exposition of Statute of Fines,” an Act for “continuance of actions after the Death of any King” and an Act for “fishing for Herrings and Pilchards.” *ibid*, p. 40, *Commons Journal of Ireland* pp. 86, 87, 107.

Commons had not turned up. After waiting for two hours, the Commons had not even sent a message to the conference to inform the Lords of their delay.<sup>146</sup> The Lords refused to meet with the Commons again until they had apologised for their behaviour. The matter was only resolved after Wentworth's interference who ordered the Commons to send Radcliffe to "make an apology for the neglect."<sup>147</sup> Wentworth chose Radcliffe to offer this apology, as he was able to trust Radcliffe to smooth over relations between the two Houses. Wentworth could not risk any reports of non-harmonious negotiations within the Irish Houses of Parliaments reaching England where rumours could imply that Wentworth could not control his Parliament.

Wentworth could also rely upon his cabal to act within committees of both Houses, which often discussed important or contentious issues. On 24 November 1634, a committee including Radcliffe, Wandesford and Mainwaring was appointed to discuss the Mint with the Lords.<sup>148</sup> George Radcliffe was chosen to be the Speaker of the committee with Philip Mainwaring, Patrick Darcy and Sir Geoffrey Galway as his assistants.<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup> *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 15, *Carte Life of Ormonde* vol. I, pp. 127 – 128.

<sup>147</sup> *ibid*, vol. I, p. 128.

<sup>148</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 83.

<sup>149</sup> At the same time, the committee of the Commons and Lords was to discuss the "infamous and scandalous Letter, published in the Name of Sir Vincent Gookin." Gookin was an English settler in Munster who wrote an open letter which "indiscriminate abuse of all sections of the community in Ireland gave general offence. Further committees to discuss Sir Vincent Gookin were subsequently nominated such as a committee of 6 March 1635 that met again with the Lords. A smaller committee was then chosen to attend Thomas Wentworth "humbly to desire to give Leave, that Sir Vincent Gookin might be brought into this House tomorrow Morning." This smaller committee included Radcliffe and Mainwaring. On 21 March 1635, the issue had still not been resolved and Wandesford, Radcliffe and Mainwaring were nominated to sit on a committee with members from the Lords the following Monday "to join with their Lordships in all such proceedings touching the same..." On 14 April 1635, Wandesford sent a message to the Lords to remind them of the issue of Sir Vincent Gookin and to arrange a further conference with the Lords. On this occasion however, the issue of Gookin was bypassed and an argument developed concerning the Lord Chancellor's breach of protocol as he received a message from the Commons. Before allowing the Lord Chancellor to relate the "Resolution of the House to join with them touching Sir Vincent Gookin," the committee from the Commons stood up and left the room whilst the Chancellor was speaking as he was supposed to sit uncovered on the wool-sack when replying to the Commons. The incident created some question about the protocols the Houses should adhere to and the following day, the Commons sent a message to the Lords to report that they were "inclined rather to wipe away the Mistake." The issue was reported to the Lord Deputy and he asked if the Lord Chancellor had made an error, he "wished it should not be persisted in, but acknowledged." The Committee returned to the Lords to discuss Gookin led by Radcliffe on 15 April 1635. On 17 April 1635, the committee from the House of Commons was to meet with Committee of Lords and then attend Wentworth and present to him the Information concerning Sir Vincent Gookin. Mainwaring was the only member of the cabal to be represented on this occasion. Clarke, 'History of Poyning's Law,' p. 213, *Commons Journal of Ireland* pp. 83, 84, 103, 107, 117, 118, *Lords Journal of Ireland* pp. 60, 67, 68 – 69. On another occasion, the Commons and Lords fell into a dispute, again provoked by a seemingly minor lapse in protocol. On 13 November 1634, a committee from the Lords discussed the "Difference of this House with the House of Commons" after which the Lord Deputy decided that both Houses "should regulate themselves according to the Course in England." This meant that the Commons, when in conference with the Lords should "stand bare" as in England, and when receiving messages at the Bar from the Commons, the Lord Chancellor or other Lords should "stand uncovered at that time, as in England." The issue was resolved and when the Lords and Commons met on 15 November 1634, "the Lords sat covered, and that Forty of the House of Commons

The members of the cabal were also included in more minor committees within the House of Commons. Their interests were wide-ranging and they are often found on committees together. These committees reflect the need of the cabal to represent the Lord Deputy's interests and to report back the mood of the Parliament. For example, Christopher Wandesford and George Radcliffe were involved in the committing of a bill on 26 March 1635 for an Act "concerning Outlawries against such Persons, as commit Treason. Murder, or Felony, and fly out of the Realm."<sup>150</sup> It was a great concern that justice against the Irish could not always be exacted as they could leave the country and either attempt to seek justice in England which would undermine the Lord Deputy, or go into exile abroad.

The Parliament of 1634 did fulfil the initial agenda which Wentworth and the King had set it. The Parliament far exceeded the amount of supply that Wentworth predicted in his planning letter to the Crown, granting six instead of the predicted two or three subsidies. Wentworth had even managed to convince the King that the supply should not be extracted from Ireland and used to supply the English Treasury.<sup>151</sup> Wentworth was also able to avoid the enacting of the Graces that would have severely impeded his intended plantation policy and would have proved difficult to manoeuvre around legally.

However, the Parliament was not as successful as Wentworth was concerned to make it appear. There were certainly moments where it did not run very smoothly but Wentworth attempted to limit the damage of this truth by not allowing word of the problems to reach the King. However, he could not contain the rumours completely.<sup>152</sup>

Wentworth's cabal played an important role in ensuring the success of the Parliament of 1634 – 35. Indeed, the Parliament may have become more uncontrollable without them. Wentworth used the cabal as a tool to keep a close eye on parliamentary

---

stood were uncovered, and so did fully conform themselves to the Order of this House." The Master of the Rolls made a "very elegant Oration" to celebrate the resolution of their differences "congratulating this Reunion of both Houses, [and] desiring Continuance of it..." The members were very concerned now to follow the protocol and when Wandesford brought four acts from the Commons, the Lord Chancellor stood at the Bar uncovered. *ibid*, pp. 29, 32.

<sup>150</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 112.

<sup>151</sup> Wentworth asked Archbishop Laud to try to ensure that the Irish subsidies would not be diverted to other uses until he had resolved the Crown debts. Laud assured Wentworth that he had spoken to Charles I concerning "the keeping of subsidies on that side for the necessities of that kingdom, and that they might not by any art be drawn over hither," and informed Wentworth that the King consented to this action. Wentworth to Laud, 19 July 1634, Laud to Wentworth, 20 October 1634, Str. P. 6 / 82, 107, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 273, 329 – 331, Bliss, *Works of Laud* vol. VI, p. 399.

<sup>152</sup> Milton, 'Wentworth and the political thought of the Personal Rule,' p. 149. Clarke has reminded us that historians need to treat Wentworth's representation of events with caution, stating that they have often read Wentworth's "appraisals of policies and assessments of problems... as statements of opinion rather than of fact." Clarke, A. '28 November 1634: A detail of Strafford's Administration,' *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* 93, Part II, (1963), p. 161.

proceedings so that potential disquiet could be quickly stifled. Radcliffe and Wandesford were to play a similar role in the Parliament of 1640, although as we shall see in Chapter 8. in the absence of Wentworth, the cabal were able to do little to control the Parliament's agenda.

### **James Butler, twelfth Earl and first Duke of Ormond<sup>153</sup> and the plantation policy**

In the early stages of his Lord Deputyship, Wentworth encountered a member of the Irish nobility who would prove to be a valuable asset to his administration. Ormond was not a fully integrated member of the cabal as he did not have the same history of long friendship as the other members. However, Radcliffe convinced Wentworth that Ormond could be a very useful friend to his regime, and he became a key figure in Wentworth's plantation policy. In fact, Ormond's Protestantism may have been the main reason why Wentworth was so keen to welcome him into his administration. Edwards, seeing few endearing qualities in Ormond, has suggested that his promotion should be seen in the light of his religiosity alone.<sup>154</sup> Ormond could be used by Wentworth to add prestige to his regime in south and central Ireland where Ormond's authority lay.<sup>155</sup> However, Ormond had only recently inherited his lordship in February 1633 from his grandfather and by this time, the estate had lost much of its political and financial clout.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> Ormond rather than Ormonde has been used throughout, as this was the Duke's preferred spelling.

<sup>154</sup> Edwards demonstrates that Wentworth saw Ormond as a direct replacement for the Catholic-sympathising Sir Piers Crosby who had begun to oppose Wentworth. Wentworth told the King's secretary that Ormond would be more pliable than Crosby. Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 378 in Edwards, D. 'The Ormond lordship in County Kilkenny, 1515 – 1642,' (PhD thesis, University of Dublin, Trinity College, 1998), p. 303. It is interesting that Wentworth himself emphasised Ormond's religiosity to the King as an example of an Irishman who as a Protestant could be seen as a true subject of the King. Wentworth wrote to Wandesford stating that he had informed the King that religion could be used to effectively Anglicise the Irish. He gave the example of Ormond who "if bred under the Wings of his own Parents" would have been "of the same Affections and Religion his other Brothers and Sisters are; whereas now he is a firm Protestant, like to prove a great and able Servant to the Crown, and a great Assistant..." Wentworth to Wandesford, 25 July 1636, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 18.

<sup>155</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 52. However, Edwards would argue that Ormond did not help to improve the government's reputation in south and central Ireland – Ormond alienated many of his tenants who felt that he had neglected them. Also, Ormond's Protestantism became a huge stumbling block in his relations with the local gentry. Although Ormond was tolerant of his Catholic servants and kin, within his territory the power of the Catholic Church was increasing and "attitudes towards the Protestant authorities hardened at an alarming rate." Wentworth had expected Ormond to maintain control over his lordship, yet relations quickly began to deteriorate. Edwards argues that Wentworth was misinformed about the situation in Kilkenny for example. He was convinced that Ormond was still in control in the area and Ormond could not inform him that he was beginning to lose his "mastery in the area." Edwards blames Wentworth as well for ignoring unfavourable reports and only listening to those whom he favoured. When Wentworth visited Kilkenny in August 1637, Ormond "stage-managed" the reception and made Kilkenny appear to be "a safe haven for English culture, true religion and loyalty to the Crown." Edwards, 'Ormond lordship,' pp. 299, 301 – 302, 305, 306.

<sup>156</sup> Kelly, W.P. 'Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?' *Journal of the Butler Society* 4, no. 1, (1997), p. 90, Kelly, W.P. 'The Early Career of James Butler, Twelfth Earl and First Duke of Ormond (1610- 1688). 1610 – 1643,' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1997), p. 50.

Initially, it had been uncertain whether the Irish administration under Wentworth would treat Ormond as friend or foe. During the first few days of the Parliament of 1634, Ormond clashed with Wentworth after affronting his authority. After Wentworth's opening speech to the Houses of Parliament, Ormond had publicly accused Wentworth of insulting the Irish Parliament by referring to the Irish as a 'conquered nation.'<sup>157</sup> Ormond had also disregarded Wentworth's proclamation stating that no man, whether a member of the Commons or Lords, was to enter the Parliament carrying a sword.<sup>158</sup> When the Earl of Ormond entered the House of Lords, he refused to surrender his sword at the door. When shown Wentworth's proclamation, Ormond threatened the usher that "if he had his sword, it should be in his guts, and so marched on to his seat..." Ormond was the only member of the House who carried his sword on that occasion.<sup>159</sup> Wentworth could not have allowed his authority to go unchallenged in this way and commanded Ormond to attend a meeting of the Privy Council that evening. Ormond admitted that he was aware of Wentworth's proclamation but stated that he was obliged to wear his sword to Parliament as the King's summons to Parliament ordered him to attend *cum gladio cinctus*. Wentworth was unable to respond to this response and was forced to send Ormond away without censure.<sup>160</sup> Wentworth conferred with George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford, uncertain how to handle Ormond. It was Radcliffe, who had already been acquainted with Ormond, who recommended that Wentworth should consider the political implications of befriending some of the influential men in Ireland.<sup>161</sup> Wentworth would later need Ormond's co-operation in order to proceed with his planned plantation policy in the south of Ireland and therefore this must have been a key consideration in Wentworth's mind. Due to Ormond's

---

<sup>157</sup> This account written by Dr Clarke in the early eighteenth century is in manuscript form, NLI Ormond MSS 2514 and printed in J. Graves, (ed.) *Anonymous Account* (Dublin, 1864), p. 16 in Kelly, 'Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?' p. 88. As Kelly points out, it is ironic that this incident found its way into Wentworth's impeachment trial. Rushworth, J. *The Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* (London, 1680), p. 167 in Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' p. 55.

<sup>158</sup> This was to prevent any outbreaks of physical violence as in the Parliament held by Lord Deputy Chichester. Carte *Life of Ormonde* vol. I, p. 129. We should be a little wary of Ormond's biographer Carte as he was appointed by James Butler's grandson to write an account of his life using family papers in Kilkenny Castle. Carte wrote a very royalist account of the seventeenth century and selected only those materials that would justify Ormond's actions. For further discussion of Ormond's biographer, see Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' pp. 5 – 7.

<sup>159</sup> Carte *Life of Ormonde* vol. I, p. 130, Southwell, R. 'The Life of James Butler, the first Earl of Ormond,' in Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. I, p. 219, Clarke, 'A Discourse between two councillors of State,' p. 161, Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' p. 55.

<sup>160</sup> Carte *Life of Ormonde* vol. I, p. 130.

<sup>161</sup> *ibid*, p. 131. Kelly has argued that Wentworth's cabal had "inescapable aura of the parvenu" as it was made up of commoners brought from England. Therefore Ormond was seen as useful to the government as he "helped provide much needed respectability." Kelly, 'Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?' p. 89. Kearney adds that the "prestige of the House of Ormond was a factor of great value for the Lord Deputy," both within the House of Lords and in the south of Ireland. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 52.

high profile position within the country, crushing him may have had repercussions beyond the plantation policy, possibly affecting Wentworth's relations with the proposed Parliament.<sup>162</sup> In this light, Wentworth did not seem to have much choice and had to befriend Ormond, admitting him to the Privy Council at the age of 24 in January 1635.<sup>163</sup> Writing from a local perspective, Edwards has criticised Ormond's change of sides, accusing him of becoming "a government insider."<sup>164</sup> However, Ormond might simply have been reacting to the circumstances he found himself in. We might perhaps see him as a "pragmatic politician" who countered his private interests against the risks of national politics.<sup>165</sup>

Although Ormond's biographers highlight these confrontations as the beginning of Wentworth and Ormond's friendship, Kelly has indicated that in reality their acquaintance was not new. Although the exact date of their first meeting is not clear and there is no record of its taking place, their later correspondence reveals the context of their discussion.<sup>166</sup> Ormond had even helped Wentworth in the parliamentary elections, obtaining a seat for Lord Maltravers (the son of the Earl of Arundel) for Callan and Wentworth's secretary, Thomas Little for Cashel.<sup>167</sup> Ormond also proved to be a useful ally in the House of Lords. Although the House was mainly Protestant, Wentworth was aware that "a Protestant majority was not necessarily a government majority." In the House of Lords, Ormond "actively promoted government policy"<sup>168</sup> and helped Wentworth by "introducing and prolonging" disputes about protocol and parliamentary procedure which

---

<sup>162</sup> McClintock, A. 'The Earls of Ormond & Tipperary's Role in the Governing of Ireland (1603 – 1641).' *Tipperary Historical Journal* (1988), p. 167.

<sup>163</sup> Ormond gained rapid promotion under Wentworth's regime, being appointed Lieutenant General of the Horse in 1638 and acting supreme commander of the army in 1640. Coke to Ormond, 12 January 1635, Carte MSS, vol. I, f. 106 in Kelly, 'Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?' p. 93. See also Edwards, 'Ormond lordship,' p. 300, *CSPI 1633 – 1647*, p. 93, Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' p. 61.

<sup>164</sup> Whitaker, T.D. *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), p. 248, Edwards, 'Ormond lordship,' p. 300.

<sup>165</sup> Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' p. 15.

<sup>166</sup> For example, Wentworth to Ormond, 2 June 1634, Carte MSS, Bodleian Library, Oxford, xxx. f. 616 in Kelly, 'Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?' p. 89, Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' pp. 55 – 56. It appears that Ormond had offered his service to Wentworth and had been tested by the Lord Deputy who asked him to sign a "draft letter of endorsement for the continuation of the subsidies to the government from the Irish House of Lords." Ormond signed the letter and Wentworth praised him for choosing the "Right Way." Wentworth to Ormond, 16 September 1633, Carte MSS, vol. I, f. 101, in Kelly, 'Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?' p. 92.

<sup>167</sup> Wentworth wrote to Ormond asking him to obtain a seat for Sir George Hamilton in Gowran as well but he was not successful. Wentworth had asked the Earl of Cork to secure a seat for Little but he had been unable to do so. *ibid.* p. 92. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 228, 243. Kelly points out however that the Earl of Ormond's influence in the borough was fairly 'hit and miss' and the borough remained predominantly Old English. Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' pp. 58 – 59.

<sup>168</sup> Kelly, 'Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?' pp. 92 - 93.

served to prevent complicity between the Lords and Commons over the Graces.<sup>169</sup>

Therefore Ormond could be a very useful ally for Wentworth and could act in a similar way to Radcliffe and Wandesford in the House of Commons.<sup>170</sup> In addition, Wentworth awarded Ormond five of the proxy votes of the House of Lords and therefore must have trusted him to support the government's interests.<sup>171</sup> Ormond and the cabal developed a close friendship but despite his involvement in their work in Parliament and the Privy Council, it is unlikely that they saw him as a fully integrated member of their clique. Their political work was however reinforced further by personal ventures. For example, in October 1637, Wandesford reported to Ormond the news that "all our merchant ships are departed for Spain."<sup>172</sup> The most significant joint venture however was to be Ormond's involvement in Wandesford's plantation experiment and his work within Wentworth's plantation policy.

### **Background to the policy of plantation**

An examination of the plantation policy reveals much about Christopher Wandesford's political and personal business in Ireland. We also learn much about the cabal's relationship with the Earl of Ormond who greatly facilitated this policy. Before the cabal's involvement can be explored, it is necessary to provide some background concerning Irish plantations so that Wandesford's involvement in the policy is clarified.

Plantation was not an innovation of Wentworth's regime. Since the Norman incursion into Ireland, successive monarchs passed the claim to the lordship of Ireland to their successors, but no real attempt had been made to administer Ireland beyond Dublin. It was not until the reign of Henry VIII that this "passive policy" was abandoned and all church lands were declared Crown property under Henry VIII's Irish statute.<sup>173</sup> From here stemmed the theory of plantation in which land could be granted to settlers once the Crown

---

<sup>169</sup> Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' p. 61.

<sup>170</sup> However, we should note that Ormond's role in the House of Lords was less problematic than the House of Commons as there had been such considerable changes to the membership of the Lords since the last Irish Parliament in 1615 that favouritism towards the government was almost assured. *ibid*, p. 60.

<sup>171</sup> Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. I, p. 192. Kelly, 'Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?' p. 93. Ormond held the proxies of the Lords Castlehaven, Somerset, Baltimore, Aungier, and later that of Lord Londonderry. 25 July 1634, *Lords Journal Ireland*, pp. 9 – 11, Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' p. 60.

<sup>172</sup> Wandesford to Ormond, 5 October 1637, *HMC Ormonde MSS* n.s. I, p. 42. Kelly, 'Early Career of James Butler,' p. 74.

<sup>173</sup> Bottigheimer, K.S. *English Money and Irish Land* (Oxford, 1971), p. 5. Church lands were claimed by the Crown in the statute 23 Henry VIII, c. 5, in Gillespie, R. *Colonial Ulster. The Settlement of East Ulster 1600 – 1641* (Cork, 1985), p. 86.

had proven its ownership of the land title.<sup>174</sup> The plantation scheme granted Crown-owned lands to English settlers who would in return bring stability, civility, religiosity and most important, increased revenue to Ireland.<sup>175</sup>

During early attempts at plantation, two problems became apparent. Firstly, the natives had to be either submissive to authority or face removal. Secondly, suitable planters had to be found to handle two-thirds of native lands and then ‘policed’ to ensure that they fulfilled their obligations.<sup>176</sup> Religious concerns were absent in these early plantation plans. Nevertheless, the proposal for the plantation of Munster specified that the planters should be English Protestants, as their primary function was to “anglicize the province.”<sup>177</sup> However, this scheme failed as few Englishmen were attracted to Ireland and also planters found that Irish labour was cheap, which minimised attempts to attract English workers.<sup>178</sup>

James I returned to the policy after the suppression of the Irish Rebellion in 1603, needing to subjugate Ireland as quickly as possible. This led him to consider the potential of planting Ulster.<sup>179</sup> The conditions set out by the government were stricter for the Protestant planters than the Irish. They were obliged to only use Protestant workers and tenants and to build defensive buildings known as bawns.<sup>180</sup> The Irish tenants in turn had no such obligations although they might face rents that were double those paid by the planters.<sup>181</sup> Wentworth’s government seems to have genuinely believed that plantation was a positive policy that would improve the lives of the native Irish. John Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry did have underlying concerns for the Irish yet his statements come across as bigoted. He informed Wentworth that the land needed “a good intelligent husband” to reach its potential. The “stupidity of the natives” meant that they could not discern between fertile

---

<sup>174</sup> Statute of 1440, 18 Hen VI, c. 6, in *ibid*, p. 85.

<sup>175</sup> MacCuarta has written that “State-sponsored plantations were an instrument in the anglicanisation of Irish society from the later 1550s...” MacCuarta, B. ‘The plantation of Leitrim, 1620 – 41,’ *Irish Historical Studies* 32, no. 127, (2001), p. 297.

<sup>176</sup> Bottigheimer, *English Money and Irish Land* p. 8.

<sup>177</sup> *ibid*, p. 11.

<sup>178</sup> For the specific example of the plantation of Leix and Offaly under Mary I, see *ibid*, p. 12.

<sup>179</sup> Gillespie, *Colonial Ulster* p. 87.

<sup>180</sup> For example, Sir William Cole, who obtained the patent of the plantation lands of the town of Enniskillen in 1612 was obliged to pay a rent of just £1 per annum, but faced the responsibility of introducing twenty English or Scottish settlers, and choose sites to build a church, jail, school and market house. Hunter, R. J. ‘Sir William Cole and Plantation Enniskillen, 1607 – 41,’ *Clogher Record* 9, 3 (1978), pp. 341 – 342.

<sup>181</sup> Bottigheimer, *English Money and Irish Land* p. 18, Moody, T.W. *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609 – 1641* (Belfast, 1939), p. 33. However, as Johnston has demonstrated in a local study of the Balfour plantation in county Fermanagh, British tenants sometimes complained that they were paying higher rents for their lands. Johnston argued that this was due to the better quality of the lands they were offered. He also showed that in some cases, for example the plantation of Carrowshee, “British and Irish tenants paid the same rents for the same sort of land.” Johnston, J. ‘Settlement on a Plantation estate: the Balfour rentals of 1632 and 1636,’ *Clogher Record* 12, no. 1 (1985), p. 99.

and poor land; their only ambition was to “glut themselves the one half of the year and to fast the other.”<sup>182</sup>

A novelty in James I’s plantation scheme in Ulster was its link with the City of London from May 1609.<sup>183</sup> The state had become aware of the need for private investment in Irish plantations as it was unable (or unwilling) to invest in the cost of plantation and needed to “secure substantial private funding.”<sup>184</sup> However, London’s contribution to the plantation was not a great success. The population planted there by the City of London did not significantly improve Ulster society as the financial interests of the individual undertakers of the plantation differed to the objectives of the State. As in early plantation attempts, the planters found that it was cheaper to have native Irishmen as tenants rather than importing British planters. In effect, the City of London connived with the Irish to allay the proposal that would segregate the native and planter communities.<sup>185</sup>

James I’s plantation policy created problems for later governments in Ireland. As he had granted large estates to settlers, he effectively devolved much of the governmental control to the local estates.<sup>186</sup> Little attempt was made to curb the influence of these estates until Wentworth aimed to reinstate Church and State authority in the localities.<sup>187</sup> Many landowners had absorbed church lands into their estates and Wentworth set up a

---

<sup>182</sup> Bramhall to Wentworth, 17 March 1634 *HMC Hastings MSS IV*, pp. 57 - 59.

<sup>183</sup> The plantation of Ulster involved six of the nine counties of Ulster. County Coleraine was renamed County Londonderry and the city of Derry to Londonderry, to recognise the input of the London corporations in the project. MacCavitt, ‘The Political Background to the Ulster Plantation, 1607 – 1620,’ in MacCuarta, B. (ed). *Ulster, 1641. Aspects of the Rising* (Belfast, 1993), p. 17.

<sup>184</sup> *ibid*, p. 17.

<sup>185</sup> Moody, *The Londonderry Plantation* p. 39. Bottigheimer argues that the City of London was driven by financial motivations and therefore was unwilling to make enormous investments into the Londonderry plantation. When costs were higher and profits were lower than expected, the City pulled out of the plantation scheme. Bottigheimer, *English Money and Irish Land* p. 22. The London representatives were mainly concerned with increasing their profits and therefore social improvement in Ireland was not always top of their agenda. W.P. Burke argued that the planters gave lands to whoever was willing to pay the most for it – regardless of their nationality. This led to 305 out of the 608 townlands being possessed by the native Irish population. Burke, W.P. ‘The Diocese of Derry in 1631,’ *Archivium Hibernicum* 5 (1916), p. 1. The City of London’s actions led to Star Chamber proceedings between the Crown and the City of London in 1633 – 35 during which the City was fined £70,000 and had to surrender their patent to the plantation of Ulster. The Crown’s case against the City demonstrated that the City had defrauded the Crown of profit, making £98,000 from the scheme while failing to plant Ulster with Protestants. However, some Irish historians have argued that Wentworth’s attack against the City of London was an excuse to make money from fining the corporations and ‘rack-renting,’ as many of the plantation lands were re-granted to the original tenants at doubled and trebled prices. Falls, C. *The Birth of Ulster* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, 1973), p. 228. Curl, J. S. *The Honourable The Irish Society and Plantation of Ulster, 1608 – 2000* (Chichester, 2000), p. 174.

<sup>186</sup> Gillespie, *Colonial Ulster* p. 89.

<sup>187</sup> *ibid*, p. 94.

commission to restore lands in the dioceses of Down and Connor back to the church and at the same time began a commission to recover impropriated livings.<sup>188</sup>

### **Wentworth and the plantation of Ireland**

Wentworth was keen to plant areas of Ireland, believing it to be a good method to improve both State and Church control in areas remote from the Pale. He used the Commission of Defective Titles to reassert royal authority by giving new patents to landowners. This increased the rents owed to the Crown and increased royal control.<sup>189</sup> The Commission of Defective Titles under Wentworth's administration was well aware of the different effects that the plantation policy could have upon the inhabitants of Ireland. The Commissioners described the Leinster plantation to Secretary Windebank and recommended that plantation in Leinster be allowed to press ahead for "the Settlement of Religion and Ciuility amongst his People, and are the surest tyes to fasten the dependance in the bett[e]r sort of Subiects immediately upon the Crowne only."<sup>190</sup>

The cabal had already gained some experience of the plantation policy within Parliament and during their work within the Commission of Defective Titles. In June 1634, Wentworth, Radcliffe and Wandesford, as part of the Commission, were ordered by the King to find out if those claiming to be in possession of lands in Ireland were able to prove their right to the land. This Commission had considerable power and whilst it was at work, no lands could be granted in Ireland without its consent.<sup>191</sup> Opposition to the plantation of Connaght had already become apparent during the Parliament of 1634 – 1635. The Old English would suffer most from this policy, despite their support of the Irish government and their English origins. In particular, the Old English in Galway were to be treated as though they were native Irish.<sup>192</sup> This was dangerous because unlike the native Irish, the Old English had a voice in Irish politics and therefore would be able to challenge this

---

<sup>188</sup> *ibid*, pp. 95, 96. Prior to Wentworth's arrival in Ireland, others had expressed concern about the state of ecclesiastical lands in Ireland. The Bishop of Kilfenora thought something needed to be done to restore Church lands to their rightful owner. He wrote to Laud, when Bishop of London, on 15 December 1631 explaining that he hoped to "oust [his tenants] from the Church lands which they seized in time of war." He was fearful that once his tenants had their titles to the lands confirmed, he would not be able to restore these lands to their rightful owner. *CSPI 1625 – 1632* p. 637.

<sup>189</sup> Gillespie, *Colonial Ulster* p. 97.

<sup>190</sup> Thomas Wentworth, Roger Ranelagh, Robert Dillon, William Parsons, Gerard Lowther, Richard Bolton, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Charles Coote, George Radcliffe, James Ware, Philip Perceval. Paul Davies to Windebank, 8 December 1635, Str. P. 9b / 109.

<sup>191</sup> 29 June 1634. King Charles I to Wentworth touching defective titles, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 254, 134, also S.P. 16 / Signet Office II, pp. 366 – 70, *CSPI 1633 – 47* p. 57.

<sup>192</sup> Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth,' p. 253.

policy. Wentworth was aware that the policy of plantation was not a popular one. He had already had to mollify the Parliament of 1633 that had raised concerns about the plantation policy. In order to pacify Parliament, Wentworth promised that only lands in territories where the King held the just title and intended to establish plantations would be taken.<sup>193</sup>

Wentworth needed to be able to trust the men he appointed as Commissioners for Defective Titles to push through favourable policies for the King – even when the land titles were not as doubtful as the Commissioners made out. Therefore, it was natural that Wentworth’s trusted cabal and favourites would be employed, as he could be confident that they would pursue policies that were in his best interests. George Radcliffe had been involved in the Commission of Defective Titles since Wentworth’s arrival in Ireland and had already proved that he was a very useful man to have on the side of the Crown. In December 1633, the Commissioners had investigated a grant of St Mary’s Abbey in which the King was found to be “grossly deceaued” in the value of the lands. Yet the Lord Chief Baron could not find for the King as the patent of St Mary’s was “good in law” as the purchasers of the land were not “priuy to the fraud.” Wentworth replied that although Chancery would not attack the purchaser unless there was evidence that they knew about the fraud, the King was entitled to the land, as the case of a King was “quite differing” from that of the subjects. Wentworth was insistent that the land be restored to the Crown and in this Wentworth reported, “Sir George Radcliffe assisted me very effectually, w[i]thout whom I were not able to buckle up these Fathers of the Law.” He added that

it will be allwayes greatly for his Ma[jes]ties Seruice, his Deputy be assisted in this Gouernment, w[i]th a Lawyer, who haueing no Possessions amongst them, may help to put some water in their wine, w[hi]ch otherwayes... might cause him to make many unequall staggering paces in the Kings Seruice.<sup>194</sup>

Wentworth used this example to demonstrate that only he and his trusted cabal were primarily concerned with interests of the Crown at heart. He felt that Irish office holders could never be completely objective as their actions could threaten their own estates. Therefore he and Radcliffe were essential components to ensure that the King was not being unfairly treated. However, there was favouritism shown towards men whom the Commissioners did not wish to investigate, and Radcliffe was considered to be quite influential in deciding whose lands should be left alone. For example, Edward, Lord Conway and Killultagh received a letter from the manager of his estates in the territory of

---

<sup>193</sup> Thomas Wentworth, Roger Ranelagh, Robert Dillon, William Parsons, Gerard Lowther, Richard Bolton, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Charles Coote, George Radcliffe, James Ware, Philip Perceval. Paul Davies to Sir Francis Windebank, 14 December 1635, Str. P. 9b / 106.

<sup>194</sup> Wentworth to unstated recipient, 7 December 1633, *ibid*, 5 / 29.

Killultagh, George Rawdon, in May 1637 informing him that although defective titles were being examined, George Radcliffe had assured Rawdon that Conway “will be well treated.”<sup>195</sup> Radcliffe was also considered to be an important and influential member of the Commission and men who wished to obtain posts within the plantation scheme sought Radcliffe’s patronage. On 1 December 1637, Sir John Temple wrote to an unknown recipient asking that he might be considered as a tenant for the portion of land belonging to the London Mercers in Londonderry. He asked his correspondent to discuss his proposition with Secretary Coke, assuring him that he had both Wentworth and Radcliffe’s backing.<sup>196</sup>

The cabal’s involvement in the plantation policy was most significant in Wentworth’s scheme to plant Connaght. This was a huge undertaking, which despite some initial success, failed disastrously. Wentworth and his Commissioners of Defective Titles, including Radcliffe, Wandesford and Mainwaring, travelled to Connaght on 30 June 1635 and having “passed ouer our worke and done what for the present wee could in euery of the Countyes intended to be planted,” sent the King a lengthy report of their findings.<sup>197</sup> They began by assembling a jury of gentlemen in Roscommon to assess the defective title of the land for the King, in which case the evidence for the King “was soe manifest and Cleare, as there was noe place left for any Contradiction.” They informed the King that although the jurors’ “owne Interests were most nearly Concerned therein,” the jury “Chose rather to imbrace the truth, and soe find for his Ma[jes]ty then in relation to their owne priuate interests to preiudice their Consciences by not finding the Kings Title.” This pattern was followed in both Counties Mayo and Sligo where the juries found for the King’s title “w[i]th the like freedome, and forwardnesse of Affections as in the County of Roscomman.”<sup>198</sup> The plantation policy appeared to be being imposed quite easily as Wentworth and his Commissioners travelled around. However, we should not believe that the juries were openly embracing the policy. Clarke has described Wentworth’s “bullying tactics” and careful selection juries that would find for the Crown.<sup>199</sup>

---

<sup>195</sup> Rawdon to Lord Conway and Killultagh, 19 May 1637, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 256, 33, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* p. 159.

<sup>196</sup> P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 256, 62, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* p. 175.

<sup>197</sup> Wentworth, Robert Dillon, Gerard Lowther, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Adam Loftus George Radcliffe to Secretary Coke, 25 August 1635, Str. P. 9b / 67. Although Mainwaring was included in this Commission, he was not officially appointed to the Commission for Defective Titles until 2 April 1638. It may be that his involvement in the inquiry into the plantation of Connaght was in a secretarial capacity. King Charles I to Wentworth, 2 April 1638, *ibid.*, 4 / 319.

<sup>198</sup> Wentworth, Robert Dillon, Gerard Lowther, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Adam Loftus George Radcliffe to Coke, 25 August 1635, *ibid.*, 9b / 67.

<sup>199</sup> Clarke, ‘The Government of Wentworth,’ p. 254.

The Commissioners and Wentworth seem to have believed that the plantation policy would be a positive move in civilising Ireland and facilitating the increase in revenue obtained from the Kingdom. Christopher Wandesford was keen to present the image that plantation was for the benefit of the Irish. He informed Sir Gervase Clifton on 12 July 1635 that Wentworth was progressing well in the plantation business “for the kings [title] is found to a principall part of the Cuntry of Cunalt, and so wilbe I hope for the whole, there being nothing but justice and honor intended to them.”<sup>200</sup> Canny has suggested that Wandesford and Wentworth aimed to establish personally sponsored plantations and were “uncompromising supporters” of plantation.<sup>201</sup> However, the wishes of the people were being disregarded in the government’s pursuit of benefits for the Crown. Despite the initial successful progression of scheme, the Commissioners were frustrated to find that in some localities they were opposed in their search for defective titles. In particular, the county of Galway proved to be stubborn. Despite the “Clearenesse of soe unauoydable Euidence... against w[hi]ch nothing materiall was obiected” and the example of neighbouring counties which had fully submitted, the Galway jury “most obstinatly and peruersly refused to find for his Ma[jes]ty.”<sup>202</sup> Wentworth had allowed them certain concessions to convince them to find for the King, but despite this the jury held firm.<sup>203</sup> The Commissioners began a course to vindicate the King’s honour by demonstrating that the Galway jury was wrong in its findings and the jurors’ belief that they could oppose plantation though legal proceedings was quashed.<sup>204</sup> The Commissioners blamed the sheriff for returning “soe insufficient, indeed... a Packed Jurye, to passe upon a businesse of soe great waight and Consequence” and punished him with a £1000 fine. The jury was ordered to appear at the Court of Castle Chamber where the Irish Privy Council intended that their “pertinacious Carriage be followed w[i]th all iust Seuerity.” The Commission resolved that, as the jurors were unwilling to grant the King what was rightfully his, the King had been “iustly prouoked” and therefore was forced to pursue them in the Star Chamber. Wentworth and the Commissioners would now begin the legal proceedings to acknowledge the defective title of Galway and settle it into the King’s name. The Commissioners believed that the jurors’

---

<sup>200</sup> Wandesford to Gervase Clifton, 12 July 1635, Nottingham University Library, Cl. C. 604.

<sup>201</sup> Canny believes that Wandesford and Wentworth were such strong believers in the benefits of plantation that they aimed to absorb the whole country “into some formally sponsored scheme.” Canny, N. *Making Ireland British 1580 – 1650* (Oxford, 2001), p. 396.

<sup>202</sup> Wentworth, Robert Dillon, Gerard Lowther, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Adam Loftus George Radcliffe to Coke, 25 August 1635, Str. P. 9b / 67.

<sup>203</sup> The jury still voted against the defective titles, even “though wee indeauoured to Satisfie them Seuerall wayes, beyond any wee had taken in any of the other three Countyes.” *ibid.*, 9b : 68.

<sup>204</sup> Clarke, ‘The Government of Wentworth,’ p. 254.

lands should be seised in order to facilitate the King's possession of Galway "w[i]thout any straine at all" and "in a very short tyme..." Once the lands were in the King's Title, the Commission intended to suggest "how the same may be manadged most for his Ma[jes]ties hono[u]r and profit, as allsoe most for the Secureing and quiet of the Country..."<sup>205</sup>

The extent of opposition to plantation was further revealed when the Commissioners discovered that there had been "plotting and Combineing to stand against his Ma[jes]ties Title." Indeed, before the Galway jury returned to give their verdict against the King's Title, Viscount Clanmorris, the nephew of the Earle of St Albans & Clanrickard, had boasted that "they would haue giuen a great Summe of money that wee had begunne here. That soe by not finding the Kings Title here, the other Countyes might take example to doe the like."<sup>206</sup> Wentworth and the Commissioners issued a proclamation that blamed the whole community for the actions of the jury, stating that the jurors were representative of the county and therefore the whole county was responsible.<sup>207</sup> The Commission began an investigation into the reasons why Galway had been so unresponsive to the work of the Commission of Defective Titles. In order to justify their difficulties, the Commissioners stated that Catholics dominated the area.<sup>208</sup> They argued that there were few Protestant freeholders to counter the actions of the ill-affected recusants.<sup>209</sup> Even the official Councillors of Law were Catholic, "by whose aduises... the Jury were very much guided." Finally, they found that the power of the Earl of St Albans and Clanricard was too great in the area. Although they acknowledged his merit, the Commissioners felt that the Earl's influence as a great estate owner as well as Governor of the town and county of Galway

---

<sup>205</sup> Wentworth, Robert Dillon, Gerard Lowther, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Adam Loftus and George Radcliffe to Coke, 25 August 1635, Str. P. 9b / 68.

<sup>206</sup> Later in the document, the Commissioners discussed their belief that the Earl of St Albans and Clanricard, whose influence was too great in Galway, had plotted to block the work of the Commission of Defective Titles in Galway. They presented evidence that the Earl had plotted with the Jury to find against the King. They felt sure that the Earl's nephew would not have made such a comment "w[i]thout a Secret priuity hee had of the Earles intentions, desires and directions therin..." *ibid*, 9b / 68 – 69.

<sup>207</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 68.

<sup>208</sup> The Commissioners blamed in particular "the Priests and Jesuits (who abound here in farr greater numbers then in other parts) haue soe much power as they [the inhabitants] doe nothing of that Nature w[i]thout Consulting them." As Catholicism was so rife in that area, the Commission for Defective Titles was worried that the Catholic faith would "shake the faith or loyalty of this People from the Crowne..." More worryingly, Galway was an important area of commerce and had close connections with Spain through its trading vessels. Wentworth was worried that Galway was a weakness by which a "forraigne Enemye" might enter Ireland. He felt that there was no other area in Ireland "better fitted w[i]th Harbours for such a purpose: That hath the Intercourse and Commerce w[i]th Spaine, or that is more naturally inclined to that Nation, then this County of Gallway." *ibid*, 9b / 68, 70.

<sup>209</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 68. Despite the fact that the Earl of St Albans and Clanricard had been asked to do so, he had "not brought inn, one English man to plant amongst them Excepting some few poore people for the Conueniency of his Buildings. So as the whole County of Galway, in a manner Consists of Natiues, and those all together Papists." *ibid*, 9b / 70 – 71.

made the area “little lesse then a County Palatine.” In reality, Clanricard’s influence over “his farrspread Kinred,” preists and lawyers meant that “nothing w[hi]ch is Carryed in an ordinary Course of proceeding can moue here w[i]thout him.”<sup>210</sup> Furthermore, it was even discovered that most of the jurors were related to the Earl, apart from “those two who found the Kings Title, w[hi]ch two for ought wee can learne, haue least relation to his Lo[rdshi]p.”<sup>211</sup> The Commissioners argued that only those jurors not under the spell of Clanricard’s influence could see the truth in the King’s Title. They believed that the Catholic Earl was at the root of Galway’s obstinate behaviour, especially “Considering how they were ledd in by the other three Countyes, they would not haue dared” oppose the ‘true’ King’s Title without encouragement.<sup>212</sup> Wentworth was insistent that the area would be planted despite the opposition. If Galway was allowed to oppose the government, “itt shall infallibly not only take away all hope of any further Plantation herafter,” but would also be perceived as a challenge to Wentworth’s authority. Galway’s behaviour would serve to detract from the “Honour and Beauty of this Great Seruice done in the other three Countyes...”<sup>213</sup> Determined to press ahead with the plantation in Galway, Wentworth recommended that neither the Earl of St Albans and Clanricard or his son be allowed into Ireland as their presence might incite the people of Galway into disobedience again.<sup>214</sup> Wentworth also intended to lay “a Sure foundation for the reduceing and secureing this County of Galway... by fully lineing and Planting it w[i]th Englishe.”<sup>215</sup> Furthermore, to ensure that the Earl of St Albans and Clanricard could not pose a risk to the government, “Especially in soe remote a Corner of the Kingdome, and amongst a People soe ill Affected,” the Commissioners asked that Galway’s position as a near-County Palatine be removed and the “county reduced backe as it formerly was; under the Prouinciall Gouernment of the President of Connaght.”<sup>216</sup> Wentworth was also concerned to revoke the Earl of St Alban’s position as Lieutenant of Galway that he had inherited from his father.

---

<sup>210</sup> The letter then contains a lengthy list of evidence to support their accusation that the Earl of St Albans and Clanricard’s power and influence was too great. *ibid*, 9b / 68 –70.

<sup>211</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 70.

<sup>212</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 70.

<sup>213</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 71.

<sup>214</sup> The Earl of St Albans and his son were at that time in England and Wentworth ordered that they should not be allowed to re-enter Ireland “untill this Seruice shall be thorowly and fully finished, it being probable that either of their presence here in that tyme may giue some interruption thereunto.” *ibid*, 9b / 71.

<sup>215</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 71.

<sup>216</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 73.

Wentworth argued that this judicial place “is now by the death of the father. clearly voyd in Law to the Sonne...”<sup>217</sup>

The case against Galway was to become a major problem for Wentworth’s administration. They were concerned to learn that Sir Roger O’Shaughnessy, Patrick Darcy and Richard Martin had left Ireland without permission to take a petition to the King expressing their grievances about the proposed plantation. The Commissioners believed that this “presumed to misinforme” the King about the legality of the land title, “to preiudice the Just and equall proceeding of us his Ministers” and audaciously attempted to get the King to interpose upon the business by offering him their service.<sup>218</sup> Obviously Wentworth was extremely concerned about the actions of these men as he was not in a position to control what information was reaching the King’s ears. Wentworth attempted to minimise the damage caused by these men by complaining that the men had left Ireland without his licence with the intention to present a petition to the King which represented only “their owne priuate humours and particular disaffection to his Ma[jes]ties princely Intendments, then from any true Sense of Publike grieffe.”<sup>219</sup> Wentworth requested that the petitioners be returned to Ireland as prisoners to demonstrate to the Irish “how much his Ma[jes]tie dislikes such Populare and Tribunelike opposes of his Publike and Princely dessignes,” and to warn others from “the like boldnesse.”<sup>220</sup> Wentworth feared that if they went unpunished, the plantation would be “Continually Subiect to interruption and disturbance” and therefore would become “impossible to be effected amongst this People. soe naturally abhorring the Planting of English Religion and Ciuility amongst them.”<sup>221</sup>

### **The plantation of Ormond**

Wentworth had a clear brief from the King on taking up his post in Ireland that he was to ruthlessly enforce the plantation policy in Ireland. He was reminded to “take care of our plantations recommended unto you, with a special eye to our proving of Ormond, as

---

<sup>217</sup> Wentworth asked the King to either grant the position to the new Earl by a new grant, dispose of it to another individual, or “(w[hi]ch under fauour wee still hold best for the Seruice of the Crown) to restore it to the Presidentiall Gouernment of Connaght...” Thomas Wentworth, Roger Ranelagh, Robert Dillon, William Parsons, Gerard Lowther, Richard Bolton, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Charles Coote, George Radcliffe, James Ware, Philip Perceval and Paul Davies to either Secretary Coke or Secretary Windebank, 14 December 1635, *ibid*, 9b / 118.

<sup>218</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 119.

<sup>219</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 119.

<sup>220</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 120.

<sup>221</sup> *ibid*, 9b / 120.

one very fit for that kind of improvement, if our title therein be found.”<sup>222</sup> By the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Catholic Earls of Ormond were so powerful that they could potentially pose a danger to the administration and therefore under James I. the Ormonds found themselves at the centre of a government policy “to chop [them] down to a more manageable size.”<sup>223</sup> However, after the Protestant earl of Ormond, James Butler, inherited the lands, the issue became less pressing<sup>224</sup> and the Irish government turned their attention to more peripheral lands of the Ormond estate where the inhabitants were native Irish or Catholic kinsmen of the Butler family.<sup>225</sup> Ormond saw the benefit of his lands being planted as he had been struggling with his tenants over land holding rights.<sup>226</sup> Ormond had actually created much of this ill feeling with his tenants. Although he had become prominent and influential as a central government official, this was at the expense of his duties as a local lord.<sup>227</sup>

The plantation negotiations with Ormond were rounded off in the summer of 1637 and Ormond had sped up the proceedings by not producing his title or claim to the land. Wentworth praised Ormond’s participation in the scheme to plant his own territory. He reported to the King that the government would have been unable to find the King’s Title “w[i]thout the assistance of our very good Lord the Earle of Ormond and evidences brought in by him...”<sup>228</sup> In reality, the title found for the King was spurious and had been achieved by the collaboration between Ormond and Wandesford. The lands were passed under the

---

<sup>222</sup> King Charles I to Wentworth, 16 July 1633, *ibid*, 4 / 44, Kelly, ‘Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?’ p. 94.

<sup>223</sup> Edwards, ‘Ormond lordship,’ p. 8.

<sup>224</sup> This suggests that plantation could be used as a form of punishment against Catholics and non-government supporters. Canny observes that the desire to plant the Ormond territory wore off when James Butler inherited it as he “was not only dogmatically loyal to the established Church but was both a client and supporter of Wentworth in government.” Canny, *Making Ireland British* p. 396.

<sup>225</sup> The first target was Idough, “a former independent lordship of the O’Brennan sept which had remained a border-land between Counties Kilkenny and Carlow.” *ibid*, pp. 396 - 397.

<sup>226</sup> These problems had become so great that Sir William Reeves, the Irish Attorney-General, recommended that Ormond looked towards the proposed plantation of the territories of Ormond in Tipperary as “an opportunity to do yourself much good... the like of which will not come around again...” By resisting the policy, Reeves warned that he could “expect no better or other measure than the rule of law will give.” Sir William Reeves to Ormond, 11 September 1633, Carte MSS, xxx, ff. 266 – 267 in Kelly, ‘Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?’ p. 94.

<sup>227</sup> Edwards states that during Ormond’s early years as the Earl of Ormond he had neglected his lordship and then associated himself with Wentworth’s unpopular administration. The main difference between Edwards and Kelly’s work as Edwards himself indicates, is that Kelly mainly examines Ormond as a national politician who improved his fortunes whereas Edwards examines him from a local perspective which revealed that “his self-serving collaboration with the state... did *not* serve him so well in Kilkenny and the south, where his power plummeted and he tarnished the good name of the family.” Edwards, ‘Ormond lordship,’ pp. 299 - 300.

<sup>228</sup> Wentworth, Roger Ranelagh, Robert Dillon, William Parsons, Gerard Lowther, Richard Bolton, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Charles Coote, George Radcliffe, James Ware, Philip Perceval and Paul Davies to Windebank, 8 December 1635, Str. P. 9b / 109.

Commission of Defective Titles and then were granted to Sir Charles Coote and Christopher Wandesford, before being passed to Wandesford on his own.<sup>229</sup>

Thanks to his “enlightened attitude” towards the plantation scheme, Ormond found himself held in great esteem by Wentworth’s government.<sup>230</sup> He cleverly used the situation to demonstrate that he was a loyal supporter of Crown policy in Ireland by sacrificing areas of his land to the Crown. However, in reality, he gained very little profit from this area and therefore he was not really losing anything in conceding to the plantation of his estate.<sup>231</sup> Thanks to Ormond’s example of submission to the plantation policy, Wentworth hoped that subsequent plantations would be established more quickly.<sup>232</sup>

The plantation of the Ormond lordship was not without its opponents however. It directly affected Ormond’s uncle Richard Butler, Lord Mountgarret and the O’Brennans, the native Irish owners of the land. However, even Mountgarret’s opposition was suppressed, and he agreed to pass his lands under the Commission for Defective Titles.<sup>233</sup> The native Irish O’Brennans put up a fight when the agents of the Earls of Ormond and Londonderry arrived at Idough to declare the King’s ownership of the land. The O’Brennans refused to accept the King’s Title and when the case was brought before a court of inquisition at Kilkenny in May 1635, it was ordered that they be forcibly removed from the land, being described as intruders in Idough.<sup>234</sup> Despite the removal of these key opponents, another stepped in to stake his claim to the lands. The Earl of Arundel stated that he had a claim to the land by his direct descent from a daughter of Strongbow.<sup>235</sup> Wentworth tried to explain to Arundel that it would be a grave misdemeanour to overturn Ormond’s patent, yet he was not deterred or intimidated, and continued to pursue the lands.<sup>236</sup> Wentworth was concerned that all land that the King was entitled to should be claimed indiscriminately. However, he also had personal motives to enforce this particular plantation as Wandesford had expressed personal interest in obtaining the plantation of

---

<sup>229</sup> ‘Power of attorney to Wandesford to receive from Sir Charles Coote,’ 21 March 1636, Carte MSS, vol. I, f. 112 in Kelly, ‘Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?’ p. 95.

<sup>230</sup> McClintock, ‘Earls of Ormond & Tipperary’s Role,’ p. 169.

<sup>231</sup> Canny, *Making Ireland British* p. 397

<sup>232</sup> By allowing the policy to go ahead so easily, Ormond also gained a good deal from the Crown in which he was granted one fourth of the lands planted by the King and one thousand acres for three of his servants. ‘Agreement between the Lord Deputy and the Earl of Ormond concerning the plantation of Ormond and other baronies,’ Carte MSS, vol. I, 163 in Kelly, ‘Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?’ pp. 94 – 95.

<sup>233</sup> *ibid*, p. 95. Kelly, ‘Early Career of James Butler,’ pp. 70 – 71, Edwards, ‘Ormond lordship,’ pp. 313 – 314.

<sup>234</sup> Edwards, ‘Ormond lordship,’ p. 312.

<sup>235</sup> Kelly, ‘Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?’ p. 95. Kelly, ‘Early Career of James Butler,’ pp. 71 – 72, Earl of Arundel and Surrey to Wentworth, 7 April 1636, Str. P. 16 / 6, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 3.

<sup>236</sup> Wentworth to Arundel, 26 August 1636, Str. P. 16 / 49, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 29, Kelly, ‘Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?’ p. 95.

Idough. Wentworth warned the King of the “unavoidable preiudice to his Ma[jes]ties profit w[hi]ch would accompany the passing of soe great & vast Territoryes, & Priuiledges.” He argued that Arundel’s claim to the land was tenuous, not having been “Sufficiently granted by letters patents, and all such other of them, as haue beene granted, and shall be Surrendred, or may be legally auoyded.”<sup>237</sup> After investigations into Arundel’s claim, Wentworth was convinced that the land should continue to be planted.<sup>238</sup> As a gesture of good will towards the Earl of Arundel, Wentworth suggested that he was offered the Castle of Wexford and the lands of his ancestors that were now in the “possession of the mere Irish” which also appeared to have been “fraudulently taken forth of the Crowne.”<sup>239</sup> This matter permanently scarred the once good relationship between Arundel and Wentworth.

The plantation of Idough is of central importance to this thesis due to the underhand involvement of Christopher Wandesford in its development. Wandesford had led the investigation into the King’s title to Idough and as one of the Commissioners of Defective Titles had declared that the current occupants of the land were living there illegally. He appointed the Earls of Ormond and Londonderry to be tenants of the area, charged with looking after the territory on the King’s behalf. Canny has described this agreement as “no more than a front for sharp practice” as Wandesford and Radcliffe had collaborated to preempt the reallocation of the King’s title by negotiating a lease from Robert Ridgeway, the second earl of Londonderry, for the ironworks that were attached to the coalfield of Idough.<sup>240</sup> By 1636, Wandesford had decided upon a business venture that necessitated Radcliffe negotiating on his behalf with Mr Brown, the monopolist of the manufacture of iron pots in the British Isles, for “the liberty of making Potts.”<sup>241</sup> Christopher Wandesford informed George Radcliffe that he was willing to offer Brown “an annuall rent if he may be permitted to prohibitt forrayne Potts.” He revealed that he wished to make “a bergain w[i]th my lord of Ormond for his part of Edough” and this was closely linked to the need to

---

<sup>237</sup> Wentworth, Roger Ranelagh, Robert Dillon, William Parsons, Gerard Lowther, Richard Bolton, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Charles Coote, George Radcliffe, James Ware, Philip Perceval and Paul Davies to Windebank, 14 December 1635, Str. P. 9b / 107.

<sup>238</sup> If the land was returned to Arundel, Wentworth believed that “It will not only take away from his Ma[jes]tie all the benefit wee expected to rayse for him by his said Commission of defectiue Titles, in the most part of the Prouince of Leinster, being the fourth part of this Kingdome, But allsoe totally violate the publike faith giuen to this People in Parliament...” *ibid*, 9b / 107.

<sup>239</sup> Wentworth, Roger Ranelagh. Robert Dillon, William Parsons, Gerard Lowther, Richard Bolton, Christopher Wandesford, Philip Mainwaring, Charles Coote, George Radcliffe, James Ware, Philip Perceval and Paul Davies to Windebank, 8 December 1635, *ibid*, 9b / 112.

<sup>240</sup> Canny, *Making Ireland British* p. 397. See also Edwards, ‘Ormond lordship,’ p. 315.

<sup>241</sup> Mr Brown had secured this monopoly for a fee of £12,000. Wandesford to Radcliffe, 6 June 1636 and ‘Answere to the propositions of the undertakers of the Manufactorys of Iron Ordnance Potts &c in Ireland.’ University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282). ff. 1r, 37v. Iron pots were a component of the process of the manufacture of iron ordnance. Canny, *Making Ireland British* p. 397.

establish the iron pots business upon “reasonable tearmes.” This is where Wandesford’s connection to the Lord Deputy and the Irish administration was very useful. If he could have “no forrayne wayre to hinder my sayle,” he would be answerable to “your farmers in a reasonable proportion for the loss of your Customes.”<sup>242</sup> Wandesford was aware that his business would have implications for the customs farm profits as he wished to prevent imports of iron pots. Although this would boost the chances of success of his own exports by limiting the competition he would have from external iron pots manufacturers, his monopoly would also diminish the profits from imports for the customs farm.

Wentworth was kept informed about Christopher Wandesford’s intentions and progress in this business from an early stage<sup>243</sup> and he must have condoned Wandesford’s plans or he would have prevented Wandesford from continuing. Wentworth did express some concern to Wandesford that his dealings in Idough should be as transparent as possible. Wandesford was acting as Wentworth’s deputy in Ireland whilst the Lord Deputy was in England attending to personal affairs and business with the King. Wentworth warned him that although he did not dislike Wandesford’s proceedings in Idough, he advised that he did nothing without the order of the Irish Council and if possible waited until Wentworth’s return to Ireland, “lest it be objected that you were both Judge and Party...”<sup>244</sup>

Despite the support and assistance of Wentworth and Radcliffe, initially Wandesford’s business plans did not proceed very satisfactorily. Mr Brown, the monopolist of iron pots, answered Wandesford’s proposal that they share the business in Ireland with “scorne and pride,” but Wandesford was still hopeful that Radcliffe would be able to “reduce him to some good end.”<sup>245</sup> Although Mr Brown’s agent was convinced to visit the proposed iron works at Idough, Wandesford did not think that Brown would be willing to jointly manufacture pots with him as “his man refused to examyne indede to se the accounts” which Wandesford believed would have been the first stage in preparing a

---

<sup>242</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 6 June 1636, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 1r.

<sup>243</sup> For example, Wandesford told Radcliffe on 22 June 1636, “I have given my lord Deputy a relation of my business of Edough tell me howe you like itt.” Wandesford to Radcliffe, 22 June 1636, *ibid*, f. 3v, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 243 – 4.

<sup>244</sup> Wentworth to Wandesford, 25 July 1636, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 14. News certainly travelled quickly about Wandesford’s involvement in the plantation project and if it was thought to be improper, this might have dramatic implications for Wentworth’s administration. On 10 June 1636, Tallis wrote to Rawdon that Wandesford was in Kilkenny taking possession of “a great territory of land called Idough.” The editors of the *CSPI 1633 – 47* mistakenly transcribed Wandesford’s land as ‘Evough.’ P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 255, 129, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* p. 131.

<sup>245</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 6 July 1636, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 7r.

bargain between them.<sup>246</sup> Indeed, the agent informed Wandesford that Brown was unwilling to enter into a joint manufacture with him, as he “cannot take care of works so far from him.” However, Brown was able to propose that he would “sell his licence for this kingdome to us.”<sup>247</sup> This would consist of an annual payment of £4,000 and the permission to produce a maximum of 2500 pots. This was to prevent the manufacture of iron pots in Ireland affecting the productivity and saleability of Brown’s pots in the other two kingdoms of the British Isles.<sup>248</sup> Wandesford had no choice but to proceed on these terms in the hope that “we make some benifit by his Patent for the sayle of our Potts.”<sup>249</sup> This deal could be made even more profitable if Wandesford could exploit his relationship with Wentworth to prevent iron pots being imported into Ireland.<sup>250</sup>

Wandesford’s plans for the manufacture of pots did come to fruition. In two letters dated 23 and 31 June 1638, we learn that Brown was paying Wandesford for the pots that he had manufactured in Ireland. He asked Radcliffe to mention to William Raylton that Mr Brown owed his “second payment for the Potts.”<sup>251</sup> Wandesford hoped to attract suitable English Protestant artisans to his plantation of Idough offering wages with the chance to lease a farm. This would ensure that he would receive a steady income from the tenants’ rents.<sup>252</sup> He hoped to create a “model community” in Idough and thanks to his Yorkshire connection, he was able to attract immigrants from his homelands.<sup>253</sup> The estate had 20,000 acres of land that Wandesford radically transformed prior to his death in 1640.<sup>254</sup> He took his responsibilities as a landlord of a plantation seriously and provided a church, built a town and planted woods. The manufacture of cotton and earthenware was introduced as

---

<sup>246</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 3 October 1636, *ibid*, f. 17v.

<sup>247</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 29 September 1636, *ibid*, f. 16r.

<sup>248</sup> Canny, *Making Ireland British* p. 397. ‘Answere to the propositions of the undertakers,’ University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), ff. 38v, 39r.

<sup>249</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 3 October 1636, *ibid*, f. 17v.

<sup>250</sup> Wandesford also felt that he had obtained favourable conditions in the negotiations with Brown. Brown’s agent had convinced him that “Woods are farr cheaper in Ireland then heere, [in England] whereby they may bee easily inabled to undersell the Swede Merchants.” ‘Answere to the propositions of the undertakers,’ *ibid*, f. 39r, Canny *Making Ireland British* p. 397.

<sup>251</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 23 June 1638, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 22r, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 246 – 7. On 31 June, Wandesford reminded Radcliffe again to “forget not to call to Mr Browne for the second payment for the potts he will judge the tyme is not yet Come supposing because Mr Rayleton gave him 2 months in the first payment beyond the articles he should have the like in this, but there is no such matter. his tyme was for payment in May.” Wandesford to Radcliffe, 31 June 1638, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 24v, Whitaker *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 247 – 9 (with minor omissions).

<sup>252</sup> Canny, *Making Ireland British* p. 398.

<sup>253</sup> Cullen, L.M. *The Emergence of Modern Ireland 1600 – 1900* (London, 1981), p. 114.

<sup>254</sup> McCall, H.B. *The Story of the Family of Wandesforde of Kirklington and Castlecomer* (London, 1904), pp. 77 – 78.

well as two collieries and an ironworks.<sup>255</sup> However, Wandesford's estate of Castlecomer hardly had a chance to establish itself fully before being overthrown only five years later in the Irish Rebellion.<sup>256</sup>

Wandesford's plantation was so closely embroiled with the plantation policy of the Irish administration that it is remarkable that Wentworth allowed Wandesford to proceed with the plantation of Idough, knowing how tenuous the King's claim to the land was. As Wandesford was part of the Commission of Defective Titles that awarded the title to the King, evidence suggests that there may have been some underhand activities in this scheme. Wandesford and Radcliffe's earlier lease of the Idough ironworks adds credence to the supposition that this was a pre-planned moneymaking scheme developed by Wandesford. It could only be carried out with the support of Wentworth and the cabal, as he was able to use Radcliffe in his negotiations and Wentworth to cover his tracks. Wandesford did not appear to mind bending the rules somewhat to further his own profits in Ireland. However, these kinds of dealings were common amongst seventeenth century servants of the Crown who often had to exploit their political connections in order to profit from their positions.

## Conclusion

An examination of three policy areas of the Irish administration, finances, Parliament and plantation, has revealed that Wentworth's cabal was integral to the government of Ireland. Although detailed evidence of their day-to-day activities is limited, Radcliffe, Wandesford and Mainwaring appear in various capacities in both official documentation of Wentworth's regime and personal correspondence. The cabal's involvement in policy was not always for the direct benefit of Wentworth or the Crown. As we have seen, Wandesford's involvement in the plantation policy was decidedly dangerous at times and served to improve his own circumstances in the country. Radcliffe's was also able to profit considerably from his participation as a shareholder in the Irish customs farm. He also had much responsibility for the customs farm and had to exercise his negotiating skills in order to maintain harmonious relations between Wentworth and the rest of the farmers as far as possible. Wentworth needed to be able to rely upon his close advisors to discuss and advise him upon potential policies, and then to carry out the work in his name.

---

<sup>255</sup> Wandesford even established orchards, gardens and a park, and a stone house to welcome travellers to Castlecomer. Whitaker, T.D. *A History of Richmondshire, in the North Riding of the County of York* (2 vols. London, 1823), Vol. II, p. 161, McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* p. 78.

<sup>256</sup> Canny, *Making Ireland British* p. 398.

Their invaluable contribution to the Parliament of 1634 – 35 reveals how far Wentworth would have struggled without them. Although Wentworth was reliant upon his cabal to serve him, their relationship was also mutually beneficial as his trusted advisors were able to use Wentworth's influence to further their own positions.

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

Religious issues and political attacks upon notable figures in Ireland were very much interlinked during Wentworth's Lord Deputyship. Through the reduction of misappropriated Church lands that had been taken in the largest quantities by influential Irish personnel and landowners, Wentworth was able to restore lands to the Church of Ireland and to the Crown. He employed the Commission of Defective Titles to enquire into the validity of landowners' claim to Church lands and although this was a popular move with the King and the Church, Wentworth jeopardised his relationship with the uppermost echelons of Irish landed society. On his arrival in Ireland, Wentworth indicated to Lord Marshall Arundel that his intended policy was to restore Crown and Church lands, much of which had been lost. He had found Ireland "abandoned for these late yeares to every man that could please himselfe to purchase what best liked him for his money." Wentworth sought to reverse this image of Ireland in which the participants worked for their own ends rather than the good of the Crown.<sup>1</sup> This mass absorption of Crown and Church lands meant that there was "little left Either to bee fitt the Kinges servants or to improve his owne Revennew by..." This situation appeared to be so dismal that Wentworth professed that only compliance with the annual contributions to the King was "all that any of them here conceaue is possible to be done forth of the incom[m]es of this Crowne."<sup>2</sup> However, Wentworth was concerned with a more rigorous policy to improve revenue for the Crown rather than allowing Irish financial policies to continue rather haphazardly and lazily meeting payments to the Contributions.

Church and State policies were very much embroiled in Ireland, where the different social and religious factions had to be carefully handled in order to produce the best financial outcome for the Crown. The Irish government had long thought that the enforcement of Protestantism could improve the civility of the population.<sup>3</sup> In order to

---

<sup>1</sup> In Wentworth's opinion, the result of the misappropriation of lands was that "all the Crowne Revennewe reduced into fee farmes..." and many defective titles, by which claimants of lands made their titles secure, had been gained "either through fraude, or errour in drawing assurance from the Crowne industriously made valide in Law by new grauntes upon a Commission formerly awarded by King James for Defectiue titles..." Wentworth to Lord Marshall Arundel, 19 August 1633, Str. P. 8 / 11.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* 8 / 11.

<sup>3</sup> McCafferty argues that for Archbishop Laud, Wentworth and Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry, Ireland was a stage on which the link between the improvement of Crown and Church revenue could be demonstrated

civilise the Catholic Irish, it was believed that the plantation and religious policies should be entwined. A strong Church could go some way to improving local society and perhaps even lead to some conversions. The influence of Catholicism was greatly feared and it was felt that if Ireland could be united under the same Church, the apprehension that Catholics might use Ireland as a backdoor into England would be reduced. By recovering Church lands, Wentworth could reap the dual benefits of reducing the power of over-ambitious landowners through the use of the Commission of Defective Titles, and improving rents from Church lands, thus increasing profit for the Crown. The influence of the Church in Ireland had declined so far that Irish nobles often wielded more influence than the Protestant clergy in local and national issues.<sup>4</sup> However, Wentworth was also aware that tackling the contentious issue of religion in Ireland could be a dangerous game.

Wentworth was aware of the need to form his own support network within the ecclesiastical world. In a similar way to bringing men such as Wandesford, Radcliffe and Mainwaring into Ireland to support him in his governmental administration, Wentworth was keen to improve his support systems within ecclesiastical circles. Wentworth had quite substantial involvement in choosing or recommending the staff of the Irish Church and he was able to suggest men whom he knew would owe him allegiance and remain loyal. He tended to favour men who were related, however loosely, to himself or his cabal. One such nominee was Christopher Wandesford's brother Michael, who was the rector of Kirklington where the Wandesford family estate lay from 1630 – 1636. He was allowed to keep his rectory at Kirklington whilst in Ireland as his Irish livings were not very profitable. He was created Dean of Limerick and Laud conceded that “the yongue

---

as being a key part of God's plan for the spread of true religion and civility. McCafferty, J. 'John Bramhall and the Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland 1633 – 1641,' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1996), p. 16. The belief that the Reformation in Ireland would provoke the anglicanisation of the Irish was a long held assumption. For example, the Act for the English order, habit and language (28 Henry VIII c.15) argued that the multiplicity of languages and traditions prevented the Irish from moving away from their wild and savage behaviour. The Act proposed to bring these ignorant savages to God and obedience to the King by enforcing conformity in “language, tongue, in manners, order and apparel, with them that be civil people, and do profess and acknowledge Christ's religion.” The Act propounded therefore that only English speakers could be appointed to Church livings. *The statutes at large passed in the parliaments held in Ireland* (3 vols, Dublin, 1786), vol. I, p. 90 in Ford, A. *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590 – 1641* (Frankfurt, 1985), p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> For example in Galway, the Catholic Earl of Clanrickarde had far more influence and authority than the archbishop of Tuam as Church lands had been alienated and tithes farmed out. Kearney, H.F. *Strafford in Ireland 1633-1641* (Manchester, 1989), p. 107.

man may Gather a little help till some better thing be provided for him, then the Deanrye of Limerick, w[hi]ch indeed is not soe good, as his Parsonadge in Englande.”<sup>5</sup> Shortly afterwards, he was transferred to the deanery of Derry, which he held until his death in 1636.<sup>6</sup> Thomas Mainwaring, the brother of Philip Mainwaring, was offered the opportunity to take the bishopric of Waterford that had been left vacant by the death of the previous Bishop. It was a small bishopric and therefore Laud admitted that it would be “as hard to fitt a Successor from hence as from thence.” So he proposed Philip Mainwaring’s brother for the living who he described as “an Honest man, and a good Scholler.” Laud admitted that if a prosperous bishopric became vacant, the King would want it for one of his chaplains, but if Thomas Mainwaring took this Irish opportunity, “I may easily gett him Remoued to a better Bishoprick. For I would not doe him the wrong nor his Brother the unkindnesse to lodge him upon this.” Laud was even willing to allow Thomas Mainwaring to defer his removal into Ireland until after the harvest in England so that he could “come to all the Receipts there, Such as they are.”<sup>7</sup> However, Philip Mainwaring passed a message to Laud through Wentworth that he “doth not Conceave it fitt for his Brother, being a man of quiett disposition...”<sup>8</sup> More generally, Wentworth could choose the Bishops that he wished to keep and dispose of. For example, he had decided to remove Jones, the Bishop of Killalowe who was “a very wretch” who “betrayes the Church at euery Turne.”<sup>9</sup>

In the same way, Wentworth was keen to further the career of John Bramhall, who became the Bishop of Derry. Although he was not a fully established member of Wentworth’s secretariat, he was integrated to some extent into the cabal once Wentworth arrived in Ireland, like Ormond, and thus his work within Wentworth’s administration needs examination. Wentworth was aware that he could not rely on Radcliffe and

<sup>5</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 14 July 1635, Str. P. 6 / 201.

<sup>6</sup> Fowler, J.T. (ed.) *Memorials of the Church of SS Peter and Wilfred, Ripon* (Surtees Society, Durham, 1886), vol. II, p. 287.

<sup>7</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 23 January 1636, Str. P. 6 / 319.

<sup>8</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 9 March 1636, *ibid*, 6 / 331. This bishopric was filled by John Atherton, “a young nominee of the Deputy” rather than allowing it to fall into the hands of the Cork family. Wedgwood, C.V. *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford: A Revaluation* (London, 1961), p. 187. Wentworth described him to Laud in a letter dated 9 March 1635, jovially pointing out that Cork “will thinke the Deuill is lett loose upon him forth of his Chaine, I will undertake there is not such a Terrier in England or Ireland for the unkennelling of an old fox.” Str. P. 6 / 331.

<sup>9</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 7 March 1634, *ibid*, 6 / 28.

Wandesford alone and although their privileged close position to Wentworth went unchallenged, other men were needed to support their regime. Bramhall was able to offer frank advice to Wentworth just as Wandesford and Radcliffe did, but did not achieve the semblance of close friendship which in the case of the triumvirate, had developed over many years. John Bramhall, Wentworth's personal chaplain, had first come into contact with Wentworth as subdean of Ripon and later prebendary of York Minster<sup>10</sup> and was now brought into Ireland as Bishop of Derry replacing George Downham.<sup>11</sup> This was in line with Wentworth and Laud's policy of filling church livings, when they became vacant, with a minister from England.<sup>12</sup> Bramhall was consecrated Bishop of Derry on 26 May 1634<sup>13</sup> and at Laud's insistence, gave up his prebendary in York.<sup>14</sup> Wentworth was keen to further Bramhall's political career within the Irish Privy Council. Wentworth wrote to Laud to express his delight that Bramhall was "putt up to London Derry" and added that "It were very good he were of this Councell, for soe able and Active a Man, beleeeue me there is not amongst them."<sup>15</sup> However, Laud warned him that "I cannot hold it fitt soe suddenly w[i]thout any tryall to make him of the Councell..." However, he did recommend that once Parliament was finished, and Bramhall had proved himself with "some good Service" he would suggest it to the King if Wentworth reminded him.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> For a full biography of Bramhall's early career, see McCafferty, 'John Bramhall and the Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland.' McCafferty writes that Bramhall first came to Wentworth's attention through Christopher Wandesford's patronage and he became "one of Wentworth's mafia" promoted by Wentworth in Ireland. Bramhall was born in Pontefract in 1593 and attended Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge graduating BA 1612, MA 1616, BD 1623, DD 1630. He went into the Holy Orders after his MA and was appointed chaplain to Tobias Matthew, Archbishop of York. He was appointed Archdeacon of Meath, 1 October 1633 before becoming Bishop of Derry. Bramhall became Archbishop of Armagh after the death of Archbishop Ussher in 1661 and died 1663. McCafferty, 'John Bramhall and the Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland,' pp. 9 – 11, Trevor-Roper, H. *Archbishop Laud 1573 – 1645* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed, New York, 1965), p. 241, Fowler, *Memorials of the Church of SS Peter and Wilfred* pp. 279 – 281, Daly, J.W. 'John Bramhall and the Theoretical Problems of Royalist Moderation,' *Journal of British Studies* 11, no. 1, (1971), pp. 26 – 27, fn. 3.

<sup>11</sup> Wentworth wrote to Laud in April 1634 to report the previous Bishop of Derry's death and suggested that it might please the King to promote Bramhall to this see. He described him as "a man of understanding and Couradg fitt for the service of this Church." Wentworth to Laud, 23 April 1634, Str. P. 6 / 49.

<sup>12</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 113 – 114.

<sup>13</sup> *ibid*, p. 149.

<sup>14</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 23 June 1634, Str. P. 6 / 92. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud* p. 241, Fowler, *Memorials of the Church of SS Peter and Wilfred* p. 281.

<sup>15</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 3 June 1634, *ibid*, 6 / 76.

<sup>16</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 23 June 1634, *ibid*, 6 / 92. Wentworth never asked Laud about this again and Bramhall was never made a Privy Councillor. McCafferty suggests that it may have been easier to refer

## The religious policy in Ireland

Ireland was clearly divided between Catholic and Protestant believers. Broadly, the Old English and native Irish were Catholic whilst the New English and planters were Protestant.<sup>17</sup> In reality, the extent and influence of Protestantism in Ireland depended upon the propinquity of plantations, garrisons, and local government strongholds. Ulster was unusually successful in attracting Protestantism, due to the large number of Scottish Protestant settlers both before and after the plantation project.<sup>18</sup> The rival systems of Catholicism and Protestantism co-existed in Ireland in “a state of uneasy toleration.”<sup>19</sup> Yet with the enforcement of a Laudian-style Church policy under Wentworth’s administration, the Puritans in Ireland found themselves under attack, rather than the Catholics.<sup>20</sup> Protestants, who were being increasingly put under political and financial pressure, could only fear Wentworth’s introduction of Laudianism, which they believed appeared to be Catholicism in all but name.<sup>21</sup> In reality, although Wentworth did not wish to pursue a policy of fining recusants, as seen in Chapter 5, his long-term ambition was to diminish and eventually remove Catholicism. However, in the early years of his deputyship he believed that “the government was not sufficiently strong or the church sufficiently viable to enable him ‘to undergo so great a business.’”<sup>22</sup>

---

ecclesiastical business from the Council to Bramhall as this would minimise debate. Bramhall did not need the prestige of being a Councillor as Wentworth’s personal support already gave him status. However, as McCafferty indicates, this would also put Bramhall in a dangerous position when Wentworth was facing impeachment. McCafferty, ‘John Bramhall and the Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland,’ p. 12.

<sup>17</sup> There were however exceptions to this rule. The Old English Catholic Ormond family, fronted by the Protestant James Butler is one such example. Even James Ussher, the Lord Primate of Ireland, was of Old English descent and surrounded by a large Catholic family. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 105.

<sup>18</sup> *ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>19</sup> *ibid.*, p. 112.

<sup>20</sup> Wentworth was not necessarily personally attracted to Laudian doctrine, but he did use it to attack Puritanism, his dislike of which “sprang from his belief that they were the enemies of lawful authority rather than distaste for any particular doctrine.” *ibid.*, p. 112. We certainly should not see Wentworth as veering towards Catholicism as some contemporaries accused him. He disliked Catholicism, but for political reasons allowed Catholics to practice their faith relatively unhindered, even “restraining the ecclesiastical courts from proceeding against catholic baptisms, marriages, and burials.” Clarke, A. ‘The Government of Wentworth, 1632 – 40,’ in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (eds). *A New History of Ireland* (Oxford, 1976), vol. III, p. 256.

<sup>21</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 104.

<sup>22</sup> Archbishop Ussher’s words in ‘Documents concerning Ussher, 1641,’ British Library Additional MS 34253, f.3 in Clarke, ‘The Government of Wentworth,’ p. 256. As Ford indicates, the government in Ireland was not in a strong enough position to insist upon religious conformity. Ford, *Protestant Reformation in Ireland* p. 12.

Despite the dangers, Wentworth needed to tackle Church policy in Ireland.<sup>23</sup> Firstly, he could see the financial benefit of furthering the plantation policy that also had the potential to promote the ‘true faith.’ Secondly control of local churches could be used to distribute political information in the localities, far removed from central government, to ensure that people in the localities complied with central policy. Thirdly he needed Archbishop Laud’s support in England particularly as a loyal supporter within the English Privy Council could ensure that Wentworth’s position would be protected in his absence. Laud equally needed Wentworth on his side if he was to make any impact upon the proceedings of the Irish Church. He was most concerned to purge Puritanism and abuses within the Church, and to regain Church lands from secular hands.<sup>24</sup> In effect, the new policy towards the Church in Ireland was to “make it conform to English standards.”<sup>25</sup> Laud was made a member of the Irish Committee that was newly set up to “consider of all the Great Proposals sent ouer” from Ireland by Wentworth.<sup>26</sup> Yet Laud warned that he was not prepared to allow his friendship with Wentworth to impair his impartiality. The majority of Irish Church business was referred to Laud and he warned Wentworth “if I find a knot in anything, I must to the Committee and will...”<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Wentworth’s involvement in Church policy has generated severe criticism of his regime. Whereas Laud used bureaucracy to “oppose the encroachments of individuals upon the rights and patrimony of the Church,” Trevor-Roper attacked Wentworth’s approach, not presenting him as a bureaucrat “but a born tyrant, inspiring both fear and love...” Trevor-Roper’s severely critical view does not give Wentworth any credit for subtlety arguing that although Laud managed to “worm himself into a position of influence by intrigue,” Wentworth effectively burst onto the Irish political scene and overthrew the existing system, installing his own men into prominent political positions. Trevor-Roper provides an overly critical interpretation of the events, giving Wentworth no credit for performing the duties that the King demanded of him as Lord Deputy and not viewing the use of his personal cabal as a successful way to obtain support in a country of potentially resentful and unhelpful politicians. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud* p. 240.

<sup>24</sup> Beckett, J.C. *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603 – 1923* (London, 1981), p. 72.

<sup>25</sup> Ford, A. ‘Dependent or Independent? The Church of Ireland and its colonial context, 1536 – 1649,’ *The Seventeenth Century* 10, no. 2, (1995), p. 173.

<sup>26</sup> Laud reassured Wentworth that “His Ma[jes]ty is maruelously pleased w[i]th your just and noble proceedings in Church affaires, and thinkes himselfe (as indeed he is) much honoured by it...” Laud to Wentworth, 12 April 1634, Str. P. 6 / 50 – 55.

<sup>27</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 23 June 1634, *ibid*, 6 / 89. As the Chancellor, Laud’s influence was also felt within Trinity College with his protégé William Chappell, becoming provost. This accounts for the increasingly Arminian theology found there during Wentworth’s regime. Beckett, *Making of Modern Ireland* p. 73. Laud believed that educating a new intake of clergy in Arminian theology would help to subdue Catholicism and the equally subversive Presbyterianism, and progress to a more uniform Laudian Church in Charles I’s three kingdoms. The influence of Trinity College upon theology was expected to be significant. Laud confessed to Wentworth “I thinke as you doe That Religion and Ciuility in that Kingdome will much depend upon the Reformation of that Place.” Laud to Wentworth, 8 April 1636, *ibid*, 6 / 337. Bliss, J. (ed). *The works of the most reverend father in God, William Laud, D.D.* (7 vols, London, 1847 – 1860), vol. VII, pp. 247 – 252.

It was not only Church politics that needed Wentworth's attention. The very fabric of the Church was in danger of falling into disrepair. Wentworth fully intended to bring Ireland to civility and make it doctrinally synonymous with the Church of England, but warned Laud that "to attempt it before the decays of the material churches be repaired, [and] an able clergy provided" would be like "a man going to warfare without ammunition or arms."<sup>28</sup> Wentworth also needed to improve the difficult position that the clergy found themselves in, as although they needed to act as representatives of the State, they also need to coerce their congregation to pay for the upkeep of the church.<sup>29</sup> The ministers were in effect being torn between their allegiance to the State and their ability to function within the community with a severe lack of funding.

Wentworth also had to tackle the problem of inferior personnel within the Church of Ireland. Although some clergy were of a high quality and some had been attracted to Ireland as it presented them with a missionary challenge,<sup>30</sup> others were poorly educated. Wentworth's administration also dealt with numerous complaints and petitions concerning pluralism, simony and absenteeism.<sup>31</sup> Wentworth also complained to Laud

---

<sup>28</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 31 January 1634, Str. P. 6 / 19, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, p. 187. Certainly Ford agrees with Wentworth, identifying the need to provide an "adequately trained and qualified protestant ministry" as a key issues affecting every diocese within Ireland. Ford, *Protestant Reformation in Ireland* p. 43.

<sup>29</sup> For example, Bedell, the bishop of Kilmore in the plantation area of Cavan found himself forced to sign a petition to the Lord Justices from the people of Cavan to protest about the contribution imposed upon them a year ago to pay for the army and the "soldiers brought upon them by a Popish undersheriff." The Bishop was not punished at the time of the petition but found that since Wentworth arrived to take up his Lord Deputyship, he had "shewed his displeasure against me." He had also received letters from the Vice Chamberlain and Archbishop Laud "whereby I am advertised that his Ma[jes]ty is informed that I opposed his service..." Bedell described the awkward position he found himself in as he was not opposed to paying for the upkeep of the army, nor the policy of recusancy fines, yet "thought fit to join with the county to give them content, being that very day to lay above 1000/ upon them toward the repair of their churches.... In joining with the country I had them pliable to join with me for the churches." Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore to Ward, 2 February 1634, McNeill, C. (ed). *The Tanner Letters. Original Documents and Notices of Irish Affairs in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries* (Dublin, 1943), p. 107. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 105.

<sup>30</sup> Ford's examination of the ministry of the Church of Ireland in the visitations of 1615, 1622 and 1634 has revealed that by 1634, all the principal livings of the Church were held by committed Protestants. Ford, *Protestant Reformation in Ireland* pp. 81, 84, 87.

<sup>31</sup> For example, one Edward Agas petitioned Wentworth to complain that whilst he remained unbeneficed, George Cottington had received two livings simoniacally in January 1633. Not only was this simonious, but Cottington was also absent, having other livings to attend to. Sir George Radcliffe was set to inquire into this complaint and if it was justified, Agas was to receive the two livings of Teighhallen [Tehallen] and Rathmakneales in the diocese of Clogher. Petition of Edward Agas to Wentworth, 11 February 1634. P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 254, 96, *CSPI 1633 -- 47*, p. 41.

that many clergymen were non-resident.<sup>32</sup> Non-resident church livings and impoverished bishoprics suited both Catholic and Puritans within Ireland as it allowed them to practice their faiths unhindered. In areas serviced by both a priest and a minister, Catholics often found themselves paying two sets of tithes. Irish Puritans were not provoked into attempts to remove the episcopacy since the Bishops had such weak power and influence anyway. There were few people in Ireland that were pressing for substantial reform of the Church before Laud's policies pushed them into action.<sup>33</sup>

Despite concerns to harmonise the Church of Ireland with the Church of England's doctrines, the fundamental difference between their tenets was the way in which predestination was defined. The Irish interpretation was one of a strict Calvinist type, which is generally thought to be thanks to the influence of James Ussher, the Lord Primate of Ireland. However, Ford argues that the strict definition of this central tenet of doctrine was consensual. Due to the Irish clergy's Calvinistic tendencies and their unwillingness to learn Irish in order to convert the native Catholic community, the clergy tended to devote their attention to the New English communities.<sup>34</sup> However, Canny argues that it was not the clergy's lack of enthusiasm that failed to bring the Reformation to the native Irish, but rather it was the Irish administration, "for reasons of political expediency," that restrained conversion policies. The clergy in Ireland did not shy away from attempts to convert the Catholic community, but rather they were restrained by policy-makers who did not wish to tackle the religiosity of a significant proportion of the Irish population before the government was secure enough to withstand the backlash.<sup>35</sup> Indeed Wentworth was aware how contentious the issue of religion was within such a divided country and knew that in order to increase Crown revenues, he had to tread

---

<sup>32</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 31 January 1634, Str. P. 6 / 19 – 22, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. 1, p. 188.

<sup>33</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 108.

<sup>34</sup> Ford argues that the Protestants saw the Catholic native Irish as followers of the antichrist and therefore had "little incentive" to convert them as they were lost souls. Therefore they "left whole parishes to the Catholic priests, content to let the people of Ireland 'go to hell in their own way.'" Ford, *Protestant Reformation in Ireland* p. 228. However, there were some ministers who did aim to tend to the conversion of the Catholic population. For example, William Bedell learnt Irish and took Protestantism to the native Irish community. Canny points out that although Bedell agreed with government policy, he "was impatient with the pace of progress and so advanced the religious dimension to the reform effort by several stages." However, he was in direct opposition to the official guidance, which did not recommend that settlers engaged with the native Irish for long periods. It was felt that prolonged contact might affect the settlers' civility. Canny, N. 'Protestants, planters and apartheid in early modern Ireland,' *Irish Historical Studies* 25, no. 98 (1986), p. 110.

<sup>35</sup> *ibid.*, p. 110.

carefully and avoid upsetting either the Catholic or Protestant communities. Wentworth assured Laud that his “directions concerning diuine Seruice, and all others for the Gouernment of the Churche beleue me shall be most carefully and industriously effected to your full Satisfaction...” However, he admitted that he had to “houer a little till a Parliament be well overcome for the Kings Supply this first Session.” He was convinced that he had the support of the Parliament and therefore was anxious to avoid “anything that should giue them an apprehention, that a Conformity in Religion is soe much as thought of...”<sup>36</sup>

Although Wentworth did not put an aggressive anti-Catholic policy into action, he did carry out measures against Catholics during his Lord Deputyship. Wentworth set up an inquiry into “those of the clergy whose wifes and Children are recusants.” The King had asked him to provide him with a list of their names yet recognised that political reasons would prevent any procedures against them.<sup>37</sup> The King praised Wentworth’s suggestion for dealing with “unseemly Mariadges after Supper, and in priuate houses.” However, his hand was yet again restrained. He did not think that this policy should be presented to Parliament “least it make a noyse to the disturbance of other businesse.”<sup>38</sup> Wentworth and the Privy Council tended to come into contact with members of the Catholic Church community if they created trouble for the administration. For example, one friar Paul Brown, a Discalced Carmelite was involved in a riot against the government when it tried to order the suppression of Catholicism in Dublin, in January 1630. Browne was later arrested for having performed an exorcism, imprisoned and brought before Wentworth and the Privy Council on two occasions.<sup>39</sup> Contact with

---

<sup>36</sup> Wentworth was keen to reassure Laud that he did intend to perfect this policy and if Laud directed that Wentworth should press ahead, “it shall not sleepe an hower w[i]th mee...” Yet he asked for just “six weeks forbearance [which] will not make us lesse ready or able for the worke then wee are now...” Wentworth to Laud, 3 June 1634, Str. P. 6 / 74 – 75.

<sup>37</sup> Laud admitted that depriving these Catholics would be “very hard, unlesse it appeare that their owne Carelesnesse or other fault easy by themselves to be preuented haue concurred in & to the Scandall w[hi]ch hence arises....” However, the King was willing to consider other punishments as long as they were “according to his lawes.” Laud to Wentworth reporting words of King Charles I, 12 April 1634, *ibid*, 6 / 50.

<sup>38</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 12 April 1634, *ibid*, 6 / 50 – 51.

<sup>39</sup> At his second appearance before Wentworth and the Irish Privy Council, Browne was interrogated by Richard Bolton, the Chief Baron of the Exchequer. “Bolton accused him of seducing the people from the Protestant religion and from loyalty to the king.” He was fined £3000 and ordered to stand on a public square on 4 days for 3 hours at a time with a notice inscribed “Imposter and Seducer.” Glynn, M. & Martin.

Catholic priests was not always a negative issue however. Christopher Wandesford, in a letter to George Radcliffe, mentioned that “Father Roach and I drinke your health hartilye. he is a good Preist I am certayne a Good fellowe.” From this, it appears that it was possible to develop a friendship with members of the Catholic community, although this relationship might have been misconstrued if it was widely known. Unfortunately, nothing is known about this relationship, or why Wandesford and Father Roach were toasting Radcliffe. Radcliffe’s response to this letter does not survive and therefore we only have a tantalising glimpse at this aspect of Wandesford’s religiosity. We know that Wandesford was a confirmed Protestant yet it is intriguing that he should add that Father Roach was a “good priest.” Did he mean that in his profession he was convincing and effective, or does this comment just indicate that Wandesford thought of him as a good man, regardless of his occupation or religiosity?<sup>40</sup>

Wentworth was in effect, Laud’s representative in Ireland but petitioners complained to Laud as well as the Lord Deputy, in an attempt to secure their rights. For example, the Bishop of Clogher wrote to Laud protesting his innocence in a case of simony in which he was accused of disposing a benefice to Lord Valentia’s chaplain, Sir Henry Power.<sup>41</sup> Laud was inclined to believe Clogher despite “all the sour usage which he hath plentifully had in those parts, yet till now I never heard him accused of Simony.”<sup>42</sup> Despite Laud’s assertion that Clogher was probably innocent, he left the case in Wentworth’s hands. George Radcliffe and John Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry were appointed to enquire into the Bishop of Clogher’s case and Clogher complained to Laud that their actions had been questionable.<sup>43</sup> Clogher may even have been a little concerned

---

F.X. ‘The ‘Brevis Relatio’ of the Irish Discalced Carmelites 1625 – 1670,’ *Archivium Hibernicum* 25 (1962), pp. 137 – 138.

<sup>40</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 26 March 1637, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 21r, Whitaker, T.D. *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), pp. 242 – 3.

<sup>41</sup> As Gillespie has pointed out, there was some truth in the accusation against Spottiswood. He admitted to having given cures at the request of Lady Valentia, but refused to admit that he had accepted money for his service. Gillespie, R. ‘The Trials of Bishop Spottiswood 1620 – 40,’ *Clogher Record* 12, no. 3, (1987). p. 332.

<sup>42</sup> Laud to Wentworth, letter received on 18 April 1634, Bliss, *Works of Laud* vol. VII, p. 64.

<sup>43</sup> Wentworth had received Laud’s letter and referred to a passage in it in which Laud informed him that the Bishop of Clogher “complaines of my lord of Derry and S[i]r Geo[rge] Radcliffe and altogether w[i]thout cause, For the B[isho]p neuer had it in reference from me, And for S[i]r George, your Grace will by this Pacquet receaue his justification.” Wentworth was not willing to listen to Clogher’s complaints that

that a layperson was investigating into his Church livings. Laud reported to Wentworth that Clogher was “a little jealous” of Radcliffe and Bramhall’s proceedings “which for my part, I must confess to you, is that which I like worse than his cause.” Laud was convinced of

Sir George Radcliffe’s honesty, and of Dr Bramhall’s justice to his own coat; and that neither of them will be an instrument of any man’s malice to overthrow the credit of a bishop. And if they should be so minded, I know your nobleness will not endure it...<sup>44</sup>

Radcliffe was often involved in inquiries into Church matters as legal knowledge was often needed to investigate into Defective Titles and even claims on livings. This was part of Wentworth’s wider policy of setting up a number of commissions to inquire into all areas of Church business.<sup>45</sup>

The cabal was also involved in the Feoffees for Improvements policy, which was very much identified with Wentworth’s ambition to return ecclesiastical lands to the Church. Wentworth placed the trust of the improvements exercise into the hands of George Radcliffe and John Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry. Wentworth reported to Laud

I haue sett the improvements in a way to passe, haue Commended the Solliciting parte to my Lord of Derry’s, the legall Parte to S[i]r Geo[rge] Radcliffe’s Care, Soe as I trust wee shall be at an end of that worke shortly for wee all three stand extreame Rightly affected to the businesse, And there shall not be an Howers tyme Lost God willing.”<sup>46</sup>

The problem with the policy in Ireland was that although the Crown officially held the majority of the improvements, most had been leased out to laymen. These were often extremely long leases and therefore the value of the rent for the vicarages depreciated over time.<sup>47</sup> As the Bishops made the decision who to issue improvements to, favourable

---

Radcliffe and Derry had shown bias in his case, and remarked to Laud that “Fame noyses him to be the worst B[isho]p in Ireland.” Wentworth to Laud, 3 June 1634, Str. P. 6 / 74.

<sup>44</sup> Laud to Wentworth, letter received on 18 April 1634, Bliss, *Works of Laud* vol. VII, p. 64.

<sup>45</sup> McCafferty, ‘John Bramhall and the Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland,’ p. 15. For example, Wentworth aimed to use the Commission of Defective Titles to restore Church lands in order to increase Crown revenues and to assert the authority of the Church and State personified by Wentworth, over delinquent landowners. Canny, N. ‘The Attempted Anglicanisation of Ireland in the seventeenth century: An exemplar of ‘British History,’ in J.F. Merritt, (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621-1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 171 - 172.

<sup>46</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 2 November 1635, Str. P. 6 / 265.

<sup>47</sup> In 1635, it was estimated that over three-quarters of the leases were for periods of 16 – 80 years. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 122.

rents might be awarded to associates and kin, therefore reducing the potential income for the Crown. This was a particularly common activity in Ulster and thus where much of the attention of Wentworth's administration was focused. The impropriations policy could be used to rein in the local powers of the Bishops, reassert the power of the State over the Church and localities, improve Crown revenues as well as potentially improve the plantation system by granting lands to men closely tied to the Church and State.

Wentworth, Radcliffe and Wandesford aimed to "free the tenants and Bishops from suits and double the rents to the sees for ever. It will give security as to the Bishop's titles, and thus cause the plantation, which has hitherto kept away from their lands, to spread on them."<sup>48</sup> Laud and Wentworth's aim was to grant perpetual leases to ministers who would pay the existing amount of rent to the Crown. In turn, the ministers would then extract increased rents from the tenants of the land. This would appear to be a long-term policy as Wentworth and Laud would have to wait for vicarages to fall vacant. However, Laud was not willing to wait. He asked Wentworth to settle the impropriations "w[i]th all the Speed you can. For if they dye in yo[u]r handes I will neuer hope to see them liue againe nor the Church by them."<sup>49</sup> Wentworth was instructed to wage a more aggressive policy and Bramhall was employed to wage a "financial crusade in Ulster."<sup>50</sup> However, he tended not to wait for "voluntary subscription" to the policy and "relied mainly upon increased rents from diocesan lands."<sup>51</sup> The King issued Wentworth a letter with permission to pass the Impropriations to the Church and Wentworth assured Laud that

S[i]r George Radcliffe hath promised to draw the Fiant himself, and to haue an Especiall Care that all be legally and effectually done, I will awarrant you the Lady Mora shall not haue a finger in the Pye."<sup>52</sup>

One such Bishop who found himself on the receiving end of an investigation into Feoffees for Impropriations was the Bishop of Killala. Although proceedings had begun, Radcliffe had to inform Wentworth that "The general pardon will cut off the offence and proceedings against the Bishop of Killala." As the case had not been brought against the

---

<sup>48</sup> John Bramhall to Laud, 18 February 1635, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* p. 96.

<sup>49</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 4 October 1635, Str. P. 6 / 254, Bliss, *Works of Laud* vol. VII. p. 175.

<sup>50</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 126.

<sup>51</sup> Bramhall did have some success in Ulster. In Armagh, revenues increased from £1,800 in 1629 to £3,500 by 1639. *ibid.* p. 123.

<sup>52</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 18 May 1635, Str. P. 6 / 181.

Bishop “till within 40 days of the meeting of Parliament, his privilege prevented us from trying it.”<sup>53</sup> The Commission that inquired into this case had attempted to prevent Killala from appealing his privilege to the Irish House of Lords to enable them to proceed to sentencing. However, Killala had already claimed parliamentary privilege and therefore Radcliffe admitted that “nothing more can be done till Parliament decides the matter.” It was eventually decided by the Commission that Killala should be fined £2000 and imprisoned. Killala appeared to have got away lightly as Radcliffe reported that the Judges had deemed that if Killala had been brought before a jury, instead of pleading parliamentary privilege, the words he had spoken would have amounted to high treason.<sup>54</sup>

Radcliffe and Bramhall did not only lead the Commissioners investigating into misappropriated land leases, but also administered the distribution and continuation of impropriations. For example, Bramhall reported to Laud that Sir Robert King had “concluded with Sir George Radcliffe and myself for eleven impropriations more at four years’ purchase, if his father Sir John King, who is now in London, will consent...” Part of the condition of this lease was that he would restore the lands to the Church “immediately after his father’s death.”<sup>55</sup> Radcliffe conferred closely with Laud upon the impropriations issue, meeting face to face with him whilst in England in May 1639.<sup>56</sup> Radcliffe was also commissioned by Wentworth to inquire into the state of “tythe fishing” which had been queried by the vicar of Kilmacominge. Radcliffe’s inquiry revealed that in angling areas of Ireland, “there is tyth paid in kinde the tenth fish (without any deduction) as a prodiall tyth to the Church of the parish wherein the fish is landed, of the fisherman inhabite there...” This custom was especially prevalent in Munster, but also applied generally throughout Ireland as Radcliffe had been informed by

---

<sup>53</sup> Radcliffe to Wentworth, 3 March 1640, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 16, *CSPI 1633 – 47* p. 237.

<sup>54</sup> The Bishop of Killala found that few clergymen had supported him in his trial. Radcliffe informed Wentworth that the “Bishop of Kilmore alone defended him.” It is unlikely that all the Bishops were supportive of this policy, which in effect diminished their power to administer lands in their bishoprics, but rather that they were afraid to speak out in support of Killala as he was being used somewhat as a scapegoat. *ibid*, 63 / 258, 16.

<sup>55</sup> John Bramhall to Laud, 21 August 1634, *HMC Hastings IV* p. 60.

<sup>56</sup> Laud reported to Bramhall that “The Bishop of Clonfert has sent me the copy of the petition presented to the Commissioners of Plantations... They were delivered very seasonably, whilst Sir George Radcliffe was with me, who advised me to write to the Commissioners in the bishop’s behalf, which advice I have followed.” Laud promised that he would “not fail a second time at or near his parting to be earnest with Sir George Radcliffe again, and to desire him particularly to speak with the two Lords Chief Justices.” Laud to Bramhall, 22 May 1639. Bliss, *Works of Laud* vol. VII, pp. 81 - 82.

“some of great integritie and well experienced in the rights of the Church.”<sup>57</sup> Yet the sea-fishing off the coast of the parish of Kilmacominge had commenced shortly before the suit began and Radcliffe argued that “in such cases of newly begun fishings, tythes haue been usually paid, according to the generall Custome.” This suit had apparently been a concern for some time having “worne out two Vicars successiueley.” Radcliffe felt that such issues should be dealt with within Ireland rather than allowing the vicar to appeal to England which he felt would be of “dangerous consequence to the Church” and of great expense to the already impoverished Irish clergy. Radcliffe confessed that he had not come across such a case before and was not sure how the vicar of Kilmacominge could be satisfied in the cause. He was also unwilling to present his own judgment on the case, preferring to leave it to Wentworth’s decision.<sup>58</sup> The importance of this case is that it clearly illustrates that Radcliffe was employed by the Lord Deputy, thanks to his extensive legal knowledge of both the English and Irish legal systems, to advise him upon the legal implications of appealing to England to settle suits. Although Radcliffe protested that he could not possibly advise the Lord Deputy what path to take, he does present all the information that Wentworth needed to make a decision. Radcliffe appears to have been flattering Wentworth by stating that he had to defer the final decision on the matter to his superior, being unable himself to make a sound judgment.

Bramhall worked in close conjunction with Wentworth on the plantation policy demonstrating that religion and plantation could be closely synchronised. On 18 February 1635, Bramhall wrote to Archbishop Laud with a plan to allow the Primate and Bishops in Ulster to “have power left to them to demise lands for sixty years.” This would enable tenants and Bishops to be free from legal suits and more importantly for the Irish Church, “double the rents to the sees for ever.” It would also have wider repercussions as it would “give security to the Bishops’ titles, and thus cause the plantation, which has hitherto kept away from their lands, to spread on to them.” Bramhall was anxious to demonstrate to Laud that this would be a policy with a limited lifespan stating “We do not want to keep this power for ever. Let us have it for five years...” He enclosed a description of the state

---

<sup>57</sup> If the fisherman was not from that area, he only had to pay half a tythe. Radcliffe to Wentworth. date unknown, Str. P. 20 / 105.

<sup>58</sup> He humbly protested that “...it ill becomes mee to deliuer my weake opinion therein; but submit all to your Lo[rdshi]ps better iudgment.” *ibid.* 20 / 105.

of appropriations in the area which although the local referees wished to defer, Bramhall, Wandesford and Radcliffe “insisted on its being made at once.” Wentworth’s closest advisors were playing a key role in Church policy here and obviously had power to demand that this report was issued to Laud. They appear on this occasion to have acted in conjunction with the Bishop of Derry, between them ordering that the report was made.<sup>59</sup>

By the end of Wentworth’s regime, it was apparent that the combined religious and plantation policy was not going as well as hoped. Bramhall complained to Wandesford that in Ulster people were “full of discontents and complaints...” Landlords complained to Bramhall “that their lands lie waste, and not without great cause; great proportions every where are untenanted and that amongst other things helps to bring down the rent of what is tenanted.” However Bramhall now feared “a trick which the Irish hath gotten, if it be not very speedily prevented, likely to be worse than both the other.” The Irish were not willing to pay fees “where they can get grass by stealth or to pay a valuable rent where they can compound for waste land and take that for 3l. which usually did yield 20l.” Men who until then had been attending to their lands properly, were copying this behaviour.<sup>60</sup> Bramhall warned “If this be not prevented timely, the fruits of it will be most pernicious.” However he believed that if they issued an Act of State “to inhibit this setting of land to graze, both to the landlords and tenants,” with “no man be permitted to set land for a less term than a whole year nor to take any man’s cattle to graze who hath not a certain habitation elsewhere,” the situation might be resolved. He hoped that this policy would also help to expand plantation into other areas that currently lay in wastelands.<sup>61</sup>

Doctrinal issues also reared their head under Wentworth’s Lord Deputyship and this was a particular problem in his relationship with James Ussher, the Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland.<sup>62</sup> Despite Ussher’s Irish and Old English background, he was a confirmed Protestant who tended to lean towards Calvinism rather than Laud’s

---

<sup>59</sup> Bramhall to [Laud], 18 February 1635, P.R.O. S.P.63 / 255, 14 & 14 – 1, *CSPI 1633 – 47* pp. 96 – 97.

<sup>60</sup> Bramhall to Wandesford, 16 April 1640, *HMC Hastings MSS* vol. IV, p. 86.

<sup>61</sup> *ibid*, vol. IV, p. 87.

<sup>62</sup> Ussher had become Bishop of Meath in 1621 and was created Archbishop of Armagh early in 1625. Capern, A.L. ‘The Caroline Church: James Ussher and the Irish Dimension,’ *Historical Journal* 39, no. 1, (1996), p. 59.

High Church policy in England.<sup>63</sup> Wentworth appeared to be more anti-puritan than anti-Catholic<sup>64</sup> whilst for Ussher, “the main enemy seemed to be Rome not Geneva...”<sup>65</sup> This difference in opinion was bound to create problems between them. The issue that created greatest dispute between Wentworth and Ussher was concerning the Irish Articles, which Laud and Charles I wanted to replace with the English Thirty-nine Articles. The Irish Articles had been Ussher’s creation and followed Calvinistic dogma.<sup>66</sup> Ussher did not want to allow their replacement without standing up for the doctrines he believed in and knowing the influence that Ussher had over Convocation that was to sit at the same time as the Irish Parliament of 1634 – 1635, Wentworth instructed Bramhall to ensure that Convocation accepted the Thirty-nine Articles.<sup>67</sup> This issue could prove to be explosive if news of Wentworth and Laud’s attempt to introduce Laudian-style Articles into Ireland reached England.<sup>68</sup>

Convocation’s eventual acceptance of the Thirty-nine Articles led to the decline in use of the Irish Articles of 1615 and its authority within the Church was intentionally expressed vaguely. Ussher had failed to fully protect the Irish Articles and he did not

---

<sup>63</sup> Kearney described Ussher’s theology as being “nearer on certain points to Geneva than to Canterbury.” Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 106.

<sup>64</sup> *ibid*, p. 109.

<sup>65</sup> *ibid*, p. 108.

<sup>66</sup> Capern, ‘The Caroline Church,’ p. 71.

<sup>67</sup> Convocation eventually did accept the Thirty Nine Articles, but not without some expression of distaste. Ussher had promised Wentworth that he would not stand in the way of the introduction of the Articles yet he had placed his client Andrews, the dean of Limerick, into a committee within Convocation that was charged with debating the Articles. Convocation agreed with Ussher and Andrews that replacing the Irish Articles with the English Thirty Nine Articles was unacceptable. They feared that Bramhall and Laud were attempting to introduce Arminian and even Catholic doctrines into Ireland. Not all of the doctrines were thought to be suited to the Irish situation and therefore Convocation decided to defend the independence of the Irish Church by rejecting what they viewed as an “attempt to impose uniformity.” The committee inserted the Irish Articles into the fifth canon of the existing Irish Articles and amended unsuitable English articles. However, when Wentworth discovered their actions and found out that Andrews had suggested to the members that the Irish articles were “to be allowed and received under pain of excommunication,” he banned them from discussing the Articles further. Here his actions began to deteriorate into illegality as “he could advise but not determine the findings of Irish convocation.” James Ussher pushed Wentworth into further irregularities when Wentworth required him to frame the Articles so that both Convocation and the Lord Deputy would find the fifth article acceptable. But when Ussher presented his work to Wentworth he “did not like the result and altered it; [and] at this point he might be accused of acting extra-legally.” *ibid*, pp. 72, 73 - 74, Ford, ‘Dependent or Independent?’ pp. 174 – 175, Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 116.

<sup>68</sup> Capern argues that Laud did display some recognition of local issues and was not simply attempting to supplant the Irish Articles with English ones. However he was anxious to see the Irish Articles “fall into disuse” due to his concern that religious uniformity required that “only one confessional statement be in place.” Capern also accuses Laud of being so Anglocentric that he was unable to see the Thirty-nine Articles as superfluous. Capern, ‘The Caroline Church,’ p. 73.

wish to be part of the process that would undermine Puritan clergymen and therefore asked to be excluded from the Court of High Commission, leaving much of the work to John Bramhall.<sup>69</sup> Despite being Primate, after the Irish Parliament, Ussher had lost much of his influence. Laud believed “that no man can easily be found more unfit for government than the Primate.”<sup>70</sup>

As we might expect, the cabal was less involved with doctrinal issues within the Irish Church and were mainly participants in the more practical applications of Wentworth’s policy. Their work within ecclesiastical policy was very much linked to more secular affairs where Radcliffe’s legal knowledge was invaluable, as was his and Wandesford’s contribution to ecclesiastical-related commissions. Their role becomes even more apparent in an examination of Wentworth’s pursuit of key Irish noblemen who were targeted in the name of restoring Church lands to the Crown.

### **The recovery of Church lands and proceedings against the Earl of Cork**

Wentworth was perhaps most effective in his Church policy when recovering Church lands for the Crown. This policy combined religious, political and legal issues and the cabal was inextricably involved in this. As Milton indicates, Radcliffe was the most valuable asset in Wentworth’s government, as his “ingenious legal trickery was vital in enabling the crown to regain the political initiative in Ireland.” By manipulating “legal loopholes, quibbles and technicalities” Radcliffe, on Wentworth’s behalf, was able to increase the power of the Court of Castle Chamber, cut enemies down to size and most importantly, reinstate Church and State authority.<sup>71</sup> By 1636, Wentworth and the cabal were systematically recovering Church property. This was especially notable in the north where Wentworth established a commission in Down and Connor, although the policy

---

<sup>69</sup> Ussher went into semi-retirement after the Parliament and Convocation of 1634 – 1635. He admitted to his correspondent Ward on 15 September 1635 that he had been “almost tyred w[i]th continuall attendance on our long continued Parliament and Convocation... I am now at last retired from Dublin to mine old place.” Capern indicates that Wentworth may have seen Ussher’s retreat as a protest against the Laudian religious policy, but admits that “he may just have been rendered disillusioned with and exhausted by the ecclesiastical policies of 1634.” Kearney propounded a further reason for Ussher’s retreat, stating that it may have been due “ostensibly for financial reasons.” *ibid*, p. 77, McNeill, *The Tanner Letters* p. 113. Beckett, *Making of Modern Ireland* p. 73. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 119.

<sup>70</sup> Bliss, *Works of Laud* vol. VII, p. 387, Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 118.

<sup>71</sup> Milton, A. ‘Thomas Wentworth and the political thought of the Personal Rule.’ in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996). p. 140.

was resisted by many landlords.<sup>72</sup> Here, revenues from Crown lands improved by 243% thanks to Wentworth's court proceedings against important landowners there.<sup>73</sup>

Wentworth pursued an aggressive policy of undermining powerful figures in the Irish political scene, believing that the Irish could only be controlled by strict policies.<sup>74</sup> Radcliffe ably carried out the legal attacks on Wentworth's behalf. He was involved in the examination of the Vice Treasurer's accounts, and this was one way in which Wentworth was able to undermine Mountnorris' status in Ireland.<sup>75</sup> Radcliffe was nominated to be one of the Commissioners for Defective Titles who sought to discover whether landowners were "really in possession of their lands or not."<sup>76</sup> Charles I was anxious that those in Ireland "whose estates and titles to their lands and possessions are concealed by persons of good judgement, and knowledge of our lawes to be very defective," were refusing to succumb to the Commission of Defective Titles and surrender their lands to the King's Title.<sup>77</sup>

One of the most notable figures that found themselves on the receiving end of an investigation by Radcliffe was the Earl of Cork.<sup>78</sup> However, the first dispute that

---

<sup>72</sup> For example, Lord Clondeboy claimed that the lands of Black Abbey were not church property contrary to the findings of an inquisition of 1623. The issue was only resolved by a letter from the King that ordered Clondeboy to surrender the lands in June 1639 but with the promise of a 60 year lease on them. Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, DI04/5/1, ff. 82 – 92 in Gillespie, R. *Colonial Ulster. The Settlement of East Ulster 1600 – 1641* (Cork, 1985), p. 95.

<sup>73</sup> King Charles I to Wentworth for Bishop of Down and Connor, 14 October 1639, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* p. 226 in *ibid*, p. 96.

<sup>74</sup> Carte, T. *The Life of James, Duke of Ormonde* (6 vols, Oxford, 1851), vol. I, p. 135.

<sup>75</sup> *HMC Ormonde ns I*, pp. 39 – 41.

<sup>76</sup> King Charles I to Wentworth, 29 June 1634, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* p. 56.

<sup>77</sup> In particular in this letter the King was referring to the lands of the Manor of Rathmore whose owner "is observed to be very refractory, to the ill example of others..." A writ, "in considerac[i]on of the good services done in diuers our affaires, by yo[u]r Agent, W[illia]m Raylton," was to be issued under the Great Seal for the lands." King Charles I to Wentworth, 15 January 1639, Str. P. 6b / 12.

<sup>78</sup> Cork was a prominent political player within Ireland and had acted as one of the Lord Justices of Ireland along with Lord Chancellor Loftus in the interim between Lord Deputy Falkland who left Ireland in 1629 and Wentworth's promotion in 1631. In 1630, he also became Lord High Treasurer. Wentworth's pursuit of the Earl of Cork began soon after his arrival in Ireland. Initially, their relationship appeared to be good and Cork was pleased that Wentworth had been appointed Lord Deputy as he had developed a correspondence with Wentworth in England and had arranged for his son and heir to marry one of Wentworth's relatives. However, Wentworth was keen to rescue Church lands and property from Cork and their relationship began to waiver. Wentworth's actions against Cork had been so fierce that Cork added to his diary that Wentworth was "A moste cursed man to all Ireland, and to me in particular..." This caption was retrospectively inserted on 23 July 1633 – the date that Wentworth arrived on Irish soil. Cork's diaries provide in minute detail his financial transactions. On 8 August 1633, he noted that he sent a "peece of xxxs to the M[aste]r of the Rolles that I betted & lost to him at the Footrace between Roberts and Clowell." Cork's diary, 23 July 1634, Boyle, R., Earl of Cork. *The Lismore Papers* Grosart, A. (ed). (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> series, each 5 vols, London, 1886 - 1888), first series, vol. III, pp. 202, 205, Gibson, C.B. *The History of the*

broke out between Wentworth and Cork was not over Cork's misappropriation of Church lands, but a disagreement concerning the tomb of Cork's wife. The tomb was sited at the east end of St Patrick's Cathedral in Dublin, in precisely the position where Laud wanted the altar erected. Wentworth had told Cork "plainly I must needs pull it downe, if he would not be so wise as to do it himselfe." But Cork refused and argued "he had rather dye."<sup>79</sup> Cork invited the Archbishop of Dublin and the Lord Primate to inspect the tomb and offer their opinions on it to Archbishop Laud, in the hope that their approval would convince Laud to allow the tomb to remain.<sup>80</sup> On receipt of these letters, Laud informed Wentworth that Cork and the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin "Justifie that the Tombe stands not in the place of the Altar, and that it is a great ornament to that Church."<sup>81</sup> But Laud argued that since he was unable to visit the tomb himself, the dispute would have to be settled by Wentworth, knowing full well that Wentworth would support Laud's opinion.<sup>82</sup> The dispute dragged on for many months,<sup>83</sup> but finally Wentworth won the dispute and the tomb was eventually moved

---

*County and City of Cork* (London, 1861), vol. II, p.40, Canny, N. *From Reformation to Restoration: Ireland 1534 – 1660* (Dublin, 1987), p. 188.

<sup>79</sup> Cork had written to Archbishops Laud and Ussher to protest against Wentworth's complaint. Wentworth professed that if they "should be of an opinion to lett it stande, I should hold myselfe excused from troubling him any more in that matter." However, he felt that the tomb was "one of the most Scandalouse pieces that euer was seene, stands iust in the Altar place, The ten Commandements taken downe to make roome and couers the whole end of the Quire..." Wentworth to Laud, 29 January 1634, Str. P. 6 / 14 – 15.

<sup>80</sup> Cork explained that the altar had never stood there as it used to be an archway leading into the Lady Chapel which had long since been boarded up and plastered over. Cork to Laud, 20 February 1634, Chatsworth House, Lismore Papers, vol 17 / 197.

<sup>81</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 11 March 1634, Str. P. 6 / 32.

<sup>82</sup> Capern, 'The Caroline Church,' p. 71. Wentworth later discredited the information sent to Laud, reporting that the Earl of Cork had "dictated some part of his letter." Wentworth had been walking with the Master of the Wards and the issue of the tomb came up. The Master of the Wards asked Wentworth "whether I had seene the Bishoppes letters I told him yes, but wott you what Judgment (said I) I gaue Maister, upon the reading them." Wentworth had told Radcliffe that there was evidence that someone else had written "those lines then the good old Bishoppes, and that I found your pen had beene there. Indeed answered he my lord I confesse I wrote the one of them, And w[i]th that by my trothe I had like to haue buffed him full in the face." Wentworth to Laud, 15 May 1634, Str. P. 6 / 59.

<sup>83</sup> Cork had even threatened to refuse to allow his son to marry Lord Clifford's daughter if his tomb was removed. But Wentworth did not believe Cork's threat; "that this should be done by me because his son will not Marry Mistresse Clifforde, saith his pott Boyles over there." Wentworth to Laud, 18 March 1634, *ibid.* 6 / 36. On 8 August 1634, Wentworth, Ussher, the Archbishops of Dublin and Tuam, the Bishops of Limerick, Kilmore, Raphe and Londonderry along with the Church personnel from St Patrick's and Christchurch cathedrals met at St Patrick's to view the tomb. A letter from the King dated 16 April 1634 asked Wentworth to inquire further into the site of the tomb with the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin and four other bishops of his choice plus the dean and chapter of St Patricks and Christ Church in Dublin. The King noted Wentworth's "care of the well and decent orderinge of any thinge that hath relacon to the

to the south side of the church.<sup>84</sup> However, Cork was left feeling extremely frustrated and humiliated by his treatment at the hands of the new Lord Deputy.

Wentworth aimed to undermine Cork's status and authority with the accusation that he had defrauded the Crown and Church in order to expand his Irish estates. Cork had risen through the Irish ranks from being a minor official and landowner, to becoming one of the most powerful and influential landowners and politicians in Ireland.<sup>85</sup> Radcliffe played an important role in unraveling the legalities of Cork's landownership. But there was also another benefit to investigating Cork's rise to prominence. If Wentworth discovered how best to undermine Cork, he would also expose the weaknesses of the wider New English community. He hoped that if he could understand the motivations and rationale of this section of the Irish community, he might be able to restore the influence and riches of the Church and diminish the standing of the New English.<sup>86</sup>

The Earl of Cork was the most important proprietor in the area of Waterford and Cork. Cork had bought the estate in 1603 from one of the original planters, Sir Walter Raleigh and his purchase included "questionable but nonetheless effective control of the episcopal lands of the diocese of Lismore." He also occupied the Bishop's Palace at Lismore.<sup>87</sup> Wentworth later described Cork's ownership of his misappropriated Church lands as a "finishing of the rotten Sacrilegious foundation, set by S[i]r Walter Rawleygh, who first layd his unhallowed handes upon these Church Possessions."<sup>88</sup> Despite the illegality of the land title, Wentworth admitted that the majority of the blame lay with Raleigh. Cork had purchased the lands from him and therefore did not directly

---

church." Chatsworth House, Lismore Papers vol. 18 / 3, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, p. 39, second series, vol. III, pp. 194 – 195.

<sup>84</sup> Initially however, the tomb appears to have been taken to Youghall to be stored. Clarke describes the tomb being "dismantled stone by stone and packed in boxes." Wentworth informed Laud that the "Lord of Corke carryes indeed his Tombe to Youghall, the place will be well fitted, stored rather for he hath there one already. But, for such a Pious and Bounteous Founder nothing can be too much." Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth,' p. 252. Wentworth to Laud, 18 May 1635, Str. P. 6 / 176 – 177.

<sup>85</sup> Ranger, T.O. 'Richard Boyle and the making of an Irish fortune, 1588 – 1614,' *Irish Historical Studies* 10, no. 39 (1957), p. 257.

<sup>86</sup> *ibid*, pp. 257 – 258.

<sup>87</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 126. For detailed information on how Cork came to own Youghal. see Ranger, 'Richard Boyle and the Making of an Irish Fortune,' pp. 276 – 277. Carte described Cork's lands as a "vast estate" of 42,000 acres. Carte, T. *The Life of James, Duke of Ormonde* (6 vols, Oxford, 1851), vol. I, p. 135.

<sup>88</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 29 January 1634, Str. P. 6 / 10.

misappropriate the land from the Church. More useful to Wentworth's agenda however, was Cork's possession of lands in nearby Cloyne. Here he had obtained a fee farm of the estates and rectories of Youghal collegiate church.<sup>89</sup> As this was a more recent purchase, Wentworth argued that it was "immediatlye of his owne handy worke, And comes closer to his Lo[rdshi]p in point of Crime."<sup>90</sup>

Despite his rather tenuous land ownership rights, Cork did not appear to be under threat from the Church as he could exploit the support of his ecclesiastical kinsmen. The Bishop of Cork, Cloyne and Ross was his kinsman, also named Richard Boyle, and another kinsman Michael Boyle was the Bishop of Waterford and Lismore.<sup>91</sup> Yet by January 1636, the relationship between Cork and the Bishop of Waterford had begun to deteriorate, leaving Cork's church lands with less protection. The Bishop of Waterford and Lismore complained to Laud about Cork's lands in a letter in which he "abuses his cousin fearfully"<sup>92</sup> and this was probably due to the fact that not only had Cork appropriated money from vicarages, he was also taking money from bishoprics.<sup>93</sup> Michael Boyle complained that Cork held diocesan lands amounting to £900 a year and also was on the verge of engulfing Youghal, which returned £700 a year.<sup>94</sup> Michael Boyle meanwhile, despite the potential revenue of the see amounting to £1600 per year, was only in receipt of £50.<sup>95</sup>

In May 1634, Cork was summoned before Wentworth, in the presence of Radcliffe and Wandesford. Wentworth informed Cork of the petition of the Bishops of Cork and Waterford "against me to his Ma[jes]ty about the colledge of yoghall" and

---

<sup>89</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 126.

<sup>90</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 29 January 1634, Str. P. 6 / 11.

<sup>91</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 126.

<sup>92</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 2 January 1636, Str. P. 6 / 311.

<sup>93</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 126.

<sup>94</sup> *ibid*, p. 126. According to Carte, the Earl of Cork was also receiving approximately £2,000 a year in tithes, "which for want of incumbents upon livings, and by the disorder and corruption of the times, he had got into his possession and turned into appropriations." Carte *Life of Ormonde* vol. I, p. 135.

<sup>95</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 126. There had been earlier threats of proceedings against Cork for his possession of Youghal although he was able to deter these actions. In 1627, the Bishop of Cork (Cork's cousin and warden of Youghal) had an attack of conscience and called a meeting with the college fellows. He decided to "prosecute the Rights of the Colledge." In the following August the fellows met with the Earl and the conclusion was "the Earle binds himselfe by solemne oath to pay the warden forty Markes a yeare And to each of the fellows twenty poundes a yeare, soe long as they did not sue him but suffer him quietly to enjoy these landes." However, the circumstances surrounding these complaints were not that Cork should not possess these lands, but rather that he was taking too much money from the College. Wentworth to Laud, 29 January 1633, Str. P. 6 / 11.

stated that the case would begin at Michaelmas.<sup>96</sup> Wentworth's pursuit of Cork's lands quickly caused ripples within the Irish community. George Butler wrote to Sir Gervase Clifton in 25 October 1634, reporting that in Ireland, there was "some unkindness conceived by my Lord of Cork against the Lord Deputy for certain Church lands which his Lordship had called him in question for..."<sup>97</sup> Cork found his "business was debated publicly" in the Privy Council and he complained to Butler that "he had not been used formerly to be called to that place to have his business discussed." Butler had offered to speak to Wentworth on Cork's behalf about this breach of privacy. He met with Wentworth and Radcliffe and presented his concerns. Wentworth became angry and sent for the Lord Treasurer so that Butler could hear about the complaints that had been made against Cork since Wentworth's arrival in Ireland and what Cork's "carriage had been to my Lord Treasurer in every particular..." Butler admitted that he was "very glad my Lord Deputy was able to acquit himself so well..." Wentworth argued that he had always approached Cork with such private matters first and "advised his Lordship to take over privately, for that he conceived if it came to a public hearing it would be less for his honor."<sup>98</sup>

The Earl of Cork was aware that an attack upon his lands was imminent and had written to Lord Clifford to ask if he knew what Wentworth was planning. Clifford reported that he had every confidence in Wentworth and felt that he would "doe nothinge in youre contrarye, but very vnwillingly and vpon constrainte." However, he was aware that Wentworth had to follow that King's orders and therefore might have to pursue policies that he personally did not like.<sup>99</sup> Cork attempted to raise support for his plight

---

<sup>96</sup> Cork's diary, 28 May 1634, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, p. 29.

<sup>97</sup> Butler noted that Wentworth was also proceeding against Lord Clanricarde "and some other lords..." George Butler to Sir Gervase Clifton, 25 October 1634, *HMCVarious Collections VII* p. 292.

<sup>98</sup> *ibid*, p. 293. Wentworth had already questioned Cork about the vicarages that he had taken from the Church and rather than be subjected to humiliation by being judged by the Privy Council, Cork "very piously yealded them up of his owne accorde, saying if they belong to the Church, God forbid, he should w[i]th hold them any longer." Wentworth to Laud, 29 January 1634, Str. P. 6 / 14.

<sup>99</sup> Clifford tried to reassure Cork that "What he shall be commanded by the Higher powers I feare me he will not be able to auoyde, but I hope youe Lordships innocencie and his Justice will free you in these." Clifford admitted that he had written to Wentworth with a "greate deale of freedom (as we allwais vse to doe); but with more at this time to meete with him in his owne stile, which was full of affection and freedom." Clifford had received a letter from Wentworth that informed him of Cork's summons to Castle Chamber but he had "concealed the cause from me; neither can I expecte it, consideringe how he is entrusted in his Majesty's secret counsailes and resolues: onely I doe promis my selfe a greate mesure of

and sent a secretary into England “to sollicite the businesse of his being Called into the Castle Chamber: and to wait upon [Treasurer Portland] to friend him in that businesse....”<sup>100</sup> Wentworth was equally in need of support in England and kept Laud fully informed of the proceedings in order to ensure that his motives were clear to all. These may not have been his true motives, but Wentworth was careful to project virtuous intentions in his correspondence. He professed to Laud that he was pursuing Cork in order to reclaim Church lands that did not rightfully belong to the Earl. Wentworth dramatically described the extent of the misappropriated lands, claiming that the case was brought against him for “noe lesse then the whole Bishoprick of Lismore, And Colledge of Youghall, w[i]th two thowsand pounds a yeare good lands...” Wentworth was keen to impress that he was not taking pleasure from reducing this important figure in Irish politics especially since he was also involved in negotiating a marriage treaty between Cork’s eldest son, Lord Dungarvan and the daughter of Lord Clifford. However, he stated that he could not let this alliance get in the way of his service to God and the King.<sup>101</sup>

Wentworth and his cabal were heavily involved in the drawing up of the Earl of Cork’s will. Primarily, this was due to the fact that the attack upon Cork might have far reaching implications upon Wentworth’s kinsmen, the Clifford family. George Radcliffe wrote to Lord Clifford to reassure him that his daughter “shall neuer be a wantinge: her owne worth and merit, (were all other regardes set aside) would enforce as much from us; as in trueth they doe gaine her much honor and affection from all.”<sup>102</sup> However, Radcliffe was not so favourable towards Cork. He found that Cork’s “disposition and his causes, are such as it is a most difficulte thinge for a man that respects Honor and Justice to keepe but faire quarter w[i]th him.” From a man that was considered to be a legal expert, this derogatory remark would appear to have great authority. Radcliffe protested that he was not willing to trouble Clifford with great detail about Cork’s proceedings but he did add that in Cork’s Star Chamber case concerning the misappropriation of Crown lands

---

equalley from his handes...” Earl of Clifford to Cork, 12 October 1634, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* second series, vol. III, p. 205.

<sup>100</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 26 October 1634, Str. P. 6 / 112.

<sup>101</sup> Wentworth had promised Cork that whilst the marriage treaty was being negotiated with Lord Ranalagh, the Master of the Wards, Christopher Wandesford and George Radcliffe, that he was “in this businesse of the Marriadge, Ministeriall and passiue...” He would not “for this or any other respect, to be declined from the comely and upright wayes of hono[u]r and justice.” Wentworth to Laud, 29 January 1634, *ibid.* 6 / 9.

<sup>102</sup> Radcliffe to Lord Clifford, 10 December 1634, Chatsworth Collection, Bolton Abbey MSS Box II / 153.

“Justice must be done; so my desire is that no such Blemish may fall upon him as might descende unto his posterity.” Radcliffe professed that due to his allegiance to Clifford’s daughter, Lady Dungarvan, “I shalbe euer ready to contribute my best assistance.<sup>103</sup> In December 1634, Radcliffe attempted to settle the agreement which would give Cork’s heir, Lord Dungarvan, £6000 a year “w[i]thout leauinge a power (as now it is) in my lord Treasurer E[arl] of Corke to reuoke it.” Radcliffe had received a copy of “a great conveyance formerly made of all his landes...” But due to its length and his “manefold & much pressinge business in the terme and Parliament tymes; what my lord Chiefe Justice his absence in the vacation,” he had been unable to tackle the project. Also, Radcliffe had found the task to be more complicated than at first sight. He did not know how much the lands that were to be estated were worth, and it was fit that Clifford “should by view or enquiry be satisfyed of that...” Secondly, the title to the land needed to be inquired into “w[hi]ch is not so fitte to be done by me, especially at this tyme,” as the matter was in dispute between the Earl of Cork and the King. Finally, Cork intended Youghal and Lismore to be part of the estate to be passed to his son and Radcliffe thought these to be “the most questionable parts of his estate; & in such sort questionable, as that if my lord Dungaruan haue them not, I thinke all the rest will prosper better.” These lands were also ripe for inquiry by the Commission of Defective Titles.<sup>104</sup> The will took many months to perfect, only coming to a conclusion in February 1636.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> *ibid*, II / 153.

<sup>104</sup> *ibid*, II / 153.

<sup>105</sup> On 22 February 1636, Lord Ranalagh, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and George Radcliffe met with Cork at his home and “held a lardge discourse how to agree vppon the conveighance of my whole estate in Ireland to my Five sons...” Cork appeared to be very disgruntled about the meeting as primarily it was to discover “how to give content to the displeased Lo[rd] deputy and his great favoryte Sir Georg Ratcliff...” In order to please them, Cork found himself “constreyned (over and above what I had articulated with them for)...” He was forced to consent to his son Dungarvan having to pay £10,000 for a marriage portion for his eldest daughter if he died without a male heir, and £5000 for every younger daughter. Cork’s other sons were to pay ‘rents’ to Cork’s principal heir Dungarvan. “Lewis to paie my heir 40 Marks cheef Rent, Roger & Frances 20 a peec cheef Rent.” The will was debated, discussed and drawn up by the Master of the Wards, Lord Chief Justice of the Commons Pleas, Christopher Wandesford, Lord Clifford’s sollicitor and Mr Samedg. Mr Samedg was described as “the councellor that assisted in drawing vp the conveighances for settling the greatest parts of my lands and Inheritance vppon my Five sons.” Christopher Wandesford enrolled the will in his capacity of Master of the Rolls. Cork noted that the “M[aste]r of the Rolles entred the capcon & Recoincon of those 3 deeds and subscribed them to be enrolled.” Cork’s diary, 22 February 1636, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, pp. 161, 187 – 188.

The case against Cork for his possession of Church lands was pursued vigorously. Wentworth presented Cork as a scheming man who had tried to cover up his possession of lands. He accused him of being “the prime mover and actor himself” but had contrived to take “Persons of his Name, blood and Preferring Conspirators w[i]th him...” Wentworth believed that Cork had schemed to gain unlawful oaths “for obscuring the rights of the Church” and had “fraudulently and uniu[st]ly gotten and distayned” the charters for Church lands. Wentworth had a harsh punishment in mind stating that Cork would be “taken flagrance crimine, highly Criminall in the Castle Chamber, finable at least ten thowsand pounds to his Ma[jes]ty.”<sup>106</sup> These were only the preliminary stages in the proceedings, and already Wentworth had decided that Cork was guilty. Wentworth was concerned that his actions were seen as scrupulous and therefore needed a signet from the King to allow the case to proceed legally. He professed to Laud that if the King desired him not to pursue the case further he would stop the proceedings, but “but if in his wisdome he shall direct it to be raualld into, then for manifesting the naked truth, (for as yet we grope but in the darke).”<sup>107</sup> This would also demonstrate to the Irish that Wentworth had the King’s support in the matter.

The proceedings against Cork were outlined in Wentworth’s letter to Laud of 3 June 1634. Cork was accused of gaining a lease from college wardens without seeking the consent of the Fellows and he had taken “into his hands the writeings and Seale under the Pretence of Secureing them for the Colledge...” Youghal was to be the primary focus of the case and although the government was to pursue Cork’s ownership of Lismore as well, that was only “in that only matter of Title, and noe matter of Crime...” Thus Lismore was to be referred to the Commission of Defective Titles rather than be pursued within Star Chamber.<sup>108</sup> Wentworth was keen to maintain Laud’s support in the proceedings against Cork, promising him that he had “noe angles hidd from your Lo[rdshi]p but in all things Proceed w[i]th light and clearnesse.”<sup>109</sup> Laud agreed that the “businesse of Youghall seemes to be extreame foule....” but was glad that Wentworth was not intending to proceed against Cork’s Lismore lands as he agreed that in that “there is

---

<sup>106</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 29 January 1634. Str. P. 6 / 13.

<sup>107</sup> *ibid.*, 6 / 13.

<sup>108</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 3 June 1634. Str.P. 6 / 78.

<sup>109</sup> *ibid.*, 6 / 80.

only matter of Title not Crime.” Laud helped Wentworth by providing relevant documents that might be useful in his proceedings against Cork. He commissioned William Raylton to go to the Tower of London to search for records concerning the title of Lismore and he was enclosing the copies “of all the ratts haue left uneate...”<sup>110</sup>

Cork finally received notice from the clerk of Castle Chamber that a bill had been issued against him on 17 November 1634.<sup>111</sup> This seemed to open the floodgates of petitions against Cork<sup>112</sup> such as the petition of John Norroon regarding tenements in Tallagh, which was referred to Radcliffe and Wandesford for investigation. At the hearing of the case on 24 March 1635, Wandesford pressed for a commission to examine Norroon’s witnesses. Radcliffe would not yield to this and “ordered that yt should be lefte to the common law, by an indifferent Jurie, to be nominated at the table, to be tried at the Barr.” Cork’s son noted in the margin of the diary that this was an injustice to his father, perhaps thinking that a Commission would have treated Cork more favourably.<sup>113</sup>

Wentworth’s treatment of Cork became more hostile as the case progressed. At a Council board meeting on 2 October 1634, Cork presented four letters addressed to himself from Lord Dorchester, Lord Ranalagh, Lord Falkland and Sir William Beecher. Wentworth took the letters, opened them and without asking Cork, read “every one of those 4 letters publicquely” and then refused to return them saying that they were now evidence.<sup>114</sup> Wentworth also kept Cork in the dark for much of the time

---

<sup>110</sup> Laud joked about the state of the documents in the Tower - “Only I wonder what the state meanes to Committ soe many ratts to the Tower, and prouide noe meat for them but records...” Laud to Wentworth, 23 June 1634, *ibid*, 6 / 93, Bliss, *Works of Laud* vol. VI, p. 75.

<sup>111</sup> Cork’s diary, 17 November 1634, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, p. 59.

<sup>112</sup> For example, on 12 February 1635, Cork recorded that Arthur Gwyn had petitioned Wentworth, pretending to be the vicar of three of Cork’s appropriated vicarages in county Tipperary filing a “moste falce and slanderows peticon againste me...” At the Council table on 26 February 1635, it was decided that Cork had been “quietly possessed” of the three vicarages of Ardfynnan, Rathronan and Mortelstown for the past thirty years and therefore Wentworth presented these to Arthur Gwyn. Cork was left with the “Recovery of them by law, so I began my sute within in year.” Gwyn was ordered to provide security that he would pay the profits to Cork if he was successful in recovering the vicarages by law. On 14 March 1635, Cork recorded in his diary that Patrick Sherlock had informed him that Thomas Wentworth had ordered that Cork was dispossessed of the livings that Gwyn had taken from him. He also warned Cork that there were “many more sutes comong againste me...” 12 and 26 February 1635, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 71, 74.

<sup>113</sup> Cork noted in his dairy on 18 November 1636 that after six months prosecution, Wentworth had referred the case to be heard by Radcliffe and Wandesford “who after our learned Councill were fully heard, referred it to a tryall at the Comon Law.” 24 March 1635 and 18 November 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 85 – 86, 212 – 213.

<sup>114</sup> 2 October 1634, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 49 – 50.

about the proceedings against him.<sup>115</sup> Cork appeared to be unaware of when his hearing in the court of Castle Chamber would take place. Radcliffe and Wentworth seem to have deliberately played a game with Cork so that he would be unprepared for his trial. For example, on 20 March 1634, it was rumoured that the trial of Sir Vincent Gookin would take place in Castle Chamber. Yet when the proceedings began, the Attorney General quizzed Cork why he had not brought into the court “thancient evidences and seale belonging to the colledge of yoghall” which he had been ordered to do on the last day of the last term of the court. Although this was the first sitting of the court in the new term, Cork was able “in timely obedience” to present the court with the deeds and seal in a box. Then Cork was ordered to produce further leases and deeds, which he promised to do that evening. Despite Vincent Gookin being rumoured to be tried in Castle Chamber that day, Cork complained: “without any other mocon... it began, & ended in me...”<sup>116</sup>

Wentworth double-crossed Cork time and time again. According to Cork’s diary entry, Wentworth had promised him in October 1635 that when all the witnesses in the case had been examined, Wentworth would provide a “true relacon of the State of the Cawse,” and then allow Cork to attend the King with it. They had agreed that until then, Wentworth would “not putt pen to paper, or wryte any thing to his Ma[jes]ty, or any other,” concerning Cork’s case, and Cork promised in return “to vse the lyke forbearance of writing, or other sollicitacons, which I had performed.”<sup>117</sup> Before a hearing day had been arranged, Wentworth confirmed his agreement with Cork and reassured him that “he had not since wrytten any thing concerning me, or my cawse...” However before they had made their agreement, Wentworth had already written to the King and “had power to proceed, or to stay all further proceeding

---

<sup>115</sup> For example, Cork was not aware why he had been commanded to appear at the Court of Castle Chamber on the first day of the new term. He recorded in his diary on 12 October 1634 that Wentworth stated that he did not know anything about the issue “but signed the Comand upon the motion of his Ma[jes]tys Attorney generall, which being from the Kinge, he neither durste, nor could with safety deny to doe...” Wentworth did however promise to consult with the Attorney General. Two days later, Wentworth visited Cork and declared that he had been unable to find out what the case was about as “it was to be carried with much secrecie, and that all that he had done therin, was written with his owne hand...” If Wentworth insisted on knowing, the Attorney General would be unable to refuse him but Wentworth did “not further desire to be acquainted therwith until it be brought Judicially before me...” yet promised Cork “indifference & Justice when it cam to a heering.” 12 October 1634, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 53 – 54.

<sup>116</sup> 20 March 1635, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 83 – 84.

<sup>117</sup> 5 April 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 174 – 175.

againste me in the starchamber...” Wentworth had now decided to forge ahead with the proceedings against Cork so that he could give the King a full account of the proceedings when Wentworth visited England. Wentworth reassured Cork that he would call a meeting with three of Cork’s friends Lord Ranalagh, Sir William Parsons and Sir Gerard Lowther, with Wandesford and Radcliffe to support himself.

Wentworth promised Cork that “if they all did not make it appeer vnto me that I deserved censure, I should be free.”<sup>118</sup> Wentworth was playing a game with Cork, pretending to be the friend who had been put in an impossible position by his employment and forced to prosecute Cork through Star Chamber. In reality, supported by his legal expert Radcliffe, Wentworth was able to play a clever game, manipulating important figures, professing friendship but in fact undermining their positions to improve the political, financial and religious situation for the Crown.

The proceedings against Cork were slow and cumbersome yet Wentworth was impatient to have “the return on opinions on Sir George Radcliffe’s case and then have at the great house of Lismore. My fingers itch to fetch it back to the church.”<sup>119</sup> However the judges were reticent to declare an opinion on the case as they were concerned about Radcliffe’s “legal ingenuities.” The basis of the case against Cork was Radcliffe’s argument that the Dean and Chapter of Waterford should also have approved the land leases, and therefore Cork’s claim to the Youghal estates was technically invalid.<sup>120</sup> Radcliffe was heavily involved in the preparation of the case against Cork and subjected him to an intensive investigation concerning his land ownership. On 20 May 1635, George Radcliffe went to Cork’s house to arrange a meeting with himself and Sir William Reeves, the Attorney General in the Council Chamber that afternoon. Cork was examined “By their Speciall Comission vpon personall interrogatories” and answered their questions for four hours. On 15 June 1635, he was examined in Sir George Radcliffe’s chamber and on 19 June, the answers to the personal interrogatories were studied and signed by Cork.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> 5 April 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 174 – 175.

<sup>119</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 14 July 1635. Str. P. 6 / 204.

<sup>120</sup> Ranger, T. ‘Strafford in Ireland: A Revaluation,’ in T. Aston, *Crisis in Europe 1560 – 1660* (London, 1965), p. 287.

<sup>121</sup> Cork’s diary, 20 May 1635, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, p. 106.

By October 1635, Cork had been dispossessed of a significant amount of Church livings and lands and Wentworth sent Laud a list which the Earl “hath been forced to restore since my Comeing to the Gouernment.” Wentworth admitted that there was still more work to do. Although they had retrieved Church livings from Cork these were “the least God knowes that hee hath usurped from the Church, but they are in a good way to follow speedily...”<sup>122</sup> Cork did feel that he was being treated very unfairly in these proceedings and this was just exacerbated by Wentworth’s alteration of the precedence of the procession into the Exchequer.<sup>123</sup>

It was unclear whether Cork would press for a private hearing, yet Wentworth was so anxious to conclude the case that he had decided to publish and grant a day for Cork’s hearing. A new angle of the prosecution was now revealed; if Wentworth was able to find Cork “Censurable for the Forgery” of the deeds to Youghal, a part of the case presumably being worked on by Radcliffe, Wentworth would proceed to a public hearing. If a private hearing was resolved upon, Wentworth intended to punish Cork with a £10,000 fine, the “whole Restitution of Youghall” and a humble acknowledgement of the King’s grace towards him. If Cork was unwilling to co-operate with a private hearing, Wentworth intended to “goe on roundly and speedily to Sentence where I am most Certaine the world cannot defend him.”<sup>124</sup>

Wentworth chose Radcliffe and Wandesford to support him in the prosecution of Cork. Along with Cork’s nominees, Radcliffe and Wandesford held a “private meeting in the castle” concerning Cork’s case. This debate continued for five hours and it was resolved that Cork should have until 27 April 1636 to decide how he would like the government to proceed against him in the reclamation of the Crown lands. If Cork had not made his mind up by then, the case was to be heard publicly in Castle Chamber.<sup>125</sup> On the assigned day, Cork met with Wentworth on the terrace of Dublin Castle to discuss his decision. Cork had decided to “wholy submitt my selfe, and cawse, to his Lo[rds]hips

---

<sup>122</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 4 October 1635, Str. P. 6 / 247.

<sup>123</sup> Cork protested in his diary that he as Lord Treasurer and “all my predecessors had ever had the precedence of the Chancellor of the exchequer within the verge of the Court,” and yet now Wentworth gave the precedence to the new Chancellor Sir Robert Meredith. Cork’s diary, 18 November 1635, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, p. 135.

<sup>124</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 9 March 1635, Str. P. 6 / 331.

<sup>125</sup> Cork’s diary, 25 April 1636, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, p. 179.

own doom...”<sup>126</sup> Wentworth had a further conference with Lord Ranelagh the following day after which Ranelagh reported to Cork that Wentworth would fine him £15,000 for the lost profits of Youghal and would then present a suite to the King that Cork would be allowed to retain “the colledg howse, gardens, and grownds to me, and my heires for ever.”<sup>127</sup> After considering whom the judges in the case would be, knowing that Wentworth would be bound to nominate men who would support the government, Cork decided to offer Wentworth a settlement. He sent his son Lord Dungarvan with an offer of £10,000, to be raised to £15,000 if this first offer was rejected. However, both of these offers were “reiected and despised”<sup>128</sup> and therefore the case was finally to be heard on 2 May 1636. After Cork’s private discussions with Wentworth in which he had explained his defence, Cork realised that he had effectively prepared his own prosecution “for the moste advantageous streignes againste me, whose ruyn they maynlie endeavour.”<sup>129</sup> On the advice of his best friends and his son, Cork finally resolved to pay Wentworth £15,000 sterling rather than allowing the case to go to a public hearing.<sup>130</sup> The Master of the Wards, Sir Adam Loftus and George Radcliffe spent half an hour in private debate with Wentworth before calling Cork before them.<sup>131</sup> Cork agreed to pay the King in a pre-trial deal £5000 up front, £5000 in the summer of 1637 and a final payment of £5000 in the summer of 1638. This was despite his “Innocencie and Integretie” which Cork professed in his diary was “as cleer as the son at high noon...” Clearly Cork identified Radcliffe as Wentworth’s right-hand man in the case against him, asking God to forgive

---

<sup>126</sup> Wentworth had after all promised to “deale nobly in the conclusion with mee, & as he had protested, prove my best Frend in the shutting vp of this matter.” 27 April 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 179 – 180.

<sup>127</sup> 28 April 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, p. 181. Wentworth had assured Cork that he would procure a grant from the King allowing Cork to retain parts of the Youghal estate but after a series of meetings with his secretaries who did not have the letters from the King, Cork was forced to ask Wentworth when they came to perfect the surrender of the college on 27 June 1637, where the letters were. Cork recorded Wentworth’s words in full: “The Kings lettres I promised your Lo[rdshi]p is either myslayed or forgotten, but I doe promise your L[ordshi]p vppon my Faith and honnor that if Councell draw vp such a warrant for passing the colledg house and gardens, and the tenements and ploughland thervnto belonging,” he would send the letter to the King in order to gain Cork a patent for the house without rent and for the land at the rent it was worth. The patent still had not been procured by 1639 when Wentworth was to return to England, but Wentworth promised to procure it whilst he was away. He also gave Cork permission to be absent from the Irish Parliament of 1640 as long as “I gave my proxie to thearle of Ormonde: which I promised to doe.” 27 June 1637, 31 December 1639, *ibid*, first series, vol. V, pp. 15 – 16, 119 – 120.

<sup>128</sup> 29 April 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, p. 182.

<sup>129</sup> *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, p. 182.

<sup>130</sup> 30 April 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, p. 183.

<sup>131</sup> 2 May 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, p. 184.

the Lord Deputy and “his great councellor, Sir Georg Ratcliff...”<sup>132</sup> Radcliffe played an integral part in the formation and application of the legal accusations against Cork. After this settlement was agreed, Wentworth proposed that all the records and proceedings in this case against Cork should be “taken from the Fyle, & be dampned, that neither me self, nor any of my posteretye should heerafter be blemished thereby...” However, Cork disagreed and this suggests that Wentworth and Radcliffe had more to hide in their proceedings against the Earl of Cork than the accused.<sup>133</sup>

The case against Cork is one of the most important examples of Wentworth’s attacks on notable Irish figures in this study due to the abundance of information that indicates cabal involvement in the proceedings. Although this evidence is still limited,<sup>134</sup> we have seen clear examples of Radcliffe’s legal proceedings, especially in his research of the legal titles to Cork’s lands. However, there were other Irish figures that received similar, if less high-profile treatment from Wentworth’s administration and we should briefly examine these to discover how far cabal involvement can be determined.

### **The involvement of the cabal in proceedings against Irish figures**

Radcliffe was involved in another dispute that involved Cork, but this time he was the victim of an attempt to cheat him. Richard Blacknoll was a key figure in Cork’s iron business but a dispute broke out between them when it was discovered that he had attempted to siphon off profits and steal lands from Cork.<sup>135</sup> Cork began legal proceedings against Blacknoll in the attempt to get his money back, but Blacknoll died in 1635 leaving his wife to inherit the lawsuit.<sup>136</sup> The case against the Blacknoll family continued but Wentworth cannot be seen as a very impartial judge as both he and Radcliffe were also victims of Blacknoll’s scheming.<sup>137</sup> Radcliffe became

---

<sup>132</sup> *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 184 – 185.

<sup>133</sup> Cork thought that “if the whole proceedings, proofes, and examinacons of witnesses be kept of Recorde together, the whole matter will iustefie me, and in after tymes testifie my sufferings, and vppon what proofes it was don.” 2 May 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, p. 185.

<sup>134</sup> Indeed Osborough indicates that Irish legal reporting is very limited until the nineteenth century. Osborough, W.N. ‘Mysteries and solutions: experiencing Irish legal history,’ in Greer, D. & Dawson, N. *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History* (Dublin, 2001), p. 228.

<sup>135</sup> Townshend, D. *The Life and Letters of the Great Earl of Cork* (London, 1904), p. 103.

<sup>136</sup> *ibid*, p. 104.

<sup>137</sup> Townshend notes that Blacknoll defrauded Wentworth and Radcliffe of £400 each. *ibid*, p. 241. Cork reported that Wentworth had told him that “Blacknal had defrauded him of 400*li*, and the M[aste]r of the

involved with the Blacknoll case very early on in his Irish career. On 5 August 1633, Cork recorded in his diary that Radcliffe had read the chancery pleading in the case between himself and Blacknoll. Radcliffe had visited Cork to collect the certificate and receipt showing Cork's payment of £3,600 "to stock my new work" and the audits which demonstrated that Blacknoll owed him £7,000. Cork hoped that Radcliffe would show these documents to Wentworth.<sup>138</sup>

The suit between Cork and Blacknoll's widow dragged on for many months.<sup>139</sup> The case was initially heard on 5 June 1635. The hearing got off to a false start with Cork's lawyer, Mr Sambedge, stating that the case could not be heard as Blacknoll was deceased. Wentworth postponed the hearing again but did not wish to let the case drop altogether as he too had been affected by Blacknoll. Finally Wentworth, the Lord Chancellor, the Master of the Wards, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Lord Chief Baron, Christopher Wandesford and George Radcliffe spent two days hearing the case in the gallery of Dublin Castle. The details of the case filled 1500 sheets of paper yet Wentworth was determined to hear the case that day. However, it was eventually decided that a further hearing would have to take place at a later date.<sup>140</sup> This case is intriguing as Radcliffe and Wentworth had themselves been embroiled in the intrigue surrounding Blacknoll's misdemeanours, and yet they were still involved in the pursuit of the case. They could not possibly have been impartial in this matter.

The attack upon Francis Annesley, Lord Mountnorris can also reveal the extent of cabal involvement in high profile cases. Radcliffe and Wandesford played a limited role in this attack, mainly participating within their capacity as members of the Privy Council. Wentworth and Mountnorris had originally been close allies in the government of Ireland, but by 1635 their relationship had begun to deteriorate.

---

Rolles & Sir G[e]o[rge] Ratcliff of as much more." Radcliffe had revealed to Cork that he had paid Blacknoll £50 and then a further £20 "for the luke land man, which the L[ord] Mountnorres is engaged to repaie him." Cork's diary, 5 August 1633, 27 May 1635, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. III, p. 204, first series, vol. IV, p. 110.

<sup>138</sup> Cork's diary, 5 August 1633, *ibid*, first series, vol. III, p. 204.

<sup>139</sup> The case was initially to be heard on 7 April 1635 but was delayed until 12 May when it was put off again. This pattern of cancellation continued, the case being appointed to be heard on 3 June, 5 June, 3 November and 7 December 1635. *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, pp. 88, 102, 107, 109 – 110, 133, 139.

<sup>140</sup> 2 July 1634, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, p. 35.

Mountnorris had become too powerful in the financial sphere as we have seen in Chapter 6 and held a substantial share in the customs farm in Ireland.<sup>141</sup> Mountnorris had good connections within both the Irish and English courts and therefore it was difficult for Wentworth to undermine him outright.<sup>142</sup> However, Mountnorris made an error that enabled Wentworth to get the better of him. Mountnorris' brother, a lieutenant in the army, had misbehaved in front of Wentworth at a review of the militia. Wentworth reprimanded him but when he turned to walk away, the lieutenant made a gesture at Wentworth, which he caught out of the corner of his eye. Wentworth punished him by striking him with his cane. This provoked another kinsman of Mountnorris, an attendant to Wentworth, to deliberately drop a stool on his inflamed and gout-ridden foot.<sup>143</sup> Mountnorris had bragged at a dinner party hosted by the Lord Chancellor that his kinsman had deliberately dropped the stool on Wentworth's foot and that his brother should have stabbed the Lord Deputy for his treatment of him.<sup>144</sup> In revenge, Wentworth informed the King that the Vice-Treasurer was misappropriating funds from the exchequer by taking 6 pence of every pound issue as a levy for himself and allowing (and actively encouraging) his servants to accept bribes before allowing payments to be issued.<sup>145</sup> As a back-up plan to remove Mountnorris, Wentworth asked for the King's permission to summon him to a court martial for the treasonous words he had spoken at the dinner party.<sup>146</sup> The King agreed to Wentworth's request.

Initially, Mountnorris seemed unaware of Wentworth's plot against him. He had written to the King in November 1635 declaring that Wentworth was cheating the King out of customs money, and if the King allowed him to come to England, Mountnorris would be able to offer him a better and more profitable deal.<sup>147</sup> Wentworth must have been aware of this, because rather than waiting for the

---

<sup>141</sup> Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth,' p. 252.

<sup>142</sup> Wedgwood, C.V. *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford: A Revaluation* (London, 1961), p. 197.

<sup>143</sup> *ibid*, pp. 198 – 199. Even the sentence of the Council of War mentioned this incident with the stool as the beginning of the dispute as it provoked Mountnorris' treasonous speech at the Lord Chancellor's dinner table. 'Copy of the sentence of the council of war pronounced against Mountnorris,' 12 December 1635, Chatsworth House, Lismore Papers, vol. 18 / 107.

<sup>144</sup> *CSPI 1633 – 47*, pp. 107 – 108, Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 199.

<sup>145</sup> *ibid*, p. 199.

<sup>146</sup> *ibid*, p. 199.

<sup>147</sup> *Clarendon State Papers* I, pp. 449, 554 in *ibid*, p. 200.

continued investigations into the allegations against the Vice-Treasurer's dealings. he issued the secret court martial against Mountnorris who was genuinely shocked and surprised at the accusation levied against him. Wentworth could not risk the disaffected Mountnorris going to England to spread rumours of financial mismanagement in the customs farm.<sup>148</sup> After only an hour-long discussion, the Vice Treasurer was found guilty of treason against the Lord Deputy. Thus Wentworth achieved his aim of retaining Mountnorris in Ireland by imprisoning him until he admitted guilt and secondly removing Mountnorris from his offices as he was under a death sentence for treason.<sup>149</sup> The sentence against Mountnorris was never actually carried out but Wentworth had achieved his aim. The investigation into the Vice Treasurer's misdemeanours whilst in office proceeded. The allegations brought before the Irish Privy Council stated that Mountnorris had "misbehaved... and carried himself corruptly in his office."<sup>150</sup> The Privy Council found the accusations to be true and officially dismissed him from office and the Privy Council.<sup>151</sup> Mountnorris languished in prison for nearly two years as he refused to admit his guilt.<sup>152</sup> So what, if any, involvement did the cabal have in the removal of another high profile member of the Irish administration? Again, detailed information is very limited although we can rationally assume that Radcliffe would have had some legal advisory contribution to give to Wentworth in support of his actions. A draft of a letter exists from Sir Arthur Ingram to Robert Cogan complaining that Mountnorris had been treated badly and commissioning Mr Radcliffe to examine the matter further, although this letter appears to be from around 1632, and therefore it almost certainly refers to an early issue

---

<sup>148</sup> *ibid*, p. 200.

<sup>149</sup> *ibid*, pp. 200 – 201. Whilst Wandesford was acting as Wentworth's deputy whilst he was in England, Wentworth wrote to Wandesford on 25 July 1636 stating that he had heard that Mountnorris had asked the King for permission to come to England. Wentworth ordered Wandesford "not at any rate let him come over: His Majesty has given me Direction for proceeding to Sentence against him, but that must be respited till my coming." Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols, London, 1739). vol. II, p. 15.

<sup>150</sup> Cork's diary, 9 February 1636, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, p. 155.

<sup>151</sup> He was replaced by Sir Adam Loftus who received the £55,500 from the Treasury accounts from Mountnorris. Cork's diary, 9 February 1636, *ibid*, first series, vol. IV, p. 155.

<sup>152</sup> Little, P. 'Select document: Providence and prosperity: a letter from Lord Mountnorris to his daughter, 1642,' *Irish Historical Studies* 32, no. 128 (2001), p. 556.

concerning the Irish customs farm.<sup>153</sup> The evidence for Radcliffe and Wandesford's role in the trial of Mountnorris is in their official capacities as Privy Councillors. Thus they both signed, along with Philip Mainwaring and other Privy Councillors, the order that Mountnorris was to deliver the Great Seal of Ireland to the Council Board.<sup>154</sup> By June 1638, Mountnorris was still refusing to give up the seal and Wentworth was forced to allow him to travel to England to appeal to the King "in the particular case of not delivering up the Seal without special warrant..." The King requested that Wentworth and the Privy Council also "send over some person well instructed in the matters his Lordship is charged with." Wentworth and the Council nominated to "dispatch over Sir George Radcliffe to attend his Majesty's pleasure to the intent we might by him humbly crave to know upon what grounds the Lord Chancellor sets this appeal..." Radcliffe would have been able to fulfil these functions, having had involvement in the case and legal knowledge to support the actions of the government against Mountnorris. Wentworth also trusted Radcliffe to convey the reasons for Mountnorris' appeal back to Ireland "so we may understand what remains for us to prove or what to offer by way of answer and defence of our own just dealings in all now depending before us..."<sup>155</sup> The Privy Council nominated Radcliffe to ask the King that Mountnorris' case be heard in Ireland "without prejudice of the parties interested or diminishing the honour of Deputy and Council." They were clearly concerned that Mountnorris' appeal to Charles I in England would lead to disparaging rumours being spread about Wentworth, and might also open the floodgates of other Irish appeals to English jurisdiction in order to override the Irish legal system.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> Sir Arthur Ingram to Robert Cogan, undated but probably c. 1632, Leeds District Archives, TN / PO 7 II 10. As Radcliffe was knighted in 1633, this provides further evidence to suggest that this letter was written prior to summer 1633 as it refers to Mr Radcliffe. By 1632, Mountnorris' action within the customs farm was already generating unfavourable criticism. The Earl of Cork complained to Sir Arthur Ingram in a letter dated 13 October 1632 that Mountnorris "expresses himself with a very high hand in the matter of the Customes, doing, and undoing, what is most agreeable to his own will and pleasure." Earl of Cork to Sir Arthur Ingram, 13 October 1632, *ibid*, TN / PO 7 II 9.

<sup>154</sup> Order from Wentworth and the Irish Privy Council that Mountnorris deliver up the Great Seal, 20 April 1638, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 256, 85.

<sup>155</sup> Wentworth and the Irish Privy Council to Secretary Coke, *HMC Various Collections III* pp. 177 – 178.

<sup>156</sup> The Privy Councillors requested that Mountnorris should be ordered to write his objections to the "injustice or irregularities of any our proceedings, and likewise his Lordship's objections against all or any of us, and so delivered to Sir George Radcliffe for us, to the intent the more speedily to apply ourselves to his Majesty's full satisfaction..." Wentworth and the Irish Privy Council to Secretary Coke, *ibid*, pp. 181 - 182.

Wentworth appears to have systematically tackled key Irish figures in order to improve the system of government in Ireland and to bolster his own position and authority. Radcliffe was certainly involved in the background of such attacks. The attacks upon Lord Wilmot<sup>157</sup> and the Earl of St Albans whom Wentworth described as “the Spirit that moues and troubles these waters,”<sup>158</sup> must have been considered by the cabal, as were the proceedings against Lord Chancellor Loftus. Wedgwood wrote that Wentworth had been “building up” to a battle with Loftus since his arrival in Ireland. Loftus was known to be corrupt and dishonest and had continuously abused his position of power.<sup>159</sup> Loftus was prosecuted for “divers irregularities in the execution of his place, divers oppressions of the subject, and undue application and wresting of decrees in Chancery and Castle Chamber.”<sup>160</sup> Loftus appealed to the King but was removed from the post of Chancellor and replaced by Bolton, the Chief Baron, whose post was filled by Sir Gerard Lowther.<sup>161</sup>

Wentworth also faced other challenges, which although from seemingly minor figures, did rattle the security of his government in Ireland, such as the case of Sir Piers Crosby. Under these circumstances, he would have turned to Sir George Radcliffe for both legal advice and support. Crosby had been made a Privy Councillor<sup>162</sup> but as a punishment for his demonstration against the administration in the Parliament of 1634 – 35 when Wentworth revealed that he would not grant the

---

<sup>157</sup> Cork was forced to sign the command for Wilmot to appear before Castle Chamber as when it was brought to him, nine others had already subscribed to the command. Cork clearly did not wish to further aggravate the wrath of Wentworth. 20 April 1635, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, p. 95. Wilmot was smarting at having to give up Crown lands, and especially as Wentworth insisted that the people who had brought lands from him without knowing that Wilmot had taken them from the Crown, were to be refunded. See Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* pp. 170, 185, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. I, pp. 399, 496.

<sup>158</sup> Wentworth disliked St Albans but knew that it would be difficult to undermine him as Cottington and Arundel were his close friends and therefore he could not “aggrauate any thing in Publicke against him.” Yet although removing him from government “would neither Satisfie a Malice nor inlardge the least power in me... I doe iudge it would be of more aduantage to the Crowne then any one Such thing that Could be done in the whole Kingdome...” Wentworth supported his statement by declaring that he was not the only one who felt this way and it is tempting to speculate that it may have been Radcliffe and/or Wandesford that he was referring to. Wentworth also acknowledged that St Albans’ “Seruices to the Crowne being a Protestant must be remembred” reminding us that Wentworth was aware that he had to play a careful balancing game between the Catholic and Protestant parties in Ireland. Wentworth to Laud, 14 October 1635, Str. P. 6 / 249 – 250.

<sup>159</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 239.

<sup>160</sup> *HMC Various Collections III* p. 179.

<sup>161</sup> Ball, F.E. *The Judges in Ireland, 1221 – 1921* (Dublin, 1993), vol. I, pp. 255 – 256.

<sup>162</sup> Clarke, ‘The Government of Wentworth,’ p. 250.

Graces, was summarily removed from the Council.<sup>163</sup> On 11 February 1635, Philip Mainwaring, Colonel Farrar and the sergeant-at-arms and constable of Dublin Castle, arrested Crosby, seising his papers and imprisoning him in Dublin Castle.<sup>164</sup>

Wentworth informed the King of Crosby's actions but neglected to mention that he had already been imprisoned for eighteen days. The King decided that Crosby should face a trial in Castle Chamber.<sup>165</sup> But as the case against Crosby in the Court of Castle Chamber developed, he was not only accused of creating a scandal against the Irish government, he now found himself accused of conspiracy to bribe Mrs Esmond into partaking in an attack on Wentworth.<sup>166</sup> Mrs Esmond was the wife of the deceased Robert Esmond, a ship's captain from Wexford. He had been imprisoned by Wentworth but died shortly after his release. Rumours developed that Esmond had died after being beaten by the Lord Deputy. Crosby was involved in a plot to encourage Mrs Esmond to make a formal complaint to the king regarding the treatment of her husband.<sup>167</sup> The case came before the Court of Castle Chamber and it is for Philip Mainwaring's involvement that this trial is particularly relevant to this thesis. Mainwaring was involved as a witness in the Star Chamber case, which became so high profile that it actually threatened Wentworth's career. William Atkins, the keeper of Dublin castle, declared that he had seen Wentworth beating Esmond with a cane. Mainwaring produced and identified the cane in court and swore that it was not used.<sup>168</sup> Despite Crosby and others best efforts to bribe Mrs Esmond, she defended Wentworth along with the doctor and apothecary, stating that Esmond had died of

---

<sup>163</sup> *ibid*, p. 250. For full details of Crosby's actions, see Clarke, A. 'Sir Piers Crosby, 1590 – 1646: Wentworth's "tawney ribbon,"' *Irish Historical Studies* 26 (1988), pp. 142 – 143.

<sup>164</sup> Cork's diary, 11 February 1635, Boyle, R. *The Lismore Papers* first series, vol. IV, p. 71.

<sup>165</sup> Clarke, 'The Government of Wentworth,' p. 250. Crosby did gain his revenge on Wentworth in his proceedings in the plantation of Galway. When the protestors against the plantation lost the Earl of Clanricarde, they "found an alternative patron in Sir Piers Crosby." Although the petitioners against the plantation of Connaght found that their efforts came to nothing, Crosby now allied himself with men who disliked Wentworth's customs farm in an attempt to discredit the Lord Deputy. This plot did not succeed: Wentworth court martialled Mountrorris and the threat of an attack on the customs farm diminished. Clarke, A. 'Sir Piers Crosby, 1590 – 1646: Wentworth's "tawney ribbon,"' *Irish Historical Studies* 26 (1988), p. 144.

<sup>166</sup> *ibid*, p. 145.

<sup>167</sup> *ibid*, p. 145.

<sup>168</sup> The cane in question was produced in Court and it was stated that "Sir Philip Mainwaring swears it was not used." Star Chamber case, 17 May 1639, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* p. 215.

consumption.<sup>169</sup> This was an attempt to discredit Wentworth's reputation and honour that ultimately failed, as the evidence against Wentworth was restricted to rumours and intrigue.

Although Radcliffe's involvement in these legal disputes is often elusive, he probably worked in the background, advising Wentworth and researching the cases for him. As Lord Deputy, Wentworth would have used his personal authority to launch the attack himself. However, Radcliffe's involvement with the Irish judges has been illuminated thanks to Kenny's research into the role of the King's Inns of Court in Dublin. By 1629, the role of the King's Inn in Ireland had become more prominent in "supervising professional conduct" especially since Catholic lawyers had been admitted to practice under the Graces of 1628.<sup>170</sup> Radcliffe certainly had much contact with the King's Inn and even had chambers appointed there for his use.<sup>171</sup> Wentworth wished to reform the justice system in Ireland and launched a commission in 1635 to inquire into the fees charged by judges and court officers. In general, Wentworth disliked lawyers who he believed had a tendency to obstruct the King's policies. Instead, he "favoured a coterie of judges who assisted him in expanding prerogative jurisdictions at the expense of the ordinary courts."<sup>172</sup> Wentworth was however concerned that even judges had personal interests, which would prevent them from administering fair justice. He admitted to Secretary Coke; "all the judges bend themselves to pronounce that for law which makes for the securing of the subject's estate wherein they have so full an interest."<sup>173</sup> However, Wentworth was able to manipulate the judiciary to his own ends, mainly by inserting new members onto the judges' bench, much in the same way as he had altered the membership of the Privy Council by introducing his supporters there. Wentworth issued the King's Inn to new trustees in 1638, and each of these men was closely tied to Wentworth's interests. Lord Chancellor Loftus was removed from the membership, and replaced by Vice Treasurer and Receiver General Sir Adam Loftus, Chief Justice Shurley who had proven to be supportive of Wentworth's administration,

---

<sup>169</sup> *ibid*, p. 215. The details of the case are found in full in "Strafford and Mountnorris," P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 217, 15.

<sup>170</sup> Kenny, C. *King's Inns and the Kingdom of Ireland. The Irish 'Inn of Court' 1541 – 1800* (Dublin, 1992), p. 101.

<sup>171</sup> *ibid*, p. 109.

<sup>172</sup> *ibid*, p. 103.

<sup>173</sup> Wentworth to Coke, 7 December 1633 in *ibid*, p. 106.

the Master of the Courts Sir William Parsons, the Chief Justice of the Commons Pleas Sir Gerard Lowther, the Chief Baron of the Exchequer Sir Richard Bolton, the new Chancellor of the Exchequer who had replaced Mountnorris Sir Robert Meredith, as well as Christopher Wandesford and George Radcliffe.<sup>174</sup> Radcliffe was included “discreetly” into this esteemed membership, as he was not even there in the capacity of a recognised government official.<sup>175</sup>

Radcliffe’s intensive legal involvement in Wentworth’s administration is identified by Kenny as a motivating reason behind the Irish House of Commons’ attempt to impeach him, along with Lowther and Bolton who were all active members of the Commission of Defective Titles.<sup>176</sup> Throughout the 1630s, the Vice Treasurer and Chancellor of the Exchequer, along with Radcliffe, had important roles within the legal sphere of the Privy Council and the Court of Castle Chamber. These “extraordinary tribunals” seemed to threaten Wentworth’s opponents more than any other activity. These men were central to the “quorum” of the Privy Council’s Castle Chamber court and in 1641 it was declared that the tribunal “could not well sit without the lord chancellor, the lord Lowther, the principal secretary [George Radcliffe] and vice-treasurer.”<sup>177</sup> Although later Radcliffe’s involvement with the Irish judges would play an important part in his downfall, having him on the Irish judiciary supporting Wentworth’s policies would have enabled Wentworth to feel secure in the knowledge that his legal interests would be protected.

## Conclusion

Wentworth juggled the problems of limited trustworthy personnel with the need to attend to numerous policy issues that often involved difficult decision-making. In Ireland, his policies would not please everybody and often Wentworth found himself enforcing one policy at the expense of the support of an important section of Irish community. Wentworth also had to be careful that policies such as the pursuit of

---

<sup>174</sup> These were also joined by five lesser judges and four law officers. *ibid*, pp. 108 – 109.

<sup>175</sup> However, Kenny recognised Radcliffe’s qualification to the post as Thomas Wentworth’s “principal adviser in all legal matters and a bencher of Gray’s Inn.” He also points out that it was Radcliffe who had been responsible for the legal attacks on the Earl of Cork’s titles. *ibid*, p. 109.

<sup>176</sup> *ibid*, p. 109.

<sup>177</sup> Barry’s ‘Case upon the commission of defective title.’ reveals on the final unpaginated page that Radcliffe signed an order of the council board along with the judges. *ibid*, p. 110.

important Irish noblemen, was not misconstrued in England.<sup>178</sup> The enormity and difficulty of Wentworth's task in Ireland was recognised by some in England. Laud informed Wentworth that he had informed the King in private about the state of Ireland. The King acknowledged that Wentworth was performing "excellent Service; And added w[i]th all that besides your other abilities, you were a maruaylous industriouse man, to Carry soe many things together in such a way..."<sup>179</sup> Wentworth did indeed work extremely hard, often at the expense of his health but he could never have physically carried out all of his policies personally. At some point, he had to delegate to men he could trust and much of their work was carried out behind the scenes and therefore generated little praise from above. Radcliffe and Wandesford were obviously highly trusted men within Irish government and acted as policy advisors, as well as actually carrying out work personally. Radcliffe and Wandesford have not often been praised for the work that they performed, as Wentworth was the front man for the policies they carried out, and therefore he is usually rewarded with all the credit. However, as will become apparent in Chapter 8, criticisms are also levied against the spokesman of any policy, and therefore when Wentworth's regime began to disintegrate, he was also the most obvious target for his critics.

---

<sup>178</sup> When visiting England in 1636, he was sure to acknowledge to the King that although his proceedings against the Earl of St Albans, Wilmot, Mountnorris, Sir Piers Crosby and the Galway jury had been presented by his enemies as a example of "a severe and austere hard-conditioned man, rather indeed a Basha of Buda, than a Minister of a pious and Christian King," it was "the Necessity of his Majesty's Service, which inforced me into a seeming Strictness outwardly." Wentworth argued that "I knew no other Rule to govern by, but by Reward and Punishment... where I found a Person well and intirely set for the Service of my Master, I should lay my Hand under his Foot, and add to his Respect and Power all I might, or sooth him in his untoward Humour, but if he camein my Reach, so far as Honour and Justice would warrant me, I must knock him soundly over the Knuckles, but no sooner he become a new Man... I also change my Temper, and express myself to him, as unto that other, by all the good Offices I could do him." Wentworth to Wandesford, 25 July 1636, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, pp. 20, 21.

<sup>179</sup> Laud to Wentworth, 12 January 1635, Str. P. 6 / 136.

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

The reaction to Wentworth's rule in Ireland might be seen as a build-up of tension that was allowed to explode once Thomas Wentworth was removed to England to help the King in his fight against the Scots. However, as Wentworth's policies had continued in the same vein as many of his predecessors' administrations, we cannot blame him for the discontent. The causes of the collapse of the Wentworth's Irish administration have been subject to endless debate, but the outcome is nevertheless apparent. The Irish Parliament of 1640 undoubtedly exerted their authority, over whom Christopher Wandesford struggled to maintain control in Wentworth's absence. Once the attack upon Wentworth's administration began, events accelerated rapidly, culminating in impeachment proceedings against the key participants in Wentworth's regime and ultimately the Attainder against Wentworth and his execution in May 1641.<sup>1</sup>

### **The role of the cabal in Wentworth's absence**

Throughout his Lord Deputyship in Ireland, Wentworth had been careful to present himself as a tireless worker for the King's benefit. He was careful to maintain the image that his efforts were yielding successes for the Crown, both in terms of profit and subjecting the Irish subjects to law and civility. Members of the cabal played a key role in perpetuating Wentworth's image as a successful Lord Deputy. For example, Christopher Wandesford informed Sir Gervase Clifton that he would "heare howe my Lord Deputy prospereth still in all his undertakings for his ma[jes]ty w[i]th much advantage to the crowne..." Wandesford dismissed rumours that the Irish population cursed Wentworth. In fact, he argued, the Irish were "nowe not contented

---

<sup>1</sup> For detailed information of Wentworth's impeachment, attainder and execution see Wedgwood, C.V. *Thomas Wentworth* (London, 1961), pp. 310 – 379 and Kearney, H. *Strafford in Ireland* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 199 – 208. For the constitutional and legal implications, see Timmis, J.H. 'The Basis of the Lords' Decision in the Trial of Strafford: Contravention of the Two-Witness Rule,' *Albion* 8, no. 4 (1976), pp. 311 – 19 and Russell, C. 'The Theory of Treason in the Trial of Strafford,' *English Historical Review* 80 (1965), pp. 30 – 50. For a contemporary perspective, John Rushworth's *The Tryal of Thomas, Earl of Strafford* (London, 1680) gives the most detailed account. For an analysis of Rushworth's version of events see Cope, E.S. 'John Rushworth and the Short Parliament of 1640,' *Institute of Historical Research Bulletin* 51 (1978), pp. 94 – 98. Radcliffe's impeachment trial will be the focus of this chapter and Wentworth's trial will only be considered in comparison to Radcliffe's, as the historiography is detailed in the examination of Wentworth's trial, but practically non-existent in an examination of the reasons for and implications of Radcliffe's impeachment.

w[i]th his justice but they expect further helpes of profitt and benifitt by his indeavors for them.”<sup>2</sup>

Wentworth worked so tirelessly in Ireland that his health suffered. His friends constantly expressed fears that he was working too hard for the good of the Crown and the Irish people, at the expense of his own health. Wandesford was concerned that Wentworth’s “excessiue care and labor will (I am afrayde) not suffer his l[ordshi]p long to contineue so, for his health and the ease of himself is the least thing he thinks of...”<sup>3</sup> It was of course in Wentworth and the cabal’s interest to demonstrate that Wentworth was selfless in his approach to Irish government, but we do know that during this time, Wentworth suffered terribly from gout and this was undoubtedly exacerbated by over-work.<sup>4</sup> Wentworth and his cabal used their acquaintances and friends to spread the news of their successes in Ireland. This was essential as they were well aware that their positions could easily be undermined if they did not present an ideal of a strong, honest and hardworking regime to England. However, despite their efforts, the Irish administration was being undermined and in the late 1630s, culminated in the demise of Wentworth and his cabal.

Although there were rumblings of discontent from various quarters within Ireland throughout his Lord Deputyship, on the whole, Wentworth had been able to enforce the laws he wanted and to increase Crown profits from Ireland. Therefore he had fulfilled the objectives he was set by the King on taking up his position. However, towards the end of the 1630s, Wentworth’s hold over Ireland began to be threatened, not only by internal politics, but by external events as well. Charles I recalled Wentworth to England in 1639, seeing him as his only hope of resolving the situation in Scotland, where the Bishops’ Wars were proving to be impossible to quash. Wentworth chose Christopher Wandesford to be his deputy in Ireland during his absence. Unfortunately whilst Wentworth was away, the system began to unravel.

---

<sup>2</sup> Wandesford to Sir Gervase Clifton, 20 August 1635, Nottingham University Library, Cl. C. 473.

<sup>3</sup> Wandesford to Clifton, 22 February 1637, *ibid*, Cl. C. 475. On another occasion, Wandesford reported to Sir Gervase Clifton that “if he [Wentworth] would take more care of his healeth I hope all men would be satisfyed w[i]th the effects of his labor, but he is to careless of that for w[hi]ch every freind doth well to chye him.” Wandesford to Clifton, 20 August 1635, *ibid*, Cl. C. 473.

<sup>4</sup> Wentworth himself informed Clifton that he would have liked to write to him personally but he would have to excuse the use of his secretary as he was “encompassed” with “manie Seriuos and pressing occasions...” After having met with the King in England and settled his English estates after Marris’ death, Wentworth returned to Ireland to find everything as he had left it. But now he had to set “my hande to the plowe againe, God helpe me and spped me well, for a life of toyle and Labour is and must be I feare, my portion on this Earthe.” Wentworth to Clifton, 24 February and 30 November 1636, *ibid*, Cl. C. 718 and 486.

This can be compared to the situation Edward Osborne had found himself in throughout the 1630s as Wentworth's Vice-President in the Council of the North. Osborne and Wandesford were competent and hardworking deputies, but in reality, a deputy was unable to exert the same strength of authority as the representative that the King himself had selected. This gave critics the opportunity to undermine an administration, without directly attacking the King or his chief minister.

Wandesford had previously proved his ability as Wentworth's deputy in the summer of 1636, when he and Sir Adam Loftus were appointed as Lord Justices of the kingdom and joint deputies.<sup>5</sup> Wandesford felt the pressure of this enormous responsibility and sought detailed advice from Wentworth in order to ensure that his policies were being thoroughly and appropriately exacted. Wentworth wrote a lengthy letter to Christopher Wandesford on 25 July 1636, with detailed responses to his deputy's concerns.<sup>6</sup> Wentworth had again appointed Wandesford to act as deputy in his absence, along with Lord Robert Dillon on 12 September 1639. At the same time, he also appointed Wandesford to be Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench.<sup>7</sup> C.V. Wedgwood highlights Wentworth's ability to leave his Irish business in the hands of his trusted men. In effect, Wandesford and Lord Dillon were the "regents of the country" whilst Radcliffe's role was to supervise Irish commercial and land issues, as

---

<sup>5</sup> Wentworth had been called to England "for our service here as for your own particular occasions concerning your estate here in England..." and on 7 August 1636, the King wrote to Wentworth from Rufford Abbey giving him "authority to assign and appoint our right trusty, &c., Adam Viscount Loftus, our Chancellor of Ireland, and our right trusty, &c., Christopher Wandesford, Master of the Rolls there, as Justice to take upon them the government of that kingdom during your absence only..." Str. P. 4 / 251. Secretary Coke had already informed Wentworth that the King approved of his choice of Wandesford to act as a deputy on 8 April 1636. *ibid*, 9b / 334. Wentworth was ordered to return to Ireland as soon as possible and give the Lord Justices "an allowance for their charge in doing your work out of the revenues and casualties of that kingdom." P.R.O. S.P. 63 / Signet Office III, 35.

<sup>6</sup> Wentworth to Wandesford, 25 July 1636, Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols, London, 1739), vol. II, pp. 13 – 23. For example, Wentworth listed a response to each of Wandesford's rather small concerns working his way through each of Wandesford's letters dated 6 June, 22 June, 6 July and 12 July. Wentworth finally professed that he had "acquitted myself to every Syllable of the Letters you have writ me..." *ibid*, p. 16.

<sup>7</sup> McCall, H.B. *The Story of the Family of Wandesforde of Kirklington and Castlecomer* (London, 1904), p. 79. On 19 August 1639, the King wrote to Thomas Wentworth with permission for him to travel to England and to appoint Lord Dillon and Christopher Wandesford "to govern in his absence." The King allowed Wentworth some time to settle his affairs, offering that if he was ill or too busy, he could take some time before travelling to England. P.R.O. S.P. 63 257, 30, 31, Str. P. 6b / 33. Lord Dillon and Wandesford were to be reimbursed for the "a reasonable sum to recoup them for the expense they have incurred as Lord Justices" out of the revenue of Ireland. King Charles I to Wentworth, 2 March 1640, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / Signet Office III 332 – 3. *CSPI 1633 – 47* pp. 235 – 6, Str. P. 6b / 38. On 20 July 1640, the King wrote to Wentworth on Wandesford's behalf to inform him that Wandesford should receive £4 per day for his work as Wentworth's deputy. P.R.O. S.P. 16 / Signet Office III, 382. *CSPI 1633 – 47* p. 244.

well as Wentworth's personal enterprises which by now had become entwined with Irish revenue and public interests.<sup>8</sup>

Wentworth returned to Dublin on 18 March 1640 to oversee the beginning of the Irish Parliament but sailed for England again on 3 April 1640 to attend the Short Parliament in England.<sup>9</sup> Wentworth gave the Sword of State to Wandesford who was appointed Deputy on 1 April<sup>10</sup> and this was the last time that Wandesford and Wentworth saw each other.<sup>11</sup> Wandesford only held office as Lord Deputy for a short period of time, but it was during one of the most difficult episodes of seventeenth century Irish History. Wandesford had to steer the government of Ireland through a time of incomparable trouble after Wentworth's final departure to England, which coincided with the increased assertion of the Irish Parliament. Was Wandesford simply a victim of circumstance, with Ireland co-incidentally exploding into rebellion whilst he happened to be in charge? Or in the absence of Wentworth's strong hand and the presence of a weak deputy, was Parliament was able to promote its own agenda, over-riding Wandesford's authority as Lord Deputy? There is strong evidence that Wandesford cannot be blamed completely for the collapse of the regime. There were already stirrings of discontent prior to the calling of the Parliament of 1640 and these continued in the early days of the first parliamentary session. For example John Bramhall reported to Christopher Wandesford on 16 April 1640 in the north of Ireland, that "All places and all sorts of men here are full of discontents and complaints..." He found that the landlords "complain that their lands lie waste, and not without great cause..."<sup>12</sup> Irish discontent that Thomas Wentworth's financial and plantation policies were not serving them directly, generated complaints and grievances that were to be presented within the forum of the Irish Parliament of 1640.

---

<sup>8</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 265.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*, p. 275.

<sup>10</sup> Wandesford's daughter Alice Thornton wrote that "The king was graciously pleased to send his commission, under the great seale of England, to my father, to succeed my Lord of Strafford in that weighty place of deputie-ship, in which he acted with so much pietie, loyalty, candor, and justice, that for his memory is blessed to many generations." Jackson, C. (ed.) *The Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton of East Newton Co. York* (Durham, 1875), p. 19.

<sup>11</sup> Thomas Wentworth left Ireland on 3 April 1640 after the first session of the Irish Parliament and Christopher Wandesford died on 3 December 1640.

<sup>12</sup> Bramhall noted in particular "great proportions every where are untenanted and that amongst other things helps to bring down the rent of what is tenanted." In the absence of a strong plantation system, the government's position in the north of Ireland could be threatened. *HMC Hastings MSS IV*, p. 86.

## The Irish Parliament of 1640 - preparations

Christopher Wandesford's key task as Lord Deputy of Ireland in Wentworth's absence was to begin preparations for a Parliament. The cabal had been aware that a Parliament was imminent since at least December 1639. Wentworth wrote to Radcliffe from Whitehall on 10 December 1639, stating that he had written to the Lord Justices informing them that "the King resolves of a Parliament both here and ther..." Wentworth was to be present at the beginning of both the English and Irish Parliaments and Radcliffe was to give a grant to issue the summons for a Parliament "as soon as is possible; for if your Parliam[en]t ther begin not by or nere the seconde of Marche, I shall not be back here in time."<sup>13</sup>

Radcliffe acted as an important informant to Wentworth from 1638 to 1640 and this was emphasised during the Bishops' Wars where Radcliffe's communications became even more vital. Radcliffe spent time in England working closely with Charles I. The King informed him of the Earl of Antrim's intentions to invade the Western Isles of Scotland in spring 1639<sup>14</sup> and therefore Radcliffe was able to warn Wentworth of the dangers that he faced from the Scots in Ulster. On another occasion, Radcliffe had met with the King at York and informed him about the potential problems that the Earl of St Albans could create in Ireland if he was not dealt with quickly.<sup>15</sup> Radcliffe was clearly in an important and influential position and was able

---

<sup>13</sup> In this letter, Wentworth also passed on the news that the King was to make him Lord Lieutenant of Ireland "and if I should move, I believe the other thing too." Here, he was referring to his long hoped for Earldom of Strafford. Wentworth at Whitehall to Radcliffe in Ireland, 10 December 1639, Whitaker, T.D. *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), p.187.

<sup>14</sup> Wentworth wrote to King Charles I on 17 October 1638 with his concerns about the activities of the Earl of Antrim supporting the rebellious Scots. Wentworth felt that his concerns matched the King's worries, which he had imparted to Radcliffe. Str. P. 3b / 9, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 226.

<sup>15</sup> Wentworth wrote to the King on 9 July 1639 from Dublin stating that he "understood that Sir George Radcliffe had in a summary Way humbly represented to your Majesty at York the Inconveniencies which would thereby fall upon your Affairs on this Side..." Wentworth to Charles I, 9 July 1639, Str. P. 3b / 77, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 365. Radcliffe's time in the North of England in summer 1638 was also spent ensuring that the Deputy Lieutenants in Yorkshire were fully trained. Edward Osborne reported to Wentworth on 31 July 1638 that "Immediately upon Signification of his Majesty's Pleaseure by Sir George Radcliffe to have all the Forces of this County in Readiness, I called all the Deputy-Lieutenants together to York" on 27 July. Osborne to Wentworth, Str. P. 10a / 198 – 199, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 193. In 1639, Radcliffe arranged the finances for Wentworth's militia who were taking their turn to man the garrison at Carlisle. Wentworth informed the King that Radcliffe was to "repaire thither for a few weekes to settle the Payments for the Regiment sent hence to Carlile, and some other priuate matters Concerning our selues will Attend yo[u]r Ma[jes]tie at Yorke..." Wentworth to Charles I, from Fairwood Park, 15 April 1639, Str. P. 3b / 58. On 24 May 1639, Sir Francis Willoughby wrote to Wentworth reporting that Radcliffe had indicated to him "that he hath taken Order for the Payment of our Money at Penrith, of which I am glad..." *ibid.* 19 / 59, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 354.

to present Wentworth's policies to the King in the best possible light. Radcliffe would also be able to ward off the danger of petitioners from Ireland who might distort the King's views of Wentworth's successes in Ireland. Radcliffe's contact with the King also demonstrates that his authority and status as Wentworth's confidant was recognised, even though Radcliffe did not hold a specific office within the Irish government. It was essential for Wentworth to maintain close contact with George Radcliffe even when they were working separately in England and Ireland. Letters directly to Radcliffe and also via other political figures kept George Radcliffe fully informed of Wentworth's activities and intentions. For example, Wentworth informed Cottington on 24 August 1640 that the Scots had now invaded Northern England. He asked Cottington to forward the letter onto Radcliffe.<sup>16</sup> During this time in England, Radcliffe was also able to reinforce contact with Wentworth's friends and allies in order to gain assurance of their continued support of Wentworth's regime.<sup>17</sup>

During Wentworth's absence in the months leading up to the Irish Parliament of 1640, Radcliffe played a key role in the organisation of the elections. Although the Parliament became more aggressive in the quest to have their grievances settled, initially it appeared that Radcliffe and Wandesford had done a good job in ensuring that Parliament had a strong Protestant majority. They also developed a faction of government supporters that consisted of office holders and close members of their family. Christopher Wandesford sat for Kildare, along with Thomas Wentworth's brother George Wentworth.<sup>18</sup> Wandesford had a number of kinsmen sitting in the Irish Parliament: his son George Wandesford sat for Clogher in Tyrone,<sup>19</sup> and his

---

<sup>16</sup> Wentworth to Lord Cottington, 24 August 1640, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 464, 86, *CSPD 1640* p. 627.

<sup>17</sup> George Garrard reported to Wentworth on 3 July 1638 that he, Radcliffe, Lord Conway and "some other of your Lordship's Friends and Servants" met for supper. Garrard stated that he doubted if Dublin "could yield the like" supper at which they drank Wentworth and the Lord Admiral's health "all at Sir George Radcliffe's Charge for ought I know, for he owned us all, and bad us heartily welcome, I never saw a better good Fellow in my life." Str. P. 18 / 80, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, p. 181. Laud wrote to John Bramhall on 22 May 1639 that he would not fail to meet for a second time "at or near his parting to be earnest with Sir George Radcliffe again and to desire him particularly to speak with the two Lords Chief Justices." *HMC Hastings IV*, pp. 81 – 82.

<sup>18</sup> George Wentworth was also elected to sit in the English Parliament of 1640 for Pontefract in Yorkshire. In 1639, George Wentworth had been created a member of the Irish Privy Council before his brother left for England in 1639. George Wentworth's official appointment to the Irish Privy Council from Charles I is dated 22 March 1640, Str. P. 6b / 38, Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 278.

<sup>19</sup> George Wandesford was Christopher Wandesford's eldest son born on 14 September 1623. Thomas Wentworth was his godfather. He attended Trinity College, Dublin from 1636 and died unmarried. McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* pp. 71 – 72, Firth, C.H. 'Christopher Wandesford,' *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 285, Whitaker, T.D. *A History of Richmondshire, in the North Riding of the County of York* (2 vols, London, 1823), vol. II, p. 159, Dugdale, W. *Dugdale's Visitation of Yorkshire* Davies, R. (ed). (London, 1859), p. 100.

half-brother Michael Wandesford sat for Thomastown, County Kilkenny.<sup>20</sup> George Radcliffe sat for County Sligo and his son Thomas sat for Sligo town. Philip Mainwaring sat for Carysfort in Wicklow. Other more minor figures within Thomas Wentworth's administration that sat in the Parliament of 1640 were Thomas Little who obtained a seat in Banagher, King's County, Joshua Carpenter for Carlingford in Louth and George Carr for Castlebar in County Mayo.<sup>21</sup>

Radcliffe did manage to fulfil his objective of increasing government supporters within the Parliament, and reducing the influence of Old and New English.<sup>22</sup> However, as we shall see, parliamentary opposition began to transcend these traditional boundaries by the second session of the Parliament and therefore Radcliffe's election success had less importance. Although 68% of the 238 members of the Irish of House Commons in 1640 were Protestant,<sup>23</sup> Kearney and Perceval-Maxwell have convincingly shown that opposition could and did transcend religious divisions. However as Perceval-Maxwell has indicated, most of the practising Catholics within the Parliament were actively oppositional, whereas only some Protestants were.<sup>24</sup>

### **Wandesford's struggle for control over the Irish Parliament of 1640**

The Irish Parliament convened on 16 March 1640, two days prior to Wentworth's arrival at Dublin,<sup>25</sup> and in Wentworth's absence, the Lord Justices made

---

<sup>20</sup> There are two further unidentified kinsmen of Christopher Wandesford who sat in the Parliament of 1640. John Wandesford sat for Inistiogue, County Kilkenny, and William Wandesford is listed for Ballinakill, Queens County and Lifford in Donegal although it is not clear if these were two different men or whether the same man was elected to two seats. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 260, 261, 262.

<sup>21</sup> For a full list of the members of the Parliament of 1640, see *ibid*, pp. 260 – 263.

<sup>22</sup> Clarke, A. 'The breakdown of authority, 1640 – 41,' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (eds.) *A New History of Ireland* (Oxford, 1976), vol. III, p. 272.

<sup>23</sup> Kearney and Perceval-Maxwell argue that two-thirds of the Commons were Protestant. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 192, Perceval-Maxwell, M. 'Protestant faction, the impeachment of Strafford and the origins of the Irish civil war,' *Canadian Journal of History* 17, no. 2 (1982), p. 239.

<sup>24</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 192, Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant faction,' p. 240.

<sup>25</sup> The Irish Privy Council wrote to Secretary Windebank on 19 March 1640 explaining that the winds had been continuously from the west and therefore they were aware that Wentworth might be late for the appointed opening of Parliament on 16 March. They explained that "We layd before us the necessity of hast required on this saide, as a p[re]paration to the intended Parliam[en]t in England..." In the Commission for calling the Parliament they noted that the power of proceeding in the Parliament lay with the Lord Justices in the Lord Lieutenant's absence and therefore decided to proceed in case the delay to the beginning of the Irish Parliament "might interrupt his Ma[jes]ties dessignes there..." They decided to proceed but intended to defer the "propounding of the subsidies" for as long as they could until Wentworth arrived. Str. P. 11a / 271.

the opening speech.<sup>26</sup> In the House of Commons, questions of parliamentary proceeding opened the events when Sir Richard Barnwall desired that the Sheriffs' returns should be examined before the Speaker of the House was chosen. Radcliffe stepped in to resolve the debate with his in-depth knowledge of parliamentary protocol. He stated that "nothing could be done till the election of a speaker was confirmed" by the Lord Justices. Radcliffe's intervention, which served to delay any further proceedings until Wentworth was present, led to the House adjourning themselves after nominating their Speaker, Mr Sergeant Eustace.<sup>27</sup> Parliament was officially opened on 20 March once Wentworth had recovered from his journey from England. Wentworth was able to exert considerable control over the first session of Parliament which perhaps suggests that State authority and power was most effective when conducted through the presence of the King's representative, but that it becomes rather more diluted in the presence of the 'representative's representative.' This supports the argument that Wandesford was unable to control the Parliament without Wentworth, as his authority was weaker. In the three weeks that Wentworth spent in Ireland until 3 April 1640 when he left to participate in the English Parliament, Wentworth and the government presented the image that the Irish assembly was accommodating in meeting his demands. On 23 March, the Commons willingly voted four subsidies, adding that this was given by the "free, ready, unanimous, and cheerful Consent, of every Member thereof, not one Man opposing."<sup>28</sup> Lord Dillon, Christopher Wandesford and George Radcliffe were the notable government members appointed to draw up the declaration of the House.<sup>29</sup> However, Wentworth's projection of success masked the reality that the House of Commons had not been particularly cooperative. The request for supply had originally been for six subsidies, and as Wentworth was late arriving in Ireland, the Commons were able to reduce this to four subsidies, adding a hazy guarantee that they would provide further funds if

---

<sup>26</sup> Mountmorres, Lord H.R. *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament, from the year 1634 to 1666* (2 vols, London, 1792), vol. II, p.19.

<sup>27</sup> *ibid*, vol. II, pp. 19 – 20, *Journal of the House of Commons of the Kingdom of Ireland 1613 – 1666* Vol. I, (Dublin, 1796), p. 133.

<sup>28</sup> *ibid*, p. 138. Wedgwood, pp. 275 – 276, 278, Beckett, J.C. *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603 – 1923* (London, 1981), p. 76. The Irish Privy Council wrote to Secretary Windebank on 23 March informing him that the whole House unanimously assented to the four subsidies "there being found therein not one Negatiue voice." A select committee had been appointed to draw up a declaration of loyalty to the King that was to be printed with the Subsidy Act. Str. P. 11a / 274.

<sup>29</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 138.

needed.<sup>30</sup> The Irish Privy Council tried to make this reduction in supply appear to be a positive act, informing Secretary Windebank that the Irish Parliament was always being asked for six subsidies, as indeed during the Parliament of 1634 – 1635. They argued that they did not want the grant of six subsidies to be seen as a permanent precedent, “as if Six must be allwayes unchangeable layd on them, and at noe tyme lesse.”<sup>31</sup> When Wentworth arrived in Ireland, he delivered the King’s letters dated 2 March to the Privy Council, which directed that six subsidies were to be demanded. However, as the arrangement with the Irish Houses of Parliament had been settled prior to this, after debate with Wentworth, the Irish Privy Council decided that it would be beneficial to gain four subsidies cheerfully, before obtaining further supply that might not be limited to two further subsidies.<sup>32</sup>

Radcliffe’s role in increasing support for Wentworth’s administration was not confined to the election period. It was hoped that the government would be able to maintain the initiative by sustaining weighty representation within parliamentary committees.<sup>33</sup> In the first session of Parliament, Radcliffe, Wandesford and Sir Edward Trevor, who sat for County Down and had been appointed the Irish Privy Council by Wentworth, sat on more than half of the committees.<sup>34</sup> Government presence within the committees was clearly an integral part of the plan to maintain control over Parliament. On 21 March 1640, the Committee of Privileges was chosen and its membership included key governmental representatives such as Lord Dillon, Christopher Wandesford, George Wentworth, George Radcliffe, Vice Treasurer Sir Adam Loftus, the Chancellor of Exchequer Sir Robert Meredith, the Master of Ordnance Sir John Borlase and the Master of Wards Sir William Parsons.<sup>35</sup> Similarly,

---

<sup>30</sup> Wentworth framed this in a positive light in a letter to Marquis Hamilton on 24 March 1639. He stated: “This Parliament hath w[i]th all possible Cleare Affections giuen his Ma[jes]tie foure Subsedyes, and passed an Ordinance of Parliament (w[hi]ch is to be printed w[i]th the Act) for the further Supplying of the Crowne to the uttermost of their Abilities as the Kings occasions may require... I doe seriously iudge [it] to be better then of they had outright giuen tenn Subsidyas.” Str. P. 10b / 141.

<sup>31</sup> The Irish Privy Council professed that they had decided to “shun that Rock,” asking for four subsidies “w[i]th a Chearfull ingagement on the howse to aduance more, besides those foure, if the occasions of His Ma[jes]tie should require it. Soe it would be more aduantage to His Ma[jes]ty in the Consequences of it then the p[re]sent granting of six or more.” They had been further assured by “some leadeing men of the House of Commons” that extra supply would be happily granted if needed. Irish Privy Council to King Charles I, 19 March 1640, *ibid*, 11a / 271.

<sup>32</sup> Irish Privy Council to Windebank, 19 March 1640, *ibid*, 11a / 271 – 272.

<sup>33</sup> For example, Sir William Parsons, Sir Adam Loftus and Sir Robert Meredith were leaders within a significant number of committees. Perceval-Maxwell, ‘Protestant faction,’ pp. 241 – 242.

<sup>34</sup> *ibid*, p. 243.

<sup>35</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 137.

the Committee of Grievances nominated on 21 March contained Wandesford, Radcliffe and Sir Edward Trevor.<sup>36</sup> Radcliffe, as in his previous Parliaments, sat upon a wide range of committees, but we should be tentative about placing too much emphasis on the subjects discussed within those committees that Radcliffe participated. He was expected to exert a strong government representation within numerous committees and therefore he may not have had a particular personal interest in the subject discussed by the committee.<sup>37</sup> However, on 1 April, Radcliffe's involvement in a committee may well be explained by his involvement and personal concerns in the Irish customs farm. The committee discussed the concern that Walter Lacy, an agent of Sir Henry Wallop, had been "exacting the Customs of the thirteenth Part of Timber passing from or by Eniscorthy." The committee wished to report his actions to the Lord Lieutenant, or in his absence the Lord Deputy.<sup>38</sup> Radcliffe was involved in important committees at which it was essential to have strong governmental control. Wentworth's cabal's presence upon committees could also ensure that Wentworth would be fully informed of the content of the discussions, as well as the mood of the debaters. For example, on 1 April, Radcliffe, Sir William Parsons and Sir Robert Meredith were involved in a select committee to discuss the laws that had been propounded in the first session of the Parliament and to consider what other laws and ordinances they thought were needed which would "tend to the better settling of the Common-wealth, and the remedying of such Abuses and Inconveniencies, for Redress whereof Laws have not heretofore been ordained..." Wentworth's supporters on this select committee could divert discussions away from grievances that Wentworth would not wish the Parliament to stray onto and to report to him issues that might become potential problems for the administration.<sup>39</sup>

Key government figures were also prominent within high-profile committees of both Houses of Parliament. On 23 March, the Lords requested twenty-four members of the Commons to meet twelve Lords. They wished to draw up a joint

---

<sup>36</sup> *ibid*, p. 137.

<sup>37</sup> On 28 March Radcliffe was involved in a committee to consider of issues reported by one Mr Brown, a member of the Committee of Grievances, concerned with "Wills and Testaments, and the Power of Ordinaries in granting of Letters of Administrations, and disposing of the Goods of Persons intestate to pious Uses..." On the same day, a bill for an Act for "examining and settling of Fees" was committed, to include Lord Dillon, Wandesford and Radcliffe. *ibid*, pp. 139 - 140.

<sup>38</sup> *ibid*, pp. 141 - 142.

<sup>39</sup> *ibid*, p. 142. As we saw in Chapter 6, Radcliffe often acted as a representative of the House of Commons, carrying bills to the Lords. He continued this in the Parliament of 1640 carrying three bills

Declaration regarding the subsidies to declare the whole Parliament's readiness to assist the King with their "Lives, Fortunes, and Estates." This select committee included Wandesford, Radcliffe, Mainwaring, Lord Dillon, the Master of Wards and the Chancellor of Exchequer.<sup>40</sup> This committee met again on 26 March, although the Lords suggested that this time a smaller committee met, as it would "sooner effect that Work so well propounded and begun." Despite this trimming down of the committee membership, Wandesford, Radcliffe and Lord Dillon, remained part of the committee.<sup>41</sup> Ultimately the Commons and Lords did not send a joint Declaration concerning supply to the King. On 30 March 1640, Wandesford was to attend the Lords to "acquaint them with the Reasons of the House, in not joining with them in the said Declaration."<sup>42</sup> He informed the Lords that after three meetings of the joint committee, they had not been able to "agree on the Words..." despite the fact that "in Substance" they were as one.<sup>43</sup>

It is not clear if the first session of Parliament ran more smoothly due to the influence of men such as Wandesford and Radcliffe on the committees, whether it was Wentworth's personal presence at the session, or simply that there was a higher level of support for government policies at the beginning of the Parliament of 1640. It is not surprising however, that Wentworth's supporters were so heavily involved in parliamentary activities. Not only were they able to keep a check upon the discussions within the Committees and report their findings back to the Lord Lieutenant or Lord Deputy, they were also experienced politicians and therefore knew much about protocol and law-making. The first session of Parliament had passed relatively smoothly and Wentworth left for England to attend the opening of the English Parliament. However, beneath this cool exterior, issues were bubbling up within the Houses of Parliament. Christopher Wandesford was left in control of the subsequent sessions of Parliament and he was to discover that Ireland was not as settled as

---

to the Lords for their examination on 23 March 1640. *ibid*, p. 138. *Journal of the House of Lords of Ireland from 10 Car I 1634 to 10 Guil III 1698* (Dublin, 1779 - 1800), vol. I, p. 101.

<sup>40</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 138.

<sup>41</sup> *ibid*, p. 139.

<sup>42</sup> *ibid*, p. 141.

<sup>43</sup> Wandesford added that the Commons did not "doubt readiness of the Lords and their Affections to express themselves for honour of King and Defence of the Kingdom." But as they could not agree on the words to use, they would "declare apart." On 31 March, the House of Lords reported that they were happy to submit their own Declaration. Lord Ranelagh stated that Wandesford had delivered the Commons' message "in very good Language." The Lords would therefore "by a Declaration of their own, exceeding theirs, if it may be, expressing Love and Loyalty, to assist the King in his great Occasions." *Lords Journal of Ireland* pp. 109, 110.

Wentworth seemed to believe.<sup>44</sup> However support for Wentworth's Irish administration began to deteriorate rapidly after this first session. The opposition that emerged should not be seen as a protest against Wandesford's rule in particular. He was a victim of circumstance, finding himself battling against an explosion of discontent against English control. Both Clarke and Kearney have indicated that Wentworth's removal to England created the final collapse of loyalty to his government. Although the government party did contain loyal and genuine supporters, such as Radcliffe and Lord Dillon, there were also others who had only remained loyal in order to further their access to patronage.<sup>45</sup> What is more, Wentworth's carefully selected government support system dissolved further by the third session of the Irish Parliament "when it became more and more obvious that [Wentworth's] star was on the wane."<sup>46</sup> Once Wentworth left Ireland, the benefits of personal enrichment by attaching one's self to his administration were also removed, and this accounts for men previously identified as government followers forming alliances with those expressing grievances against the administration. Kearney argues that we should not see the support of the first session of Parliament as insincere as parliamentary support was generated by the very presence of the King's representative, personified in Wentworth. However, when Wentworth left Ireland on 3 April, this loyalty "easily turned to a lukewarm attitude..."<sup>47</sup> With the adherents to Wentworth's government policies depleted, the remaining loyal supporters would have found it more difficult to wield much influence. Perceval-Maxwell still identifies Radcliffe as a leader within the Commons in the second session of the Parliament of 1640, but by now his membership of committees had fallen from half, to one-third.<sup>48</sup>

Prior to the second session of Parliament that was to begin on 1 June 1640, Wandesford was already concerned about the signs of aggression that he had witnessed within the first session of Parliament. He despaired that he would be able to

---

<sup>44</sup> Kearney argues that Wentworth had "no vision of a future catastrophe" and demonstrates that he continued to purchase extensive lands in Ireland. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 185, 189.

<sup>45</sup> *ibid*, p. 195, Clarke, 'The breakdown of authority,' p. 277.

<sup>46</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 195.

<sup>47</sup> *ibid*, p. 195.

<sup>48</sup> Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant faction,' p. 244. Wentworth's departure into England quickly began to present other problems for the members of the Irish Privy Council that he left behind to be responsible for the actions of the Irish Parliament. Wentworth had received a letter from William Raylton informing him of the English Privy Council's exceptions to some laws made in the Irish Parliament. Wentworth assured Windebank that Lord Chancellor Loftus, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas Sir Gerard Lowther, and George Radcliffe were "Confident to giue very good Satisfaction to all

control Parliament effectively and related his frustration to Sir Gervase Clifton on 28 May 1640, in which he described the “wall of separation” which “these Rash builders mayde of untempred, distempred mortar indeed...”<sup>49</sup> Parliament was clearly already asserting their strength and building up prerogatives that Wandesford felt were inappropriate. Parliament appeared to be attempting to push their rights beyond acceptable means. He felt that “it is the wurke of an easye witt, to fynde faults” and therefore the government and Parliament of Ireland should be pulling together rather than attempting to undermine each other’s privileges and rights. As Lord Deputy, Wandesford saw his duty as promoting the ideal of “every man operating what he can to the Common Tranquillitye.”<sup>50</sup>

Wandesford was correct to be concerned about his abilities to contain the grievances of the Parliament. Although Parliament appeared to grant supply readily enough in the first session in Wentworth’s presence, this was offset in June by their demands for a new way of levying the taxes for the three remaining subsidies that had not yet been collected. This change would delay the process, and it appeared likely that the amount received by the government would also be lessened.<sup>51</sup> The manner of assessing the subsidies became a particularly contentious issue in the second session of Parliament. In 1635, Wentworth had decided upon a fixed amount of money that each Irish county had to raise. This would generate a set rate of £40,000 for each subsidy. However, in a direct reversal of Wentworth’s policy, on 13 June 1640 the House of Commons asserted that the supply was to be levied “in a moderate parliamentary way after an easy and equal rate of each man his estate.”<sup>52</sup> This obviously could have dramatic implications for the actual amount of revenue raised from the supply granted in the first session. Radcliffe’s committee membership was notably less than previous parliaments but he did partake in the important committee appointed to consider “how the four intire Subsidies granted this Parliament shall be assessed...” on 9 June.<sup>53</sup> It was clearly important for the government to have a voice

---

that hath been objected against the frame of those Lawes.” Wentworth to Windebank, 10 April 1640, Str. P. 11a / 280.

<sup>49</sup> Wandesford hoped that “there children, after a long Repentance (I doubt) may pull it downe agayne.” Wandesford to Clifton, 28 May 1640, Nottingham University Library, Cl. C. 477, *HMC Various Collections VII* p. 423.

<sup>50</sup> *ibid*, Cl. C. 477.

<sup>51</sup> McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* p. 80.

<sup>52</sup> *CSPI 1633 – 47*, p. 251, Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 191.

<sup>53</sup> In the second session of the Irish Parliament of 1640, Radcliffe sat on only two committees. The first of these on 5 June was to discuss the proposed Act to Letters Patents passed and to be passed on the

within this committee as it could dramatically affect the amount of money raised for the King.

As soon as Parliament reassembled on 1 June 1640, the Commons were also intent upon gaining redress of their grievances. The session only lasted just over two weeks but even in this short time, Wandesford was forced to allow concessions to the Parliament that revoked Wentworth's policies. For example, the bill that was to secure Wentworth's policy of plantation in Connacht and Limerick was referred to a sub-committee and was never seen again. This committee did include government supporters such as George Radcliffe, Lord Dillon, Sir William Parsons and Sir Adam Loftus. However they may have been unable to push this policy through in the face of burgeoning opposition, perhaps believing it to be unwise to force and unpopular policy at the possible expense of supply.<sup>54</sup> Kearney believes that the rejection of the plantation bill and the alteration in the way in which supply was to be levied, demonstrates that a new form of opposition was emerging, unified in their ideals regardless of whether they were Catholic or Protestant.<sup>55</sup>

Not content with raising issues that displeased them in the secular sphere, the Commons turned their attention to ecclesiastical ones, submitting a petition on 17 June demanding that forty-four complaints against the clergy were addressed.<sup>56</sup> In particular they complained about the exactions of the clergy and the illegal use of the Court of High Commission. On the same day, three members of the Commons drew up letter to the High Commission requiring that it reversed two of its sentences of

---

Commissions of Grace and Remedy of Defective Titles. The second met on 9 June to discuss the issue of subsidy assessment and this committee also included Lord Dillon, the Master of the Wards and the Recorder of Dublin. In the Parliament of 1634 – 1635 and the first session of the 1640 Parliament, Radcliffe had often acted as a representative of the House of Commons by carrying bills to the Lords. However, in the second session of the 1640 Parliament, he did this on only one occasion, 3 June 1640. This may to some extent represent the short length of time that the Parliament sat and also the limited amount of legislation that they got through. *Commons Journal of Ireland* pp. 143 - 145.

<sup>54</sup> On 3 June 1640, the bill for an act to secure the plantations of Roscomon, Sligoe, Mayo, Galway and the town of Galway, Clare, Limerick and Tipperary was committed. After debate, the committee was to report their findings to the House. *ibid*, pp. 143 – 144.

<sup>55</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 190 – 191.

<sup>56</sup> For example, the petition complained that parish clerks took a barrel of corn for every plough. Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. II. p. 31. By the third session of Parliament, John Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry, was still concerned about the grievances levied against the Church in June 1640. Bramhall wrote to Laud on 4 November 1640 that although he had not intended to communicate with him “till these troubles were in some measure blown over,” but the Commons had resolved to send agents into England to complain to the King or Parliament, and therefore he needed to present his view of the happenings. However, Bramhall only intended to “meddle no further than the Church is concerned.” Bramhall felt that the grievances had no real substance as some of the complaints were “contrary to the canons of the Church or statutes of this

excommunication.<sup>57</sup> A further worrying development for the government on 17 June was a petition presented by John Chylde against John Atherton, the Bishop of Waterford and Lismore accusing him of sodomy.<sup>58</sup> Atherton was probably targeted as he had been an influential player in Wentworth's attack upon the Earl of Cork.<sup>59</sup> Wandesford was extremely concerned about this new development in which the Commons directly attacked the Church of Ireland. He wrote to George Radcliffe on 21 June 1640 explaining about Chylde's petition to the House of Commons that they had embraced wholeheartedly. Wandesford declared that Radcliffe would "as all civill men do here blush when you see what stuff is in itt."<sup>60</sup> The House of Commons had presented the petition to Wandesford asking him to begin legal proceedings against Atherton. However, after consulting with the Irish Privy Council, Wandesford decided that it was "not fit that a Parson of his qualitey should be touched upon so far as to secure him" until further evidence to support Chylde's claim was provided. Lords Dillon and Lowther were appointed to examine the case and at present the accuser stood "confydently to his Accusation as an Act of Conscience to disburthen himself and w[i]thout any practice att all against the B[isho]p."<sup>61</sup> On 5 December 1640, Atherton was hanged for sodomy and as McCafferty has pointed out, this conclusion was highly discomfoting for Wentworth's Irish administration, as

---

realm..." Bramhall was anxious that Laud should thank Wandesford for his troubles to protect the Church from this onslaught. Bramhall to Laud, 4 November 1640, *HMC Various Collections VII* p. 90.

<sup>57</sup> A letter from the Speaker of the House of Commons to the Court of High Commission to absolve William Stout and Richard Fountain, who had been excommunicated thanks to a petition presented by a priest named Holt. Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. II. p. 30, *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 149.

<sup>58</sup> *ibid.*, p. 148.

<sup>59</sup> *Commons Journals of Ireland* pp. 149 – 150, Clarke, A. *The Old English in Ireland 1625 – 1642* (London, 1966), pp. 130 – 131, Ranger, T.O. 'Strafford in Ireland: a revaluation,' in T. Aston, (ed). *Crisis in Europe 1560 – 1660* (1965), p. 288, Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant faction,' p. 243. Atherton himself was convinced that these charges were a plot by influential men in Waterford in revenge for his part in the Cork affair. Wandesford to Radcliffe, 29 June 1640, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 27v.

<sup>60</sup> Radcliffe was clearly in contact with Wentworth's old friend Sir Gervase Clifton at this time. Regarding the complaints against John Atherton, Wandesford wrote that "unless S[i]r Gervas Clifton helpe you to expound that part w[hi]ch concerneth the varyety of the femayle kynde I doubt you will not understand it." Wandesford to Radcliffe, 21 June 1640, *ibid.*, f. 27r.

<sup>61</sup> Wandesford was very concerned that the trial of John Atherton might not be a fair trial. "The B[isho]p of Waterford is set att Libertye upon Securitye. here be fewe who pittie him. I must watch that he have a fayre and just proceding, or else it will goe the worse w[i]th him." Wandesford to Radcliffe, 29 June 1640, *ibid.*, ff. 27v, 29v.

Atherton had been one of the driving forces in Wentworth's plans to restore church temporalities.<sup>62</sup>

A third issue propounded by the Commons was a complaint concerning the composition of the House, an issue that would come back to haunt Radcliffe in his impeachment trial as we will see later. The Commons complained of the failure to issue writs to seven Anglo-Irish boroughs, which had held seats in previous parliaments. This was a direct attack upon the right of the government to control the membership of the House of Commons.<sup>63</sup> The Commons decided to issue writs to the excluded Anglo-Irish boroughs, directly revoking Wentworth's orders. This case is especially significant as the Anglo-Irish could not have pushed this measure through the House alone, and therefore they had generated support within the New English faction.<sup>64</sup> This demonstrates that the parliamentary attacks upon government policy were leading men to abandon their traditional opposition against each other, in unity against the government.

Wandesford had become increasingly concerned about the proceedings within the Houses of Parliament and this led to his decision to prorogue Parliament. He wrote to Radcliffe, who was in England with Wentworth, explaining that the problems within Parliament were getting worse "notw[i]thstanding the good order you left them in..." A new and particularly worrying development was that the composition of the opposition within the House was beginning to alter. In the recent debates on the Declaration, Wandesford had noticed that it was not being "prosecuted by the Irish onely, but those of our owne partye (as we call them) have joyned apparently with them..." This was a startling development as Wandesford was reliant upon the management of the Commons by supposed government supporters, particularly in the absence of Radcliffe and Wentworth. Wandesford also enclosed in his letter a copy of the draft of the Declaration that the House of Commons had presented to him. He believed that this version was "much more moderate" than the committee who wrote the Declaration had hoped, which demonstrated that governmental supporters still had some control within the committees. Wandesford stated that Lord Dillon, Sergeant Sambach and others had by "strong contestation in a Committe of the whole house

---

<sup>62</sup> McCafferty, J. "'To follow the late precedents of England:' the Irish impeachment proceedings of 1641," in Greer, D.S. & Dawson, N.M. (eds.) *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History* (Dublin, 2001), p. 58.

<sup>63</sup> Clarke, 'The breakdown of authority,' pp. 276 – 277.

<sup>64</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 190.

obtain[ed] the Alteration to the better.”<sup>65</sup> By mid-June 1640, Wandesford was already concerned that he might be losing control of Parliament. He intended to reply to the Commons’ Declaration the following day and he had taken the advice of the Irish Privy Council that he should make a speech to the whole House. As the Declaration stood, Wandesford did not “thinke fit to give way unto...” and he wished that he might have had to opportunity to have “spoken to the house before this was delivered to me as a thing agreed upon ...” He was clearly in a difficult position now as he was faced with two choices. Firstly he could “breake of this meting in displeasure and by that means hazard the tymely coming in of the subsedyes” or secondly “give way to this ill president against the Crowne, w[hi]ch is a thing I may not doe.” In reality, Wandesford felt that the House had become so “intemperate” that he was obliged to dissolve them on the following Monday. Again Wandesford sought the advice of the Irish Council that “unanimously voted for a prorogation...” Wandesford was becoming more cautious in his approach to Parliament and felt unable to make his own decisions without the support of the Council. He was missing Radcliffe’s contribution acutely, stating that “We now fynde your absence in the house and were not the cause of the King supported by my L[or]d Dillon there I know not what would become of us.”<sup>66</sup> Yet Radcliffe had only recently left Ireland to go to England.<sup>67</sup>

Wandesford wanted Wentworth to be aware of the difficulties that he was experiencing and hoped that Radcliffe would let the Lord Lieutenant know of the problems. Wandesford did not wish to “trubble” Wentworth with these details, and hoped that Radcliffe would be able to “represent things more seasonably.”<sup>68</sup> On 21 June 1640, Wandesford again asked Radcliffe to pass on information about

---

<sup>65</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 12 June 1640, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 25v.

<sup>66</sup> *ibid.*, ff. 25v – 26r.

<sup>67</sup> On 8 June 1640, Radcliffe was granted “Leave and Licence to go into England.” *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 145. On 13 July, Radcliffe admitted to Lord Viscount Conway that he had been in England three weeks longer than he intended. His business “was to see my lord [Wentworth] and keepe him from business,” in order to protect his health. He explained “now that I see him able to walke in his garden, I beginne to thinke of Irelande: and hope I may there lye in a corner quietly, when all this world is in action.” He thought that he would travel back to Ireland on 16 or 17 July. Radcliffe to Lord Viscount Conway, 13 July 1640 from Leicester House, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 459, 34.

<sup>68</sup> In the original letter, the word ‘seasonably’ is omitted and there is a blank within the sentence. However, Whitaker has inserted ‘seasonably’ into his text. Wandesford to Radcliffe, 12 June 1640, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 26r. Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 249 – 251 (with some omissions and changes in the order of the letter).

Parliament to Wentworth.<sup>69</sup> Radcliffe was working very closely with Wentworth at this time and Wandesford was aware that there was no need to duplicate information in his letters to them as they would communicate the information to each other.<sup>70</sup>

The complaints presented by the House of Commons had been presented with a confirmation of the declaration of loyalty to the King issued in March with the Subsidy Bill, but Wandesford was not convinced.<sup>71</sup> On 14 June, the House of Lords led by Lord Chancellor Loftus, recommended to Wandesford that Parliament be prorogued, and royal assent given to those Acts already passed. Loftus was particularly keen to obtain the royal assent for the Act against Defective Titles “which may well be called the Golden Act, worth to the Subject many Millions of Money.”<sup>72</sup> On 16 June, John Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry reported Wandesford’s response to the Lords, stating that assenting to the Acts and proroguing Parliament “solely rested in the King’s power.” Therefore Wandesford would discuss the issue with the Irish Privy Council and report back on another occasion to the House of Parliament.<sup>73</sup> On 17 June, Wandesford sat in the chair of State and gave the royal assent to the eleven Acts passed in the Parliament. He then made a “learned Speech” in which he stated that Parliament was to be prorogued “for his Majesty’s service, as for the Good of the Subjects of this Kingdom in generall,” to reassemble on 1 October 1640.<sup>74</sup> Wandesford believed that this prorogation would calm the situation over supply. Before Parliament was prorogued, Wandesford did however allow the Commons to enter a resolution into the *Commons Journal* in which they claimed control of taxation. Wentworth blamed Wandesford for Parliament’s action, as this was a dangerous prerogative.<sup>75</sup> Wentworth felt that Wandesford was being too lenient upon Parliament at precisely the time he needed to assert his authority and show a stern front to the members of Parliament. Wentworth wrote to Radcliffe on 5 November

---

<sup>69</sup> Wandesford explained that “What you fynde here together w[i]th the severall Papers to w[hi]ch our Letters refer you will communicate with the Lord Leue[tenan]t as you fynde opportunitye.” Wandesford to Radcliffe, 21 June 1640, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 26v.

<sup>70</sup> For example on 29 June 1640, Wandesford told Radcliffe that he would not inform him in detail of “the Condition of things here” as he would find the details “in myne to my L[or]d Leue[tenan]t.” Wandesford to Radcliffe, 29 June 1640, *ibid*, f. 29v.

<sup>71</sup> Beckett, J.C. *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603 – 1923* (London, 1981), p. 77.

<sup>72</sup> The Lords selected a committee to attend Wandesford with these recommendations, and also to suggest that Parliament was prorogued until 5 October 1640. *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 120.

<sup>73</sup> *ibid*, p. 121.

<sup>74</sup> *ibid*, pp. 122 – 123, *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 149.

<sup>75</sup> On 15 June 1640, Wandesford gave permission “that the Declaration touching the Subsidies shall be entered and enrolled...” *ibid*, p. 147, McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* p. 80.

1640 ordering him to “tell [Wandesford] from me that he must *tenir roide*, and not suffer my gentlemen to grow insolent upon him, and that his old rule of moderate counsels will not serve his turn in cases of this extremity.”<sup>76</sup> Wentworth accused Wandesford of acting too cautiously with the Commons and allowing them to gain the upper hand on this occasion. This forms an interesting parallel with Wandesford’s warnings to Wentworth in the 1620s not to become overly optimistic and throw away his caution too quickly. In January 1628, Wandesford warned Wentworth that his last letter had “the tune of a merrye larke singing... after she hath escaped the hunter’s gin” and reminded him not to be “too wanton, the next day may prove a larkin days agayne and who knows your fortune then.”<sup>77</sup>

Wandesford must have felt particularly isolated during the summer of 1640, as both Wentworth and Radcliffe were in England. In June 1640, he begged that Radcliffe kept his word “for returning so soon” as he could.<sup>78</sup> By August 1640, facing the recall of Parliament in October, Wandesford was still requesting the support of his friend in Ireland professing in a letter to him that he hoped “nothing can protract your cumming to us out of hand.”<sup>79</sup> In Radcliffe’s absence, Wandesford was reliant on Lord Dillon for support and he explained to Radcliffe on 21 June 1640 that the help he had from Dillon had been consistently loyal to the Crown. Wandesford professed “had [Dillon] not struggled dextrously in the house (after you weare gone) for the kings honor we had lost to much of that or all the Subsidyes.”<sup>80</sup>

Wandesford was placed in an extraordinarily difficult position, as he needed to appease the Parliament so that they granted desperately needed supply to the Crown, but in order to obtain this, he had to battle against the Commons’ desire to develop

---

<sup>76</sup> Wentworth to Radcliffe, 5 November 1640, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 212.

<sup>77</sup> Wandesford to Wentworth, 16 and 20 January 1628, Str. P. 16 / 245, Cooper, J.P. (ed). *Wentworth Papers 1597 – 1628* (London, 1973), p. 285.

<sup>78</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 29 June 1640, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 29v.

<sup>79</sup> Later in August, he pestered Radcliffe again: “It seames you cannot set downe a day for your cuming awaye. I long much to se you here: when you come I hope to be satisfyed in many things w[hi]ch we apprehend.” Wandesford to Radcliffe, 24 and 28 August 1640, *ibid*, ff. 34r, 35v. Cork received a letter from William Perkins on 21 July 1640 which reported that “S[i]r Georg Ratcliff and Mr Little take their iourney for Ireland to morrow.” But on 25 August, he wrote again stating that Radcliffe had informed him that he “goes away on thursday next Mr Littell is gonn after my Lo Leutenant to Newcastle...” On 9 September 1640, Henry Smithwicke wrote to Cork that “Sir Georg Ratclife landed the last night.” Chatsworth House. Lismore Papers, vol 21 / 33, 41, 46.

<sup>80</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 21 June 1640, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 28v, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 252 – 3 (with some omissions).

their prerogative.<sup>81</sup> Prior to the meeting of the third session of the Parliament. Wandesford's dilemma worsened. The Scots defeated the King's forces at the Battle of Newburn on 28 August 1640 and therefore Wandesford was well aware of the need for supply in order to pay for a large standing army in Ulster to protect Irish interests. This meant that Parliament would be in a good position to negotiate the redress of their grievances in exchange for supply, and Wandesford feared that he would be forced into a corner. Kearney notes that Wandesford's problems were exacerbated by Wentworth's hope that the Irish standing army might be used in England. This served to place him in an even more difficult position between the need for an army, the need to pay for it and therefore the potential for the Parliament to negotiate for the redress of grievances.<sup>82</sup> Wandesford was aware by 29 June 1640 that parliamentary supply was not forthcoming. He informed Radcliffe that money was coming in very slowly.<sup>83</sup> To fully inform himself of the situation, Wandesford had called the Committee of Revenue to consider how they could follow Wentworth's directions for a large army in Ulster and "found it impossible that monyes could be provided here, to pay the horse..." He hoped that Radcliffe would be able to "fortiffye his Ex[chequer] (as we all desyre to doe) that itt is not in our power to comply w[i]th that command..." He wanted to pass this information onto Radcliffe before he returned to England so that he could personally discuss the matter with Wentworth. Wandesford was placing his hope that once Radcliffe returned to Ireland, he would be able to "unwynde us all out of this laborinth."<sup>84</sup> Wandesford was frustrated by Wentworth's apparent lack of understanding of the financial situation in Ireland and thus his ineffectual demands that an army be raised and supplied.<sup>85</sup> In August, Wandesford wrote to Radcliffe

---

<sup>81</sup> For example, on 17 June, the Commons asserted that the Committee of Grievances and Privileges should meet regularly to consider issues and "prepare them into Heads against the next Sitting." This committee only contained extremely limited government influence, in the form of an unidentified Mr Wandesford, one of Christopher Wandesford's relations and Thomas Little, one of Wentworth's minor secretaries. *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 149.

<sup>82</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* pp. 191 - 192.

<sup>83</sup> He informed Radcliffe that he would hear that "the vicetreasurer speakes of the slowness of cumming in of Monyes, I think the care he hath of the Revennue makes him full as apprehensive of the matter as there is cause." Wandesford to Radcliffe, 29 June 1640, University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282), f. 29v.

<sup>84</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 28 June 1640, *ibid*, f. 30v.

<sup>85</sup> Wandesford informed Wentworth that the Irish Privy Council had found that "at all possible diligence hath been used to quicken the paymente expected of the subsidie, and yet all that could be gotten in of his Maj[es]tes monyes. and all that was in Mr Vicetre[asure]rs hands besides. was but little more then sufficient to pay the Captaines and Soldiers of the eight thousand foote now at Carregfergus, to the 28<sup>th</sup> of August..." After settling these wages, only "foureschore Pound" remained even though the officers of the field and "the ould Army are still unpaid." He professed that it was no longer possible for the Irish Exchequer to "bere so high a Charge w[i]thout supply from thence..." and that

enclosing a public dispatch from which he would see that “monyes are not so plentiful in this Kyngdome as you say they are in London...”<sup>86</sup> By 7 August, £8000 remained outstanding from the subsidies.<sup>87</sup> Wandesford had no choice but to allow a third meeting of Parliament, despite the danger that it was likely to proceed in its increasingly aggressive nature.

The third session of Parliament met from 1 October until 12 November 1640, and is notable for its integral role in the collapse of Wentworth’s regime in Ireland. The issue of supply was contentious during this third session. Each subsidy was to be reduced from £40,000 to £12,000. Clearly, at this new assessment rate, four subsidies would barely raise much more than the value of a single subsidy.<sup>88</sup> The House of Lords was also dissatisfied with the burden of supply that was to fall upon their shoulders, and the Committee of Privileges met on 29 October to consider how the Lords’ payments could be eased as “some of the Lords pay the Twelfth Part of the Estates of a Subsidy.”<sup>89</sup> The following day, a committee from the Lords was nominated to attend Wandesford to present their concerns, hoping that “a Moderation be used in taxing them, with relation to the Ease done the House of Commons, and to their Lordship’s Estates...” They also asked that in the future, the Subsidy Bill was drawn up in a different way so that the Lords could be certain that what they granted was “at least in Proportion with the Commons.”<sup>90</sup>

Radcliffe’s role within this session of Parliament is fairly obscure and although he does appear on some committees and acted as a carrier of bills to the Lords and the Lord Deputy.<sup>91</sup> On 10 October, Radcliffe, Lord Dillon and the Master

---

they needed a quantity of money “as may be competent to prevent those sad effects w[hi]ch y[ou]r L[ordshi]p well knows may arise from the sloe payment of an Army, united in one body.” Wandesford and Irish Privy Council to Wentworth, 28 July 1640, *ibid*, ff. 31v – 32r.

<sup>86</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 24 August 1640, *ibid*, f. 33v.

<sup>87</sup> Wandesford to Radcliffe, 7 August 1640, *ibid*, f. 33r.

<sup>88</sup> Clarke, *Old English* p. 132, Perceval-Maxwell, ‘Protestant faction,’ p. 250.

<sup>89</sup> *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 139.

<sup>90</sup> On 7 November Ormond reported to the Lords that the Committee from the Lords had discussed the issue with Wandesford who agreed that it was a matter of consequence and that he would take it into consideration. Ormond reported Wandesford’s response to the House of Lords. He would ensure that the King “will take special Care to see the same taxed with Ease, Moderation and Equality...” As for the future raising of supply, Wandesford was not sure “whether it may happen in his time or no; if it do, he will give them the best Satisfaction he may therein; if in the Lord Lieutenant’s Time, he will give their Lordships the best assistance he can, in recommending the same to his Lordship’s Care.” *ibid*, pp. 139 - 140.

<sup>91</sup> Radcliffe carried the Act for the “granting of six entire Subsidies by the Prelates and Clergy of Ireland” to the Lords on 15 October 1640. On 21 October 1640, Radcliffe along with Lord Dillon, the Vice Treasurer and the Chancellor of the Exchequer were to carry details concerning mortuaries to the Lord Deputy. *ibid*, p. 126, *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 157.

of the Wards represented the government on the select committee to discuss the questions concerning the privileges of the House.<sup>92</sup> Lord Dillon and Radcliffe joined with the Vice Treasurer Sir Adam Loftus to discuss a bill to establish and reduce temporal and ecclesiastical Court fees.<sup>93</sup> However, although Radcliffe did attend more committees in the third session than in the earlier sessions of the 1640 Parliament, supporters of the administration were not in attendance at vital meetings. For example, the committee nominated to meet on 7 November to determine when the Remonstrance outlining their grievances could be presented, did not contain any government supporters.<sup>94</sup> This committee led to the most dramatic event within the third session of the Parliament when the House of Commons presented their grievances against the government.<sup>95</sup> On 7 November 1640, the Humble and Just Remonstrance was ready to be presented and on 9 November the Speaker of the House of Commons presented it to the Lord Deputy.<sup>96</sup> The complaints within the Remonstrance formed the roots of the impeachment case against Wentworth although Kearney has pointed out that the Remonstrance and the impeachment articles were different in that the Remonstrance outlined the grievances of the Old English as well as the New English.<sup>97</sup> The Remonstrance broadly consisted of the accusation that Wentworth had introduced arbitrary government in Ireland.<sup>98</sup> Wandesford did not

---

<sup>92</sup> *ibid*, p. 156.

<sup>93</sup> On 24 October the issue of fees was committed to examine precedents in the settling of fees, and both Radcliffe and Vice Treasurer Loftus attended this committee. On the same day, a bill was committed again demonstrating concern with ecclesiastical revenue, to discuss the "Improvement of the Revenue of the Church, and securing of Estates derived from ecclesiastical Persons..." Christopher Wandesford and George Radcliffe attended this committee. *ibid*, pp. 159 - 160.

<sup>94</sup> Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant faction,' p. 252.

<sup>95</sup> The committee members were reproached for passing the Remonstrance without debating it within the House. The committee excused themselves by stating that one member of the House had stood up and they believed that he was about to call them to a meeting with Wandesford who intended to adjourn the House. Therefore they had to pass the Remonstrance quickly without further debate. *Commons Journal of Ireland* pp. 142, 148, 149 – 151, 152 in Russell, C. 'The British Background to the Irish Rebellion of 1641,' *English Historical Review* 61 (1989), p. 169.

<sup>96</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* pp. 162, 163.

<sup>97</sup> Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 201.

<sup>98</sup> P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 73 in Russell, 'The British Background,' p. 170. The Remonstrance attacked "arbitrary rates upon trade; against decisions upon paper petitions to the council board; the denial of the limitation act of... James the first... extrajudicial judgments against patents of estates in the council; the monopoly of tobacco, and other monopolies; the ill usage of the commissioners for the plantation of Londonderry; high commission courts and clerical exactions; informations in the Exchequer against antient boroughs, and their right to send members to Parliament, &c." Mountmorres. *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. II, pp. 39 – 40. Although the Remonstrance combined complaints from both the Old and New English, articles that might have been an "embarrassment to Pym's party" in the English House of Commons, were not emphasised. Kearney has described the Remonstrance as being "drafted with an eye to English politics" and therefore the plantation of Connacht, the actions against the jury of Galway and religious grievances were not

immediately react to the Remonstrance. On 11 November, a select committee from the Commons was chosen to attend Wandesford to find out when he would give his response and it was agreed that they would meet the following day.<sup>99</sup> Wandesford's response was to prorogue the Parliament for a few days until 17 November.<sup>100</sup>

Wandesford was forced to ward off this attack upon Wentworth's government by hurriedly proroguing Parliament, especially as it now appeared that the Lords were about to bring their own Remonstrance as well. On 19 November, Wandesford tore the page that recorded the decision to reduce the subsidies dated 20 October 1640 and its confirmation on 11 November, from the *Commons Journal*.<sup>101</sup> This has parallels with King James I's tearing the English House of Commons' Protestation from the *Commons Journal* in 1621 in order to protect the monarchy from parliamentary encroachment upon its authority.<sup>102</sup>

Wandesford's hurried prorogation only served to make the Commons more oppositional when they reconvened. On 17 November, they wrote impeachment articles against Thomas Wentworth and his rule in Ireland. A commission was appointed to take the impeachment and present it to the King. It was impractical to address their complaints to Wentworth's ally Lord Deputy Wandesford, and therefore they nominated a committee to take the Remonstrance directly to the King in England. Wandesford attempted to prevent the commission from going to England, but it left without his licence.<sup>103</sup> Russell indicates that the committee membership shows that opposition to Wentworth's administration had broken down traditional

---

explicit. When the Remonstrance was formed into the articles of impeachment, only New English complaints were aired. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 202.

<sup>99</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* pp. 164, 165.

<sup>100</sup> *ibid*, p. 165.

<sup>101</sup> *ibid*, p. 166, Clarke, *Old English* pp. 133 – 135, *Lords Journal of Ireland* pp. 139, 142, Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant faction,' p. 250, Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 201.

<sup>102</sup> The Commons had claimed that one part of the body did not owe its whole existence to the head alone. The parallels with the body politic are apparent here, and King James I reacted "in a piece of high theatre" by tearing the page from the *Commons Journal* in front of the Privy Council. The Protestation had also insisted that free speech was essential for the future of Parliament. James subsequently dissolved the Parliament of 1621. Hirst, D. *England in Conflict, 1603 – 1660* (London, 1999), pp. 23, 107.

<sup>103</sup> Gormanston, Kilmallock and Muskerry (all Catholics) were to take grievances to the King. The petition asked that as they were unable to leave Ireland, would the English Commons present it to the King on their behalf? They urged the English Parliament to "join with it your own desires and assistance in behalves of the commons of this kingdom that... it may be relieved from such grievances as it now groans under." British Library. Egerton MS 1048, f.13, in Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant faction,' p. 251, Carte, T. *The Life of James, Duke of Ormonde* (6 vols, Oxford, 1851), vol. I, pp. 216, 231.

groupings of Irish political opposition.<sup>104</sup> Catholics and Protestants, as well as New and Old English were unified in their opposition to Wentworth's administration in Ireland.

Why did the Irish Parliament pursue Wentworth in an attempt to impeach him? Was it really because they believed that he was tyrannical or can we identify more sinister manoeuvrings beneath this cover? Perceval-Maxwell has presented an interesting thesis that the assault on Wentworth's government was a calculated and informed attack in order to obtain the profits of the proposed plantation of Connacht. This plan to wrestle control of the government originated within Wentworth's own Privy Council, particularly amongst Sir Adam Loftus, Sir William Parsons, Sir Charles Coote, Sir Robert Meredith and Sir John Borlase. These were branded in a Post-Reformation account as "the prime movers in the conspiracy."<sup>105</sup> Sir George Wentworth asserted that his sources, which including Sir Charles Coote, Lord Robert Dillon, and "many papers," recognised that this group of men had plotted to bring down Wentworth's government.<sup>106</sup> The original plan had been to relocate Wentworth to an office in England, but once the Short Parliament was called, the plotters realised that public opinion could be turned against Wentworth. If exploited accurately, this might lead to Wentworth's impeachment. It would also be part of the plan to remove George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford at the same time so that the way would be open for Sir William Parsons and Sir John Borlase to be the new Lord Justices. In this capacity they could ensure the removal of any remnants of Wentworth's supporters.<sup>107</sup> Consequently, the new Irish government would be able to share the profits of the plantation lands. Maxwell-Stuart's thesis is interesting, but should certainly be considered cautiously. Even if men were moving behind the scenes with the profits of plantation in mind, there were certainly others who were convinced that Wentworth's regime had had a negative effect upon Ireland. George Wentworth may

---

<sup>104</sup> The Irish Lords took longer to appoint their committee before Parliament was adjourned, as Ormond "did so divert, contend, and even wrangle for [Wentworth] till midnight." However, the Lords chose four Lords in Dublin to carry their complaints to London. Southwell, R. 'The Life of the First Duke of Ormond,' in Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* pp. 220 – 221, *Commons Journal Ireland* pp. 162 – 165, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 64, *Lords Journal of Ireland* pp. 142, 148, 149 – 151, 152, Russell, 'The British Background,' p. 169.

<sup>105</sup> Account of the rebellion in Ireland ascribed to Nicholas Plunkett, *HMC 2<sup>nd</sup> Report* p. 230 in Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant faction,' p. 237.

<sup>106</sup> This report was written between 1642 and 1649. Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 228 – 233. Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant faction,' p. 237.

<sup>107</sup> Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 230. Perceval-Maxwell, 'Protestant faction,' p. 238.

also have been driven by the desire to restore the good name of his brother and therefore developed conspiracy theories to do so.<sup>108</sup>

Wandesford again prorogued Parliament on 17 November to meet again on 26 January 1641, to try and prevent this impeachment attack on Wentworth.<sup>109</sup> The Commons protested against Wandesford's actions by petitioning the King. They were aware that the King felt that Parliament had "fallen from its loyal attitude" by attempting to regulate the levy of supply. The Commons' petition announced that when Wandesford tore the pages from the *Commons Journal* on 19 November, "it struck a strange terror and amazement into the hearts of all your Majesty's subjects of that kingdom, who either saw or heard it." Only extreme loyalty to the Crown had prevented Ireland from "breaking out into tumult," and the problems between the Irish Commons and the government of Ireland "arose simply from the arbitrary action of the Council in applotting the first subsidy, and in demanding a far larger sum than could be paid." They justified their actions against the subsidies by declaring that they were aggrieved that the Irish House of Commons was forced to agree to subsidy ratings that were much higher than in England. The Commons felt that their actions had been misconstrued to the King and as they had been banned from leaving Ireland, they were unable to "bring the truth to your knowledge." The petitioners requested that they be allowed to travel to England to justify their actions and asked that the order torn from the *Commons' Journal* be restored.<sup>110</sup>

Wandesford had prorogued the third session of Parliament to try and contain this direct attack upon Wentworth. He had been unable to withstand the attacks of a more aggressive and ambitious Parliament and despite his attempts to ward off problems by sudden prorogations, the House of Commons were clearly the most dominant force in the Irish politics of 1640.

### **The death of Christopher Wandesford**

The turmoil of the Parliament of 1640, the responsibility of Deputyship and worry about Wentworth who had recently been impeached by the English Parliament, took a huge toll upon Wandesford's health. He appeared to lose enthusiasm for the government of Ireland once the news of Strafford's arrest and trial reached him. Lord

---

<sup>108</sup> However, Perceval- Maxwell indicates that other circumstantial evidence is inclined to back George Wentworth up. *ibid*, p. 238.

<sup>109</sup> *Lords Journal of Ireland* p. 142.

Scudamore recorded in his journal that Wandesford had fallen into a trance when he heard that Wentworth had been imprisoned in the Tower accused of high treason and that the Sergeant at Arms was about to arrest Radcliffe under suspicion of treason.<sup>111</sup> Wandesford managed to dine with Ormond, Dillon and Radcliffe and others on 29 November but was taken ill again shortly afterwards and died on 3 December 1640.<sup>112</sup>

Despite the problems that he faced, Wandesford was not universally hated in his capacity as Lord Deputy. Wandesford's half-brother, William Wandesford wrote to Sir Rowland Wandesford, a distant kinsman, from Dublin on 12 December, stating that many Irishmen had appreciated the work of the Lord Deputy. He reported that

The people in the streets bemone his losse, and praise his goodnesse. The nobles mourne and weepe for him, some so passionately, that their Ladies charge their families not to name him, (so apt are their griefes to take touch at the least mencion of him;): for his enemies he either had none, or none that durst appeare in his life for feare, or I hope will now after his death for shame; for his fortunes in this Kingdome they are unsettled, but I hope in good time may be to a faire renoune."<sup>113</sup>

Clearly as Wandesford's relative, William Wandesford's view of his half-brother was almost certainly distorted, but this statement supports the view that it was not

---

<sup>110</sup> P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 59, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* pp. 248 – 249.

<sup>111</sup> Scudamore reported that on 12 November 1640, the English House of Commons had debated how they might demand Radcliffe to come to England "as a delinquent to be questioned in our Parliament..." It was decided that despite the fact he was a member of the Irish Parliament and therefore could argue for parliamentary privilege, he was accused of Treason and therefore "Hee had lost all his Priuiledge, till hee should discharge himself of that Treason Hee stood accused of..." The Commons felt justified to send for Radcliffe and Sir Robert King who was to be used as a witness against him. 'John, First Lord Scudamore, his News-Letters from March 26 to December 24 1640,' British Library, Additional MS 11045, (second series), 12 November, ff. 133r - 133v. Rushworth recorded that the House of Commons had had "a serious debate" concerning Radcliffe, "an intimate of the Lord Lieutenants in Ireland, in whom he reposed great Trust and Confidence, and by the discourse was as if he were guilty of High Treason, in endeavouring to subvert the Fundamental Laws and that he did joyn with the Earl to bring an Army from Ireland into this Kingdom, and had joined with the said Earl to use Regal Power, and to deprive the Subjects of this Kingdom of their Liberties..." As both Radcliffe and Sir Robert King were members of the Irish Parliament, the matter was referred to a committee to decide if they could be called to England. On 13 November, it was decided that Radcliffe could be called as he was accused of High Treason, and Sir Robert King, although not ordinary for a witness in a trial to be called whilst a member of Parliament, these were extraordinary circumstances. Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* pp. 4 – 5. After hearing the news of Wentworth's imprisonment and Radcliffe's imminent arrest, Lord Scudamore reported that "my Lord deputy came not to himselfe, after hee fell into that trance." 'John, First Lord Scudamore News-Letters,' British Library, Additional MS 11045, 15 December 1640, f. 134.

<sup>112</sup> On the day Wandesford died, plans were already being made for his potential replacement as Master of the Rolls. Rawdon wrote to Lord Conway and Killultagh on 3 December 1640 stating that Sir Maurice Eustace, the Speaker of the Commons, "would be a good man for the place..." P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 56, *CSPI 1633 – 47* p. 247. Wandesford was carried from Dublin Castle to Christ's Church where he was interred before the Lord Deputy's seat on 10 December 1640. McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* p. 81.

<sup>113</sup> Firth, C.H. 'Letters of William Wandesford to Sir Rowland Wandesford,' *English Historical Review* 9 (1894), p.551.

Wandesford himself that caused the eruption of Parliamentary discontent, but rather that he was unfortunately, as the representative of English rule in Ireland, the recipient of the culmination of their grievances. Aware of the need for continuity of representation in Ireland, Charles I appointed Lord Dillon and Sir William Parsons as Justices of Ireland in Wandesford's place.<sup>114</sup>

However, other people in Ireland did not view Wandesford's demise so sympathetically, seeing it within the context of the downfall of Wentworth's extra-judicial administration more generally. The Earl of Cork's servant Walley wrote to his patron on 12 December 1640, stating that God's "wrathfull hand" was to be thanked for Wentworth's downfall as He cast down

the proude and loftie from their seates, and Exaltes the meeke and lowly;  
for it could not be thought that the Lo[rd] Lieutenants tirrorising, and most  
intemp[er]ate hand in the gou[er]nm[en]t of this Kingdom wold longe  
p[er]sist.

Walley believed that God had made the Earl of Cork a judge within Wentworth's trial as he was the man who had "thirst after yo[u]r ruinne had it bin in

---

<sup>114</sup> Charles I wrote to the Irish Privy Council on 15 December 1640 stating that he had granted "full power & authority" to Thomas Wentworth "to nominate and assigne by Letters Patents under Our Greate Seale of that Kingdome in Our name... any p[er]son whome he shall thinke fitt to be Our Deputy during Our pleasure for the Government of the said Kingdome in his absence until Our said Lieut[enan]t Generall and Governour Generall should returne thither..." Since he had nominated Christopher Wandesford "to be Our Deputy of Our said Kingdome in his absence..." it had now come to his knowledge that Wandesford had died "whereby that Government is at this present unsupplied, but only by you our Councell..." The King reported that Wentworth had been a suitor to nominate and appoint "some fitting Governour or Governours, to undertake that charge..." As a result, he had received good reports of the "integrity, abilities and good affections" of Robert Lord Dillon and Sir William Parsons [Master of Court of Wards and Liveries] and therefore "We doe make choice of them to be our Justices there for the present government of that Kingdome..." The letter made it clear however, that this arrangement "shall no wayes auoyd or annihilate any power or authority" outlined in the Letters Patent of 13 January 1639 granted to the Lord Lieutenant "but that the same shall be valid unto him, any thing in these presents to the contrary notwithstanding." P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 57, *CSPI 1633 - 47* pp. 247 - 8. Sir John Borlase replaced Lord Dillon as one of the Lord Justices of Ireland only a few days later alongside Sir William Parsons. It was re-iterated that their warrants still had to be signed by the Chief Baron and Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mainwaring, or two of them. 30 December 1640, *ibid*, p. 247, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / Signet Office, vol. III, 400. There is also a copy in P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 58 in Philip Mainwaring's hand. Both Parsons and Borlase were New English. Russell, 'The British Background,' p. 168. Mainwaring's responsibilities to the government of Ireland as Secretary of State were maintained. The King wrote on 15 December 1640 that the Justices "shall have the power to grant warrants, signed also by the Chief Baron of our Exchequer and Sir Philip Mainwaring, Kt., Principal Secretary in Ireland, for issuing money to the Army..." King Charles I to the Irish Privy Council, 15 December 1640, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 57, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* p. 247.

his power...” God had also demonstrated his support for Cork by removing “owt of yo[u]r L[ordshi]ps way his Confederates Radclife, and Wandesford...”<sup>115</sup>

Wentworth was so distraught at his Wandesford’s death that he stated that it “more affects me than the prospect of my own, for in him is lost the richest magazine of learning, wisdom and piety that these times can boast.”<sup>116</sup> Wandesford had chosen Wentworth in his will to bring up his son during his minority. The King confirmed this in a letter dated 4 January 1641, which offered Wentworth the chance to compound for the wardship of Wandesford’s son.<sup>117</sup> Alice Thornton reported that the King ordered both Wandesford’s funeral and his son’s wardship to be paid for by the Treasury of Ireland. This was to reward the family for Wandesford’s “faithful service in that place and his being deputie.” However, the Irish Parliament seized the King’s Treasury and therefore the funeral and wardship charges “fell sad upon all my father’s estate and his children...”<sup>118</sup>

In Wandesford’s death, Wentworth lost a strong supporter and also a potential witness who might help him to defend himself in his trial in England. The Irish Parliament were able to use Wandesford’s demise as an opportunity to press their grievances further and try to remove another key figure within Wentworth’s administration, Sir George Radcliffe.

### **The impeachment of Sir George Radcliffe**

The Irish Houses of Parliament reconvened on 26 January 1641.<sup>119</sup> The House of Commons was again pursuing its grievances. In the early months of 1641, they

---

<sup>115</sup> Walley informed Cork that Wandesford had died “even upon a Soden, not 2 days sicke... on the third day of this moneth early in the morninge...” Walley to Cork, 12 December 1640, Chatsworth House, Lismore Papers, vol. 21 / 75.

<sup>116</sup> Writing to Sir Adam Loftus on 15 December 1640, Wentworth wrote that “Since I left Ireland I have passed through all sorts of afflictions ... but indeed the loss of my excellent friend the Lord Deputy more afflicts me than all the rest, by how much I have, in my own esteem far more to lose in my friend than in myself.” McCall, *Story of the Family of Wandesforde* p. 81, Whitaker, *History of Richmondshire* p. 163.

<sup>117</sup> King Charles I to the Master of the Wards on behalf of the son of Christopher Wandesford, 4 January 1641, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / Signet Office III, 410, *CSPI 1633 – 47* p. 251. The King did show support for Wandesford’s family and ordered on 6 February 1641 in a letter to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland that he should take “acknowledgment by the oaths of two or more sufficient witnesses of all the land, &c., left by Christopher Wandesford, late Deputy of Ireland, for the advancement of his sons or daughters.” P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 423, *CSPI 1633 – 47* p. 257.

<sup>118</sup> The wardship cost the family £2,500 and the funeral amounted to more than £1,300. Jackson, *Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton* p. 26.

<sup>119</sup> On this first day, the discussion focused around whether Parliament should continue in the absence of any authority. In the absence of either a Lord Deputy or the Lord Lieutenant, Parliament’s position appeared to be in jeopardy. On 26 January 1641, Sir James Barry asked the House “Whether the

launched an attack upon the Subsidy Act issued in March 1640. This issue was exacerbated by Wandesford's removal of the order for the rating of subsidies from the *Commons' Journal*.<sup>120</sup> Later that month, the House of Commons issued a protestation which the King received on 9 March 1641, complaining that Wentworth's supporters had changed the wording to the Subsidy Act and therefore it was not a statement truly issuing from the House. In 'The Protest of the Irish House of Commons against the Preamble to the Irish Act of Subsidy,' the Commons indicated the strength of their dissatisfaction with Wentworth's regime. They complained that the preamble to the Subsidy Act had been inserted without their knowledge. In effect, this new preamble had anticipated the complaints of the Commons and tried to cancel out their influence by pre-empting them.<sup>121</sup> The replaced preamble thanked the King for "providing and placing over us so just, wise and vigilant, and profitable a Governor" as Wentworth. However, in February 1641, the House of Commons reversed the sentiments within this new preamble and presented their own version of their view of Strafford's government. They argued that when Wentworth inherited the government of Ireland, it was a "flowrishinge, wealthye, and happy estate..."<sup>122</sup> However, during the course of Wentworth's administration, "his Advisors Councillors and Ministers, have altered the face of the government of the said Kingdome, by the introducinge of a new unlawfull Arbitrary and tyrannicall government..."<sup>123</sup> They argued that Wentworth and his administrators were greedy self-seeking ministers who only worked for their own benefit and this had tended to "the great Impoverishment, and destrucc[i]on of

---

Parliament is now to dissolve, or any Power remaining to continue it... Shall we take royal Power, to make a Deputy of Lord Justices? The King only can do it." Justice Mayart responded that "...the Lord Lieutenant hath Power to name a Deputy, but not to name Justices; therefore the Parliament cannot continue." *Lords Journal of Ireland* pp. 143 - 144. It was eventually decided that the House should be adjourned but before a declaration could be issued, the King's commission to the new Lord Justices Sir William Parsons and Sir John Borlase was received. Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. I, p. 335.

<sup>120</sup> On 9 February, a select committee was appointed to meet with the Lord Justices, which asked for the King's order regarding the rating of supply, to be sent to the Commons. *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 168.

<sup>121</sup> For example, the new section of the preamble thanked the King for the "large and ample benefits which we have received and hope to receive by his Majesty's Commission of Grace for Remedy of Defective Titles," for Wentworth's "pains in restoration of the Church, the reinforcement of the Army within this Kingdom... his support of your Majesty's wholesome laws here established, his encouragement and countenance to your judges and other good officers, ministers, and dispensers of the law... his care to relieve and redress the poor and oppressed..." P.R.O. S P. 63 / 258, 73, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* p. 265.

<sup>122</sup> 'Protest of the Irish House of Commons against the Preamble to the Irish Act of Subsidy,' received by the King on 9 March 1641, P.R.O. S P. 63 / 258, 73, *CSPI 1633 - 1647* p. 265.

<sup>123</sup> P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 73, *CSPI 1633 - 1647*, pp. 265 - 266.

his Ma[jes]ties said Subjects in their landes, goodes, lives and just libties ...”<sup>124</sup>

Although they asserted that the preamble was false, the Commons promised to adhere to “the body of the said Act for the granting of the said Subsidies that they are nowe as glad and Cheerefull for to haue passed & graunted.” They hoped that they would be allowed to remove the “Contrived” preamble. Furthermore, they launched a dangerous attack upon Wentworth and his supporters. They asked that neither Wentworth or his ministers, advisors and councilors, who had “in althinges, serued their owne turnes and deceived his Ma[jes]ty and whoe are most hatefull and insupportable to this said people,” should be permitted to have any part in “Counsellinge advisinge or Actinge with or concerninge the government of this Kingdome, or the Affaires thereof...” Having removed these potentially dangerous supporters of the Wentworth regime, the Commons further pressed that the “Contrivers, Advisors and Actors” of the surreptitiously inserted subsidy preamble “maie bee discovered impeached and punished for the same and other their offences and Misdemeanors Accordinge to the Justice, and the Course of Parliament.”<sup>125</sup> This action was another convenient excuse to attack the ministers of Wentworth’s regime and to begin the process of rooting out their misdemeanors and ultimately punishing them for their contribution to Wentworth’s government.

By the end of February 1641, it was apparent that the Irish House of Commons was involved in the wider process of actively pursuing supporters of Wentworth’s regime. On 17 February 1641, a Grand Committee of the whole House of Commons wrote a “protestation concerning the Earl of Strafford and his manner of government.”<sup>126</sup> On 27 February 1641, a committee of forty-four members of the House of Commons was charged with the task of drawing up articles of impeachment against Chancellor Sir Richard Bolton, John Bramhall, Lord Chief Justice Sir Gerard Lowther and Sir George Radcliffe.<sup>127</sup> The articles of impeachment were presented to

---

<sup>124</sup> The Commons believed that the Earl of Strafford and his ministers had “beyond all measure & moderac[i]on advanced and enriched themselves by extorc[i]ons oppressions and all sorts of Iniustice to the generall greife discontent & destrucc[i]on of his Ma[jes]ties said faithfull people.” P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 73, *CSPI 1633 – 1647*, pp. 265 - 266.

<sup>125</sup> P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 73, *CSPI 1633 – 1647*, pp. 265 - 266.

<sup>126</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 176 in McCafferty, J. “To follow the late precedents of England:” the Irish impeachment proceedings of 1641, in Greer, D.S. & Dawson, N.M. (eds.) *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History* (Dublin, 2001), p. 59.

<sup>127</sup> The message was carried to the Lords on the same day by Captain Audley Mervin who reported that the Commons “did impeach the said persons of high treason; and desired that their persons might be secured, and sequestered from the house of lords, the council table, and other places of judicature...”

the House of Commons against these members of Wentworth's administration on 6 March 1641.<sup>128</sup> The articles consisted of three broad accusations. Firstly, the four men were charged with trying to bring about the "destruction of the Commonwealth of this realm..." To do this, they had "traitorously contrived, introduced and exercised an arbitrary and tyrannical government against law" in Ireland with the "countenance and assistance" of Wentworth. Secondly, they were accused of taking "regal power over the goods, persons, lands and liberties of His Majesty's subjects of this Realm..." In order to achieve their ends, they had passed unjust sentences, judgments and decrees "in extrajudicial manner against law..." Due to these acts, the people of Ireland had been forced into sedition and rebellion as they had been "ruined in their goods, lands, liberties and lives..."<sup>129</sup> A third charge accused the administration of trying to protect themselves by attempting to "subvert the rights of Parliament and the antient courses of Parliamentary proceedings..." which was against the oaths of their offices. Finally, the impeachment was confirmed and surmised by the statement that all four men had committed offences equating to high treason.<sup>130</sup> Sir Richard Bolton argued that he could not defend himself against these articles, as the charges were far too general.<sup>131</sup>

Bramhall, Bolton and Lowther presented their written responses to the charges on 13 May 1641 to the Irish House of Lords, and these were almost identical in their dismissal of each charge.<sup>132</sup> McCafferty believes that since none of these impeachments were taken to their logical conclusion, strength is given to the argument that key figures of Wentworth's administration were impeached simply to

---

Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. II, p. 43, *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 186, *Lords Journal of Ireland* pp. 165 – 166.

<sup>128</sup> However, the articles of impeachment had already been written into the *Commons Journal* on 4 March 1641. Mountmorres, *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament* vol. II, p. 44.

<sup>129</sup> The Remonstrance was keen to demonstrate that many of these people were "of good quality and reputation..." yet had been "utterly defamed by pillory, mutilation of members and other infamous punishments..." *Commons Journal of Ireland* pp. 198 –99.

<sup>130</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 198 – 199.

<sup>131</sup> 4 March 1641, *Lords Journal of Ireland* pp. 176 – 177.

<sup>132</sup> Bolton, Bramhall and Lowther all pointed out that it was not in their interests to destroy the Irish economy as their fortunes were invested in Ireland. Bramhall's answer to the charges can be found in the *Hastings Papers* HA 14072-3. Bramhall, Bolton and Lowther's written replies are in the Duchy of Cornwall office, Buckingham Gate, London, Bound MS, *Political tracts and treatises: subsidies and the Irish grievances 1640 –41* pp. 12 – 20 in McCafferty, "'To follow the late precedents of England,'" p. 67. A committee was assembled on 19 June 1641 to prepare "p[ar]ticuler, & seu[er]all charges" against Bramhall, Bolton, Radcliffe and Lowther. They were ordered to use "all diligence, faith & secrecie as the importance and weight of soe greate a Cause doth require." They had permission to send

prevent them supporting Wentworth in his trial. Bramhall, Bolton and Lowther believed that they were in little personal danger as their impeachments were simply a front to prevent them from acting as witnesses at Thomas Wentworth's trial, which began on 22 March 1641.<sup>133</sup>

Lowther and Bolton were granted bail in July 1641, although Bramhall's request was refused. He petitioned again for his release in April 1644 and February 1645, but was still declined.<sup>134</sup> As no charges had been proven against Bolton and Lowther, they both successfully regained their political positions in Ireland. However, Bramhall and Radcliffe were refused release and restoration to their former positions. A committee of the Irish House of Commons was resolute that there were still further charges to be brought against Radcliffe and Bramhall.<sup>135</sup>

Radcliffe had already found himself on the receiving end of impeachment charges from the English Houses of Parliament. Wentworth had already been summoned from Yorkshire to London in November 1640 and in a letter to Radcliffe informed him; "I am to-morrow to London, with more dangers besett, I believe, than ever any man went with out of Yorkshire."<sup>136</sup> Wentworth was correct to be fearful and the House of Commons brought preliminary charges against him on 25 November 1640, and the Lords committed him to the Tower.<sup>137</sup> At the same time, the English Parliament also impeached Radcliffe. A warrant for his arrest was issued on 13 November 1640.<sup>138</sup> On 15 November 1640, the English House of Commons required

---

for rolls, records and evidence to support their charges. The committee included Captain Audley Mervin and the lawyer Patrick Darcy. P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 481, 51, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* p. 309.

<sup>133</sup> This is an important article as it focuses on the impeachments of the members of Thomas Wentworth's government. However, there is much less focus on George Radcliffe's experience and it does not follow his trial in England at all. It examines Bramhall, Bolton and Lowther who remained in Ireland to face their charges whereas Radcliffe was called into England. McCafferty indicates that the importance of the attempted impeachments of Bramhall, Bolton and Lowther is that it helped to accelerate Wentworth's demise, as they were prevented from acting as witnesses in his trial. The impeachments also generated support and publicity for the actions of both the English and Irish Parliaments and therefore contributed to keeping Irish opposition focused in 1641. McCafferty, "To follow the late precedents of England," pp. 51, 61, 72.

<sup>134</sup> 10 April 1644 and 3 February 1645, *Commons Journal of Ireland* pp. 321, 337. The House of Lords did not release Bramhall until April 1645 and this finally marked the end of impeachment proceedings against him. *Lords Journal of Ireland* pp. 203 – 204, 217, McCafferty, "To follow the late precedents of England," pp. 65 – 66.

<sup>135</sup> 21 June 1642, *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 297, *ibid*, p. 66.

<sup>136</sup> Wentworth to Radcliffe, 6 November 1640, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 218.

<sup>137</sup> Gardiner, S.R. 'Thomas Wentworth,' *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 280.

<sup>138</sup> The warrant from William Lenthall, speaker of the House of Commons, to John Hunt, sargeant-at-arms in Ireland, requested that he "apprehend Sir George Radcliffe, member of the Parliament in Ireland, and bring him to the House in safe custody, to answer an information of high treason." *CSPD 1640 – 1641* p. 257.

Radcliffe and Sir Robert King to come over to England as witnesses in the trial of Strafford. The King avoided allowing the Commons to assert their authority in this way and over-rode their command by summoning Radcliffe and Sir Robert King himself.<sup>139</sup> He issued two letters on 15 November, the first of which ordered Radcliffe and Sir Robert King, the muster-master general and clerk of the cheque, to travel to England at once.<sup>140</sup> The second letter demonstrated more sympathy for the predicament Radcliffe found himself in. The King stated that he was willing for Radcliffe to “have three or four days for settling his affairs, after which he is speedily to come to England.”<sup>141</sup> However, Radcliffe evaded this warrant until he was taken to the Gate House of the Tower of London on 9 December 1640 where he was to be “kept in safe & sure custody...” Furthermore, it was ordered that the keeper of the Gatehouse was to “suffer no man to speake w[i]th the s[ai]d S[i]r George Radcliffe but in his presence & hearinge.”<sup>142</sup>

The nature of the charges against Radcliffe reveals that he was thought to be such a close confidant of Wentworth that he was effectively a conspirator in the crimes committed by the Lord Lieutenant against the Irish. The committee of the Irish House of Commons levied six general charges against George Radcliffe on 29 December 1640.<sup>143</sup> All of these charges represent the wider concerns of the community in Ireland who feared that Wentworth’s government was attempting to introduce a Catholic and arbitrary government, whilst allowing his supporters to line their own pockets with Irish money. Firstly, Radcliffe was accused of conspiring with Thomas Wentworth “to bringe into Ireland an Arbitrary Gouverment and to Subvert the

---

<sup>139</sup> P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 51, 52, Notestein, W. (ed). *The Journal of Sir Simonds D’Ewes. From the beginning of the Long Parliament to the Opening of the Trial of the Earl of Strafford* (New Haven, 1923), p. 31, *Journal of the House of Commons of England*, pp. 27 – 28 in Russell, C. ‘The British Background to the Irish Rebellion of 1641,’ *English Historical Review* 61 (1989), p. 175.

<sup>140</sup> Draft of the King to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, 15 November 1640, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 52, *CPSI 1633 – 47* p. 246.

<sup>141</sup> Copy of Secretary Windebank to Wentworth, 15 November 1640, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 53, *CPSI 1633 – 47* p. 247.

<sup>142</sup> 9 December 1640, ‘Order of the English House of Commons against Radcliffe,’ P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 471, 58, 16 / 473, 36.

<sup>143</sup> The English House of Commons sent a message to the House of Lords stating their resolution to accuse George Radcliffe of High Treason and to inform them that they would shortly bring Articles against him. On 26 December, a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to draw up charges against Wentworth and also had the authority to “examine Witnesses concerning Sir George Ratcliff, and to prepare a Charge against him, and to present it to this House.” The House of Lords was concerned that the Commons should “take care to make safe his Person” to which Mr Pym was sent to the Lords to acquaint them that Radcliffe’s “Person is already in safe Custody in the Gate-house, and they intended to have acquainted their Lordships with it, when they had produced the Articles against him...” Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 17.

fundamentall Lawes,” and stated that he did “joyne with the Earle to bringe in an Army from Ireland to Subdue the Subjects of England...” Secondly, the Irish House of Commons accused him of having joined with Wentworth “to use Regall power and to Deprive the Subjects of their lib[er]ties and p[ro]prieties...” This tied into the wider fear that Wentworth’s plantation policy and Commission of Defective Titles would threaten Irish landholding. Radcliffe and Wentworth were also charged with making illicit personal profit from Ireland. The third charge stated that Radcliffe had collaborated with Wentworth “to take 800000li out of the Excheq[uer] in Ireland and bought tobacco therewith, & Converted the same p[ro]fitt to their owne uses.” The intense fear of Catholicism formed part of the fourth charge. Radcliffe and Wentworth were thought to have confederated to “Countenance Papists and build monasteries, to alieuiate the affecc[i]ons of the Irish subjects from the Subiecc[i]on of England.” Relating to Scottish issues, the fifth charge stated that Radcliffe and Wentworth had attempted to “Drawe the Subjects of Scotland from the Kinge.” Finally, in order to protect themselves from potential charges, it was thought that Radcliffe and Wentworth had manipulated the Parliament and “laboured to Subvert the Liberties and p[ri]viledge of p[ar]liaments in Ireland...”<sup>144</sup> By 31 December, the articles against Radcliffe had been fully prepared. The charges were read and engrossed before being sent to the House of Lords “in maintenance of their Accusation of Sir George Ratcliff...”<sup>145</sup> The English House of Commons sent for Radcliffe and read the accusations against him on 31 December 1640. Radcliffe “made a good short speech of his innocency not doubting but to give good satisfaction, and desired counsel might be assigned, which was granted...”<sup>146</sup> Also at this time, witnesses that had been called from Ireland to testify against both Radcliffe and Wentworth were sworn in against Radcliffe.<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> ‘[S]ir George Ratcliffs Charge 29th December 1640,’ British Library, Harley MS 1769, f. 42.

<sup>145</sup> Sir John Pym carried these articles from the Commons to the Lords, stating that the Commons desired a conference with the Lords “concerning Articles exhibited against Sir George Ratcliff.” Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 18.

<sup>146</sup> On 31 December, the Commons sent a message to the Lords by Sir John Strangways asking for a committee of both houses to declare “the articles against Sir George Ratcliff what time we thought convenient.” The Lords agreed to hold the meeting “presently in the painted chamber.” At the meeting, John Pym “read the articles ingrossed in parchment, which he delivered unto us with a fine speech afterwards.” *HMC Buccleuch III*, p. 404. Radcliffe’s request for counsel appears in the form of a petition dated 2 January 1641. The List of counsel assigned to him appears on 4 January, *HMC Appendix to the Fourth Report* p. 37.

<sup>147</sup> *HMC Buccleuch III*, p. 404. On 5 January 1641, a draft order was made for the “attendance of witnesses from Ireland at the trial of the Earl of Strafford and Sir George Radcliffe.” *HMC Appendix to the Fourth Report* p. 38.

The charges of the committee of the Irish House of Commons against Radcliffe were written more fully and presented to the King as a Remonstrance on 3 January 1641. The King ordered that a copy of the Remonstrance should be sent to Radcliffe and stated that he was “required to send his Ma[jes]ty his answer forthw[i]th in wrighting to the p[ar]ticulars therein expressed.”<sup>148</sup> It was not until 27 June 1641 that Radcliffe’s answer to the charges, addressed to the King, was read in the English Privy Council.<sup>149</sup> Firstly however, Radcliffe was required to answer to questions of a committee of the English House of Lords “appointed to consider of the Greevances of the Lords & Commons of Ireland.” They were concerned with three issues. Firstly, they asked Radcliffe why he believed that “the King shall loose a Revenew of Inheritance of 20000 *li* p[er] ann[um] & more by passing of the Act of Limitations.”<sup>150</sup> Radcliffe responded that a Statute of Limitation would impede the benefits of the work of the Commission of Defective Titles, which he believed would amount to £6 – 7,000 per year in rents and tenures. If the Statute were allowed to pass, then the plantations of Connaght, Ormond and Tipperary would be prevented, resulting in a loss of £20,000 per year for the King. Radcliffe argued that if the King consented to the Act of Limitations, he should first ensure that an Act of Parliament was in place to protect his plantations. Radcliffe recalled that the Irish House of Commons had sent to England an Act “drawne by themselves whereby the Kinges Tyle to those plantac[i]ons was confirmed...” which had passed apart from a few small errors in the wording. Radcliffe pointed out that if the Irish revenues were allowed to lose so much money, the Irish Army could not be paid for. This would provide the opportunity for the native Irish, who were “too hard for the Englishe, & Brittishe,” to “destroy all the plantac[i]ons.” Radcliffe demonstrated the cost of supplying Ireland with an army by revealing that the three subsidies amounting to £120,000 which the King had gained by initially consenting to the Graces, had all

---

<sup>148</sup> 6 January 1641, P.R.O. S.P.16 / 476, 36.

<sup>149</sup> ‘Sir George Ratcliffes answer to the particulars Exp[re]ssed in the Remonstrance of the Kn[igh]ts Cittizons and Burgesses of the howse of Com[m]ons in Ireland,’ P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 62, *CSPI 1633 – 47* pp. 252 – 6.

<sup>150</sup> ‘Notes by Nicholas on the Irish Grievances, read to the committee of the House of Lords on 13 March 1641,’ P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 74, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* pp. 266 – 267. The Statutes of Limitations was also specifically mentioned in the Petition of Remonstrance against Wentworth’s government of 7 November 1640. It was the only Grace directly referred to (the Graces were, on the whole, left out of the complaints, due to their association with being Catholic demands, further supporting the argument that the Remonstrance was written with consideration for English attitudes). and the complaint implied that Wentworth denied the advantages of an English law to the Irish. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 202.

been spent in paying and settling the army. Secondly, the Lords asked Radcliffe to clarify if the Irish lawyer Patrick Darcy or any others from Connaght had offered any composition for “confirmation of their Tyttles.” This related to concerns about the treatment of the Galway jury who had not found in favour of the King’s Title, and therefore had been pursued by Wentworth. Radcliffe was not afraid to defend himself on the grounds that he knew nothing of such a thing. Finally the Lords questioned how Connaght could be planted with English and Scots men, particularly in the port towns “w[hi]ch lye most convenyent for the trade w[i]th Spayne: And whether the Inhabitants there be not all in a Manner Natiues & Catholiques.” Radcliffe responded that the four counties of Connaght, especially those coastal areas, did not contain more than ten Catholic churches in the whole area, believing that the threat of Catholicism was being exaggerated in England.<sup>151</sup>

On 27 June 1641, Radcliffe’s response to the Remonstrance of the committee of the Irish House of Commons was read to the King at the Privy Council. The King declared that he had sent Radcliffe’s response to Wentworth.<sup>152</sup> This might enable Wentworth to formulate responses to the charges that would corroborate Radcliffe’s defence, giving their collective defence unity and therefore strength. Wentworth read the copy of the ‘Originall Aunswere to the Remonstrance presented to us by the Committee of o[u]r Com[m]ons of Ireland, w[hi]ch is signed by S[i]r George Radcliff,’ and “avowed” that Radcliffe’s answers to the Remonstrance were “to be likewise his aunswere to the said Remonstrance...”<sup>153</sup> The basis of Radcliffe’s defence was that Ireland had been governed according to Magna Carta, the laws and customs of Ireland and the statutes of the country. He argued that Ireland had “groweth to a flourishing state: as maie well appeare both by the considerable Improvem[en]t of the values of land there, and by the greate increase of Trade, Commerce and Shipping...” He believed that Ireland had been fairly treated and this was demonstrated by the fact that the Irish House of Commons had “freely & cheerefully” given six subsidies in the Parliament of 1634 – 1635. Parliament had decided that this should amount to £250,000. Having defended Wentworth’s

---

<sup>151</sup> ‘Notes by Nicholas on the Irish Grievances,’ P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 74, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* pp. 266 – 267.

<sup>152</sup> On 24 March 1641, the King had issued an order which commanded that a copy of the ‘Originall Aunswere to the Remonstrance presented to us by the Committee of o[u]r Com[m]ons of Ireland, w[hi]ch is signed by S[i]r George Radcliff,’ be sent to Wentworth by William Raylton. P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 478, 59.

<sup>153</sup> 27 June 1641, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / 476, 82.

administration, Radcliffe turned his attention to the King's generosity towards the Irish people. Although the Irish Parliament had granted supply to the King, he had not used the money for his own benefit. The subsidies were "returned backe unto the people for their ease, Comfort, & Seruility..." Radcliffe also implied that as the current Irish Parliament had granted four subsidies, they could not have been discontented with their government. What was more, these were granted with "greate & zealous expressions of their readiness to Complie w[i]th yo[u]r Ma[jes]tes occasions..."<sup>154</sup>

Radcliffe complained that the Remonstrance presented against him in Parliament had not been presented according to parliamentary protocol. The Remonstrance had been read twice and then immediately put to the vote, despite the fact that the matters had "neuer beene form[er]ly discussed or examined in the house..." Radcliffe complained that no member of the House was permitted to speak against the Remonstrance or bring up any questions.<sup>155</sup> Radcliffe argued that the House of Commons were mistaken in many of their complaints against him and that "it will very manifestly appeare that the said house of Com[m]ons weare misinformed therein..." For example, he felt particularly unable to accept the Commons' complaint that Ireland was reduced to poverty and stated that the "Charge of each Subsidie would not bee anie considerable burthen att all..."<sup>156</sup>

In many of the charges levied against Radcliffe, he was held responsible for the collective actions of the Irish Privy Council. He was asked to justify proceedings that he personally had little to do with. At first sight, many of the accusations seem to have little connection with Radcliffe's role in the Irish government. It seems that he

---

<sup>154</sup> 'Sir George Ratcliffes answer,' P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 62. Accusations of financial impropriety were also levied against Wentworth in his impeachment trial. He was accused of taking £24,000 of the King's money. Sir Adam Loftus, the Vice Treasurer was interrogated and supported Wentworth and Radcliffe who were associated with him in financial wranglings. Loftus confirmed that Wentworth and Radcliffe "had never a penny out of the Exchequer, but on such Warrants as I durst not deny them, for their due entertainments and other things importing His Majesties Service." However, he did recall, that Radcliffe had approached him to withdraw money from the Exchequer for Wentworth, "to be paid for the profits of the Customs which were in arrear." Radcliffe gave his own and Wentworth's bond for the money and Loftus accepted this, "they being Partners in the Customs..." Loftus recalled that this money was discharged in two bonds of £19,000 and £5,000 and was repaid "lately; within these three months." Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p.115.

<sup>155</sup> Radcliffe argued that some had attempted to debate the Remonstrance. He stated that "an eminent member of the said house did for a good space of time stande upp and offer to speake Yet hee would not bee heard for the noise of such as called for the question..." 'Sir George Ratcliffes answer,' P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 62.

<sup>156</sup> Radcliffe believed that the burden of the subsidy payments was insignificant as it would not "exceed three pounds p[er] Cent of the an[n]uall rent or value of the lands, and 2/i p[er] Centu[ry] of their goods..." *ibid*, 258, 62.

was the focus for broader attacks upon the Irish government more generally; effectively he was viewed as the representative of Wentworth's administration, which indicates how close the alliance between Wentworth and Radcliffe was thought to be. The Commons assumed that Radcliffe had inside knowledge of Wentworth's supposed intention to manipulate and control the Irish Privy Council. The Commons may also have been levying a wide variety of complaints against Wentworth's government more generally, directly against Radcliffe, in order to make the charges appear more complete and convincing. However, Radcliffe was able to use these more vague charges with which he had little involvement to demonstrate that the Commons' attack upon him was inaccurate.

In his responses to the charges, Radcliffe appealed to the King's prerogative throughout. He demonstrated that in fact it was the Parliament that was encroaching upon the King's rights, and therefore the Irish Privy Council's actions against them were justified. Radcliffe's all-encompassing responses also clearly demonstrate his legal mind. He refused to be drawn into accusations that he had nothing to do with, stating where necessary that the particular charge was not something he could answer as he was not involved. For example, in response to the fourteenth article concerned with actions in Parliament, Radcliffe stated that it was "soe generall as that noe Answere can bee giuen thereto..."<sup>157</sup>

The charges against Radcliffe fall into three broad categories: Revenue issues, extra-judicial behaviour and complaints about the Irish clergy. The first charge of the Remonstrance levied against Radcliffe was that Irish trade had suffered at the hands of Wentworth's administration. Radcliffe, as a customs farmer, was thought to have contributed to this decline. Radcliffe retaliated by demonstrating that the entries in the Customs Books proved that "Trade is soe farr from a gen[er]all decaie, that it is much increased." In fact, he believed that under Wentworth's government, trade had doubled and the value of Irish commodities was worth twice that of imported merchandise. In Radcliffe's opinion, this could only "inrich the Kingdome." He provided specific evidence of a survey conducted by Customs Officers that indicated that there was an increase in shipping and trade. He defended Wentworth's customs policy stating that the fees within the Book of Rates had not increased under

---

<sup>157</sup> He held that if anyone had particular complaints, they should explain fully what it was. If indeed an error had arisen, he was sure that the Ministers of State would be "soe farr from p[er]sisting in an Error

Wentworth. Neither had he received any specific complaints of “anie extreame usadge or Censures of Marchants, Or that they are beggared, disenabled, or discouraged to trade...” In fact, Radcliffe argued that merchants had been fully supported and encouraged in their trading. Most important, Radcliffe was able to appeal to the proof of the increase in the King’s personal profits, demonstrating that his five-eighth share of the customs profits was “now one of the Choicest Branches of your Ma[jes]tes reuenuē, as maie appeare by the yearely accompts thereof.”

The sixth charge against Radcliffe concerned the impost on tobacco that had been radically increased. However, Radcliffe stated that the tax was not as great as the Commons complained, and argued that the government been forced to act as they had found “greate neglect or fraude in the Collection of that Impost.” Due to the “nature of that drug soe unnecessary and Subject to soe much abuse might beare,” the government had altered the collection of the impost so that now the King received tobacco customs and an annual rent.

Radcliffe was also accused of his part in the unlawful increase of monopolies. However, Radcliffe argued that the accusation against him was too vague for him to answer. The Commons had not mentioned which monopolies they were complaining about and indeed Radcliffe believed that there was not a single current monopoly that had passed under the Great Seal of Ireland during Wentworth’s Lord Deputyship. He questioned whether the Commons were mistakenly accusing him granting of monopolies that were already in existence in 1633 such as starch, or otherwise which were granted in England, such as “Glasses and Iron potts: none of w[hi]ch haue receiued anie greate Countenance from the State in Ireland...”

Radcliffe’s response to the final general article which complained of Ireland being brought to the edge of ruin, stated that he had demonstrated that “there hath beene noe such grievances or pressures putt of late upon the gentry, Murchants, or other subjects of Ireland whereby to bringe them neare to ruine & destruction...” He declared that the customs farmers had dealt fairly in all of their proceedings and had “not gained one penny but what appeares upon Record in the Exchecq[ue]r...” He admitted that there was a scarcity of coin in Ireland, but disputed that this could be attributed to any of the pretended grievances brought against him. He believed that this was due to a combination of factors. Firstly, it could partly be attributed to the

---

as that they will bee verie ready & willing to giue all due satisfaction, and redresse the same for the

failure of pilchard fishing which used to bring coin into Ireland, secondly due to the “late troubles in Scotland w[hi]ch haue brought some hinderance of Trade,” and thirdly to the issue of great Irish nobles who drew “their rents and profitts out of that kingdome” yet lived in England. He also placed some blame on some port towns which had been exacting “some strange duties called Towne bargaines and others upon Marchants goods that haue come to trade there...”

The second category of charges was concerned with the subversion of law. The second article of Radcliffe’s impeachment was concerned with arbitrary legal proceedings. Radcliffe countered this charge by stating that he did not know of any instances of “arbitrary decisions of ciuill Causes” except where the proceedings were by the consent of the parties. Against each of the charges levied against him, Radcliffe argued that he had no evidence that there had ever been concerns about these proceedings. For example, he stated that the right of freehold had not been threatened and at the same time, the “ordinary Course and Courts of Justice” had been preserved. Furthermore, the Irish had not had any cause to complain about the loss of any legal advantages such as bills of reversal, or concerns about immoderate fees being collected. However, Radcliffe did admit that some petitioners had approached Wentworth for redress of grievances “against such as denied them right or did them wronge, but that they haue hadd just releife thereby according to lawe & equity...” He believed that Wentworth’s “sinceare & upright administrac[i]on of Justice w[i]thout partiality” was acknowledged as a “publique benefit to the Kingdome” by the Commons in the preamble to the Subsidy Act. However, as we have seen, the Irish House of Commons had complained that this preamble had been inserted illicitly.

In the third article, the Irish Privy Council was accused of proceeding in “Ciuill Causes Contrarie to lawe...” Here Radcliffe was accused as a representative of the Council as a whole. However, Radcliffe demonstrated that the use of the Council as a court of justice was an “auntient usadge & Custome time out of minde” and therefore Wentworth had been within his right to use the Council to judge cases. However, Radcliffe was careful to indicate that the Council Board had only been used in this way when it was in the clear interest of the State. In particular, he highlighted “the maintenance of religion, Rights of the Church, and brittish planters, w[hi]ch w[i]thout the protecc[i]on & Justice of that Board would bee in danger of

---

future...” *ibid.*, 258, 62.

Subuersion...” Radcliffe was concerned to demonstrate that the Council had not been used arbitrarily as a court of law to press illegal proceedings through.

The supposed subversion of the benefit of the Graces formed the fourth charge. Radcliffe’s defence showed that the Graces had not been suppressed illegally as according to Poyning’s Law, the Graces could not pass in Ireland without the Lord Deputy and Council presenting them to the King under the Great Seal of Ireland. Radcliffe explained that blame should be laid on the English Privy Council who had debated the Graces but decided not to allow the Graces to pass into law. Radcliffe felt personally assured that the Irish people had not been ill treated in this as instead they had gained the benefit of the Commission for remedy of Defective Titles which had enabled many to secure “their estates for easie rents...” Accused of rejecting beneficial laws, Radcliffe argued that the government of Ireland had been unable to pass the Statute of Limitations as it would rob the King of £20,000 each year and would prevent the King from “Strengthening and Civilizing a greate parte of that Kingdome, and of bringing in Com[m]erce, industrie & religion thither by the intended plantac[i]on there...” The plantations were ready to be settled and would increase the honour and profit of the Crown as well as improving the “comfort, benefit, & Security of yo[u]r good subjects.”<sup>158</sup> In the impeachment charges against Wentworth, the issue of allowing the Court of Castle Chamber to be misused in settling plantation was raised. Wentworth defended himself against this fifteenth charge by stating that Wandesford’s plantation of Idough was “established in a Legal way” whilst Wentworth was in England, therefore disassociating himself with any impropriety.<sup>159</sup> The ninth article against Radcliffe also attacked the use of the Court of High Commission. Radcliffe defended Wentworth’s government by protesting that the Court was not an innovation and was “fully warranted by an Act of Parliam[en]t...” He believed that the use of the Court was integral to Irish law, if used with the moderation that it ought to be. Radcliffe professed that the Court had been used moderately during Wentworth’s rule, yet if there were ever any irregularities suspected in its proceedings, these should certainly be investigated.<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> *ibid.*, 258, 62.

<sup>159</sup> The charge levied also suggested that armed force had been used to settle the plantation to which Wentworth explained that “no souldiers were sent, but only 12 at the intreaty of Mr Wanesford, for security of his Houses and Plantations against Rebels that then were out, and burned and spoiled Houses thereabouts.” Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 26.

<sup>160</sup> ‘Sir George Ratcliffes answer,’ P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 62.

The problem of vague accusations again raised its head in the fifth article against Radcliffe. The charge indicted that letters patent had been “extrajudicially avoided...” Radcliffe seemed to be aware of what this charge might be angling towards however, pointing out that if the Commons were referring to the letters patents of the plantation of Connaght, nothing was done at the Council Board which would give cause of complaint. These letters patents found the King’s Title to the lands “according to yo[u]r auntient right” and a statute of Henry VII’s reign that indicated the King’s right to “all Such lands in Connaght...” Radcliffe added that if anyone was not satisfied with the decision of the Judges, they should be “proceeded w[i]th in a legall waie...” This charge was levied against Radcliffe as he was seen as one of the instigators of problems with letters patents.<sup>161</sup>

The Commons accused Radcliffe, and Wentworth’s government more generally, of prohibiting men from taking their complaints to England when they were dealt with unfairly in Ireland. Radcliffe protested that it had always been prohibited for “anie liege man or Officer of the Kinge to goe out of the Realme” and therefore Wentworth had used precedents. He argued that “the nobility undertakers and others holding estates or Offices in Ireland should bee resident there, and not to departe w[i]thout licence,” and that the command had issued from the Crown.

In the fourteenth article against Radcliffe, the complaint that certain burgesses had been excluded from the Irish Parliament of 1640 was levied. To the Commons, this appeared to be an attempt to pack Parliament. Radcliffe explained that in the Parliament of 1634 – 35, it had been discovered that one town had sent burgesses despite never having sent members of Parliament before. Several other towns had also sent members, although they had “neuer sent but once in the last foregoeing Parliam[en]t...” In all of these examples, none of the members had any grant for this privilege. Complaint had been made to the Committee of Privileges, but no action was

---

<sup>161</sup> For example, Richard, Earl of Westmeath had petitioned the English House of Lords on 29 January 1641 explaining that he had compounded with the committee of defective titles for new letters patents to be passed to him and his heirs. This was to provide the King with a rent of £277, 11s. 6d per annum. However, when he tried to pass these patents, John Bramhall and George Radcliffe advised the Commissioners not to allow this action. On 20 June 1637, the commissioners for Defective Titles ordered “that the petitioner should not be admitted to pass by new letters patent eleven impropriate rectories of his estate” in County Cavan which were worth £500 a year. Westmeath was now petitioning the House of Lords that he might be restored to his possessions, and the illegal proceedings against him declared void. On 3 February 1641, the committee of the English House of Lords ordered that Bramhall and Radcliffe should attend them to answer this charge on 20 March 1641. *HMC Hastings MSS II* p. 139. The issue had still not been resolved by 27 May 1641, when the House of

taken during the Parliament of 1634 – 1635. After the Parliament, the issue was discussed and it was decided that it was “a greate Inconuenience that a Sherriffe should haue power by his returne to make Burrowes and send men to the p[ar]liament, w[hi]ch is a p[re]rogatiue of the Crowne...” The King’s Attorney General had therefore issued writs against the pretended boroughs that demanded them to prove that they had the privilege to send members to Parliament. Radcliffe stated that none of these towns had been able to answer to this demand and therefore “their liberties weare seised...” However, these towns had once again disobeyed by sending members to attend the Parliament of 1640 and therefore the Privy Council was justified in their actions against them.<sup>162</sup> Radcliffe’s part in the removal of these boroughs was brought up again when witnesses were examined in Wentworth’s trial. On 23 March 1641, Nicholas Barnewell, an Old English witness, was asked to demonstrate that Radcliffe had threatened members of Parliament. In 1634, the Irish House of Commons had debated the re-election of the sequestered boroughs. Nicholas Barnewell supported the general opinion of the House that the boroughs should have their members restored, but “Sir George Radcliffe was of another Opinion.” After the debate, Barnewell claimed that Radcliffe threatened to billet soldiers on him.<sup>163</sup> Wentworth tried to counter this accusation demonstrating that he was out of the country when the alleged words were spoken and therefore he could not be accused of any part in them. However, John Pym observed that “the Spirit of my Lord of Strafford could move in Sir George Radcliffe, wheresoever it was spoken.”<sup>164</sup> This demonstrates the way in which Radcliffe’s indiscretions could be used against Wentworth as they were so closely associated with each other’s work.

The fifteenth article dealt with the accusation of regulating and ascertaining fees. Radcliffe reported that the commissioners appointed to regulate fees had met with numerous difficulties. It was thus decided to make an Act of Parliament “to authorise and establish that w[hi]ch the Comissioners should agree on and sett

---

Lords ordered that a hearing of the Earl of Westmeath’s cause against the Bishop of Londonderry and Sir George Radcliffe was to be held. *HMC Appendix to the Fourth Report* p. 68.

<sup>162</sup> ‘Sir George Ratcliffes answer,’ P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 62.

<sup>163</sup> Radcliffe had asked Barnewell, “Will not your House hold Five hundred men?” Barnewell answered, “you know what my house will hold as well as my self; and I smiling at it, he answered, But it is no laughing matter, you shall have 500 men laid on you.” Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 112. Kearney notes that Anglo-Irish witnesses were used in moderation against Wentworth, as Pym “could not afford to make too much use of Papist witnesses” as this would threaten the impact of his case against Wentworth. Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland* p. 206.

<sup>164</sup> Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 112.

downe...” The Commons had suddenly decided to complain about these actions, and Radcliffe asked that if the Commons should “advise what els were fit to bee done for Settling fees it maie bee pursued according to reason and Justice...” Radcliffe admitted that the Privy Council had done all they could in this as those charging extortionate fees had already been punished and convicted.

It appears to be strange that ecclesiastical issues should be levied as a complaint against Radcliffe as he performed a secular role within Wentworth’s government. However, this might represent the need of the Irish government to control both Church and State in order to maximise their authority. The tenth article against Radcliffe challenged the excessive fees of the clergy. Radcliffe admitted that there were “exorbitant Customes & duties taken in some places by the Clergie...” However, he was unable to suggest whether these were extra-legal as “they haue beene for the most parte of auntient and longe Continued use, longe before the Reformation of religion in that Kingdome.” He also pointed out that the clergy was also complaining of “extreame povertie in their meanes by other Customes as p[re]judiciall to them...”<sup>165</sup>

Radcliffe’s comprehensive response to the charges contain a range of themes and claims centred around his belief that Wentworth’s regime had always attempted to serve the King and never tried to subvert the laws of Ireland. However, he complained that due to his close imprisonment, he had been unable to consult his papers whilst preparing his response and therefore he was unable to provide all the evidence that he might have done. He hoped that his memory had served him correctly, but wished to be excused if he had made any minor errors.<sup>166</sup>

The Grievance Committee of the Irish House of Commons issued its responses to Radcliffe’s statement, and as we would expect, disputed many of Radcliffe’s assertions.<sup>167</sup> They attempted to undermine Radcliffe’s claim that the Remonstrance against him had not passed through the House correctly and therefore was illegal. The Grievance Committee asserted that Radcliffe was present in the Irish House of Commons at the time the Remonstrance was read twice, and yet he did not stand to complain against it. Once the Remonstrance had been levied against him, Radcliffe had brought a message from Christopher Wandesford, the Lord Deputy, ordering that

---

<sup>165</sup> ‘Sir George Ratcliffes answer,’ P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 62.

<sup>166</sup> *ibid*, 258, 62.

the House of Common should attend him.<sup>168</sup> Wandesford intended to prorogue the Parliament again in order to divert the Commons' attack upon his associate. Contrary to Radcliffe's assertion, the House complained that Wentworth's government had continually infringed Magna Carta and laws of Ireland. They also disputed that Ireland had become richer during Wentworth's administration. They pointed out that prior to Wentworth's involvement, Ireland had attracted many newcomers with its moderate government, leading to an influx of trade and therefore money. However, they complained that "The last seven years of oppressive government have cut the harvest which had sprung up, and the country is now depleted." They also disputed George Radcliffe's defence that Ireland had experienced the advantages of the Graces. They felt that in the Parliament of 1634, they were denied any of the benefits. The Commons continued to defend their attack on Radcliffe and hoped that their grievances would be addressed.<sup>169</sup>

Once the charges against Radcliffe were presented, petitioners began to come out of the woodwork, asking that their personal grievances against Radcliffe be settled. Several petitions attempted to contest Radcliffe's claim to land or role as a trustee to a will.<sup>170</sup> Other petitioners claimed that Radcliffe was indebted to them.<sup>171</sup> George Wentworth petitioned the House of Lords on 9 July 1641 that William

---

<sup>167</sup> 'Reply of the Irish Grievance Committee to the statement of Sir George Radcliffe, received 12 February 1641,' P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 258, 64, 65, *CSPI 1633 – 47* pp. 257 – 8.

<sup>168</sup> *ibid*, 258, 64, 65.

<sup>169</sup> *ibid*, 258, 64, 65.

<sup>170</sup> A petition of the widow Margaret Wandesford, dated 8 February 1641 made claim to a house and lands at Bolton, in Yorkshire, under settlement from her uncle, Thomas Duffield. She hoped that Radcliffe, "who has wrongfully entered upon the said house and lands, may now be called upon to answer and to show by what title he claims." A petition from Edward Hutchinson and his wife Frances dated 4 June 1641 was submitted on behalf of Frances' young brother William Osbaldeston the child of the late Attorney-General in Ireland, Sir Richard Osbaldeston. The petitioners requested that new trustees be appointed to replace Sir Gerrard Lowther and Sir George Radcliffe who were the only surviving trustees of the will. On 29 July 1641, the case was ordered to be heard and on 4 August 1641, two orders were produced which demanded Radcliffe to convey the estate of Osbaldeston to Henry Martin and Henry Fowles. *HMC Appendix to the Fourth Report* pp. 48, 71, 92, 94.

<sup>171</sup> On 16 June 1641, Sir Edward Denny petitioned that Radcliffe owed the Dowager Viscountess Baltinglasse £660, which debt had been transferred to the petitioner. Denny asked "in case Sir George Radcliffe be convicted, an order may be made for the payment of the debt out of his estate." On the same day, two draft orders appeared asking Radcliffe to answer the petition. On 1 July 1641, Radcliffe responded to the petition acknowledging his debt to Lady Baltinglasse of £600. He claimed that he had already paid £200 to her. He also acknowledged that he owed money to others, amounting in total to £19000. He hoped to settle these debts if he was allowed to access the profits of his estate "from which, in consequence of the action of the Irish House of Commons, he has received nothing since he was first impeached of treason, and has been dependant for his own maintenance on the charity of friends." *ibid*, pp. 75, 81.

Raylton might be allowed permission to speak with George Radcliffe.<sup>172</sup> Radcliffe's position at this time appeared to be bleak.

### **Why did the English and Irish Parliaments pursue Radcliffe?**

Radcliffe was not impeached simply because he was a high profile figure in Irish government. In fact, it is unusual that Parliament chose to pursue him as well as Wentworth. Usually, it was the key minister of the King who was accused, leaving his servants to slip away into obscurity. For example, in the 1626 English Parliament, the House of Commons attempted to impeach the Duke of Buckingham and his servants were not implicated. However, in 1640, the House of Commons depicted Radcliffe as Wentworth's accomplice and partner-in-crime. The Commons used George Radcliffe to ruin Thomas Wentworth further by demonstrating that Radcliffe had carried out Wentworth's treasonous orders. George Radcliffe was shown to have threatened members for their votes in Parliament and to have been the chief agent in the prosecution of Sir Piers Crosby.<sup>173</sup> These actions gave support to the Commons' agenda that Wentworth had dreamt up treasonous policies, using Radcliffe to carry them out at ground level. In reality, Radcliffe did fully understand Wentworth's policy aims and therefore to some extent might be seen as a conspirator.

The most convincing explanation of Radcliffe's trial is that by imprisoning Radcliffe in preparation for his impeachment case, the Commons effectively deprived Wentworth of excellent legal advice, a friend who could support him through his time of need and most importantly, a key witness to support him in his defence. They could make him testify against Wentworth and most significantly, could prevent him from

---

<sup>172</sup> George Wentworth was charged with settling the estate of his late brother in particular to settle his debts and raise marriage portions for Thomas Wentworth's children. George Wentworth stated that Wentworth's known debts amounted to £107,000 but there was no more than £400 available readily. He argued that Radcliffe was the "only person in England acquainted with the Earl's estate," and therefore he asked that Raylton might consult with Radcliffe. *ibid*, pp. 83 – 84.

<sup>173</sup> Firth, C.H. 'George Radcliffe,' *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 124, 'Application for attendance of Sir Geo. Radcliffe, and other witnesses, in the case of Sir Pierce Crosbie against the Earl of Strafford,' 5 February 1641, *HMC Appendix to the Fourth Report* p. 47. When Sir John Clotworthy gave evidence at Wentworth's trial on 23 March 1641, Radcliffe's behaviour towards Sir Piers Crosby was discussed. Clotworthy was asked whether he had heard Radcliffe threaten Crosby, which he affirmed. He stated "I heard Sir Peirce Crosby speaking against a Bill in Parliament; and as soon as he had sate down from speaking against the Bill, Sir George Radcliffe said to him, That is not Privy-Councillor like. or to that purpose, I heard him." Clotworthy also gave evidence that he had been on the receiving end of Radcliffe's threats. In the Parliament of 1634 – 35, Clotworthy voted against a Bill. Radcliffe was one of the Tellers and counted the numbers for and against. When he came to Clotworthy, Radcliffe asked him if it was not in his interest to vote for the Bill asking him "Have not you a Lease in such a place?" Clotworthy replied "yea: remember that, saith he..." Rushworth, *Trial of Thomas Earl of Strafford* pp. 110, 111.

testifying on Wentworth's behalf. Support is given to this argument when we consider that Wentworth and Radcliffe were prevented from meeting throughout their trials.<sup>174</sup> Wentworth might conceivably have used Radcliffe in both the preparation and presentations of his defence, if he had have been permitted. When he was first imprisoned, Wentworth wrote to George Radcliffe informing him that "If they cum to chardge, I will send for you to have your helpe in my defence. I pray therefore make ready, if the occasion be offered; else stir not."<sup>175</sup> Radcliffe would also have been able to help Wentworth in the preparation of his defence, having proved himself as a good lawyer throughout their friendship, and possessing in-depth personal knowledge of Wentworth's administration.

Despite this ban on their meeting and preparing Wentworth's defence together, rumours that Radcliffe and Wentworth had collaborated did emerge. The Duke of Ormond's biographer Thomas Carte wrote that Charles I actually forwarded the Remonstrance against Wentworth to Radcliffe. Carte alleged that Wentworth's written response to the Remonstrance was written by Radcliffe on his friend's behalf and was merely approved by Wentworth before its submission.<sup>176</sup> Radcliffe clearly considered issues that might help Wentworth and wrote 'Questions upon the Earl of Strafford's Defence.' This list of questions appear to be Radcliffe's notes upon possible lines of defence in Wentworth's trial and seem to be Radcliffe's ideas about lines of enquiry which would have created Wentworth's defence. Due to the sketchy nature of these notes, it is doubtful that they were ever sent to Wentworth, especially

---

<sup>174</sup> On 7 January 1641, the King sent a message to the English House of Lords informing them that the Irish Committee of the English House of Commons had prepared a Remonstrance against the Earl of Strafford. The King had shown this to the English Privy Council and then it had been sent to Wentworth. Wentworth responded by indicting that he "could not well answer the particulars unless he might advise with Sir George Rattcliffe..." The King felt that they might meet in the presence of the Earl of Cork with the proviso that "they should not speak of anything but of those matters in the remonstrance." Although the House of Lords professed that this was a "gracious favor from the King," they wished to debate the Remonstrance and if they saw fit, two members of the House of Lords should also supervise the meeting between Radcliffe and Wentworth along with Cork. However, on reporting this message to the King the following day, the Lords found that the King had decided that "the Earl of Trayford and Sir George Ratcliffe should not come together, but for the remonstrance, that he left to himself." *HMC Buccleuch III* p. 406. The Houses of Parliament were very concerned that Radcliffe and Wentworth should not be allowed to meet and records were kept of the visitors who had attended Radcliffe in his prison in the Gatehouse. For example on 9, 16 and 23 January, 15 and 27 February, 13 March, 15 May 1641, the list of persons who had visited Radcliffe from 31 December to 27 February was reported. *HMC Appendix to the Fourth Report* pp. 38, 41, 44, 52, 55, 57, 64.

<sup>175</sup> Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 218. Timmis believes that Radcliffe's impeachment was premeditated and intended to prevent him appearing as a key witness in Wentworth's defence. Timmis, J. *Thine is the Kingdom* (Alabama, 1974), p. 52.

in this form and this is augmented by the fact that, at least in theory, Radcliffe was forbidden from written communication with Wentworth.<sup>177</sup> In his list of points, Radcliffe aimed to demonstrate that Thomas Wentworth was a faithful servant to the King and that he had gained Charles I's assent for his policies.<sup>178</sup> This was a strong counter-argument to the accusations presented by Parliament. Their attack upon Wentworth emphasised his misuse of law. They believed that the law had been subverted and used to bolster the position of councillors and judges "who had twisted it to their own illegal purposes."<sup>179</sup> Indeed, Rushworth stated that the attempt to condemn Wentworth on a legal basis "caused the most Learned of the Long Robe to tumble over their Law-Books, and to apply their minds to look into the bowels of our antient Laws...."<sup>180</sup> The case against him tried to prove that Wentworth had attempted to break the bond of law that tied the King to his government and that this had led to disunity. John Rushworth described Parliament's principal objection against Wentworth as "his attempts to subvert that excellent Law called The Petition of Right..." which ironically Wentworth had helped to create in the English Parliament of 1628 - 29.<sup>181</sup> Conspiring to disrupt the unity between the King and his people was against the law and undermined the King.<sup>182</sup> However, Parliament's argument based on the subversion of law was fairly weak. Although Parliament and particularly Pym attempted to present a legal attack on Wentworth, it was rather transparent and was easily identifiable as "essentially political in its nature."<sup>183</sup> This enabled Wentworth to cleverly defend himself on the conservative basis of law. This effectively served to force his opponents to "turn from the law to other more drastic remedies and more radical ideas."<sup>184</sup>

Although they were not allowed to see each other, George Radcliffe and Thomas Wentworth did continue to correspond secretly. On 8 May 1641, Radcliffe

---

<sup>176</sup> As noted in Chapter 6, we should be wary when using Carte as a source as he has a clearly royalist slant to his biography and selected materials from the Ormond family papers to support his royalist objective. Carte *Life of Ormonde* vol. I, p. 238.

<sup>177</sup> On 30 November 1640, the House of Commons ordered the Lieutenant of the Tower of London that Wentworth was not to speak with Radcliffe "nor suffer any Message or Letter to be sent from Sir George Ratcliff unto him." If any communications were discovered, it was to be reported to the House. Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 15.

<sup>178</sup> Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 233 – 235.

<sup>179</sup> Judson, M.A. *The Crisis of the Constitution* (New Brunswick, 1949), p. 357.

<sup>180</sup> Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* preface in *ibid*, p. 358.

<sup>181</sup> *ibid*, preface.

<sup>182</sup> Judson, *The Crisis of the Constitution* p. 363.

<sup>183</sup> *ibid*, p. 363.

<sup>184</sup> *ibid*, p. 358.

wrote to Wentworth, but referred to him in the third person to prevent their communication from being instantly obvious.<sup>185</sup> Radcliffe inquired whether he should apply for permission to be moved from the Gate House to the Tower on the chance that he might see Wentworth. Wentworth replied, “I think it best you stay where you are and let us see the issue of tomorrow.”<sup>186</sup>

There was also a rumour that Radcliffe had managed to see Wentworth in his prison. Radcliffe may have done so, as the order for his arrest was issued on 13 November 1640 and he evaded this warrant until 9 December when he was imprisoned in the Gatehouse.<sup>187</sup> It is therefore potentially possible that Radcliffe did meet with Wentworth, as during late November and early December 1640, Strafford was in the custody of Black Rod and visitors could easily come and go.<sup>188</sup> There was certainly concern to ensure that Radcliffe and Wentworth were kept separate so that they could not collaborate on their defence. On 15 December 1640, Lord Scudamore recorded in his journal that the House of Lords had sent for the Lieutenant of the Tower to attend them, demanding who had been frequently visiting Wentworth and “what liberty hee was allowed.” The Lieutenant reported that “many divers people” had visited Wentworth and that he had liberty of the Castle. This was clearly thought to be too dangerous and now the House of Lords wished to “restrayne his Lo[rds]hip to three Chambers onely,” and to make sure that Wentworth did not escape. Although it was left to the Lieutenant of the Castle’s discretion as to who should visit Wentworth, the Lords did not want Wentworth to be “much visited.” It was felt that “some particular delinquencies are discovered by those witnesses w[hi]ch have beene examined to make good the Charge the Com[m]ons haue given up against my Lord Lieutan[a]nt...”<sup>189</sup> The concern was clearly linked to Radcliffe as Scudamore reported that Radcliffe used a friend to move the House of Commons that he might “haue liberty to goe to Church.” Objections were raised in the House, many fearing that he “might slip away in the Crowde from his Keepers in coming out of the Church...” It was also felt that Radcliffe’s initial imprisonment in the Sergeant-at-

---

<sup>185</sup> Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 223.

<sup>186</sup> *ibid.*, p. 224, Lady Burghclere, *Strafford* (2 vols, London, 1931), vol. II, p. 334.

<sup>187</sup> On 1 December 1640, Radcliffe was still missing and the House of Commons issued a statement that George Radcliffe was to appear in the House within two days. If he did not, they would send a message to the Lords requiring them to move the King to order a Proclamation to force Radcliffe to attend. Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 16.

<sup>188</sup> Burghclere, *Strafford* pp. 237 - 238.

<sup>189</sup> ‘John, First Lord Scudamore News-Letters,’ 15 December 1640, British Library, Additional MS 11045, f. 134r.

Arms' house should be reconsidered as in the past, some prisoners had escaped from there. Therefore it was decided that Radcliffe ought to be imprisoned fully in the Gatehouse. This was particularly pressing now that their key witness Sir Robert King had arrived in England and "hee would be here w[i]th all speede to make good their accusac[i]on ag[ains]t S[i]r George Ratcliffe..." Parliament did not want Radcliffe to escape in the meantime.<sup>190</sup>

### **Comparison of the charges against Wentworth and Radcliffe.**

The charges brought against George Radcliffe and Thomas Wentworth were remarkably similar. In fact, on 31 December 1641, the Commons had presented their accusation against Radcliffe and it was noted that the charges "were no more than they were against the Lord Trayford."<sup>191</sup> Radcliffe and Wentworth were thought to be closely allied with each other in their treasonous activities. This was augmented by the fact that they had worked closely together on Irish policy formation, and Radcliffe also played a key role in carrying the policies out. We should also recognise however that impeachments followed a standardised pattern that aimed to discredit the King's evil ministers and attack the subversion of the monarch's policy, a political tool to avoid attacking the King himself.

Radcliffe and Strafford were frequently compared and contrasted during their impeachments. John Pym wrote that "...the Earle is charged as an Actor, Sir Geo[rge] Ratcl[iffe] as an Instrument and subordinate Actor."<sup>192</sup> Despite the fact that Wentworth was the more infamous of the two, Pym described Radcliffe as being just as guilty of subverting the laws of England and Ireland. If Pym was representative of general parliamentary opinion, we might question why Parliament did not pursue Radcliffe's impeachment more fully. This supports the theory that Pym's aim was to simply use Radcliffe to implicate Wentworth further. Pym accused Radcliffe of misleading Wentworth who had not been "bred in the study and practice of the Law and saving stronger lusts and passions to incite, and lesse knowledge restraine him, might easily bee transported." Pym argued that as Radcliffe was fully trained in law, he was a more calculating criminal than Wentworth. Pym suggested that Radcliffe

---

<sup>190</sup> It was noted however that if Sir Robert King was delayed, "they had other witnesses besides to make good their Charge ag[ains]t S[i]r George Ratcliffe, and the Earle of Strafford." *ibid.*, f. 134v.

<sup>191</sup> *HMC Buccleugh II*, p. 404.

would have been aware that he was subverting laws and yet he continued to pursue Wentworth's policies.<sup>193</sup>

Roberts has indicated that it was never Thomas Wentworth's intention to violate the law, and if he ever did so, it was in order to protect the King's prerogative.<sup>194</sup> It appears that George Radcliffe understood and shared this political philosophy. They thought that the King should prevail over the rights of his subjects although ideally, "regal power and popular privileges.... were best preserved when they went hand in hand and maintained one another."<sup>195</sup> In Radcliffe's biography of Wentworth's life, he defended Wentworth's attitude towards law, stating that Wentworth "thought that regal power and popular privileges... were best preserved when they went hand in hand and maintained one another." However, experience had taught him that "it was far safer that the King should increase in power than that the people should gain advantages on the King." This meant that if Wentworth had to choose between supporting the King or supporting the Parliament, he would always chose the King. Roberts believes that as Wentworth was not afraid to express this opinion, "Parliament dared not leave him by the King's side."<sup>196</sup>

When we examine the specific articles of Impeachment brought against Radcliffe and Wentworth by the Irish House of Commons, the charges are very similar. The articles are all based around the loose accusation that Wentworth and Radcliffe had attempted to "subvert the fundamentall Laws and government of the kingdome" and had "exercised an arbitrary and tyrannical government against Law."<sup>197</sup> This was thought amount to treason as they had attempted to permanently alter the English constitution, which might cause English subjects to rebel against the King. Treason in legal terms meant either a threat to the King's life or the creation of a division between the monarch and his subjects (by a minister for example), which might be serious enough to force the population to rise against their king and threaten

---

<sup>192</sup> Pym, J. *Two Speeches made by John Pymm Esquire; the one after the Articles of the Charge against the Earle of Strafford were Read. The other, after the Articles of the Charge against Sir George Ratcliffe were read* (London, 1641), p. 7.

<sup>193</sup> Radcliffe was "in his naturall temper and disposition more moderate, and by his education and profession better acquainted with the grounds and directions of the Law," and yet was "carried into his offences by a more immediate Concurrence of will." *ibid*, p. 7.

<sup>194</sup> Roberts, C. *The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 81.

<sup>195</sup> Radcliffe, 'An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde,' in Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. ii, p. 434.

<sup>196</sup> *ibid*, p. 434, Roberts, *Growth of Responsible Government* p. 81.

<sup>197</sup> Mervin, A. *A Speech made by Captaine Audley Mervin to the Upper House of Parliament in Ireland, March 4. 1640* (London, 1641), pp. 12 – 13.

his life.<sup>198</sup> Seventeenth century political thought was based around the desire for unity and harmony. Wentworth was thought to have jeopardised this by creating a division between Charles I and his people. The fourth article in the Remonstrance against Thomas Wentworth gave an example of his attempt to subvert the law. The Irish House of Commons complained that the subjects had been denied the benefit of the Graces of 1628, which Wentworth had implied might be granted after Parliament had granted supply in the first session of the 1634 Parliament.<sup>199</sup>

Another theme that emerges in the articles against Thomas Wentworth and George Radcliffe is that they used law unjustly and falsely. In his speech to the Irish House of Lords, Captain Audley Mervin indicated that due to unfair trials and sentences, many thousands of the King's subjects "hath bin ruined in their goods, lands, liberties, & lives."<sup>200</sup> The Remonstrance against Wentworth set out to prove that he had arbitrarily judged upon civil causes brought to him by petition. The third and fourth articles also concerned the arbitrary use of law particularly attacking the Court of High Commission and unfair legal proceedings in civil cases.<sup>201</sup>

A further common factor in the Articles of Impeachment against Radcliffe and Wentworth was the belief that they had endeavoured to subvert parliamentary rights. The articles against Radcliffe accused him of being a Privy Councillor who had gone against his oath to the King to be a loyal subject and had aimed to suppress parliamentary privilege.<sup>202</sup> The fourteenth article in the Remonstrance against Wentworth stated that he had failed to allow Parliament its natural freedom.<sup>203</sup>

The decline of trade and the suppression of the merchants in Ireland were particularly prominent in the Articles of Impeachment against Wentworth. The 'illegal' Book of Rates was also criticised for provoking the decay of trade. The Irish House of Commons also complained about the monopolisation of the tobacco trade and the general increase of monopolies.<sup>204</sup>

In both cases, the Irish House of Commons claimed that the Articles of Impeachment equated to high treason against the King. Both Radcliffe and Wentworth answered these charges of impeachment by stating that the accusations

---

<sup>198</sup> Russell, 'Theory of Treason,' pp. 33 – 34.

<sup>199</sup> Carte, *Life of Ormonde* vol. I, pp. 220 – 221.

<sup>200</sup> Mervin, *Speech made by Captain Audley Mervin* pp. 12 – 13.

<sup>201</sup> Carte, *Life of Ormonde* vol. I, p. 217.

<sup>202</sup> Mervin, *Speech made by Captain Audley Mervin* pp. 12 – 13.

<sup>203</sup> Carte, *Life of Ormonde* vol. I, p. 228.

<sup>204</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 219, 222, 223.

were false. Thomas Wentworth is reported to have said that the Articles were the accusations of a faction and that this was “a conspiracy and a practice and that all this store rose up there [Ireland] since he was charged here of High Treason by Parliament in England.”<sup>205</sup> In his answer to the Remonstrance against him, Radcliffe demonstrated that any innovations that he and Wentworth had introduced in Ireland were for the King’s benefit.<sup>206</sup>

Contemporary fears that Ireland was being used as an experiment in arbitrary government to later be applied in England were rife. Carte described the charges within the Remonstrance of the Irish House of Commons against Wentworth as highlighting acts of government that in Ireland were considered usual, but appeared arbitrary to the English.<sup>207</sup> The Remonstrance certainly appears to have been written in order to provoke an adverse reaction against the Earl of Strafford from the English. Equally feared in England was the possibility that the Irish (and more significantly Catholic) army might be used against the English in order to impose Wentworth's policies of ‘Thorough’ and therefore an arbitrary rule upon Charles I’s subjects. Rumours that Radcliffe had advised Wentworth to raise an army against the English, and not just the Scots, were reported in Parliament by Sir Robert King.<sup>208</sup>

In August 1640, Wentworth had written to Radcliffe proposing that the Scots in Ulster should be forced to return to Scotland in order to limit the threat of the Bishop’s Wars spreading into Ireland. Wentworth was concerned that the Scottish troubles might have repercussions within Ireland. He informed Secretary Windebank on 10 August 1638 that although the Scottish problems would not hit the north of Ireland like thunder and lightening, he was concerned that “the skirts of the great rain” of the storm would generate problems there.<sup>209</sup> Wentworth had already informed Laud about his policy of the ‘black oath’<sup>210</sup> which he hoped would deter significant problems within the Ulster community. His proposal was that Scots living in Ireland should swear an oath denouncing the Scottish Covenant. This would force the Ulster Scots to publicly declare where their allegiances lay. This would then enable Thomas

---

<sup>205</sup> ‘William Drake’s notebook,’ in Jansson, M. *Two Diaries of the Long Parliament* (Gloucester, 1984), p. 27.

<sup>206</sup> *CSP 1633 – 1647* p. 255.

<sup>207</sup> Carte, *Life of Ormonde* vol. 1, p. 217.

<sup>208</sup> Notestein, *Journal of Sir Simonds D’Ewes* p. 25.

<sup>209</sup> Wentworth to Windebank, 10 August 1638, Str. P 11a / 109, Perceval-Maxwell, M. ‘Strafford, the Ulster-Scots and the covenanters,’ *Irish Historical Studies* 18 (1972 - 3), p. 533.

<sup>210</sup> Wentworth to Laud, 11 and 12 February 1639, Str. P. 7 / 166, 168 - 169.

Wentworth to impose a stricter policy, after having given them the chance to choose between conformity and fleeing to Scotland.<sup>211</sup> However, there is little evidence that once Wentworth left for England to help the King in the Bishops' Wars in 1639, that this policy was pursued. Indeed, the oath was not very successful and Wentworth admitted to Radcliffe that thousands of Scots in Ireland had ignored or refused to take it.<sup>212</sup> As late as August 1640, he was still unsuccessfully urging Radcliffe, to banish all Scottish tenants from Ulster. Radcliffe noted at the top of the letter that he rejected Wentworth's idea, realising the outrage that this 'ethnic cleansing' would prompt.<sup>213</sup>

In the climate of intense fear of Catholicism, there were concerns raised about Radcliffe's religiosity. He was described as the "great Recusant Ratcliffe,"<sup>214</sup> which reinforced the fear that Radcliffe would have no qualms about using an Irish Catholic army against the Protestant English populous. In Radcliffe's trial, the accusations brought against him by Pym demonstrated that he had "traiterously confederated with the earl [of Strafford] to countenance papists, and build monasteries."<sup>215</sup> Sir John Clotworthy also made allegations against George Radcliffe in November 1640 stating that Radcliffe had advised Wentworth in May 1639 that the King could "have what he pleaseth in England" with help of the Irish Catholic army.<sup>216</sup> In the twenty-second article of the impeachment charges against Wentworth, Maynard presented the case for the prosecution that Wentworth, "confederating with one Sir G[eorge] Radcliff, did together with him traitorously conspire to employ the Army, for the ruin and destruction of the Kingdom of England, and His Majesty's Subjects."<sup>217</sup> Clarke points out that the significance of the Irish army was not in their potential contribution to the Bishops' Wars, (the army was not actually ready until just prior to Charles I's defeat at the Battle of Newburn on 28 August 1640), but rather that its presence generated and exacerbated fears that Wentworth might use the army against the English.<sup>218</sup> The role of Sir John Clotworthy is significant in this charge. He had made a speech to the English House of Commons on 7 November 1640 that described the state of Ireland in

---

<sup>211</sup> Perceval-Maxwell, 'Strafford, the Ulster-Scots and the covenanters,' p. 536.

<sup>212</sup> Wentworth to Radcliffe, 8 August 1640, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 209, Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 300, Perceval-Maxwell, 'Strafford, the Ulster Scots and the covenanters,' p. 541.

<sup>213</sup> Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 206 – 207.

<sup>214</sup> Notestein, *Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes* p. 532.

<sup>215</sup> Nalson, J. *Impartial Collections of the Great Affairs of State* (London, 1682), vol. I, p. 702.

<sup>216</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 315.

<sup>217</sup> 'Mr Maynard's closing speech,' in Timmis, *Thine is the kingdom* p. 108.

<sup>218</sup> Clarke, 'The breakdown of authority,' pp. 278 – 279.

detail and heavily criticised the Irish administration. But most importantly, he exacerbated fears that there was too much toleration towards Catholics and he pointed to the potential uses of the Catholic army. Clotworthy had recommended that Radcliffe's arrest be ordered on the basis of an alleged remark "that this army raised in Ireland is against England and not against the Scots."<sup>219</sup> The fear of popery was well established and Sir John Clotworthy exploited this by implying that Charles' evil ministers were attempting to enforce Catholicism upon England. These rumours were further expounded by the fact that Charles I favoured a Laudian style Church policy that Puritans felt was leaning towards Catholicism. The influence of Charles' Catholic wife Henrietta Maria was also feared. As Charles I was fighting the Bishop's Wars against the Scots in 1639 and 1640, as advised by Wentworth, those opposing him used this to show that by attacking the Presbyterian Scottish, "the private designe of the papists might bee advanced."<sup>220</sup> The combination of these factors generated parliamentary fears that Wentworth had Catholic tendencies. It was commonly known that he supported a pro-Spanish and anti-Palatinate foreign policy and during his time as deputy in Ireland, he appeared to have allowed many concessions to Irish Catholics. He also pursued a policy that aimed to bring the Church of Ireland into line with the Laudian Church in England that appeared to take an oppositional stance to Puritanism. This served to compound fears of Thomas Wentworth's desire to suppress the English Protestants with an Irish Catholic army and to enforce a policy of 'Thorough' over them as he had done in Ireland. The fear that Wentworth and Radcliffe might be cryptic-Catholic was never confirmed. Radcliffe was fundamentally Protestant in his religiosity and there is no suggestion that he ever supported the Roman Catholic Church, although as we will see in Chapter 9, these concerns were raised once again during his exile.

Neither Radcliffe nor Wentworth were formally impeached. Lloyd described the failure of George Radcliffe's impeachment stating that the House of Commons "prosecuted him not, lest they should shame themselves."<sup>221</sup> The impeachment of Wentworth failed as it was "an awkward weapon for attacking an unpopular minister, for it concerned the minister's crimes, not his errors."<sup>222</sup> Wentworth himself believed

---

<sup>219</sup> *ibid*, p. 279. Notestein, *Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes* p. 256.

<sup>220</sup> *ibid*, p. 28.

<sup>221</sup> Lloyd, D. *Memoirs of the lives, actions, sufferings, and deaths of those noble, reverend, and excellent personages* (London, 1668), p. 181.

<sup>222</sup> Roberts, *Growth of Responsible Government* p. 81.

that the impeachment charges against him could not be enforced. He wrote to Radcliffe explaining that he was “free of fear, the articles that are coming I apprehend not.” He believed that any accusations concerned with his Irish administration were insignificant, “their proofs being scant.”<sup>223</sup> Wentworth demonstrated that any errors and misdemeanours that might have occurred during his career in Ireland were simply uncalculated mistakes, and he used this as a line of defence. He aimed to show that errors occurring in the line of duty for his king did not equate to high treason. This is directly comparable to Radcliffe’s defence. Radcliffe refused to be drawn into vague accusations and retaliated against specific charges that he knew nothing about, by stating that if any irregularities had occurred, they should certainly be investigated. In this way, he suggested that Wentworth’s administration was transparent and accountable. However, as Wentworth defended himself on the conservative basis of law, he forced the opposition into a more radical stance. This led to a Bill of Attainder being read against him in the House of Commons for the first time on 10 April 1641.<sup>224</sup> This method of attacking Wentworth would succeed where the impeachment had failed, as his guilt simply had to be put to the vote of the members of the House. The House of Commons correctly reasoned that it would prove easier to convict Wentworth of his crimes, rather than by attempting to prove that his crimes equated to high treason.<sup>225</sup> This is evidence of the fact that the prosecution against Wentworth had little or no foundation in law. The fact that the impeachment case had to be abandoned proves that the case against Wentworth was fundamentally weak and flawed.<sup>226</sup>

### **The involvement of Wentworth’s cabal within his trial**

Edward Osborne’s involvement in Wentworth’s trial was focused around the 27 article against Wentworth, which was concerned with Wentworth’s imposition of a tax within Yorkshire of “eight pence per diem.” This tax was to be levied with force “by his own authority, and without any lawful Warrant.” This tax had first been collected in August 1639 after Wentworth was created Lieutenant General of the

---

<sup>223</sup> Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 222 – 223.

<sup>224</sup> The trial reached its conclusion on 7 May 1641 when the House of Lords enacted that Wentworth should “undergo the pains and forfeitures of high treason by law.” *House of Lords Braye MSS* f. 142b in Timmis, ‘Basis of the Lords’ Decision,’ p. 311.

<sup>225</sup> Roberts, *Growth of Responsible Government* p. 93.

<sup>226</sup> Timmis, ‘Basis of the Lords’ Decision,’ p. 311.

King's forces in the North.<sup>227</sup> Edward Osborne was called to be a witness for Wentworth, but Mr Maynard challenged his participation in Wentworth's defence, as he was "one of them that sent out the Warrant for paying Money on pain of death." He desired that Osborne "might not be examined to the justification of himself by saying, the Money was levied by consent."<sup>228</sup> The tax would enable a month's remuneration to be paid to the soldiers in the North.<sup>229</sup> However, Osborne managed to convince the trial that he should be allowed to stand as a witness as the warrant was issued long before any complaints against it. Osborne was asked whether it was true that the majority of the Council of the North had declined the petition for levying money. Osborne believed that "the major part of them that subscribed the Petition" did not openly dissent. He reported that Wentworth had gone to the King's Manor in York and delivered their consent to the King faithfully. The accusation seemed to hinge around the belief that Wentworth changed the petition that he delivered to the King.<sup>230</sup> The prosecution was also concerned to clarify whether the men consenting to the petition were men of quality, suggesting that perhaps some had "come to gaze only." Osborne defended himself by stating that "it is impossible for him to see through the bodies of men; but there were not many of inferior quality that he knew..."<sup>231</sup> Osborne was also interrogated whether it was a voluntary tax and he professed that he "never knew of any forcible course to make men pay it, but it was freely paid."<sup>232</sup> Wentworth summarised the evidence presented regarding article twenty-seven and demonstrated that he was "in no Fault" as the warrant came from the Vice President alone. It is interesting that Wentworth detached himself from the policy of his Vice President as a way to protect himself, because as we saw in Chapter 3, Osborne was always concerned to gain Wentworth's permission in policy decisions. Wentworth also added that in that charge there was "no Statute-Treasons in the whole Charge, nor colour or pretense thereof..."<sup>233</sup>

---

<sup>227</sup> Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 599.

<sup>228</sup> *ibid.* p. 616.

<sup>229</sup> *ibid.* p. 620.

<sup>230</sup> *ibid.* p. 617.

<sup>231</sup> *ibid.* p. 618.

<sup>232</sup> *ibid.* p. 621.

<sup>233</sup> *ibid.* p. 639.

Men associated, however loosely, with Wentworth's cabal found themselves blacklisted as "Enemies of Justice."<sup>234</sup> George Wentworth was regarded with some suspicion within the Short and Long Parliament where he was sitting for Pontefract, and had to seek special permission to visit his brother in prison. He also had to make a protestation to the House of Commons that promised to keep their discussions concerning his brother secret.<sup>235</sup> A witness in Wentworth's prosecution referred to words that he alleged George Wentworth had used, but George Wentworth was prevented from giving evidence explaining what he had actually said as it was suspected that he would only "speak in his own justification, which was not permissible."<sup>236</sup>

Even the most minor figures of Wentworth's administration faced investigation. Early in the proceedings against Wentworth, the House of Commons required Thomas Little and Guilford Slingsby, described as "the secretaries there [Ireland]," to provide information on Irish proceedings.<sup>237</sup> On 12 February 1641, the House of Commons ordered that Wentworth's minor secretaries, Thomas Little and Joshua Carpenter should, within seven days respond to the House's questions concerning how much tobacco was left within the Irish magazines.<sup>238</sup> They were extremely suspicious of even these minor figures of the administration and on the same day ordered that both Little and Carpenter could be released from their imprisonment with a bond of £20,000 and a bail of £5000 "to attend the Pleasure of this House from Time to Time, and to abide the Censure of this House for their several Contempts done to this House."<sup>239</sup> Wentworth's administrative men found their estates investigated and Thomas Little was ordered "to have the Liberty of the Castle only, that he may give an Accompt of the King's Revenues..." He was to receive no visitors unless the Constable of Dublin Castle agreed and if a visit was permitted, two members of a committee had to be present. He was to receive no

---

<sup>234</sup> Rushworth reported a wording of a poster at Sir William Bronkard's house, stating that Sir Thomas Danby, Sir George Wentworth, Sir Gervase Clifton, Sir William Pennyman and Sir Henry Slingsby were such "Enemies of Justice." *ibid*, p. 59.

<sup>235</sup> For example, on 26 February 1641, George Wentworth was granted permission to visit Wentworth, although all other members of the House of Commons were to refrain from visiting him without first seeking permission. *ibid*, p. 32.

<sup>236</sup> Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth* p. 345.

<sup>237</sup> On 13 November 1640, the Commons ordered Little and Slingsby to send the Book of Entries to England. Rushworth, *Trial of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 7.

<sup>238</sup> *Commons Journal of Ireland* p. 172.

<sup>239</sup> *ibid*, p. 172.

letters or papers “unless the Constable shall first have Knowledge thereof...”<sup>240</sup> It appears that the Commons were trying to minimise the number of potential witnesses available for Wentworth to use in his trial in England by imprisoning and investigating men close to him in Ireland. Thomas Little was used to unearth misdemeanours within the customs farm. The Lord Justices of Ireland reported to Charles I that the Irish customs were deteriorating in the absence of “a strong system of supervision.” They protested that the restraint of Wentworth and Radcliffe had “made it impossible to settle up the accounts.” They believed that more than £15,000 was being held by the customs farmers despite the fact that the Irish Treasury was empty. They asked “how far the late Earl of Strafford’s lands and goods or his quarter share of the customs may be used for paying off the King’s debts.”<sup>241</sup> It was hoped that the Irish Vice-Treasurer and Auditor could call upon Thomas Little and Joshua Carpenter to help them work out how much money Wentworth and Radcliffe owed the King and “what they should have received for their 3/8 share of the Customs...”<sup>242</sup>

### **Conclusion: The outcome of the proceedings and events after Wentworth’s execution**

The Commons declared for a Bill of Attainder against Thomas Wentworth and it was passed by a majority of 204 to 59 on 21 April 1641.<sup>243</sup> The bill was passed by the Lords on 8 May 1641, and the royal assent to Wentworth’s execution given on 10 May. Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford was executed on 12 May 1641 and “died like a Gentleman and a Christian; a martyr for the Church and King.”<sup>244</sup>

Radcliffe offered as much comfort to Wentworth as possible through his letters in the days before his execution. Even when Wentworth had been condemned to death by the House of Parliament and Charles I, Radcliffe and Wentworth were prevented from meeting. In a letter written between 9 and 12 May 1641, Radcliffe wrote to Wentworth:

whatsoever small remainder of tyme God shall vouchsafe me in this world, my purpose is to imploy it chiefly in the service of your children...  
The Father of Mercyes and God of all consolation be your peace and

---

<sup>240</sup> *ibid*, pp. 188 – 189.

<sup>241</sup> Lord Justices and Irish Privy Council to Secretary Vane, 7 June 1641, *CSPI 1633 – 1647* p. 299.

<sup>242</sup> *ibid*, p. 299.

<sup>243</sup> Gardiner, S.R. ‘Thomas Wentworth,’ *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 281.

<sup>244</sup> Radcliffe, ‘An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde,’ in Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. ii, p. 433.

everlasting comfort.<sup>245</sup>

Radcliffe attempted to support Wentworth throughout his trial, despite restrictions on their communication and personal contact. They did manage to exchange comforting letters with each other. In one such letter, Wentworth professed Radcliffe's innocence in the impeachment proceedings.<sup>246</sup>

Rushworth wrote that once Thomas Wentworth had been executed on 13 May 1641, Radcliffe's testimony was no longer "useful to Strafford or formidable to his prosecutors," and therefore the impeachment articles against him "were tacitly allowed to be frivolous..."<sup>247</sup> However, we learn in a letter from Radcliffe to Thomas Wentworth's son, that he was still confined to his prison in June 1642.<sup>248</sup> This was despite the fact that King Charles I had issued a declaration that belittled the Commons' proceedings against Radcliffe. The King professed that he was grieved when "urged to expresse anything of resentment or dislike w[hi]ch may reflect upon our house of Commons now assembled." He had become aware that the House of Commons had breached the right of privilege of Parliament in the case of Sir George Radcliffe who upon the say-so of the House of Commons alone had issued an order for the Sergeant-at-Arms to arrest him. The King argued that "noe priviledge of Parliament extends to such a case Notw[i]thstanding that the said Sir George Ratcliffe was not at all impeacht at that tyme..." Essentially his accusation rested upon "only some private verball information given against him in the house of Commons." Therefore the King wished to announce his displeasure at the committee of the House of Commons who had proceeded unfairly against Radcliffe. He expected the House of Commons to restore justice as they had "soe farre exceeded both the bounds of a Committyes power, and the limmitts of their duty, and regard to their Soueraigne."<sup>249</sup>

As George Radcliffe was never officially impeached and brought to trial, evidence presented by Parliament to support their accusations of him is lacking. It does appear that there was some attempt to treat Radcliffe's impeachment independently, and not solely accuse him in order to prevent him from acting as a

---

<sup>245</sup> Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 225.

<sup>246</sup> Wentworth paried that "God deliver you out of this wicked world according to the innocence that is in you." Wentworth to Radcliffe, 12 May 1641, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II. p. 417, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 224.

<sup>247</sup> Rushworth, J. *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, of Weighty Matters in Law, of Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments* (8 vols, London, 1680), vol. iv, p. 219.

<sup>248</sup> Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* pp. 238 – 239.

<sup>249</sup> 6 January 1642, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 488. 38, *CSPD 1641 – 1643* p. 246.

witness in Strafford's defence.<sup>250</sup> However, once Thomas Wentworth was removed, there no need to continue in the proceedings against Radcliffe. Without Wentworth, Radcliffe was not thought to be influential enough to threaten Parliament's power.

---

<sup>250</sup> For example, we learn that the charge of high treason of Sir Richard Bolton, John Bramall, Bishop of Derry and George Radcliffe were to be drawn up by a committee using "all diligence, faith, and secrecy, as the importance and weight of so great a cause doth require." *ibid*, 1641 – 1643 p. 20.

## **Chapter 9: Epilogue**

After the execution of Thomas Wentworth, the cabal went their separate ways, although the familial connections between them ensured that some limited contact was maintained. Radcliffe's life after the Personal Rule is the focus of this epilogue as the evidence for his activities after 1641 is most complete. After Wandesford's death, only Radcliffe was the most logical target within Wentworth's cabal against whom to seek retribution, although as we have seen in Chapter 8, Radcliffe's impeachment trial was not taken to its logical conclusion. However, having been so closely allied with Wentworth and the King's Personal Rule, Radcliffe was most seriously drawn into the royalist cause and became an important member of the Court of the Duke of York in exile.

### **Radcliffe: Royalist in Exile**

Radcliffe remained imprisoned until 1642 despite the fact that Wentworth, the focus of Parliament's attention, was executed in May 1641.<sup>1</sup> Radcliffe was seen as a dangerous supporter of Personal Rule government and although Parliament did not intend to continue impeachment proceedings against him, it was politically safest for him to be secured in prison. Once he was released from his prison, Radcliffe was further punished through the redistribution of his lands, a common punitive action taken against many royalists after the Civil War. Radcliffe's Irish estates had rebelled against the King, and this may have been due to their landlord's association with the legacy of the strong rule with which Wentworth was felt to have ruled Ireland.<sup>2</sup>

Radcliffe's English estates suffered more directly at the hands of the Commonwealth

---

<sup>1</sup> Radcliffe wrote to Thomas Wentworth's son Lord Raby on 10 June 1642 explaining; "I was in hope to have gained my liberty, and had ye meanes to have waited on you: but as the world goes, I may not move, but must expect with quietnes for better dayes." George Radcliffe to Lord Raby, 10 June 1642, Whitaker, T.D. *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810), p. 239.

<sup>2</sup> The report examining the state of the English-owned estates in County Wicklow by the Commission of Martial Law dated 12 March 1650, noted that Radcliffe's Down deer park and his several towns in County Wicklow were standing against the monarchy. Wentworth's manors of Newcastle and Carnew and his towns and lands in Catherlogh and Byrne's Country, were also recorded as rebelling against the government. 'Abstract of the Estates of the English lately in the county of Wicklow and now in opposition to his Majesty in the report of the Commission of Martial Law to Teige Carroll, King's County,' 12 March 1650, *HMC Ormonde I* pp. 147 – 148.

government. On 16 July 1651, an act was passed ordering the sale of his estates to pay off his debts.<sup>3</sup> Some Royalists were able to buy back their own lands<sup>4</sup> but unfortunately, Radcliffe was not in a strong enough financial position to do so.

Radcliffe had promised Wentworth that he would dedicate the rest of his life “chiefly in the Service of your Children.”<sup>5</sup> He was still very much attached to the Wentworth family despite spending much of the remainder of his life in exile in Europe, along with many other royalist supporters. Radcliffe made efforts to arrange suitable marriages for Wentworth’s children. In July 1653, Radcliffe wrote to Colonel Gervase Holles, concerned that he had not heard “of any matches” either for Wentworth’s son, Lord Raby or his sisters, Anne, Arabella and Margaret.<sup>6</sup> Radcliffe was adamant that the Wentworth family had already been punished enough by the execution of their father, and petitioned Parliament that Wentworth’s children should “hold their place and precedencies which they had on the first of November, 1640... notwithstanding any Act of Parliament against their father...”<sup>7</sup>

Other members of Wentworth’s administration in Ireland also stepped in to help his family. Ormond offered assistance to Wentworth’s son and Radcliffe wrote to thank him for his help. Radcliffe felt “exceedingly your debtor for sundry civilityes and reall courtesies to my lord of Strafford...”<sup>8</sup> Radcliffe felt responsible for Wentworth’s son and thanked people who had supported him on his behalf. However, Radcliffe was frustrated by Wentworth’s children’s lack of communication with him. Whilst in exile, Radcliffe informed Colonel Gervase Holles that he heard “some times

---

<sup>3</sup> The sale of Radcliffe’s lands took place in January 1656. Firth, C.H. ‘Radcliffe,’ *Dictionary of National Biography* p. 125, *CSPD 1655 – 1656* p. 144. The Council of the Commonwealth’s proceedings of 10 November 1657 recorded that “certain lands of Sir Geo[rge] Ratcliffe were given to Henry Stuart and James Gray, till from the rents they should have received 19,000 *l.* recompense for an unjust sentence passed against them in the Star Chamber Court in Ireland.” *ibid*, 1657 – 1658 p. 158.

<sup>4</sup> Thirsk noted that this large-scale redistribution of “delinquent’s lands” was comparable to the social changes brought about by the reallocation of lands brought about by the distribution of the monasteries. Thirsk, J. ‘The Sales of Royalist Land during the Interregnum,’ *The Economic History Review* n.s., 5, no. 2 (1952), pp. 188, 192.

<sup>5</sup> Radcliffe, G. ‘An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde, in a Letter to the late Earl,’ in Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford’s Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols, London, 1739), p. 417.

<sup>6</sup> *HMC Bath II*, p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> George Radcliffe to Ormonde, 15 January 1655, *HMC Ormonde ns I* p. 314.

<sup>8</sup> In particular. Radcliffe referred to Ormonde’s “favours about the officers of his troope. I hope he will one day be able to pay your lordship with better respects then these poore acknowledgements...” Radcliffe to Ormond, 2 April 1644, Carte, T. *The Life of James, Duke of Ormonde* (6 vols, Oxford, 1851). vol. VI, p. 85.

of my Lord of Str[afford] though never from him.”<sup>9</sup> Radcliffe was concerned that Wentworth’s son was not looking after his estates properly and wished that he or Gervase Holles “could quicken him to looke after his busines, which I feare is not managed, as it ought to be.” Radcliffe felt that Raby needed a reliable servant to “looke to his estate...”<sup>10</sup> Radcliffe tried to adopt an attitude of paternal care towards Wentworth’s children, although he was not in a position to personally intervene in their activities and they do not appear to have made much attempt to communicate with him.

Despite being summarily removed from his position in the Irish government, Radcliffe continued to show interest in Irish politics. Radcliffe was consulted on some Irish issues, as he had first hand knowledge of the situation in Ireland.<sup>11</sup> In particular, Radcliffe maintained a correspondence with the Earl of Ormond, both from England and during his exile in Europe.<sup>12</sup> This correspondence reveals that Radcliffe was a strong supporter of Ormond’s policy in Ireland. On 18 October 1643, Radcliffe wrote to Ormond to express his delight that “his majesty has put the sword into your lordshipp’s handes.”<sup>13</sup> He offered assistance to Ormond, if his “poore (weakenesses rather then) abilityes may contribute any thinge to your service,” clearly believing that his experiences in Ireland would enable him to offer good advice to the new Lord Deputy.<sup>14</sup> He certainly felt able to offer his own commendation of suitable men for

---

<sup>9</sup> Radcliffe to Colonel Gervase Holles, 15 July 1653, *HMC Bath II*, p. 110. On an earlier occasion, Radcliffe thanked Holles for his news that Strafford had arrived safely in England. He wrote that this was the first news of him that he had received “since I parted from you save onely that I heard upon the by, that he had bene at Caen...” Radcliffe was pleased that Wentworth’s son had gone to London as he could no longer be “accused as the cause of his stay here, as I have bene very lately by some that are neere to him.” Radcliffe added regretfully that “it is not the first time that I have bene misconstrued.” Radcliffe to Colonel Gervase Holles, 31 January 1652, *ibid*, p. 99.

<sup>10</sup> Radcliffe to Colonel Gervase Holles, 15 July 1653, *ibid*, p. 110.

<sup>11</sup> Carte, *Life of Ormonde* vol. V, pp. 516 – 525. Whitaker believed that Radcliffe’s letters prove that he still acted as Secretary for Ireland, although evidence to support this theory is lacking otherwise. Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 285.

<sup>12</sup> Ormond asked his brother-in-law Sir George Hamilton to extend his apologies to Radcliffe for “not answering his letter, that being in this, and my French letter as bad as it is having taken up six times the time I thought it possible that a letter could do.” Ormond to Sir George Hamilton, 18 July 1654, *HMC Ormonde n.s. I* p.299.

<sup>13</sup> He professed that he felt sure that Ormond’s Lord Deputyship was “almost the onely meanes to restore peace and obedience vnto that miserable kingdome,” and hoped that Ormonde’s “private interests may prosper, together with the publique...” Radcliffe to Ormond, 18 October 1643, Carte *Life of Ormonde* vol. V, p. 516.

<sup>14</sup> Radcliffe stated that he could predict the types of opposition Ormond would face in all three of the

offices in Ireland. He recommended the nephew of a friend Sir Henry Skipwith, who thought that Radcliffe's suit to Ormond might hold sway with the Lord Deputy.<sup>15</sup> Radcliffe hoped to maintain a correspondence with Ormond and requested that he send him a cipher to enable him to "more freely communicate such privacies as may occurred." Radcliffe also asked Ormond to take into his "care and protection" George Carr and Joshua Carpenter.<sup>16</sup> These men were minor players in Wentworth's administration in Ireland and it is interesting that Radcliffe was concerned that they should be well provided for under Ormond's leadership. Radcliffe was concerned that all members of Wentworth's cabal should be protected as though part of an extended family, and this link remained despite Wentworth's personal demise.

As we would expect, once Radcliffe was released from imprisonment, he aligned himself with the Royalist cause. In 1643, Radcliffe joined Charles I and his court at Oxford. The King informed Radcliffe of important and potentially explosive policies as he had proved himself to be a trustworthy and loyal servant of the Crown under Wentworth, and used Radcliffe in a legal capacity during the Civil War.<sup>17</sup> There had been English fears of the Irish Catholic army being used against the English for a number of years, and Radcliffe was entrusted with the knowledge that this was at least a possibility in the early years of the Civil War. Radcliffe was to examine the wording and content of a commission that would authorise Ormond "to commande all the forces transported out of Irelande into Englande..."<sup>18</sup> However, Ormond was not

---

Kingdoms of the British Isles as well as the lack of "supplies, assistance and support you may expect," having experienced these at first hand under Wentworth's administration. However, in spite of these problems, Radcliffe was sure that "the same goodnes will cary you on and thorough with successe and honor." *ibid*, vol. V, p. 517.

<sup>15</sup> Radcliffe professed that he began to "blush to thinke how many I haue recomended already..." but believed that this gentleman, "though almost a stranger to me, yet beinge of a very civile carriage, and a servant of the same maister with me," should be considered for a post in Ireland. Radcliffe to Ormond, 17 January 1643, *ibid*, vol. VI, pp. 13 – 14. In December 1643, Radcliffe informed Ormond that he had communicated to Sir Thomas Wharton some issues he had heard concerning suits for offices in Ireland. In particular he was concerned about those vying for the places of vice-president of Connaght, the Vice-Treasurer and the Master of the Rolls "into which I desire none may be admitted, but such as your lordship shall haue reason to approve..." Radcliffe to Ormond, 14 December 1643, *ibid*, vol. VI, pp. 537 – 538.

<sup>16</sup> Radcliffe to Ormond, 18 October 1643, *ibid*, vol. VI, p. 517.

<sup>17</sup> Radcliffe had continued to practice his legal profession and was created Doctor of Law at Oxford University on 31 October 1643. Firth, 'George Radcliffe,' *D.N.B.* p. 125.

<sup>18</sup> Radcliffe informed Ormond that Sir Patrick Weems had asked him "to see to the passinge of a commission from his majesty" concerning the Irish army. Radcliffe described to Ormond the difficulties he had experienced in drafting the commission, particularly "in respect of the dispersinge of the souldiers into severall places vnder severall commanders." This issue was resolved by Ormond becoming the

destined to have the Lieutenancy of the forces. Radcliffe informed Ormond on 17 January 1643 that although the commission had finally been completed and “ready to be sealed,” at the last moment, he had been “forbidden to proceed.” It had been decided that “prince Rupert must haue it in all points (so farre as I vnderstande,) as your lordship should haue had it.”<sup>19</sup>

Charles I had planned to use Radcliffe to carry the Duke of York into Ireland for his safety in 1645, but other circumstances led to his dispatching James to Europe with Lord Admiral Northumberland.<sup>20</sup> Radcliffe followed the Duke of York into exile and was quickly attached to his court where he held a position of considerable influence.

Whilst in exile, like so many other Royalist exiles, Radcliffe faced huge financial problems.<sup>21</sup> Whilst sailing to Dieppe in June 1648, a corsair attacked the boat on which he was travelling and robbed Radcliffe and his companion of £500 in money and jewels. Radcliffe wrote to Secretary Nicholas on 2 September 1650, from The Hague informing him that he could not “do anything of moment for want of money...”

---

“commande in chiefe all his majesty’s forces in North Wales, and in the countyes of Chester, Shropshire, and Worcestershire, (whether Irish or English)...” Radcliffe was meticulous in drafting the commission. He disliked the “ommission of some clauses, (which I had seene heretofore in other commissions of like nature,) and the manner of the penninge of other...” and therefore he presented the case to the Lords and “obtained permission to rectify the errors.” Radcliffe kept Ormond fully informed of the progress of his legal work and wrote again three days later stating that it would take another week of work before he could dispatch it. After the years of work together in Ireland under Wentworth’s regime, Radcliffe was able to recommend that the Lord Deputy remained in Ireland rather than embarking upon a proposed journey to England. Although he would be very welcome to his friends, amongst whom Radcliffe counted himself, they were concerned that “as thinges stand in Irelande, wee had rather haue you stay there a while, as conceiving the peace and security of that kingdome dependes much vpon your person and presence.” Radcliffe explained that “the reason of this last stay was, because the prince of Wales had a commission to be captain generall of all Wales and the marches, (which I knew not till now), and your lordship must be his lieutenant generall in North Wales, Cheshire, Shropshire, and Worcestershire.” Radcliffe to Ormond, 14 and 17 December 1643, Carte, *Life of Ormonde* vol. V, pp. 537 – 538, 539.

<sup>19</sup> Radcliffe reassured Ormond that it was “an accommodation for his highnes, and no disrespect to your lordship, that caused this change.” Radcliffe hoped that the Irish soldiers in Cheshire, “who served so cheerfully vnder your lordship’s name and authority” would still “quit themselues like men vnder the commande of so eminent a person as this prince...” Radcliffe to Ormond, 17 January 1643, *ibid*, vol. VI, p. 13.

<sup>20</sup> Firth, ‘George Radcliffe,’ *D.N.B.* p. 125, *HMC Hastings* IV, pp. 92 – 93.

<sup>21</sup> Radcliffe attempted to help other exiles who found themselves in financial straits. He wrote to Ormond on 25 August 1654: “I have now received a second letter from my Lady Isa[belle] who as in a former so in this importunes me to know whether a gold chain, which was pawned when she was here, be redeemed by your Lordship or no; for if it be not redeemed she will send money to me to disengage it. I think Mr Lane paid the money for it in my presence, but I am not sure that this was it which she means.” *HMC Ormonde n.s.* 1 p. 306.

Despite his loneliness, he was unable to bring his wife into Europe to be with him. Although he had been offered the chance for his wife to be brought into France by “a fisherman there that would bring her over without a pass,” he unfortunately had “no means to keep my wife here,” and therefore had to refuse this assistance.<sup>22</sup>

Radcliffe was not a popular member of the Duke of York’s household. In particular the Queen Mother, Henrietta Maria felt that Radcliffe was a bad influence over her son James, the Duke of York whom she wanted to remain at her Court in Paris where he could be controlled. However, Radcliffe and Sir Edward Herbert convinced James to relocate to Brussels where he would be able to exert his own influence and become an important political force.<sup>23</sup> James’ move to Brussels was motivated by his disaffection with being forced onto the edges of political power, overshadowed by his mother and her court and restricted by his “financial necessity.” James also had to move away from his mother’s influence before being able to appoint Radcliffe and Herbert as his personal advisors.<sup>24</sup> Radcliffe was acutely aware that the Queen Mother disliked him and would attempt to restrain James from leaving her court. Radcliffe informed Secretary Nicholas “there will be a strange endeavour to keep his Highnes there, and want of money will be a powerful argument to persuade

---

<sup>22</sup> Radcliffe to Secretary Nicholas, 2 September 1650, *CSPD 1650* p. 320. Throughout his exile, Radcliffe declared that he was desperately short of money. He told his correspondent Colonel Gervase Holles about the difficulties he was having in retrieving £10 that he lent to Lieutenant Colonel Smith who “was in extremity of want.” Radcliffe had “layd downe the money to him at the Hague a yeare agoe” and Mr Wyndham had vowed to repay Radcliffe on Lieutenant Colonel Smith’s behalf. Wyndham had “often promised to pay me when any money comes in, but I get nothinge, and it is a summe considerable to me in my present condition.” Radcliffe to Colonel Gervase Holles, 28 February 1652, *HMC Bath II* p. 101.

<sup>23</sup> The Queen Mother disliked both Radcliffe and Herbert and this served to cement their relationship. Sir Edward Hyde described the Queen’s dislike of Radcliffe and Herbert of “which they well enough discerning, grew into a Friendship, or rather a Familiarity together, though They were of the most different Natures and Humours imaginable.” However, of the two, Hyde preferred Radcliffe who he found to be a “Man very capable of Business” and if “the Prosperity of his former Fortune had not raised in him some Fumes of Vanity, and Self-conceitedness, was very fit to be advised with; being of a Nature constant, and sincere.” Hyde, E. Earl of Clarendon, *Life* p. 123 in Reynolds, N.A.C. ‘The Stuart Court and Courtiers in Exile 1644 – 1654,’ (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1996), p. 144.

<sup>24</sup> Reynolds observes that “the move from Paris liberated James from the strictures of his family to some extent.” *ibid*, pp. 142, 157 – 158, 162, 163. Radcliffe also obtained an official post within James’ household. He was described as “Monsieur le Chevalier” by a number of correspondents. In June 1649, Monsieur Porrée wrote to Ralph, Baron Hopton, enclosing a book. Monsieur Porrée asked if “the Resident [Sir Richard] Brown and the Chevalier [Sir George] Ratcliff” could present his book to the King. When James’ court was established in Brussels, Radcliffe was appointed “to manage all Affairs of Money.” Address label dated 7 July 1654 from Sir Richard Brown to Radcliffe, British Library, 15857 MS. f.140, Monsieur Porrée to Baron Hopton, 24 June 1649, *HMC Pepys MSS* p. 258, Reynolds, ‘The Stuart Court and Courtiers in Exile.’ p. 143.

him.”<sup>25</sup>

In 1650, Radcliffe and Herbert heard rumours that the future Charles II had been killed at the Battle of Dunbar and therefore James would become King. In order to augment James’ power and independence away from his mother, Radcliffe and Herbert planned for the marriage of James, Duke of York to the daughter of the Duke of Lorraine.<sup>26</sup> However, Charles had actually survived the battle and reasserted himself over his younger brother, ordering him to return to Paris where he would be back under the influence of the Queen Mother.<sup>27</sup>

Radcliffe did make some attempt to improve his relationship with the Queen Mother Henrietta Maria recognising that to improve one’s status within the exiled Royalist Court, it was easier to work with the Queen Mother than against her. Radcliffe wrote to Ormond on 5 January 1655 explaining that he had been to visit Lord Jermyn to apply for an audience with the Queen Mother, after “some speech I had with the Duke of York about the Queen’s indignation at me, wherein I thought that I could very fully clear myself, if I had but indifferent hearing.” However, Henrietta Maria’s faction took the occasion to reinforce their feelings against Radcliffe. Radcliffe reported that Lord Jermyn “would not afford me so much as civil language...” despite the fact that they had always had a good relationship. This attack on Radcliffe’s position further exacerbated his desire to retire from politics. However, he was willing to remain in post if the future King Charles II commanded him to. If this was the case, Radcliffe professed “all their great looks or scornful usage shall not deter me from him...”<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Reynolds indicates that it was unlikely that Henrietta Maria knew that James was intending to stay in Brussels for more than a few weeks. Hatton wrote to Nicholas on 23 September 1650, “My greatest feare is least the Queene of England should discover the resolute reason to st[ay] time at Brussels...” *ibid*, p. 158, Radcliffe to Secretary Nicholas, 18 September 1650, *CSPD 1650* p. 320.

<sup>26</sup> Reynolds, ‘The Stuart Court and Courtiers in Exile,’ p. 159, *CSPD 1650*, pp. 320 – 322, 373, 437, *HMC Bath II*, pp. 97 – 98.

<sup>27</sup> Firth, ‘George Radcliffe,’ *D.N.B.* p. 125. Royalist exile Abraham Cowley predicted that lack of money would force James to return to Paris to the protection of Henrietta Maria’s court. Cowley quipped that this was despite the fact that the Duke’s advisors would “rather design a Journey into Germany, or indeed Japan, or the West Indies.” Cowley to Bennett, Paris, 18 November 1650, *Miscellanea Aulica* pp. 152 – 154 in Reynolds, ‘The Stuart Court and Courtiers in Exile,’ p. 145.

<sup>28</sup> Radcliffe intended to seek permission to retire from the Court. “...since His Majesty was graciously pleased to recommend me to his brother, I shall not presume to withdraw myself without His Majesty’s good pleasure to licence me. I have had a great ambition to serve his Majesty in what condition soever his own wisdom and goodness should think fit to place me, and I did believe that I might have been as

John Lord Biron attacked Radcliffe for his involvement in the Duke of York's household. Biron's charges brought on 12 November 1651, aimed to discredit Radcliffe and cast doubt upon his motivations. Radcliffe forwarded a copy of the charges, to Colonel Gervase Holles on 31 January 1652, which accused Radcliffe of acting in a sinister manner in order to promote his own interests.<sup>29</sup> Biron accused Radcliffe of monopolising access to James, Duke of York therefore preventing others from participating in his government. Radcliffe exasperated other exiles by presenting himself as rather better and more experienced than those around him. Radcliffe further annoyed Biron by holding councils concerning the Duke of York's affairs without "communicatinge any thinge of them to me..." In Biron's opinion, Radcliffe's Machiavellian style increased his own power at the expense of others in government.<sup>30</sup>

---

useful to His Majesty in mine attendance on the Duke of York as any way else, which I was the more inclined unto because it was the desire of the King, his blessed father, that I should be about this Duke his son." Clearly Radcliffe felt a strong alliance to King Charles I's cause and therefore the Restoration of the monarchy. Radcliffe to Ormond, 5 January 1655, *HMC Ormonde n.s.1* pp. 313 - 314.

<sup>29</sup> The first charge accused Radcliffe of making the Duke of York distrust his servants. He was accused of writing a letter to Dr Killigrew in Jersey, which he was to show to the Duke of York, suggesting that "ill offices had bene done his Highnes to the Kinge at Breda..." Radcliffe did not outline the specific offences but attempted to demonstrate that he personally was working for the benefit of the monarchy. Radcliffe's letter was debated the following day in James' presence. John Lord Biron felt personally implicated in association with these offences as Radcliffe had mentioned Biron's involvement to one Mr Wyndham. John Lord Biron continued his attack by alleging that Radcliffe had tried to gain personal advantages through his connections with the Duke of York. He accused Radcliffe of being over-eager to ingratiate himself to the Duke, meeting him in Brussels on the "very night of his arrival there..." Biron accused Radcliffe of entering York's service "upon the pretence of orders from the King at Beauvais" and therefore he had "entred immediately upon the government of all his Highness houseould affaires." Biron found Radcliffe to be elusive. He tried to question Radcliffe "upon what ground his Highnes had made his journey thither" but Radcliffe refused to reveal this information stating that "he was tyed to secrecy therein..." He annoyed Biron further by adding "that beinge a privy counselor he might be intrusted with many thinges, which he could not accordinge to his oath reveale to me." 12[?] November 1651, *HMC Marquis of Bath II* p. 97.

<sup>30</sup> Biron added further charges against Radcliffe. He felt that the Duke was living in unsuitable circumstances and as he had "little power or credit... to remedy them" with Radcliffe's monopolistic influence, Biron pretended to set off on a visit to The Hague. In reality, he went to the Princess Royal, Elizabeth to request that she rescue the Duke of York "from the incommodities he lived in by invitinge his Highnes to her." Despite the fact that the Princess was grieving for her husband the Prince of Orange, she offered to help the Duke of York as soon as possible. James accepted her invitation but Biron accused Radcliffe of being unable to wait until the Princess was ready for them, persuading the Duke to travel to Doort to put pressure on the Princess Royal to receive him sooner. The princess was unable to accommodate him and his Court so quickly and she was forced to send "Monsieur de la Vieuville to beseech him for the present to turne backe and make some stay at Rhinen till she could make her house ready for him." Biron indicated that once at Rhinen, "the same impatience held Sir George Radcliffe..." He convinced the Duke to begin travelling to The Hague again "before I could procure the Princesse approbation of it, which gave her a second trouble of sendinge an expresse to stoppe him on his way." James' court did eventually travel to The Hague in December 1650. Biron argued that his story could be supported both by the Queen Mother and the Princess Royal as "many thinges of this nature, able to

John Lord Biron's case against Radcliffe did not undermine Radcliffe's influence in the long-term, although he was initially removed from the Duke of York's Court whilst under investigation. In a letter to Colonel Gervase Holles, Radcliffe wrote that after the case was heard at Court, he was "quit of that which was made the cause of my removall from the Duke." He was cleared of convincing the Duke to leave France away from the influence of his mother, although Radcliffe acknowledged that he "should not have gone to the Duke without a speciall order, notwithstandinge that I was his servant, and had the Kinge's promise to be one of his officers..." The future King Charles II ordered Lord Biron and Radcliffe to be friends "and so an end of the busines." Radcliffe now had official permission to attend the Duke<sup>31</sup> yet found himself in a delicate situation in the summer of 1652. Although he was permitted to attend the Duke of York, he protested that

I am in a condition that I can hardly speake any thinge concerninge the Duke's busines, now especially since my Lord Birons death. They think that I might pretend to some imployment about his Royal Highnes and truly I finde the Duke constant in his opinion of me, and willinge enough to use my service. And I have great reason to believe that I stand upright in the Kinges good opinion. Yet I have some motives which keepe me backe (at the present) from movinge for any thinge, least I should knocke my foot against that stone, at which I have stumbled three tymes allready.<sup>32</sup>

Radcliffe was bitter about the treatment he had received from the exiled Royal family, especially as he felt so strongly about the Royalist cause. He felt that Henrietta Maria "has been prevailed withal to oppose (I had almost said to oppress) me..." and was distressed at the "endeavours and arts [that] have been used to make the King have an ill opinion of me..." He believed that men sought to give him a bad name in an attempt to undermine his position within the court of the Duke of York. He was so frustrated that he asked Ormond to seek permission from the King to allow him to gracefully retire. He felt unable to serve the monarchy effectively in the face of such opposition.<sup>33</sup>

---

confirme the rest, havinge bene done in their houses, much to their profest dissatisfaction." *ibid*, p. 98.

<sup>31</sup> Radcliffe to Colonel Gervase Holles, 31 January 1652, *ibid*, p. 99.

<sup>32</sup> Radcliffe to Holles, 13 August 1652, *ibid*, pp. 105 – 106.

<sup>33</sup> Radcliffe to Ormond, 5 January 1655, *HMC Ormonde n.s.1* p. 314. Radcliffe was not alone in a desire to remove himself from the exiled court. His friend Sir Richard Brown admitted to Radcliffe that he was desperate to return to England and never forgot to pray that he could "with Gods Grace returne to that

Despite his despondency and Henrietta Maria's obvious dislike of him, Radcliffe returned to Paris with the Duke of York and became one of his chief advisors, which he found to be a thankless task.<sup>34</sup> He declared to his wife in August 1656 that he was as "weary as a dog of mine office, for I labour in vain, do no good, but get scorns or ill-will."<sup>35</sup> Although Radcliffe was allowed to attend the Duke of York, he was still excluded from the activities of the wider exiled Court.<sup>36</sup> He was unable to provide information to Holles about the politics of the day "for I come very seldome at the Court, and their busines is close carried." Radcliffe was clearly feeling detached and lonely, asking Holles if he liked Calais and Bologne, as he was considering "removinge myelfe... for there is cheapenes, and frequent meanes to heare from my friends, or send to them."<sup>37</sup> In his current position in Paris however, he was in a valuable position to report upon foreign news.<sup>38</sup> Radcliffe did not leave Paris until September 1656 and then joined the royalist exiles in the Low Countries. He had suffered a stroke that paralysed him from the waist down, but he continued to serve the Royalist cause and to promote the Restoration.<sup>39</sup> He died at Sluis on 22 May 1657

---

home, and there end my dayes in peace and bee layed in the graue of my auncestors, and in the ashes of my deare wife." Brown to Radcliffe, 4 April 1653, British Library Additional MS 34702 f. 66.

<sup>34</sup> Reynolds wrote that the Queen Mother's influence, although enormous, could not completely control the court. Radcliffe and Herbert were allowed to accompany York at her court when he was granted a royal pension of "4000 pistoles a yeare." This pension was granted on 28 April 1651 and the Duke arrived in July of that year. Ormond to Nicholas, 4 May 1651, Bodleian Library, Carte MS 29, f. 434r in Reynolds, 'The Stuart Court and Courtiers in Exile,' p. 161.

<sup>35</sup> *Nicholas Papers*, vol. II, p. 185 in Firth, 'George Radcliffe,' *D.N.B.* p. 125.

<sup>36</sup> It was perhaps felt that Radcliffe was still a bad influence over the Duke of York. Indeed, Radcliffe did hold sway with the Duke as he was able to press issues with the Duke on behalf of his friends, such as Colonel Gervase Holles. Radcliffe reassured Holles that he foresaw "little difficulty" in helping him secure an employment within the Duke's service. A few days later, Radcliffe reported "The Duke has absolutely promised me that you shall have his consent to have that place when it is void, which I thinke wilbe shortly... He approves of your beinge employed, so as I conceive there is very good hopes for you." On 5 May 1652, Radcliffe reported again about the progress of Holles' application. Radcliffe had told the Lord Chancellor that he had recommended Holles to the Duke of York "for some imployment about his tenths." The Chancellor asked Radcliffe to present his recommendation to the King who "heard me willingly and promised me to remember you when the matter came in question... I said that for your diligence and fidelity I would be your surety, but the Kinge was pleased to say that he made no doubt of you." Radcliffe to Holles, 18, 21 February and 5 May 1652, *HMC Bath II*, pp. 100, 102.

<sup>37</sup> Radcliffe to Holles, 21 February 1652, *ibid*, p. 101.

<sup>38</sup> He reported upon the escalation of the Frondes in France. He wrote of the "troubles in France between the Kinge of France and the Princes of the Blood... Every day bringes out lyinge gazetts, and nothings is reported on one side which is not contradicted by the other." Radcliffe also asked for Holles to keep him informed of any news from England as although "many thinges come to Callais out of England," information often did not reach him. Radcliffe to Holles, 31 January and 18 February 1652, *ibid*, pp. 99, 100.

<sup>39</sup> Lloyd, D. *Memoirs of the lives, actions, sufferings, and deaths of those noble, reverend, and excellent*

and was buried on 25 May in Flushing. Radcliffe does not appear to have left a will.

Radcliffe's religious beliefs may have provoked contemporary concern but his beliefs seem to have concurred with the moderate Protestant religiosity of Wentworth. Due to the climate of fear of popery during Charles I's Personal Rule, the accusation of Catholicism was used to undermine Wentworth's position in Ireland and to attack both Radcliffe and Wentworth during their impeachments. As there had been no Parliament to preserve the country's Protestant faith during the Personal Rule, Parliament exploited the fear that Charles I's trusted ministers were aiming to convert the nation to Catholicism. Radcliffe's beliefs continued to be suspected in exile. John Lord Biron's attack on Radcliffe exacerbated concerns in the exiled Court about Radcliffe's true faith. Biron expressed concern that Radcliffe was presenting Catholic sympathies to the Duke of York who was unprotected by loyal Protestant councillors. He stated that Radcliffe had encouraged the Duke of York to attend several masses "upon pretence of hearinge good musique..."<sup>40</sup> The Duke's removal to Brussels had already made other Royalist exiles suspicious of Radcliffe's motives suspecting that he was encouraging James to convert to Catholicism.<sup>41</sup>

Radcliffe's biographer Whitaker linked him with an attempt to form an alliance between the Jansenists and the Church of England in the 1650s. The Jansenists were a heretical branch of the Catholic Church whose doctrines contained elements of Calvinism. In particular their belief in predestination that was similar to that of Protestant doctrine. The Jansenists believed that sin could not be prevented and therefore predestination was the only way to be saved.<sup>42</sup> They were hostile to the

---

*personage* (London, 1668), p. 182, Whitaker, *Life and original correspondence of Radcliffe* p. 288.

<sup>40</sup> Radcliffe and James, Duke of York, were not discreet in their attendance at mass. Biron described the Duke of York's attendance on All Saints day at the Archduke's chapel, "where he appeared so publicly that it gave great scandal to all the English that were there." On another occasion, they attended a service at Brussels cathedral "upon occasion of a solemne thanksgivinge for the takinge of Monson from the French..." Biron was particularly concerned that this would cause great offence to the French "that his Highnes should be present at the solemnizinge of a victory obtained against them." 12[?] November 1651, *HMC Marquis of Bath II* p. 98.

<sup>41</sup> Reynolds has indicated that James, Duke of York did attract attention to himself by attending Catholic services. However, he argued that we should not interpret this as an early conversion to Catholicism. He argued that James was simply interested in the lives of other Europeans and therefore took an interest in their Churches. If this was indeed the case, this supports the idea that Radcliffe was also not a latent Catholic but simply intent on experiencing life in Brussels. Reynolds, 'The Stuart Court and Courtiers in Exile,' pp. 146, 165.

<sup>42</sup> Hardon, J.A. *Modern Catholic Dictionary* (London, 1981), p. 290.

Jesuits and rejected the Catholic Church's penitential cycle. Therefore, an alliance with the Jansenists might be seen as less objectionable than a Catholic alliance in the eyes of the English Royalist exiles. Miller has argued that Radcliffe would have considered that such an alliance could be beneficial to the Royalists as external support was needed to restore Charles II to the English throne.<sup>43</sup> However, there is no other evidence that Radcliffe was plotting such an alliance.

### **Radcliffe and political authority**

Although we can piece together information regarding the activities of the cabal, we have fewer opportunities to discover their innermost political and religious beliefs. However the Merthyr Mawr MS provides an opportunity to analyse Radcliffe's beliefs concerning political and religious authority.<sup>44</sup> This manuscript is the only extended statement of political thought by a member of the cabal. Although this manuscript is not dated, its contents and arguments suggest that it was written after the collapse of the Personal Rule and almost certainly during the 1650s. It was at this time that Radcliffe may have considered some of the implications of the regicide in 1649, and although he does not mention Charles I directly, the consideration of who had the right to choose governors would appear to tie in with the post-Civil War turmoil. The royalist contingent was plotting the Restoration of the monarchy, and therefore Radcliffe's considerations in this context would be pertinent. In this manuscript, Radcliffe attempted to rectify the problem of how the people could allow the monarchy to return to the throne, but at the same time, allowing the King the benefits of Divine Right. Although this manuscript is invaluable as it gives us an insight into a member of the cabal's political philosophy, we should remember that it is peculiar to the unusual situation of the 1650s and therefore one cannot assume that these thoughts would necessarily represent Radcliffe's thinking within the context of the 1630's.

This manuscript reveals Radcliffe's fundamental beliefs on the origins of

---

<sup>43</sup> Miller, J. *James II. A study in kingship* (Hove, 1978), p. 9.

<sup>44</sup> 'A discourse of Sir George Radcliffe's relating to the original of the civil power,' in James Tyrell's *Commonplace Book*, Merthyr Mawr MS f. 119. I would like to thank Mr Murray McLaggan for his kind permission to study the MS in his possession and for providing me with a copy. This manuscript can also be consulted on microfilm at Trinity College, Dublin.

government, describing God as the originator of all power and authority. This was very much in line with other royalist writers. John Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry also defended the system of monarchy defending the Royalist belief that the original political authority came from God.<sup>45</sup> Sir Robert Filmer described the “lordship of Adam” as being “as large and ample as the absolutest dominion of any monarch which hath been since the creation.” Filmer believed that this inheritance was an inherent right of monarchs.<sup>46</sup> In opposition to this, some writers justified limited monarchy through the natural law theory of the origins of power. This was popular to demonstrate that as man had chosen to give all their power to one representative with conditions attached that the populous had selected, the fundamental authority lay with the multitude that had chosen the ruler.<sup>47</sup> Those who wished to limit monarchical power denied that God had granted original power to a specific person and therefore deduced that original power was presented to the populace as a whole.<sup>48</sup> However, several civil lawyers had written that this did not apply to the English circumstance, as kings who ruled by conquest did not obtain consent for authority from their subjects.<sup>49</sup> Radcliffe believed that power was God-given and resided in one person, the King. Radcliffe propounded that “whatsoever power any creatures haue, they haue it by communication from God...” This could take the form of “naturall power, or might...” The second form of power was that of “morall power, authoritie or dominion; which is exercised only amongst reasonable creatures...”<sup>50</sup> Radcliffe believed that this power and authority clearly distinguished between governors and their subjects and “makes the directions giuen by Superiors, to be not only Rules, but Lawes... obligatory to inferiors.” The subjects had to obey the laws established by the

---

<sup>45</sup> Daly, J.W. ‘John Bramhall and The Theoretical Problems of Royalist Moderation,’ *Journal of British Studies* 11, no. 1, (1971), p. 28. Bramhall’s two political pamphlets, *The Serpent-Salve* and *The Catching of Leviathan* were written in 1643 and 1658 respectively.

<sup>46</sup> Filmer, Sir Robert. *Patriarchia and Other Writings* J.P. Sommerville (ed). (Cambridge, 1991), p. 7.

<sup>47</sup> Sommerville, J.P. *Politics and Ideology in England 1603 – 1640* (Harlow, 1986), p. 60.

<sup>48</sup> *ibid*, p. 61.

<sup>49</sup> This argument pointed out that when William I conquered England, the people lost any authority of the monarch’s powers. William the Conqueror and his successors did not have a contract with the people that limited the extent of his powers. *ibid*, pp. 61, 67. John Bramhall agreed that William the Conqueror’s power had initially been absolute but over time, the monarchy had become more limited by offering charters, laws and concessions to their subjects. Daly, ‘John Bramhall and Royalist Moderation,’ p. 30.

<sup>50</sup> Radcliffe supported this statement with a reference to the words of God to Cain: “Unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule ouer him.” [Gen: 4: 7]. ‘A discourse of Sir George Radcliffe’s.’ Merthyr Mawr MS f. 119.

ruler, as he was effectively God's representative on Earth.

This relationship with law formed two distinct parts. On one hand, the laws were forward-looking in the sense that they could affect future actions. On the other hand, jurisdiction was necessarily backward-looking as it took account of the behaviour of the subjects and led to a "necessarie consequence [of] Reward and punishment or the power of the sword." Radcliffe described the different forms of society in which jurisdiction and laws operated. Firstly, there was the domestic situation with power being exerted by "the father of the familie, ouer his wife, children, servants..."<sup>51</sup> Secondly, there was ecclesiastical power in which the "Fathers of the Church, in their severall orders and subordinations..." had control over their congregations. Finally, Radcliffe identified this system in political relationships where the power of the "Pater Patriae" was "primarily paternall ouer good subjects..."

Radcliffe believed that both domestic and ecclesiastical power was God-given and could not be questioned. But he felt that the issue of political power and the source of political authority needed clarification to avoid challenges to the King's authority. He felt that most men would agree that "it is from God in some sort or other..." which he supported with biblical references.<sup>52</sup> However, he was keen to oppose the views that had been "conceited by some, that the power of gouernement, is originally and radically in the people..." The use of the word 'conceited' demonstrates Radcliffe's belief that this was unfounded and almost arrogant to assume that the common man should think they were exceptional enough to play a part in the selection of rulers. He described the mistaken belief that "common consent" should allow rule to be distributed to one or more men. This element of community consent had been thought to be enough to justify the "cause of the authoritie of the magistrate." However, Radcliffe did not think that his previously given biblical references supported this and argued that if the civil magistrate

---

<sup>51</sup> *ibid*, f. 119. This was in contrast to those who believed that the origins of power lay with the community. Although they might concede that in nature fathers were the authority in the family, they did not extend this to a belief that fatherly power was kingly. Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology* p. 61.

<sup>52</sup> For example, he argued that political authority was "manifest by Sundrie testimonies. Pro: 8.15.16. By mee Kings raigne, and Princes decree iustice. by me Princes rule and Nobles; euen all the Judges of the Earth Dan. 4. 25. The most High ruleth in the Kingdome of men and giueth it to whomsoeuer he will. Eccles: 17. 17. In the diuisions of the nations of the whole earth, he sett a Ruler ouer euerie people. Rom. 13. 1." 'A discourse of Sir George Radcliffe's,' Merthyr Mawr MS f. 119.

was seen as God's Minister (in the sense that he was using God's laws on Earth). how could "the people be said to giue him power...?"

Radcliffe supplemented his assertions with numerous examples. He used the allegory of sheep to demonstrate that "Sheepe do not giue power to their Shepheard." He believed that "people are Sheepe by the law of God and nature, appointed to obey ioyntly and seuerally: and therefore haue not the originall power to command." Commanding and obeying were opposed to each other and therefore could not be contained within one person. We can only command or obey, just as "a man cannot be both father and Son in respect of the same man."

Radcliffe also believed that God would only give power to men who could effectively rule under his command. Therefore all subjects should obey their monarch, as to oppose them would be opposing God.<sup>53</sup> In order to be an effective magistrate, God would have provided a man with "guifts and endowements... of eminent wisdome and vertue..." These skills would not be "found promiscuously or uniuersally in all or a major part of the people..." Therefore, the majority of the population were "necessarily and naturally borne to obey... and verie few fitt to command in chiefe." On a larger scale, the majority of people were not "qualified for gouernment, [and therefore] much lesse can haue right to the power of gouernment." Radcliffe noted that society had to pass the authority of justice to the judges, who were "Gods deputy and not the peoples." This would appear to bolster his own position within Ireland where he acted in the judiciary at the highest level. To some extent, he may have believed himself to be part of God's judiciary, invested with the authority on God's behalf to judge others. In Radcliffe's argument, God was at the head of the judicial hierarchy and had invested power in a chosen few to enact justice on his behalf.<sup>54</sup>

Radcliffe was aware that his argument might be challenged by the example of Protestant Reformers during the Reformation who were forced to oppose Catholic magistrates. In this circumstance, the people were forced to advance their own power

---

<sup>53</sup> Radcliffe was confident that God would select rulers carefully and therefore "No power is naturally in that Subject which cannot possibly execute it." *ibid*, f. 119.

<sup>54</sup> Radcliffe believed that God held the original "soueraingty and power of commanding" and He was "that one Law giuer who is able to saue and distroy." *ibid*, f. 119.

above that of those with authority in order to obtain their true faith.<sup>55</sup> Protestants had embraced the belief that it was possible to favour a limited monarchy and to resist a ruler since the late sixteenth century, to justify their actions against Catholic rulers who refused to tolerate them.<sup>56</sup>

Radcliffe clearly had in-depth knowledge of classical Greek texts and compared his own thoughts to those offered by classical authors. He felt that some of his beliefs could not be reconciled to some passages in Aristotle's *Politiques* because Aristotle had been unable to "discover a Diuine institution." However, he justified his own beliefs with the supposition that "the Diuell is often Gods ape: and it was not unusuall with heathen men to deduce the originall of States from their Gods..." He believed that such classical thinkers had to diminish political authority at the expense of their spiritual thinking and therefore their opinions had been swayed. Aristotle had considered whether a republic or monarchy would be the most successful form of government and had decided that a republican commonwealth was best.<sup>57</sup>

Radcliffe was aware that rulers, to some extent, had to be appointed when their places became vacant by "*mediante populo*, and by publique consent: and so the people are some cause in the institution of governours." He posed the question of what would happen "When the Royall race in any Kingdom is extinct..." Would the right to choose a leader "devolve to the multitude?" Could this be used to prove "that Soueraingty is primarily in them?" Radcliffe countered this potential argument by demonstrating that when a vacancy arose, God appointed Governors "partly by qualifying and stirring up the spirit of generous persons fitt for dominion; partly by Subjecting the people under them." In the same way that ecclesiastical ministers had an inward as well as an outward calling to their profession, Radcliffe argued that the magistrate would experience that same fate. He explained "No man takes upon him this honor, but he that is sent..."

Radcliffe's political system formed the basis of his view of the natural hierarchy of society. Radcliffe was concerned with the institution of power and not the way in which it was applied. In the domestic context, Radcliffe demonstrated that "A woeman may chuse whom shee likes to be her husband: but being married, the husbands power is

---

<sup>55</sup> *ibid*, f. 119.

<sup>56</sup> Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology* p. 60.

<sup>57</sup> *ibid*, p. 58.

not from his wife, but by the law of the first institution.” In the case of patriarchy, “The relation of a father to his sonne comes by naturall generation: the authoritie of a Father ouer the Sonne is by diuine ordination.” In an ecclesiastical sense, “The Pope is chosen by the Cardinalls: they are not thereby his Lords in chiefe; for he claimes no power from them but by title Paramont.”

Therefore, in the event that a vacancy should arise, whether for a particular governor, or a new family or “Stock to be King” the people might have some say in who was chosen. However, they were influence by “diuine prouidence in an especiall manner” which “swaies their votes” and therefore “the Kings power hath an higher rise and foundation.” Even if the people did have some influence over who is chosen, Radcliffe believed that God still made the final decision, and even implemented the choice of ruler by exerting his divine power over the people. In this way, the monarch still had the God-given right to rule.<sup>58</sup>

Radcliffe’s political beliefs should be seen as specific and peculiar to the circumstances in which he wrote this manuscript. During the Civil War and in exile, Radcliffe was a fervent believer in the Restoration of the monarchy and his discussion on the origins of government clearly betrays his royalist perspective. Although he could see that the British Isles now had some part to play in choosing the next ruler of England, Radcliffe believed it would undoubtedly be a member of the Stuart royal family who God had chosen to rule the three kingdoms of the British Isles. God would be able to influence the population to ensure that the monarchy was restored. He clearly felt that Charles I’s belief in the Divine Right of Kings was central to the right of government. Radcliffe had acted in a judicial capacity in Ireland and justified his selection to this role by Wentworth and the King, as God-given. He believed that God had influenced their decision to employ him and therefore Radcliffe saw himself within a hierarchical system that was divinely ordained.

---

<sup>58</sup> Radcliffe argued “That this man shall be King the people may haue some consent: but that there shall be a Soueraine Ruler ouer euery people, and that this shall be his office and his Power, is not a thing of mans deuising, but Gods ordinance and Institution...” ‘A discourse of Sir George Radcliffe’s,’ Merthyr Mawr MS f. 119.

## Sir Edward Osborne and Christopher Wandesford's legacy

Wandesford did not live to experience the true extent of the downfall of Wentworth's regime, but the legacy he left to his family, had far reaching repercussions. If it were not for Alice Wandesford's half-brother, Edward Osborne, the family would have struggled even more. Wandesford made Sir Edward Osborne executor of his will, and left him in charge of his household and to act as the guardian of his children along with Alice.<sup>59</sup> Wandesford's daughter Alice described Osborne's "fraternall a love for, and parentall caire over" the Wandesford family. Wandesford's widow Alice relied on her brother and communicated frequently with him throughout the difficult years following the death of her husband.<sup>60</sup>

Alice Wandesford appears to have returned to England as soon as possible once the Irish Rebellion broke out and returned to the family estate at Kirklington.<sup>61</sup> She was concerned about Osborne's warning about "the debility of the will to inable executors & defray there charges" especially if Wandesford's lands at Idough were lost. She was concerned that her son George would not be "capable of making a wife a ioynture or Dower," but she was concerned that he should be allowed her marriage portion after her

---

<sup>59</sup> In his final will dated 2 October 1640, Wandesford ordered that the executors John Bramhall, Edward Osborne, Major Norton and William Wandesford, from the profits of his estate were to provide education for his children, pay off his debts and £1500 to his wife Alice as her dowry. Wandesford was also concerned to provide for "the Natives of Idough" called the Brennans who had "seuerall times refused such proffers of benefit... out of my own priuate charity, and conscience to tender to them." They were to have a lease of the land at his estate of Castlecomer for twenty one years. Wandesford requested that the Court of Wards of Ireland would grant the lease of his lands and the custody and marriage of his son to "my most deare and most honoured friend Thomas Earle of Strafforde Lord Lieutenn[a]nt of Ireland and to my deare and beloued wife and to my well loued Cozen S[i]r George Rattcliffe." National Library of Ireland, Dublin, Prior-Wandesford MS 35, 458 (1). Wandesford's daughter Alice described how her family was very much dependent upon Osborne after the death of her father in 1640. "My uncle, Sir Edward Osborne, who was my mother's half-brother, was a very good, wise and prudent man, under whose tuition my father left the hope of his house, my brother George, as being joint gardian with my mother." Jackson, C. (ed.) *The Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton of East Newton Co. York* (Durham, 1875), p. 54.

<sup>60</sup> For example, on 20 March 1641, she wrote telling him of her financial difficulties. She needed £300 to pay for supplies for the Castlecomer estate "or ellce the ten[n]ants will fly of..." She was considering pawning the plate and hoped that she could put off paying the tradesmen until the estate rents and arrears had improved. Osborne was able to help Alice by giving her £150 to pay off her debts. Receipt acknowledging that she had received £150 from her 'brother S[i]r Edward Osborne' dated 18 May 1641, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Leeds, DD5/38/2. These letters were within a bundle of papers to Edward Osborne regarding Wandesford affairs 1640-7 and are not numbered individually. I have distinguished between them by the dates of the letters.

<sup>61</sup> On 21 January 1642, Alice Wandesford wrote to Osborne from Chester. It is not clear when she moved to Kirklington or if she remained on the estate permanently. *ibid*, DD5/38/2.

own decease.<sup>62</sup> Alice was concerned about her son's future and begged for Osborne's advice as to the best course of action to take.<sup>63</sup>

Alice faced a trial of strength with Wandesford's brother William Wandesford who intended to take over the administration of the will and she was keen to ensure that his intentions were for the "joynt good of the children, creditors and the Estate..."<sup>64</sup> Osborne had to negotiate with William on Alice's behalf. After a discussion with John Bramhall, the Bishop of Derry, Mr Norton and her cousin Wandesford, they decided to allow "my brother William Wandesford to take the Executorship upon him..." Alice was aware that "his fortune is meane to mine such a hazard," but believed that he would deal honestly in the proceedings and would bargain well with the creditors.<sup>65</sup> However, William Wandesford did not appear to be the "disinterested guardian" that he claimed to be.<sup>66</sup>

Osborne took great responsibility for Wandesford's family until his death on 9

---

<sup>62</sup> Alice Wandesford to Sir Edward Osborne, 12 May 1641, *ibid*, DD5/38/2.

<sup>63</sup> Alice commended him to Osborne's care for his "free disposeall, for university. Marriage, or what Course of Life you see fittest for his disposition and temper, w[hi]ch being w[i]th you, you may better Judge then some rash Judgements haue parst upon him." Alice's concerns were reiterated on 15 October 1641. Alice had spoken to Sir George Wentworth about the plans for her son George to go to Oxford with Wentworth's son Lord Raby. George Wentworth had told her that it was in his power to do this but Lord Raby's activities were currently uncertain "by reason of there bussines, that might for some tyme stay him in England before his settleing there..." But Alice was concerned that "this place [was] not fitt for his resideing..." George Wandesford had been sent to stay with his uncle Osborne at his Kiveton estate and Alice asked that he was given the opportunity to "wayt oppon my Lady Strafford before he leave the country, I am behailden to her for her love and respect to him, Indeed by her virtues & sweetness she hath left a good name in this place & if by ill requital she hath deuided her selfe from the family, they are more to be blamed, who carry them selves to high." On 11 May 1642, Alice was able to report that her son George "hath gott a safe passage into France." Alice Wandesford to Osborne, 8 and 15 October 1641, 11 May 1642, *ibid*, DD5/38/2.

<sup>64</sup> Alice Wandesford to Osborne, 11 May 1642, *ibid*, DD5/38/2.

<sup>65</sup> Alice Wandesford to Osborne, 20 March 1642, *ibid*, DD5/38/2.

<sup>66</sup> Firth, C.H. 'Letters of William Wandesford to Sir Rowland Wandesford,' *English Historical Review* 9 (1894), p. 549. Alice was confused at William Wandesford's advice to "have the Timber & brick layd up for the building of Kirklington house prayed at a low rate and to take yt at that price in part of payment for his monyes..." Alice asked Osborne's advice stating that "you are wise to know what to consent to... I have such varios expressions in things of consequence to my porre condition as I know not what to chouse for my owne security..." She was unsure whether her brother had her best interests at heart, or whether she was being gullible in believing him. He had advised her to obtain some money from friends "& the rest forth of that I have received from the Estate, otherwiase to sell part & pay the rest, w[hi]ch I shall have all accounted backe againe when the lands are restored in Ireland..." But Alice was aware that "the lands... in Ireland will be in question as well clamed in this kingdom, if not they will be to lett and settle a long tyme before any profitt can be made of them, in the meane tyme I should trouble my frends and impoverish my selfe, and yt may be, not live to quit the Ingadgments of my friends..." Alice Wandesford to Osborne, 7 May 1642, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Leeds, DD5/38/2.

September 1647.<sup>67</sup> After his death, Alice Wandesford found herself very much alone and her estate was seised by Wandesford's brother William to pay off the family's debts by "which he was much wronged of too by one he made a leace of it for seven yeares takeing many hundred pounds more then his due..." Luckily, Alice Wandesford was able to support herself and her children "from her jointure."<sup>68</sup>

Edward Osborne had continued his political career until his death in 1647. As we have seen in Chapter 3, he sat in the Long Parliament for Berwick and continued as Vice President of the Council in the North until the institution was abolished in 1641. When the Civil War broke out, Osborne continued his work for the King as the General of the King's forces in the North.<sup>69</sup> In a letter from John Frecheville to Lord Loughborough dated 12 April 1644, Frecheville told Loughborough that Osborne and Mr. Awdborough "are gone to Oxford to move the King for a present supply, which is not to be expected but from his Highness."<sup>70</sup> Osborne supported the royalist cause and was identified as a royalist delinquent by the House of Commons in April 1642.<sup>71</sup> This is not unexpected as he was a loyal supporter of the Crown and had so closely identified himself with the interests of the Crown during the Personal Rule of Charles I and the policy of 'Thorough.'<sup>72</sup> In 1644, Osborne was still involved in the policies and issues of the North and we find him involved in a commission of 'Charitable Uses,' along with the Earl of Strafford's namesake and cousin, Thomas Wentworth and Robin Rockley, another relation of Wentworth. The commission was to inquire into an Elizabethan Act "to redress the misemployment of Lands Goods and Stocks of money heretofore given to charitable uses..."<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Christopher Wandesford's daughter, Alice Thornton described her uncle's death at his home in Kiveton which she believed was caused by eating melons from his garden which he ate "a little freely, but that fruit was too cold for him, and strooke him into a vomiting and purging so violently that it could not be staid till his strength was past recovery..." Only a few days later, Osborne died and Alice found that "in whoes death I suffered the losse of a father, and my mother a husband." Jackson, *Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton* p. 54.

<sup>68</sup> *ibid*, p. 54.

<sup>69</sup> Bliss, J. (ed). *The works of the most reverend father in God, William Laud, D.D.* (7 vols, London, 1847 – 1860), vol. VII, p. 423.

<sup>70</sup> John Frecheville to Lord Loughborough, 12 April 1644, *HMC Hastings II*, p. 126.

<sup>71</sup> *Journal of the House of Commons of England*, vol. II, 860b.

<sup>72</sup> Cliffe, J.T. *The Yorkshire Gentry* (London, 1969), p. 342.

<sup>73</sup> Leader, J.D. *Records of the Burgery of Sheffield* (London, 1897), pp. 5 - 7.

Osborne's political contribution was rather limited after the downfall of Strafford and he appears to have been content to live in semi-retirement on his estate at Kiveton in Nottinghamshire until his death in 1647.

### **Sir Philip Mainwaring: Secretary of State of Ireland**

After the execution of Thomas Wentworth, Sir Philip Mainwaring retained his office as secretary of state for Ireland.<sup>74</sup> Even after Wentworth's disgrace, Mainwaring was working directly with the Crown and this demonstrates that the King must have held him in high esteem despite the downfall of the cabal. Mainwaring appears to have allied himself with the monarchy, spending some time in England in 1641. A letter from the King to Mainwaring dated 7 August 1641 ordered that Mainwaring be paid an annuity of 10 shillings a day as he had "recently been with the King in England," and was about to return to Ireland.<sup>75</sup> However, after the Civil War, evidence that Mainwaring was actually fulfilling the duties of his office is wanting and therefore it is likely that he was just holding on to a sinecure. Mainwaring held onto his post and appeared in Charles II's draft list of 1660 of the men to be administered the oath of the Irish Privy Council.<sup>76</sup> On 7 March 1661, Charles II wrote to the Lord Justices directing that Sir James Shaen was to hold the office of Principal Secretary of State and Keeper of the Privy Signet in Ireland "in as full and beneficial manner" as Sir Philip Mainwaring and his predecessors. The King informed the Lord Justices that Shaen had agreed to pay Mainwaring "a certain sum of money in order that he (Sir James) may at once enter upon this office, which Sir Philip is now too old to perform."<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> In 1641, Edward Nicholas wrote to the Lord Justices of Ireland, requesting that they send soldiers to Spain as the King directed. He mentioned that the King had already sent them a letter telling them to do this, "prepared and sent to you by Sir Philip Mainwaring, Secretary for Ireland." Nicholas to the Lord Justices, 11 August 1641, *CSPD 1641 – 1643* p. 83.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 330.

<sup>76</sup> Charles II to the Lord Justices, 19 December 1660, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 305, 55 and 56, *CSPI 1660 – 1662*, pp. 141 – 142.

<sup>77</sup> 7 March 1661, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / Signet Office IV, pp. 347 – 349, *CSPI 1660 – 1662*, p. 250. On 18 March 1661, Secretary Nicholas wrote to Lord Chancellor Eustace that on Sir Philip Mainwaring's surrender and with representation from the Lords, Sir James Shaen had been made Principal Secretary "of" Ireland. There appears to have been some dispute about the precise wording of the Secretary's title as he added in his postscript that "There is still some stop in Sir James Shaen's being made Secretary "for" Ireland." P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 308, 29, *CSPI 1660 – 1662*, p. 268. However Sir James Shaen may not have taken the office or possibly shared it with another secretary as well. On 13 May 1661, Charles II wrote to the Lord Justices indicating that Sir Paul Davies was to be appointed "Principal Secretary of State and Keeper of the Signet

Wentworth had rewarded Mainwaring for his services in Ireland by having the estates of Edward Viscount Loftus of Ely conveyed to Mainwaring, Robert Lord Dillon and Sir Adam Loftus. However, after the downfall of Wentworth's regime, Edward Loftus wished to reclaim his lost estates in order to raise money to pay off his debts.<sup>78</sup> The triumvirate that had taken over the lands was ordered to return the lands to Edward Loftus. Lord Dillon and Sir Adam Loftus obliged with the order but Mainwaring refused to return his share of the lands.<sup>79</sup> Wentworth's decree had been officially reversed by the House of Lords on 3 May 1642 yet Mainwaring stood firm and was resolute in his determination not to relinquish the lands.<sup>80</sup> The case between Mainwaring and Loftus was

---

and Privy Seal of the Kingdom of Ireland." This grant was to take place on the death of Sir Philip Mainwaring and Davies was also to keep his existing office as Clerk to the Council. P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 307, 57, *CSPI 1660 – 1662* p. 330.

<sup>78</sup> Loftus had been compelled in 1637, "by arbitrary decree of the Earl of Strafford, to convey his estate to Robert Lord Dillon, Sir Adam Loftus and Sir Philip Mainwaring." Copy of petition, 27 July 1655, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 286, 48, *CSPI 1647 – 1660* p. 575. Major-General Lambert reported that Lord Loftus was in prison for debt, and his estates in England and Ireland were encumbered. He felt that Loftus should be favoured in the case. P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 286, 51, *CSPI 1647 – 1660*, 26 April 1654, p. 577.

<sup>79</sup> It was noted in the State Papers that "Sir Philip Mainwaring did not obey the decree of Parliament of 1642, which declared this decree void and illegal, and that restitution should be made though Sir Ed Loftus and Lord Dillon did so obey." 27 July 1655, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 286, 48, *CSPI 1647 – 1660*, p. 576.

<sup>80</sup> An advisory committee recommended that Mainwaring was "compelled to obey the Lords' order if he come to Ireland, and stand committed until he obey." There are two copies of this document but only one suggests that Mainwaring be committed. 3 May 1642, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 286, 52 and 53, *CSPI 1647 – 1660*, p. 577. Mainwaring petitioned Cromwell, the Lord Protector and his Council stating that he could not relinquish the lands "without violation of his conscience and breach of trust..." He argued that the Lords' order of 3 May 1642 "expressed that such lands as hath been bought by the said Lord Viscount Loftus descendable to the heir general, with £2000, shall descend to Anne Loftus, daughter of Sir Robert Loftus and grandchild and heir general of Adam Viscount Loftus." Yet Mainwaring found that some of the lands currently under his ownership were "descendable to Anne, for whom he is trusted." 2 September 1654, P.R.O. S.P. 63 / 286, 55, *CSPI 1647 – 1660*, p. 578. George Wentworth was also involved in this case as he pursued Viscount Ely for not bestowing an estate as he had promised upon his heir Sir Robert Loftus and his wife Elenor, the sister of George Wentworth's wife Frances Rush. The case had been referred to Thomas Wentworth and the Irish Privy Council and they decided in February 1638 that Loftus should provide an estate of £1200 a year for his son. Loftus refused to obey the order and as a result was imprisoned and lost his offices. When Loftus appealed to the English Parliament to reverse the order of the Irish Privy Council, he claimed that the decree had been an excuse for George Wentworth to obtain revenue from his estate worth £2,944. George Wentworth retaliated by stating that he had been acting for the good of Loftus' disinherited grandchild who would have no income if Strafford's decree were reversed. The Parliament found in Loftus' favour and all of the parties involved in Loftus' lands were ordered to compensate him. Loftus made further allegations that George Wentworth had disobeyed the order of the House of Lords dated 3 May 1642, and this was debated in April 1647. Wentworth defended himself by saying that he had not been served with the order and therefore could not have complied and he was successful in warding off any further proceedings. *Commons Journal* 284b, *Journal of the House of Lords of England*, vol. IV, pp. 393 – 395, 717 – 718, *HMC 9<sup>th</sup> Report*, pp. 295 – 296, 300 – 317. George Wentworth to William Raylton, 12 July 1645, Str. P. 40 / 69. The case was finally resolved in 1678 when the Lords defended their order of 1642 which reversed Thomas Wentworth's 1638 decree against Loftus. *HMC Various III* pp. 220 – 30, *HMC 9<sup>th</sup> Report* pp. 301, 327 – 8.

not resolved quickly and even dragged on after Mainwaring's death in 1661. Edward Viscount Loftus of Ely petitioned King Charles II that a bill might be sent to the Irish Parliament that would confirm him as the owner of the estates that had illegally been redistributed by Wentworth in 1637. The stumbling block was that "Sir Philip Mainwaring (lately dead) has passed his interest in the estate to some persons unknown..."<sup>81</sup>

Mainwaring was seen as somewhat of a royalist delinquent during the Interregnum. He was imprisoned for a short time in 1650 for refusing to leave London in direct disobedience to the Rump Parliament's order.<sup>82</sup> He sat in Parliament for a final time in 1661 elected for Newton in June 1661 but died in August.<sup>83</sup>

### **Sir George Wentworth's solo foray into politics**

Wentworth's younger brother, who had assisted him in Ireland, continued to work in politics after the execution of his brother. He sat in the Parliament of 1640 for Pontefract and worked as receiver for Compositions for Recusants in the North from 1641 – 1644.<sup>84</sup> George Wentworth was appointed a trustee of Strafford's estates, along with Sir William Savile and Sir William Pennyman on 4 June 1641, whilst seemingly attending the King at Westminster. They were to settle Strafford's debts and raise marriage portions for Wentworth's children and a jointure for his wife.<sup>85</sup>

George Wentworth took on a number of roles after his brother's execution. He seems to have spent much time in Ireland during the Irish Rebellion and regularly attended Irish Privy Council meetings, supporting the Earl of Ormond.<sup>86</sup> He was

---

<sup>81</sup> 26 July 1662, P.R.O. S.P. 16 / Signet Office V, p. 245, *CSPI 1660 – 1662*, p. 578.

<sup>82</sup> Mainwaring was released from his imprisonment in October 1651. *CSPD 1650* p. 203, *ibid*, 1651 pp. 480, 496.

<sup>83</sup> His contribution to Parliament was limited to a single committee membership to discuss the bill for better provision for curates. Ormerod, G. *History of Cheshire* (vol. 1, part 2, London, 1882), p. 483.

<sup>84</sup> For example, it is noted that "Sir George Wentworth, Receiver for Compositions with Recusants in the 11 northern counties, having desired convenient time for making up his accounts for the years 1641, 1642, and 1643, this Committee do order that his accounts for those years be delivered some time in Candlemas term next, and that Messrs. Elmhurst, Raylton, and Pulford do attend this Committee likewise. None of them in the meantime shall dispose of any sums in their hands due to the King for recusants' compositions but by special order of this Committee." *CSPD 1645 – 1647* p. 497, *ibid*, 1660 – 1661, p. 367.

<sup>85</sup> Temple Newsam MSS, West Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Leeds, TN/F 18 1.

<sup>86</sup> *HMC Ormonde n.s. ii* pp. 115, 121, 341.

Provost-Marshal of Leinster from around 1640 until 1647.<sup>87</sup> He also had some military duties in Ireland, as a captain of the horse in the Irish royal army from about 1638 to June 1647.<sup>88</sup> He also appeared on a list of men who had requested a military command in Ireland.<sup>89</sup> George Wentworth also appeared to have military duties in Yorkshire. On 3 May 1643, he wrote to the constable of Knottingley and Ferrybridge in West Yorkshire ordering him to make a search for arms in the King's name. If any weapons were found, the constable was to take them to a local captain. A number of weapons were found including muskets, swords, pikes and a pair of pistols.<sup>90</sup> Wentworth left Ireland once the Earl of Ormond's rule collapsed and led a quiet life away from politics during the Interregnum. In 1660, he was reappointed to the Irish Privy Council<sup>91</sup> and in 1661 to his former post as Provost-Marshal of Leinster.<sup>92</sup> Strafford's influence over his younger brother seems to have been the motivating force in his political career. Indeed, Wentworth did not obtain a new office between Wentworth's execution and his death in May 1666.

## Conclusion

Wentworth was the key figure in the cabal around whom the lesser figures gravitated. Once Wentworth was removed from their lives, their relationships did begin to weaken. Wandesford died before the true impact of the disintegration of the cabal had occurred. His legacy was to leave his family in debt and struggling to maintain the Wandesford estates in England and Ireland. Wandesford's wife was reliant upon Sir Edward Osborne to help her through a difficult time, but it was not necessarily his affiliation to the cabal that led to his actions, but rather his closer familial connection to Wandesford's wife, his half-sister. Radcliffe demonstrated some allegiance for Wentworth's children, expressing concern about their welfare in letters after

---

<sup>87</sup> Petition of George Wentworth to Lord Protector, 21 July 1657, *CSPI 1647 – 1660* p. 643.

<sup>88</sup> It is noted in a petition that Wentworth served the Parliament as captain of a horse troop before and during the Irish Rebellion until June 1647. Petition of George Wentworth to Lord Protector, 21 July 1657, *ibid*, 1647 – 1660 p. 643.

<sup>89</sup> List of those who desired a military post in Ireland, 1649, *CSPI Addenda 1625 – 1660* p. 290.

<sup>90</sup> Sir George Wentworth to the constable of Knottingley and Ferrybridge, 3 May 1643, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Brigg Manuscripts MS 447.

<sup>91</sup> *CSPI 1660 – 1662* p. 142.

<sup>92</sup> *HMC Ormonde n.s. III* p. 409.

Wentworth's execution. However, he was unable to effectively help them, especially when he was removed from England and living in exile in Europe with the Royalist court. Mainwaring tried to continue in his work within Ireland but his efforts were continually frustrated and he faced frequent attempts to remove him from his office. George Wentworth also maintained some Irish duties but neither ever matched the influence that the cabal as a whole had upon Ireland during the 1630s.

The kinship ties that had maintained the cabal's close working and personal relationships under Wentworth appeared to be less important once their leader was removed from the equation and the cabal drifted apart. The cabal did share one common feature after the demise of the Wentworth regime. They all remained fervent Royalist supporters, although Radcliffe was the most prominently so. Their lives become more difficult to trace once the coherence of their common employment is lost, and they become more distant figures leading separate existences after 1641.

## Conclusion

This thesis has shown that any study of Thomas Wentworth's political career cannot disregard the important and influential role of his cabal. The men who worked closely alongside him were integral to his rule in both a personal and professional capacity. Wentworth valued them as confidants, advisors and policy makers. The role of the cabal provides further depth and breadth to the historiography of Wentworth. For example the comparison of Wentworth's actions to those of Wandesford in the Parliaments in the 1620s clearly demonstrates how Wentworth's desire for a courtly career restrained his actions.

After an analysis of the relationships and the theoretical terms that might be used to describe the exact association of the men involved in Wentworth's career, it has proven difficult to find a suitable term that takes into account both the political and domestic nature of their friendship. The term 'secretariat' appears to focus primarily upon a business function and it is arguable that only Mainwaring was officially a member of Wentworth's 'secretariat' in this context. It was common for important men to have secretaries to carry out administrative duties such as letter writing and carrying, but Wentworth's secretaries went beyond these limited confines. Wentworth and his cabal's working and personal relationships were bound together and perhaps more complex than the definition of a secretariat can encompass.<sup>1</sup>

Defining Wentworth's associates in terms of a client – patron or 'men-of-business' model has been dismissed due to its reliance upon the concept of reciprocity but where the client sought benefits for himself. This was at the expense of a strong friendship or kinship element in the transaction, which was so obviously central to

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, although Elizabeth I's servant, Robert Beale was Clerk to the Council, he actually played an important part as a diplomat negotiating with Mary Queen of Scots in Elizabeth's custody. Basing, P. 'Robert Beale and the Queen of Scots,' *British Library Journal* 20 (1994), p. 65. A justification of the validity of the term 'secretariat' within Irish politics is further hampered by limitations of evidence. The identification of individuals and their activities is largely obscure until the eighteenth century, and although the importance of men involved in administration has been recognised, analysis of their activities is difficult. Sainty attempted to uncover the role of the Irish secretariat but confronted the tendency of the government not to officially record the names of the officials of the secretariat. Even if a systematic record was made, it may have been lost in the fire that destroyed much of the archival records of the secretariat in 1922. Sainty, J.C. 'The Secretariat of the Chief Governors of Ireland, 1690 – 1800,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 77, Section C (1977), p. 3.

Wentworth's administration. In this context, the notion of the 'cabal' is more appropriate, with its advisory capacity, suggesting policy and expressing opinion to Wentworth. Most important, it suggests that their relationship was on an equal footing, as each member of the group was able to openly express dissatisfaction or point out problems with policies without fear of reproach. This extent of open and honest debate could only exist amongst the closest of friends whereas a client – patron relationship would be dominated by the expression of what the patron wanted to hear. The term 'cabal' is less hierarchical and reinforces the degree of responsibility of the men closely engaged in Wentworth's career. George Radcliffe, Christopher Wandesford and Philip Mainwaring after all were highly important figures in Ireland in their own right (although obviously they owed this initially to Wentworth's influence), each being members of the Irish Privy Council, working to further the government policies.

However, an analysis of the most suitable term with which to describe the complex working relationship between Wentworth and his cabal is confused further by the fact that they themselves use a variety of terms to express this, and often used words that seem to be inappropriate to their circumstances. For example, Wandesford used the terms 'friends' and 'servants' in an interchangeable manner in a letter to Sir Gervase Clifton.<sup>2</sup> This might be taken as recognition of the difficulties of precisely defining this unusual relationship even by the men who were involved in such an affiliation.

It is clear that Wentworth favoured a form of government in which he could ask for the advice of others whom he knew he could trust. Wentworth needed to be able to rely upon his advisors to offer him fair and honest opinions, and equally, the cabal required respect from Wentworth in order to confidently impart independent and valued advice. Radcliffe himself acknowledged that Wentworth

never did any Thing of any Moment, concerning either political or domestical Business, without taking Advice; not so much as a Letter written by him to any great Man, of any Business, but he shewed it to his Confidants, if they were near him.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> In this letter, Wandesford described a disagreement between Wentworth and the Earl of Holland and placed himself "In the number of friends (I might say servants)" who wished to see Holland and Wentworth friends again. The argument between Wentworth and Holland is discussed again in later correspondence between them. Wandesford to Clifton, 26 November 1636 and 22 February 1637, Nottingham University Library, Cl. C. 474, 475.

<sup>3</sup> Radcliffe, G. 'An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde, in a Letter to the late Earl.' in Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols, London, 1739), vol. II, p. 433.

Radcliffe identified these ‘confidants’<sup>4</sup> as himself and Charles Greenwood in the early stages of Wentworth’s career, although later Wandesford was included, and they “met almost daily, and debated all Business and Designs, *pro et contra*.” Radcliffe believed that it was by this means that Wentworth’s “own Judgment was very much improved, and all the Circumstances and probable Consequences of the Things consulted were discovered and considered.”<sup>5</sup> Clearly, Wentworth’s relationship with these men must have been very strong and open. Flattering Wentworth’s memory, Radcliffe recalled that this circle of advisors were “much weaker Men” than Wentworth. However, he found this to be a valuable exercise as “there is no Man of ordinary Capacity, that will not often suggest some Things, which might else have been let slip without being observed.”<sup>6</sup>

Wentworth’s personal workload as Lord Deputy of Ireland was intense and Radcliffe described him as being “constantly at work.” Therefore he could not possibly have worked on every aspect of government without “able Instruments in every Kind proper for his Assistance.” Wentworth expected his advisors to work as hard as he did, giving them “little Rest, still calling on and encouraging them to be doing, and to give Accounts of what they had done.” For this hardworking support team, rewards were plentiful for “all that deserved it,” and Wentworth could also further their careers and here we can acknowledge at least some semblance of the benefits of a client – patron allegiance. Radcliffe stated, “If those he employed were diligent and dextrous to dispatch the King’s Business, they needed not to study for Suits themselves; his Watchfulness and Bounty would prevent them.”<sup>7</sup>

Although it is clear that Wentworth valued his associates and closest advisors in a political and professional sense, we should remember the importance he placed upon

---

<sup>4</sup> The term confidant was used to describe Radcliffe’s relationship with Wentworth by near-contemporary David Lloyd in 1668. He stated that he found “Sir George Ratcliffe involved in all the Earl of Strafford’s troubles: None will question in his worth, that considereth him as the great Confident of that Earl in his affairs; and all persons must needs confess his faithfulness that observeth him that excellent persons companion in all his sufferings.” Lloyd, D. *Memoirs of the lives, actions, sufferings and deaths of those noble, reverend, and excellent personages* (London, 1668), p. 149.

<sup>5</sup> Radcliffe, ‘An Essay towards the Life of my Lord Strafforde,’ in Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II. p. 433.

<sup>6</sup> Radcliffe was careful not to lift his own position as advisor above that of Wentworth, describing the debates as a chance for the advisors to give “Hints and Occasions to observe and find out that, which he that speaks to it, perhaps, never thinks on; as a Whetstone, which cannot cut itself, does make a Knife sharper.” *ibid.* p. 433.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.* p. 434.

their role within his personal life. Although Wentworth might be accused of simply using the rhetoric of friendship, these men were more than just political allies. Much emphasis was placed upon the cabal's family and kinship ties to him and in this sense, their 'domestic friendships' remained integral to their relationship.

The historical picture lacks any close analysis of the role of Wentworth's cabal, and this is even more surprising when we consider that Wentworth would have struggled to maintain his rule in Ireland for so long without them. He relied on both Edward Osborne and Christopher Wandesford to deputise for him. However, in reality Osborne and Wandesford's hold over the North and Ireland respectively was relatively fragile. This was primarily due to the fact that Wentworth had personalised his government to such an extent, by emphasising his personal link to the King and establishing a court at Dublin Castle and his own palace at Jigginstown.<sup>8</sup> This personification of Wentworth's rule made it extremely difficult for anyone else to step into the breach as his representative. Any deputy would therefore suffer the problem of being seen as the 'representative's representative' and would be unable to exert the same influence, authority and status as Wentworth.

Once in Ireland, Wentworth was aware of the need to maintain his position in the North by keeping in regular contact with Sir Edward Osborne and other members of the Council of the North and also by using his London contacts to keep him informed of

---

<sup>8</sup> Wentworth's establishment of a lavish and ceremonial function to the deputyship was a deliberate policy. Wentworth's policy was however criticised and thought to be for his personal benefit rather than that of the King. Wentworth attempted to describe the palace of Jigginstown as a building for the King's use, only to be used by the Deputy in the King's absence. Wentworth to Laud, 27 September 1627, Str. P. 7 / 42 – 44, Knowler, *Letters and dispatches* vol. II, pp. 105 – 107. Craig believes that this ambiguity of purposes is evident in the plan of the building as Wentworth "did not know whether he would live in it as the King's guest, or as his host." Therefore the internal rooms are not distinguished between, perhaps allowing for the subdivision once the King had decided which function he would like Jigginstown to take. Craig, M. 'New Light on Jigginstown,' *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* 33 (1970), p. 110. The importance of the Deputy was also demonstrated through the establishment of what was effectively an alternative royal court in Ireland. This was essential to express the splendour and extravagance of the Deputyship. This impressive court would have exemplified Wentworth's position and exaggerated his connection to the King in England, helping to maintain his authority and giving the impression that he maintained the King's support. A critical account of the influence wielded by Laud and Wentworth in their respective courts was presented by James Howell, a former secretary of the Council of the North under Lord Scrope, who informed his correspondent Mr Jackson in March 1638: "The news here is, that Lambeth-House bears all the sway at Whitehall, and the Lord Deputy kings it notably in Ireland; some that love them best could wish them a little more moderation." This comment might, of course, have been driven by jealous and the domination of the King's attention of a few of the King's favourites, but is significant as the influence of Wentworth's court was great enough to be noted in England. James Howell to Mr Jackson, 3 March 1638. Jacobs, J. (ed). *Epistolae Ho-Eliaevae. The Familiar Letters of James Howell* (2 vols, London, 1892), vol. II, p. 420.

news and potential dangers.<sup>9</sup> Communication between England and Ireland was mainly conducted by letters, but personal meetings were also favoured, especially to communicate highly confidential news.<sup>10</sup> Other close friends and kin of Wentworth played a key role in communicating information between the two countries.<sup>11</sup> Wentworth's brother, Sir George acted as a useful go-between, and because of his relationship to the Lord Deputy, he was able to access high and important people.<sup>12</sup>

Wentworth's letters to Osborne from Ireland often reminded his Vice President of the need to keep him fully informed. In March 1639, he instructed Osborne "Let me heare as often from you as there shall be occasion."<sup>13</sup> Osborne warned Wentworth of the importance of maintaining and developing friendships in England, advising that "the more friendship you gaine & preserue here... the fewer rubs you will finde in the progress of your affaires both publike & priuate..."<sup>14</sup> Wentworth's gentry friend Sir Gervase Clifton also kept him informed of courtly events and intrigues which might affect or interest him.<sup>15</sup> Another useful contact for Wentworth was George Garrard who wrote long and detailed newsletters to Ireland. Wentworth had asked him to "spend some

---

<sup>9</sup> For more information on Wentworth's methods of retaining his position in England whilst he was in Ireland and the dangers he faced, see Merritt, J.F. 'Power and communication: Thomas Wentworth and government at a distance during the Personal Rule, 1629 – 1635,' in J.F. Merritt, (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 109 – 132.

<sup>10</sup> For example, Osborne hoped that Wentworth would visit England in 1635 to settle his estates after the death of his steward Richard Marris. Osborne to Wentworth, 4 December 1635, Str. P. 15 / 282. Presumably, Osborne hoped to be able to take this opportunity to discuss confidential issues and news with Wentworth. It was also hoped that Osborne would be able to attend Wentworth in Dublin, but this never came to fruition. For example, Christopher Wandesford had told Osborne that Wentworth would like him to go to Ireland that summer. 13 May 1638, *ibid*, 18 / 35. In a letter dated 13 August 1639, Osborne reported that he had gained permission to visit Ireland but he was prevented from travelling due to the state of the Scottish affairs. *ibid*, 10a / 361.

<sup>11</sup> For example, George Radcliffe was to carry plans for the alterations of the King's Manor with him from Ireland to Osborne as he was travelling to England. Wentworth to Osborne, March 1639, *ibid*, 10a / 275.

<sup>12</sup> Merritt, 'Power and communication,' pp. 122 – 3.

<sup>13</sup> Wentworth recognised the value of Radcliffe passing between England and Ireland – "...by my Cosen Radcliffe I shall haue the opportunity more fully to Consider & understand all wee haue to doe..." Wentworth to Osborne, March 1639, Str. P. 10a / 277. Osborne recorded events in minute detail for Wentworth, particularly in matters that affected Wentworth's personal reputation. For example, in a letter dated 3 November 1633, Osborne reassured Wentworth that in the case between himself and Foulis in the Star Chamber, the Earl of Carlisle was being especially vigilant towards Wentworth's honour. Osborne to Wentworth, 3 November 1633, *ibid*, 13 / 83.

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

<sup>15</sup> On one occasion, Clifton stated that he had wanted to write to Wentworth from Newmarket because "I thought that place would better furnish me then wher I liud... but I see without frinds ther is nothing to be got at Court, not so much as a little Intelligence to make y[ou]r Lo[rds]hip a Present of..." Sir Gervase Clifton to Wentworth, 10 March 1634, *ibid*, 13 / 214.

time” each month, writing news about politics, foreign policy and rumours. Garrard stated that if Wentworth would permit him, “I wold tell you sometimes. what wee heare is done in Ireland too.” This clearly would be invaluable to Wentworth would needed to know what rumours were being reported in England about his rule in Ireland and the North. This would enable him to pre-empt the damage of rumours that might undermine his reputation whilst absent from London.<sup>16</sup>

Clearly, communications between the President and Vice President were essential in the smooth running of the Council of the North. Not only did Osborne rely upon Wentworth’s advice, he also asked Wentworth to communicate specific information to the Council on his behalf, so that the command would appear to have more authority.<sup>17</sup> The issue of communicating with the absent President was an issue that the Council of the North wished to address. In 1633 for example, Sir Arthur Ingram had brought a letter to the Council, which recommended that a foot post between the North and Ireland be established in order to facilitate easier communications. However, Osborne was concerned that having one specific messenger would be problematic in itself as “he may Sometimes be att chester or on his way when ther may happen a Suddaine important occasion to dispatch other l[ett]ers away.”<sup>18</sup> The added difficulty of the President being absent was that Osborne often heard reports of Wentworth’s activities, but was unsure whether they were true. In most cases, Osborne was unwilling to believe anything he had heard about Wentworth until he received it from reputable sources, or from Wentworth himself.<sup>19</sup> Osborne often felt that he was to blame for problems, as he had not acquainted Wentworth with the business before he took it upon himself to deal with it.<sup>20</sup> On the other

---

<sup>16</sup> Garrard reported on 15 March 1635 that “Wee had a Report here of some difference that fell out in Ireland betwixt the Earle of Ormond and S[i]r Geo[rge] Redcliffe. that he shold giue the Earle the lye. for w[hi]ch he stroake him, and was committed to the Castle of Dublin, but beeing not seconded, it vanished quickly.” *ibid*, 15 / 364. Other examples of Garrard reporting to Wentworth rumours about Ireland in England include *ibid*, 14 / 12,102, 323.

<sup>17</sup> Osborne had asked Wentworth to write a “pithy & iudicious” letter which accordingly the Lord Deputy had addressed to the Vice President and the Council. Osborne hoped that Wentworth’s letter would “sett a sharper edge uppon the ould blades towards his Ma[jes]ties Seruice & that I shall find less opposition therein hereafter.” Osborne to Wentworth, undated, *ibid*, 13 / 88.

<sup>18</sup> Osborne to Wentworth, 10 September 1633, *ibid*, 13 / 43.

<sup>19</sup> Osborne reported that “Tis heer confidently aduertised from aboue that your Lo[rd]sh[i]p resolves to attend the Kinge downe... but hearinge nothinge therof from better hands I cannot beleeeue it.” Osborne to Wentworth, 23 March 1634, *ibid*, 13 / 233.

<sup>20</sup> For example, Osborne was engaged in a dispute about the collection of revenue with the Justices of the Peace. Osborne to Wentworth, 11 November 1637, *ibid*, 17 / 224.

hand, Wentworth was also not above reproving Osborne when he felt that he had exceeded his jurisdiction.<sup>21</sup>

Wentworth was also reliant upon the cabal to carry out policies on his behalf. For example, Radcliffe was involved in ecclesiastical issues, legal work and financial transactions in Ireland.<sup>22</sup> Wentworth had to delegate activities to men whom he knew had his best interests at heart and in 1640 left Wandesford in a political capacity, with Radcliffe entrusted to look after his personal financial affairs. Wentworth also relied upon Radcliffe to communicate information to the King, generate and maintain support for his Lord Deputyship in England and gather information that might help him further his work in Ireland.<sup>23</sup>

Given that Radcliffe did not hold a particular office in Ireland, it is intriguing that he was still accused of treason. If he had no official standing, how could they implicate him as an evil participant in Wentworth's administration? This is explained by considering that the fundamental reason for the accusation against Radcliffe was to prevent him from imparting legal advice to Wentworth who was preparing his defence against the Commons' impeachment accusation. The Commons did not even exploit Radcliffe's position as an Irish Privy Councillor. However, if the attack on Radcliffe took into account this role, other Councillors might also be attacked, and this was not part of the House of Commons' agenda. Instead, the Commons accused Radcliffe in his capacity as "an intimate of the Lord Lieutenants of Ireland"<sup>24</sup> which in itself demonstrates the unique nature of the relationship between Radcliffe and Wentworth.

---

<sup>21</sup> A good example of this was when the gentry of Yorkshire petitioned the King in 1640 complaining of the "Insolency of the Souldier." The gentry felt that the King should provide for them so "nune of them should loose a penny through any iniury offered by that unruly Companie." Wentworth had hoped that since Osborne was Deputy Lieutenant, he would not allow such complaints to be generated. He reprimanded Osborne stating that "if you had beene pleased to advise therein with mee I am p[er]swaded I could haue put you into a better way for the ease and protection of that People...." Wentworth to Osborne, 31 July 1640, *ibid*, 21 / 203.

<sup>22</sup> Radcliffe held much responsibility and wielded much influence in Ireland under Thomas Wentworth's deputyship. Reflecting on Wentworth's administration in a later letter dated 4 August 1647, Francis Viscount Valentia wrote to Sir Philip Perceval regarding his fears of the excessive power wielded by ministers of the Crown in Ireland. "If I am not deceived, Sir John Temple would be another Radcliffe, but he wants his capacity, and I hope shall never have such powerful support to do mischief." *HMC Egmont I*, p. 442.

<sup>23</sup> See for example, Str. P. 3b / 58, 77, 88, 9b / 350, 10a / 1, 22, 275.

<sup>24</sup> Rushworth, *Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* p. 4.

Wentworth was the glue that held his cabal together. Whilst each member of the cabal had their own individual relationships with each other, they were primarily associated with Wentworth who emphasised kinship links to reinforce their bond to him. Once Wentworth was executed in May 1641, the cabal lost its focus and only tenuous links between them remained.

## **Bibliography**

### **i. Manuscript sources**

Arundel, West Sussex

*Arundel Castle*

Autograph Letters, 1585 – 1617, no. 223, Autograph Letters, 1617 – 1632. no. 235 and 285. Letters from Philip Mainwaring to the Earl of Arundel.

Baslow, Derbyshire

*Chatsworth House*

Bolton Abbey MS Box II/153.

Lismore Papers, vols. 17, 18, 21.

Letter book of Richard Boyle, ff.472 – 766.

Bradford, West Yorkshire

*Bradford Archives*

Hopkinson MS 32D86/38, p.14. Election petition of Sir John Mallory against the return of Sir John Savile and Sir Thomas Wentworth, 1614.

Bridgend, Mid Glamorgan

Merthyr Mawr MS F/119 in the possession of Mr and Mrs M.A. McLaggan, Merthyr Mawr House. George Radcliffe's discourse 'Of the originall of Government' in James Tyrell's Commonplace book.

Dublin

*National Library of Ireland*

Prior-Wandesford MS (Papers of Sir Christopher Wandesford of Kirklington and Castlecomer).

Leeds

*Leeds District Archives*

Temple Newsam MS (Papers of Sir Arthur Ingram) TN / PO 7

*Yorkshire Archeological Society*

Brigg MS 447 Letter from Sir George Wentworth to constable of Knottingley and Ferrybridge.

Duke of Leeds MS DD/5/12.33. 'A Book of Advice Written by The Right Honourable Christopher Wandesford Lord Deputy of Ireland to his Son and heir George Wandesford Esq in Order to the Regulating the conduct of his Whole Life.'

DD175 Papers of George Radcliffe.

DD/5/3, 13, 20, 23, 38. Papers regarding the Osborne family.

Middleton Papers, MD 59. Box 12 Robert Trapps to Lord Wentworth and others.

London

*British Library*

Additional MS 11045 (News letters of John, first Lord Scudamore, from 26 March to 24 December 1640, second series) Charges against Thomas Wentworth and George Radcliffe.

Additional MS 15857, letters from Sir Richard Browne to George Radcliffe, 1653 – 55.

Additional MS 28094, Commission to Sir Edward Osborne, 1630.

Additional MS 34702, letters from Sir Richard Browne to George Radcliffe. 1653 – 55.

Additional MS 35832, Letter to Sir George Calvert from Philip Mainwaring, 1623.

Harley MS 7000, letter from Christopher Pepper to Henry Savile, 8 January 1620.

Harley MS 1769 Charge against George Radcliffe 1640.

Sloane MS 3722, letter from Christopher Wandesford to Sir M. Eustace. 1640.

*Public Record Office*

State Papers 16, (Domestic), Charles I.

State Papers 63, (Ireland), Charles I.

Manchester

*John Rylands Library*

Mainwaring MS

Charter no. 418, Writ to Philip Mainwaring to appear before the Barons of the Exchequer 1642.

Charter no. 456, Writ for the apprehension of Philip Mainwaring, 1642.

Paper no. 10, Depositions of witnesses on behalf of Philip Mainwaring against John Davenport, 1637.

Paper no. 60, Inventory of the goods and chattels of Philip Mainwaring, 1648.

*Chetham Library*

Adlington MS, Mun.E.8.22. Petition for, and hearing of the case against Sir David Fowlis, Sir Thomas Laton & Henrie Fowlis in Star Chamber.

Sir Philip Mainwaring's books.

Newport, Isle of Wight

*Isle of Wight County Record Office*

Papers of Sir John Oglander (OG/BB/298).

Nottingham

*Nottingham University Library*

Correspondence of Sir Gervase Clifton, Cl C 68, 473-503, Cl. LP 47.

Oxford

*Bodleian Library, University of Oxford*

MS Add. C. 286 (S.C. 30282) Letters from Christopher Wandesford to Sir George Radcliffe.

Sheffield

*Sheffield City Libraries*

Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments, Strafford Papers.

## ii. Printed primary sources

*Acts of the Privy Council of England*

*June 1623 – March 1625*

*March 1625 – July 1626*

*June 1626 – December 1626*

*January 1627 – August 1627*

*September 1627 – June 1628*

*May 1629 – May 1630*

*June 1630 – July 1631*

Bamford, F. (ed). *A Royalist Notebook. The Commonplace Book of Sir John Oglander Kt of Nunwell* (London, 1936).

Bliss, J. (ed). *The works of the most reverend father in God, William Laud, D.D.* (7 vols, London, 1847 – 1860).

Bond, M.F. (ed). *The Manuscripts of the House of Lords Addenda 1514 – 1714* (London, 1962), vol. II.

Boyle, R., earl of Cork. *The Lismore Papers* Grosart, A. (ed). (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> series, each 5 vols, London, 1886 - 1888).

Bruce, J. (ed). *Letters and Papers of the Verney Family down to the end of the year 1639* (Camden Society, London, 1853).

*Calendar of State Papers Domestic*

*Calendar of State Papers Ireland*

Carte, T. *The Life of James, Duke of Ormonde* (6 vols, Oxford, 1851).

Cooper, J.P. (ed). *Wentworth Papers 1597 – 1628* (London, 1973).

Curtis, E & McDowell, R.B. (eds.) *Irish Historical Documents 1172 – 1922* (London, 1943).

Davies, J. *A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued* (London, 1612).

D'Ewes, S. *Two Speeches spoken by Sir Simonds D'Ewes. The first touching the Antiquity of Cambridge lately published by Iohn Thomas, with many ignorant and foolish mistakes which are here rectified. The other concerning the Privilege of Parliament in causes Civill and Criminall* (London, 1642).

Dugdale, W. *Dugdale's Visitation of Yorkshire* Davies, R. (ed). (London, 1859).

Eglisam, G. *The Fore-Runner of Revenge Being two Petitions: The one to the King's most Excellent Majesty; the other To the most Honourables Houses of Parliament Wherein is expressed divers actions of the late Earle of Buckingham; especially*

*concerning the death of King James, and the Marquesse Hamelton, supposed by Poyson* (London, 1642).

Filmer, Sir Robert. *Patriarchia and Other Writings* J.P. Sommerville (ed). (Cambridge, 1991).

Gardiner, S.R. (ed). *Debates in the House of Commons in 1625* (London. 1873).

Gardiner, S.R. 'An unpublished speech of Lord Wentworth,' *The Academy* 7 (1875), pp. 581 - 583.

Gardiner, S.R. (ed). *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625 – 1660* (Oxford, 1906).

Gilbert, J. T. (ed). *Calendar of Ancient Records of Dublin* (vol. III, Dublin, 1892).

*The government of Ireland under the honorable, just and wise governor Sir John Perrott, knight* (London, 1626).

Hervey, M.F.S. (ed). *The Life Correspondence and Collections of Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel* (Cambridge, 1921).

Hide, Mr. *Mr Hides Argument before the Lords in the Vpper House of Parliament Aprill 1641* (London, 1641).

*Historical Manuscripts Commission*

4<sup>th</sup> Report

9<sup>th</sup> Report

Appendix to the Fourth Report

Buccleuch III

Coke MSS II

Egmont I

Hastings II

Hastings IV

Laing MSS I

Manuscripts of the Duke of Buccleuch at Montagu House vol. III second series

Marquis of Bath I

Marquis of Bath II

Ormonde MSS n.s. I

Ormonde MSS n.s. II

Ormonde MSS n.s. III

Ormonde MSS n.s. VII

Pepys MSS

Various Collections III

Various Collections VII

Various Collections VIII

*The Humble and Just Remonstrance of the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses, in Parliament assembled in Ireland* (Dublin, 1641).

Hyde, E., earl of Clarendon. *The government of Ireland under the honorable. iust, and wise gouernor Sir Iohn Perrot Knight, one of the Priuy Councell to Queene Elizabeth, beginning 1584, and ending 1588* (London, 1626).

Jackson, C. (ed). *The Autobiography of Mrs Alice Thornton of East Newton Co. York* (Durham, 1875).

Jacobs, J. (ed). *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae. The Familiar Letters of James Howell* (2 vols. London, 1892).

Jansson, M. *Two Diaries of the Long Parliament* (Gloucester, 1984).

*Journal of the House of Commons of England*, vol. II.

*Journals of the House of Commons of the Kingdom of Ireland 1613 – 1666* (Dublin, 1796), vol. I.

*Journal of the House of Lords of England*, vol. II.

*Journal of the House of Lords of Ireland from 10 Car I 1634 to 10 Guil III 1698* (Dublin, 1779 - 1800), vol. I.

Knowler, W. (ed). *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches* (2 vols, London, 1739).

Lloyd, D. *Memoirs of the lives, actions, sufferings, and deaths of those noble, reverend, and excellent personages, that suffered by death, sequestration, decimation, or otherwise, for the Protestant Religion, and the great Principle thereof, allegiance to their soveraigne, in our late Intestine Wars, From the Year 1637, to the Year 1660. and from thence continued to 1666. With the life and martyrdom of King Charles I* (London, 1668).

Lodge, E. (ed). *Illustrations of British History, Biography, and Manners, in the regins of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, and James I, exhibited in a series of Original Papers, selected from the manuscripts of the noble families of Howard, Talbot, and Cecil* (3 vols, London, 1791), vol. III.

Keeler, M.F, Cole, M.J. & Bidwell, W.B. *Proceedings in Parliament 1628* (6 vols, New Haven, 1983).

McNeill, C. (ed). *The Tanner Letters Original Documents and Notices of Irish Affairs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (Dublin, 1943).

Maltby, J.D. (ed). *The Short Parliament (1640) Diary of Sir Thomas Aston* (Camden Sociey, London, 1988).

Maynard, J. *Mr. Mainard's Speech before both Houses in Parliament, on Wednesday the xxiii of March, in reply upon the Earle of Straffords answer to his Articles at the Barre* (London, 1641).

- Merewether, H.A. & Stephens, A.J. (eds). *The History of the Boroughs and Municipal Corporations of the United Kingdom* (Brighton. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1835, this edition 1972), Vol. III.
- Mervin, A. *A Speech made by Captain Audley Mervin to the Vpper House of Parliament in Ireland, March 4 1640* (Dublin, 1641).
- Moore Smith, G.C. (ed). *The letters of Dorothy Osborne to William Temple* (Oxford, 1928).
- Mountmorres, Lord H.R. *The History of the Principal Transactions of the Irish Parliament, from the year 1634 to 1666* (2 vols, London, 1792).
- Nalson, J. *Impartial Collections of the Great Affairs of State* (London, 1682).
- Notestein, W. (ed). *The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes. From the beginning of the Long Parliament to the Opening of the Trial of the Earl of Strafford* (New Haven, 1923).
- Notestein, W. & Relf, F.H. (eds.) *Commons Debates for 1629* (Minneapolis, 1921).
- Notestein, W, Relf, F.H & Simpson, H. (eds.) *Commons Debates, 1621* (New Haven, 1935).
- Pym, J. *Mr. Pymmes Speech to the Lords in Parliament. Sitting in Westminster Hall, on the tryall of Thomas Earle of Strafford, the twelfth of April 1641* (London, 1641).
- Pym, J. *Two Speeches made by John Pymm Esquire; the one after the Articles of the Charge against the Earle of Strafford were Read. The other, after the Articles of the Charge against Sir George Ratcliffe were read* (London, 1641).
- Raine, J. (ed). *The Correspondence of Dr. Matthew Hutton* (London, 1843).
- Rushworth, J. *Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, of Weighty Matters in Law, of Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments* (8 vols, London, 1680).
- Rushworth, J. *The Tryal of Thomas Earl of Strafford* (London, 1680).
- Seddon, P.A. (ed). *Letters of John Holles 1587 – 1637* (3 vols, Nottingham, 1983).
- Spenser, E. *View of the Present State of Ireland* (Dublin, 1633).
- Stafford, T. *Pacata Hibernia* (London, 1633).
- Steele, R. (ed). *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations 1485 – 1714* (vol. II, Oxford, 1910).
- Taylor, J. *The Carriers Cosmographie or A Briefe Relation, of The Innes, Ordinaries, Hosteries and other lodgings in, and neere London, where the Carriers, Waggon. Foote-posts and Higglers, doe usually come, from any parts, townes, shires and*

*countries, of the Kingdome of England, Principality of Wales, as also from the Kingdomes of Scotland and Ireland* (London, 1637).

Thirsk, J. & Cooper, J.P. (eds.) *Seventeenth-Century Economic Documents* (Oxford, 1972).

Townshend, D. (ed.) *The Life and Letters of the Great Earl of Cork* (London, 1904).

Venn, J. & Venn, J.A. *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge, 1927).

Verney, F.P. (ed.) *Memoirs of the Verney Family During the Civil War* (2 vols, London, 1892), vol. I.

Whitaker, T.D. (ed.) *The life and original correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight, LL.D. The friend of the Earl of Strafford* (London, 1810).

Wray, Sir John. *Eight Occasional Speeches, made in the House of Commons, this Parliament. 1641* (London, 1641).

Wright, L.B. (ed.) *Advice to a Son* (New York, 1962).

### **iii. Printed secondary sources**

Adams, S. 'Faction, Clientage and Party: English Politics, 1550 – 1603.' *History Today* 32, no. 12 (1982), pp. 33 – 39.

Adams, S. 'The Dudley Clientele and the House of Commons, 1559 – 1586,' *Parliamentary History* 8 (1989), pp. 216 – 239.

Adams, S. 'Baronial contexts? Continuity and change in the noble affinity, 1400 – 1600,' in Watts, J.L. *The End of the Middle Ages? England in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (Sutton, 1998).

Adams, S. 'The Dudley clientele, 1553 – 1563,' in G.W. Bernard (ed.) *The Tudor Nobility* (London, 1992), pp. 241 – 265.

Adams, S. *Leicester and the Court* (Manchester, 2002).

Adamson, J.S.A. 'Parliamentary management, Men-of-Business and the House of Lords, 1640 – 49,' in C. Jones (ed.) *A Pillar of the Constitution. The House of Lords in British Politics, 1640 – 1784* (London, 1989), pp. 21 – 50.

Aylmer, G.E. 'Attempts at Administrative Reform, 1625 – 40.' *English Historical Review* 72 (1957), pp. 229 – 259.

Aylmer, G.E. *The King's Servants* (London, 1961).

- Aylmer, G.E. 'The first Duke of Ormond as Patron and Administrator.' in T.C. Barnard, & J. Fenlon, (eds.) *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610 – 1745* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2000), pp.115 – 135.
- Bagwell, R. *Ireland under the Stuarts* (London, 1909), vol. I.
- Ball, F.E. *The Judges in Ireland, 1221 – 1921* (Dublin, 1993), vol. I.
- Banks, A.L. 'Strafford – the Medical Background,' *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 52, (1959), pp. 361 – 366.
- Barber, S. 'Nothing but the First Chaos': Making Sense of Ireland,' *The Seventeenth Century* 14 (1999), pp. 24 – 42.
- Barnard, T.C. 'Lawyers and the law in later seventeenth-century Ireland,' *Irish Historical Studies* 28, no. 111 (1993), pp. 256 – 282.
- Barnard, T.C. 'Introduction: The Dukes of Ormonde,' in T.C. Barnard, & J. Fenlon, (eds.) *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610 – 1745* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2000), pp. 1 – 53.
- Basing, P. 'Robert Beale and the Queen of Scots,' *British Library Journal* 20 (1994), pp. 65 – 82.
- Beckett, J.C. *The Making of Modern Ireland 1603 – 1923* (London, 1966).
- Beckett, J.C. *The Anglo-Irish Tradition* (London, 1976).
- Binns, J. *The Memoirs and Memorials of Sir Hugh Cholmley of Whitby 1600 – 1657* (Bury St Edmonds, 2000).
- Bossy, J. *Christianity in the West 1400 – 1700* (Oxford, 1985).
- Bottigheimer, K.S. *English Money and Irish Land* (Oxford, 1971).
- Bottigheimer, K.S. *Ireland and the Irish* (New York, 1982).
- Braddick, M. J. *Parliamentary taxation in seventeenth-century England: local administration and response* (Royal Historical Society, Studies in History, 70. London, 1994).
- Braddick, M. J. 'The early modern English state and the question of differentiation from 1550 to 1700,' *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 38 (1996), pp. 92 - 111.
- Braddick, M. J. *The nerves of state: taxation and the financing of the English state, 1558-1714* (Manchester, 1996).
- Braddick, M. J. *State formation in early modern England, ca. 1550-1700*. (Cambridge, 2000).

- Braddick, M. J. & Walter, J. (eds). *Negotiating power in early modern society : order, hierarchy and subordination in Britain and Ireland*. (Cambridge, 2001).
- Bradshaw, B. & Morrill, J. S. *The British Problem, c. 1534 – 1707* (Basingstoke, 1996).
- Brady, C. *The Chief Governors. The rise and fall of reform government in Tudor Ireland 1536 – 1588* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Brady, C. 'England's Defence and Ireland's Reform: The Dilemma of the Irish Viceroy, 1541 – 1641,' in B. Bradshaw and J. Morrill (eds). *The British Problem, c.1534 – 1707* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 89 – 117.
- Briggs, R. *Early Modern France 1560 – 1715* (Oxford, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, 1998).
- Brooks, F.W. *York and the Council of the North* (York, 1954).
- Browne, P. 'The 'Brevis Relatio' of the Irish Discalced Carmelites 1625 – 1670,' *Archivium Hibernicum* 25 (1962), pp. 136 – 163.
- Burgess, G. 'The Divine Right of Kings Reconsidered,' *English Historical Review* 425 (1992), pp. 837 – 861.
- Lady Burghclere, *Strafford* (2 vols, London, 1931).
- Burke, W.P. 'The Diocese of Derry in 1631,' *Archivium Hibernicum* 5 (1916), pp. 1 – 6.
- Campbell, M. *The English Yeoman Under Elizabeth and the Early Stuarts* (London, 1960).
- Canny, N. *The upstart earl. A study of the social and mental world of Richard Boyle first Earl of Cork 1566-1643* (Cambridge, 1982).
- Canny, N. 'Protestants, planters and apartheid in early modern Ireland,' *Irish Historical Studies* 25, no. 98 (1986), pp. 105 – 115.
- Canny, N. *From Reformation to Restoration: Ireland, 1534 – 1660* (Dublin, 1987).
- Canny, N. 'Irish Resistance to Empire? 1641, 1690 and 1798,' in L. Stone (ed). *An Imperial State at War* (London, 1994), pp. 288 – 321.
- Canny, N. 'Irish, Scottish and Welsh responses to centralization, c.1530 – c. 1640.' in A. Grant and K. Stringer (eds). *Uniting the Kingdom. The Making of British History* (London, 1995), pp. 147 – 169.
- Canny, N. 'What really happened in Ireland in 1641?' in J.F. Ohlmeyer (ed). *Ireland from Independence to Occupation 1641 – 1660* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 24 – 42.

Canny, N. 'The attempted Anglicanisation of Ireland in the seventeenth century: An exemplar of 'British History,' in J.F. Merritt, (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621-1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 157 – 187.

Canny, N. *Making Ireland British, 1580 – 1650* (Oxford, 2001).

Capern, A.L. 'The Caroline Church: James Ussher and the Irish Dimension.' *The Historical Journal* 39 (1996), pp. 57 – 85.

Carlyle, T. *Historical Sketches of Notable Persons and Events in the Reigns of James I and Charles I* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, 1902).

Carroll, R. 'Yorkshire Parliamentary Boroughs in the Seventeenth Century,' *Northern History* 3 (1968), pp. 70 – 104.

Carty, A. *Was Ireland Conquered? International Law and the Irish Question* (London, 1996).

Castiglione, B. *The Book of the Courtier* (trans. by Sir Thomas Hoby) (London, 1959).

*Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration, Collected by George Thomason, 1640 – 1661* (2 vols, London, 1908).

Caulfield, R. *The Council Book of the Corporation of Kinsale from 1652 to 1800* (Guildford, 1879).

Chart, D.A. *An Economic History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1920).

Clarke, A. '28 November 1634: A Detail of Strafford's Administration,' *Journal of the Royal Society of the Antiquaries of Ireland* 93, Part II (1963), pp. 161 – 167.

Clarke, A. *The Old English in Ireland 1625 – 1642* (London, 1966).

Clarke, A & Fenlon, D. 'Two notes on the Parliament of 1634.' *Journal of the Royal Society of the Antiquaries of Ireland* 97 (1967), pp. 85 – 90.

Clarke, A. 'A Discourse between two councillors of State, the one of England. and the other of Ireland (1642). From B.M. Egerton MS 917,' *Analecta Hibernica* 26 (1970), pp. 161 – 175.

Clarke, A. 'Ireland and the General Crisis.' *Past and Present* 48 (1970), pp. 79 – 99.

Clarke, A. 'Historical revision. The History of Poynings' Law, 1615 – 41.' *Irish Historical Studies* 18 (1972-3), pp. 207 – 222.

Clarke, A. 'The Irish Economy, 1600 – 60,' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (eds). *A New History of Ireland* (Oxford, 1976), vol. III, pp. 168 – 186.

- Clarke, A. 'The Government of Wentworth, 1632 – 40,' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (eds). *A New History of Ireland* (Oxford, 1976), vol. III, pp. 243 – 269.
- Clarke, A. 'The breakdown of authority, 1640 – 41,' in T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin and F.J. Byrne (eds). *A New History of Ireland* (Oxford, 1976), vol. III, pp. 270 – 288.
- Clarke, A. 'Sir Piers Crosby, 1590 – 1646: Wentworth's "tawney ribbon,"' *Irish Historical Studies* 26 (1988), pp. 142 – 160.
- Cliffe, J.T. *The Yorkshire Gentry* (London, 1969).
- Cockburn, J.S. 'The Northern Assize Circuit,' *Northern History* 3 (1968), pp. 118 – 130.
- Cogswell, T. *The Blessed Revolution. English politics and the coming of war, 1621 – 1624* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Cogswell, T. 'Phaeton's chariot: the Parliament-men and the continental crisis in 1621,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 24 – 46.
- Collinson, P. 'Puritans, Men of Business and Elizabethan Parliaments,' *Parliamentary History* 7 (1988), pp. 187 – 211.
- Cooper, J.P. 'The fortune of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford,' *Economic History Review* 2<sup>nd</sup> series, 11 (1958), pp. 227 – 248.
- Cooper, J.P. 'Strafford: A Revaluation,' *English Historical Review* 79 (1964), pp. 375 – 382.
- Cooper, J.P. 'Strafford and the Byrnes' Country,' *Irish Historical Studies* 15 (1966), pp. 1 – 20.
- Cooper, J.P. *Land, Men and Beliefs* G.E. Aylmer & J.S. Morrill (eds.) (London, 1983).
- Cope, E.S. 'John Rushworth and the Short Parliament of 1640,' *Institute of Historical Research Bulletin* 51 (1978), pp. 94 – 98.
- Craig, M. 'New light on Jigginstown,' *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* 33 (1970), pp. 107 – 110.
- Crawford, J.G. 'The origins of the Court of Castle Chamber; A Star Chamber Jurisdiction in Ireland,' *American Journal of Legal History* 24 (1980), pp. 22 – 55.
- Cressy, D. 'Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England,' *Past and Present* 113 (1986), pp. 38 – 69.
- Cullen, L.M. *The Emergence of Modern Ireland 1600 – 1900* (London, 1981).

Curl, J.S. *The Honourable The Irish Society and Plantation of Ulster, 1608 – 2000* (Chichester, 2000).

Cust, R. 'Charles I, the privy council, and the forced loan,' *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), pp. 208 - 235.

Cust, R. *The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626 - 1628* (Oxford, 1987).

Cust, R. 'Politics and the Electorate in the 1620s,' in R. Cust & A. Hughes, (eds). *Conflict in early Stuart England : studies in religion and politics, 1603-1642* (London, 1989), pp. 134 - 167.

Cust, R. 'Charles I, the Privy Council and the parliament of 1628,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 2 (1992), pp. 25 - 50.

Cust, R. 'Honour, rhetoric and political culture : the earl of Huntingdon and his enemies,' in S.D. Amussen & M.A. Kishlansky, (eds). *Political culture and cultural politics in early modern England : essays presented to David Underdown* (Manchester, 1995), pp. 84 – 111.

Cust, R. 'News and politics in early seventeenth-century England,' in M. Todd, (ed). *Reformation to revolution : politics and religion in early modern England* (London, 1995), pp. 232 - 251.

Cust, R. 'Wentworth's 'change of sides' in the 1620's,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 63 – 80.

Cust, R. 'Charles I and popularity,' in T. Cogswell, R. Cust & P. Lake, (eds). *Politics, religion and popularity in early Stuart Britain: essays in honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 235 – 258.

Daly, D.W. 'John Bramhall and the Theoretical Problems of Royalist Moderation,' *Journal of British Studies* 11, (1971), pp. 26 – 44.

Davies, G. *The Early Stuarts 1603 – 1660* (Oxford, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, 1959).

*Dictionary of National Biography* L. Stephen and S. Lee (eds), (London, 1885-1900), 63 vols.

Donaldson, G. *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom. James V – James VII* (Edinburgh, 1965).

Driver, J.T. 'The Mainwarings of Over Peover: a Cheshire family in the Fifteenth and early Sixteenth centuries,' *Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society* 57 (1970), pp. 27 – 40.

Dudley Edwards, R. & Moody, T.W. 'Historical Revision. The History of Poyning's Law: Part 1, 1494 – 1615' *Irish Historical Studies* 2 (1941), pp. 415 – 424.

Edwards, D. 'The Poisoned Chalice: The Ormond inheritance, sectarian division and the emergence of James Butler, 1614 – 1642,' in T.C. Barnard, & J. Fenlon, (eds.) *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610 – 1745* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2000), pp. 55 – 82.

Ellis, S.G. 'The Struggle for Control of the Irish Mint, 1460 – c. 1506,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy Section C*, 78 (1978), pp. 17 – 36.

Ellis, S.G. 'Parliament and community in Yorkist and Tudor Ireland,' in A. Cosgrove & J.I. McGuire (eds). *Parliament and Community Historical Studies XII Papers read before the Irish Conference of Historians, Dublin* (Dublin, 1983), pp. 43 – 68.

Evans, F.M.G. 'Emoluments of the Principal Secretaries of State in the Seventeenth Century,' *English Historical Review* 35 (1920), pp. 513 – 28.

Evans, F. M.G. *The Principal Secretary of State. A Survey of the Office from 1558 – 1680* (Manchester, 1923).

Fairclough, N. *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language* (Harlow, 1995).

Falls, C. *The Birth of Ulster* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, 1973).

Farrell, B. *The Irish Parliamentary Tradition* (London & Dublin, 1973).

Fenlon, D.B. 'Wentworth and the Parliament of 1634. An Essay in Chronology,' *Journal of the Royal Society of the Antiquaries of Ireland* 94 (1964), pp. 159 – 175.

Firth, C.H. 'Letters of William Wandesford to Sir Rowland Wandesford,' *English Historical Review* 9 (1894), pp. 548 – 554.

Fisher, N.R.R. 'Colonel Edward Cooke of Highnam (c.1622 – 1684) and Henry Somerset, First Duke of Beaufort: Client and Patron,' *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 115 (1997), pp. 245 – 264.

Fisk, W.L. 'The Straffordians – a cross section of conservative political thought,' *The Historian* 21, No. 4 (1959), pp. 341 – 55.

Fletcher, A.J. 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Restoration of Pontefract as a Parliamentary Borough,' *Northern History* 6 (1971), pp. 88 – 97.

Ford, A. *The Protestant Reformation in Ireland, 1590 – 1641* (Frankfurt, 1985).

Ford, A. 'Dependent or Independent? The Church of Ireland and its Colonial Context, 1536 – 1649,' *The Seventeenth Century* 10 (1995), pp. 163 – 187.

Foster, A. 'The function of a bishop: the career of Richard Neile, 1562 – 1640,' in R. O'Day and F. Heal, *Continuity and change. Personnel and administration of the Church in England 1500 – 1642* (Bristol, 1976).

Foster, J. *The Register of Admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521 – 1889* (London, 1889).

- Foster, J. *Alumni Oxonienses 1500 – 1714* (Oxford, 1891).
- Foster, R.F. *Modern Ireland 1600 – 1972* (London, 1988).
- Fowler, J.T. (ed.) *Memorials of the Church of SS Peter and Wilfred, Ripon* (Surtees Society, Durham, 1886), vol. II.
- Gardiner, S.R. (ed.) *Camden Miscellany 8* (London, 1883).
- Gardiner, S.R. *The History of England* (London, 1894), vol. VII.
- Gibson, C.B. *The History of the County and City of Cork* (London, 1861), vol. II.
- Gillespie, R. *Colonial Ulster The Settlement of East Ulster 1600 – 1641* (Cork, 1985).
- Gillespie, R. 'The End of an Era: Ulster and the outbreak of the 1641 rising,' in Brady, C & Gillespie, R. (eds.) *Natives and Newcomers. Essays on the making of Irish Colonial Society 1534 – 1641* (Dublin, 1986), pp. 191 – 214.
- Gillespie, R. 'Peter French's petition for an Irish mint, 1619,' *Irish Historical Studies* 25, no. 100 (1987), pp. 413 – 420.
- Gillespie, R. 'The trials of Bishop Spottiswood 1620 – 40,' *Clogher Record* 12, 3 (1987), pp. 320 – 333.
- Gillespie, R. 'Dublin 1600 – 1700: a City and its Hinterlands,' in P. Clark & B. Lepetit, (eds.) *Capital Cities and their Hinterlands in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 1996), pp. 84 – 104.
- Gillespie, R. 'The Religion of the first Duke of Ormond,' in T.C. Barnard, & J. Fenlon, (eds.) *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610 – 1745* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2000), pp. 101 – 113.
- Glynn, M. & Martin, F.X. 'The "Brevis Relatio" of the Irish Discalced Carmelites 1625 – 1670,' *Archivium Hibernicum* 25 (1962), pp. 136 – 163.
- Gooder, A. (ed.) *The Parliamentary Representation of the County of York 1258 – 1832* (Wakefield, 1938), vol. II.
- Graves, M.A.R. 'Thomas Norton the Parliament Man: An Elizabethan M.P., 1559 – 1581,' *Historical Journal* 23, (1980), pp. 17 – 35.
- Graves, M.A.R. 'The Management of the Elizabethan House of Commons: The Council's "Men-of-Business",' *Parliamentary History* 2 (1983), pp. 11 – 36.
- Graves, M.A.R. 'The Common Lawyers and the Privy Council's Men-of-Business, 1584 – 1601,' *Parliamentary History* 8 (1989), pp. 189 – 215.

Greengrass, M. 'Noble Affinities in Early Modern France: The Case of Henri I de Montmorency, Constable of France,' *European History Quarterly* 16 (1986), pp. 275 – 311.

Greengrass, M. 'Functions and limits of political clientelism in France before Cardinal Richelieu,' *L'État ou le Roi. Les fondations de la modernité monarchique en France (XIVe-XVIIe siècles)* (Paris, 1991), pp. 69 – 82.

Gruenfelder, J.K. 'The Electoral Patronage of Sir Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1614 – 1640,' *Journal of Modern History* 49 (1977), pp. 557 – 574.

Gruenfelder, J.K. *Influence in Early Stuart Elections 1604 – 1640* (Ohio, 1981).

Hadfield, A. and Maley, W. 'Introduction: Irish representations and English alternatives,' in B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield and W. Maley (eds). *Representing Ireland. Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534 – 1660* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 1 – 23.

Hammer, P.E.J. 'The Uses of Scholarship: The Secretariat of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex, c. 1585 – 1601,' *English Historical Review* 107 (1994), pp. 26 – 51.

*Handbook of British Chronology* E.B. Fryde, D.E. Greenway, S. Porter and I. Roy (eds), (3<sup>rd</sup> edition, London, 1986).

Hardacre, P.H. 'Patronage and Purchase in the Irish Standing Army under Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1632 – 1640,' *Journal of Army Historical Research* 27, no. 269 & 270 (1989), pp. 40 – 45, 94 – 104.

Hardon, J.A. *Modern Catholic Dictionary* (London, 1981).

Havran, M.J. *Caroline Courtier. The life of Lord Cottington* (London, 1973).

Havran, M.J. 'The Character and Principles of an English King: the Case of Charles I,' *Catholic Historical Review* 69, no. 2 (1983), pp. 169 – 208.

Hayton, D. W. 'An Irish Parliamentary Diary of the Reign of Queen Anne,' *Analecta Hibernica* 30 (1982), pp. 97 – 149.

Hayton, D.W. 'Dependence, clientage and affinity: the political following of the second Duke of Ormonde,' in T.C. Barnard, & J. Fenlon, (eds.) *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610 – 1745* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 2000), pp. 211 – 245.

Hayton, D. W. 'Irish Parliament in the 18th Century The Long Apprenticeship,' Supplement in *Parliamentary History* 20, no. 1 (2001).

Henning, B.D. *History of Parliament. The Commons 1660 – 1690* (London, 1983).

Hextor, J.H. 'Power Struggle, Parliament, and Liberty in Early Stuart England,' *Journal of Modern History* 50 (1978), pp. 1 – 50.

- Hibbard, C. *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (North Carolina, 1983).
- Hickson, M.A. *Ireland in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1884).
- Hill, C. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (London, 1964).
- Hinton, R.W.K. 'II. The Decline of Parliamentary Government under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts,' *Cambridge Historical Journal* 13. no. 2 (1957), pp. 116 – 132.
- Hirst, D. 'Court, Country and Politics before 1629,' in K. Sharpe (ed). *Faction and Parliament* (London, 1978), pp. 105 – 137.
- Hirst, D. *England in Conflict, 1603 – 1660* (London, 1999).
- Howarth, D. *Images of Rule* (Basingstoke, 1997).
- Hughes, C. 'Nicholas Faunt's Discourse touching the Office of Principal Secretary of Estate, &c 1592,' *English Historical Review* 20 (1905), pp. 499 – 508.
- Hughes, J.L.H. 'The chief secretaries in Ireland 1566 - 1921,' *Irish Historical Studies* 8 (1952), pp. 59 - 72.
- Hughes, J.L.H. (ed). *Patentee Officers in Ireland 1173 – 1826 Including High Sheriffs, 1661 – 1684 and 1761 – 1816* (Dublin, 1960).
- Hunter, R.J. 'Sir William Cole and Plantation Enniskillen, 1607 – 41,' *Clogher Record* 9, 3 (1978), pp. 336 – 350.
- Hunter, R.J. 'Ulster Plantation Towns 1609 – 41,' in D. Harkness and M. O'Dowd (eds). *The Town in Ireland* Historical Studies 13, (Belfast, 1981), pp. 55 – 80.
- Irwin, L. 'The Irish Presidency Courts, 1569 – 1672,' *Irish Jurist* n.s. 12 (1977), pp. 106 – 114.
- Jackson, B. 'A Document on the Parliament of 1613 from St Isidore's College, Rome,' *Analecta Hibernica* 33 (1986), pp. 49 – 58.
- Johnston, J. 'Settlement on a Plantation estate: the Balfour rentals of 1632 and 1636,' *Clogher Record* 12, no. 1 (1985), pp. 92 – 109.
- Judson, M.A. *The Crisis of the Constitution* (New Brunswick, 1949).
- Kearney, H.F. 'Richard Boyle. Ironmaster,' *Journal of the Royal Society of the Antiquaries of Ireland* 83 (1953), pp. 156 – 162.
- Kearney, H.F. (ed) 'The Irish wine trade,' *Irish Historical Studies* 9 (1955). pp. 400 – 442.
- Kearney, H.F. 'Strafford in Ireland 1633 – 40,' *History Today* 39 (1989). pp. 20 – 25.

- Kearney, H.F. *Strafford in Ireland 1633-1641* (Manchester, 1989).
- Keeler, M.F. *The Long Parliament, 1640 - 1641. A Biographical Study of its Members* (Philadelphia, 1954).
- Keeler, M.F. (ed). *Bibliography of British History, Stuart Period, 1603 - 1714* (2nd edition, Oxford, 1970).
- Kelly, W.P. 'Ormond and Strafford, pupil and mentor?' *Journal of the Butler Society* 4, no. 1 (1997), pp. 88 - 106.
- Kenny, C *King's Inns and the Kingdom of Ireland: The Irish 'Inn of Court,' 1541 - 1800* (Dublin, 1992).
- Kenyon, J. *The Popish Plot* (Harmondsworth, 1974).
- Kilburn, T. & Milton, A. 'The public context of the trial and execution of Strafford,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 - 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 230 - 287.
- Kyle, C. R. 'Attendance, apathy and order? Parliamentary committees in early Stuart England,' in C.R. Kyle & J. Peacey (eds). *Parliament at work: parliamentary committees, political power, and public access in early modern England* (Woodbridge, 2002), pp. 43 - 58.
- Kynaston, D. *The Secretary of State* (Lavenham, 1978).
- Lake, P. 'Retrospective: Wentworth's political world in revisionist and post-revisionist perspective,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 - 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 252 - 283.
- Laurence, A. 'The Cradle to the Grave: English Observation of Irish Social Customs in the Seventeenth Century,' *The Seventeenth Century* 3 (1988), pp. 63 - 84.
- Leader, J.D. *Records of the Burgery of Sheffield* (London, 1897).
- Little, P. 'The Earl of Cork and the Fall of the Earl of Strafford, 1638 - 41,' *Historical Journal* 39, no. 3 (1996), pp. 619 - 635.
- Little, P. "'Blood and Friendship": The Earl of Essex's Protection of the Earl of Clanricarde's Interests, 1641 - 6,' *English Historical Review* 112 (1997), pp. 927 - 941.
- Little, P. 'Select Document: Providence and posterity: a letter from Lord Mountnorris to his daughter, 1642,' *Irish Historical Studies* 32, No. 128 (2001), pp. 556 - 566.
- Lockyer, R. *Buckingham. The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham 1592 - 1628* (Harlow 1981).
- Lynch, K.M. *Roger Boyle, First Earl of Orrery* (Tennessee, 1965).

MacCuarta, B. 'The plantation of Leitrim, 1620 – 41,' *Irish Historical Studies* 32, no. 127, (2001), pp. 297 – 320.

MacNeill, J.G. *The Irish Parliament: what it was, and what it did* (Dublin, 1886).

McCafferty, J. "‘God bless your free Church of Ireland’: Wentworth, Laud, Bramhall and the Irish Convocation of 1634,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 187 – 208.

McCafferty, J. "‘To follow the late precedents of England’": the Irish impeachment proceedings of 1641,' in Greer, D & Dawson, N. *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History* (Dublin, 2001), pp. 51 – 72.

McCall, H.B. *The Story of the Family of Wandesforde of Kirklington and Castlecomer* (London, 1904).

McCavitt, J. "‘Good planets in their several spheares” – the establishment of the assize circuits in early seventeenth century Ireland,' *Irish Jurist* n.s. 24 (1989), pp. 248 – 278.

McCavitt, J. 'The Political Background to the Ulster Plantation, 1607 – 1620,' in MacCuarta, B. (ed.) *Ulster, 1641. Aspects of the Rising* (Belfast, 1993), pp. 7 – 23.

McClintock, A. 'The Earls of Ormond & Tipperary's Role in the Governing of Ireland (1603 – 1641),' *Tipperary Historical Journal* (1988), pp. 159 – 172.

Maguire, J.B. 'Seventeenth Century Plans of Dublin Castle,' *Journal of the Royal Society of the Antiquaries of Ireland* 104 (1974), pp. 5 – 14.

Maley, W. 'How Milton and some contemporaries read Spenser's View,' in B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield and W. Maley (eds). *Representing Ireland. Literature and the origins of conflict, 1534 – 1660* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 191 – 208.

Marshall, A. 'Sir John Williamson and the conduct of administration in Restoration England,' *Historical Research* 69 (1996), pp. 18 - 41.

Merritt, J.F. (ed). *Crown Servants Series One: The Papers of Thomas Wentworth, 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Strafford, 1593 – 1641, from Sheffield City Libraries. A Listing and Guide to the Microfilm Collection* (Reading, 1994).

Merritt, J.F. 'Introduction. The historical reputation of Thomas Wentworth,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford. 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 1 – 23.

Merritt, J.F. 'Power and communication: Thomas Wentworth and government at a distance during the Personal Rule, 1629 – 1635,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford. 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 109 – 132.

- Millar, O. 'Strafford and Van Dyke,' in R. Olland and P. Tudor-Craig (eds). *For Veronica Wedgwood these. Studies in Seventeenth Century History* (London, 1986), pp. 109 – 123.
- Miller, J. *James II. A study in kingship* (Hove, 1978).
- Milnes, R.M. 'Wentworth Woodhouse and its owners,' *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal* 6 (1879 – 80), pp. 343 – 384.
- Milton, A. 'Thomas Wentworth and the political thought of the Personal Rule,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 133 – 157.
- Mitchison, M. 'Ireland and Scotland: The Seventeenth-Century Legacies Compared,' in T.M. Devine and D. Dickson (eds.) *Ireland and Scotland 1600 – 1850* (Edinburgh, 1983), pp. 2 – 12.
- Moody, T.W. *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609 – 41* (Belfast, 1939).
- Morgan, H. 'Writing Up Early Modern Ireland,' *Historical Journal* 31, no. 3 (1988), pp. 701 – 711.
- Murray, R.H. *Ireland, 1603 – 1714* (London, 1920).
- Newton, A.P. 'The establishment of the great farm of the English customs,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* Fourth Series, I, (1918), pp. 129 – 56.
- Noonkester, M.C. 'Charles I and Shrieval Selection, 1625-6,' *Historical Research* 64 (1991), pp. 305 – 311.
- O'Brien, G. *The Economic History of Ireland in the Seventeenth Century* (Dublin, 1919).
- Ó Cuív, B. 'James Cotter, A Seventeenth-Century Agent of the Crown,' *Journal of the Royal Society of the Antiquaries of Ireland* 89, Part I (1959), pp. 135 – 159.
- O'Farrell, P. *Ireland's English Question* (London, 1971).
- O'Grady, S. H. *Strafford in Ireland* (Dublin, 1923).
- O'Grady, S.H and Flower, R. *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum* (3 vols, London, 1926 - 1953).
- Ohlmeyer, J.H. *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms. The career of Randal MacDonnell, marquis of Antrim, 1609 – 1683* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Ohlmeyer, J.H. 'Introduction. A failed revolution?' in J.F. Ohlmeyer (ed). *Ireland from Independence to Occupation 1641 – 1660* (Cambridge, 1995). pp. 1 – 23.

Ohlmeyer, J.H. 'Strafford, the 'Londonderry Business' and the 'New British History': in J.F. Merritt, (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621-1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 209 – 229.

Ohlmeyer, J. 'Records of the Irish Court of Chancery: a preliminary report for 1627 – 1634,' in Greer, D & Dawson, N. *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History* (Dublin, 2001), pp. 15 – 49.

Ormerod, G. *History of Cheshire* (London, 1882), vol. I, part II.

Osborough, W.N. 'The regulation of the admission of attorneys and solicitors in Ireland, 1600 – 1866,' in D. Hogan & W.N. Osborough, (eds.) *Brehons, Sergeants & Attorneys. Studies in the History of the Irish Legal Profession* (Dublin, 1990), pp. 101 – 152.

Osborough, W.N. 'Mysteries and Solutions: experiencing Irish Legal History.' in Greer, D & Dawson, N. *Mysteries and Solutions in Irish Legal History* (Dublin, 2001), pp. 217 – 240.

Pawlisch, H. *Sir John Davies and the conquest of Ireland: A study in legal imperialism* (Cambridge, 1985).

Perceval-Maxwell, M. 'Strafford, the Ulster-Scots and the covenanters,' *Irish Historical Studies* 18 (1972-3), pp. 524 – 551.

Perceval-Maxwell, M. 'Protestant faction, the impeachment of Strafford and the origins of the Irish civil war,' *Canadian Journal of History* 17, no. 2 (1982), pp. 235 – 55.

Perceval-Maxwell, M. 'Ireland and Scotland 1638 to 1648,' in J. Morrill (ed). *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 193 – 211.

Perceval-Maxwell, M. 'Ireland and the Monarchy in the Early Stuart Multiple Kingdom,' *Historical Journal* 34, No. 2, (1991), pp. 279 – 295.

Phair, P.B. 'Seventeenth Century Regal Visitation,' *Analecta Hibernica* 28 (1978), pp. 79 – 102.

Phelan, M. 'Sir Thomas Wentworth's visit to Kilkenny,' *Journal of the Butler Society* 2, no. 2 (1982), p. 190 – 2.

Pogson, F. 'Wentworth as President of the Council of the North, 1628 - 41.' in Appleby, J.C. & Dalton, P, *Government, Religion and Society in Northern England 1000 - 1700* (Stroud, 1997), pp. 185 - 98.

Pogson, F. 'Making and maintaining political alliances during the personal rule of Charles I: Wentworth's association with Laud and Cottington.' *History* 84 (1999), pp. 52 – 73.

- Pogson, F. 'Wentworth and the Northern Recusancy Commission,' *Recusant History* 24, no. 3 (1999), pp. 271 – 287.
- Prest, W.R. *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts 1590 – 1640* (London, 1972).
- Prest, W.R. *The Rise of the Barristers* (Oxford, 1986).
- Preston, R.A. 'William Blathwayt and the evolution of a royal personal secretariat,' *History* 34 (1949), pp. 28 - 43.
- Quintrell, B. 'Charles I and his Navy in the 1630s,' *The Seventeenth Century* 3 (1988), pp. 159 – 179.
- Quintrell, B. 'The Church triumphant? The emergence of a spiritual Lord Treasurer. 1635 – 1636,' in J.F. Merritt (ed). *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621 – 1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 81 – 108.
- Ranger, T.O. 'Richard Boyle and the making of an Irish fortune, 1588 – 1614,' *Irish Historical Studies* 10, no. 39 (1957), pp. 257 – 297.
- Ranger, T.O. 'Strafford in Ireland: A Revaluation,' in T. Aston (ed). *Crisis in Europe 1560 – 1660* (London, 1969), pp. 271 – 295.
- Record, P.D. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford* (Oxford, 1953).
- Reid, R.R. *The King's Council in the North* (London, 1921).
- Richardson, H.C. & Sayles, G.O. 'The Administration of Ireland – reprint,' *Analecta Hibernica* 29 (1980), pp. 1 – 70.
- Ringrose, H. *The Inns of Court. An Historical Description of the Inns of Court and Chancery of England* (Oxford, 1909).
- Roberts, C. *The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Robertson, J. 'Stuart London and the idea of a royal capital city,' *Journal of the Society for Renaissance Studies* (2001), pp. 37 – 58.
- Roebuck, P. 'The Making of an Ulster Great Estate: The Chichesters. Barons of Belfast and Viscounts of Carrickfergus, 1599 – 1648,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy Section C*, 79 (1979), pp. 1 – 27.
- Rook, K. 'The Protestation of the Commons, 1641,' *The Bradford Antiquary* 47 (1982), pp. 135 – 145.

- Roots, I. 'English politics 1625 – 1700,' in T.G.S. Cain and K. Robinson (eds). *Another Mould. Change and continuity in English culture 1625 – 1700* (London, 1992), pp. 18 – 52.
- Ruigh, R.E. *The Parliament of 1624* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971).
- Russell, C. 'The Theory of Treason in the Trial of Strafford,' *English Historical Review* 80 (1965), pp. 30 – 50.
- Russell, C. *Parliaments and English Politics 1621 - 1629* (Oxford, 1979).
- Russell, C. 'The British Background to the Irish Rebellion of 1641.' *English Historical Review* 61 (1989), pp. 166 – 182.
- Russell, C. 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and anti-Spanish sentiment, 1621 – 1624,' in J.F. Merritt, (ed), *The political world of Thomas Wentworth, earl of Strafford, 1621-1641* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 47 – 63.
- Rutledge, V.L. 'Court-Castle faction and the Irish viceroyalty: the appointment of Oliver St John as lord deputy of Ireland in 1616,' *Irish Historical Studies* 26, no. 103 (1989), pp. 233 – 249.
- Sainty, J.C. 'The Secretariat of the Chief Governors of Ireland, 1690 – 1800,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 77, Section C (1977), pp. 1 - 33.
- Salt, S.P. 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire, 1614 – 1628,' *Northern History* 16 (1980), pp. 130 – 168.
- Schreiber, R.E. *The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton 1589 – 1635* (London, 1981).
- Seaward, P. 'Constitutional and Unconstitutional Royalism,' *Historical Journal* 40, no. 1 (1997), pp. 227 – 239.
- Sedgwick, A. 'Jansen and the Jansenists,' *History Today* 40 (1990), pp. 36 - 42
- Sharpe, K. *Faction and Parliament* (London, 1985).
- Sharpe, K. *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (London, 1992).
- Shearman, H. *Anglo-Irish Relations* (London, 1948).
- Silke, J.J. 'Irish Scholarship and the Renaissance. 1580 – 1673,' *Studies in the Renaissance* 20 (1973), pp. 169 – 206.
- Simms, J.G. 'Mayo Landowners in the Seventeenth Century,' *Journal of the Royal Society of the Antiquaries of Ireland* 93 (1965), pp. 237 – 247.
- Smith, A.G.R. 'The secretariats of the Cecils, circa 1580 – 1612,' *English Historical Review* 83 (1968), pp. 481 – 504.

Smith, A.G.R. *Servant of the Cecils: The Life of Sir Michael Hicks, 1543 – 1612* (London, 1977).

Smith, A.G.R. *The Emergence of a Nation State. The Commonwealth of England 1529 – 1660* (Harlow, 1984).

Smith, D.L. 'The Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Personal Rule of Charles I,' *Journal of British Studies* 30, No. 3 (1991), pp. 257 – 287.

Smith, D.L. *Constitutional royalism and the search for settlement* (Cambridge, 1994).

Smith, D.L. *The Stuart Parliaments 1603 – 1689* (Oxford, 1999).

Sommerville, J.P. *Politics and Ideology in England 1603 – 1640* (Harlow, 1986).

Stacy, W.R. 'Impeachment, Attainder, and the 'Revival' of Parliamentary Judicature under the Early Stuarts,' *Parliamentary History* 11, part 1 (1992), pp. 40 – 56.

Sutherland, N.M. *The French Secretaries of State in the age of Catherine de Medici* (London, 1962).

Tennenhouse, L. 'Sir Walter Raleigh and the Literature of Clientage,' in G.F. Lytle and S. Orgel (eds.) *Patronage in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1981), pp. 235 – 258.

Thirsk, J. 'The Sales of Royalist Land during the Interregnum,' *The Economic History Review* n.s., 5, no. 2 (1952), pp. 188 – 207.

Thompson, C. 'Court Politics and Parliamentary Conflict in 1625,' in A. Hughes and R. Cust, *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (Harlow, 1989), pp. 168 – 192.

Thorne, S.E. *Essays in English Legal History* (London, 1985).

Timmis, J.H. *Thine is the kingdom* (Alabama, 1974).

Timmis, J.H. 'The Basis of the Lords' Decision in the Trial of Strafford: Contravention of the Two-Witness Rule,' *Albion* 8, no. 4 (1976), pp. 311 – 319.

Treadwell, V. 'The House of Lords in the Irish Parliament of 1613 – 1615,' *English Historical Review* 80 (1965), pp. 92 – 107.

Treadwell, V. 'The establishment of the farm of the Irish customs 1603 – 13,' *English Historical Review* 93 (1978), pp. 580 – 602.

Treadwell, V. 'Sir John Perrot and the Irish Parliament of 1585 – 6,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* Section C, 10 (1985), pp. 260 – 308.

Trevor-Roper, H. *Archbishop Laud* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed, New York, 1965).

Tyacke, N. 'Sir Edwin Sandys and the Cecils: a Client-patron Relationship,' *Historical Research* 64 (1991), pp. 87 – 91.

Underdown, D. *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649 – 1660* (New Haven, 1960).

Upton, A.F. *Sir Arthur Ingram c. 1565 – 1642* (Oxford, 1961).

Watts, J. 'Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford,' in T. Eustace (ed). *Statesmen and Politicians of the Stuart Age* (Basingstoke, 1985), pp. 83 – 115.

Wedgwood, C.V. *Strafford* (London, 1935).

Wedgwood, C.V. 'The lost archangel. A new view of Strafford,' *History Today* 1 (1951), pp. 18 – 24.

Wedgwood, C.V. *The King's Peace 1637 – 1641* (London, 1955).

Wedgwood, C.V. *The King's War 1641 – 1647* (London, 1958).

Wedgwood, C.V. 'The Earl of Strafford and the Arts,' *History Today* 2 (1961), pp. 659 – 664.

Wedgwood, C.V. *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford: A Revaluation* (London, 1961).

Whitaker, T.D. *A History of Richmondshire, in the North Riding of the County of York* (2 vols, London, 1823), vol. II.

Williamson, A. 'Patterns of British Identity: 'Britain and its Rivals in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,' in G. Burgess (ed). *The New British History* (London, 1999), pp. 138 – 173.

Windeyer, W.J.V. *Lectures on Legal History* (Sydney, 1949).

Wood, H. 'The Office of Chief Governor of Ireland, 1172 – 1509,' *Journal of the Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* Section C, 12 (1923), pp. 206 – 238.

Wood, H. 'The Office of Secretary of State for Ireland and Keeper of the Signet or Privy Seal,' *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 38, Section C, (1928), pp. 51 – 68.

Woolrych, A. 'Political theory and political practice,' in C.A. Patrides and R.B. Waddington (eds.) *The Age of Milton* (Manchester, 1980), pp. 34 – 71.

Wrightson, K. 'Two concepts of order: justices, constables and jurymen in seventeenth century England,' in J. Brewer and J. Styles (eds.) *An Ungovernable People. The English and their law in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (London, 1980), pp. 21 – 46.

Zagorin, P. 'Communication: Sir Edward Stanhope's Advice to Thomas Wentworth, Viscount Wentworth, Concerning the Deputyship of Ireland: An unpublished letter of 1631,' *Historical Journal* 7, no. 2, (1964), pp. 298 – 320.

Zagorin, P. *The Court and the Country* (London, 1969).

Zagorin, P. 'Did Strafford change sides?' *English Historical Review* 101 (1986), pp. 149 – 163.

Zaller, R. *The Parliament of 1621* (Los Angeles, 1971).

#### **iv. Unpublished theses**

Edwards, D. 'The Ormond lordship in County Kilkenny, 1515 – 1642,' (PhD thesis, University of Dublin, Trinity College, 1998).

Kelly, W.P. 'The Early Career of James Butler, Twelfth Earl and First Duke of Ormond (1610- 1688), 1610 – 1643,' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1997).

McCafferty, J. 'John Bramhall and the Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland 1633 – 1641,' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1996).

Reynolds, N.A.C. 'The Stuart Court and Courtiers in Exile 1644 – 1654,' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1996).