

WENTWORTH AND COURT POLITICS, 1628-40

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy by Fiona Pogson.

November 1995.

WENTWORTH AND COURT POLITICS, 1628-40

Fiona Pogson

The career of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, has attracted the attention of historians ever since the seventeenth century, but no work has yet tried in any detail to assess his relationship with the major figures of the English Court and administration, including the King himself. My intention in this thesis is to examine his role in the politics of the Court of Charles I, from the death of the Duke of Buckingham to the calling of the Long Parliament.

Wentworth's abrasive handling of senior Irish office-holders led to bitter disputes being fought out at Court and, as a result, the maintenance of a number of alliances to safeguard his Irish government was essential. One of the most interesting aspects of Wentworth's career, and a central point of reference in the 1630s, was his association with William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. While it is no longer generally accepted that Wentworth played a powerful role in England before 1639, and it is now beginning to be questioned whether Laud himself was even in control of the Anglican Church, neither their close political partnership nor the nature of their relationship has been adequately scrutinised. An analysis of their association shows that despite their voluminous correspondence, they did not act as a 'faction'. They understood that they were both essentially isolated figures in Charles I's government and their relationship provided them with support. But an examination of the struggle for the Treasury in 1635-6 reveals the limitations of their relationship, which was largely maintained on paper, and should cause us to pay attention to Wentworth's relationship with Laud's opponent, Francis Cottington. Wentworth enjoyed a friendship with Cottington which provided him with an alternative, and sometimes more reliable, means of access to the King.

But Wentworth could not afford to rely solely on Laud and Cottington: both had their limitations and neither enjoyed a close, personal friendship with Charles I. He needed to be on good terms with those who enjoyed a high degree of access to the King. The Earl of Carlisle performed this service for him until 1636, but his successor as Groom of the Stool, the Earl of Holland, closed that avenue. Wentworth had already come to appreciate the importance of the Queen's influence and understood that he needed to use long-standing friends and acquaintances, and more recent contacts, in an effort to win her favour. Wentworth therefore utilised a wide variety of means of access to the Court and engaged in sometimes bitter disputes in order to safeguard his position. But the Court was not divided into so-called 'factions', espousing particular opinions on government policies, but operated in a much more flexible manner. A Lord Deputy who did not enjoy the King's complete confidence could not afford to attach himself to a single group or individual.

CONTENTS

Preface		1
Chapter One:	Wentworth's struggle for Court preferment during the Ascendancy of Buckingham, 1614-28.	6
Chapter Two:	'The Lady Mora and her waiting-maid': Wentworth's association with Weston and Cottington.	48
Chapter Three:	Wentworth and Laud.	84
Chapter Four:	The Struggle for the Lord Treasurership, 1635-6.	121
Chapter Five:	Wentworth's Contacts at Court, 1628-40.	149
Chapter Six:	Wentworth and the Queen's Circle.	189
Chapter Seven:	Wentworth's relationship with the King.	236
Conclusion:		287
Appendix:	Garrard and Conway	299
Bibliography:		305

PREFACE

There is no shortage of material on the life and career of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. He is the subject of several biographies; his Irish administration has been examined in monographs and his parliamentary career during the 1620s has received attention. He is acknowledged as a significant, if not central, figure in the political history of Charles I's reign. But there has been no study of his role in the politics of the Court of Charles I: indeed no work has tried to assess in any detail his relationship with the major figures of the English Court, including the King himself. This thesis examines his surviving correspondence with members of the Court of Charles I in an attempt to go some way towards filling this gap.

Until 1949, only a very few privileged historians were allowed access to the Strafford Papers, formerly held by the Fitzwilliam family at Wentworth Woodhouse. Samuel Rawson Gardiner, whose work drew upon an extraordinary range of archives, could only regret the 6th Earl Fitzwilliam's refusal to allow him access to the Strafford Papers,¹ and C.V. Wedgwood was unable to see them when writing her life of Strafford, published in 1935.² The Earl of Birkenhead and Lady Burghclere were allowed to consult the Strafford Papers, but made little of the opportunity.³ Most historians had to rely on William Knowler's highly selective edition of Strafford's correspondence, published in London in 1739, and on James Bliss's edition of Laud's

¹ Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642* (10 vols. London, 1883-4), vol. IX, p. viii.

² C. V. Wedgwood, *Strafford* (London, 1935).

³ Lady Burghclere, *Strafford* (London, 1931); The Earl of Birkenhead, *Strafford* (London, 1938).

unpublished correspondence with Wentworth.⁴ Since the Strafford papers entered the public domain in 1949, few historians have made proper use of them. In revising her biography in 1961, C. V. Wedgwood acknowledged that ‘the correspondence, taken as a whole, reveals a much more complex and contradictory character’ than she had initially recognised. But J. P. Cooper subsequently pointed out that Wedgwood’s revised version still lacks adequate discussion of some aspects of Wentworth’s career, including his desire to establish and maintain court contacts with a range of individuals.⁵ Cooper himself understood the importance of the Strafford Papers and used them in his study of Wentworth’s personal fortune. He also made part of the archive more accessible by editing Wentworth’s early correspondence.⁶ Within the last thirty years, studies of Wentworth’s political activities in Yorkshire and his representation of the shire in Parliament have drawn heavily on the papers.⁷ But it has been Irish history which has benefited most of all from historians gaining wider access to the Strafford papers. Hugh Kearney’s influential study of Wentworth’s Irish administration has been followed by Aidan Clarke’s

⁴ William Knowler ed., *Letters and Despatches of the Earl of Strafforde* (2 vols. London, 1739 and Dublin, 1740); William Laud, *The Works* ed. J Bliss (7 vols. Oxford, 1847-60), vols. VI and VII.

⁵ C. V. Wedgwood, *Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford 1593-1641: A Revaluation* (London, 1961), p. 13; J. P. Cooper, ‘Strafford: A Revaluation’, in J. P. Cooper, *Land, Men and Beliefs: Studies in Early-Modern History* ed. G. E. Aylmer and J. S. Morrill (London, 1983), pp. 192-200.

⁶ Cooper, ‘The fortune of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford’, *Economic History Review* second series, 11 (1958), pp. 227-48; Cooper ed., *Wentworth Papers 1597-1628* (Camden Society, fourth series, 12, 1973).

⁷ See J. T. Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry* (London, 1969); John K. Gruenfelder, ‘The Electoral Patronage of Sir Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1614-1640’, *Journal of Modern History* 49 (1977), pp. 557-74; S. P. Salt, ‘Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire, 1614-1628’, *Northern History* 16 (1980), pp. 130-68.

work on his activities throughout the 1630s and by that of Jane Ohlmeyer on his relationship with the Earl of Antrim.⁸ However, careful examination of the Strafford Papers reveals that they are also a rich source of evidence for a study of Wentworth's court connections, particularly during the 1630s.

Significant collections of Wentworth's correspondence with the most prominent members of Charles's government are to be found there. As well as over two hundred and thirty items of correspondence between Wentworth and Laud, there are valuable collections of Wentworth's correspondence with Cottington and Weston, Coke and Windebank, Arundel, Carlisle and Coventry, Newcastle and Northumberland. Charles's own letters to Wentworth have been carefully preserved. The archive also contains smaller, but nevertheless important, collections of letters to and from men in attendance on the Queen: Goring, Dorset, and Henry Percy; and it also includes Wentworth's correspondence with the Queen's Secretaries, Sir Robert Ayton and Sir John Winter. Wentworth's small, but almost complete, correspondence with

⁸ Hugh Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland 1633-41: A Study in Absolutism* (Manchester, 1959 and Cambridge, 1989); Aidan Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland* (London, 1966); Clarke, 'The Earl of Antrim and the First Bishops' War', *The Irish Sword* 6 (1963-4), pp. 108-15; Clarke, 'Sir Piers Crosby, 1590-1646: Wentworth's "tawney ribbon"', *Irish Historical Studies* 26 (1988), pp. 143-60; Clarke, 'The government of Wentworth, 1632-40', in *A New History of Ireland: vol. III Early Modern Ireland 1534-1691* ed. T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin and F. J. Byrne (Oxford, 1976), pp. 243-69; Jane H. Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms The career of Randal MacDonnell, marquis of Antrim, 1609-1683* (Cambridge, 1993). See also Cooper, 'Strafford and the Byrnes' Country', *Irish Historical Studies* 15 (1966), pp. 1-20; Terence Ranger, 'Strafford in Ireland: A Revaluation', in *Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660* ed. Trevor Aston (London, 1965); M. Perceval-Maxwell, 'Strafford, the Ulster Scots and the covenanters', *Irish Historical Studies* 18 (1973), pp. 524-51.

Holland has also survived.⁹ In addition to the guard books holding original letters to Wentworth, the archive includes letter books containing copies of what Wentworth considered to be significant outgoing and incoming mail. This is of particular importance regarding his correspondence with Laud, as the Archbishop destroyed Wentworth's letters.

Constrained as he was by loyalty to his patron's family, William Knowler's discreet edition of Wentworth's correspondence cannot be regarded as an adequate source on its own for the study of his contacts with the Court any more than it can for a careful assessment of his Irish administration or his interests in Yorkshire. Admittedly, Knowler did include many valuable items of correspondence, including all George Garrard's newsletters, but he only included two, unrepresentative, items from Wentworth's correspondence with Holland, for instance, and less than a quarter of his correspondence with Laud. His habit of omitting entire paragraphs without notice can also mislead the unwary. References in this thesis to letters published by Knowler, are to the manuscript versions (or secretarial copies) in the Strafford Papers, and not to Knowler's edition.¹⁰

Throughout this thesis, 'the Court' is defined in a broad sense: it was a 'polycentric world' where the monarch came into contact with his influential

⁹ Holland sent letters of respect to Wentworth in the summer of 1636; these have apparently not survived.

¹⁰ I would like to thank the Trustees of Olive, Countess Fitzwilliam's Wentworth Settlement, and the archivists and staff of Sheffield City Libraries. The original spelling of all quotations has been retained, but standard contractions have been silently extended. Punctuation has been modernised where necessary. All dates are old style unless otherwise stated, but the year is taken to begin on 1 January.

subjects.¹¹ If the Court is defined in a narrow sense, signifying only the royal Household and the Privy Council, discussion of ‘court politics’ becomes meaningless. It is essential that Henrietta Maria and her household are included in any definition of the Court, otherwise the Queen’s involvement in court politics is not properly understood. It is also important to note the part played by lesser figures in court affairs, men who assisted the development of alliances between more major figures. The Dublin government constituted one of the centres of the English Court and, despite his physical absence from the Palace of Whitehall for most of the 1630s, Wentworth participated energetically in court politics. This thesis aims to shed some light on the complex nature of his alliances with influential members of Charles I’s Court.

¹¹ See Linda Levy Peck, ‘The Mental World of the Jacobean Court: An Introduction’, and Malcolm Smuts, ‘Cultural Diversity and Cultural Change at the Court of James I’, in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* ed. Peck (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 3, 103-5; cf. David Starkey ed., *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Harlow, 1987), p. 5.

CHAPTER ONE

WENTWORTH'S STRUGGLE FOR PREFERMENT AT COURT
DURING THE ASCENDANCY OF BUCKINGHAM, 1614-28

In 1614 Sir Thomas Wentworth inherited a proud family ancestry and a substantial income from land in Yorkshire. He had already made his entry on to the political scene, sitting in the 'Addled' Parliament as Knight of the Shire for Yorkshire. His father, Sir William Wentworth, had served the county as sheriff in 1601 and had sought to raise the family's fortunes by purchasing a baronetcy in 1611 and marrying his heir to Margaret Clifford, daughter of the Earl of Cumberland.¹ During most of Sir William's adult life, the West Riding was dominated by its greatest landowner, Gilbert, seventh Earl of Shrewsbury, and for a short time by his brother Edward, the eighth earl, but the division of the Talbot lands in 1618 meant that Thomas Wentworth would not be restricted as his father had been by the presence in the riding of a great landed magnate. Wentworth aimed to fulfil the ambitions which his father had held for him, hoping to match the family's increasing wealth and political status in the county with preferment at Court. But it was not until 1628 that his ambitions were fulfilled. Rivalries and disputes with other powerful Yorkshire families had ramifications at the Courts of both James I and his son, and the attitude of both monarchs towards their Parliaments forced Wentworth to make hard choices which would necessarily make an impact on his local reputation.² The years 1614-28 were also the years in which George Villiers,

¹ Wentworth reported to his father that the Earl of Northampton had received him very graciously and commended his match with the Clifford family; Sheffield City Libraries, Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments, Strafford Papers [hereafter Str. P.] 21/1, 10 Dec 1611.

² See G. C. F. Forster, 'Faction and County Government in Early Stuart Yorkshire', *Northern History* 11 (1975), pp. 70-86, for a discussion of 'factional' rivalry in the county.

Duke of Buckingham, enjoyed the favour of two monarchs and wielded immense influence in both national and local politics. Wentworth tried unsuccessfully to attach himself to the Duke several times during the 1620s, and although he did not lack useful connections at Court, he found that his patrons were unable to withstand Buckingham's influence. Only during the last few weeks of the Duke's life did Wentworth enjoy his favour and even then he was not securely attached to him.

One important consideration has been borne in mind during the writing of this chapter. Although the bulk of Wentworth's surviving correspondence dates from the Personal Rule, historians have made greater use of his earlier papers. Much of his correspondence from 1614-28 has been edited by J.P. Cooper and published by the Camden Society, making it easily accessible. As a result, his attempts to gain preferment at Court during the 1620s are better understood than his relationship with the Court during the Personal Rule. However, some episodes during the earlier period still deserve attention, in particular his reaction at being pricked sheriff of Yorkshire in 1625. This incident has received little attention from historians but it raises some interesting points about how Wentworth saw his future in both national and local politics. On the other hand, there are few aspects of Wentworth's career which have received more attention than his re-entry into royal and ducal favour in the summer of 1628 and yet the most recent, thorough examination of this episode should not go unchallenged.³ This chapter aims, therefore, to examine Wentworth's long struggle to win Court favour and government office during the period 1614-28,

³ Perez Zagorin, 'Sir Edward Stanhope's advice to Thomas Wentworth, Viscount Wentworth, concerning the deputyship of Ireland: an unpublished letter of 1631', *Historical Journal* 7 (1964), pp. 298-320; Zagorin, 'Did Strafford change sides?', *English Historical Review* 101 (1986) pp. 149-63.

giving particular attention to neglected or contentious episodes and benefiting from much valuable recent work on the Court, Parliament and local politics.⁴

In 1615 Sir John Savile nominated his neighbour, Sir Thomas Wentworth, as a possible replacement as *Custos Rotulorum* in the West Riding.⁵ In February 1614 Lord Sheffield, President of the Council of the North, had forwarded complaints against Savile's 'evell caryadge' to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere and asked that he be left out of the Commission of the Peace.⁶ In December 1615 Savile himself requested that he be removed from office: he acted to avoid the likelihood of dismissal, and had no intention of permanently losing this post.⁷ Wentworth had been sufficiently wary of Savile's intentions to ask his friend Charles Greenwood to visit Savile, having given him a series of instructions for the interview. Greenwood was directed to press Sir John regarding his willingness to part with the office. He was also required to try and gain information regarding the likely opposition there would be to Wentworth's appointment and ascertain in particular if Sir John Jackson and Mr. Serjeant Hutton were among the nominees and whether Wentworth ought to stand against them. If an appointment had already been made, or was likely to be made, Wentworth was anxious that Savile not mention this negotiation in the

⁴ See Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry*; Richard Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1626-1628* (Oxford, 1987); Cust, 'Politics and the Electorate in the 1620s', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England* eds. Cust and Ann Hughes, (Harlow, 1989), pp. 134-67; Gruenfelder, 'The Electoral Patronage of Sir Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford'; L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge, 1989); Salt, 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire'; Kevin Sharpe, 'The Earl of Arundel, His Circle and the Opposition to the Duke of Buckingham, 1618-1628' in *Faction and Parliament: Essays on early Stuart history* ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford, 1978), pp. 209-44.

⁵ See James J. Cartwright, *Chapters in the History of Yorkshire* (Wakefield, 1872), pp. 182-91, on Savile's career.

⁶ Str. P. 20/202, 15 Feb 1614.

⁷ *Ibid.* 20/211, Savile to Ellesmere 6 Dec 1615.

future. But if Wentworth was indeed a strong candidate, then he hoped that Sir John might be provoked by Greenwood into revealing his true feelings:

‘Yett I wold have yow as of your selfe, to tell him what a speach yow had h[e]ard of his being putt owte of the Commission of peace and his place of Custos rotulorum and well to observe his countenance and gesture.’⁸

Greenwood could detect nothing which worried him. On the contrary, Savile appeared to be most concerned to protect Wentworth’s reputation.⁹ Wentworth was duly appointed to the post and served for almost two years before Savile’s true intentions emerged. George Villiers, now Earl of Buckingham, wrote briefly to Wentworth informing him that as Savile had now been received back into royal favour, the King would be pleased if Wentworth would agree to make way for Savile’s re-appointment. His reward would be the promise of future preferment.¹⁰ Wentworth’s response was to make a gracious acknowledgement of the King’s favours, but to deny Savile’s version of events. He insisted that Savile did not give up the office simply because he wished to; his desire to have it back was sufficient evidence of that. He disingenuously claimed not to have been made acquainted with Savile’s intention to nominate him for the post and denied that he was ‘soe much beholden unto him as is pretended’. He went on to enlighten Buckingham as to the real reason for Savile’s need to dispose of his offices, and contrasted it with what he claimed was his own good service in the post. Finally he requested Buckingham not to make him endure the disgrace which would necessarily accompany his removal from this prestigious local office.¹¹ Several

⁸ *Ibid.* 20/213, ‘Instructions in a reference betwixt me and Sir Jhon [sic] Savile whearin I used Mr Greenwood’ 25 Dec 1615.

⁹ *Ibid.* 20/215, Greenwood to Wentworth 26 Dec 1615.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 20/221, 5 Sept 1617.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 21/11, 15 Sept 1617; S. R. Gardiner ed., *The Fortescue Papers* (Camden Society, new series, 1, 1871), pp. 23-7; Cooper ed., *Wentworth Papers*, p. 99.

days later, Buckingham replied that he had acquainted James with Wentworth's arguments and both of them were satisfied that he should remain in the place.¹² Wentworth had not responded to this threat from Savile by simply trusting to Buckingham's sense of honour. He requested the support of the Lord Keeper, Sir Francis Bacon, both directly and through the mediation of Edward, Lord Wotton.¹³ The threat to his local reputation was not merely imagined as several weeks after the close of correspondence between Wentworth and Buckingham on this subject, damaging rumours continued to circulate in the West Riding that Wentworth was about to be removed from the post.¹⁴ But once these had passed, his prospects towards the end of the decade seemed reasonably good: he had avoided the indignity of being removed from the *custos*-ship, apparently without antagonising Buckingham or the King. He received a further mark of favour in 1619 when he was sworn of the Council in the North and in 1621 he had the honour for the second time of sitting in Parliament as Knight of the Shire, together with the Secretary of State, Sir George Calvert.¹⁵ There was every reason for him to hope that his local standing would be maintained and that he would in addition be able to secure Court preferment.

¹² Str. P. 20/223, 23 Sept 1617.

¹³ *Ibid.* 21/12, Wentworth to Wotton 15 Sept 1617; *ibid.*, 21/13, Wentworth to Bacon 15 Sept 1617. See also *ibid.* 20/222, copy of a letter to be written to James I by the Earl of Cumberland, 1617. Wentworth does not appear to have had any close connection with Bacon, as the only other piece of surviving correspondence between them in the Strafford Papers concerned a high constable, *ibid.* 2/6-7, Wentworth to Bacon 13 July 1617.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 20/224, Charles Radcliffe to Wentworth 5 Nov 1617.

¹⁵ Wentworth assisted Calvert in the debates on foreign policy and supply; Simon Adams, 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', in *Faction and Parliament: Essays on early Stuart history* ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford, 1978), pp. 142, 163.

Wentworth had begun to cultivate useful connections at Court following his marriage in 1611. He was well-received by Lord Treasurer Northampton, whose family enjoyed the King's particular favour and controlled several major offices at Court, and he may well have intended trying to follow-up this good start after his foreign tour. But their fall from power as a result of the Overbury murder ended that possibility. Wentworth enjoyed a number of other Court connections by 1617, which he utilised in his attempt to fend off Savile's actions, including a friendship with Edward, Lord Wotton.¹⁶ Wentworth also enjoyed a long-standing friendship with Wotton's half-brother Sir Henry Wotton, corresponding with him while he served as ambassador in Venice. But Sir Henry spent most of James I's reign abroad and was not in a position to further Wentworth's career, although Wentworth entertained hopes in November 1617 that Wotton might be recalled to succeed Winwood as Secretary of State.¹⁷ Wentworth regarded Sir Edward Sackville, later 4th Earl of Dorset, as another potentially useful contact.¹⁸ His attempt to secure a burgess-place for Sir Richard Wynn, a dependant of the Earl of Pembroke, is another example of his attempt to widen his circle of connections at Court.¹⁹ But his most important associations were with the Secretary of State, Sir George Calvert and Lord Treasurer Cranfield, later Earl of Middlesex. The origins of Wentworth's relationship with Calvert, his fellow Yorkshire-man,

¹⁶ Str. P. 2/31, Wentworth to Lord Wotton 13 June 1619.

¹⁷ Str. P. 2/13-4, Wentworth to Sir Henry Wotton 8 Nov 1617; *ibid.* 2/37, same to same 8 April 1620; *ibid.* 12/27, same to same 9 April 1628; *ibid.* 19/130, same to same [Dec 1628]; Logan Pearsall Smith, *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, (2 vols. Oxford, 1907), vol. I, pp. 208, 212; *Dictionary of National Biography* (21 vols. London, 1921-2) [hereafter *DNB*], 'Sir Henry Wotton'.

¹⁸ Str. P. 2/37, Wentworth to Sackville 26 Feb 1620; *ibid.* 2/73-4, same to same 26 March 1621. Wentworth remained on good terms with Dorset, appointed Lord Chamberlain to the Queen in 1628, until the late 1630s.

are somewhat obscure. Wentworth approached him in July 1619 requesting his support for a suit on behalf of his chaplain Thomas Carr,²⁰ but their association was closer by late 1620 when he worked hard in Yorkshire to secure both his and Calvert's return as Knights of the Shire for the 1621 Parliament.²¹ He appears to have met with little difficulty convincing the electorate to return him to Parliament, but Calvert's candidacy was another matter. Wentworth had to urge Calvert to ask Lord Chancellor Bacon to command Savile to stop circulating black propaganda against the non-resident Secretary.²² Wentworth's determined efforts to prevent Savile supplanting either himself or Calvert were successful, but as Peter Salt has argued, he risked alienating the Yorkshire electorate over his support of a Court candidate.²³

Little is known about the origins of Wentworth's relationship with Cranfield, although it is likely that he came into contact with the Lord Treasurer through the financier Sir Arthur Ingram.²⁴ One result of this connection was Wentworth's appointment in April 1622 as Receiver-General for the Crown

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 2/74-5, Wentworth to Lord Darcy 31 March 1621; Salt, 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire', p. 148.

²⁰ Str. P. 2/33-4, 22 July 1619; see also *ibid.* 2/34, 4 Oct 1619.

²¹ Cooper, *Wentworth Papers*, pp.142-5; Cust, 'Politics and the Electorate in the 1620s', pp. 143-6. Cust points out that Wentworth understood the advantage to be gained at Court by securing the election of a privy councillor; he was not concerned merely to protect his local reputation by defeating Savile, p. 143.

²² Str. P. 2/55-6, 5 Dec 1620.

²³ Salt, 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire', p. 148; Derek Hirst, *The Representative of the People?* (Cambridge, 1975) pp. 143-4, 174-5, 180-81. For Calvert's role in the 1621 Parliament see John D. Krugler, "'Our Trusty and Wellbeloved Councillor: The Parliamentary Career of Sir George Calvert, 1609-24', *Maryland Historical Magazine* 72 (1977), pp. 470-91.

²⁴ Wentworth requested the use of Ingram's grand house in York to hold a dinner for his supporters on election day in 1620; Str. P. 2/56-7, Wentworth to Ingram 6 Dec 1620.

Lands in Yorkshire and both Ingram and Wentworth presented Cranfield with New Year's gifts in January 1623.²⁵ When Wentworth wished to relinquish this unprofitable office in August 1623 he found that Cranfield was cooperative, although he had to clear himself from an accusation that his deputies had failed to pay in £600 owing to the Crown.²⁶ During 1622 rumours, possibly prompted by his association with the Lord Treasurer, had circulated at Court that Wentworth would receive the post of Comptroller of the King's Household, but nothing came of this.²⁷ Wentworth acted as middle-man between Cranfield and his brother-in-law Lord Clifford over Clifford's wish to have his father's patent for licensing cloth exports extended and had been given the impression by Cranfield in June 1622 that he 'stood soe right in his Majesties opinion and thos[e] about him that I could move nothing to misse'.²⁸ But a year later the situation was not so promising. Despite Wentworth's standing in local affairs, James refused to appoint him as one of the Deputy Lieutenants for Yorkshire in the summer of 1623. Wentworth's name was not included in a list of seventeen men under consideration for Deputy Lieutenants' places, despite the attempts of Calvert and Cranfield to change the King's mind, and the good-will of Secretary Conway.²⁹ The reason for this

²⁵ Centre for Kentish Studies, Sackville of Knole, Cranfield Papers U269/1 [hereafter CKS Sackville MSS], O[fficial] E[xchequer] no. 1344, Cranfield to Wentworth 23 April 1622; M. Prestwich, *Politics and Profits under the Early Stuarts: The Career of Lionel Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex*, (Oxford, 1966) p. 379.

²⁶ Str. P. 2/98-9, Wentworth to Cranfield 5 June 1623; CKS Sackville MSS, OE, no. 774, same to same 15 Aug 1623.

²⁷ Norman Egbert McLure, *The Letters of John Chamberlain* (2 vols. Philadelphia, 1939), vol. II, pp. 381, 446.

²⁸ Str. P. 2/82-5, Wentworth to Clifford 31 May 1622: this suit was unsuccessful, as the Duke of Lennox had an interest in it. Cranfield wished the profits had gone instead to the King himself; *ibid.* 21/19, Wentworth to Marris 3 June 1622.

²⁹ Public Record Office, State Papers [hereafter SP] 14/148/26, Calvert to Conway 4 July 1623; SP 14/148/34, Conway to Calvert 5 July 1623; SP 14/148/44, same to same 6 July

probably lies in the bad relations between Wentworth and the President of the Council of the North, Lord Scrope. Wentworth appears to have unwittingly given offence to Scrope by failing to wait on him at his London residence.³⁰ In early 1623 James ensured that Scrope's interests on the Council were not harmed by Secretary Calvert and it is likely that he acted in a similar manner over the appointment of Deputy Lieutenants.³¹ Scrope was now related by marriage to Buckingham, giving him greater access to the King's favour. Wentworth spent the summer and autumn of 1623 in Yorkshire, claiming to be enjoying the country life, but his failure to secure a Deputy Lieutenancy must have been a blow.³² This was the first major set-back to his ambitions to secure office at Court, and it was made worse by his failure to win the hand of several eligible ladies, after the death of Lady Margaret in August 1622.³³ After a serious illness in early 1624³⁴ Wentworth was back in London in the spring, sitting in the Commons for the borough of Pontefract; he did not contest the shire, and was not even certain that he would be returned for Pontefract.³⁵ He

1623; SP 14/151/71, same to same 27 Aug 1623; SP 14/148/55, Cranfield to Conway 7 July 1623; Str. P. 2/108, Wentworth to Conway [Aug] 1623. See SP 14/149/48, Chamberlain to Carleton 26 July 1623, on the king's decision to appoint Deputy Lieutenants himself.

³⁰ Str. P. 21/20, Wentworth's account of his relations with Scrope [Jan 1623?].

³¹ SP 14/150/81, Conway to Calvert 11 Aug 1623.

³² Str. P. 2/96-7, Wentworth to Calvert 28 April 1623; *ibid.* 2/115, Wentworth to Sir Peter Middleton 18 Sept 1623.

³³ Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 49; Cooper, 'The fortune of Thomas Wentworth', pp. 229-30.

³⁴ Str. P. 2/126-7, Wentworth to Calvert 20 Feb 1624; *ibid.* 2/127-8, Wentworth to Ingram 20 Feb 1624.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 2/123-4, Wentworth to Sir Richard Beaumont, 18 Jan 1624. Parliament met on 19 Feb; Wentworth was still in Yorkshire on 22 Feb, *ibid.* 2/129. Wentworth had supported Pontefract's campaign for the restoration of its franchise in the 1621. The fact that Pontefract gained his support and not the larger town of Wakefield testifies to the rivalry between Wentworth and Sir John Savile; Wakefield was situated in Savile's centre of

was aware that his frayed relations with Lord President Scrope - whose support he had courted successfully before the last election - and the absence of his name on the list of Deputy Lieutenants had resulted in his standing in Yorkshire being reduced.³⁶

During the 1624 Parliament Wentworth lost further ground at Court when Lord Treasurer Cranfield was impeached and removed from office.³⁷ Wentworth apparently chose not to risk what was left of his standing at Court by trying to defend him. He recognised that Charles and Buckingham were determined to remove James's Lord Treasurer and, with his eye on the future, he also avoided antagonising the Prince and the Duke needlessly by making known his views on foreign policy. He recognised that war with Spain was almost inevitable and that attempts to detach Prince Charles from Buckingham could not succeed in time to save Cranfield and Bristol from disgrace; in any case Wentworth probably recognised, as did Lord Keeper Williams, that the attack on Cranfield and the call for war against Spain were both the work of the Prince, as much as the Duke.³⁸ As Peter Salt has argued, his reluctance to risk alienating the Duke contrasts with Christopher Wandesford's less cautious attitude.³⁹ In February 1625 Wentworth lost another friend at Court when

influence; A. J. Fletcher, 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Restoration of Pontefract as a Parliamentary Borough', *Northern History* 6 (1971), pp. 88-97.

³⁶ Str. P. 2/62, Wentworth to Scrope, 8 Dec 1620.

³⁷ Prestwich, *Cranfield*, pp. 423-68.

³⁸ John Hackett, *Scrinia Reserata: A Memorial offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams* (London, 1692), part I, pp. 189-90. It is possible that Williams told James that the attack on Cranfield was 'the Prince's undertaking' in order to discourage the king from intervening to save the Treasurer, but during Buckingham's illness during the trial Charles did take an active part in proceedings; Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. V, p. 231.

³⁹ Str. P. 2/132-3, Wentworth to Gervase Clifton 5 June 1624; *ibid.* 21/23, Wentworth to Wandesford 24 June 1624; Salt, 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire', p. 152, n. 132.

Secretary Calvert stepped down from his post. John D. Krugler has shown how Calvert's resignation was a consequence of the desire of both the Prince and the Duke to break with Spain: Calvert was not willing to go along with this and wished to leave office with a good financial deal. Religion was not the primary reason for his resignation: rather his return to the Catholic faith almost certainly took place very soon after he left office and was possibly the work of Toby Mathew.⁴⁰ On the accession of Charles I the following month Calvert resigned as a Privy Councillor, explaining that he was not prepared to take the required oaths of office because of his Catholicism.⁴¹ In short, at the end of James I's reign Wentworth had failed to secure Court preferment, had lost his two major patrons and was out of step with the views of both the heir to the throne and the favourite on foreign policy. He had maintained a cautious attitude towards the reversionary interest, but although it was not likely that he would receive any immediate benefit from the change of monarch, he had little option but to do what he could to gain some advantage from it in due course.

The death of James I ensured the continuing power of the Duke of Buckingham. The old King's opposition to military action against Spain had placed Buckingham in an insecure position, but the accession of Charles

⁴⁰ Krugler, 'Sir George Calvert's Resignation as Secretary of State and the Founding of Maryland', *Maryland Historical Magazine* 68 (1973), pp. 239-54. Mathew remained on close terms with Calvert; he was one of four witnesses to Calvert's will, *The Calvert Papers* (3 vols. Maryland Historical Society, Fund-Publication no. 28, Baltimore, 1889), vol. I, p. 50.

⁴¹ Wentworth remained on close terms with Calvert, later Lord Baltimore, until the latter's death in 1632. Wentworth and Cottington, Calvert's 'Noble, and auntient freinds' were appointed overseers and supervisors of his will, *The Calvert Papers*, vol. I, p. 49. I owe this reference to my colleague Dr. John C. Appleby. See also Str. P. 12/28, Calvert to Wentworth 17 April 1628.

rescued him from this.⁴² Both the Tuscan resident and the Venetian ambassador noted that Charles made public demonstrations of his favour towards the Duke and that his new position of First Gentleman of the Bedchamber allowed him unrivalled access to the King. 'In short, nothing is done without him.'⁴³ Buckingham's female relatives were prominent in the group of ladies who escorted Henrietta Maria from France.⁴⁴ But the Duke understood that his influence was not without opposition and Pesaro correctly interpreted his unwillingness to convey to France the proxies for the King's marriage as signifying a reluctance to leave England so soon after Charles's accession, before he felt absolutely secure in the new King's favour. His relations with the Queen, in particular his determination that female members of his family be admitted to her bedchamber, are indicative not only of his concern that the status of his family be appreciated, but also suggest that he regarded her Court as a potential source of trouble and wished to know what was happening there.⁴⁵ It is clear that Charles was no cipher in the Duke's hands: Buckingham's relationship with the King did not prevent Charles from refusing to appoint the favourite's brother, Kit Villiers, to a position in the

⁴² Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion* ed. W. D. Macray, (6 vols. Oxford, 1888), vol. I, p. 29; *HMC, Mar and Kellie* (Supplementary), (London, 1930), pp. 201, 203; Sharpe, 'Arundel', pp. 226-7.

⁴³ *HMC, Eleventh Report, Appendix I, Skrine* (Salveti), (London, 1887), p. 3, Salvetti to the Grand Duke of Tuscany 11 April 1625 [N.S.]; *Calendar of State Papers relating to English Affairs, existing in the archives and collections of Venice* (38 vols. London, 1864-1947), [hereafter *CSPV*], 1625-6 p. 3, Pesaro to the Doge and Senate 9 April 1625 [N.S.]; G. E. C[okayne], *Complete Peerage* (8 vols. London, 1889), vol. II, pp. 65-6.

⁴⁴ *HMC, Eleventh Report, Appendix I, Skrine* (Salveti), p. 19, 13 June 1625.

⁴⁵ Thomas Birch ed., *The Court and Times of Charles the First* (2 vols. London, 1848), vol. I, p. 134, unknown to Mead 4 Aug 1626; Christopher Thompson, 'Court Politics and Parliamentary Conflict in 1625', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England* eds. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (Harlow, 1989), p.171.

bedchamber because of his drunkenness.⁴⁶ But despite the Duke's fears, his influence at Court and over the government was stronger after the accession of Charles I. Sir John Savile's success in attaching himself more securely to the favourite ensured that during 1626-8 he had a grip on local office, giving him the initiative in the politics of Yorkshire. He was able to make life extremely difficult for his rival, although his position in Buckingham's circle of patronage did not necessarily prevent Wentworth from entering it, as it did not in the summer of 1628. In the summer of 1625 and again in the spring of 1626 there were opportunities for Wentworth to demonstrate his willingness to serve the Duke. The fact that he failed to do so in a manner which would satisfy Buckingham is evidence of the problem of divided loyalties with which the county gentry across the country wrestled, and should be remembered when considering his relationship with the Duke in the summer of 1628.

In April 1625 Wentworth decided to stand for the shire in the first Parliament of the new reign. He appears to have had a renewed burst of energy following his disappointments of 1623 and 1624, believing it unwise to abandon himself to retirement and self-pity. He shared his thoughts with his friend and cousin Christopher Wandesford:

'...weare it reasonable, think yow, for a man of my iudgment and valew rashly to abandon my selfe and high designes to stand bare and bleake, like a beacon on the topp of a hill, without consultacon, without counsell? Farr bee it from yow (yow will now saic) soc to ymagine, farther from mee so supinely to sleepe, whilst all others are awake.'⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, pp. 12-13, Mead to Stuteville 23 April 1625. Villiers was instead banished from Court.

⁴⁷ Str. P. 2/170 4 April 1625.

Writing to George Butler, Wentworth states that he was ‘overperswaded and then engaged’ by his friends to stand for the shire, but once engaged he appears to have worked as hard as he did in 1621 to prevent Sir John Savile winning a county seat, although he was cautious enough to make contingency plans.⁴⁸ On the day of the election, the sheriff was forced to halt the voting because of the threat of riot and he simply declared the return of Wentworth and his partner, Sir Thomas Fairfax. When Savile petitioned Parliament to have Wentworth’s return declared void, one of Wentworth’s supporters believed that he would have no difficulty in combating Savile’s action: ‘I doubt not but you are sufficiently provided of frends there to manifest unto the howse of Parliament the just and equall carriage of that busines.’⁴⁹ But this was not the case and the majority of the Commons, in particular Court members, accepted Savile’s argument.⁵⁰ In local terms this was a short-lived victory as Wentworth was re-elected and sat at Oxford in August, but it demonstrated Savile’s growing influence at Court.

Wentworth himself was not left totally stranded at Court after the removal of Cranfield and Calvert’s resignation. His second marriage in February 1625 to Arabella Holles, daughter of the Earl of Clare, gave him a father-in-law who was to be a notable critic of Charles I’s excessive reliance on the prerogative,

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 2/177-8 1 May 1625. He wrote to Mr. Cowper, mayor of Pontefract, asking that he be elected together with Sir John Jackson to represent the borough if he failed to win a county seat, *ibid.* 2/175, 1 May 1625. See also *ibid.* 2/172 Wentworth to Sir Francis Trappes; *ibid.* 2/173 Wentworth to Sir Peter Middleton; *ibid.* 2/174 Wentworth to Sir John Jackson, all 6 April 1625; *ibid.* 2/176 Wentworth to Henry Stapleton; *ibid.* Wentworth to Sir John Hotham; *ibid.* 2/177 Wentworth to John Melton, all 1 May 1625.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 20/241, John Grymesdyche to Wentworth 20 May 1625. See also Hirst, *The Representative of the People?* p. 14; *The Memoirs of Sir Hugh Cholmley* (privately printed, 1787), pp. 23-4.

⁵⁰ Gardiner, *History of England* vol. V, pp. 349-51; Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry*, p. 286.

but Clare had useful connections particularly with John Williams, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal and Bishop of Lincoln, who was one of the few guests present at Wentworth's wedding.⁵¹ But Williams's standing at Court did not long outlive the death of James I. He annoyed the new King by explaining to him that it was not possible to continue James's last Parliament, but that 'the old Parliament determined with his death that call'd it in his own Name'. Charles was reluctantly forced to accept that this was indeed the correct procedure, and Williams's opposition to the King's decision to move the session to Oxford cost him his office.⁵² Hacket chose to stress Buckingham's role in his dismissal, but the King was 'glad to be rid of him', regarding him as a nuisance and Charles compounded the blow by ordering him to stay away

⁵¹ Str. P. 34/ not numbered, Radcliffe's notes for his life of Strafford. Clare's ambitions for high office had been thwarted by the death of his greatest patron Prince Henry and the disgrace of another, the Earl of Somerset. His correspondence with Williams reveals his bitterness at this failure, P. R. Seddon ed., *Letters of John Holles 1587-1637*, (3 vols. Thoroton Society, 1983), vol. 2, pp. 361-3, 8 Aug 1627; *ibid.* pp. 366-9, 19 Aug 1627; Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London, 1993), pp. 20-28.

⁵² In 1621 it had been agreed that Williams would hold office for a probationary period of eighteen months and, if his work was satisfactory, he would continue in office for another eighteen months. This agreement had not been observed by James I, but it was used by Charles as a means of removing Williams; Geraint Wynn Thomas, 'Archbishop John Williams: Politics and Prerogative Law, 1621-1642', D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford (1974), pp. 39, 205. Charles chose to ignore Williams's warning that if he moved the session to Oxford, it was still the same session and it was not the Commons' custom to give twice in one session; Hacket, *Scrinia Reserata*, part II, pp. 4-5, 13-18, 22-4; Thomas, 'Archbishop John Williams', p. 197; G. A. Harrison, 'Innovation and Precedent: a procedural reappraisal of the 1625 Parliament', *English Historical Review* 102 (1987), p. 60. See *Short Title Catalogue of English Books printed before 1641* ed. A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (London, 1926), no. 9246, 'A Declaration of the True Causes which moved his Majestie to assemble...and dissolve the last two meetings of Parliament' [30 June 1626], for the King's admitted reluctance to follow Williams's advice.

from the Council Board.⁵³ The removal of Williams, coming so quickly after the demise of Cranfield and Calvert's resignation, left Wentworth once again with no substantial means of access to the Court. But Buckingham's difficulties with the 1625 session meant that he was open to offers of assistance from prominent members of Parliament. As part of his own campaign to regain Buckingham's favour Bishop Williams asked Wentworth to promise that he would assist the King's business at Oxford and not 'joyn with any that should fly upon my Lord Duke'. The Duke accepted this offer and apparently promised his favour as a reward.⁵⁴ But Wentworth's comments in Parliament at Oxford did not endear himself to either the favourite or the King. His speech on 10 August made it clear that he did not accept the argument that the House was 'engaged' to support the Crown's military policies and believed that supply should wait until after the business of the commonwealth had been addressed. Two days later he made a particularly sharp remark on Buckingham's performance as Lord Admiral in response to Sir Edward Villiers's intervention, mindful no doubt of the harrassment of northern coastal towns by Dunkirk privateers.⁵⁵ He had to consider his obligation to the electorate of Yorkshire, particularly after he had trumpeted his role as a committed spokesperson for the county during his second election.⁵⁶ Put together there was certainly enough in his words to annoy Buckingham. This failure to avoid criticising the Duke led directly to his

⁵³ Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VI, p. 31; Hacket, *Scrinia Reserata*, part II, pp. 16-17. For Clare's reaction to the news see Seddon ed., *Letters of John Holles*, vol. II, p. 310, Clare to Williams 22 Oct 1625; *ibid.* p. 311, same to same 24 Oct 1625.

⁵⁴ Hacket, *Scrinia Reserata*, part II, p. 17; Str. P. 40/50, Wentworth to Weston undated.

⁵⁵ W. B. Bidwell and Maija Jansson eds., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1625* (New Haven, 1987), pp. 445, 451, 475; S. R. Gardiner ed., *Debates in the House of Commons in 1625* (Camden Society, new series, 6, 1873), p. 126; Salt, 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire', p. 156.

selection as sheriff in November 1625 and his removal from local office in July 1626. Richard Cust has stressed that a political purge, rather than a removal of unsuitable candidates, was unusual and that the hand of Buckingham can be clearly seen in the majority of expulsions from county office in 1626.⁵⁷ But it is not at all clear that Buckingham was the driving force behind the selection of sheriffs in November 1625. The pricking of sheriffs coincided with the issuing of instructions for disarming recusants which had the novel feature of naming certain recusant peers while omitting others who enjoyed close court connections, thus making royal suspicions about the loyalty of those named all too apparent. This was the King's doing; and it is worth considering whether or not the pricking of sheriffs was also largely the work of the King himself.⁵⁸

Two crucial pieces of evidence are provided by Sir Arthur Ingram's letters to Wentworth, both probably written in November 1625 from London.⁵⁹ Ingram did not name his sources, but claimed in the first letter that his information came from 'good Hands', and in his second from 'tow [*sic*] counsellors'. It is possible that one informant was Williams, who had only recently lost his office of Lord Keeper, and may have seen paperwork relating to the selection of sheriffs. Richard Weston may also have discussed the Duke's attitude towards Wentworth with Ingram, although both these points are nothing more than conjecture. Whoever his sources were, Ingram was able to warn Wentworth on 7 November that his name was under consideration for the

⁵⁶ G. W. Johnson ed., *The Fairfax Correspondence* (2 vols. London, 1848), p. 9; Salt, 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire', p. 155.

⁵⁷ Cust, *Forced Loan*, pp. 187-9.

⁵⁸ B. W. Quintrell, 'The Practice and Problems of Recusant Disarming, 1585-1641' *Recusant History* 17 (1985), pp. 215-17.

⁵⁹ Str. P. 20/243, 7 Nov 1625; *ibid.* 20/254, undated (but written before 20/245, same to same 21 Nov).

shrievalty and told him that he would have to regard it as 'a suffering for' his 'Carryadge in Parlimentt.' According to Ingram, Buckingham was convinced that a combined opposition had operated against him in Parliament: Archbishop Abbot, Williams, the Earls of Arundel and Pembroke were the suspects in the Upper House and the Duke believed a number of members of the Commons had combined with them. Buckingham had not ruled Wentworth out of involvement in this and Sir Humphrey May had allegedly poisoned the Duke and the King against him, although Weston had done his best to counteract this.⁶⁰ On 13 November at Whitehall, Charles selected his sheriffs not only from the customary judges's list of recommendations, but also from another list which gave the names of seven members of the House of Commons in the recent Parliament. Ingram explained to Wentworth how the King announced his choice of sheriffs:

'The Judges proseaded in ther ould courss and so wentt itt to the King, butt when the names cam to the King, the king declared him self thatt hee had the names of seaven that hee would have shereffs and so named them him self and my Lord Kepper (*sic*) sett them down. Itt was tould me by tow counsellors thatt in the naming of you the king said you wear a[n] honest gentellman, butt nott a tittell to anny of the rest.'

Ingram claimed that no-one at Court would have been able to avert it, 'For itt was sett and resolved whatt should bee donn befor the greatt duk's gowing over and from thatt the King would nott chang a tittell.'⁶¹ Buckingham had sailed from Harwich eight days before the formal pricking took place, and had not been at Court since early October.⁶²

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 20/243, 7 Nov 1625.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 20/254, undated.

⁶² Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, pp. 61-2, Mead to Stuteville 12 Nov 1625.

Charles's comment regarding Wentworth's honesty deserves attention. It might have been a genuinely surprised reaction to seeing his name on the list, an interpretation which fits with the view that Buckingham was responsible for suggesting names and Charles simply read them out. As we do not know what Charles's tone of voice was when he spoke the words, they can be interpreted in another way. His comment may have been designed to make it known to Wentworth's contacts that he regarded him as being not as bad as the rest, and that if he accepted his punishment without complaint and mended his ways he might expect some change in fortune. If this was the case, then the King appears to have had a more significant part in the selection of names. It has been naively suggested that the King's comment was a sarcastic one, but there is no evidence to support that assertion, other than Charles's comment regarding another pricked sheriff, Richard Knightley, which nevertheless was more prophetic than sarcastic: 'now he shall have work enough'.⁶³

The pricking of Richard Knightley as sheriff of Northamptonshire is another important part of this business. Knightley had come to Charles's attention after a violent altercation with the recusant peer Lord Vaux. As a deputy lieutenant Knightley had been involved in the search for recusant arms at the home of Vaux's mother.⁶⁴ Noonkester points out that Secretary Conway described this incident and the pricking of Knightley at length in a letter to the Duke written on 30 November.⁶⁵ He has argued that this must mean that Buckingham had not planned Knightley's selection, but Conway did not give a similar amount of detail about the selection of other sheriffs. He simply enclosed a list of those who had been pricked 'by extraordinary Recommendation', indicating that

⁶³ M. C. Noonkester, 'Charles I and Shrieval Selection, 1625-6', *Historical Research* 64 (1991), pp. 305-11, 308; Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, p. 140.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* vol. I, p. 56, Mead to Stuteville 10 Oct 1625.

⁶⁵ British Library [hereafter BL], Harleian MS. 1580, ff. 341-3v.

while the Duke was not responsible for Knightley's inclusion, he would not be surprised at the rest of the names. Knightley's reaction to his selection and his hope that Buckingham would be able to get him off the hook would seem to bear this out.

But there is evidence which can support an alternative version of events. Buckingham himself disclaimed any part in this appointment, telling Wentworth in Weston's presence shortly before Whitsuntide in 1626 that he had not been responsible for his pricking.⁶⁶ Buckingham appears to have made his feelings clear to those who opposed him: shortly after Charles's accession he told Cottington that he intended to try and destroy his career.⁶⁷ Either his busy schedule between the dissolution of Parliament and his voyage to the Hague meant that he had not been involved in any way in the planning of Wentworth's punishment, and his denial of responsibility was indeed genuine, or it is possible that he had at least some part in it, even if he was not directly responsible for his pricking. Much of this rests on the problem that we do not know exactly when a list of parliamentary trouble-makers was drawn up and when it was decided to punish them by pricking them sheriff. A letter from Sir George Paul to Secretary Conway written on 24 October suggests that the removal of several influential and obstructive members would enable the King to secure parliamentary supply. Buckingham had already parted from the King, preparing for his journey to the Hague, and Paul's letter may indicate, therefore, that a decision to select trouble-makers had not been finalised.⁶⁸ It may have been done as late as the beginning of November when Buckingham

⁶⁶ This was one of two meetings between Wentworth and Buckingham at which Weston was present; the other was during the Easter term, Str. P. 40/50, Wentworth to Weston undated [July 1626].

⁶⁷ Martin J. Havran, *Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington* (London, 1973), p. 82.

⁶⁸ SP 16/8/34; Noonkester, 'Shrieval Selection', p. 305. Paul was a member of Parliament and an adviser to the Duke; Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham* (Harlow, 1981), p. 273.

had already sailed for Holland, a possibility which is strengthened by the fact that Ingram was informed of Wentworth's likely punishment in early November and rumours appear to have reached others in Yorkshire not long after. Lord President Scrope apparently thought it likely that Wentworth would be pricked sheriff of that county before the formal announcement was made.⁶⁹

It is also important to bear in mind that before his interview with Buckingham at Whitsuntide, Wentworth himself seems to have assumed that he had not incurred the Duke's lasting animosity. In January 1626, believing that Scrope wished to relinquish the Presidency of the Council of the North, Wentworth had written to Secretary Conway asking for his assistance in his suit, explaining that he would not press it without the approval of the Duke.⁷⁰ In April 1626 Weston had taken Wentworth to Whitehall where Buckingham had been prepared to set aside all their previously poor relations.⁷¹ What happened in the intervening few weeks is not clear, but in July Wentworth was removed from the Commission of the Peace and the Keepership of the Rolls. This in itself tells us little as sheriffs could not remain on the Commission, but he was replaced with Savile, which suggests that either Buckingham or the King

⁶⁹ Str. P. 20/243; *ibid.* 20/244, Scrope to Wentworth 16 Nov 1625 (from York), in which Scrope asked that Wentworth appoint a servant of his to the attachment office in the sheriff's court. This letter is dated three days after the formal pricking took place: Wentworth asked the servant concerned whether the Lord President had known of his pricking when he wrote the letter and the servant replied that Scrope had not known for certain, but was confident that Wentworth would be pricked sheriff, *ibid.* 21/35, Wentworth to Wandesford 5 Dec 1626.

⁷⁰ SP 16/18/110, 20 Jan 1626. Wentworth must have assumed, or at least hoped, that Scrope would resign as his religious sympathies were shortly to be attacked in the Commons; *HMC, Fourth Report, Appendix* (London, 1874), p. 6, Petition of the House of Commons to the King, 11 March 1626.

⁷¹ Str. P. 40/50, Wentworth to Weston undated [July 1626].

himself wished to make the punishment especially severe.⁷² In Somerset, the pricked Sir Robert Phelips witnessed his local enemy John Poulett receive marks of the King's favour and it is possible that Savile owed his rise as much to the King himself as to the Duke.⁷³

The weight of evidence suggests that both Charles and Buckingham were involved at some point in this matter. If Buckingham's denial is genuine, then it is likely that the Duke had done no more than furnish the King with names of obstructive members, possibly soon after the dissolution of the 1625 Parliament. Charles might have decided on a course of action after the Duke had sailed; this could account for the fact that Ingram's informers became aware of Wentworth's likely punishment in early November. Contemporaries viewed Buckingham as the guilty party: this was clearly Ingram's view and probably also that of some of the pricked sheriffs who contemplated standing for Parliament in order to restart their attack on the Duke. But Wentworth found it difficult to believe that the Duke had set out to ruin him and he appears to have been determined to gain his favour as quickly as possible. His removal from the Commission of the Peace may well have embittered him, but until then Wentworth was not prepared to risk alienating the King and

⁷² The king's letter discharging Wentworth from office was handed to him in session in an attempt to humiliate him, but he responded in a typically assertive manner: 'the worlde may well thinke I knew the way which would have kept my place. I confesse in deed itt had been too deare a purchase, and soe I leave itt, not consciouse of any fault in myself, nor yet guilty of the vertue in my successor, that should occasion this removall', *ibid.* 40/50. Wentworth was not included in the *Liber Pacis* for the West Riding in October 1626, Public Record Office [hereafter PRO], Exchequer 163/18/12, but was probably reinstated in late 1628 or early 1629. He appears in the Commissions of the Peace for all three Ridings, and as Keeper of the Rolls in the West Riding, in January - February 1632, SP 16/212. I owe these references to Dr. Quintrell.

⁷³ Noonkester, 'Shrieval Selection', p. 310.

Buckingham any further. When he was shown a way by which he could still sit in the House of Commons, tempting though it was, he took little time before deciding against it.

In November 1625 Ingram informed Wentworth of a conversation he had had with Sir Francis Seymour at Reading. Seymour had been pricked sheriff of Wiltshire, to keep him out of the 1626 Parliament, but he intended to challenge the King's action and hoped for Wentworth's assistance. Seymour proposed that Wentworth secure him a burgess's place in the north and he would do the same for Wentworth in the west. Seymour understood that both Sir Edward Coke and Sir Robert Phelips, also pricked sheriff for the same reason, planned to stand for Parliament. Ingram dared not give Wentworth any encouragement as this course of action would anger the King.⁷⁴ Indeed on informing Wentworth of his selection only a few days previously, Ingram had advised him 'to undergow itt cherfully' and pointed out that his reputation had already risen in the eyes of 'the publick who speak most strongly of itt'.⁷⁵ Wentworth took Ingram's advice and wrote to his father-in-law informing him of the plan, but also of his decision not to defy the King.⁷⁶ Clare approved of his caution, arguing that 'This is a Novelty and a Straunger, that a Sheriff, who, according to the receaved rule of our forefathers, is tyed to his County as a snail to his shel, may cause him self to be chosen a Burges, or servant for a Borough, and so in a sort quit the greater and the King's Service for a subiects, and a less: thearfor as a Novelty, it is rather to be followed then to beginn it'. Clare could, however, see advantages as well as disadvantages to this line of action. If the plan succeeded, it might 'make great on[e]s more caut[i]ous in wrasling with

⁷⁴ Str. P. 20/246, 22 Nov 1625. See also Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, pp. 72-3, Chamberlain to Carleton 19 Jan 1626.

⁷⁵ Str. P. 20/254, [Nov 1625].

⁷⁶ This letter has apparently not survived.

that Hy Court'. Clare would be pleased if Coke and Phelips were returned as burgesses, and Seymour too, as long as Wentworth's hand was not seen in it. He concluded by confirming Wentworth's own opinion and restating his own view: 'this busines is of such a natuer, as it is mucche better to be a spectator then an actor'.⁷⁷ Wentworth shared his thoughts on the matter with Wandesford, telling him he had decided not to flout the King's wishes.⁷⁸ By early 1626 news of this plan had leaked out: John Chamberlain informed Sir Dudley Carleton of a rumour that Coke, Phelips and Seymour planned to sit in Parliament, and Coke was indeed returned as Knight of the Shire for Norfolk.⁷⁹ Charles's reaction to Coke's election and to a similar case involving Walter Long, sheriff of Wiltshire in 1627-8, made Clare's words and Wentworth's decision seem very sensible.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Str. P. 22/54, 27 Nov 1625. This letter is also worthy of note for Clare's opinions on the state of government: 'Yow resolve, in my opinion, of this particular rightly, for wee live under a prerogative goverment, whear book law submits unto *lex loquens*; then be these extraordinaries, that rely rather upon inference or interpretation then the letter, too weak staves for suche subiects to leane upon'. Clare described Charles's pricking of sheriffs for political reasons as a 'trick'; Seddon ed., *Letters of John Holles*, vol. II, p. 317, Clare to Earl of Exeter 4 Jan 1626. See also *ibid.*, p. 340, Clare to Williams 24 Nov 1626, for Clare's views that the law had become subject to the prerogative.

⁷⁸ Str. P. 21/35, 5 Dec 1625.

⁷⁹ McLure, *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, vol. II, p. 628, Chamberlain to Carleton 19 January 1626; Noonkester, 'Shrieval Selection', p. 311.

⁸⁰ Bidwell and Jansson eds., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1626* (3 vols. New Haven, 1991-2), vol. II, pp. 12, 35-8, 83-4, 105-6 134-5; *DNB*, 'Sir Edward Coke'. This matter came before the Commons' Committee for Privilege, Thompson ed., *Sir John Borough's Notes of Proceedings in Committees of the House of Commons 27 February - 23 March 1626* (Wivenhoe, 1988), p. 1, and was still a topic of interest several years later, PRO, Chancery [hereafter C] 115, Scudamore Papers M31 no. 8121, John Flower to Scudamore 6 Feb 1630, mentioning the Star Chamber prosecution of Walter Long '...who when he was made Sheriffe, procured himselfe to be elected a Burgess of the Parliament, and contrarie to his duetie, without Licence left his Countrie and served in the Parliament. He did it (as it

During 1626 Wentworth, together with Clare, turned their attention towards another former supporter of the favourite, the Earl of Arundel. Arundel was a focus of interest for those opposing the Duke's power and had set out to try and reduce the favourite's power and influence early in the new reign. But he had only succeeded in antagonising Charles and strengthening the Duke's influence at Court. Arundel's suggestion that the new King avoid his father's errors and restrict the distribution of titles to men of noble birth only, received no backing in Council and Buckingham was not likely to forgive such a deliberate attack on his origins and rise to power.⁸¹ It was repaid the following February when Buckingham contrived to ruin Arundel's arrangements for the King's coronation.⁸² The marriage of Arundel's heir, Lord Maltravers, to Lady Elizabeth Stuart, sister of the Duke of Lennox, without royal consent, was given as the reason for Arundel's imprisonment in the Tower in February 1626, although Vernon Snow has argued convincingly that it was the Earl's stance on the issue of proxy voting, and not his son's marriage, which prompted Charles and Buckingham to punish him.⁸³ Clare saw the Earl

seemes) presuming that the Parliament writt would beare him out'. See also Mary Frear Keeler, *The Long Parliament, 1640-1641: A Biographical Study of its Members* (Philadelphia, 1954), pp. 256-7.

⁸¹ *CSPV, 1625-1626*, p. 12, Pesaro to Doge and Senate 18 April 1625; *ibid.* p. 21, same to same 25 April 1625.

⁸² Arundel had arranged that the royal barge would moor at the river close to Sir Robert Cotton's house, who had planned an elaborate reception. Buckingham, however, had the barge rowed past Cotton's steps and moored nearer to Parliament where the King clambered out. Buckingham had also been given the post of Constable for the coronation, which allowed him to upstage Arundel; M. F. S. Hervey, *The Life, Correspondence and Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, (New York, 1969), pp. 238-9.

⁸³ Vernon F. Snow, 'The Arundel Case, 1626', *The Historian* 26 (1964), pp. 323-49; Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, pp. 86-7, Meddus to Mead 10 March 1626. When Arundel was confined, Clare gave him advice on how he should respond to the king's order that he

Marshal's imprisonment as a tactical move, designed by the Duke to disrupt the opposition forming against him in the House of Lords. He wrote to his wife that 'Buckingham blowes the coales, gladd of the occasion to be ridd of the Marshall, and surely this man prospers in all ways, be they never so bad, and lyke an yrishe dogg, wrings our necks asunder lyke sheepe.'⁸⁴ He reported to the Earl of Exeter that after finding Buckingham at Salisbury House, the Duke engaged him in conversation concerning the details of the impeachment charges. Clare took the opportunity to raise the issue of the Earl Marshal's imprisonment in the context of the privileges of the Upper House. 'This he acknowledged, declyning a fuller answear'.⁸⁵ But other evidence suggests that Charles himself was keen to see Arundel removed from Parliament and the Court. Arundel was allowed to take his seat in the Lords in early June after the King and the Duke had bowed to pressure from the House of Lords, but he was refused access to the Court until the summer of 1628. But Buckingham understood well enough that he could not rely on the King's aversion to Parliament to safeguard himself against attacks from a combination of powerful nobles and before the end of 1626 he had made overtures of peace towards Arundel and Pembroke. In contrast, Charles maintained a hostile attitude towards the Earl Marshal.⁸⁶

If Buckingham recognised the strength of opposition to him in the Upper House, he was also very much aware that the removal of Wentworth, Seymour and Phelips from the 1626 Parliament had not made the Commons a more tractable body. Indeed removing Wentworth but allowing the less restrained

surrender his proxies, Seddon ed., *Letters of John Holles*, vol. II, pp. 322-3, ? Feb 1626; p. 328 [12 April] 1626. Earlier Clare had asked the Earl Marshal to explain to the king why he was unable to attend the coronation, *ibid.*, vol. II, pp. 318-9, 24 Jan 1626.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 325, 10 March 1626.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, vol II., pp. 329-30, 16 May 1626.

⁸⁶ See below, p. 46.

Christopher Wandesford to sit does not appear to have been a sensible strategy.⁸⁷ Sir John Eliot's determination to impeach the favourite had led to a dissolution, but Charles's financial worries could not be so readily dissolved. When the defeat of his uncle Christian IV of Denmark brought home to the King his failure to provide adequate support for the Protestant cause - his sister's cause - Charles decided to raise funds in a heavy-handed manner. The King's decision to raise money through a forced loan, in effect levying subsidies without parliamentary approval, put many men like Wentworth - the backbone of county government and society - in an intolerable situation.

Writing to Wandesford in early December 1625, Wentworth stated that he had resolved not 'to contend with the prerogative out of a Parliament, nor yet to contest with a Kinge *but when I am constrained therunto*, or els make shipwrack of my inward integritie and peace of conscience.'⁸⁸ He was referring to his decision not to seek election as a burgess in defiance of the King, referred to above. But a year later he found it much more difficult to follow the same course. Wentworth received conflicting advice from his friends and relatives on how he should respond. His friend George Radcliffe took a firm stance and was imprisoned in the spring of 1627.⁸⁹ Several letters in the Holles correspondence indicate that the Earl of Clare found himself in an uncomfortable situation once he had been advised of the King's personal involvement.⁹⁰ He probably discussed his options with Wentworth when the latter brought his wife on a visit to her parents in December 1626, and he also

⁸⁷ Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, p. 101, D'Ewes to Stuteville 11 May 1626.

⁸⁸ Str. P. 2/184, 5 Dec 1625, my italics.

⁸⁹ T. D. Whitaker ed., *The Life and Original Correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe* (London, 1810), pp. 139-41, Radcliffe to his wife 30 April 1627.

⁹⁰ Seddon ed., *Letters of John Holles*, vol. II, pp. 342-3, Clare to Haughton 30 Dec 1626; *ibid.* pp. 341-2, Clare to Countess of Banbury 27 Dec 1626; *ibid.* p. 343 same to same 1 Jan 1627; *ibid.* pp. 343-4 Clare to Buckingham 1 Jan 1627; Cust, *Forced Loan*, pp. 104-5.

sought advice from his old friend Bishop Williams.⁹¹ That Wentworth took a long time to decide on his course of action is evident from Clare's letter to his wife of 19 May 1627 which stated that Wentworth had written to Radcliffe - already imprisoned in the Marshalsea - asking him to consult Clare on his behalf. The Earl advised his son-in-law not to refuse, but if he decided to do so to come to London before he was sent for. Clare thought that Wentworth might have received advice to delay his visit to London until Buckingham had sailed on the Rhé expedition; he thought that there was some sense in this as the Duke's departure might bring a change of tone, but his departure had been delayed several times already and might not take place at all.⁹² Wentworth received letters from other friends and relatives urging him to pay the loan, most notably from his first wife's brother Lord Clifford, and his close friend George Calvert, now Lord Baltimore. Writing from London at the end of April, Clifford advised him to give his answer either to the commissioners or to the Council, but later urged him instead to 'slip the money into sum Commissioner's hande', fearing that an appearance before the Council was what Savile hoped he would choose.⁹³ George Radcliffe believed that Savile had stirred up the loan business and ensured that his Yorkshire enemies would be firmly dealt with.⁹⁴ Calvert warned Wentworth that his enemies hoped to see him effect his own downfall by persisting in refusing; he urged him to either pay or come to London to make his answer to the Privy Council, where his friends would be better able to advise him. Calvert also altered his advice, fearing that Wentworth had held back for long enough and that if he chose to pay he should do so immediately in the county, rather than delay his answer

⁹¹ Seddon ed., *Letters of John Holles*, vol. II, p. 342, Clare to Haughton 30 Dec 1626.

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 350-1.

⁹³ Str. P. 16/169, 30 April 1627; *ibid.* 16/171, 20 May 1627.

⁹⁴ Whitaker ed., *Radcliffe*, pp. 143-5, Radcliffe to his wife 7 May 1627.

any longer.⁹⁵ In case Wentworth thought that the driving force behind this tough course was Buckingham, Clifford insisted that the Duke's departure to Rhe would not make any difference: 'the Kinge takes the punishment into his owne direction.'⁹⁶ Mead reported that the Duke's supporters were 'more eagerly persecuting his enemies in his absence than himself did at home', supporting Clifford's reading of the situation rather than Clare's.⁹⁷

Charles's involvement in the forced loan was recognised by contemporaries who warned their friends against refusing. But it was also evident that 'slip[ping] the money into sum Commissioner's hande' was not regarded by the King as an acceptable response. He expected to receive firm, committed support for the loan from the peerage and county gentry, putting them under immense pressure. Clifford's remark that the King's 'harte is soe enflamed in this business as he vowes a perpetual remembrance as well as a present punishment', forced Wentworth, like Phelips, to face the prospect of enduring long-lasting disgrace. Phelips chose to pay, albeit discreetly, in order to try and secure restoration to royal favour after being pricked sheriff the previous November.⁹⁸ Wentworth decided otherwise: he recognised that he had only a very slim chance of ousting his rival Sir John Savile from the Duke's favour, and was unlikely to regain the office of *custos rotulorum*. The only concrete thing left to him was the respect which he received from the county and refusing the loan could only enhance it.

⁹⁵ Str. P. 12/5, 1 May 1627; *ibid.* 12/6, 21 May 1627.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* 16/171, 20 May 1627. The Duke left for Rhe on 24 June.

⁹⁷ Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, p. 253, Mead to Stuteville 21 July 1627.

⁹⁸ Str. P. 16/171, 2 May 1627; Cust, *Forced Loan*, pp. 106-11; Derek Hirst, 'The Privy Council and Problems of Enforcement in the 1620s', *Journal of British Studies* 18 (1979), p. 50. See also Edward, Lord Montagu's paper setting out the reasons for his willingness not only to pay, but to encourage others to do likewise; *HMC, Fifteenth Report, Appendix VIII, Duke of Buccleuch and Queenberry* (Drumlanrig I), (London, 1897), p. 265.

Wentworth eventually decided to present his answer at the board.⁹⁹ In June he delayed his appearance before the Privy Council for a few days, excusing himself on the grounds of ill-health.¹⁰⁰ According to his father-in-law, ‘he carried himself discreetly’ before the Council on 29 June, leading Clare to hope that his punishment would entail only a few days’ imprisonment, followed by confinement ‘according to his own desyre.’¹⁰¹ On 7 July the Earl of Manchester, President of the Council, reported to the King that Wentworth had made a ‘fair and dutiful’ answer, but had continued to refuse and was therefore committed.¹⁰² During his restraint in the Marshalsea and later in Dartford, together with George Radcliffe, he was kept informed of political affairs, in particular of rumours that Parliament would be recalled. Wandesford wrote regularly to him.¹⁰³ Relatives and friends dealt with his petitions to the Privy Council. Arthur Ingram handled the business of his first petition to the Council board to be allowed to attend to business in London for six days which was read and approved by the King.¹⁰⁴ His brother William Wentworth informed him that the council was busy dealing with the *habeas corpus* case and his second petition (to be allowed to make another such visit) had not yet

⁹⁹ SP 16/65/12(II), Wentworth to the loan commissioners of the West Riding 27 May 1627. Wentworth’s status allowed him this privilege, compared with his cousin Christopher Wandesford: ‘I doe not thinke itt fitt for me to desyre to give my answere att the table, or if I should, could I obtayne itt, but I must deny here’, Str. P. 16/261, Wandesford to Wentworth 9 Sept 1627.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* 21/44, Wentworth to Manchester 3 June 1627.

¹⁰¹ Seddon ed., *Letters of John Holles* vol. II, p. 354, Clare to Lady Clare 30 June 1627.

¹⁰² SP 16/70/45, 7 July 1627. Wentworth served two weeks in the Marshalsea before going into confinement in Dartford; Seddon ed., *Letters of John Holles* vol. II, p. 356, Clare to Williams 18 July; *ibid.* p. 358, Clare to Exeter 22 July.

¹⁰³ Str. P. 12/9, Francis Burdett to Wentworth 14 Aug 1627; *ibid.* 16/261, 16/262, 16/242, 16/262, all Wandesford to Wentworth [early Sept], 9 Sept , Nov, 26 Nov 1627.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 12/15, Ingram to Wentworth 30 Oct 1627; *ibid.* 12/16, same to same 4 Nov 1627.

been answered. The Earl of Dorset was willing to submit this petition to Charles and Ingram handled the business with advice from Weston, Clare and Philip Mainwaring.¹⁰⁵ After five months' confinement, Wentworth was informed of the King's decision to release the loan refusers by Dorset and, in addition, by the unsympathetic Sir Humphrey May. The Earl's friendly note expressed gladness at the King's action, and was not critical of Wentworth's course. May's letter, on the other hand, broke the news in quite a different tone:

‘Yesternight out of more grace and favour then all you refractory fooles can deserve, his Majesty gave order for a generall releasement out of your severall confinements. I call you fooles, aswell for the damage you have donne to your selves, as for the interest of our posterities that may suffer by your ill example. Do not constere this course as an argument of a parliament at hand, for I protest faithfully it is very far from it.’¹⁰⁶

One month later, however, Charles chose to take such a course.¹⁰⁷ While Wentworth's imprisonment for refusing the loan doubtless secured him respect in his county, it was not enough to guarantee him the representation of the shire in the 1628 Parliament.¹⁰⁸ Savile had much support from the recusant community and if Wentworth hoped to be elected Wandesford advised him to

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* 22/3, William Wentworth to Wentworth 26 Nov 1627; *ibid.* 24-25/8, petition to the King [Nov 1627]; *ibid.* 12/20 Ingram to Wentworth 1 Dec 1627.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 22/2, Dorset to Wentworth; 12/20(b) May to Wentworth, both [27 Dec 1627].

¹⁰⁷ Charles decided on 29 January 1628 to summon his third Parliament, after a lengthy and fierce council debate; Cust, *Forced Loan*, pp. 72-85; Cust, ‘Charles I, the Privy Council and the Parliament of 1628’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* sixth series, 2 (1992), pp. 26-30.

¹⁰⁸ Cust, ‘Politics and the Electorate in the 1620s’, p. 150.

stand with Henry Bellasis, who was well regarded by the Catholic gentry.¹⁰⁹ During the last eighteen months Savile had been able to use Buckingham's support to establish control over all three ridings of Yorkshire. Conscious of the accusation that could be levied at him by the county gentry, that he was merely a creature of the Court - a charge he had himself made against Calvert five years earlier - he had tried to curry favour with as many influential men as possible. Charles I's attempts to raise non-parliamentary finance had given him an opportunity to do so. In May 1626 Sir Henry Savile complained to Wentworth that Sir John Savile had managed to take control of the collectorship of the Privy Seal loans in the West Riding from Sir Henry and his brother-in-law, Sir Henry Goodricke.¹¹⁰ Sir John had apparently procured letters from the Privy Council to interrupt the collection of the money while he tried to have the assessment reduced, as a means of gaining popularity in the country. His new division of the assessment, Sir Henry Savile argued, was made in favour of his friends.¹¹¹ During June and July Savile had received further fruits of Buckingham's favour. In late June Joseph Mead reported rumours that Sir John Savile was about to be given the presidency of the Council, and although Scrope was able to hang on to his place, Savile was appointed Vice-President in late July and was in practice the dominating figure on the Council.¹¹² In November he was sworn a privy councillor,¹¹³ and also in July it was Sir John who replaced Wentworth as *custos rotulorum* of the West Riding. Wentworth put a brave face on this loss of office:

¹⁰⁹ Str. P. 16/246, [Jan 1628], *ibid.* 16/245, 16-20 Jan 1628.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* 20/258, Sir Henry Savile to Wentworth 1 May 1626. Sir Henry was a kinsman of Sir John.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* 20/259, Savile to Weston [copy enclosed with above].

¹¹² Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, p. 116, Mead to Stuteville 24 June 1626.

¹¹³ *Acts of the Privy Council, Charles I* (11 vols. London, 1929-64) [hereafter *APC*], vol. I contd., p. 353, 8 Nov 1626; Hirst, 'The Privy Council and Problems of Enforcement in the 1620s', p. 59.

‘Now doubtles the old fellow thinks itt is my night, yett havinge a little knowne the vicisitude which raignes here amongst mortall men, I doe with all pacience and modestie expect better tymes and in the meane space have within my self as cherefull a lighte as maybee’.¹¹⁴

But in the immediate future there was no prospect of the situation changing for the better. Wentworth’s refusal to pay the forced loan in 1627 had allowed Savile to further strengthen his influence both at Court and in the county. In December his rise continued with his appointment as Comptroller of the King’s Household.¹¹⁵ But the fact that Savile enjoyed Buckingham’s favour did not mean that there was no room for his rivals in the Duke’s system of patronage. Viscount Mansfield was confident that his own dispute with Savile over land in Yorkshire would not affect his relationship with the Duke.¹¹⁶ Wentworth’s rivalry with Savile had not assisted his efforts to win the King’s favour, but his punishment in 1625-6 should not be seen as a result of his local feud. Charles needed to be convinced that Wentworth deserved favour and the King appears to have been reluctant to grant him this in June 1628 when Buckingham and Weston both recognised that it would be a wise move to draw him into royal favour. Wentworth was given the baronies of Wentworth Woodhouse and Newmarch and Oversley the day after Savile was given the barony of Pontefract.¹¹⁷

Wentworth’s promotion followed the 1628 session of Parliament in which grievances caused by the Crown’s financial and military policies led the

¹¹⁴ Str. P. 21/36, Wentworth to Charles Radcliffe 19 July 1626.

¹¹⁵ Birch, *Court and Times* vol. I, p. 304, Mead to Stuteville 15 Dec 1627.

¹¹⁶ Str. P. 12/23, Mansfield to Wentworth 24 Jan 1628; SP 16/108/72, Mansfield to Buckingham June 1628.

¹¹⁷ *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series, Charles I*, [hereafter *CSPD*], 1628-1629, pp. 220-22, docquets of 20 and 21 July 1628.

Commons to seek redress through a petition of right. The tension which arose from the determination of both houses to extract the traditional and only acceptable answer from the King left him suspicious of the key participants; Michael Young has noted that this ‘distrust was mutual.’¹¹⁸ L. J. Reeve has noted that the formal reconciliation between the King and a number of peers and senior clergy, arranged by Lord Weston, hardly signified Charles’s willingness to forgive and forget: it was a necessary move, prompted by the recognition at Court that it was unwise for the monarch to have lost the support of a significant number of peers and county gentry.¹¹⁹ Wentworth’s re-entry to Court favour was part of this policy, not a separate event - although his rank did not entitle him to kiss the royal hand - and yet because of his later career, the events of June-July 1628 have never failed to attract attention.¹²⁰

Wentworth’s sudden change in fortune during the summer of 1628 was not well received in his home county: Wentworth was made aware of local opinion by Wandesford, who informed him that ‘the comon opinion’ passed him ‘nowe under Sir John Savile’s character’, believing ‘that there is a Thomas as well as a John for the king.’¹²¹ Clarendon recorded Pym’s accusation that he had ‘turned apostate from these good affections, and,

¹¹⁸ Michael B. Young, ‘Charles I and the Erosion of Trust, 1625-1628’, *Albion* 22 (1990), pp. 217-35, 228.

¹¹⁹ Reeve, *Road to Personal Rule*, pp. 22-3; Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, pp. 358-9, Mead to Stuteville 31 May 1628, naming Abbot, Williams, Essex, Lincoln, Warwick, Bristol and Saye.

¹²⁰ H. D. Traill devoted ten pages of his biography to this subject, arguing that Wentworth’s ‘support of the popular party in the session of 1628 (like his resistance to the forced loan in the previous year) was part of a plan adopted for the purpose of convincing Buckingham that it was better to have him as a friend than an enemy’, *Lord Strafford* (London, 1893), pp. 32-42, quotation p. 37.

¹²¹ Str. P. 16/247, 30 July 1628.

according to the custom and nature of apostates, was become the greatest enemy to the liberties of his country, and the greatest promoter of tyranny, that any age had produced.' Macaulay regarded Wentworth as 'one of the most distinguished members of the opposition' who 'felt towards those whom he had deserted that peculiar malignity which has, in all ages, been characteristic of apostates.'¹²² But this view has been challenged by those who argue that 'sides' did not exist, as well as by those who point to Buckingham's own shifting foreign policy as the major change. As Wedgwood has argued, friendship with Spain probably formed a major part of Wentworth's discussions with Weston in June 1628. Weston recognised that they shared the belief that war against Spain was not in England's economic interests. Wentworth's failure to join in attacks on the Duke in the final stages of the parliamentary session made it possible for Buckingham to consider drawing him into royal service and the fact that he avoided condemnation of recent religious developments meant that he could be made to look acceptable in the eyes of the King. Wedgwood admits that his new status no doubt caused him to be resented by some members of the Commons, but as she rightly points out, in July 1628 he was not assured of receiving any significant office and it needs to be understood that much depended upon the course of royal policy, particularly regarding foreign affairs.¹²³ Opinions of the events of 1628 delivered in 1641 are not helpful in trying to make sense of Wentworth's change in fortune. They tell us much more about 1641 than they do about 1628.

¹²² Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, p. 223; Lord Macaulay, *The History of England* (6 vols. London, 1913-15), vol. I, p. 76. See also John Rushworth, *Historical Collections* 8 vols. (London, 1721), vol. IV, p. 225, for Lord Digby's description of Wentworth as 'that grand Apostate to the Commonwealth'.

¹²³ Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics* (Oxford, 1979), p. 427; Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, pp. 68-70.

It is worth considering Wentworth's own comments on his rise to favour. His first speech as President of the Council of the North, given at York probably in late December 1628, has attracted attention because of the new Lord President's views on the relationship between the monarch and his subjects and the proper role of the Council. But the speech is arguably of greater interest because its opening section contains his thoughts on the course of his career during the previous eighteen months:

'...there weigh me, within the space of one year a bird, a wandring bird cast out of the nest, a prisoner planted here again in my own soil amongst the companions of my youth; my house honoured, myself entrusted with the rich dispensacion of a soveran goodness, nay, assured of all these before I asked, before I thought of any. Can you show me so sudden, so strange variety in a private fortune? Tell me was there ever such over-measure? The like credit given' to so weak a debtor? Baulked indeed before I begin, owing more both to king and people than I shall ever be able to repay to either.'

He gives the impression that his recent rise in fortune owed everything to the simple generosity of the King and nothing to any manoeuvring on his part. But the views expressed in this speech on the manner in which sovereign and people should interact demonstrate what made it possible for Weston to make his approaches.¹²⁴

¹²⁴ Bodleian Library [hereafter Bodl.] Tanner MS. 72, f. 300, printed in *The Academy* VII (5 June 1875), pp. 581-3. No contemporary copy of this speech survives, although this version - made at the Restoration - is regarded as authentic.

Perez Zagorin has discussed this subject in an article in which he argues that Wentworth did indeed ‘change sides’.¹²⁵ He uses as a central piece of evidence a letter written by Sir Edward Stanhope over three years after the event, sent to Wentworth in an attempt to dissuade him from accepting the Deputyship of Ireland. According to Stanhope, Charles was ‘perswaded by the Duke of Buckingham (whoe receaved his informatione from the Lord Treasurer that undertooke to reduce him [Wentworth] to a mylder temper and make him his creature) that he was a man of excellent parts for actione and imployment in the affayres of state’.¹²⁶ According to Zagorin, ‘no other conclusion can be drawn than that Strafford entered the service of the Crown as the dependent or ‘creature’ of Buckingham whose patronage he was at last successful in gaining.’¹²⁷ But was this indeed the case? Another version of events makes no mention of Buckingham. According to Hacket,

‘The L[ord] Treasurer Weston picked out the Northern Cock, Sir Thomas, to make him the King’s Creature, and set him upon the first step of his rising’.¹²⁸

It is likely that a direct approach to Wentworth was made by Weston, who had acted as an intermediary with the Duke in 1626 and who at Wentworth’s request had interceded with Charles in the hope of finding out why he had lost the King’s favour.¹²⁹ If these approaches were made during the last few days of the 1628 session, they took place during Weston’s own rise to great office;

¹²⁵ Zagorin, ‘Did Strafford change sides?’, pp. 149-63. See also Derek Hirst, ‘Court, Country, and Politics before 1629’, in *Faction and Parliament* ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford, 1978), pp. 113-17 for a critique of Zagorin’s thesis.

¹²⁶ Str. P. 21/79, [Oct 1631].

¹²⁷ Zagorin, ‘Did Strafford change sides?’, p. 161; see also Zagorin, *The Court and the Country* (London, 1969), pp. 56-8.

¹²⁸ Hacket, *Scrinia Reserata*, part II, p. 82.

¹²⁹ See above, p. 26.

he was appointed Lord Treasurer on 15 July.¹³⁰ Zagorin describes Weston as ‘another of the Duke’s dependents’, but there is evidence which suggests that Weston’s relations with Buckingham turned sour very shortly after his elevation to the Treasurership.¹³¹ As far as Wentworth is concerned, there is no reliable evidence that he became Buckingham’s ‘dependant’.¹³² The section of Stanhope’s letter in which he refers to Wentworth’s entry into favour is written as a piece of satire, intended to encourage Wentworth to consider how his career could be described to the King by ill-wishers, and was not necessarily Stanhope’s own reading of events. Possibly more significant is the fact that Savile also received a barony; there were no signs that he had lost Buckingham’s favour and the Duke would have found it difficult to accommodate such inveterate enemies as close dependants. Buckingham had not thrown Savile out of his circle of patronage and it was not until December, several months after the Duke’s death, that Wentworth’s initial mark of favour was followed up with further honours; a viscountcy and the office of Lord President of the Council of the North. Buckingham was prepared to allow Wentworth to demonstrate his good affection for the King’s service, as indeed the Duke had been willing to do in 1625, in return for preferment at some point in the future. In short, Wentworth was on probation and it might well have been difficult for him to stick to the attached conditions if Buckingham’s ascendancy had continued for any length of time. But on 23 August Buckingham’s life came to a violent end and Wentworth was amongst those who benefited from the Duke’s removal. He was in Yorkshire when he received news of Buckingham’s death from Edward Osborne. From London, Osborne wrote ‘I would to God you were here to play your owne Cardes: I

¹³⁰ M. van Cleave Alexander, *Charles I’s Lord Treasurer: Sir Richard Weston, Earl of Portland (1577-1635)* (Chapel Hill, 1975), p. 128; Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, p. 382; SP 16/110/31, Ayton to Carlisle 18 July.

¹³¹ Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, pp. 59, 61.

would nott doubt butt your game would be fairer nowe then ever, for I feare he was nott soe reall as he seemed.’¹³³

Years later, Wentworth’s speech to the King on receiving his earldom included the remark that the King had promised him further ennoblement and the Presidency of the Council of the North, only days after creating him a baron.¹³⁴

J. P. Cooper has used the text of this speech to criticise Wedgwood’s argument that Wentworth was not certain of receiving any substantial preferment until after Buckingham’s death.¹³⁵ But it is evident from the above paragraph that Osborne, one of Wentworth’s close supporters and his future Vice-President, had no inkling that his patron had already been promised high office. Regarding the speech, Wentworth could hardly have commented on the great opportunity presented to him by the death of Buckingham to destroy his Yorkshire rival and thus manoeuvre himself into office; instead he gave a variation on the truth which suited him better. In this speech Wentworth also asserted that he gained his baronetcy through Charles’s ‘own mere and free Grace’, evidently an exaggeration.

When Buckingham was assassinated in August 1628, Wentworth could look back on fourteen years during which he had striven to win royal favour. But his career during the early years of Charles I’s reign in particular demonstrates how difficult it was for senior members of the county gentry to accommodate both the demands of the Crown and the expectations of the electorate.¹³⁶ During 1625-7 it is possible to see a shift in Wentworth’s attitude towards the

¹³² Zagorin, ‘Sir Edward Stanhope’s advice’, p. 301.

¹³³ Str. P. 12/36, 24 Aug 1628.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.* 3(ii)/101.

¹³⁵ Cooper, ‘Strafford: A Revaluation’, p. 195.

¹³⁶ See Richard Cust’s valuable discussion of the reactions of Wentworth, Phelps and Lord Montagu to the forced loan, *Forced Loan*, pp. 106-11.

Crown. In late 1625 it took him very little time to decide not to challenge the King over the selection of sheriffs and yet during 1627, after lengthy discussion and private thought, he made a decision to oppose the Crown over the forced loan. Both local and national issues had contributed to this development. He had been alienated by Sir John Savile's advance in local politics at his expense, but his contributions to debates in the 1628 session of Parliament demonstrate another factor in this process; his principled opposition to the King's resort to non-parliamentary taxation, to the billeting of soldiers and to imprisonment without showing just cause; in short, to the grievances complained of in the Petition of Right.¹³⁷

Yet Wentworth had not set his face against the Court: even when refusing to lend the King money his demeanour before the Privy Council won him the respect of the Earl of Dorset, and when an opportunity to receive a mark of royal favour was finally presented to him, he grasped it. Charles himself was probably still cool towards Wentworth in the summer of 1628, and had to be persuaded by the Duke to bestow royal favour on him. This is not the interpretation given by Wedgwood; she presents a picture of the King making a decision to draw Wentworth away from his less restrained colleagues in the Commons for positive reasons. In her 1935 edition she wrote that Wentworth 'accepted the overtures of the King *while Buckingham was still in power*, and thus came back to the service of the Duke as much as of the King.'¹³⁸ In her 1961 edition she argues that the King himself, as well as his advisers, had decided to try and utilise Wentworth's talents in the service of the Crown, and

¹³⁷ Maija Jansson Cole and Robert C. Johnson eds., *The Commons Debates in 1628* (4 vols. New Haven, 1977-8), vol. II, pp. 60-61, 250, 300-301, 327, 363, 414, vol. III, pp. 188, 559, vol. IV, p. 243; see also Str. P. 21/47, Wentworth to Stanhope 6 April 1628.

¹³⁸ Wedgwood, *Strafford*, p. 349. Wedgwood's italics.

that Weston was ‘the chosen instrument’.¹³⁹ But it is more likely that Buckingham understood the need to defuse the tension between the monarch and his most important subjects, which if it continued could do neither the King nor the Duke any good. Charles’s reluctant acknowledgement that approaches to Wentworth and other members of both Houses were necessary is the likely reason for Weston’s actions, and not high-minded royal ideas that such an energetic man might serve the Crown well.

The future appeared much brighter for Wentworth following the assassination of the Duke. After the initial uncertainty regarding the pattern of court politics in the wake of Buckingham’s death, it gradually became clear that the King’s trust in matters of government had settled on Lord Treasurer Weston, the man immediately responsible for Wentworth’s rise to favour.¹⁴⁰ But Wentworth was also on good terms with James Hay, Earl of Carlisle, tipped by some to be the most likely successor to Buckingham in the King’s affections.¹⁴¹ Carlisle’s appointment as Groom of the Stool in February 1631 gave him access to the monarch which few could match.¹⁴² The Earl of Arundel’s restoration to royal favour in the summer of 1628 brought another of Wentworth’s patrons back to Court,¹⁴³ and he may also have hoped to benefit from the Earl of Dorset’s

¹³⁹ Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 68.

¹⁴⁰ SP 16/121/34, James Hay to Carlisle 22 Nov 1628.

¹⁴¹ Roy E. Schreiber, ‘The First Carlisle: Sir James Hay, First Earl of Carlisle as Courtier, Diplomat and Entrepreneur, 1580-1636’, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 74 (1984), pp. 116-18; SP 16/119/5, Goring to Carlisle 20 Oct 1628; SP 16/121/38, same to same 22 Nov 1628; SP 16/121/60, Cottington to Carlisle 25 Nov 1628.

¹⁴² Schreiber, ‘The First Carlisle’, p. 128.

¹⁴³ Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, p. 382, Beaulieu to Puckering 23 July 1628. Arundel was finally restored to royal favour in July 1628, after having been rebuffed by Charles four months earlier, SP 16/95/51, Arundel to Charles I 9 March 1628; SP 16/95/85, Conway to Arundel [draft] 14 March 1628; SP 16/96/13, Arundel to Conway 16 March 1628.

recent appointment as Lord Chamberlain to the Queen.¹⁴⁴ It was essential that he have means of access to the King for two reasons: first, he never enjoyed a warm relationship with the King, who preferred to keep him busy well away from Court, and secondly his manner of dealing with powerful men, particularly in Ireland, led to bitter struggles which were partly fought out at the English Court. But it was also necessary that he maintain lines of access to the King through a variety of people, both because of the nature of his employment and also because it was not sensible to rely on one or two well-wishers to counter factious opposition in his absence. The chapters which follow will explore his relationships with ministers and courtiers during the period 1628-40. They will argue that Wentworth's famous relationship with William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury must not allow us to ignore his efforts to maintain and develop additional means of approaching the King. From a study of Wentworth's court connections a picture emerges which is not one of a Court divided into rigid factions, but rather of a much more flexible organism where personal ambition created rivalries between politically like-minded men, and where those with very different views pulled together in the service of the Crown.

¹⁴⁴ SP 16/110/31, Sir Robert Ayton to Carlisle 18 July 1628; Birch, *Court and Times*, vol. I, pp. 375-6, Beaulieu to Puckering 16 July 1628.

CHAPTER TWO

'THE LADY MORA AND HER WAITING-MAID': WENTWORTH'S
ASSOCIATION WITH WESTON AND COTTINGTON

The role played by Richard, Lord Weston,¹ the Lord Treasurer, in Wentworth's preferment in 1628 has been discussed above; this chapter will discuss the development of Wentworth's association with Weston during the early 1630s until the latter's death in 1635. It will also consider the nature of Wentworth's very complex relationship with Francis, Lord Cottington, Chancellor of the Exchequer during the 1630s, although the specific issue of the Treasury in 1635-6 will be dealt with below. This chapter will show that although Wentworth's relations with Weston deteriorated during the early 1630s, his friendship with Cottington survived a number of misunderstandings, as well as the unmitigating hostility of William Laud.

As has been noted above, after several months of uncertainty at Court following the death of Buckingham, Lord Treasurer Weston emerged as the dominant man in the King's counsels. Traditionally, historians' assessments of him have tended to endorse Laud's opinion of him as slothful and corrupt.² His recent biographer Professor Alexander, however, notes that while it 'would be misleading to portray Weston as either a reformer or a moderniser'; he had, nevertheless, 'an enviable record of government service.' Alexander notes that

¹ Weston was created Earl of Portland in February 1633, but this thesis will refer to him consistently as Lord Treasurer Weston.

² See for example, Str. P. 6/191-2 Laud to Wentworth 12 June 1635. See also Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VII, p. 377 and Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 207.

his opposition to war prevented the Crown's debt from rising even higher.³ As Lord Treasurer, Weston belonged to all five of the Privy Council's standing committees⁴ and he is regarded by Alexander as having been an active member of them, as well as being a frequent attender at the court of Star Chamber and the Exchequer Chamber.⁵ Patricia Haskell includes Weston in her group of active members of the Privy Council.⁶

Weston was fortunate to retain the favour and support of the King, despite several attempts to remove him from office. He had succeeded in linking his children to two important families through marriage in 1632,⁷ but also attempted to retain the good will of the Earls of Dorset, Carlisle and Arundel.⁸ His association with Francis, Lord Cottington was generally a close one, although signs of strain occasionally showed partly caused by the latter's friendship with Wentworth.⁹ Weston did not step into Buckingham's shoes and

³ Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, pp. 160, 220. See also Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven, 1992), pp. 145-50.

⁴ The committees for trade, Irish affairs, the ordnance, foreign plantations and foreign affairs.

⁵ Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, pp. 149-52. Evidence of attendance at Committee meetings and the business that was discussed is very sketchy. Laud's correspondence with Wentworth is probably our best source of evidence regarding the Irish committee.

⁶ Patricia Haskell, 'Sir Francis Windebank and the Personal Rule of Charles I', Ph. D. thesis, University of Southampton (1978), pp. 89-90. The others were Laud, Manchester, Coventry, Cottington, Vane, Newburgh, Coke and Windebank.

⁷ His son Jerome married Lady Frances Stuart, sister of the Duke of Lennox and cousin of the King, in June. His daughter Anne married Basil, Lord Feilding, heir to the Earl of Denbigh, in December; Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, pp. 170-71.

⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 173-4.

⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 187-8; Str. P. 13/219, Cottington to Wentworth 11 March 1634. Laud was aware of tension between Weston and Cottington in January 1635; *ibid.* 6/135, Laud to Wentworth 12 Jan 1635. This was almost certainly caused by Cottington's ambition to get the

become unassailable, however, and he found himself the target of a number of attempts to remove him from office. The most dangerous opposition to the Lord Treasurer came from courtiers surrounding the Queen, and from the Queen herself. It is difficult to regard this strife as explicable solely, or even mainly, in terms of difference over foreign policy. The Queen could not consistently be regarded as pro-French (i.e. acting in support of Louis XIII), and neither could Weston be regarded as dependably pro-Spanish. Friction at Court between the adherents of Henrietta Maria and the Lord Treasurer was largely based on matters of honour and clashes of personality, as well as resulting from the Treasurer's attempts to reduce household expenditure.¹⁰ Clarendon states that 'He had not that application and submission and reverence for the Queen as might have been expected from his wisdom and breeding, and often crossed her pretences and desires with more rudeness than was natural to him.'¹¹ The Queen herself appears to have been particularly annoyed at the Lord Treasurer's role in persuading Charles not to allow her mother, Marie de' Medici, to reside in England.¹² A more dramatic and potentially violent breach between Weston's family and Henry Rich, Earl of Holland, occurred in 1633, when the Lord Treasurer's son Jerome, serving as an ambassador in France, intercepted and opened a packet which contained letters from Holland and the Queen to a French minister. On returning to England, he handed them to Charles, and this action led Holland to challenge Jerome Weston to a duel. The King reacted to this by putting Holland under house arrest, while the Queen's supporters accused the Weston family of

Mastership of the Court of Wards, which reportedly annoyed Weston who hoped that his son might get the post; *ibid.* 14/338, Garrard to Wentworth, 17 March 1635.

¹⁰ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 175-7.

¹¹ Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, p. 64.

¹² Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, p. 178.

cowardice.¹³ The quarrel widened to involve Lord Feilding, who, to vindicate his fiancée's family, challenged George Goring.¹⁴ Once more the King had to intervene to stop the duel taking place.¹⁵ Although Holland managed to avoid serious punishment, his enmity towards the Lord Treasurer did not abate. During the following summer, as Chief Justice in Eyre of the forests south of the Trent, Holland held a justice seat in the forest of Dean. One of those prosecuted before this court for a variety of offences was John Gibbons, Weston's secretary. It is surely not surprising that Gibbons was fined the high figure of over £11,000. Despite quickly sacking Gibbons, the Lord Treasurer could not avoid the suspicion that he had in some way connived at his crimes. Other associates of Weston were also prosecuted before the court and proceedings against Gibbons were begun in Star Chamber.¹⁶ As well as this onslaught launched by the Earl of Holland, Weston also faced determined opposition from William Laud.

Laud had several reasons for strongly disliking the Lord Treasurer. He disliked his Catholic sympathies and feared his support for his old enemy, John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln. He was angry because of actions which Weston

¹³ *HMC, Tenth Report, Appendix I Eglinton*, (London, 1885), p. 47, Hugh, Lord Montgomery to the Earl of Eglinton 6 April 1633. Montgomery noted the Queen's displeasure at Holland's confinement.

¹⁴ Gardiner described Goring as 'the noisiest of the offenders', *History of England* vol. VII, p. 218.

¹⁵ Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, p. 194; Gardiner, *History of England* vol. VII, pp. 217-9; Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 176-7; SP 16/236/14, Richard Kilvert to Sir John Lambe 4 April 1633; SP 16/236/47, Copy of an entry on the Council Register 13 April 1633; Barbara Donagan, 'A Courtier's Progress: Greed and Consistency in the Life of the Earl of Holland', *Historical Journal* 19 (1976), p. 327.

¹⁶ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, p. 177; Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VII, p. 364; Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, pp. 194-6; George Hammersley, 'The Revival of the Forest Laws under Charles I', *History* 45 (1960), pp. 90, 92, 94-8.

took which he thought were detrimental to Church interests: Laud was particularly concerned to see impropriations in the royal gift be restored to the Church of Ireland and he believed that Weston was obstructing this.¹⁷ In general he despised what he regarded as the Treasurer's corrupt and self-seeking conduct in government.¹⁸ In Laud's opinion Weston was inactive or determinedly obstructive, and featured in his correspondence with Wentworth as the 'Lady Mora', the agent of delay.¹⁹ There was clearly a clash of personalities between the two men, and both appear to have seized every opportunity to try and undermine the other.²⁰ Once Laud thought he had concrete proof of Weston's corrupt management of royal revenues he launched an attack on the Lord Treasurer, backed by Lord Keeper Coventry. This attack concerned the specific case of a section of royal forest which had been sold at a low price so that the Treasurer could purchase it through a third party. Laud also made more general criticisms relating to Weston's mismanagement of affairs and to his slowness in answering Wentworth's questions concerning important Irish matters.²¹ Weston's method of handling these accusations

¹⁷ Str. P. 6/169, Laud to Wentworth 27 March 1635; *ibid.* 6/191, same to same 12 June 1635.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 6/227, Laud to Wentworth 31 July/3 Aug 1635.

¹⁹ Laud and Wentworth referred to Weston and Cottington as the 'Lady Mora and her waiting-maid' or 'waiting woman'; *ibid.* 6/190 Laud to Wentworth 12 June 1635; *ibid.* 6/255 same to same 4 Oct 1635. In January 1635 Laud reported to Wentworth that as he was showing Charles a letter from Wentworth, the King noticed the term 'Lady Mora', which Laud had scribbled as a marginal note, and asked what it meant. Laud 'told him it was a Common bye word between us when wee meant to expresse any extreame delay', *ibid.* 6/135, 12 Jan 1635. Laud later claimed that he regretted not telling Charles exactly what was meant by the term; *ibid.* 6/167, Laud to Wentworth 27 March 1635.

²⁰ Laud's diary shows that both Laud and Weston tried to undermine each other's position before the King; Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 220, entry for December 1633.

²¹ Concerning Weston's slowness in answering Wentworth's letters see Str. P. 6/113, Laud to Wentworth 26 Oct 1634.

appears to suggest that there was an element of truth in them. He simply assembled several supporters who were willing to defend him, particularly the Duke of Lennox and the Duchess of Buckingham, and asked the King for mercy. After some consideration, Charles was prepared to grant Weston a continuance of royal favour and although he did create a new Irish Committee at Laud's request, the Lord Treasurer's influence over Irish matters was not reduced.²² Weston was involved in negotiations with the Spanish resident Necolalde and was probably a party to the King's inner thoughts on foreign policy. On the domestic front he was also closely concerned with the forthcoming ship money writs and was not, therefore, dispensable. Charles must also have been aware of Laud's animosity towards his Treasurer and probably also understood that Weston had made less personal profit from the Treasurer's office than any of his recent predecessors.²³ Despite this set-back, Laud was more than ready a few months later, after Weston's forestry difficulties, to renew his attack on the Lord Treasurer. Working with the former customs farmer, John Harrison, and the diplomat Sir Thomas Roe, Laud was able to present Charles with a wide-ranging indictment of Weston's administration. Charles's reaction was to demand that Weston give him a detailed list of his receipts since the beginning of his Treasurership. The King signed this document, signifying his approval of Weston's conduct, which must have convinced Laud that attempts to open Charles's eyes to what he considered gross corruption, were futile.²⁴

²² Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, pp. 190-91; Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VII, pp. 355-6.

²³ Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, pp. 191-2.

²⁴ Clarendon, *State Papers* (3 vols. Oxford, 1767), vol. I, p. 158; Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, pp. 196-8, cf. Katharine McElroy, 'Laud and his Struggle for Influence from 1628 to 1640', D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford (1943), pp. 114-17, in which McElroy gives the impression that Weston decided to present this paper to the King. Laud was similarly disheartened to witness Charles's refusal to punish Sir James Bagg after the

Laud and Wentworth discussed Weston in very unfavourable terms, yet this disguises what had been reasonably good relations between Wentworth and the Treasurer during the late 1620s.²⁵ These good relations did not survive however. During the autumn of 1631 Sir Edward Stanhope had written to Wentworth to dissuade him from accepting the office of Lord Deputy of Ireland.²⁶ This extremely long letter²⁷ argued that Weston and Cottington wished to remove him from England to safeguard their own positions at Court:

‘I verily thinke there is noe man these your two greate friends are soe ieaious of, and feare more, then your Lordship, not in point of unfaythfullness (for Malice itt selfe dares not offer to the world soe false an accusatione) but in respect of your eminent parts, greate abilityes, and sufficiencie every way to be the man (I say the man) in whom his Majesty is like to repose as much trust, imploye in as weighty affayres, and consequently reward with as great honors as anye.’²⁸

Stanhope discussed a number of matters which he believed supported his case: Weston had not given Wentworth sound counsel over the affair surrounding the seditious letter found in Sir Robert Cotton’s library, a matter which involved his father-in-law the Earl of Clare;²⁹ Cottington had reneged on a

Court of Star Chamber found him guilty of gross deceit in 1635, H. R. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud* (2nd ed. London, 1969), pp. 223-5; Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VIII, pp. 89-91.

²⁵ See above, pp. 38-43.

²⁶ Str. P. 21/79, [Oct] 1631. See Zagorin, ‘Sir Edward Stanhope’s advice’, pp. 298-320.

²⁷ It runs to 35 pages.

²⁸ Str. P. 21/79, [Oct] 1631, f. 4.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, f. 7. In May 1630 a prosecution in Star Chamber was brought against Sir Robert Cotton, the Earl of Clare and others for publishing a seditious paper. (Wentworth himself had passed a copy of this paper to the King the previous November, and Gardiner asserts

promise to find a position for Wentworth's close friend and relative Christopher Wandesford;³⁰ and both of them had obstructed Wentworth in his attempt to acquire the lease of the alum farm.³¹ He could see no positive factor which could outweigh the dangers which could face Wentworth if he attempted to govern Ireland.³² In Wentworth's reply he admitted that this was 'the knottiest peece that ever fell into debate with me', and he recognised that it was possible that the two aimed 'to sett me a little farther of, from treading upon anything themselves desire', but claimed, on balance, that he did not share Stanhope's very suspicious opinion of Weston and Cottington's motives.³³

Wentworth accepted the position of Lord Deputy, procured for him by Weston, in part because he had little choice: although he was a privy councillor, his position as President of the Council of the North meant that in 1631 he did not have permanent residence at Court and there appeared to be no immediate prospect of an alteration in his situation. His acceptance of the post was also partly due, no doubt, to his belief that one way to win favour from the King was to do what was, for Stanhope, the impossible: to govern Ireland well and make the country of benefit to the English Exchequer, rather than being a drain on its resources. He had great confidence in his ability to accomplish this very difficult task. But of great importance in reaching this decision was his realisation that he could not antagonise Weston and come out victorious; during the early summer of 1631 the Queen herself had been involved in an

that his promotion to a place in the Privy Council owed something to this action, *History of England*, vol. VII, p. 138.)

³⁰ Str. P. 21/79, f. 7.

³¹ *Ibid.*, f. 7.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 11-16; *HMC, Denbigh V* (London, 1911), p. 8, Edward Nicholas to Lord Feilding 13 Dec 1631.

³³ Str. P. 21/76, 25 Oct 1631.

attempt to unseat Weston and had failed. The Lord Treasurer appeared to be secure in the King's favour and Ireland appeared to be the only realistic route to future preferment. Kevin Sharpe has recently noted that Wentworth 'described Weston as the 'very principal' of his friends.'³⁴ This description is to be found in a letter from Wentworth to Weston written in October 1632 and although there is an attempt by the writer to maintain a light and friendly tone in places, the subject matter is not of a similar nature. This letter was written by Wentworth to deny that he was aiming to replace Weston as Treasurer, rumours of which had been circulating since the summer of 1629.³⁵ Weston was by now deeply suspicious of Wentworth's ambitious nature, which placed pressure on their mutual friend, Cottington, and this does appear to have led to strained relations between the Treasurer and the Chancellor in early 1635.³⁶

Wentworth was particularly annoyed at the beginning of his Deputyship by Weston's failure to support his right of patronage over the Irish army. On the death in 1633 of Lord Falkland, the previous Lord Deputy, his company fell vacant, but was claimed by his son, Lorenzo Cary, who was fortunate enough to have the support of the King.³⁷ Wentworth argued that his right to patronage was being eroded, but was equally upset at Weston's suit on Cary's behalf:

'My Lord to confesse a truth this troubles me very much, and that not the least occasioned by your Lordships Mediation, having sett up my Confidence to be strengthned by your

³⁴ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, p. 148.

³⁵ Str. P. 21/98, 21 Oct 1632; BL Additional MS. 35,331, f. 31, Walter Yonge's diary June 1629. I owe this reference to Dr. Quintrell.

³⁶ See Str. P. 6/143, Laud to Wentworth 12 Jan 1635; Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer*, pp. 187-8, (Alexander mistakenly gives the date of this letter as 1634).

³⁷ P. H. Hardacre, 'Patronage and Purchase in the Irish Standing Army under Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1632-1640', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, 67 (1989), p. 98.

Power and Judgment in the Undeniable rightes of my place'.³⁸

Wentworth was furious that the case had been concluded before he had been able to give his opinion and feared that he would be seen to be lacking control over the Irish army.³⁹ Relations between Wentworth and Weston were also strained as a result of financial matters relating to Wentworth's control of the northern commissions for recusancy compositions and knighthood fines. By June 1633 Wentworth was clearly annoyed that Weston was not prepared to allow him to pay himself 12d in the pound (portage) as an allowance for his work on the recusancy commission. He sent Weston a lengthy account of his service, stressing the increase in recusancy revenues which had been achieved under his leadership of the commission, and noting that he had not claimed any expenses for diet in comparison with his predecessor, Lord Savile. He failed to see why he should not have 12d in the pound, as sheriffs could claim the same sum for revenues which they collected. Finally he pointed out that he did not wish to make a great profit from his service, but merely wished not to make a loss.⁴⁰ In November he wrote to Weston, insisting that although he had received his ordinary expenses as a receiver, his claims for extraordinary expenses, particularly relating to his work on the knighthood commission, had not been settled. He had incurred heavy expenses feeding local dignitaries helping on the commission and had also had to pay informers. His fees for

³⁸ Str. P. 3/28-9, 4 Nov 1633; see also *ibid.* 3/28, Weston to Wentworth 3 Oct 1633.

³⁹ See below, pp. 239-41. For Weston's explanation to Wentworth see Str. P. 13/234, received 24 March 1634.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 3/2-3, 9 June 1633. Despite his assertion that he did not retain the King's revenue in his own hands, but immediately paid it into the Exchequer, he almost certainly regularly used it to purchase land; *ibid.* 3/88 Wentworth to Weston and Cottington 31 May 1634; *ibid.* 21/71, 73, 74, 81, all Wentworth to Richard Marris, 1, 18, ?, June, 12 Dec 1633; *ibid.* 20/41 Marris to Wentworth received 10 July 1634.

portage relating to the recusancy commission had still not been settled.⁴¹ In 1635 Wentworth was also frustrated in his attempts to get Weston to repay £5,870 which the Lord Deputy's agent, William Raylton, had mistakenly paid on demand into the Exchequer on Wentworth's recusant revenues account. Writing to Laud, Wentworth described this as 'one of the Courtesyes my Lord Treasourour did me the Christmas before his death', stating that Weston did this in revenge because Wentworth had notified the King of the slowness of Weston's replies.⁴² This was a more general complaint of the Lord Deputy against the Lord Treasurer: although Weston assured Wentworth of 'a true and quick correspondency' in August 1633,⁴³ within two months Wentworth complained of the delay in sending him instructions from England.⁴⁴ This continued to be a feature of Wentworth's correspondence until Weston's death in March 1635.⁴⁵ This was at least partly caused by the Lord Treasurer's serious illness, but Cottington also informed Wentworth that Weston did not like him writing in the interim. Cottington also advised Wentworth not to 'send any Packett without some letters to my Lord Treasurer for he is mighty iealous when others have letters and he none; and harkens much after it.'⁴⁶

Wentworth was careful to consult Weston over matters in which the Lord Treasurer might feel he had an interest. One example of this is Wentworth's

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 3/29, 4 Nov 1633. See also *ibid.* 3/32, Wentworth to Cottington 4 Nov 1633. Cottington wrote to inform Wentworth that this matter had been settled, *ibid.* 3/53, 26 Dec 1633.

⁴² *Ibid.* 3/199-202, Wentworth to the Commissioners of the Treasury 27 April 1635; *ibid.* 6/182, Wentworth to Laud 18 May 1635 and *ibid.* 6/206, same to same 14 July 1635.

⁴³ *Ibid.* 13/34, 27 Aug 1633.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 3/20, Wentworth to Cottington 22 Oct 1633.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 3/62-3, Wentworth to Weston 14 March 1634; *ibid.* 3/74, same to same 9 April 1634; *ibid.* 3/146, same to same 3 Dec 1633.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 3/53, 26 Dec 1633.

complaint against Luke Netterville, a family friend of the Lord Treasurer, who had incensed the Lord Deputy by his apparently insolent behaviour in Parliament. Wentworth had forbore to punish him, because of his connection to Weston, but he clearly wished that Weston would give him permission to do so. Wentworth also stated that Philip Mainwaring was a witness to Netterville's behaviour, presumably in case Weston questioned the truth of this accusation.⁴⁷ In his reply, Weston wrote that he would not get involved, but would take it very well if Wentworth showed moderation.⁴⁸ Wentworth's answer to this was to say that he would let Netterville go without any punishment, but thought it worthwhile to continue to criticise his conduct.⁴⁹ By doing this he pushed Weston into encouraging him not to spare the man, and then claimed instead that as the Lord Treasurer had pointed out to him where his duty lay, he would drag Netterville through the Castle Chamber 'soe soone as his Parliament priviledg is out.'⁵⁰

Weston's feelings also had to be taken into account in the matter of the Earl of Cork's family tomb. This tomb, erected in St Patrick's Cathedral, contained the bones of the Elizabethan Lord Chancellor Weston and in the spring of 1634 Wentworth was warned by Laud that Cork had attempted to enlist Weston's support on this matter and that the Lord Deputy should be careful to avoid giving offence to Weston.⁵¹ In April Laud informed Wentworth of Weston's views on the matter:

'His Lordship...honourably expressed, that since some so neare him in blood were buried there, it might stande since it

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 3/137, 8 Oct 1634.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 14/194, 27 Oct 1634.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 3/147, 3 Dec 1634.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 14/268, Weston to Wentworth 17 Jan 1634; *ibid.* 3/179, Wentworth to Weston 7 March 1634.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 6/32, 11 March 1634.

was now up; and that two Archbishops upon the Place thought well of it. To that I answered, I that never saw it, could not be iudg, but would leave it to your Lordship and them that were upon the place’.

Having shifted responsibility for the matter on to Wentworth and the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, Laud proceeded to support Wentworth’s opinion that it would be very dangerous for Cork to be seen to be beyond the control of the government in this case; it might discourage others from coming forward with evidence against him in the matter of concealed impropriations. Laud was able to move Charles to appoint a commission to consider the future of the monument, which he claimed Weston would try and obstruct.⁵² Six days later, however, Cottington reported that Weston appeared to have changed his mind and ‘doth now beleeve it is a tricke of Corks cunning’, and in his reply Wentworth appeared to be confident that Cork had failed to provoke Weston into showing him any support, particularly as the Treasurer had not mentioned the matter in any of his letters.⁵³ Wentworth asked Weston not to allow anyone to damage his opinion of him, and he wrote to Jerome Weston expressing his sorrow at hearing of the Lord Treasurer’s illness and professing his services.⁵⁴ It seems, however, that it was Weston who realised that he needed to shift his position more than Wentworth. Wentworth had no intention of allowing the tomb to remain where it was, despite Weston’s initial request, and it appeared that Laud had been successful in persuading the King to put the matter into the hands of the Lord Deputy and the two Archbishops: Weston must have realised that on this matter at least, the will of the Lord Deputy would prevail.

⁵² *Ibid.* 6/53, 12 April 1634; *ibid.* 6/55 15 April 1634.

⁵³ *Ibid.* 14/29, Cottington to Wentworth 16 April 1634; *ibid.* 3/83, Wentworth to Cottington 14 May 1634. See also SP 63/254/100, Cork to [Weston] 20 Feb 1634; see below, pp. 103-4.

⁵⁴ Str. P. 3/63, Wentworth to Weston 14 March 1634; *ibid.* 8/106, Wentworth to Jerome Weston 24 April 1634; Alexander, *Charles I’s Lord Treasurer*, p. 193.

Over the next few months their relationship was to become further strained by Wentworth's anger at the activities of his former friend and business associate, Sir Arthur Ingram. During the summer of 1633 Ingram and Wentworth had succeeded in re-negotiating the farm of the recusancy composition monies in general terms, the plan being to raise an extra several thousand pounds a year from the farm.⁵⁵ When the details of the revised farm were finalised with Weston and Cottington, Ingram ensured that from the profits of the collection of fines over the next three years, he would take two thousand pounds, a sum which he was owed by the Crown.⁵⁶ It appears that Wentworth was not informed of this revision until March 1634, when Ingram wrote to explain how the revised scheme would allow him the repayment of his debt.⁵⁷ The Lord Deputy received much more disturbing news later the same month from Sir Edward Osborne, Vice-President of the Council of the North, who sent Wentworth a lengthy criticism of Ingram's behaviour, accusing him of having usurped his position as Wentworth's deputy on the recusancy commission. Osborne enclosed a copy of a letter from Weston to himself and the rest of the commission which in effect gave Ingram control over the business.⁵⁸ That Wentworth took no action immediately was because of Ingram's role in another business of importance to him, the settling of the lease of the alum farm. The Lord Deputy urged his agent William Raylton 'to get the Alum

⁵⁵ The relationship between Wentworth and Ingram is discussed at length in Anthony F. Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram* (Oxford, 1961), ch. IX and *passim*. Several letters concerning Ingram's revision of the recusancy farm are printed in Clare Talbot ed., *Miscellanea: Recusant Records* (Catholic Record Society, 1961), pp. 386-9; and see also *ibid.* pp. 297-303.

⁵⁶ Leeds Archives, Temple Newsam MSS [hereafter referred to as TN], L[ocal] A[ffairs] 8, f. 4.

⁵⁷ Str. P. 13/217, 10 March 1634.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 14/8, 28 March 1634.

business dispatcht and after that be done I shall take notice of Sir Arthur Ingrams proceedings in the matter of the recusants'.⁵⁹ After Ingram had written to him in July to ask why he had not heard from Wentworth, and had tried to explain his meddling in the recusancy business, he was sent a reply from the Lord Deputy the following month which left him in no doubt as to Wentworth's opinion of his conduct. He was informed that Wentworth did 'as little approve of your Judgment in the thing itselfe, as I doe of your Friendship to me.' The Lord Deputy was furious that Ingram had, by promising to raise a larger profit in the space of three years, claimed that he could perform a more impressive service for the King than Wentworth could. He was also extremely angry that the deal had been done with Weston and Cottington several months before he was informed of it, and did not take kindly to Ingram's promise that the monies would still pass through Wentworth's hands: 'As if all had beene in your Power; As if I were to enioy even my Receavourshipp, which I have, as I take it, under the Great Seale, rather by your Compassion, then that Right which is not to be taken from me.'⁶⁰ Wentworth's anger was such that it prevented a reconciliation between himself and Ingram,⁶¹ and it was the cause of several angry letters to Weston and Cottington.

In a letter to the Lord Treasurer in March 1634, Wentworth questioned why his deputy receiver had been summoned to London and also stated that he had

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 21/116, 1 June 1634. Wentworth obviously decided that he could not wait for the completion of the alum business before dealing with Ingram. Letters to Cottington and Lord Treasurer Juxon three years later show that the business was still suffering hindrances; *ibid.* 3/295, Wentworth to Juxon and Cottington 26 Aug 1637; *ibid.* 3/296-7, same to same 3 Oct 1637.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 14/148, Ingram to Wentworth 29 July 1634; *ibid.* 8/136-9, Wentworth to Ingram 22 Aug 1634.

⁶¹ TN PO7/II (Irish customs correspondence), ff. 17, Radcliffe to Ingram 28 Oct 1634; *ibid.* ff. 18, same to same 9 May 1635.

heard that Ingram desired to be appointed one of the quorum of the commission. He warned Weston that this would not be a wise appointment, as Ingram would try and take control of the business, 'none of them being able to rule him unlesse I were there my selfe'. It would be advisable to leave the business in the hands of Osborne, the Vice-President, and Sir John Melton, the Secretary to the Council of the North.⁶² In reply Weston made a brief comment, stating that Ingram had been appointed in order that he should become acquainted with the commission's proceedings, not to rule it.⁶³ This issue made its first appearance in Wentworth's correspondence with Cottington in May, by which time Wentworth had received notification from Ingram himself. From a discussion of Cottington's relationship with Weston, Wentworth slipped into an angry retort concerning the recusancy composition. He complained that they had both been involved, 'in doeing and keeping Councell concerning a Bargaine, a very trimme one, you have made with Sir Arthur Ingram, for farming those Rents, where you thinke he deserves to have a filthy debt of two thowsand poundes (not worth a hundreth) payd him for the hope hee gives of raying three thowsand poundes rent, And yet not fitt to allow mee my chardges layed forth of my purse in the actuall settling of neere ten thowsand poundes by yeare.' Wentworth went on to lament the fact that he appeared to be 'undervalewed soe farr, as to have such a broken Marchant obruded upon me', and that his deputy receiver had been summoned to London to make an account of the business 'as if I had been turned Bankrupte'. He particularly regretted the fact that Cottington had not seen fit to consult him on this matter.⁶⁴ Two weeks later he sent a letter jointly

⁶² Str. P. 3/62-5, 14 March 1634.

⁶³ *Ibid.* 14/28, 15 April 1634. Clare Talbot notes that in January 1636 a new commission was issued and only Wentworth and Osborne were to be of the quorum; *Miscellanea: Recusant Records*, p. 297.

⁶⁴ Str. P. 3/84-5, 14 May 1634.

addressed to Weston and Cottington on the sole topic of Ingram and the recusancy farm. He enclosed a copy of Ingram's letter to him of 10 March and more or less repeated the points which he made in his letter to Cottington. An important theme which runs throughout this letter is Wentworth's anger that Ingram could be perceived to be doing the King greater service than the Lord President himself, whose honour and reputation was now under threat. He also stressed the fact that in his opinion Osborne and Melton were far better able to serve the King in this business than Ingram, who, he claimed, understood the business no better than Wentworth's horse. He concluded by issuing what amounted to a threat: he could see no reason why he should continue to pay the King's rent into the exchequer before it was due, as had been his practice. He now asked for leave under the terms of his patent to pay nothing before it was due.⁶⁵

In July Wentworth received news of the reaction of Weston and Cottington to his angry letters. George Garrard prepared the way by notifying Wentworth that Cottington had taken him to Ingram's house several times recently, where they had toasted the Lord Deputy.⁶⁶ Cottington's letter to Wentworth justified both his role in the business and Ingram's conduct in general. He informed Wentworth that Ingram was 'soe sensible of your displeasure as he never comes to me butt he cries and weepes abundantly.' He asked Wentworth to write to Ingram so that he would not be pestered with 'his criing lamentations.' In a more serious vein, Cottington insisted that the deal would not make any major alteration to the recusancy commission and hinted that in all probability Ingram would find himself saddled with a debt.⁶⁷ A month later Cottington

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 3/86-9, 31 May 1634; see also *ibid.* 21/118, Wentworth to Raylton 25 June 1634.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 14/102, 20 June 1634. See appendix, regarding Garrard's relationship with Cottington and the significance of his letters to Wentworth.

⁶⁷ *Str. P.* 14/119, 2 July 1634.

wrote again to inform Wentworth that he had visited Weston at Tunbridge Wells and had seen the letter which Wentworth had addressed to them jointly. His light-hearted letter again refused to take Wentworth's anger seriously, reminding the Lord Deputy that Ingram 'was your Minion and one on whom you soe much doated'.⁶⁸ Responding to the Chancellor's concluding comments, Wentworth wrote:

'I freely on my word assigne unto your Lordship all my Interest in him. You shall have him all for your selfe.'⁶⁹

Even in the heat of his anger Wentworth was able to enter into the spirit of Cottington's letters; his correspondence with the Lord Treasurer on the same subject was not so light-hearted.

In early July Weston visited Tunbridge Wells to take the waters. From there he wrote to Wentworth that Cottington would answer on the subject of Ingram, but the following day he wrote a brief note relating to this business. He stated that he found it hard to believe 'that any businesse could have stirred up such a Tempest to the prejudice of the opinion you ought to hold of me, as if I could putt Ingram into a Ballance with you.'⁷⁰ This reply did not cause Wentworth to moderate his tone. His reply argued that he had not written anything which he ought not to have done and did not see why expressing 'a Just dislike and disdaine for Ingram should call into question his relationship with Weston.'⁷¹ The matter was not referred to again in their correspondence, but these few passages show quite clearly the contrasting relationships which Wentworth had with the Lord Treasurer and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. As discussed below, he enjoyed a usually friendly and relaxed correspondence

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 3/111, 3 Aug 1634.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 3/113, 22 Aug 1634.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 14/123, 3 July 1634; *ibid.* 3/119, 4 July 1634.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 3/126, 23 Aug 1634.

with Cottington, which was not seriously damaged even by Wentworth's fury over Ingram's behaviour. But his relationship with Weston suffered because of both men's proud characters. Weston could not, as Cottington did, chide Wentworth jokingly over his anger; Weston saw this as a personal affront to himself and although Wentworth refused to allow the Treasurer to have the last word on the matter, he refrained from dredging the business up again. He could not afford to let this develop into a permanent breach with Weston because of Irish parliamentary business. Of crucial importance to the Lord Deputy's plans for the reform of the country was to ensure that the Irish subsidies voted in 1634 remained in Ireland and were not plundered by the English Lord Treasurer.⁷² Some co-operation was, therefore, essential if Wentworth's administration of Ireland was to run smoothly, but his relations with Weston until the latter's death were hardly cordial.

Wentworth reacted to the news of Weston's death by rejoicing to Laud that he was 'delivered from a mighty and determined malice': he was now more optimistic for the future of Irish affairs due to the removal of 'the heaviest block' that lay in his path.⁷³ He described his feelings at greater length to the Earl of Newcastle, and commented that he thought Weston's enmity towards him had originated from the Treasurer's jealous reaction to his association with Laud. Interestingly, he admitted that his response to Weston's suspicion had probably aggravated the situation, 'for I confesse I did stomacke it very much to be soe meanly suspected'.⁷⁴ Newcastle probably received the truth of

⁷² See *ibid.* 3/104, Wentworth to Weston 19 July 1634; *ibid.* 6/81-2, Wentworth to Laud 19 July 1634; *ibid.* 6/87, same to same 23 Aug 1634; *ibid.* 6/322-3, Laud to Wentworth 2 Aug 1634.

⁷³ *Ibid.* 6/163, 13 April 1634; see also *ibid.* 14/336, Conway to Wentworth 17 March 1635.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 8/221, 9 April 1635. See also *ibid.* 13/238, 'Sir George Wentworth's Relation' March 1634: 'W[illia]m Raylton being with me at Newmarkett 190[Goring] tould him that 174[Weston] had unto 190 expressed much Jealousy against 186[Wentworth] for want of

the matter, for it is clear that Wentworth furnished Laud with ammunition in his campaign to discredit Weston, and whatever the real nature of Wentworth's association with Laud, it certainly appeared to most contemporaries that they were very closely aligned. Although Wentworth informed the Treasurer of Irish matters relating to trade and revenue, it appears that he was not particularly keen on doing so. As detailed reports were sent to Secretary Coke, Wentworth probably regarded the duplicating of information to Weston as time-consuming and unnecessary: it is worth noting that Wentworth seldom corresponded with Weston's successor, Lord Treasurer Juxon.⁷⁵

Although the Lady Mora had passed away, her 'waiting-maid' was still very much alive. Cottington and Wentworth's correspondence reveals that their relationship was an extremely complex one, although it is not clear exactly when their friendship began. The earliest extant letters from Cottington in the Strafford Papers date from 1629, shortly before Wentworth was appointed to the Privy Council, and show that there was already a close friendship between the two men. As well as discussing private suits on behalf of friends, this early correspondence contains Cottington's views on the likelihood of peace with Spain.⁷⁶ In the summer of 1632 Cottington was asked by Wentworth to help

letters; saying that he did perceive 186 would forsake his ancient friends and adhere now unto 171[Laud]'; cf. *ibid.* 8/239, Portland to Wentworth 1 May 1635; *ibid.* 8/240, Wentworth to Portland 23 May 1635.

⁷⁵ Very few letters from Wentworth to Juxon survive: see *ibid.* 3/294-8, ^{285.}four letters written in ^{May} August, September and October 1637. *Ibid.* 3/296, Wentworth to Juxon 20 Sept 1637, makes it clear that Wentworth had not written to Juxon before the summer of 1637 and only intended in future to write to him about once a year. There is no evidence from Wentworth's other correspondence that he kept up a more frequent correspondence with Juxon.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 12/70, 1 Aug 1629; *ibid.* 12/71, 5 Aug 1629; *ibid.* 12/73, 20 Aug 1629; *ibid.* 12/79, 7 Sept 1629.

him drag Sir David Foulis into the Star Chamber,⁷⁷ and when the case was underway in the autumn of 1633 he asked for his assistance in ensuring that his interests were not ignored.⁷⁸ By this time, Wentworth was in Ireland and his correspondence with Cottington during the period 1633-9 shows that he regarded Cottington as an important link with the English government.⁷⁹ Cottington's experience in government and his particular knowledge of financial affairs were valued by Wentworth, who also appreciated that Cottington was well regarded by the King.⁸⁰ The Chancellor was also useful as a secondary means of communicating with the Lord Treasurer. Wentworth often sent information directed towards Weston to Cottington and tried to encourage him to put pressure on Weston to give speedy answers to his letters. In August 1633, shortly after his arrival in Dublin, Wentworth sent details of the state of Irish revenue to Cottington and asked him to pass them on to Weston; Wentworth did not have enough time to write twice. Of great importance in this letter was the Lord Deputy's concern at plans to restrict the export of tallow, one of Ireland's principal exports. This letter also contained a report on the Earl of Cork's corrupt practice of allowing towns and rectories

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 21/97, 12 Aug 1632.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 3/32-3, 4 Nov 1633.

⁷⁹ See for instance, Str. P. 13/37, Cottington to Wentworth 2 Sept 1633, reporting that he had read a communication from Wentworth discussing Carlisle's Munster interests to the King.

⁸⁰ Cottington appears to have escaped from any serious censure over the Spanish silver incident in the summer of 1636. Havran alludes only briefly to this episode, *Caroline Courtier*, p. 135, and Haskell argues that Charles was not particularly angry over Windebank's role in the matter, 'Windebank', pp. 256-8, but see SP 16/329/21 Roe to Elizabeth of Bohemia 20 July 1636; *CSPV 1636-9*, p. 59, Correr to Doge and Senate 5 Sept 1636; *HMC, Tenth Report, Appendix II Gawdy*, (London, 1885), p. 160, Anthony Mingay to Framlingham Gawdy 26 Sept 1636. Goring informed Conway that he had heard that Cottington and Windebank had tried to shove the blame for the departure of the silver on to Northumberland, SP 16/331/19, 6 Sept 1636.

which he controlled to pay nothing towards the contribution for the army, which placed a heavy financial burden on other areas of Munster. Wentworth also discussed various propositions for the plantations of Connacht and Ormond.⁸¹ In October Wentworth again complained of the slowness of replies from England, and discussed various financial matters, including the licensing of pipestaves which ought to provide £3,000 *per annum* to the Crown.⁸² The following month Wentworth again wrote to Cottington, this time again discussing the plans for the plantation of Ormond. Much correspondence on Irish economic policy passed through Cottington's hands.

But Wentworth also approached Cottington on issues which threatened his authority as Lord Deputy of Ireland. Cottington was asked to help Wentworth avoid the indignity of having Lorenzo Cary foisted upon him, an act which would result in him being seen to have less than complete control over the Irish army. Wentworth also discussed the activities of the Duke of Lennox's secretary, Mr. Webb, who was apparently investigating the potential profits which could be reaped from the plantation of Connacht and alleging that Lennox could have what he wished from the plantation without reference to the Lord Deputy.⁸³ By writing to Cottington rather than to Weston on matters relating to the Irish economy, Wentworth probably intended to show his displeasure at the Lord Treasurer's tardiness in answering his letters, but Cottington warned him that Weston was extremely suspicious of this practice and that he should take care to write regularly to the Lord Treasurer.⁸⁴ Thereafter, until Weston's death, Wentworth generally confined himself to discussing his personal business or 'English' matters (i.e. Ingram and the

⁸¹ Str. P. 3/9-12, 26 Aug 1633.

⁸² *Ibid.* 3/20-22, 22 Oct 1633.

⁸³ *Ibid.* 3/32, 4 Nov 1633.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 3/52-3, 26 Dec 1633.

recusancy composition) and avoided discussing Irish economic policy. Following Weston's death, Wentworth once again turned to Cottington, urging him in May 1635 to oversee the swift return of the documents concerning the Connacht plantation.⁸⁵ In late 1636 Wentworth asked Cottington to assist him in his revision of the Irish customs farm.⁸⁶ He evidently preferred dealing with Cottington, corresponding rarely with Lord Treasurer Juxon; and had communicated regularly with Weston reluctantly, and only when advised to do so.

Wentworth encouraged Cottington to look after his interests in matters concerning senior office-holders in Ireland, and the Chancellor was happy to oblige. The problematical issue of the Earl of Cork's tomb features in Wentworth's correspondence with Cottington four months before it appears in his correspondence with Laud. In early September 1633 Cottington warned the Lord Deputy that 'The King was told by some of my Lord of Corkes frendes that you had allready discontented him two wayes, one about his Tombe, the other about I know not what Armes and inscription. But they say the King laughed and swore you did like your selfe, seemeing to be much pleased with it.'⁸⁷ In Wentworth's reply he claimed that he had given Cork private advice to remove his family monument, which was found very distasteful both in Ireland and in England, and had hoped that Cork, for his own sake, would quietly move it elsewhere. It was also Cottington who notified him in April 1634 that he would not face any opposition from Weston by forcing Cork to remove the tomb from St Patrick's Cathedral.⁸⁸ Six months later Cottington struck a different note when he informed the Lord Deputy, rather ominously, that the

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 3/203, 23 May 1635.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 3/266, 10 Dec 1636. See also *ibid.*, Cottington to Wentworth 1 Oct 1636.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 3/17, 2 Sept 1633.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 14/29, 16 April 1634.

King had laughed ‘hartyly’ at a passage in one of Wentworth’s letters which suggested that the Lord Deputy was not instrumental in starting proceedings in the Court of Castle Chamber. Although Cottington passed this information on in a lighthearted manner, the warning was clear.⁸⁹ In September 1635 Wentworth wrote to Cottington emphasising the strength of the case against Cork and stating his opinion that allowing him to visit England would simply delay the proceedings against him in the Castle Chamber.⁹⁰ The following month Wentworth lamented the fact that Cork’s case was to be removed from Ireland. Although he appeared to have accepted the fact, this was far from the truth. The Lord Deputy was preparing to muster all the support he could gain to delay and obstruct the removal of this case to England to ensure the survival of his own authority as Lord Deputy.⁹¹ He hoped that Cottington, as well as Laud, would aid him in this. But Cottington, like Laud, warned Wentworth of the support Cork received from the Earls of Pembroke and Salisbury, and neither were pleased to learn shortly afterwards that Wentworth had already begun an attempt to remove another senior Irish office-holder.⁹²

In October 1635 Wentworth notified Cottington of the death sentence passed against Lord Mountnorris, the Vice-Treasurer, commenting that he realised this would ‘ringe lowde amongst you on that side’, but asked him to wait until he was able to send full details of the case.⁹³ Cottington was able to inform

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 14/217, 22 Nov 1634. Cottington managed to warn Wentworth that the King found this assertion difficult to believe without delivering a sermon on how he ought to write to the King; see *ibid.* 7/101v, Laud to Wentworth 17 May 1638 for Laud’s response to a similar passage.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 3/219, 11 Sept 1635.

⁹¹ *Ibid.* 3/226, 31 Oct 1635.

⁹² *Ibid.* 15/253, 30 Oct 1635. See also *ibid.* 15/241, Pembroke and Salisbury to Wentworth 21 Oct 1635.

⁹³ *Ibid.* 3/235, 14 Dec 1635.

him the following month that this matter had made ‘a great noyse’ amongst some people, but that ‘it hath stuck little amongst the wiser sort, and begins to be blowen away amongst the rest.’⁹⁴ Cottington was also used by Wentworth to try and get Mountnorris quickly replaced by Sir Adam Loftus and, as bribery was to be employed in this case, it is hardly surprising that Wentworth did not involve Laud.⁹⁵ Wentworth also approached Cottington for assistance in his struggle to remove Lord Chancellor Loftus from office. He made a similar request in April 1638: Cottington was asked not to be swayed by the comments of ill-affected ‘busyemen’ until Wentworth had had time to send over full details of the case, but in the mean time he was treated to a lengthy criticism of Loftus’s conduct towards the Dublin Council and himself, the King’s Lord Deputy.⁹⁶ Wentworth made the same point to Cottington as he made to Laud: either he or Loftus had to be relieved of office as they could not remain in government together.⁹⁷ In 1638-9 his continuing hope that Cottington would assist him is evident in his correspondence with the Chancellor concerning the consequences of the proposed plans for Londonderry. It can also be seen in his readiness to communicate to Cottington his lack of confidence in the Earl of Antrim’s plans.⁹⁸

On several Irish matters which might have strained their relationship, it does appear that Cottington kept Wentworth informed of his actions. One such example concerns Viscount Wilmot, who approached Cottington in early 1635 to mediate with Wentworth regarding the suit brought against him regarding his possession of crown lands in Athlone. Cottington informed the Lord

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 15/335, 27 Jan 1636.

⁹⁵ See below, p. 106.

⁹⁶ Str. P. 3/316-7, 23 April 1638. See also *ibid.* 3/323, same to same 8 May 1638.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 3/330-31, 7 June 1638; see below, p. 112.

⁹⁸ Str. P. 10b/22-4, 8 Dec 1638; *ibid.* 10b/35, 10 Feb 1639.

Deputy that he would like to perform this service, but invited Wentworth to state his side of the case.⁹⁹ Another such incident concerns James Barr, described by Wentworth as ‘a Scottish pedlar’, who apparently carried around the English Court a proposal to increase the revenue from the Irish customs and, according to Wentworth, had accused him of criminal matters relating to his management of the customs revenues. Wentworth asked Cottington to assist him in this matter: if he found the King to be unsatisfied with any part of his answer, he would like Cottington to inform him so that he could properly defend himself against Barr’s accusations.¹⁰⁰ These two cases became linked as Wilmot was one of Barr’s supporters.¹⁰¹ According to Cottington, this proposition did not surface until after Weston’s death and he did not judge Barr’s claims to be worthy of any serious consideration.¹⁰² Before he received this letter from Cottington, Wentworth had written to Laud claiming that Barr’s scheme ‘was originally fomented by the Lord Treasurer and Cottington to Wentworth’s prejudice’, but it is quite likely that this was not actually Wentworth’s view, but that he used this as a means of persuading Laud to aid him in this business. If Laud regarded this as a mainly Irish business, it would not have aroused his zeal so much as if he suspected the involvement of the late lady Mora and her waiting-maid.¹⁰³ In February 1637 Cottington was quick to notify Wentworth that Sir Abraham Dawes had drawn up a book of rates for new impositions in Ireland ‘of which I had no notice till I saw it at the Irish Committee, and ther gave no other opinion butt that it should be

⁹⁹ Str. P. 3/190, 16 Feb 1635; see also Wentworth’s reply, *ibid.* 3/191-2, 10 April 1635.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* 3/193, Wentworth to Cottington 10 April 1635. See also *ibid.* 3/197-8, Wentworth to Charles I 9 May 1635.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* 6/151, Wentworth to Laud 10 March 1635.

¹⁰² *Ibid.* 15/79, Cottington to Wentworth 20 May 1635; see also *ibid.* 3/212, Wentworth to Cottington 13 July 1635; *ibid.* 15/184, Cottington to Wentworth 4 Aug 1635.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* 6/179, 18 May 1635.

Consulted with your lordship, and what resolution is taken I know nott.’¹⁰⁴ Wentworth clearly regarded the revised book of rates as part of an attack on his management of Irish revenue,¹⁰⁵ but it was not until October, when the book had already arrived in Ireland, that this matter appeared in Wentworth’s correspondence with Laud.¹⁰⁶ Wentworth probably retained suspicions regarding Cottington’s interest in Irish customs revenues, but on the whole he appears to have valued the support of the Chancellor on Irish matters, particularly in his actions against Cork, Mountnorris and Loftus. Laud’s role as a conductor of information to and from the Court was an important one, but Cottington provided an alternative means of access to the King and in some cases a quicker and no doubt more effective one.

Wentworth also hoped that Cottington would assist him in a number of northern matters, one of these being what he regarded as his victimisation by the Attorney General, William Noy, concerning his lease of land in Galtres forest.¹⁰⁷ On another northern matter, Cottington received a lengthy dispatch in the autumn of 1633 criticising the conduct of exchequer officials at Whitehall and Judge Vernon at the York assizes regarding northern recusants who had compounded with the recusancy commission to avoid the Sunday fines. He also mistakenly accused Vernon, instead of his partner Davenport, of rejecting depositions at the Durham assizes which had been taken before the Council of the North, using Sir Edward Coke’s argument that the Council in session did not constitute a court of record. Cottington was asked to use his influence to get Vernon hauled before the Council board for these offences and that he be

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 16/139, 27 Feb 1637.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* 3/293, Wentworth to Cottington 28 Aug 1637.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 7/53, Wentworth to Laud 18 Oct 1637; *ibid.* 7/72-3, Laud to Wentworth 16 Nov 1637.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 3/19, 15 Sept 1633; *ibid.* 3/32, 4 Nov 1633; W. J. Jones, “‘The Great Gamaliel of the Law’: Mr. Attorney Noye”, *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 40 (1977), p. 218.

removed from the Northern Circuit in future. He asked Cottington to delay this until his own suit in Star Chamber against Sir David Foulis had been completed, as he did not wish to suffer the enmity of the common lawyers before he had Foulis well and truly punished.¹⁰⁸ In November Cottington received a letter from Wentworth which contained a lengthy section regarding his suit against Foulis; as Chancellor of the Exchequer, Cottington would probably begin the sentencing in Star Chamber and his decision would have added importance. Given recent precedents, he expected that this case would merit a significant punishment as Wentworth had been slandered while engaged in the King's service and therefore Foulis's offence struck at the authority of the Crown. His statement that he 'wholly' recommended himself to Cottington's care was exaggerated as he also asked Laud, Weston and Carlisle for their support, but his letter to Cottington did go into great detail regarding the punishment he would like to see imposed on Sir David and Henry Foulis and his willingness to let the sheriff of Yorkshire, Sir Thomas

¹⁰⁸ Str. P. 3/22-8, 22 Oct 1633. Wentworth was made aware of this incident in general terms by the Vice-President, Sir Edward Osborne, but he jumped to the conclusion that the judge involved was Vernon, who had already crossed him in his work as receiver-general of recusant revenues, *ibid.* 13/31, 21 Aug 1633. Vernon had sat at the York assizes, but it was Judge Davenport who presided over the Durham assizes, Michael James Tillbrook, 'Aspects of the Government and Society of County Durham, 1558-1642', Ph. D. thesis, University of Liverpool (1981), p. 156. See also J. S. Cockburn, 'The Northern Assize Circuit', *Northern History* 3 (1968), p. 125, where Cockburn names Vernon as the judge responsible, cf. Cockburn, *A History of English Assizes 1558-1714* (Cambridge, 1972), p. 42, where the author has replaced Vernon's name with that of Davenport. In August 1632 Davenport presided over the Assizes at Durham and handled a case between Peter Smart and Thomas Carr, Wentworth's chaplain. Carr won the case and Tillbrook notes that Davenport 'appears to have taken a consistently antagonistic attitude towards Smart throughout the trial', 'County Durham', p. 527. Cottington was prepared to show Charles Wentworth's letter relating to the carriage of Bishop Morton of Durham towards the northern recusants who

Leighton escape punishment.¹⁰⁹ Cottington's assistance was again requested in 1639 when Wentworth took out a libel suit against Sir Piers Crosby.¹¹⁰ Cottington was also asked for assistance on matters where Weston was apparently being obstructive. In October 1634 Wentworth approached Cottington for assistance in the matter of his northern recusancy account as he could make no progress on this matter with the Treasurer. Weston had apparently demanded the payment of almost £6,000 into the Exchequer, of which Wentworth believed he only owed a few hundred pounds. Cottington was asked to explain the mystery of this demand.¹¹¹ Over a year later Wentworth informed Cottington that assignments to the navy would be paid a month late because of the death of his steward Richard Marris. He had written officially to the Treasury Commission, but Cottington, he wrote, owed him this favour as the payment of the above-mentioned £6,000 into the Exchequer had thrown his financial affairs into chaos.¹¹² Cottington was obviously reluctant to repay this money, but he was still regarded as a valued associate of the Lord Deputy; their correspondence reveals that the two men shared a friendship which was capable of surviving disagreements of this nature.

In Wentworth's correspondence with Laud, Cottington is frequently discussed disapprovingly in terms of his Spanish and Roman Catholic leanings:

had compounded, and reported to Wentworth that the King was aware of the Bishop's ill behaviour, Str. P. 14/119, 2 July 1634.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 3/32-4, 4 Nov 1633; *ibid.* 8/45, Wentworth to Laud 31 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 3/30, Wentworth to Weston 3 Oct 1633; BL, Egerton MS. 2597, f. 78, Wentworth to Carlisle undated. In the event Cottington was unable to attend Star Chamber due to illness, Str. P. 3/52, Cottington to Wentworth 26 Dec 1633; *ibid.* 3/55, Wentworth to Cottington 7 Feb 1634.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* 10b/70-71, 16 April 1639.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* 3/135-6, 6 Oct 1634.

¹¹² Str. P. 3/243-4, 13 Feb 1636.

Cottington was the ‘Don’ or the ‘beadsman’ who engaged in ‘Spanish tricks’.¹¹³ Similar usage also appears in Wentworth’s correspondence with Cottington himself, but then Wentworth made reference more genially to ‘Don Francisco’ Cottington’s ‘Spanish Gravity’, which he was accused of using to cover up his lively personality.¹¹⁴ For Cottington still enjoyed a close friendship with Wentworth;¹¹⁵ and this allowed him to make some notable complaints relating to the King’s treatment of him. In September 1633 he lamented the fact that while Charles and Weston had both been in the country, he had been ‘stucke here like a Turd upon a wall’, and had now only been granted ten days’ leave.¹¹⁶ Immediately after the death of his wife in March 1634, Cottington remarked bitterly that the King had prevented his journey into the country and had not bothered to send him a letter of condolence.¹¹⁷ Both men shared a love of hawking and several of their letters contain attempts to outdo each other, either in success or failure at the sport. Responding to Cottington’s lament that he had been called back to Court suddenly and had

¹¹³ See for example, *ibid.* 6/66, Laud to Wentworth 14 May 1634; *ibid.* 6/92, Laud to Wentworth 23 June 1634; *ibid.* 6/323, Laud to Wentworth 2 Aug 1634; *ibid.* 6/194, Laud to Wentworth 12 June 1635; *ibid.* 6/206, Wentworth to Laud 14 July 1635; *ibid.* 6/268, Wentworth to Laud 2 Nov 1635. The origin of the term ‘beadsman’ is explained in *ibid.* 6/88, Wentworth to Laud 23 Aug 1634: ‘As long as you live take heed of a fellow that hath Traded above twenty yeares with the Duke of Lerma, Rotherigo de Calderon, and with the man that went praying in the Streets, letting his Great Beads still knock downe one after another, that you would allmost have thought he had been discharging Pistolls, whilst he and Cottington were falsifying Records, abusing Judges, and perverting Judgment, all the space’. See also *ibid.* 6/108, Laud to Wentworth 20 Oct 1634.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* 3/157, 22 Dec 1634; *ibid.* 3/212, 13 July 1635; *ibid.* 10b/70, 16 April 1639.

¹¹⁵ Cottington’s portrait hung in Wentworth Woodhouse; Oliver Millar, ‘Strafford and Van Dyck’, in *For Veronica Wedgwood, These* ed. Richard Ollard and Pamela Tudor-Craig (London, 1986), p. 122.

¹¹⁶ Str. P. 3/17, 2 Sept 1633.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* 13/219, 11 March 1634.

had to abandon his hawking, Wentworth wrote that there was such a shortage of partridges in Ireland that he would have to resort to using sparrowhawks to hunt blackbirds.¹¹⁸ Cottington and Wentworth also enjoyed lighthearted digs at each other on the subject of romance. Discussing Attorney General Noy, Cottington proposed to make him ‘fall in love with my Lady Carlile, who they say hath Civilized very harsh men, And drawn them from Northren Barbarisme to Southren Courtship & neatnesse’.¹¹⁹ Wentworth responded by telling Cottington that he had indeed been much improved by his ‘observations and attendances upon her Ladyships wisdom and Civility’ and that Cottington could do with a dose of this himself.¹²⁰ In November 1634 Cottington told Wentworth that it was reported in England that the Lord Deputy did ‘Galantear a certaine faire ladie ther.’¹²¹ Wentworth claimed not to have the slightest idea who Cottington meant by this.¹²² In the spring of 1638, Wentworth wished his friend well having heard rumours of his impending marriage to the daughter of Lord Keeper Coventry.¹²³ Talk of this marriage was, according to the

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.* 13/79, Cottington to Wentworth 29 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 3/36, Wentworth to Cottington 24 Nov 1633. See also *ibid.* 3/53, Cottington to Wentworth 26 Dec 1633: ‘A poore Deputy you are God wott to hunt Black birds in a ditch’. In December 1635 Wentworth told Cottington that he had not been out with his own hawks for two years; if Cottington could say the same he would be ready to hang himself, *ibid.* 3/236, 14 Dec 1635. In February 1636 Wentworth wrote to tell Cottington that his illness had probably been due to staying out late hawking and that he could hardly expect his body to be as it was when he was 22, *ibid.* 3/242, 13 Feb 1636. For Wentworth’s love of hawking see also *ibid.* 40/70, Radcliffe [?] to William, 2nd Earl of Strafford undated.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.* 3/53, 26 Dec 1633.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.* 3/58, 7 Feb 1634.

¹²¹ *Ibid.* 14/217, 22 Nov 1634.

¹²² *Ibid.* 3/157, 22 Dec 1634.

¹²³ *Ibid.* 3/316, 23 April 1638. Wentworth was informed of this rumour by Laud, who noted that this match would not please the ghost of Weston; *ibid.* 7/88, received 17 Feb 1638. See also *ibid.* 7/101, same to same 14 May 1638.

‘bridegroom’, nothing more than idle gossip. Wentworth’s response to this was to treat Cottington to a piece of advice; he ought not to have broken off the wedding.¹²⁴ In 1637 Henry Rich, Earl of Holland, featured in their correspondence as Cottington commented on Wentworth’s reported friendship with the Earl. The Lord Deputy replied that he laughed at his friend ‘for being that last Silly bird which had not fastned one feather into the Eagles wing of my Lord of Hollande; it is a Shame for an old and (as you presume) soe perfect a Faulkoner to be soe Clumst and long about it with your imping needles.’¹²⁵ Joking apart, Holland - as Groom of the Stool - was a figure at Court who could not be ignored: Wentworth was very much aware of his support for Irish opponents of the Lord Deputy’s rule, particularly Mountnorris and Loftus, and approached Cottington as well as Laud to try and counteract Holland’s influence at Court. This reached a critical point when Wentworth requested that Holland submit to questioning in the Lord Deputy’s Star Chamber case against Sir Piers Crosby.¹²⁶

Cottington was also responsible for a number of jokes at Wentworth’s expense. A comment which Cottington made at the Council board concerning Wentworth’s views on how to avoid trouble in Parliament was reported to

¹²⁴ *Ibid.* 10b/11, Cottington to Wentworth June 1638; *ibid.* 10b/12, Wentworth to Cottington 1 Aug 1638.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.* 16/106, Cottington to Wentworth 13 Jan 1637; *ibid.* 3/270, Wentworth to Cottington 23 Feb 1637. See also *ibid.* 16/139, Cottington to Wentworth 27 Feb 1637. By the summer the situation had been reversed: Wentworth alleged that Sir Arthur Ingram had managed to create ‘a Right understanding’ between Cottington and Holland, *ibid.* 3/293, 28 Aug 1637.

¹²⁶ Wentworth discussed Holland’s attitude towards this request and asked for Cottington’s support in this case, *ibid.* 10b/24, 8 Dec 1638; *ibid.* 10b/70-71, 16 April 1639. On Wentworth’s relations with Holland see below, pp. 192-202.

Wentworth by Laud,¹²⁷ Also in 1634 Laud claimed that after he had advised Cottington to make a visit to Ireland, where ‘it would advantage him both in wisdom and Judgment, how to expresse himselfe’, Cottington had claimed that there was no need for him to do this, as he could learn from Wentworth and stay at home. He apparently had a copy of the speech which Wentworth planned to make at the opening of the Irish Parliament and was passing it around the Court - Laud, however, was unable to get hold of it. In a later letter from Laud, the Archbishop passed on Cottington’s description of its various passages, a description which tallied with Wentworth’s actual speech.¹²⁸ Cottington, however, denied ever seeing Wentworth’s speech, either before or after it was made. He also claimed not to remember having asked Philip Mainwaring when Wentworth would come home, a question which had apparently moved Wentworth to tell Mainwaring that he would prefer it if Cottington made himself ‘merry at something els.’¹²⁹ Despite his occasional annoyance at Cottington’s pranks, Wentworth did not allow this to damage their friendship. This is evident if his relationship with the Chancellor is not interpreted solely through his correspondence with Laud. From 1635 onwards

¹²⁷ Str. P. 6/70, 14 May 1634.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* 6/92, 23 June 1634; *ibid.* 6/323, 2 Aug 1634. See also *ibid.* 6/82, Wentworth to Laud 19 July 1634. For the speech itself see *ibid.* 3/158-65, delivered in Parliament to both Houses on 15 July 1634. One significant point was Wentworth’s advice not to take part in private meetings, which particularly amused Cottington. Wentworth denied having ever taken part in one, and indeed the evidence for a meeting in Sir Robert Cotton’s house before the 1628 session is flimsy, *ibid.* 6/88, Wentworth to Laud 23 Aug 1634; Harold Hulme, *The Life of Sir John Eliot* (London, 1957), pp. 184-5; Sharpe, *Sir Robert Cotton 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1979), p. 183; J. N. Ball, ‘Sir John Eliot and Parliament, 1624-1629’, in *Faction and Parliament* ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford, 1978), p. 194.

¹²⁹ Str. P. 3/139, Cottington to Wentworth 15 Oct 1634. See also *ibid.* 3/113-4, Wentworth to Cottington 22 Aug 1634 and *ibid.* 3/1412 same to same 18 Nov 1634; *ibid.* 5/145, Wentworth to Windebank 20 Dec 1634.

the Archbishop had generally poor relations with Cottington, which he discussed at length in his correspondence with Wentworth, but it was in the Lord Deputy's interests to try and maintain a strong relationship with both men.

The relationship between Wentworth, Laud and Cottington has to be understood in the light of their differing personalities and attitudes towards the business of government. As has been discussed above, Laud had no liking for what he considered to be Weston's corrupt practices in the management of his office and he clearly associated Cottington with Weston's conduct in government. But he was also extremely concerned at Cottington's apparent support for John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln and deeply opposed to Cottington's crypto-Catholicism.¹³⁰ It was in Wentworth's interests to try and prevent an open breach developing between Laud and Cottington, but this was to be no easy matter. In August 1635 Cottington informed Wentworth that Laud 'declares much his displeasure towards me and peradventure it increaseth by my taking no notice of it'.¹³¹ He repeated this in October, and persisted in claiming that he took no notice of Laud's antagonism towards

¹³⁰ Although it is worthy of note that in 1631 Laud approached Cottington for assistance regarding a matter in which his standing with the King was at stake, his use of timber from the forest of Shotover: 'I beseech you, to do me that right to set me in his Majesty's favour and good opinion as you find I have deserved; or if anything stick upon me, let me know the particulars and be called upon to clear myself, which I shall account a singular favour from your Lordship', undated [but c.10 July 1631], Laud, *Works* vol. VII, pp. 39-40; Anthony J. Cooper, 'The Political Career of Francis Cottington, 1605-52', B. Litt. thesis, University of Oxford (1966), pp. 65-6. In October 1632 Laud asked Wentworth to thank Weston and Cottington for their assistance regarding a private suit; Str. P. 20/112, 1 Oct 1632.

¹³¹ *Ibid.* 15/184, 4 Aug 1635.

him.¹³² Wentworth, in his replies, regretted this state of affairs, and advised Cottington that it might be better if he did become angry over it, arguing that there might be a better chance of reconciliation if the air was cleared. He admitted, however, that he did not know how he could attempt a reconciliation between them.¹³³ This episode occurred during the operation of the Treasury Commission, when the two men disagreed over a number of matters and Laud worked to try and prevent Cottington gaining the staff.¹³⁴ Cottington visited Laud in July 1637 to discuss Bishop Williams's punishment, but his failure to repeat his visit confirmed Laud's suspicions that this approach was not made in earnest. While he was careful to inform Wentworth of Cottington's occasional good services on the Lord Deputy's behalf, Laud's relations with the Chancellor were never good.¹³⁵

¹³² *Ibid.* 3/225, 3 Oct 1635. See also *ibid.* 15/253, Cottington to Wentworth 30 Oct 1635, where Cottington refers to Laud's opinion of him: '...and certainly if this man doe hate any one (of which ther is little doubt) I am he, and indeed have least deserved it.'

¹³³ *Ibid.* 3/220, 11 Sept 1635; *ibid.* 3/225-6, 31 Oct 1635.

¹³⁴ See below, chapter four.

¹³⁵ Laud also noted Cottington's apparent friendship with Holland, Str. P. 7/49v, 28 Aug 1637; *ibid.* 7/75, 16 Nov 1637; and during 1637 Laud was concerned at what he saw as Cottington's attempts to develop a friendship with the Earl of Northumberland, *ibid.* 7/17, Laud to Wentworth 11 Feb 1637, which turned out to be a needless concern. In December 1637 Laud commented approvingly to Wentworth on Cottington's conduct concerning the composition with the Duchess of Buckingham for the Irish customs, *ibid.* 7/81, 19 Dec 1637. In the spring of 1638 Laud also pointed out to Wentworth that Cottington 'spake very honestly' concerning Wentworth's handling of Loftus compared with Arundel who spoke against Wentworth on this matter, *ibid.* 7/112v, received 5 June 1638. In the summer and autumn of 1638 Laud and Cottington seem to have been briefly on reasonable terms, although Laud's suspicions had still not weakened, *ibid.* 7/119v, 22 June 1638. For Cottington's account to Wentworth of this improvement in relations see *ibid.* 18/152, 24 Nov 1638. But by the beginning of 1639, Laud believed that Cottington supported the calling of Parliament, *ibid.* 7/156v, 29 Dec 1638; *ibid.* 7/174v-5, received 22 March 1639; *ibid.* 7/187, 1 May 1639.

Laud was usually deeply suspicious of Cottington's involvement in Irish affairs. He was particularly concerned that Cottington would attempt to hold up the granting of royal impropriations to the Church of Ireland. He warned Wentworth that Cottington had, in his opinion, double-crossed the Lord Deputy in his attempt to gain Mountnorris's posts for Sir Adam Loftus in 1636. But Laud was well aware of Wentworth's friendship with Cottington and chided him for placing trust in the man.¹³⁶ Laud's dislike of Cottington was increased by the Chancellor's inability to resist deliberately goading Laud into making a fool of himself; the enraged Archbishop must have appeared to him a very amusing sight. Wentworth, however, valued the Chancellor's experience in governmental affairs and enjoyed a generally friendly correspondence with him. He was prepared to discuss important matters of Irish business with him, request his assistance on difficult issues and occasionally he ignored Laud and dealt solely through Cottington.¹³⁷ It was clearly in Wentworth's interest to have more than one means of approaching the King and, on the whole, Cottington proved to be an effective ally.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* 6/289, 30 Nov 1635: 'And if this be the third tyme you have been soe served by this waiting woman, none is to be blamed but your selfe, that would soe often trust her'. It is interesting to compare this statement with Cottington's performance at Strafford's trial, where he stoutly defended his friend; Havran, *Caroline Courtier*, p. 152; Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 349.

¹³⁷ Wentworth appears not to have approached Laud in his attempt to replace Mountnorris with Sir Adam Loftus because the payment of money was involved.

CHAPTER THREE

WENTWORTH AND LAUD

One of the most interesting aspects of the career of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford was his relationship with William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. Laud and Wentworth feature in traditional historiography as the architects and promoters of 'thorough', the policy of reform which opposed corruption, self-interest and lax administration in the King's government; and even in recent work they are still given joint treatment.¹ It is assumed that they formed a recognisable grouping or faction in the politics of the Court. But this relationship was more complex than has been assumed: Wentworth and Laud did not enjoy a close, personal friendship and their association developed because they were both essentially isolated at Court. It is important to note that this association was largely maintained on paper: during most of the 1630s Wentworth was absent from Whitehall, being resident either in York or Ireland.

Their surviving correspondence, comprising over two hundred and thirty letters, forms a significant part of the Strafford Papers and is mainly to be found in two letter books.² The bulk of their correspondence is in the form of long letters, particularly those written by Wentworth, and the nature of their correspondence required some form of defence against it falling into the wrong hands. Cipher was used by Wentworth in his correspondence with a number of individuals, including the King, but Laud did not find this an easy way to

¹ See for example, G. M. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts* (London, 1919), p. 178; Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 132-45.

² Str. P. 6 and 7. Several letters dating mainly from 1630-1633 can be found in Str. P. 8, 12, 13 and 20.

communicate. One confused passage prompted the Lord Deputy to write that ‘there is a iust iudgment fallen upon me for challenging your Grace in Cypher...for on my faith there is of your Cipher in this letter sett in the Margent that for my life I can make noe earthly thing of’.³ As a result, in 1636 an additional interesting technical feature appeared in their correspondence. At Wentworth’s suggestion, the letter itself would contain the more public and bland topics, while a side paper was used to discuss the more sensitive material; their criticisms of individuals at Court. These sidepapers contained no greeting or signature, and were intended, no doubt, to reduce the need for Laud to use a large amount of cipher.⁴

³ Str. P. 6/54, Laud to Wentworth 12 April 1634; *ibid.* 6/58, Wentworth to Laud 15 May 1634. See Laud, *Works*, vol. VII, p. 70, for the corrected passage, in which Laud stated his opinion that Weston would attempt to obstruct the Commission of Inquiry into the Cork tomb. Several months earlier, Laud had expressed his dislike of communicating in cipher: ‘I have received your Cipher, but God in heaven knowes what I shall make of it. If you write much in it, it is impossible I should find leisure to sitt and decipher it. If you write only five or six lines, which you would keepe secret, it may be I may make a Shift to read so much, though I am such a Stranger to that Course, that I cannot tell whether I can or noe. But if I finde I cannot, I’ll tell you soe’, Str. P. 6/26, 13 Jan 1634.

⁴ For Laud’s dislike of cipher see *ibid.* 6/284, Laud to Wentworth 30 Nov 1635. Concerning Wentworth’s suggestion that they use sidepapers see *ibid.* 6/295, 3 Jan 1636; for Laud’s response see *ibid.* 6/316-7, 23 Jan 1636. For an example of one such letter see *ibid.* 6 325-36, Wentworth to Laud 9 March 1636. The ‘public’ letters had to be retained by Wentworth because these often contained instructions from the King relayed to him by Laud and he needed to be able to prove, if questioned, that matters were done at the King’s command, whereas the sidepapers could simply be destroyed. Concerning their past correspondence the plan was for both to copy out the ‘public’ sections and destroy the original letter. Fortunately Wentworth chose to amend this plan and have his secretaries copy the sidepaper as well. Laud realised that he would have nothing which might protect him if the King denied giving a particular command and requested that Wentworth send him back his former letters so that he could record the public matters discussed in them. Their subsequent

Despite the existence of this very important collection, little is known of the early stages of the association of Wentworth and Laud. Letters extant written by Laud show clearly that their relationship pre-dated by at least several months their meeting which features in his diary.⁵ In these early letters of late 1630, Laud was already in agreement with Wentworth's criticisms of Richard, Lord Weston, the Lord Treasurer, and 'thorough' was already a topic of their correspondence.⁶ By Laud's third surviving letter he was already commenting on the length of Wentworth's letters.⁷ But their early correspondence gives no clue as to when their association actually began. Wentworth first sat in the House of Lords in the 1629 session as Baron Wentworth of Wentworth, Newmarch and Oversley, and Laud sat as Bishop of London, but the session was a short one and the two men were members together on only one committee. There appears to be no evidence which would suggest that their association was formed in Parliament.⁸ In November 1629 Wentworth became a privy councillor, but he and Laud did not attend the Council together until

correspondence contains no mention of this being done; see Laud, *Works*, vol. VII, p. 235. Wentworth's sidepapers generally made heavy use of cipher.

⁵ *Ibid.* vol. III, p. 213, 21 Jan 1631. Wedgwood was apparently unaware of their very early correspondence and instead emphasised the significance of this meeting. But Laud's diary as a whole contains very few references to Wentworth: there is no mention of him again until the entry relating to his imprisonment on 11 Nov 1640; *ibid.* p. 238.

⁶ Str. P. 20/107, 17 Nov 1630.

⁷ *Ibid.* 12/184, 28 Dec 1630. Wentworth's letters to Laud from this period do not appear to have survived.

⁸ This was 'the committee appointed to take a view of the Store of Munitions of Shipping and Arms and the Defence of the Kingdom'. It was the only committee on which Wentworth sat. Laud sat on six others; see *Journals of the House of Lords*, vol. 4, pp. 37 and 7, 19, 25, 31, 34 and 39.

the following March.⁹ They were not present together again until 7 May.¹⁰ Alexander Leighton claimed that his trial in Star Chamber in June 1630 ‘did occasion their combination’,¹¹ and Laud’s correspondence at least shows that they did discuss this matter.¹² It is also worthy of note that in this month Laud and Wentworth were present together at four meetings of the Privy Council and this high pattern of joint attendance was not to be repeated until February and March 1631.¹³ This suggests that Leighton’s trial may well have been the starting point of their association.¹⁴

Laud and Wentworth’s association provided both men with much-needed support and assistance. Their relationship in the early 1630s is not easy to examine as no correspondence appears to have survived between December 1630 and July 1632,¹⁵ but by the autumn of 1632 the King was aware of their

⁹ For Wentworth's appointment as a privy councillor see *APC*, vol. 5, p. 174. For Wentworth and Laud's first joint appearance on 19 March see *ibid.* vol 5, p. 317. See also Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VI, p. 336 and Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 81.

¹⁰ *APC*, vol. 5, p. 373.

¹¹ Alexander Leighton, *An Epitome or Brief Discoverie* (London, 1646), p. 68. See also Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VII, p. 152 and Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 91.

¹² Str. P. 12/184, 28 Dec 1630.

¹³ *APC*, vol. 6, pp. 5, 12, 16 and 24. Heylyn made no mention of Laud and Wentworth working together on the punishment of Leighton, but states that their friendship developed not long after Wentworth was sworn a privy councillor, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (London, 1668), p. 194.

¹⁴ But see Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 91. See Quintrell, ‘The making of Charles I’s Book of Orders’, *English Historical Review* 95 (1980), pp. 553-72, for a convincing argument that in 1630 Wentworth and Laud were not responsible for the book’s creation.

¹⁵ Str. P. 20/110, Laud to Wentworth 30 July 1632 (not 1631 as Laud wrote. Note the reference to ‘Mr Secretarye Windebank’ and see Laud, *Works*, vol. VII, p. 301).

regular correspondence.¹⁶ Shortly before Wentworth's departure for Ireland, Laud wrote to Wentworth on the subject of the state of the Church of Ireland and this issue was obviously one of the main reasons for Laud's attempt to maintain a close association with the Lord Deputy.¹⁷ As President of the Council of the North, Wentworth had himself realised the desirability of engaging allies at Charles I's Court and this was to become even more crucial once he had left for Ireland. Laud's problem of distance was not one of geography. His diary shows his dislike of what he termed 'great factions in Court', and he maintained a self-righteous opposition to the following of 'private ends' rather than 'public service'.¹⁸ He found it difficult to outwit his less ponderous rivals at Court and was never completely certain of retaining the King's favour. Both men were essentially isolated at Court and neither could rightly be described as courtiers. But Laud's position gave him access to Charles which was particularly advantageous for the Lord Deputy in his contests with the Court supporters of Irish magnates. Wentworth made himself unpopular because of his abrasive manner of dealing with individuals, a manner which lost him the support of the Earl of Arundel in particular. Although he retained a number of connections, most notably with the Earl of Carlisle and Lord Cottington, he needed a line of approach to the King through someone who could be relied upon to defend his work and relay the King's opinion of his efforts to him. Although Laud was not always in agreement with Wentworth's actions, he did ensure that Charles heard the Lord Deputy's argument.¹⁹ Laud benefited from his association with

¹⁶ Str. P. 20/112, 1 Oct 1632: according to Laud, Charles said to him 'I see thear is good Correspondencye betweene mye Lord Deputye & you (which I am glad of because you ar both honest men & mye servants)'.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 20/113, 30 April 1633.

¹⁸ Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 221.

¹⁹ It must be remembered that although Laud was a frequent attender of the Privy Council and Star Chamber, he was not a member of the committees for trade and foreign affairs until

Wentworth in that he felt the need for some strong moral support and hoped that Wentworth would give him the undivided loyalty which others failed to do.

At first sight their relationship might seem surprising. Laud was twenty years older than Wentworth and pointed this out when he was tired of reading Wentworth's complaints of ill health. The two men were also from very different backgrounds. Clarendon portrayed the son of a Reading clothier as 'a man of great parts, and very exemplar virtues' who 'retained too keen a memory of those who had so unjustly and uncharitably persecuted him before'.²⁰ Although neither Laud nor Wentworth were quick to overlook opposition to their actions, and Wentworth in particular seemed to enjoy a talent for making enemies, the proud and self-confident Yorkshire landowner did not share Laud's usual caution and hesitancy in affairs of state and the politics of the Court. To a certain extent their characters complemented each other: Laud's cautious words were occasionally able to restrain the Lord Deputy; his strength of will was able to inspire the more pessimistic Archbishop.

As C. V. Wedgwood points out, Wentworth also had religious views which differed strikingly from those of his older associate. The aspect of High Church Anglicanism which attracted Wentworth was its insistence on obedience to the secular power. Church ceremonial and the exact form of the

1635, *ibid.* p. 223., and it is doubtful that he exerted any real influence over the direction of foreign policy even after this point as Charles probably did not reveal matters of great importance to the committee. These appointments may well signify nothing more than Charles's willingness to allow Laud the appearance, rather than the substance, of influence. See below, p. 193.

²⁰ Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, pp. 120-121. Regarding Wentworth's complaints of illness see Str. P. 6/238, Wentworth to Laud 12 Sept 1635; *ibid.* 6/253, Laud to Wentworth 4 Oct 1635.

liturgy were things he found difficult to regard as matters worthy of disobedience.²¹ George Radcliffe noted that Wentworth had been ‘bred up in Calvin’s opinions, wherein he was afterwards more moderate’, and that he was not fond of religious disputes.²² His Calvinist upbringing and education was certainly recognised by Laud who chided him for his use of the term ‘Pastors’:

‘...where, I praye, in all the Ancient Fathers doe you find Pastor applyed to any but a Bishop? Well, I see the errors of your breeding will sticke by you; Pastors and Elders and all will come inn, if I let you alone.’²³

As Wedgwood notes, Wentworth probably regarded the Archbishop as something of a pastor-figure.²⁴ It is clear, however, that Wentworth did not regard Laud as a close, personal friend during the early 1630s and indeed Laud remarked to Wentworth in the summer of 1633 that he was apparently the last at Court to hear of the secretive marriage to his third wife, Elizabeth Rodes, which had taken place nearly a year before.²⁵ The tone of their correspondence is not one of deep friendship, sharing and enjoying mutual trust and absolute confidence; Laud was not a friend to Wentworth in the sense that George Radcliffe and Christopher Wandesford were, and it could be argued that Wentworth’s correspondence with Lord Cottington displays as much, if not more, evidence of friendship.

²¹ See, for instance, *ibid.* 10/169-70, Wentworth to Lorne 28 Aug 1638.

²² *Ibid.* 34/not numbered, Radcliffe’s notes for his life of Strafford.

²³ *Ibid.* 6/44, Wentworth to Laud 12 April 1634; *ibid.* 6/67, Laud to Wentworth 14 May 1634.

²⁴ Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 94.

²⁵ Str. P. 8/16, 13 Aug 1633; R. M. Milnes ed., *Private Letters from the Earl of Strafford to his Third Wife* (Philobiblon Society, 1854), pp. 6-7. Wentworth did not learn from this: in early 1635 Laud heard the news of the birth of Wentworth’s son from Arundel; Str. P. 6/135, Laud to Wentworth 12 Jan 1635.

Despite this absence of a close friendship, there were significant beliefs which drew the two men together. Of great importance was their shared belief in the necessity of order. Both could see disorder wherever they looked, be it in the King's government, the counties of the north or in university colleges. Wentworth's first speech as President of the Council of the North in December 1628 set out his views on this matter,²⁶ and Laud's obsession with order can be seen throughout his career.²⁷ Their criticisms of 'the Lady Mora and her waiting-maid' were a significant part of this issue. Both men clearly shared a firm belief that Charles's multiple kingdoms needed firm government and administration. They also shared the belief that they were the right men for the task.

Nevertheless, throughout their association Laud and Wentworth managed to disagree over personalities and politics. In 1634 there was a strong disagreement between the two men over Wentworth's choice of a replacement for the old and infirm Sir Dudley Norton, principal Secretary of State in Ireland. Philip Mainwaring seems to have been regarded by Wentworth as an able assistant who had given him good service in the past and he had worked as an agent in the Spanish Netherlands and the United Provinces for the Earl of Arundel.²⁸ Wentworth had approached Cottington, asking him to mediate with the King, but Laud told Wentworth that Cottington also disagreed with this choice and had remarked that Wentworth would burn his fingers if he persisted in it.²⁹ On the issue of recusancy, which concerned both the Archbishop and

²⁶ Bodl., Tanner MS. 72, f. 300.

²⁷ See Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud*, p. 133 and *passim.*, and Charles Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud* (London, 1987), *passim.*

²⁸ David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his Circle*, (New Haven, 1985), p. 69; Hervey, *Arundel*, pp. 248-9.

²⁹ Str. P. 6/33, 11 March 1634. For Mainwaring's letters to Wentworth see *ibid.* 12/95, 8 Dec 1629; *ibid.* 12/149, 9 Oct 1630; *ibid.* 12/158, 29 Oct 1630; *ibid.* 12/161, 6 Nov 1630; *ibid.*

Wentworth in his capacity as receiver of recusant revenues in the North, their opinions again diverged. In December 1637, Laud informed Wentworth that Charles had granted him the profits of fines and arrearages in the High Commission courts of both provinces to benefit the St Paul's repair fund. He claimed that the Vice-President, Sir Edward Osborne, had ensured that this would not affect the actual recusancy compositions; recusants, however, could still be fined for clandestine marriages, among other offences.³⁰ In reply, Wentworth informed Laud that there was a private resolution in the North that minor misdemeanours should not result in prosecution, lest this lead annoyed recusants to refuse to compound. Wentworth estimated that if the ecclesiastical courts began prosecutions, the loss of revenue would amount to £10,000.³¹ Laud's reply to this showed that he disapproved of granting what amounted to an immunity from prosecution;³² Wentworth responded by trying to show that this policy was a sensible one in the circumstances, and that no immunity from prosecution had been allowed for gross or scandalous crimes.³³ The Lord Deputy's policy of encouraging compounding had already led him into conflict with Judge Vernon in 1633 and on this whole issue he was clearly out of step with Laud, who was not comfortable with this policy.³⁴

12/181, 19 Dec 1630 and *ibid.* 13/17, 12 July 1632. See also *ibid.* 4/88-9, Charles I to Wentworth (signet) 16 June 1634, appointing Mainwaring Secretary and commenting on his past service to the Crown.

³⁰ *Ibid.* 7/79v-80, 19 Dec 1637.

³¹ *Ibid.* 7/83v, 10 April 1638.

³² *Ibid.* 7/99v, 14 May 1638.

³³ *Ibid.* 7/104v, 8 June 1638; *ibid.* 7/121, 7 Aug 1638.

³⁴ For Wentworth's dispute with Judge Vernon (who was following Lord Keeper Coventry's Star Chamber charge) see *ibid.* 3/64-5, Wentworth to Weston 14 March 1634; Talbot ed., *Miscellanea: Recusant Revenues*, pp. 299.

In 1633 Laud and Wentworth also took up diverging positions on an issue which closely concerned the King. This was the prosecution of John Bridgeman, Bishop of Chester, who Wentworth had found to be a useful ally in his attempts to extract composition payments from recusants in Lancashire.³⁵ By the summer, the affair had become a contest before the Privy Council between the Bishop and his supporters, and the investigating team led by Sir Thomas Canon. From the very beginning of the affair, Wentworth had clearly given his support to Bridgeman. As Dr. Quintrell notes, Wentworth was himself at this moment undergoing a similar experience at the hands of Sir David Foulis, who had spread rumours relating to Wentworth's handling of money paid in knighthood fines.³⁶ This, as well as Wentworth's handling of later accusations against his financial management in Ireland, reveals that the Lord Deputy took a very dim view of this dangerous form of slander. Wentworth's usual method of dealing with this problem was to defend himself vigorously, or counter attack, and this is precisely what he did on behalf of the Bishop, attempting to influence the Council while Charles and Laud were in Scotland. It is clear that the King disapproved of Wentworth's action, ordering the removal of the Council's offensive letter from its register;³⁷ and it is possible that it was knowledge of the King's reaction to his behaviour which encouraged him at last to leave London for North Wales and embarkation for Ireland. There does not appear to be any other immediate reason for his departure at this time: since the autumn of 1632 Wentworth had delayed his

³⁵ See Quintrell, 'Lancashire ills, the King's will and the troubling of Bishop Bridgeman', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire* 132 (1983), pp. 67-95 and also Quintrell, 'Laud, Wentworth and the Bridgeman Case', *ibid.* 137 (1987), pp. 155-9. On Bridgeman's usefulness to Wentworth see Staffordshire Record Office, Earl of Bradford MSS at Weston Park [hereafter Staff. R O], D1287/18/2, a series of letters from Wentworth to Bridgeman dating from 22 July 1629 to 10 Oct 1632.

³⁶ See Quintrell, 'Lancashire ills', p. 82 and also Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, pp. 107-10.

³⁷ Quintrell, 'Lancashire ills', pp. 88-90.

departure despite warnings from Cottington and Coke, and he appeared to be determined to stay to attend his libel action against Sir David and Henry Foulis in the Star Chamber.³⁸ Charles was not alone in his disapproval of Wentworth's stance on the Bridgeman case. In his 'Memoriall' of July 1633, Laud referred to Wentworth's actions as 'violence and prejudging of the busines against the king', and commented very unfavourably on Wentworth's attempts to harm the reputation of Canon by 'bringing the poore man into the Star Chamber for a busines of 2 yeere old and for which submission made before'. This document makes it clear that Wentworth did not deal openly with Laud on this matter:

'The Lord Deputy the inditer of the Commissioners, and the whole manager of that parte of the busines: don without my knowledge.'³⁹

Writing to Laud shortly before his departure to Ireland, Wentworth had tried to persuade him to regard Bridgeman as a useful prelate who had worked hard in his diocese and who was now being hounded mercilessly.⁴⁰ Wentworth stayed with Bridgeman in Chester en route to Beaumaris, a fact which cannot have gone unnoticed by Laud, and from Beaumaris he sent a note to Bridgeman enclosing three letters to be sent to Lord Treasurer Weston, Lord Cottington, and Secretary Coke. These contained a plea from Wentworth to the recipients to mediate with the King on the Bishop's behalf.⁴¹ But the King's strong

³⁸ See Str. P. 12/301, Cottington to Wentworth 24 Sept 1632; *ibid.* 12/304, Newcastle (relaying Cottington's advice) to Wentworth 12 Oct 1632; *ibid.* 12/312, Cottington to Wentworth 30 Nov 1632 and *ibid.* 5/8, Coke to Wentworth 27 May 1633.

³⁹ Lambeth Palace, Laudian Papers 943, ff. 183-4, Laud's 'Memoriall' 11 July 1633; Quintrell 'Laud, Wentworth and the Bridgeman Case', pp. 158-9.

⁴⁰ Str. P. 8/2-5, 4 June 1633. This is the earliest surviving letter from Wentworth to Laud.

⁴¹ Staff. R. O., D1287/18/2 (47) 27 July 1633. Str. P. 5/6, Wentworth to Coke 19 July 1633 contains the same text as Bridgeman's copy. The letter from Wentworth was written on 19

personal involvement in the affair doomed Wentworth's chances of success and the affair ended with a vexatious penalty for Bridgeman.⁴² It is clear from this that Wentworth and Laud, on this issue at least, did not form a united bloc and that Wentworth was perfectly willing to try and work through other members of the Privy Council, as he was to do over the appointment of Philip Mainwaring nine months later. Nor did Wentworth rely wholly on Laud for assistance during his libel action against Sir David Foulis in the Star Chamber in the autumn of 1633, approaching Cottington and Carlisle for their help.⁴³ Whatever else the Bridgeman episode demonstrates about the central government's interest in ecclesiastical affairs in the North, and the importance to the King and his Archbishop of repairing St. Paul's Cathedral, it certainly shows that Laud was not pleased with what he regarded as Wentworth's interference in the matter. Wentworth had shown that he was prepared to defend a useful ally, even if it meant clearly opposing the King's wishes. This independent spirit, as Dr. Quintrell notes, contrasts notably with Laud's more cautious approach.⁴⁴ Quintrell also notes that Laud was not amused at Bridgeman's attempts to bribe him, and 'clearly associated Wentworth with this line of approach'.⁴⁵ Laud's unease at Wentworth's dubious methods of operation seems to have abated during the 1630s, probably due to their separation by the Irish sea and to Laud's belief that Wentworth would be able to implement the policy of 'thorough' on the Church of Ireland.

July, but received by Bridgeman (from Beaumaris) dated 27 July. Wentworth sailed on 23 July.

⁴² Quintrell, 'Lancashire ills', p. 82. Bridgeman did his best to conceal the annual payments to the Crown, thereafter, in his personal accounts.

⁴³ Str. P. 8/45, Wentworth to Laud 31 Oct 1633; see above, pp. 67-8, and below, pp. 168-9.

⁴⁴ Wentworth remained friendly with, and supportive towards, Bridgeman, who wrote him several effusive letters; see Str. P. 17/29, *ibid.* 20/119.

⁴⁵ Quintrell, 'Laud, Wentworth and the Bridgeman Case', p. 157.

Shortly after Wentworth's arrival in Ireland, his chaplain Dr. John Bramhall sent Laud an account of the state of the Church of Ireland. Bramhall described the poor condition of church buildings in Dublin, concluding that a far worse state of affairs must prevail in the rest of the country. He noted that the English liturgy was not uniformly used and that the serious problem of pluralism existed, due to the poverty of church livings. His final point concerned the matter of alienated church lands and he made specific reference to the Earl of Cork. He praised Wentworth's initial attempts to discover the true state of the Church and clergy,⁴⁶ and Laud was clearly pleased with Wentworth's plans to restote alienated church lands.⁴⁷ In case the Archbishop raised his hopes for the Irish Church too high, the Lord Deputy inserted a note of caution when he wrote to Laud emphasising the appalling state of the Church as a whole, and the severe practical problems which needed to be overcome. His catalogue of problems was indeed a lengthy one, echoing Bramhall's comments on the poverty of the clergy which in turn led to pluralism. Several clergy had recusant wives and children and popish influence was generally very strong. Wentworth believed it essential for the future good government of the Church of Ireland that 'all the Cannons now in force in England should be imposed upon this Clergy'.⁴⁸

The Lord Deputy was keen in principle to work with the Archbishop to reform the Church, but was more concerned at the outset of his period of rule in Dublin to establish the army as a properly funded and well trained body and to pay off the debts of the Crown as soon as possible. He regarded the poverty of the Church and the lack of suitable clerics as immense obstacles in the way of

⁴⁶ SP 63/254/54, 10 Aug 1633.

⁴⁷ Str. P. 6/24-6, Laud to Wentworth 13 Jan 1634, and see also *HMC, Hastings IV* (London, 1947), p. 55, Laud to Bramhall 16 Aug 1633.

⁴⁸ Str. P. 6/9-16, 29 Jan 1634; see also *ibid.* 6/19-22, Wentworth to Laud 31 Jan 1634.

doctrinal reform.⁴⁹ Laud was horrified by what he read of the appalling state of the Irish Church and clergy and was prepared to accept that it could not be remedied overnight.⁵⁰ He was not, however, to be diverted from his aim to pull the Church of Ireland into doctrinal conformity with the Church of England simply by material problems. He agreed that the practical measures were important, but so were the spiritual:

‘I would sett upon the Repaire of the Materiall and the spiritual Church together; and first, I would have a Generall and a strickt Command issue out; that every Minister should read all divine Service wholly and distinctly in a grave and religious manner to their People. And this, I take it, may be presently done without any noyse, because they have the English Liturgie allready. And at the same tyme would I have an Act made, that noe man, of what degree soever, should hold above two Benefices with Cure, and those within a limited distance, that they may the better take Care of them. If these two were once settled, the rest would follow in order.’⁵¹

Laud’s desire to enforce doctrinal conformity required the passing of the Thirty-Nine Articles by Convocation and Wentworth acquiesced in the Archbishop’s insistence that this be attempted. For the better government and disciplining of the Church of Ireland both Archbishop and Lord Deputy aimed to secure the acceptance of the English canons of 1604. Laud admitted to Wentworth that some of the canons ‘will not presently fitt that Churche’, but argued that their introduction would remove ‘such a confusion...as hath hitherto been among them.’⁵² Wentworth faced the persistent opposition of the

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 6/6, Wentworth to Laud Dec 1633.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 6/67, Laud to Wentworth 16 May 1634.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 6/39-40, Laud to Wentworth 11 March 1634.

⁵² *Ibid.* 6/143, 12 Jan 1635.

primate, James Ussher, throughout his attempt to persuade Convocation to pass the articles and the English canons,⁵³ and had to accept the need to drop the requirement to bow at the name of Jesus. He informed Laud that he had been successful in managing to get the ‘substance’ of the English canons received and Laud rested content with that. He was particularly pleased about the canon relating to confession and it appears that Laud could see that in some respects the English canons could be improved upon.⁵⁴ The Archbishop’s close interest in the Irish Church can be seen in his concern to ensure that the appointment of a committee to deal with Wentworth’s Irish despatches did not endanger the process of reform. He alerted Wentworth to this potential problem in March 1634 and was greatly relieved when the King announced that this committee, comprising Laud, Weston, Arundel, Cottington and the two Secretaries would not normally handle church business, but that it would be left to Laud and Charles himself in England to handle the work. He mentioned the important aspect of efficiency in dealing with business, but Laud’s main concern was more likely that of preventing Weston, in particular, from having a close involvement in Irish ecclesiastical matters.⁵⁵ Laud certainly did not wish to see the Irish Church have autonomy: he believed it right and proper that the English High Commission deal with serious matters and that an Irish version should exercise a subordinate role.⁵⁶

⁵³ *Ibid.* 6/127-31, Wentworth to Laud 16 Dec 1634; *ibid.* 6/150, same to same 10 March 1635.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 6/164, Wentworth to Laud 13 April 1635; *ibid.* 6/188, Laud to Wentworth 12 May 1635; *HMC, Hastings IV*, pp. 67-8, Laud to Bramhall 11 May 1635. Wentworth made it clear to Laud that he never failed to bow before the altar or at the name of Jesus; Str. P. 6/201, 14 July 1635.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 6/72, 21 March 1634; see also *ibid.* 6/50, Laud to Wentworth 12 April 1634.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 6/51, Laud to Wentworth 12 April 1634. Wentworth was prepared to accept that the English court of High Commission could call over important cases, but only if they had not actually started to proceed in an Irish court. If they had, he was not in favour of them being

In general Wentworth and Laud worked together closely on the issue of church reform. They discussed the desirable qualities of candidates for Irish bishoprics, promoted a number of 'Laudian' clerics to Irish sees and tried to purge Trinity College of its puritan ethos,⁵⁷ but Wentworth's attempts to gain places in the Church for certain individuals did not always find favour with Laud. One reason was that Laud himself did not favour Wentworth's candidates, and in the case of Dr. John Atherton, appointed to the see of Waterford and Lismore in 1636, Laud wrote that he had 'noe opinion either of his worth or Honesty. I pray god I be deceived.'⁵⁸ As far as Wentworth was concerned, Atherton had qualities which compensated for any defects of character and which would be of immense value in his struggle with the Earl of Cork: 'And as for 132 [Cork], hee will thinke the Devill is lett loose upon him forth of his Chaine. I will undertake there is not such a terrier in England or Ireland for the unkenning of an old fox.'⁵⁹ In this case Wentworth

removed to England before they had reached the appeal stage; *ibid.* 6/57, Wentworth to Laud 15 May 1634. On this point the Archbishop's wish to control the Irish church was in danger of conflicting with the Lord Deputy's insistence that his authority be seen to be upheld.

⁵⁷ See Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, pp. 113-5. Concerning Laud's promise to wait until he heard from Wentworth regarding appointments of Irish bishops, but also his warning that Charles was resolved to place his chaplains at the top of the list, see Str. P. 8/16, Laud to Wentworth 16 Aug 1633; concerning their discussion on the most suitable age for a bishop see *ibid.* 8/17-8, Wentworth to Laud 9 Sept 1633 and *ibid.* 8/41-2 Laud to Wentworth 14 Oct 1633; concerning Bramhall's appointment as Bishop of Derry see *ibid.* 6/69, Laud to Wentworth 14 May 1634.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 6/336, Laud to Wentworth 8 April 1636.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 6/331, Wentworth to Laud 9 March 1636. Atherton was executed for bigamy and sodomy. As has been noted elsewhere, Laud disapproved of Philip Mainwaring and George Garrard. See also *ibid.* 7/88, Laud to Wentworth received 17 Feb 1638: 'I heare you have knighted a Lincolneshire gentleman, one Mr. Sowth. Hee will deserve it, for I heare hee is

succeeded in his desire to have clergy in Ireland who would be of assistance to him, but two years later, in the case of a living in Taboine to which the King held the right of presentment, he was to find himself defeated by the considerably greater influence of the Duke of Lennox who also had a candidate. Against his better judgement, Laud had argued Wentworth's case before the King that the living should go to the Lord Deputy's chaplain, Dr. Baron:

'I would to God you had in this followed my first Councill.
Tis not tyme a day for you to loose the Affections of men soe
neare the King as the Lord Duke is. I have had much adoe to
satisfye him. But for Dr. Baron I cannot prevayle'.⁶⁰

Of crucial importance in strengthening the Irish Church was the need to raise the wealth and status of the clergy, freeing the Church from lay control. The King was willing to restore to the Irish Church impropriations in the royal gift and Laud urged Wentworth to assess the value of these impropriations in order for the King to know the extent of his generosity and also - and of more practical importance - to assess the revenue this would bring to the Church, which would enable it to begin to remedy the problem of pluralism.⁶¹ There were other wealthy lay impropriators, however, who were not so willing to

very valiant at one kind of Combate. He was Censured in the High Commission Court for getting two sisters with Child. But I hope you knighted him for some other vertue.' Note also Wentworth's attempts to get a dispensation for his cousin Michael Wandesford and Bishop Atherton from Laud's ruling against the holding of English livings in commendam with Irish benefices; *ibid.* 6/164-5, Wentworth to Laud 13 April 1635. Laud was prepared to move Charles for this favour, but made clear his objections to Wentworth's request, *ibid.* 6/187-8, Laud to Wentworth 12 May 1635.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 7/119v, Laud to Wentworth 27 June 1638; see also *ibid.* 7/118v, same to same 22 June 1638.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 20/113, 30 April 1633; *HMC, Hastings IV*, p. 61, Laud to Bramhall 1 Oct 1634.

assist in the recovery of the Church of Ireland and who were given a dose of 'thorough'. The greatest victim was Richard Boyle, Earl of Cork, who controlled not only a large number of impropriated rectories, but also the diocese of Lismore and the impropriated possessions of the college of Youghal. In taking on one of the leaders of the New English planter party, Wentworth needed to have a trusted line of access to the King to protect his position, and he therefore kept Laud informed of his actions in his attempt to force Cork to relinquish his hold on impropriated land.⁶² This process began in the autumn of 1633 when Wentworth was able to report to Laud that he had made 'the Earle of Corke disgorg himselfe of two Vicaradges: that his Tenant and he had held from the poore incumbent these thirty yeares.' This required Wentworth to use his accustomed bullying tactics, with Cork and also with 'the poore incumbent' and his counsel, the King's attorney, who was given a lecture by the Lord Deputy on his duty in the matter. Cork was informed that the incumbent's title was 'as cleere as the day' and that if the Earl could not say anything on his part in the matter, he would lose possession of the vicarage:

'All this to his face, Before the whole Counsell. And was not this now Thorough? I am most Confident this dayes worke will gaine a hundred livings to the Church, thus Sacriledgiously taken from it, by fine force, and rapine...But I beseech you where hath beene the good Primate and the rest of the Bishops, all this while suffring such damnable

⁶² See Str. P. 8/34-5, 22 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 8/44, 31 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 6/3-4, Dec 1633; *ibid.* 6/9, 29 Jan 1634.

oppression of the poore Clergye? Nay, not to spare them,
some of them are as badd as any Lay man in the Kingdome.’⁶³

By December Wentworth had succeeded in forcing Cork to hand over several more vicarages,⁶⁴ and in March 1634 Wentworth’s attack moved a stage further. Cork’s own relative, Michael Boyle, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, wrote to Laud accusing the Earl of illegally holding lands belonging to the see of Lismore worth about £900 *per annum* and of preparing to ‘swallow up Youghal College’ with its endowments worth £700 *per annum*. He asked Laud to inform the King of this matter and also to write to Wentworth, giving him the authority to ‘do me justice and restore the property of the see of Lismore and the College of Youghal.’⁶⁵ It appears, as Kearney notes, that this letter was not written spontaneously: John Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, had apparently put pressure on the Bishop and on Richard Boyle, Bishop of Cork and the fellows of the college of Youghal to petition either Laud or the King who should then commend the matter to the Lord Deputy.⁶⁶ Bramhall was clearly implementing Wentworth’s policy of encouraging as many clerics^{as possible} high or low - to petition for the restoration of their lands so that Cork could be threatened with a public hearing if he failed to cooperate. Laud was in general agreement with this policy, although he held a poor opinion of

⁶³ *Ibid.* 8/35, 22 Oct 1633. For Wentworth’s criticism of the Archbishop of Cashel, who held about 19 vicarages under the pretence of a commendam, see *ibid.* 8/45, Wentworth to Laud 31 Oct 1633.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 6/3-4, Wentworth to Laud Dec 1633.

⁶⁵ SP 63/254/106, 7 March 1634. See also SP 63/254/120 and 121, Report on the State of the Diocese of Lismore and Waterford and Report on the Estate of the College of Youghal, both 3 May 1634, and *CSPI, 1633-1647*, p. 51, Charles I to the Lord Deputy for the Bishop of Waterford and others 13 May 1634.

⁶⁶ *HMC, Hastings IV*, p. 56, Bramhall to Laud 19 Feb 1634; Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, p. 127. See also Str. P. 6/23, Wentworth to Laud 31 Jan 1634.

Michael Boyle.⁶⁷ Not surprisingly, Cork made strenuous efforts to have his case moved to England and throughout 1635 Wentworth faced opposition at Court to his attack on Cork.

Although Wentworth could rely on Laud's help in the matter of recovering impropriations, the same was not entirely true over the issue of the Earl's family tomb in St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, which Wentworth planned to remove. This was as much a political battle of wills as a debate over theological principles.⁶⁸ The first mention of this contentious issue in their correspondence appears in a letter from Wentworth to Laud written in January 1634,⁶⁹ but Laud's postscript to a later letter makes it clear that complaints about the tomb had come from Ireland before Wentworth had even been named as Lord Deputy.⁷⁰ On Cork's request, the Archbishop of Armagh had viewed the tomb and had communicated his favourable opinion of it to Laud. Wentworth claimed to be content to accept Laud's judgement on the matter, but thought it worthwhile nonetheless to give his derogatory opinion on the monument, not hesitating to mention that it stood where the altar had once been. This proved to be the sticking point as Ussher claimed that no altar had been placed in that position during his lifetime and no one was obviously able to give accurate testimony to the position of the pre-Reformation altar.⁷¹ Wentworth had placed Laud in an uncomfortable position and in his reply in March he pointed out that it was difficult for him 'that am absent to cross directly the report of two Archbishops.' More importantly, Laud warned Wentworth that he risked incurring the wrath of Lord Treasurer Weston as the

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 6/38-9, Laud to Wentworth 11 March 1634.

⁶⁸ Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, p. 118.

⁶⁹ Str. P. 6/14, 29 Jan 1634.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 6/32-3, 11 March 1634.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 6/15, Wentworth to Laud 29 Jan 1634.

bones of his ancestor, Lord Chancellor Weston, were deposited in the tomb. Laud pointed out that

‘You must have dayly use of his lordship here. And I would not both in regard of the Kings Service, and your owne good, that this should occasion a breach between you’.

As a postscript to this letter, Laud warned Wentworth that his plan to remove the tomb was regarded by many at Court as a form of punishment, delivered to Cork because he was not fully cooperating in the negotiations regarding the projected marriage between his eldest son, Lord Dungarvan, and Wentworth’s niece Elizabeth, daughter of Lord Clifford.⁷² Despite these reservations, Laud did communicate with Cork and the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, insisting that the tomb must at present occupy the place where the altar had once stood.⁷³ Although Wentworth won the argument and the tomb was removed in the spring of 1635,⁷⁴ it is certain that the trouble created by this diverted attention at Court away from the real and practical issue of recovering impropriated land and it was to be the first of several matters on which Laud was called upon to explain and defend the Lord Deputy’s aggressive and often unwise actions.

By the end of 1635, Wentworth had angered Viscount Wilmot over the issue of Wilmot’s ownership of alienated crown land in Athlone; the Earl of St Albans and Clanricarde over his plans to include the county of Galway in the plantation of Connacht; and Lord Mountnorris, the Vice-Treasurer of Ireland

⁷² *Ibid.* 6/32, 11 March 1634. See also SP 63/254/97, Archbishop of Dublin to Laud 17 Feb 1634. Concerning Weston’s interest see SP 63/254/100, Cork to [Weston] 20 Feb 1634.

⁷³ Str. P. 6/61-2, Laud to Cork 21 March 1634; *ibid.* 6/62-3, Laud to Archbishop of Armagh undated and *ibid.* 6/63-5, Laud to Archbishop of Dublin 21 March 1634.

⁷⁴ It was eventually relocated under an archway in St. Patrick’s Cathedral; *ibid.* 6/253, Laud to Wentworth 4 Oct 1635.

and member of the Irish customs farm, whom Wentworth was trying to oust from office.⁷⁵ Laud had to make strenuous efforts to defend Wentworth's actions at Court as he had to contend with support for Mountnorris from the Earl of Holland and Secretary Windebank, and the Earl of Essex and Windebank's support for Clanricarde. The Earls of Pembroke and Salisbury put up determined opposition to Wentworth on behalf of Cork, and Laud warned Wentworth, in no uncertain terms, of the consequences of his actions:

‘...you want not them which whisper, and perhapps speake lowder where they think they may against your proceedings in Ireland, as being overfull of personall prosecutions against men of Quality, and they stick not to instance in St Albanes, the Lord Willmot and this Earle. And this is somewhat lowdly spoken by some on the Queenes side...if you could find a way to doe all these Great Services and decline these Stormes I thinke it would be excellent well thought on.’⁷⁶

⁷⁵ See Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, pp. 197-204 for a general account; see SP 63/255/124, Wilmot to Windebank 28 May 1636 concerning Athlone; concerning Mountnorris see Str. P. 24-25/443-59, a collection of copies of letters, petitions etc., relevant to this case; Clarendon, *State Papers*, vol. I, p. 361, Mountnorris to Charles I 26 Nov 1635; *ibid.*, p. 449, Lady Mountnorris to Wentworth 13 Feb 1636; *ibid.*, pp. 543-6, ‘Observations upon the Order of the Court of Castle Chamber against the Lord Mountnorris’, 25 May 1636; Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, pp. 70-72.

⁷⁶ For quotation see Str. P. 6/280, 16 Nov 1635; concerning support for Mountnorris see *ibid.* 6/327-8, Wentworth to Laud 9 March 1636; concerning Pembroke and Salisbury's support for Cork see *ibid.* 6/208, Wentworth to Laud 14 July 1635. Lord Dungarvan also approached the Earl of Bristol in his attempt to prevent the tomb being removed. Bristol agreed to speak to Laud on the matter and reported to Dungarvan that commissioners would decide the fate of the tomb; Chatsworth House, Baslow (Trustees of the Chatsworth Settlement), The Lismore Papers, [hereafter Chatsworth, Lismore Papers] box 18, f. 7, Dungarvan to Cork 10 May 1634.

By January 1636 Laud could be at least relieved that Mountnorris appeared to have lost the support of Cottington, who was being offered £6000, ostensibly by Sir Adam Loftus, Wentworth's candidate for the Vice-Treasurership. Laud did ask Wentworth, however, why the King should not receive at least half of the sum - and also regretted the fact that his honesty never netted him a sum such as this.⁷⁷ The following month Laud informed Wentworth that there was a variety of reports at Court concerning this offer of money and that Cottington had given the money which he had received to Charles, a move which 'may make the king jealous of the integrity of Wentworth's [your] proceedings'.⁷⁸ Cottington's correspondence with Wentworth on the matter makes the role of the former appear less sinister than Laud would have us believe. He told Wentworth that he had passed the money to Charles as this was the best way to ensure a speedy and quiet resolution of the matter.⁷⁹ Despite Wentworth's denial of direct involvement in this payment of money, Laud must have remembered a similar episode in the Bridgeman affair, three years before.⁸⁰

During the summer and autumn of 1636 Wentworth was back in England. The Earl of Newburgh noted that he made 'his addresses...wholly to the Archbishop' and with good reason.⁸¹ Wentworth planned to use his time in London to win as much favour from the King as he could, and if possible gain

⁷⁷ Str. P. 6/318-9, 23 Jan 1636.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 6/320-21, 4 Feb 1636, partly in cipher.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 3/241, 27 Jan 1636.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 6/335-6, Wentworth to Laud 9 March 1636. Wentworth insisted that the idea to give £2000 to Cottington, £1000 to each of the Secretaries and £2000 to the King was Sir Adam Loftus's idea. Raylton would explain this to Laud. 'Cunningly Cottington turns all to the king. A thing of that nature immediatly I durst not offer the king. Lennox hath the money soe there you have the tale and the tales maister'.

⁸¹ *HMC, Fourth Report, Appendix*, p. 291, Newburgh to Middlesex 11 July 1636. See also Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, pp. 210-20 on Wentworth in England in 1636.

the earldom which he sought - the desired public mark of royal favour. He regarded this as particularly necessary as the death of his friend Carlisle had led to the appointment in May of the Earl of Holland as Groom of the Stool. As it was abundantly clear to the Lord Deputy that opposition to his government in Ireland was being orchestrated by Holland, it was imperative that he be seen to retain the King's favour.⁸² In his attempt to secure this, Wentworth approached Laud for his assistance making it clear that he wanted any mark of royal favour which he might receive to be a public one.⁸³ But despite the fact that he appeared to have impressed the King with his detailed report on the state of Ireland, and the fact that this was widely reported, Charles refused him his wish. Laud made it clear that there was no point in him travelling south again from Yorkshire before returning to Ireland, but Wentworth chose to ignore his advice.⁸⁴ The summer of 1636 was an interesting period for both Lord Deputy and Archbishop. Wentworth's apparently successful defence of his Deputyship in June and Laud's entertainment of the King and Queen at Oxford in August, at which Wentworth was not present, failed to remove the fears and insecurities which plagued both men. Six weeks after his 'triumph' at Oxford Laud dreamed 'that the King was offended with me, and would cast me off, and tell me no cause why. *Avertat Deus*. For cause I have given none.'⁸⁵ Wentworth returned to Ireland in November 1636 knowing that opposition to his rule was still strong and that he needed Laud's support at Court as much as ever before. It is also apparent that Laud needed reassurance from Wentworth that their association stood firm. In September 1637 Laud informed Wentworth of a rumour

⁸² Str. P. 6/358, Wentworth to Laud 14 Sept 1636.

⁸³ *Ibid.* 6/347-8, 26 Aug 1636 (written at Wentworth Woodhouse).

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 40/15, Charles I to Wentworth 3 Sept 1636; *ibid.* 6/362, Laud to Wentworth 26 Sept 1636.

circulating at Court 'that the kindnesse betweene you and mee was not yet quite broken of, but that it was of late very much impayred.' In November he wrote that the rumour had apparently been raised initially in the country and that he believed that the late Earl of Clare was responsible.⁸⁶ Wentworth found this rumour very strange and it is possible that it originated with Laud himself and was nothing more than a means to get the Lord Deputy to confirm his alliance with the Archbishop.⁸⁷

The following year the Lord Deputy was fighting hard to defend his management of the Irish finances and his personal integrity in his use of the Crown's revenues. This had begun to plague Wentworth as early as the spring of 1635, when James Barr's attempt - apparently backed by Lord Wilmot - to oust Wentworth's farm of the Irish customs had led to much 'muttering' in Ireland.⁸⁸ Laud read the relevant passage of Wentworth's letter to Charles, who listened and pointed out that Barr had put forward the proposal for his own advantage only. Charles also pointed out that Barr had actually offered to farm the customs at six thousand pounds more than the present farmers' fine, not at only one thousand pounds more, as Wentworth had stated.⁸⁹ By the summer Laud was able to report to Wentworth that nothing more was mentioned at Court of Barr's offer,⁹⁰ but this was not the end of attacks on the Lord Deputy's management of Irish revenues. By 1637, accusations made at Court that he built 'up to the sky' and had grown 'monstrous rich' forced him to make fierce denials, and he lamented the fact that he still lacked public

⁸⁵ Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 227; Carlton, 'The Dream Life of Archbishop Laud', *History Today* 36 (December 1986), p.13.

⁸⁶ Str. P. 7/50v, 18 Sept 1637; *ibid.* 7/60v, 11 Nov 1637.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 7/63, Wentworth to Laud 27 Nov 1637.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 6/151-2, Wentworth to Laud 10 March 1635.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 6/171, Laud to Wentworth 27 March 1635.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* 6/192-3, 12 June 1635; see also *ibid.* 6/230-31, 31 July/3 Aug 1635.

testimony of the King's favour, which might have prevented these accusations from flourishing.⁹¹ After performing the task of reading out the relevant sections of Wentworth's correspondence to the King, Laud was able to reassure the Lord Deputy that Charles had interrupted him with praises of Wentworth and an insistence that it did not matter how rich his Lord Deputy became 'as long as you tooke nothing out of His Cophers, nor wrung it uniuistly from His people.' Laud was also confident that a mark of the King's favour would come in time.⁹²

But Wentworth could not rest satisfied with Laud's efforts on his behalf. His reply contained figures relating to the profits of the customs which would support his claim that the yield had noticeably increased under his Deputyship.⁹³ Wentworth's fear that his management of the customs was under threat was justified when Charles ordered that the new book of rates for the Irish customs be sent over in November 1637. Laud warned Wentworth that Charles had a high opinion of Sir Abraham Dawes and Wentworth claimed to be grateful for his advice on how to act.⁹⁴ This issue had not disappeared by the spring of 1638, when Wentworth prepared his defence by giving Laud further financial details and justifying his own personal profitmaking on the grounds that it made up for the loss of revenue sustained on his English lands caused by his absence.⁹⁵ Again, Laud read ^{these} to the King, and defended Wentworth's discussion of his management of the customs and apparently was able to answer Charles's criticisms on a number of points, for

⁹¹ *Ibid.* 7 42v-44, Wentworth to Laud 27 Sept 1637; *ibid.* 7 45, same to same 28 Sept 1637.

⁹² *Ibid.* 7 58, 24 Oct 1637.

⁹³ *Ibid.* 7 61v-2, 27 Nov 1637.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 7 72-2v, Laud to Wentworth 16 Nov 1637; *ibid.* 7 81v, Wentworth to Laud 10 April 1638.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 7/66v-9v, 1 March 1638.

which Wentworth thanked him.⁹⁶ Laud proved to be a vital means for Wentworth to gain access to the King on what were such crucial matters. Cottington's position as Chancellor of the Exchequer meant that he had an obvious interest in any claim to increase the profit on the farm of the Irish customs and Wentworth could not depend on his support. He gained information concerning attempts to unseat him from the farm from other courtiers, but it was Laud alone who he relied upon to vindicate his financial management in Ireland.⁹⁷

In 1638 Wentworth attempted to remove the last major obstacle to his government in Ireland, Lord Chancellor Loftus.⁹⁸ Loftus's angry refusal to hand over the Great Seal caused him to be suspended from office and imprisoned and, as Wedgwood points out, he had given Wentworth an advantage over him, as he could not now go to England to try and evade the power of the Lord Deputy. But Wentworth's actions were regarded by many at Court as extreme and once again Laud had to strive hard to put forward Wentworth's version of events and persuade Charles to accept it.⁹⁹ Three days after the eventful Council meeting, on the 23 April, Wentworth penned a short letter to Laud giving reasons for Loftus's committal to prison, arguing that the general feeling in Dublin was that he deserved this treatment, and interestingly comparing it to disturbances in Scotland, no doubt to encourage Laud to believe that firm measures were necessary.¹⁰⁰ On 26 April, he thanked Laud for sending him news of the attitudes of the Earl of Arundel and Lord Keeper

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* 7 89v-90, Laud to Wentworth 27 March 1638; *ibid.* 7 93v, Wentworth to Laud 26 April 1638.

⁹⁷ See *ibid.* 15 56, Earl of Carlisle to Wentworth 4 May 1635.

⁹⁸ See below, pp. 245-9.

⁹⁹ Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, pp. 243-4; Str. P. 7 101v, Laud to Wentworth 17 May 1638.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* 7 91-2, 23 April 1638.

Coventry towards his handling of Loftus and he enclosed duplicates of the paperwork between himself and the Council and Loftus.¹⁰¹ On 23 May, Wentworth wrote to Laud telling him that he and the Dublin Council were anxious to hear what would happen in this case, or to put it in Wentworth's dramatic terms:

‘To say the plaine truth, whether wee shall have a government
or noe.’¹⁰²

Laud's letter of the 17 May contained interesting information for the Lord Deputy. Laud had been reading a passage in Wentworth's correspondence on the Loftus case to the King, in which Wentworth claimed that he had allowed the Dublin Council total freedom in the matter of the sentence:

‘His Majesty smyled. And it was at such a passage of my
Speeche as that the king told me you had written much after
that sort to Himselfe, and then smiled againe. I durst not aske
him why he smiled, but I am much mistaken in my
Coniectural Judgment, if hee did not thinke your lordship put
yourselfe behinde the Curtaine and made that their Act, which
was principally your owne. And that you would seeke soe to
hide it from him...be wary of your penn in this kind with His
Majesty, For He loves extreamly to be openly delt with by his
great officers and those that hee trusts. And if Hee should
have such an Immagination, as I have here Coniectured at, I
am most Confident it will not take well with him.’

Laud made it clear in this letter that he, too, found it difficult to accept that Wentworth had allowed himself to be guided by the Council in this matter.¹⁰³

In his reply, Wentworth persisted in claiming that he had not led the Council to

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* 7/94v, 26 April 1638.

¹⁰² *Ibid.* 7/96v, 23 May 1638.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* 7/101v, 17 May 1638.

its decision and tried to ensure Laud's support by claiming that he and Loftus could not remain in government together. He was reluctant to tell the King himself - but perhaps a friend might do it for him.¹⁰⁴ There was an additional feature to this case which ought to have commended itself very much to the Archbishop: Loftus controlled the archdeaconry of Glendalough and Lancelot Bulkeley, Archbishop of Dublin, pointed out to Laud that the Lord Chancellor had no canonical title to this. Keen to remove the archdeaconry from lay control, Bulkeley had approached the Lord Deputy and the Dublin Council over this matter, having appointed a replacement archdeacon, and he now asked Laud to try and prevent the removal of the case to England as he could not face the prospect of crossing the Irish sea in his old age.¹⁰⁵ Not surprisingly, Laud found it hard to believe that Bulkeley was not encouraged in his proceedings against Loftus by the Lord Deputy.¹⁰⁶

Wentworth and Laud had to work hard to prevent Loftus being granted the King's permission to travel to England, as they faced strong opposition from Holland in particular over this and other matters.¹⁰⁷ Laud told Wentworth that he should have consulted him before requesting permission from the King to examine Holland in his libel action against Sir Piers Crosby, as this had raised a storm of indignation from Holland's supporters at Court.¹⁰⁸ Laud himself had clashed with Holland over a Star Chamber case in which Holland believed he had an interest as Justice in Eyre.¹⁰⁹ Wentworth's undoubted talent for making

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 7/107-7v, 8 June 1638.

¹⁰⁵ SP 63/256/94, 10 May 1638.

¹⁰⁶ Str. P. 7/101v, Laud to Wentworth 17 May 1638; *ibid.* 7/102, Wentworth to Laud 26 May 1638.

¹⁰⁷ *HMC, Various Collections III* (London, 1904), pp. 177-184, 186-91, 196-200, 208; Str. P. 7/101, Laud to Wentworth 17 May 1638.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 7/141v, 2 Nov 1638.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 7/118, Laud to Wentworth 22 June 1638.

enemies was becoming a liability for the King and his government by the end of the decade. In January 1639, when Charles needed as much support from his wealthy subjects as he could get, Laud advised Wentworth to mend his differences with the Earl of Cork, telling him that the King would take it well.¹¹⁰ Wentworth's breathtaking response to this was to insist that there had never been any personal malice on his part and that he had been friendly to Cork because of the marriage connection between their families; Cork was one of the 'greatest lyers in the world'.¹¹¹ It is clear that by the late 1630s, Laud was weary of having to defend Wentworth's actions in these almost constant struggles with Irish magnates and their English supporters. This was one aspect of 'thorough' which the Archbishop found unpleasant and in which his warnings and appeals to the Lord Deputy apparently had little effect.

By 1638 Charles needed support from the nobility of all his three kingdoms as he faced the crisis in Scotland. This concerned both Archbishop and Lord Deputy, and Wentworth realised that one way of trying to prevent the problems in Scotland from escalating into serious rebellion was to try and discourage Archibald Campbell, Lord Lorne - later Earl of Argyll - from becoming actively involved. The quickest way to encourage Lorne's association with the Covenanters was to support the plans of his enemy, Randall MacDonnell, Earl of Antrim, which amounted to an attempt to regain his ancestral lands in the western Highlands.¹¹² The fact that Antrim enjoyed

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* 7/159, 31 Jan 1639. See also Mary Anne Everett Green ed., *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria* (London, 1858), pp. 26-7, Henrietta Maria to Cork 28 Aug 1639.

¹¹¹ Str. P. 7/165v-6, 11 Feb 1639; see also *ibid.* 7/169, 12 Feb 1639.

¹¹² Wentworth believed that Antrim's plan had provoked Argyll into joining the Covenant; *ibid.* 10b/55, Wentworth to Vane, 16 April 1639; *ibid.* 10b/64-6, Wentworth to Northumberland 15 April 1639; Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration*, pp. 79-82; Clarke, 'Antrim', pp. 108-15; Allan I. Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement* (Edinburgh, 1991), p. 193.

support from the Queen and the Marquis of Hamilton was a matter of much concern for Wentworth, but more worryingly was the fact that he could not rely on Laud to support him wholeheartedly on this issue.¹¹³

Antrim became a significant feature of Laud and Wentworth's mutual correspondence from the end of 1637, when he was added to their cipher.¹¹⁴ A dispute between the Dowager Duchess of Buckingham and Sir William St. Leger, President of Munster, over the late Duke's estate, led to Laud's request that Wentworth show favour to Antrim.¹¹⁵ Wentworth's response to this was to accept St. Leger's side of the argument.¹¹⁶ In June 1638 Laud warned Wentworth that Charles would be likely to try and make use of Antrim and his kinsmen in the Scottish crisis and asked why the Lord Deputy had taken an aversion to him.¹¹⁷ Wentworth admitted to Laud that he did not have much personal regard for Antrim.¹¹⁸ Laud promised that he would 'not offer to force any thing upon your Affections, which your owne Judgment approves not',¹¹⁹ but nevertheless, he continued to try and persuade Wentworth to show favour to the Earl and in August he finally gave the reason behind his support for Antrim, or rather, his wife: it was given 'in remembrance of my lord Duke that is gone'.¹²⁰ Wentworth could not be expected to show a similar feeling of

¹¹³ Concerning the Queen and the issue of St. Patrick's Purgatory see Str. P. 7/124v, Wentworth to Laud 7 Aug 1638; *ibid.* 7 138, Laud to Wentworth 10 Sept 1638; *ibid.* 7/147, Wentworth to Laud 27 Nov 1638. Concerning Antrim's association with Hamilton see *ibid.* 7 137v-8, Laud to Wentworth 10 Sept 1638; *ibid.* 7/140, same to same 8 Oct 1638.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* 7/73v, Laud to Wentworth 16 Nov 1637.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.* 7 76, 23 Nov 1637.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.* 7 63, 27 Nov 1637; *ibid.* 7 82, 10 April 1638; *ibid.* 7/104, 8 June 1638.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.* 7 119, 22 June 1638.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.* 7 114v, 3 July 1638; *ibid.* 7 131v, 4 Sept 1638.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.* 7 127v, 30 July 1638.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.* 7 134v, 31 Aug 1638; *ibid.* 7 188v, 1 May 1639.

gratitude and loyalty to the memory of Buckingham and he looked upon Antrim as a debt-ridden Irish Roman Catholic, who possessed the blood of rebels in his veins.¹²¹ He impressed upon Laud his belief that Antrim was working with Hamilton to disrupt the English plantation in Ulster and Laud promised that his favour to Antrim did not extend as far as ignoring this.¹²² Laud did, however, warn him that Charles was not pleased at the continued bad feeling between his Lord Deputy and the Marquis of Hamilton and stated his own view that Hamilton had performed a valuable service for the King in Scotland.¹²³ Despite Laud's strong advice, Wentworth's poor relations with Antrim, and his opposition in general terms to a scheme of that kind, led him to oppose Charles's clearly stated wish that he give aid and support to the Earl.¹²⁴ Nevertheless, Wentworth and Laud certainly agreed on the general point that the King's handling of the Scottish crisis was not impressive. When Wentworth commented on the certainty that the Edinburgh riots were planned and organised 'together with some Intelligence and private animation of the Great ones, perhaps of those then in the Court of England',¹²⁵ Laud related his opinion to the King, but Charles was 'more willing not to heare then to

¹²¹ *Ibid.* 7/124-4v, 7/11 Aug 1638; *ibid.* 7/134, 3 Nov 1638.

¹²² *Ibid.* 7/134, Wentworth to Laud 3 Nov 1638; *ibid.* 7/143-3v, Laud to Wentworth 13 Nov 1638.

¹²³ *Ibid.* 7/173-3v, received 22 March 1639. Hamilton kept Laud informed of his progress in Scotland; Gardiner ed., *The Hamilton Papers* (Camden Society, new series, 27, 1880), pp. 15, 23, 35, 38, 47-8, 51, 55, all Hamilton to Charles I 24 June, 11 Aug, 27 Sept, 5, 22 Oct, 2, 5 Nov 1638.

¹²⁴ Str. P. 40/30, Charles I to Wentworth 25 Jan 1639; *ibid.* 40/32, same to same 10 April 1639. See also Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration*, p. 87; P. H. Donald, *An Uncounselled King: Charles I and the Scottish Troubles (1637-1644)* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 193-4; Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement*, p. 193; Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 79-80.

¹²⁵ Str. P. 7/63v, 27 Nov 1637.

hear'.¹²⁶ From the summer of 1638, Laud was very pessimistic of eventual success in Scotland.¹²⁷ But buoyed up by his apparent success in keeping Ulster quiet, Wentworth was confident that unrest in Scotland could be quelled if swift and decisive action was taken and the right men were chosen to do it. He tried to encourage the Archbishop with his positive approach, but Laud's response was simply to wish that Wentworth was in Yorkshire to strengthen the resolve of the north.¹²⁸ Laud was even more depressed that not even Hamilton could get Charles 'to be Thorow in any thing that should be.'¹²⁹

In the autumn of 1639 Wentworth arrived in England to give assistance to the King in his effort to destroy the Scottish rebellion. Laud must have taken heart at his recall, but it becomes more difficult to investigate the state of their association because none of their surviving correspondence is dated later than May 1639.¹³⁰ The extent of the welcome at Court which greeted the Lord Deputy was noted by the Venetian ambassador, although, interestingly, it does not receive a mention in Laud's diary.¹³¹ Shortly after his arrival in London Wentworth had become one of the few councillors who were entrusted with the handling of the Scottish crisis and his influence could be witnessed in the

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* 7/80-80v, Laud to Wentworth 19 Dec 1637.

¹²⁷ See *ibid.* 7/118v, 22 June 1638; *ibid.* 7/120v, 20 July 1638; *ibid.* 7/127-7v, 30 July 1638; *ibid.* 7/140, 8 Oct 1638; *ibid.* 7/154, 29 Dec 1638; *ibid.* 7/176, 5 April 1639 - all Laud to Wentworth.

¹²⁸ See *ibid.* 7/131, Wentworth to Laud 4 Sept 1638; *ibid.* 7/161, same to same 11 Feb 1639; *ibid.* 7/183v-4, same to same 10 May 1639; *ibid.* 7/175v, Laud to Wentworth received 22 March 1639.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* 7/186v, Laud to Wentworth 1 May 1639.

¹³⁰ It is clear that his correspondence with Laud continued after this date; *ibid.* 3(ii)/108, Charles to Wentworth 12 April 1640, in which the king mentions having seen 'divers letters' from Wentworth to Laud.

¹³¹ *CSPV, 1636-1639*, p. 578, Giustinian to the Doge and Senate 7 Oct 1639.

more hard-line approach towards the Covenanters and the negotiations with Spain.¹³² Laud remained busy and active in the Scottish business, handling correspondence with Viscount Conway in the summer of 1640.¹³³ During this period he was, however, willing to follow Wentworth's lead, leaning on the Lord Deputy's greater optimism and drive.¹³⁴ The extent to which Wentworth had become the dominant partner is illustrated by Laud's willingness to put his reservations to one side and support Wentworth's advice that the King recall Parliament. This is in sharp contrast to their disagreement five years earlier over Wentworth's wish to prorogue rather than dissolve the Irish Parliament. Laud's reasons for opposing Wentworth's wish at that time are interesting, as they betray a lack of confidence in the Lord Deputy's ability to continue to manage the various interest groups in both Houses. In December 1639, an entry in Laud's diary linked himself with the Lord Deputy and the Marquis of Hamilton as 'The first movers to it', but this entry shows clearly that he still had strong reservations about the decision to recall the English Parliament.¹³⁵ As in 1636 Laud had, however, no qualms about attempting to persuade Charles to give Wentworth a public mark of favour. Writing to inform George Radcliffe of the King's resolution to call Parliament, Wentworth also made reference to his long-desired earldom. He told Radcliffe that he had been appointed Lieutenant-General:

'...and if I should move, I believe the other thing too. My Lord of Canterbury hath moved it tow or three times, but itt sticks: what would you advise a man should doe in this case? Let me

¹³² See below, pp. 277-9.

¹³³ Laud was of course busy with Convocation during April and May 1640 and he attended most of the meetings of the Privy Council between Wentworth's return from Ireland and his own imprisonment.

¹³⁴ See McElroy, 'Laud', p. 296; Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud*, pp. 378, 387-8.

¹³⁵ Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 233; Str. P. 6/136-7, Laud to Wentworth 12 Jan 1635.

by the next finde what you thinke. The Queen useth me passing well; and the moving for this Parliament gives me a good report with the multitude.¹³⁶

Laud was still Wentworth's primary channel to the King, although we see from this that the Archbishop's lack of success led him to consider a more direct approach.¹³⁷

Laud and Wentworth's continuing failure to act in a manner befitting a 'faction' is clearly demonstrated by events surrounding the appointment of a new Secretary of State in 1640. The King's peremptory refusal to consider the Earl of Leicester for this post may stem in part from Laud's opposition to the Earl on the grounds of his squabble with Viscount Scudamore on the French embassy and his belief that Leicester was a dangerous puritan, although the Earl's religious views and his incessant requests for the payment of his ambassadorial expenses must also have irritated Charles.¹³⁸ By mid-January 1640, Sir Henry Vane, Treasurer of the Household, was being named as Coke's successor:¹³⁹ in Wentworth's opinion this was an extremely unpleasant

¹³⁶ Whitaker ed., *Radcliffe*, p. 187, 10 Dec 1639.

¹³⁷ Wentworth was created Earl of Strafford at New Year 1640.

¹³⁸ Arthur Collins ed., *Letters and Memorials of State* (2 vols. London, 1746), vol. 2, p. 618, Northumberland to Leicester 21 Nov 1639; Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud*, p. 378. Concerning the dispute between Leicester and Scudamore see *HMC, De L'Isle and Dudley VI* (London, 1966) [hereafter *De L'Isle VI*], p. 157, Lady Leicester to Earl of Leicester 2 Jan 1639. For Laud's views on Leicester see Str. P. 6/366, Laud to Wentworth 15 Nov 1636; *ibid.* 7/5, same to same 5 Dec 1636, regarding Leicester's work in France, and *ibid.* 7/187, same to same 1 May 1639 on his religious views. On Laud's connections with Scudamore see Ian Atherton, 'Viscount Scudamore's 'Laudianism': The religious practices of the first Viscount Scudamore', *Historical Journal* 34 (1991), p. 587.

¹³⁹ SP 16/442/16, Robert Read to Thomas Windebank 16 Jan 1640; SP 16/442/33, Thomas Smith to Thomas Pennington 17 Jan 1640; SP 16/442/101, Windebank to Roe 24 Jan 1640. See also Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud*, pp. 374-6.

prospect, owing to Vane's anger at Wentworth's choice of the Barony of Raby as a title for his son William, and Vane's long-standing, close association with the Marquis of Hamilton.¹⁴⁰ The day after Lord Treasurer Juxon, acting as the King's messenger, asked Coke to resign his place, and it became clear that Vane was indeed the intended successor, Wentworth strove hard to prevent this by changing tack and arguing that Coke should continue in office. This was unsuccessful, and Wentworth and Laud must have both understood that by failing to agree on a candidate for this important office, they had made it easier for the Queen's candidate to snatch the prize.¹⁴¹

The emotive scene created by Wentworth and Laud's brief, final conversation on 12 May 1641 gives a false impression of their relationship. On certain fundamental matters of policy they found themselves in agreement, and it must have been their mutual desire to see government and society function in an orderly and controlled manner which had drawn them into an association in the first place - that, and the realisation that they were both isolated figures at the English Court in need of support. It is clear that Laud and Wentworth, together with Bishop Bramhall, worked hard to reform the Church of Ireland even if the Lord Deputy's priorities were not exactly the same as the Archbishop's. Laud acted for Wentworth as a vital means of access to the King on Irish matters, in particular in safeguarding his control of the Irish customs farm, and on some issues Wentworth regarded him as a more dependable ally than Cottington or Carlisle. But to see Wentworth and Laud as a united 'faction' in terms of court politics is to exaggerate the depth of their

¹⁴⁰ *De L'Isle VI*, pp. 207-8, Lady Carlisle to Lady Leicester 5 Dec 1639; *ibid.* p. 221, Hawkins to Leicester 9 Jan 1640; *ibid.* p. 224, same to same 16 Jan 1640; SP 16/444/54, Sir Richard Cave to Roe 7 Feb 1640.

¹⁴¹ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. 2, p. 631, Northumberland to Leicester 16 Jan 1640; Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, pp. 165-6.

association. Their correspondence of 1635-6 concerning the Treasury reveals Laud's initial lack of knowledge of Wentworth's intentions, and his repeated attempts to probe the Lord Deputy show that he was not convinced by Wentworth's denial of interest in the post. Throughout Wentworth's Deputyship, their letters show that Wentworth could not rely on Laud's unequivocal support partly because of the Archbishop's unease at the Lord Deputy's more aggressive actions. Laud enjoyed friendships and associations which Wentworth did not share: the reverse was also true and in the cases of Antrim and Leicester these differences were politically significant. The important point is that their association was largely maintained on paper. Their actions often failed to live up to the claims of friendship and alliance which their correspondence stressed. Their surviving letters reveal not only their need for reciprocal support but also their failure to consistently provide it. Although clearly incomplete, this correspondence allows us to explore this very complex relationship.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE LORD TREASURERSHIP, 1635-6

The death of Weston ushered in a very interesting period in Caroline court politics; the struggle for control of the Treasury.¹ At the beginning of the contest, there appeared to be several prime contenders; Wentworth, Cottington, and the King's final choice, William Juxon, Bishop of London. George Garrard wrote to Wentworth on 12 March 1635 that 'Though not yett dead, yett they name Treasurers in the towne, some my Lord Cottington, Others your Lordship, and some the Bishop of London, But most, that it will be regulated awchyle by a commission, wherof my Lord Cottington to be of the Quorum'.² Five days later, Garrard wrote to Wentworth and confirmed that the Treasury had indeed gone into commission and that the commissioners were Laud, Cottington, Manchester and the two secretaries, with Cottington only being of the quorum.³ Garrard's accurate predictions are interesting in the light of the traditional description of Juxon as a surprise choice.

With the establishment of the Treasury Commission, Laud gained a golden opportunity in his quest to blacken the reputation of Weston - and at the same time hopefully damage Cottington's chances of further preferment - by exposing malpractice in that office. Gardiner expresses it well:

'His moral indignation against the carelessness and the worse than carelessness of officials filled the sails of his purpose,

¹ This chapter has benefited from much discussion with Brian Quintrell. See his 'The Church triumphant? The emergence of a spiritual Lord Treasurer, 1635-6', in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth* ed. Julia Merritt (Cambridge, forthcoming).

² Str. P. 14/323, 12 March 1635.

³ *Ibid.* 14/338, 17 March 1635.

and he drove straight to the mark before him, reckless what offence he gave or what difficulties he laid up in store for the future.’⁴

Laud was not to find it an easy task to humiliate Cottington, but as the year went on it became imperative for him to try and destroy Cottington’s influence at Court. This was not solely because of Laud’s great sense of moral outrage at the past and present activities of the ‘Lady Mora and her waiting-maid’. His letter to Wentworth of 4 October 1635 contains mention of all his fears relating to Cottington: the strength of the Queen’s support for him regarding the Treasury; his potential ability to persuade the King to halt the prosecution of John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln; and his close friendship with the arch-deserter, Secretary Windebank.⁵ Because of these fears, the need to prevent Cottington gaining the Treasury was Laud’s paramount concern and his paramount aim, therefore, was to find a candidate who might stand a good chance of gaining the white staff: his partner in ‘thorough’ was an obvious choice.

Weston’s serious illness in the early part of 1634 led Cottington to remark to Wentworth that although he had recovered, he remained infirm and that ‘doubtless his place will fall between your selfe and Mr Attorney for this kingdome yeelds nott a third fitt for it.’⁶ In his reply Wentworth remarked that neither he nor Noy were suitable candidates and that Cottington was the man for the job.⁷ Despite his visit to Tunbridge Wells in the summer, the Lord Treasurer remained ill during the autumn and winter of 1634. Wentworth received news of Weston’s likely and actual death from a number of

⁴ Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VIII, p. 69.

⁵ Str. P. 6/252-7.

⁶ *Ibid.* 14/29, 29 April 1634.

⁷ *Ibid.* 3/83, 14 May 1634.

correspondents and he gained further information on political opinion at Court from his brother, George Wentworth, who was at Court in March 1635.⁸ Wentworth wrote to his brother on 25 March that if Weston had died and if he heard the Lord Deputy being named as a potential Lord Treasurer he was to answer that he had heard his brother say that the Treasurer's job was not suitable for him and that he did not wish to have it:

‘And therefore intreat all my freinds that speake of it, to
Silence it as much as may be, as a thing not to be intertained
by me.’⁹

Wentworth maintained a consistent line throughout the year in which the Treasury was in commission. He knew very soon after Weston's death that he was being named by voices at Court as a possible Lord Treasurer,¹⁰ but he also became aware of the fact that the Queen had a strong interest in the matter. Her role in the appointment of Weston's successor has not received as much attention as it merits, but correspondence in the Strafford Papers makes her involvement evident. The Earl of Dorset, the Queen's Chamberlain, wrote to Wentworth on 12 March, having just come from Weston's deathbed, to promise him that he would do all he could to further his chances in the competition for the Treasury, for ‘My great Maisters Service wants such an Atlas’. Dorset went on to tell Wentworth that he stood well in the Queen's affections, for ‘Two dayes since fame rumouring your death, with sorrow shee protested, that then the king had lost a brave and faithfull Servant, one whome she loved, valed, and esteemed’. George Wentworth was apparently a

⁸ See for example, *ibid.* 14/313, James Howell to Wentworth 5 March 1635; *ibid.* 14/316, Lord Chaworth to Wentworth 10 March 1635; *ibid.* 14/322, Cottington to Wentworth 12 March 1635 and *ibid.* 14/327, Sir John Bingley 13 March 1635.

⁹ *Ibid.* 8/208, 25 March 1635.

¹⁰ See *ibid.* 9/69, Necolalde to Wentworth 31 March 1635, hoping that Wentworth would return from Ireland soon. Wentworth had apparently intimated to Necolalde before his departure that he hoped to be in Ireland for only two years.

witness to this interesting scene.¹¹ The Lord Deputy does not appear to have replied hurriedly. His answer, written on Whit Tuesday (May 19), protested that he had ‘neither mind nor a body disposed to undertake soe heavy a Chardge’ and he concluded by simply asking Dorset to represent to the Queen his appreciation of her ‘Princely Grace towards me’.¹² David Smith has read Dorset’s letter as genuine encouragement to the Lord Deputy to enter the race for the Treasury.¹³ But Wentworth had absolutely no reason to believe that the Queen was keen to see him hold the white staff and probably interpreted this approach correctly: it was an attempt to ascertain whether he had any interest in the post, and if he did, to try and draw him out into the open.

It might be assumed that the correspondence between Laud and Wentworth should contain much interesting and revealing material on their attitudes towards this matter, but in fact it contains very little material, and that of a secretive nature, on the Treasury. Much has to be gleaned by reading between the lines. Laud did not write to tell Wentworth of Weston’s death until 27 March, and noted it casually, remarking that it would probably not be news to him. He was primarily concerned with securing the restitution of Irish royal impropriations to the Church and noted the rumours that Weston died in the Roman Catholic faith.¹⁴ In the late spring of 1635, Laud was immediately concerned with his role as one of the Treasury commissioners and was determined to try and launch an investigation into the state of the King’s revenues. In an unusual reversal of roles, Wentworth had to advise Laud to consult the King first before publicly attacking or opposing any plans of

¹¹ *Ibid.* 8/234-5, 12 March 1635.

¹² *Ibid.* 8/236, 19 May 1635.

¹³ David L. Smith, ‘The Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Personal Rule of Charles I’, *Journal of British Studies* 30 (1991), pp. 264-5.

¹⁴ Str. P. 6/169, 27 March.

Cottington's.¹⁵ But in June, Laud began warily to probe Wentworth to try and ascertain whether he was ambitious for the position of Treasurer. He did this by claiming that Cottington's friends had begun to say that Wentworth was indeed keen to be appointed and that he was working through Laud and the Queen.¹⁶ Wentworth firmly denied any interest in the post:

'...beleeve me I am veryly perswaded all the holy men of Calabria with their beades knock they them together never soe earnestly, will not be able to lead 130 [Wentworth] into that measure, wherin she foresees herselfe shall be abominably forth even in the first stepps shee shall make, And to put herself into a dance and learne it afterwards she conceaves there will be noe tyme for it'.¹⁷

Laud's response was to repeat the afore-mentioned rumour and tell Wentworth that his resolution was a wise one, but nevertheless stating his opinion that if Wentworth refused to 'dance' then little good could be expected of the Treasury.¹⁸ But not even rumours suggesting that Cottington might be succeeded as Chancellor of the Exchequer by Sir Arthur Ingram could induce Wentworth to change his mind: he never altered his stance, continuing to insist that he was not ambitious to be Lord Treasurer. In fact he does not appear to have been at all concerned by Laud's news regarding Ingram's chances and instead named an alternative candidate:

'Tis strang that the Queen should be to make Cottington Treasurer but it may be well soe, for Sir Richard Wynn I hear shall succeed Cottington'.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 6/175, Laud to Wentworth 28 April 1635; *ibid.* 6/193-4, same to same 12 June 1635; *ibid.* 6/182, Wentworth to Laud 18 May 1635.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 6/194, 12 June 1635.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 6/206, 14 July 1635.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 6/232, 31 July/3 Aug 1635.

There appears to be no corroborating evidence to suggest that Wynn was indeed a candidate and I am tempted to conclude that this comment was Wentworth's idea of a joke. If he was supposed to find the prospect of Ingram as Chancellor extremely unpalatable, then Laud could hardly have welcomed the thought of a relative of the Bishop of Lincoln gaining the post.¹⁹

By October Laud was certain that all was lost and that Cottington was practically home and dry.²⁰ The Lord Deputy was clearly not prepared to be considered as a candidate for the post of Lord Treasurer and there are alternative explanations for this. There is the reason which he himself gave: that he was unwilling to shoulder the burden and risk failing in this most difficult of employments. There is the fact that 1635 was a very important and busy year in Irish affairs.²¹ There is also the fact that Wentworth may well have wanted to be Treasurer, but was not prepared to put himself forward - or allow others to do so - as a candidate for the post. He would have realised that he was not on the King's list of potential Treasurers, no matter how much support he might have been able to secure at Court.²² The King had not offered

¹⁹ SP 16/291/30, Roe to Queen of Bohemia 23 June 1635; Str. P. 6/225, Laud to Wentworth 6 July 1635; *ibid.* 6/239, Wentworth to Laud 12 Sept 1635. See also Upton, *Ingram*, p. 234; Str. P. 6/237, Wentworth to Laud 12 Sept 1635 and *ibid.* 6/251, Laud to Wentworth 4 Oct 1635. Regarding Wentworth's relations with Ingram, see above, pp. 61-2. Wynn was the Queen's Receiver of Revenues, but there does not appear to be any evidence that she wished him to replace Cottington. For Laud's handling of Wynn when he sought a favour for Williams, see Hacket, *Scrinia Reserata* part II, pp. 128-9. I owe this reference to Dr. Quintrell.

²⁰ Str. P. 6/252-4, Laud to Wentworth 4 Oct 1635.

²¹ See Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, *passim*.

²² Gerald Aylmer has argued that 'If Charles had really had the 'root of the matter' in him, known an able man when he saw one, and felt that he could manage men of ability, he should have brought Strafford back from Ireland...and made him Lord Treasurer', Gerald Aylmer and William Lamont, 'Charles I', *The Tudors and Stuarts* (London, 1976) p. 125.

it to him directly and that might have been the only basis on which he would have taken the position. There appears to be no evidence that he was being dishonest and disingenuous when he claimed to be unwilling to be considered; it was just that Laud needed a lot of convincing.

In late November, Laud made what appears to have been his final attempt to probe Wentworth by telling him two stories. The first was that he had been asked by 'a gentleman of the Queenes side' why he was so earnest to make Wentworth Treasurer, who was regarded as so 'obnoxious'. Laud denied that he was meddling in the business, but replied that Wentworth could not be described as 'obnoxious' and was in fact a good servant of the King. The other story was that he was approached by a knight from 'the Kings side' who told him he was going the right way to make Cottington Treasurer as his support of Wentworth made men turn towards the Chancellor. Once again, Laud apparently told his visitor that he 'medled not in those matters'. Whether or not these tales were genuine, they were designed to elicit a clear response from Wentworth which Laud would take as final. Wentworth's reply that he did not mind being regarded as obnoxious as long as no one made him Treasurer was clear enough. Laud's letter contains an even more interesting passage, however. He claimed that there was a rumour at Court, which he attributed to Cottington, that Laud was actually preventing Wentworth from becoming Treasurer as he himself was ambitious for the post.²³ Laud's letters are generally littered with criticisms and unfavourable comments relating to Cottington, probably because he knew of Wentworth's friendship with him and needed reassurance that there was no close political association between the two. In this case, Laud probably feared that Cottington would write (or had

But Charles understood that if the Treasury was controlled by Wentworth, peace and harmony would probably have disappeared forever from his Court.

²³ Str. P. 6/288-9, 30 Nov 1635.

already written) to Wentworth discussing Laud's ambitions and wished to rubbish the Chancellor's comments. But there appears to be an additional dimension to this particular passage. Laud had in fact given Wentworth an opportunity to consider the Archbishop as a candidate for the Treasury. If he hoped for Wentworth's approval, he was disappointed.²⁴ It is surely noteworthy that Wentworth never tried to persuade Laud to put himself forward as a candidate for the Treasury, despite entertaining some fears for the future of his Irish revenues with Cottington as Treasurer.

Cottington himself was an obvious candidate for the position of Lord Treasurer. Charles knew him well as his former secretary in the early 1620s, and his friendship with Weston had helped him to re-enter royal service after his temporary fall from Buckingham's favour in 1625. He was closely associated with Weston during their control of the Treasury and Exchequer. As Chancellor of the Exchequer since 1629, he had gained valuable knowledge of the state of the Crown's finances and had in addition served on the five major standing committees of the Privy Council and on a number of royal commissions.²⁵ In March 1635 he also replaced Sir Robert Naunton as Master of the Court of Wards and is credited with raising the revenue of the Court by introducing 'closer personal supervision of the Court's operations and officers, especially in the North and in Wales.'²⁶ One of his earliest acts as Master was

²⁴ *Ibid.* 6/294, Wentworth to Laud 3 Jan 1636.

²⁵ See Havran, *Caroline Courtier*, p. 115.

²⁶ Cooper, 'Cottington', pp. 79-83, 159-64; Havran, *Caroline Courtier*, pp. 137, 136-8. Naunton held office at the King's pleasure, not for life, and he had been a marked man since at least 1633, when he had objected to the Privy Council's treatment of Sir Francis Nethersole. Cottington managed to procure a commission of investigation into Naunton's state of health and the Master resigned in mid-March 1635. Cottington had also engineered the resignation of the Earl of Suffolk from the Captaincy of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners. This was done to allow the Earl of Salisbury to step into Suffolk's place and

to use his influence with the King to secure the wardship of William Wentworth for his father, the Lord Deputy. The first mention of this is found in a letter from Wentworth to Cottington of 18 February 1635, and the Lord Deputy appeared to be very grateful for Cottington's efforts. He was confident that Charles would grant him this favour and asked Cottington to advise him on the matter, realising that others would interpret it as a sign of greed.²⁷ Cottington appears to have gone ahead on the matter without further consulting Wentworth, as the Lord Deputy's letter to the King shows, but once the business had been finalised in late May, he thanked Cottington for this service.²⁸

As has been argued in a previous chapter, it is clear that the relationship between Wentworth and Cottington was essentially one of friendship, but not one of absolute trust. Their correspondence during the period of the Treasury

renounce his reversion to the Wards; Schreiber, *The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton 1589-1635* (London, 1981), pp. 126-8; Aylmer, *The King's Servants* (London, 1961), pp. 114-7. There is evidence that Cottington had nursed ambitions for the Mastership for several years: in late 1631 William Murray reported rumours at Court suggesting that Naunton would receive a sum of money in return for standing down in favour of Cottington, and that Salisbury would receive Suffolk's offices; SP 16/204/72, Murray to Vane 18 December 1631.

²⁷ Str. P. 3/173, in which Wentworth states that he has already been threatened with assassination. The letter from Cottington to Wentworth first mentioning this business appears not to have survived.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 3/196, Wentworth to Charles I 9 May 1635; *ibid.* 3/203, Wentworth to Cottington 23 May 1635. See also *ibid.* 15/79, Cottington to Wentworth 20 May 1635. In 1637 Wentworth's kinsman Rowland Wandesford was appointed Attorney of the Court of Wards, 'without his suit or solicitation but on account of his worthiness by the sole and principal desire of Lord Cottington Master of the Wards', Cambridge University Library MS Add. 6863, ff. 88v-9, cited in Wilfred R. Prest, *The Rise of the Barristers: A Social History of the English Bar 1590-1640* (Oxford, 1986), p. 143 n. 38.

Commission contains interesting material relating to Weston, revealing the complex relations between these three men. While the Treasurer was alive, Wentworth did not attack him in his correspondence with Cottington, other than to occasionally complain of the delays incurred in receiving answers from Weston.²⁹ On 26 March, when Wentworth had heard of Weston's serious illness, he even claimed that this news had made him ill and that he was praying daily for the Treasurer's recovery.³⁰ By 13 July, however, when Wentworth was discussing Weston's handling of the attempts made by Barr to undermine his administration of the Irish customs revenue, he launched into an attack on the way he had been treated by the late Treasurer.³¹ In his reply Cottington defended Weston's role in this business and Wentworth was not able to draw the Chancellor into criticising his late friend.³² Nevertheless, on the issue of the vacant Treasurership, Cottington and Wentworth entered into much bantering with each other, claiming that the other was the best candidate for the post and assuring each other of their own weakness and lack of importance. As noted above, this had begun during Weston's illness in early 1634 and it started again in March 1635, with Cottington claiming in May that he had scarcely any grip on his place at Court because of his enemies' manoeuvrings against him. By 30 October, in his last letter to Wentworth on the subject before Juxon's appointment, he was arguing that Laud would get the Treasurer's place, 'who without all doubt wyll be most unfitt, yet better he then none'. For his own sake, Cottington, wrote, this would at least relieve him of the need for very hard work in the Exchequer, as Weston, his friend, had

²⁹ See for example, Str. P. 3/20, Wentworth to Cottington 22 Oct 1633.

³⁰ *Ibid.* 3/185.

³¹ *Ibid.* 3/212. See also *ibid.* 3/219, 11 Sept 1635.

³² *Ibid.* 15/184, 4 Aug 1635.

expected of him. He could rely on the knowledge that Laud would try and exclude him from the business as much as possible.³³

Cottington's letters to Wentworth on the subject of the Treasury contain a complex mix of information, warnings and banter. Of particular interest is the contrast between Cottington's letters to Wentworth written in May and August and his letter of late October. His letters written in the summer are quite despondent in tone, but by October Cottington appears to suggest that he expects to keep his position of Chancellor of the Exchequer. His letters of 3 and 30 October, which both discuss Laud's growing power, must be read in the light of his probable knowledge that Laud in fact did not stand any chance at all and that someone else had in fact been lined up for the job. This coincides with the period when Laud probably began trying to put himself forward as a candidate for the post, having accepted that Wentworth would not agree to do so: that November he gave Wentworth the opportunity to give him some support. Cottington, with his wonderful sense of humour, must have found this situation hilarious. These letters can also be read as warnings to Wentworth from the Chancellor, conveying information on Laud's actions which Wentworth clearly did not receive from the Archbishop himself. This raises the question: how much knowledge did Wentworth himself have of the manoeuvrings at Court regarding the Treasury? It might be inferred from his correspondence with Laud and Cottington that he knew little of the true state of affairs, especially as his main informant, Laud, did not fully understand the terms of struggle for the post. But this is to assume that Wentworth lacked a source of more accurate information, when even before Weston's death he had been informed by George Garrard that Juxon was a candidate for

³³ *Ibid.* 15/79, 20 May 1635; *ibid.* 15/253, 30 Oct 1635; see also *ibid.* 15/108, 16 June 1635; *ibid.* 15/184, 4 Aug 1635; *ibid.* 15/225, 3 Oct 1635 - all Cottington to Wentworth.

Treasurership.³⁴ In September Garrard further reported that Juxon was growing in royal favour: ‘at Michelmas his Majestye intends to call the Bishop of London to be one of his Privy Councill; which I am very Glad off; for he hath the Good Opinion of every man.’³⁵ Also in September, Garrard wrote to Viscount Conway that it was reported at Court that Cottington would be made Lord Treasurer, ‘but he will not confess it to me, yet I have seen him often this summer.’³⁶ In October he noted the ‘Stronge reports there weare both throughout London and all the Country over, that at the Kings comming to Hampton Court a Lord Treasurer shold be declar’d, and the Staffe given to my Lord Cottington, but noe such matter; for ought I can heare, his Majestye intends to continewe the Commission.’³⁷ In January 1636 Garrard was very insistent that Cottington would not receive the staff, despite rumours to the contrary.³⁸ The accuracy of his information might seem surprising, but it appears that Garrard was a close friend of Cottington’s.³⁹ This would account

³⁴ *Ibid.* 14/323, 12 March 1635.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 15/206, 1 Sept 1635. On this matter Garrard was in error; Juxon was appointed a member of the Privy Council at the same time as receiving the Lord Treasurer’s staff.

³⁶ SP 16/298/10, 18 Sept 1635.

³⁷ Str. P. 15/232, Garrard to Wentworth 3 Oct 1635.

³⁸ *Ibid.* 15/332, Garrard to Wentworth 25 Jan 1636: ‘My Lord Cottington, your good frend and mine, Is, God be thancked, well recovered. Here was one of the most outrageous reports some three dayes before the Kings going to Newmarkett, that ever I knewe, That he shold have the Lord Treasurers Staffe given him before the Kings going. No man wold beleave mee, though I affirmed the Contrary. I am sure I saw him daily, and he told mee otherwise.’

³⁹ *Ibid.* 15/315, Garrard to Wentworth 8 Jan 1636. When Garrard sought the Mastership of the Charterhouse in 1635 he visited Laud, accompanied by Cottington - which probably did little good for his cause - and also wrote to Wentworth to solicit his support. Laud did not have as good an opinion of Garrard as did Cottington and Wentworth; having known him a long time, Laud knew of Garrard’s liking for ‘good company’ and feared that he would not ‘be as vigilant for the thrift, and carefull for the Government of that howse as is requisite’,

for his failure to believe the rumours which were circulating at Court that Cottington would soon be appointed Treasurer. It is quite likely that while using information from newsletter writers such as John Pory and Edward Rossingham for the more general Court news, he gained very accurate material on the Treasury, for instance, directly from Cottington.⁴⁰ The Lord Deputy, therefore, received snippets of very useful information in Cottington's letters to him as well as being able to read much into Garrard's reports. Wentworth knew of Garrard's friendship with Cottington and is likely, therefore, to have found his inclusion of Juxon on the list of potential Lord Treasurers very interesting and therefore understood, probably from March 1635, that Cottington might not be appointed Lord Treasurer.⁴¹ What is even more interesting is Wentworth's failure to communicate this information to Laud. Despite Wentworth's generally friendly correspondence with Cottington, he appeared to concur fully with Laud's incessant criticisms of the Chancellor, in particular over the issue of the soap monopoly and Cottington's opposition to the investigation into the King's revenue. This was due to his understanding of Laud's fear of desertion - what could be termed the 'Windebank factor'. Any show of friendliness or even neutrality towards Cottington might have aroused suspicion in Laud and damaged their relationship. Wentworth did, however, fail to agree with Laud's certain belief that Cottington would receive the staff, but he gave no particular reason for his dissension from Laud's opinion and never mentioned Juxon's name.⁴²

ibid. 6/189, Laud to Wentworth 12 May 1635; *ibid.* 14/266, Garrard to Wentworth 15 Jan 1635.

⁴⁰ I am grateful to Dr. Quintrell for much discussion on this point.

⁴¹ His banter with Cottington regarding the Chancellor's candidacy must be read in the light of this knowledge; see Str. P. 3/213, 13 July 1635; *ibid.* 3/219-20, 11 Sept 1635; *ibid.* 3/236, 14 Dec 1635.

⁴² See *Ibid.* 6/265-8, Wentworth to Laud 2 Nov 1635; *ibid.* 6/334-6, same to same 9 March 1636.

The proceedings of the Treasury Commission allow us to gain an interesting insight into the relationship between William Laud and Francis Cottington. As discussed above, Laud regarded his membership of the Commission as a golden opportunity to try to destroy Cottington's career.⁴³ But Cottington's opposition to Laud's attempts to investigate the true state of the King's revenues was not simply, as Laud believed, the fear of a corrupt politician that his misdeeds would be discovered.⁴⁴ Cottington was well aware of the work which needed to be done to raise royal revenue and he regarded Laud's attempts to launch a lengthy investigation of the work of former years as an unnecessary distraction from the real and necessary business of raising money. In his letter to Wentworth of 16 June he briefly stated how badly in his opinion the work of the Treasury Commission was going, to which Wentworth simply told him to press on with it.⁴⁵ Wentworth received lengthy accounts from Laud on the subject of the Treasury Commission, and in particular on Cottington's opposition to the enquiry into the state of the King's revenue.⁴⁶ Although the King appeared to be happy to let this investigation run its course, he was not particularly willing to implement the necessary economies which would help to reduce the Crown's debts. Charles's refusal to scrap his plan to buy land for a deer park and enclose it with a brick wall exasperated Laud who made strenuous efforts to persuade him to reconsider. Believing that Cottington had

⁴³ McElroy argues that Laud persuaded the King to put the Treasury into Commission for precisely this purpose; 'Laud', p. 130. But it must be pointed out that Charles probably did not wish to make a hurried decision and had in the past placed important offices in commission. See SP 16/285/29, Windebank's notes of business transacted by the Lords of the Treasury, 21 March 1635, which show Laud's determination to turn the Treasury upside-down.

⁴⁴ Str. P. 6/175, Laud to Wentworth 28 April 1635.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 15/108, 16 June 1635; *ibid.* 3/213, Wentworth to Cottington 13 July 1635.

⁴⁶ See for example, *ibid.* 6/191-4, 12 June 1635; *ibid.* 6/230-33, 31 July 1635.

encouraged Charles to proceed with this plan, he launched into an angry criticism of the Chancellor at a meeting of the Treasury Commission. Cottington, who was never particularly perturbed by Laud's clumsy attacks on him, jokingly accused the Archbishop of not showing enough consideration for the King's need for healthy recreation, which might amount to a greater offence, namely treason. Storming out of the meeting, Laud again tried to persuade Charles to drop the scheme, bitterly criticising Cottington, but he was forced to listen to the King who informed him that Cottington had in fact also urged him to do the same.⁴⁷ Laud and Cottington also clashed over the soap monopoly, which led to serious ruptures in the work of both the Treasury Commission and the Committee for Trade. Katharine McElroy argues that Laud's opposition to the monopoly originated in his very traditional views relating to industrial organisation, in particular his support for the guild system which, he believed, protected workers and the public from exploitation. The Westminster soapmakers did not conform to Laud's traditional views and he was also certain that the monopolists had employed bribery to persuade certain privy councillors, including Cottington, to support them. Once he was a member of the Treasury Commission Laud discovered that the company had not been paying the Crown more than a fraction of the agreed amount. He attempted to persuade his colleagues on the Commission and on the Privy Council to back his scheme to replace the monopolists with the former soapmakers, but with only the Lord Privy Seal, the Earl of Manchester, supporting him, Laud faced the strenuous opposition of Cottington, Windebank, Dorset and Arundel. When Cottington and Windebank were able to thwart even the agreement that the Westminster Corporation pay a higher rent to the Crown, Laud despaired of ever being able to remove or reduce

⁴⁷ *CSPV, 1632-1636*, p. 436, Correr to the Doge and Senate 16 Aug 1635 [N.S.]; Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, pp. 132-5.

Cottington's influence with the King.⁴⁸ It was this series of set-backs to Laud's attempts to inject a little 'thorough' reform into the government that convinced him that Cottington would be appointed Lord Treasurer. In cipher he informed Wentworth that he did not 'purpose to speake any more to the King about Cottington being Treasurer.' He claimed that he had done his duty and would leave the rest to God. He did not wish Charles to think that his spleen was fuller than his judgement. As Martin Havran points out, however, '...the archbishop had already quite emptied his spleen and had not chosen to trust such a crucial matter to Providence.'⁴⁹

In the summer Cottington entertained the Queen at his Middlesex home, Hanworth. Laud noted that the Queen - at Oatlands, while the King was away hunting - had invited herself, and clearly she had chosen to visit him to discuss a business of great importance. Cottington was probably assured that he would retain his office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, but that the post of Treasurer was to go to another. The ousting of Naunton earlier in the year from his Mastership of the Court of Wards may well have been done in order to provide Cottington with fitting compensation for the Treasury and, in general, he had received a reasonable deal. As well as the Queen's role in this business, the position of the King also needs consideration. From his experience of the early months of the Treasury Commission he must have realised that placing either Laud or Cottington in the Treasury would have raised tension in the Court and Privy Council to an unacceptably high degree. The ideal solution was to give the Treasurer's post to someone with whom Cottington could work and to whom Laud could have no (public) objections. If that person had important connections in the financial and commercial world, then he ought to have been

⁴⁸ Str. P. 6/254, Laud to Wentworth 4 Oct 1635; McElroy, 'Laud', pp. 168-186.

⁴⁹ Str. P. 6/287, 30 Nov 1635; Havran, *Caroline Courtier*, p. 131.

an obvious choice. Juxon was already being talked about as a leading candidate, before Weston had even departed this world.

According to Mason, William Juxon gained the post of Lord Treasurer chiefly due to his association with Laud: he was Laud's second choice for the position behind Wentworth.⁵⁰ This assumption rests on the belief that Juxon had continued to be the Archbishop's protege and had no other major court connections. It appears to be the case that in 1611 Juxon and Laud had worked closely together to secure for Laud the presidency of St John's College, Oxford, and that Juxon had succeeded him on Laud's recommendation ten years later.⁵¹ In 1627, however, Juxon's delivery of a Latin oration to the King appears to have impressed Charles and to have led to Juxon's appointment as a chaplain in ordinary.⁵² This, probably as much as Laud's recommendation, accounts for Juxon's appointment as Clerk of the Closet in 1632. The entry in Laud's diary which notes this appointment, makes no mention of the King's regard for Juxon and gives the impression that Juxon owed this appointment wholly to Laud. It is, however, interesting to note that his diary gives a similar account when describing the appointment of Francis Windebank as Secretary of State, and in this case the favour of the Lord Treasurer, Lord Weston, was of crucial importance.⁵³ It appears that his advancement to the Bishopric of Hereford and, before he could be consecrated, to the see of London in 1633,

⁵⁰ Thomas A. Mason, *Serving God and Mammon: William Juxon 1582-1663* (Newark, 1985), pp. 82-3.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* pp. 25-8, 30.

⁵² *Ibid.* p.34.

⁵³ Laud, *Works*, vol. III, pp. 215-6; Mason, *Juxon*, p. 45.

was due directly to royal favour, and the King's good opinion of him was also of importance in his appointment as Lord Treasurer three years later.⁵⁴

It is unclear when Juxon first became a candidate for the post of Lord Treasurer. Garrard's letter to Wentworth would appear to suggest that it was before Weston's death. The Treasurer's lingering illness must have prompted manoeuvrings at Court long before his actual death. The accuracy of Garrard's predictions and his close association with Cottington would certainly appear to suggest that the Chancellor had some role in the appointment, but other evidence points to the role of members of the Queen's entourage and, ultimately, to the Queen herself. When Juxon's background is investigated, he does not appear to be as unusual a choice for the staff as many contemporaries thought. Of possibly greater importance than his religious career were his connections with the financial world of the city of London. Juxon himself had been educated at the Merchant Taylors' School, a reflection of his family's connections with the city company,⁵⁵ and was related to Sir Nicholas Crisp, who leased lands from successive Bishops of London. Crisp was a member of the syndicate which took over the farm of the Great Customs in 1638.⁵⁶ Another member of this farm was George, Lord Goring, a favourite of the Queen and a man with important financial connections. In a note which has not received much attention, John Harrison, a member of the farm which was supplanted by Goring's organisation in 1638, commented bitterly that his removal was due to the influence which Goring had over his 'creature'

⁵⁴ Charles expressed his appreciation of Juxon's advice to Sir Philip Warwick; *Memoires of the Reign of King Charles I* (3rd ed. London, 1703), p. 96: 'I never gott his opinion freely in my life, but when I had it, I was ever the better for it.'

⁵⁵ Mason, *Juxon*, pp.19-20.

⁵⁶ See *ibid.* pp. 91-2; Robert Ashton, *The Crown and the Money Market 1603-1640* (Oxford, 1940), pp. 102-3.

Juxon.⁵⁷ Another member of the syndicate was Sir Abraham Dawes, the author of the 1635 revised Book of Rates, who was favoured by Charles and, according to Harrison, became a client of Cottington's on the death of Weston.⁵⁸ It may well have been the case that the Queen was finally able to move her favourites into positions of influence after Weston's death and that the wily Cottington was quick enough to sense the danger and adapt his position accordingly. He probably realised that if he made a bid for the Treasury based on his own power at Court, it would be insufficient to gain him the post, due to the strength of the opposition. If he showed that he was willing to work with the new men, he would, however, stand a better chance of saving his position as Chancellor of the Exchequer, which he might have been in danger of losing if he had displayed any antagonism towards them. The danger to Cottington did not emanate from the proponents of 'thorough', but from the

⁵⁷ BL, Stowe MS. 326, ff. 62v-63. According to this note Goring had 'obtain'd the power of disposing all thinges in this great office by placing therein his creature the Bishop of London'.

⁵⁸ Ashton, *The Crown and the Money Market*, pp. 100-103. Ashton notes that the syndicate which took over the management of the farm of the great customs 'appeared to possess all the ingredients which were required for success in the business of customs farming. Expertise in customs administration was provided by Dawes and Jacob; business experience and substantial wealth by Crispe, Sir Job Harby, and perhaps by Sir John Nulls, about whom little is known, but who appears to have been one of Harby's business associates; and influence at Court by Goring, who had already considerable experience in the exploitation of such influence to the end of securing lucrative economic concessions from the Crown. If Harrison is to be believed, the Pindar syndicate was safe in its tenure of the farm so long as Weston was Lord Treasurer, but it was Goring's influence over his successor, Juxon, that was the prime factor in ousting Pindar from control. Even allowing for Harrison's dislike of Juxon, whose financial probity he was prepared to impugn, the picture which he paints offers a coherent and plausible explanation of the history of the great farm in the 1630s', p. 102.

Queen, and her visit to Hanworth in August 1635 was almost certainly to discuss the issue of the Treasury.

Writing from Westminster to the Earl of Middlesex a few days before Juxon's appointment, John Holles, Earl of Clare, believed that the position of Treasurer still hung in the balance but he made the interesting comment:

‘Cottington is sik, & in daunger, Wentworth shale not have it, the K[ing] commends the Bishop for an honest man, but tym is past and with it the fundamental and legal supplemental revenues of the Crown; he must have an able man to supply the former wants with care and industrie, and with the subjects as littil hurt as may be, forced thearunto by necessitie, not embrasing it willingly.’

This somewhat garbled letter informed Middlesex that Juxon appeared to be a suitable candidate because of his reputation for honesty, but that in Clare's opinion this was not enough.⁵⁹ The Venetian ambassador also commented on Juxon's personal integrity, but Clare was not alone in his belief that Juxon was not up to the job. The extremely experienced Secretary Coke was particularly concerned that Juxon would have difficulty handling Philip Burlamachi's demands that the Crown pay him what he was owed.⁶⁰ More recently Mason

⁵⁹ CKS, Sackville MSS, C[orrespondence] P[ersonal] no. 29, 1 March 1636.

⁶⁰ See Mason, *Juxon*, pp. 91-2; Young, *Servility and Service: The Life and Work of Sir John Coke* (London, 1986), pp. 223-4; *HMC, Twelfth Report Appendix II*, (Cowper II), (London, 1888), p. 126, Pye to Coke 17 July 1636; *ibid.* pp. 126-7, Coke to Laud 19 July 1636; *ibid.* p.128, Juxon to Coke 27 July 1636, in which Juxon admits his lack of knowledge concerning Burlamachi's accounts; *ibid.* p. 131, Coke to Juxon 3 Aug 1636. Coke's determination to prevent Burlamachi from receiving his demands appears to have worsened his relations with his brother-secretary. The following year, Windebank supported Burlamachi in his attempt to replace Thomas Witherings as postmaster, a move which Coke strenuously opposed. Coke's removal from office left Witherings without a protector and in

has recognised that ‘Juxon...undermined his reform effort by countenancing Lord Goring’s financial schemes’. Mark Fissel is unable to accept the positive view of Juxon’s Treasurership presented by his biographer, and condemns his inability to deliver revenue when the King needed it.⁶¹ During late 1638, when tight control over spending was essential, Laud shared with Wentworth his opinion that Juxon did not have a firm enough grip on the Treasury, clearly believing that he could do a better job.⁶²

Mason argues that Garrard’s inclusion of Juxon, together with Cottington and Wentworth on his list of rumoured candidates for the Treasury, suggests that Laud had considered Juxon as a reserve candidate behind Wentworth even before Weston’s death. But this is to fail to see the role of Garrard for what it probably was; providing an important link between Cottington and Wentworth. A close examination of the correspondence between Laud and Wentworth would appear to suggest that by October 1635 Laud was attempting to promote his own candidacy, not that of Juxon, and an examination of the correspondence between Cottington and Wentworth would appear to suggest that Cottington had realised this and informed Wentworth.

August 1640 he was indeed replaced by Burlamachi; Sharpe, ‘Thomas Witherings and the Reform of the Foreign Posts, 1632-40’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 57 (1984), pp. 157-8.

⁶¹ Mark Charles Fissel, *The Bishops’ Wars: Charles I’s campaigns against Scotland 1638-1640* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 295. On Juxon and Goring see Mason, *Juxon*, pp. 98-107. Goring managed to get control of the farm of the import duties on tobacco and also the farm for licensing the sale of tobacco in 1637, and he was a prominent member of the syndicate which took over the farm of the great customs in 1638.

⁶² Str. P. 7/156v, 29 Dec 1638: ‘As for the Kings Coffers, the lock of them is too much at Command, and there be too many keys. The Lord Treasourour, to my knowledge, would use providence enough were he let alone; but were I in his Case, they should command the Staffe when they would, but not a penny of money, till those difficultyes were over.’

Three pieces of evidence remain to be considered, however, and each of them shed light on this subject. The first is the list of bishops who had held the office of Lord Treasurer from the eleventh to the fifteenth century. It has been assumed that Laud prepared this list in support of Juxon's candidacy, but two important errors on this list should lead us to the view that it was actually prepared and submitted to the King in support of his own candidacy. It is in an unfamiliar hand, not that of either Laud or his secretary, William Dell, and it cannot be stated definitely that it was prepared to be shown to the King, but this is likely. It only lists about half of all clerical Treasurers and among its omissions is Roger Walden who resigned his position upon becoming Archbishop of Canterbury in January 1398. Among those included is Simon Langham, but the document omits the fact that he actually became Archbishop of Canterbury over three years after he ceased to hold the office of Lord Treasurer. These could be accidental omissions, but they could equally well be deliberate. If there is no evidence that directly connects the list with Laud's candidacy, then there is also none to connect it with Juxon.⁶³

The second piece of evidence is a passage in a letter from James, Marquis of Hamilton, to his brother-in-law, Basil, Lord Feilding, whose late wife Anne was the daughter of Lord Treasurer Weston. Written on 11 March, it informed Fielding that the appointment of Juxon was followed

‘with ane publyk declaration of his Majestie att the Consall tabill thatt he woold heave med Choyes of Canterberi for that plase if itt had not beine out of the Consideration of over

⁶³ SP 16/315/61, undated but calendared as [6 March 1636]. I am grateful to Dr. Quintrell for discussion on the significance of this document.

pressing his aged bodie with affaires, who[s]e fidelity and affection to his servis his Majestie did much commend.’⁶⁴

Hamilton was one of Charles’s closest personal friends and he was present when the appointment was announced. Clearly he regarded Charles’s statement as significant enough to repeat to Feilding and although he made no comment on it, he was close enough to the King to know that it was a public declaration of confidence in Laud, given as a consolation prize. There was no need for Charles to have made a declaration of this nature if Laud had not been attempting to gain the Treasurer’s post for himself. It is likely, then, that Laud, knowing that his own attempt to get the post had been noted, not only by Cottington but by other councillors, asked the King to make a statement of this kind.

Thirdly, Laud referred to Juxon’s appointment in a well-known entry in his diary:

‘Sunday, William Juxon, Lord Bishop of London, made Lord High Treasurer of England. No Churchman had it since Henry 7. time. I pray God bless him to carry it so, that the Church may have honour, and the King and the State service and contentment by it. And now if the Church will not hold up themselves under God, I can do no more.’⁶⁵

Gardiner regarded Laud’s words as his ‘song of triumph’, and to many observers Juxon’s appointment must have appeared to confirm the growing power of the Archbishop of Canterbury.⁶⁶ But Laud had used his diary once before as a form of self-deception and a reappraisal of the significance of this

⁶⁴ Warwickshire Record Office, C2017/C1,59, Hamilton to Feilding 11 March 1636; *HMC Fourth Report, Appendix*, p. 257.

⁶⁵ Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 226.

⁶⁶ Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VIII, pp. 141-2.

entry is called for. The clue to Laud's state of mind lies in the final sentence. These are surely the words of a man depressed at witnessing a crucial governmental office slip out of his fingers.⁶⁷

Laud's experience of Windebank's 'defection' may well have taught him not to trust others, and further evidence that he was actively seeking the post of Treasurer for himself may be inferred from his attitude towards Wentworth in the winter of 1635. In December 1635 Wentworth informed Laud that he had requested permission from Charles I to come to England for several months.⁶⁸ Laud responded to this by urging him to make it clear that private business was the cause of his visit otherwise it would be rumoured that he 'came to fetch a staff', which would do him no good. More importantly it would do Laud no good at all: his attempts to prevent Cottington's appointment might be upset if Wentworth's arrival in England occasioned the speculation - or panic - that he was coming to claim the Treasurer's post.⁶⁹ He warned Wentworth that his desire to visit England had already been noted by Cottington and his supporters, although there does not appear to be any evidence that the Chancellor knew of these plans. Laud further prophesied that the Treasury would be settled before the Lord Deputy received permission to leave Ireland.⁷⁰ On March 1636 Wentworth was able to inform Laud that the King

⁶⁷ See below, p. 153. For an alternative reading of this sentence see Andrew Foster, 'The Clerical Estate Revitalised', and Peter White, 'The *via media* in the early Stuart Church', both in *The Early Stuart Church 1603-42* ed. Kenneth Fincham (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 141, 230.

⁶⁸ Str. P. 6/283, 14 Dec 1635. Wentworth claimed his wish to visit England was prompted by something written by Laud, probably referring to the passage 'I find that notwithstanding...' *ibid.* 6/279, 16 Nov 1635.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 6/310, 2 Jan 1636: '102 (Laud) tells me hee should be gladd to see you here, but hee thinkes you will not dreame of Comeing.', cf. Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 207.

⁷⁰ Str. P. 6/312-13, 14 Jan 1636.

had granted him leave to come over and that Cottington had not yet got the Treasurer's post.⁷¹ In fact Charles had granted it to Bishop Juxon three days previously. How Wentworth was informed of the appointment is something of a mystery. There does not appear to be a letter extant from Laud to Wentworth between that written on 4 February and that written on 8 April. This gap of two months in their correspondence is unusual at a time when Wentworth was not in England. Wentworth's letter to Laud of 9 April shows that he knew by then of the appointment of a new Treasurer, but he did not thank Laud for sending him the news.⁷² George Garrard's letter to Wentworth of 15 March had informed the Lord Deputy that Juxon had been appointed and James Howell had also written on the same day with the news.⁷³ It does, however, seem strange initially that Laud should not bother to write to inform Wentworth of this major appointment, although if Juxon's success was a bitter blow to Laud, rather than Cottington, the Archbishop's failure to write and notify Wentworth of the news is not totally surprising. We have to look elsewhere to discover Laud's reaction to this appointment. Years later, Laud referred to Juxon's success in a sentence in his marginal notes on Prynne's *Breviate of the Life of William Laud*. Laud wrote, '...I hope it was no crime to pray for him in that slippery place, and that the Church might have no hurt by it.' These are hardly the words of a man who had actively striven to secure this appointment for his fellow bishop.⁷⁴

If Laud was intensely depressed by his failure to secure the Treasury, Cottington's reaction was notably different. Garrard informed Wentworth

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 6/332-3, 9 March 1636.

⁷² *Ibid.* 6/339-40, Wentworth to Laud 9 April 1636.

⁷³ *Ibid.* 15/364, Garrard to Wentworth 15 March 1636; *ibid.* 15/365, Howell to Wentworth 15 March 1636. Howell's letter was received by Wentworth on 29 March.

⁷⁴ Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 266.

when he notified the Lord Deputy of Juxon's appointment that Cottington was very pleased with the news.⁷⁵ Sir John Temple informed Wentworth that although Cottington had gone hunting with Pembroke in the country and had less work in the Exchequer than before, he had not lost any of the King's favour.⁷⁶ Wentworth had an opportunity to witness Cottington's state of mind when he visited him at Hanworth in July 1636.⁷⁷ Cottington, already Master of the Wards, had indeed benefited from the appointment of William Juxon as Lord Treasurer: his new master was clearly someone with whom he was able to work,⁷⁸ and Laud's interference in financial matters was now at an end. Laud himself wrote to Wentworth in cipher, a month after Juxon's appointment, that according to an unnamed source, Windebank's son and secretary had been in a tavern with guests, discussing the new Lord Treasurer:

‘There they sayd 110 [Cottington], 27, 23, 15, [blanks] would in one year Screw (that was the word) into 29, 15, 84 [the] 105 [Treasurer] that now are, and doe all things he pleased, being most able, &c. As for 102 [Laud], twas noe matter; they were peremptorye men but Could doe nothing.’

Although Laud was still recognised by Pye and Coke as a means of access to the Lord Treasurer, his dissatisfaction at Juxon's handling of the Treasury during the Scottish crisis reveals that he was clearly not a driving force behind him.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ Str. P. 15/364, 15 March 1636.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 16/19, 18 April 1636.

⁷⁷ George Bankes, *The Story of Corfe Castle* (London, 1853), p. 65, letter from Wentworth to Sir John Bankes 24 July 1636, written at Hanworth.

⁷⁸ Cottington was also friendly with another ‘Laudian’ bishop, Matthew Wren. He had planned to attend Wren's consecration as Bishop of Hereford but the dying Weston had entreated him to stay with him; *ibid.* 14/323, Garrard to Wentworth 12 March 1635.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 6/339, 8 April 1636.

Laud recognised that his standing at Court had not increased as a result of the struggle for the Treasury. Laud commented on his isolation at Court to Prince Charles Louis and at Oxford in August he made a special effort to mend fences with Cottington.⁸⁰ Despite his apparent triumph at Oxford⁸¹ Laud remained plagued by a sense of isolation and insecurity. During the last eighteen months he had realised that the strength of opposing interests at Court was overwhelming. Cottington had survived Laud's efforts to remove him from influence and he remained a focal point of the Archbishop's anxieties, regarding Williams in particular. Laud was also concerned that the new clerical Lord Treasurer was too weak to withstand the demands of grasping courtiers. What he failed to see was that William Juxon was in many ways the ideal candidate. As far as Charles was concerned, he had appointed an honest and trustworthy cleric, whom he knew well. In doing so he had removed one opportunity for serious strife between Laud and Cottington. He had also pleased his wife, who had been involved in this appointment and whose influence has been seriously underestimated. Although there is no evidence, it is likely that there was a political purpose behind the Queen's visit to Hanworth in the summer of 1635. Cottington must have been aware of the interest shown in Juxon by the Queen's party, as Garrard had picked up the Bishop's name before Weston's death. Despite Wentworth's banter with Cottington, it is probable that the Lord Deputy understood the situation. This

⁸⁰ Victoria and Albert Museum, National Art Library, Forster MSS 48 G. 25, no. 7, Charles Louis to the Queen of Bohemia, 31 May 1636; SP 16/331/14, Garrard to Conway 4 Sept 1636.

⁸¹ Laud's apparent triumph at Oxford in August - not Juxon's appointment - appears to be what Dorset meant by his comment to Middlesex that 'the little man is turned up trump' - if indeed Laud is the person referred to; *HMC, Fourth Report, Appendix*, p. 291, 1 Oct 1636. For details of the expensive entertainments which Laud organised for the royal visitors see John R. Elliott, Jr. and John Buttrey, 'The Royal Plays at Christ Church in 1636: A New Document', *Theatre Research International* 10 (1985), pp. 93-106.

would account for his repeated assurances to Laud that Cottington would not get the prize. His failure, however, to enter into an explicit discussion of the exact state of affairs, as well as Laud's failure to reveal his own candidacy, should warn us against assuming that the existence of a voluminous correspondence between these two men signified that theirs was an exceptionally close political alliance. The struggle for the Treasury in 1635-6 was only one of several episodes which reveal flaws and weaknesses in this alliance.

CHAPTER FIVE

WENTWORTH'S CONTACTS AT COURT, 1628-40

During the years 1628-40 Wentworth was absent from Court for most of the time and required the assistance of several individuals in ensuring that his interests were looked after. His relationship with Lord Treasurer Weston and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Francis Lord Cottington, have been considered in a previous chapter, as has his complex association with Archbishop Laud. His relationship with courtiers who were members of the Queen's circle will be examined later. This chapter is concerned with the development of his relationships with the Earl of Arundel and the Earl of Carlisle, both substantial figures at Court whose Irish interests made an impact on the Lord Deputy's work. It is also concerned with Wentworth's relationship with the 'official' links between monarch and Lord Deputy, the Secretaries of State, and the head of the English legal system, Lord Keeper Coventry. It will examine Wentworth's attitude towards these figures, bearing in mind that a Lord Deputy who was physically isolated from the Court had to maintain several lines of access to the monarch. Most importantly it was essential that he receive orders from the King as quickly as possible along with any relevant material which would assist him in the Crown's work. This was the responsibility of the Secretaries of State.

In December 1628, the same month that Wentworth became Lord President of the Council of the North, Sir Dudley Carleton, later Viscount Dorchester, was appointed Secretary of State, a promotion honouring 'a commitment which was as much Charles's as Buckingham's.'¹ A major obstacle to an assessment

¹ Lawrence John Reeve, 'The Secretaryship of State of Viscount Dorchester, 1628-32', Ph. D. thesis, University of Cambridge (1983), p. 23.

of the relationship of Dorchester and Wentworth is the very small amount of their correspondence which has survived. One letter which can be found in the Strafford Papers shows that Dorchester was responsible for at least some of the governmental correspondence with Wentworth as President of the Council of the North and it indicates that previous correspondence had taken place between them.² Wentworth reported to Dorchester on the spreading of the plague in Yorkshire and on the actions he had taken.³ However, the fact that material regarding northern business exists in the Coke manuscripts suggests that Coke handled much of this business.⁴ It would appear that Wentworth valued his relationship with Dorchester sufficiently for him to accede to the Secretary's request that his relative, Thomas Carleton, be spared a knighthood fine.⁵ However, Dorchester's death in February 1632, not long after Wentworth's appointment as Lord Deputy of Ireland, was probably beneficial to Wentworth in that there was no longer a Secretary of State who had sympathies with the Earl of Cork, a combination which could have been very dangerous. L. J. Reeve notes that Dorchester had had almost total control of Irish correspondence during the final stage of Falkland's Deputyship and then while Cork and Loftus acted as Lords Justices.⁶ There is no doubt that Wentworth was not in agreement with the policies, or the thinking behind them, which Cork and Dorchester advocated and in particular he opposed

² Apart from a signet letter written by Carleton, Str. P. 4/49, 30 Jan 1632, only one piece of their correspondence is to be found in the Strafford Papers, *ibid.* 12/170, Carleton (Dorchester) to Wentworth 23 Nov 1630. Wentworth's reply to it can be found in the State Papers, SP 16/177/44, 24 Dec 1630.

³ SP 16/200/14, 22 Sept 1631.

⁴ See for example, BL, Additional MS. 64,901, f.141, Wentworth to Coke 23 Dec 1630 on the behaviour of Lord Fauconberg.

⁵ SP 16/182/78, Thomas Carleton to Dorchester 19 Jan 1631; SP 16/187/55, same to same 30 March 1631; Reeve, 'Dorchester', p. 338.

Cork's plans to use the recusancy fines as a basis for financing the army.⁷ Punishing the recusant majority to the benefit of the powerful planter minority was not what the newly appointed Lord Deputy had in mind, and Reeve points out that Wentworth probably was at least helped in his attempt to quash this policy by Dorchester's death.⁸

In order for Wentworth to be able to manage Irish affairs in his desired way, it was essential that he maintain good channels of communication with at least one of the Secretaries of State, the men responsible for relaying the King's orders to the Irish government. The Secretaries were also in a position to allow generous grants of Irish land or revenue to pass the signet. Amongst Wentworth's propositions for the government of Ireland heard by the Privy Council in February 1632 was the request that Irish despatches be handled by only one Secretary and that no grant relating to Ireland be allowed to pass the signet until the Lord Deputy had seen and approved it. Charles signified that he wished Secretary Coke to be responsible for this work and that it should not be left to Secretary Dorchester's successor.⁹ This arrangement met with total approval from Wentworth. Throughout his Deputyship he valued Coke's assistance: he commented on his industrious nature, and thanked him for his speed in despatching letters and other necessary papers to Ireland. Wentworth was lavish in his praise of Coke to the King, suggesting to Charles that his aged servant should be rewarded with Irish land.¹⁰ Occasionally Coke did omit

⁶ Although Reeve acknowledges that Dorchester's support for Cork was not unlimited, *ibid.* pp. 226-252. There was a marriage alliance between the two families, *ibid.* p. 230.

⁷ Str. P. 1/76v-8, Wentworth to Cottington 1 Oct 1632.

⁸ Reeve, 'Dorchester', pp. 250-252.

⁹ SP 63/253/16, Wentworth's propositions heard by the Council on 17 February and entered into the Register on 22 February 1632. See below, pp. 237-8.

¹⁰ Str. P. 5/24, Wentworth to Coke 8 Nov 1633; *ibid.* 5/96, same to same 18 Aug 1634; *ibid.* 9/122, same to same 14 Dec 1635; *ibid.* 3/232, Wentworth to Charles 5 Dec 1635; *ibid.*

to send Wentworth something of importance, but he simply mentioned the matter quietly to Laud who either got Coke to remedy his mistake or excused him for it. Laud himself was willing to praise Coke's careful attention to Irish business.¹¹ But the Secretary was more than just a conduit of royal orders and conveyor of the Lord Deputy's proposals; he was a man trusted by Wentworth to handle important business such as his efforts to have Vice-Treasurer Mountnorris removed from office.¹² From Laud's correspondence with Wentworth it is clear that the Archbishop and Secretary often discussed Irish business and tried to coordinate their approaches to the King.¹³ Laud was startled, therefore, when he read in Wentworth's letter that Coke had declared open war on the Lord Deputy and understood that he should interpret this as a rare mistake in Wentworth's ciphering.¹⁴ Wentworth's strong advocacy of the Earl of Leicester as a successor to Coke, when Coke was unwilling to retire, is puzzling in the light of his praise of Coke. It probably should be interpreted as an understanding that Coke's age was beginning to make an impact on his

6/86, Wentworth to Laud 23 Aug 1634; *ibid.* 3/58, Wentworth to Cottington 7 Feb 1634; Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, pp. 80-81; Young, *Coke*, pp. 214-19. See below, p. 254.

¹¹ Str. P. 6/150-151, Wentworth to Laud 10 March 1635; *ibid.* 6/170, Laud to Wentworth 27 March 1635; *ibid.* 6/185, same to same 12 May 1635; *ibid.* 7/73, same to same 16 Nov 1637: 'we are noe forwarder now in any businesse with France or Spaine then when I writt last to you; And this, I beleeve, is the Reason why you heare nothing from Mr Secretary Coke.' See also Laud's rather exasperated comment to Sir Thomas Roe following Coke's forced retirement from office: 'Sir Henry Vane is both Treasurer of the household and Secretary. I pray God your despatches be the better by it; for you often complained in the old man's time'. Laud *Works*, vol. VII, p. 598, 14 Feb 1640; see also *ibid.* p. 575, same to same 31 May 1639. Northumberland shared Roe's complaints; SP 16/361/84, Northumberland to Windebank 15 June 1637.

¹² Str. P. 9/6-10, Wentworth to Coke 7 April 1635.

¹³ *Ibid.* 6/278-9 Laud to Wentworth 26 Oct 1635; *ibid.* 6/360, same to same 12 Sept 1636; *ibid.* 7/57 same to same 7 Oct 1637; *ibid.* 7/142v, same to same 13 Nov 1638.

work, particularly under the strain of war. It was essential for the Lord Deputy to try and bring about the appointment of someone with whom he enjoyed reasonably good relations, because Wentworth's initially good relationship with the other Secretary, Sir Francis Windebank, had turned sour.¹⁵

Despite Charles's acceptance of the proposition that one Secretary alone should be responsible for Irish despatches, in practice Secretary Windebank handled much Irish business. Wentworth accepted that he would have to deal with Windebank, partly because he would remain in London while Coke, as the senior Secretary, followed the King on progress, but also because he probably recognised that Windebank enjoyed Charles's trust to a greater extent than Coke did. But this does not mean that Wentworth resented this fact: in the early years of his Deputyship his correspondence with Windebank had an easy and friendly style and for the more important and sensitive business they used an extremely detailed cipher.¹⁶ It should be noted that their relationship was not affected by Windebank's falling out with Archbishop Laud in 1634. Despite Laud's claim in his diary that he had procured the Secretary's place for Windebank, Weston's support had been a decisive factor and Windebank was not long in showing that he understood the need not to antagonise the Lord Treasurer. A rift had occurred apparently before the spring of 1634: Laud claimed afterwards that he had known about Windebank's 'defection' for a long time before he notified Wentworth, but had remained silent until it began

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 6/351, Laud to Wentworth 22 Aug 1636. 114 was the cipher for Coke; I presume that Wentworth meant 115 for Windebank, rather than 104 for Coventry.

¹⁵ The struggle over the Secretaryship in late 1639 and early 1640 is discussed below, pp. 213-9.

¹⁶ Str. P. 5/213, Windebank to Wentworth 20 Nov 1633, commenting on Wentworth's habit of doodling faces at the Council board. Bodl., Clarendon MSS, vol. 19, no. 1486.

to become public knowledge.¹⁷ But this did not make an impact on Wentworth's attitude towards the Secretary. During the period which Laud regarded as Windebank's betrayal of him, the Secretary wrote to Wentworth to thank him for the care he had taken arranging his son's passage to Ireland, and raised the issue of Laud's treatment of him.¹⁸ Wentworth responded in a light-hearted manner, although he understood from Laud's letters that the Archbishop was deeply wounded by Windebank's 'defection'. He promised to keep a correspondence with both of them, and Windebank felt confident enough of Wentworth's affections to continue writing on the topic.¹⁹ While this correspondence was taking place, Wentworth appears not to have mentioned it to Laud.

Patricia Haskell has argued a case for a better working relationship between Wentworth and Windebank than has previously been thought. She argues that Windebank tried to assist Wentworth in the appointment of Sir Gerard Lowther as Chief Justice of Common Pleas in Ireland, an appointment which Coke was attempting to prevent.²⁰ In January 1634 Windebank wrote to Wentworth promising to do his best to secure Lowther's appointment and received the Lord Deputy's thanks for his efforts.²¹ Wentworth also asked

¹⁷ Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 215, entry for 15 June; *ibid.* vol. VII, p. 74, Laud to Sir Thomas Roe 22 April 1634; Str. P. 6/309, Laud to Wentworth 2 Jan 1636. Despite this knowledge of Charles's opinion of Windebank, Wentworth was prepared to complain in very strong terms to the King about his practices; Haskell, 'Windebank', pp. 57-8, 97-100.

¹⁸ Str. P. 5/237, 14 May 1634.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 5/88, Wentworth to Windebank 5 June 1634; *ibid.* 6/66-7, Laud to Wentworth 14 May 1634; *ibid.* 14/115, Windebank to Wentworth 1 July 1634.

²⁰ Haskell, 'Windebank', pp. 109-113. Note also Wentworth's insistence that Coke should not know of his wish to have Philip Mainwaring as Secretary; Coke wanted the office for a relative, Str. P. 3/55, Wentworth to Cottingham 7 Feb 1634.

²¹ Str. P. 13/172, 17 Jan 1634; *ibid.* 5/223, Windebank to Wentworth 10 March 1634; *ibid.* 13/226, same to same 14 March 1634; *ibid.* 5/88 Wentworth to Windebank 5 June 1634.

Windebank to try and move the King to allow Sir Roger Jones to pay £500 for a pardon which would allow him to avoid a trial. Wentworth felt that Coke's insistence that the King never allowed any one a pardon before conviction was being applied too harshly. A more important consideration, however, was the fact that the money could be well spent building royal stables in Dublin, and Windebank was eventually successful in getting Charles to make an exception to his rule.²² Laud was careful to inform Wentworth that Windebank had spoken to the King on Wentworth's behalf regarding Cork's wish to come to England in October 1635.²³ When the Lord Deputy requested that Windebank give his opinion of Wentworth's handling of business, he does not seem to have been offended by the Secretary's comments regarding his talent for making enemies: neither did he react angrily to Windebank's remark that Bishop Bridgeman of Chester had confessed his faults and that Wentworth had been in error in supporting him, as the King wished him to know.²⁴ During the early years of his Deputyship, therefore, Wentworth found Windebank a useful and willing assistant and seemed to enjoy a reasonably friendly relationship with him. Unfortunately this did not last as Wentworth discovered that Windebank was also prepared to be helpful to others.

Patricia Haskell points to Windebank's support for Mountnorris being the start of the deterioration of relations between Wentworth and the Secretary, stating that Laud's opinion of Windebank delivered to Wentworth when he was in England in the summer of 1636 turned him against the Secretary. This was not the case, as already in October 1635 Wentworth complained to Laud that

²² *Ibid.* 5/90, Wentworth to Windebank 5 June 1634; *ibid.* 5/118, same to same 24 Aug 1634; *ibid.* 5/145, same to same 20 Dec 1634; Haskell, 'Windebank', p. 112.

²³ Str. P. 6/258-9, 4 Oct 1635.

²⁴ Str. P. 5/213, Windebank to Wentworth 20 Nov 1633; *ibid.* 5/62, Wentworth to Windebank 22 March 1634. No doubt Wentworth interpreted this as Charles's delight at proving him wrong and not as malice or mischief-making on the part of the Secretary.

Windebank allowed 'irregular things' to pass by him, in contrast to Coke who was careful to observe the King's instructions.²⁵ He became suspicious of Windebank's dealings with the Earls of Pembroke and Salisbury, Cork's main supporters at Court, while Laud's obsession concerned Windebank's role in getting the Bishop of Lincoln temporarily out of trouble. Laud did, however, point out to Wentworth that Charles had required Windebank to write to the Lord Deputy regarding the Earl of Cork's business; the Secretary 'hath noe part in this but his obedience.'²⁶ Nevertheless Windebank sought to help Wentworth's Irish opponents from the autumn of 1635 onwards. He wrote to the King asking him to consider a petition from Lord Tunbridge, son of the Earl of St. Albans and Clanricarde, which asked for a stay of proceedings regarding the Earl's lands, which Charles refused to do.²⁷ He also became involved in the struggle over the control of the Irish customs farm, although he was not able to convince Charles to accept Patrick Darcy's arguments.²⁸ But it was Windebank's efforts to further the claims of the Earl Marshal which infuriated the Lord Deputy.

In December 1635 Wentworth accused Windebank of indiscriminately passing an allegedly exorbitant grant of Irish land to the Earl of Arundel. He was annoyed at Windebank's procurement of letters from the King supporting Arundel's claims and in a heavily coded letter to the King, Wentworth argued that Charles would be advised to direct Windebank to 'use a little more animadversion in Private Suites' before they were submitted to the King, or preferably refer them to Dublin for consideration before-hand.²⁹ Despite his

²⁵ *Ibid.* 6/247, 4 Oct 1635; see also *ibid.* 6/277, Laud to Wentworth 21 Oct 1635.

²⁶ *Ibid.* 6/249, Wentworth to Laud 14 Oct 1635; *ibid.* 6/291-2, Laud to Wentworth 30 Nov 1635.

²⁷ Bodl., Clarendon MSS, vol. 7, no. 559, 28 Oct 1635.

²⁸ *Ibid.* vol. 8, no. 645, Windebank to Charles I 29 Jan 1636.

²⁹ Str. P. 3/230, 5 Dec 1635; see below, pp. 180-84.

knowledge of Charles's opinion of Windebank, Wentworth was prepared to complain in very strong terms to the King about his practices. Windebank's service to Wentworth in warning him of attempts to remove him from the farm of the Irish customs in January 1636 suggests either that the Secretary wrongly assumed that the Lord Deputy's criticism of him was minor, or that Charles kept it from him.³⁰ But this service did not lessen Wentworth's anger. Eighteen months later Wentworth made a similar criticism regarding a grant to the Earl of St. Albans and Clanricarde. Again he asked Charles to remind Windebank of the need to communicate the terms of such a grant to him before presenting it to the King for his signature, that was if Charles chose not to revert to the scheme set down in 1632 and require Coke alone to handle Irish business.³¹

Charles took no notice of this suggestion, but when he replied to Wentworth's first criticism he had defended his Secretary's part in the business.³² He impressed on Wentworth his esteem of Windebank and in late 1638 Charles advised him 'not [to] thinke it odd' that he used Windebank to write to him in matters 'of greatest consequence and secrecie' as 'he ether is, or shall bee your friend.'³³ But there was no friendship between Wentworth and Secretary Windebank during the second half of the decade; their correspondence focused on matters of business. The turning point in their relationship had been Windebank's willingness to assist opponents of Wentworth's policies, as well his readiness to serve the Lord Deputy.³⁴ Wentworth was prepared not to allow Coke's occasional 'failures' to annoy him to any great extent: an unwillingness

³⁰ *Ibid.* 9/329, 28 Jan 1636.

³¹ *Ibid.* 3/287, 26 June 1637.

³² *Ibid.* 3/244, 13 Jan 1636; *ibid.* 7/74, Laud to Wentworth 16 Nov 1637.

³³ *Ibid.* 40/29, 28 Dec 1638.

³⁴ If Coke's friendship with Wentworth was recognised at Court, then it is not surprising that Windebank was approached by enemies of the Lord Deputy.

to persuade Charles to relax a rule was not likely to infuriate Wentworth to the same extent as colluding in the passing of an exorbitant grant.

As well as his regular contacts with the Secretaries of State, it was also necessary for Wentworth to maintain a correspondence with the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal. In the autumn of 1625 John Williams was replaced by Sir Thomas Coventry, praised by Clarendon not only for his work in office, but also for his ability to stay in it. Clarendon gives us a detailed portrayal of Coventry's character and qualities, but in one aspect at least this is misleading. We are told that Coventry 'was seldom known to speak in matters of state, which he well knew were for the most part concluded before they were brought to that public agitation'.³⁵ This is an assessment which fails to take account of Coventry's willingness to stick his neck out occasionally in matters of importance. He was not always cautious and reserved, but was prepared to infuriate the King when he was sufficiently moved.³⁶ In the first letter which Wentworth received in Ireland from Cottington he learned that:

'In an extraordinary starr chamber day, the last weeke, (or that before) orders were established for the government of the trade of sope making, which the king and his Councell at the table first sawe and allowed of. It was doone by votes which occasioned many eloquent Harangues, butt your great frend (the keeper) made a most damnable popular one which is likely nott to be forgiven him.'

Neither Cottington's remarks nor Wentworth's reply suggest that Coventry's intervention was uncharacteristic.³⁷ Only weeks later, in the autumn of 1633,

³⁵ Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, p. 58.

³⁶ See Cust, *Forced Loan*, p. 45 and n. 21.

³⁷ Str. P. 13/37, Cottington to Wentworth 2 Sept 1633; *ibid.* 3/18, Wentworth to Cottington 15 Sept 1633.

Cottington informed Wentworth that the King had berated Coventry for raising a very delicate subject, the recall of Parliament.³⁸ Likewise Coventry took a strong line against Sir James Bagg in November 1635, having the casting vote against him, and then insisting to the King that the sentence must be recorded.³⁹ He came close to dismissal,⁴⁰ but managed to hang on in office until his death - until almost the end of Wentworth's own political career.

It is not clear whether Wentworth and Coventry enjoyed a close relationship, although during most of Wentworth's Deputyship they worked reasonably well together. Wedgwood described the Lord Keeper as 'an amiable, conscientious and learned man, admirably fond of the much younger Wentworth'.⁴¹ But this is a rather extravagant claim. In the spring of 1634 Vice-President Osborne thought it necessary to advise Wentworth to try and develop a good working relationship with the 'honest and upright' Lord Keeper.⁴² Cottington's description of Coventry as Wentworth's 'great friend' might not necessarily have been meant seriously, but may refer to Wentworth sharing Coventry's opinion of the soap projectors.⁴³ Wentworth's complaint regarding Coventry's intervention in the leasing of the alum farm, does not

³⁸ *Ibid.* 13/79, 29 Oct 1633.

³⁹ SP 16/301/56, Windebank's notes, 11 Nov 1635; BL, Additional MS. 64915, ff. 81-81v, Coventry to Coke 8 Aug 1637; Str. P. 15/283, Garrard to Wentworth 5 Dec 1635; *ibid.* 15/315, same to same 8 Jan 1636; Gardiner, *History*, vol. VIII, pp. 89-91; Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, p. 663.

⁴⁰ BL, Egerton MS. 784, diary of William Whiteway, 1618-34, f. 94.

⁴¹ Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 90.

⁴² Str. P. 14/30, 16 April 1634.

⁴³ *Ibid.* 13/37, Cottington to Wentworth 2 Sept 1633; *ibid.* 3/18, Wentworth to Cottington 15 Sept 1633: regarding the soap monopoly Wentworth wrote, 'If I had beene by you I should have made a sowre face or two'. Coventry's stance against Weston did not endear him to Cottington, a fact which made rumours about Cottington's unsuccessful bid to marry one of the Lord Keeper's daughters in 1638 more interesting, see above, pp. 78-9.

suggest that they enjoyed a particularly close friendship.⁴⁴ Most of their correspondence related to official business, with the Lord Deputy being required to carry out the orders of the English courts which concerned Irish people, land or property. Some of their correspondence concerned Wentworth's northern government, in particular disputes between Justices of the Peace in the ridings of Yorkshire.⁴⁵ It was clearly sensible for Wentworth to establish and maintain good relations with Coventry, to whom he was related by marriage.⁴⁶ It would not be beneficial to him if the Lord Keeper was antagonistic towards the court of the Council of the North, or towards his jurisdiction in Ireland. Because of Wentworth's aggressive style of government, which produced several major disputes involving prominent men, it was necessary for him to try and encourage Coventry to take a sympathetic stance towards his affairs. But during the early years of Wentworth's Irish government there is no evidence of this and indeed by 1635 relations between them had become strained.

A letter written by Wentworth in March 1635, not delivered to Coventry because it was damaged by rain, shows that he was resentful of Coventry's apparent reluctance to assist him in his work. The particular subject of the letter was Coventry's refusal to put 'a Factious and perverse Justice' out of the Commission of the Peace, but Wentworth also commented on Coventry's unwillingness to assist him against Sir David Foulis's continuing trouble-making.⁴⁷ Two months later a shorter, but similar, letter reached Coventry

⁴⁴ Str. P. 3/124, Wentworth to Weston 23 Aug 1634; Cooper, 'The fortune of Thomas Wentworth', p. 237, n. 8.

⁴⁵ For example, Str. P. 17/141, Coventry to Wentworth 25 July 1637; *ibid.* 17/167, same to same 18 Aug 1637; *ibid.* 10a/75, Wentworth to Coventry 27 Sept 1637.

⁴⁶ Coventry was the father-in-law of Wentworth's nephew, Sir William Savile.

⁴⁷ Str. P. 8/196-8, 3 March 1635.

safely.⁴⁸ Coventry responded by making an attempt to ease the tension between them in December 1635, telling him ‘that those mists which were either purposely or otherwise rased by misreports concerning yow or me must quickly vanish’.⁴⁹ The main mischief-maker was Cottington who had made sure that Coventry learned of some careless remarks Wentworth had written to him. In October 1633 Wentworth’s anger at what he believed to be Judge Vernon’s conduct at the Durham assizes had caused him to write ‘If these Moote Maisters be lett alone, they will leave no latitude at all for his Majestie to governe’. But he had requested that no action be taken until his own case against Sir David Foulis had finished; ‘for these Gownemen will Play me some Trick or other if they can, They hate me damnably allready’.⁵⁰ It appears to have taken at least eighteen months for these comments to become known at Court and in June 1635 Coventry informed Wentworth of reports of a misunderstanding between them concerning Wentworth’s apparent slandering of himself and the rest of the judges, something which he professed to find hard to believe.⁵¹ In reply, Wentworth insisted that his ‘Lavish Expressions’ related only to Vernon and were not intended as a general slur on the entire judiciary, a reading which is difficult to accept. He went so far as to cite his own descent from a Chief Justice of the King’s Bench as proof of his high regard for Coventry’s profession.⁵² Wentworth probably responded well to Coventry’s direct approach and during his visit to England in the spring of 1636 he and Coventry appear to have discussed one of his major grievances, Chancery’s willingness to hear complaints of injustice against him before they had been dealt with in Ireland. Coventry accepted his argument that one of his

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 8/237-8, 23 May 1635.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 15/297, 24 Dec 1635.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 3/23-8, 22 Oct 1633.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 15/132, 29 June 1635.

⁵² *Ibid.* 8/260-61, 10 Sept 1635; *ibid.* 15/230, Coventry to Wentworth 1 Oct 1635; *ibid.* 8/297, Wentworth to Coventry 4 Nov 1635.

propositions of February 1632 had condemned this practice and the King had agreed to the point.⁵³ This appears to have been a turning point in their relationship: during 1637 their correspondence was more friendly, with Coventry agreeing to accept Wentworth's recommended candidate for a judge's place in Ireland. They were also united by a family bereavement.⁵⁴ By the summer of 1637 Wentworth was offering to arrange a marriage for one of Coventry's daughters and Coventry was prepared to prevent Sir Piers Crosby gaining access to witnesses in Wentworth's Star Chamber action against him.⁵⁵ Wentworth also requested Coventry's assistance for Bishop Bramhall of Derry who had apparently been unfairly charged in Star Chamber with the use of unbecoming language.⁵⁶ Wentworth and Coventry were now apparently enjoying a much more harmonious working relationship.

By the spring of 1638 it was vital that Wentworth enjoyed reasonable relations with the Lord Keeper. Lord Chancellor Loftus's attempt to make an appeal in England against his sentence was arguably the greatest test of Wentworth's power and influence. As soon as Wentworth was aware that Loftus wished to appeal, he wrote to Coventry asking him not to make a decision until he had received the Dublin Council's decree; he thought it worthwhile, however, to

⁵³ *Ibid.* 15/339, Coventry to Wentworth 2 Feb 1636; *ibid.* 8/362-3, Wentworth to Coventry 1 March 1636; *ibid.* 8/386-8, Wentworth and the Dublin Council to Coventry 29 March 1636; *ibid.* 8/391-2, Coventry to the Lords Justices (in Wentworth's absence) and the Dublin Council 13 July 1636.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 8/401, Wentworth to Coventry 3 Jan 1637; *ibid.* 16/109, Coventry to Wentworth 14 Jan 1637; *ibid.* 8/406-8, Wentworth to Coventry 23 Jan 1637.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 10a/32, Wentworth to Coventry 27 June 1637; *ibid.* 10a/75, same to same 27 Sept 1637; *ibid.* 17/79, Coventry to Wentworth 6 June 1637.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 10a/48, 11 Sept 1637; *ibid.* 17/228, Coventry to Wentworth 16 Nov 1637; *ibid.* 7/73v, Laud to Wentworth 16 Nov 1637.

emphasise Loftus's alleged bad conduct during the case.⁵⁷ Coventry replied by thanking him for his letter and urging him to try and mend the differences within the Loftus family which had been partly responsible for the Lord Chancellor's predicament. Part of his letter was dated separately and it informed Wentworth of a conversation in Whitehall gallery involving the King, Laud and himself, among others. Coventry admitted to Wentworth that neither he nor the Lord Privy Seal, the Earl of Manchester, knew of any relevant precedents. Neither did Coventry know what Charles had decided to do.⁵⁸ It appears that Wentworth did not need to have any great fears regarding Coventry's attitude to this case. Viscount Conway wrote to Wentworth on 3 April that the Lord Keeper had advised Loftus to end his suit without coming to England.⁵⁹ Wentworth promised Coventry that Raylton would soon bring him the Council's decree, but in the mean time he wrote at length about Loftus's unwillingness to settle property on his son Robert and his misdemeanours in office.⁶⁰ But Coventry was clearly not satisfied with all the details of the case, leading Wentworth to insist that he had not placed the rest of the Council under pressure to give a particular judgement. But to emphasise his readiness to act against the high and mighty, he treated Coventry to a piece of family history, the willingness of his ancestor Chief Justice Gascoigne to order the arrest of the future Henry V.⁶¹ Wentworth also thought it worthwhile explaining his version of events to Lady Coventry who was a friend of Loftus's daughter Lady Moore.⁶² However, Wentworth's description of Lady Moore as 'that foule mouthed daughter of the Lord Chancellors' was hardly

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 10a/104-5, 1 March 1638.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 18/6, 30 March/2 April 1638.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 10a/124, 3 April 1638.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 10a/116-18, 23 April 1638.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 10a/134-6, 14 May 1638. See also *ibid.* 10/148-51, Wentworth to Coventry 31 May 1638.

⁶² *Ibid.* 10a/157-8, 4 Aug 1638.

diplomatic, but it was written in reaction to Coventry's request that Wentworth continue to try and mediate between members of the Loftus's family. For good measure, Wentworth accused Lord Moore of neglecting his horse troop while he was in England on his father-in-law's business.⁶³ Coventry must have been left in no doubt that Wentworth was intent on removing Loftus from office and regarded the episode as a trial of strength between himself and this one remaining grandee of the planter party in the Dublin government. Not content with putting the Lord Keeper under immense pressure regarding his opposite number in Ireland, Wentworth had to approach Coventry in early 1639 on another serious matter, his attempt to force the Earl of Holland to give evidence in Star Chamber. Again, Coventry was not happy about Wentworth's handling of the affair.⁶⁴

Lord Keeper Coventry features occasionally in the correspondence between Laud and Wentworth. If Laud did not get on well with Cottington, he does not appear to have been particularly close to Coventry, either, although he did not regard him as an enemy: Laud must have approved of Coventry's stance over *Pell versus Bagg*. But Laud delighted in telling Wentworth how his lawyer advised him that the Crown's ship money case had been handled inadequately by Coventry and Attorney General Bankes and how Laud himself had had to intervene in order to avert a probable defeat for the Crown before the judges.⁶⁵ Laud's response to Wentworth's information that Cottington had embarrassed

⁶³ *Ibid.* 18/104, Coventry to Wentworth 9 Aug 1638; *ibid.* 10b/1618 Wentworth to Coventry 4 Sept 1638.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 18/167, Coventry to Wentworth 3 Jan 1639; *ibid.* 10b/40-41, Wentworth to Coventry 20 Feb 1639; *ibid.* 18/176, Coventry to Wentworth 25 Feb 1639; *ibid.* 10b/47-50, Wentworth to Coventry 16 April 1639.

⁶⁵ Laud's lawyer Edward Herbert (later Lord Keeper) advised him 'that if one clause were not added the business would fall short, and the suits entered be judged against the Crown'; *ibid.* 7/30-30v, 5 April 1637.

him with Coventry is also revealing. Wentworth used Cottington's mischief-making regarding his comments on the judges as part of his strategy to convince Laud that he shared his views on Cottington. But Laud found it hard to believe that Cottington had done what Wentworth alleged, pointing out that Cottington and Coventry were not on cordial terms.⁶⁶ It is worth noting also that Wentworth does not appear to have taken up the matter with Cottington himself and indeed continued his usual, mainly lighthearted style of correspondence.

In the autumn of 1635, however, Laud noticed a distinct change in the relationship between Cottington and Coventry. Cottington's appointment as Master of the Court of Wards had led to a dispute with the Lord Keeper over the right to present to benefices owned by royal wards. But Laud's intervention in this dispute by persuading Charles to resume the right and allow Laud to advise him on the selection of ministers may have been instrumental in encouraging Cottington to adopt a different manner towards Coventry.⁶⁷ In late November Laud remarked to Wentworth that Cottington had recently toasted Coventry's health and reports were spreading at Court of a developing friendship. Laud regarded this as a blow to his own position: 'Can you tell now, 13 and 115 [Windebank] haveing slunk asside, what will become of ... 102 [Laud]? Left alone Certainly.'⁶⁸ In the summer of 1636 Coventry still appeared to be on good terms with Cottington, accompanying him and Lord Treasurer Juxon to dinner with Laud and by the early part of 1638 a marriage was apparently being planned between Cottington and one of

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 6/208, Wentworth to Laud 14 July 1635; *ibid.* 6/233, Laud to Wentworth 31 Jul/3 Aug 1635; *ibid.* 6/257, same to same 4 Oct 1635.

⁶⁷ Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud*, p. 109.

⁶⁸ Str. P. 6/286, 30 Nov 1635.

Coventry's daughters, which never took place.⁶⁹ Laud had probably abandoned Coventry as a lost cause, but he did not omit to inform Wentworth that the Lord Keeper had spoken to the King on the Loftus matter 'very moderatly and with all faire respect' concerning Wentworth's handling of the matter.⁷⁰

Coventry's attitude towards Wentworth during the Loftus case neatly summarises his attitude towards the Lord Deputy in general: he was prepared to be of assistance to him where he felt he could legitimately be so, but he entertained doubts regarding some of Wentworth's more aggressive methods of government and probably regarded him as a manipulator of the law. In 1635-6 Coventry went out of his way to avoid a serious breach in his relationship with Wentworth and while he cannot be described as a dependable supporter of Wentworth in every instance, on the whole his attitude did not threaten Wentworth's ability to govern Ireland. Wentworth's close friend, George Radcliffe, did not consider Coventry to be an opponent of the Lord Deputy: according to Radcliffe, Coventry, when dying, thought highly enough of Wentworth to give him a 'a most singular testimony' of his service, 'above the ordinary course of Court freindship.'⁷¹

The Secretaries of State and Lord Keeper Coventry formed the official links between monarch and Lord Deputy, but it was essential for Wentworth to maintain several other unofficial links in addition. One of these contacts, and a most unlikely friend of the Lord Deputy, was James Hay, Earl of Carlisle, a man whose extravagant lifestyle had epitomised the Jacobean Court. Carlisle was an experienced diplomat with a wealth of knowledge of foreign affairs.⁷²

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 6/286, Laud to Wentworth 22 Aug 1636; *ibid.* 7/101, same to same 14 May 1638.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 7/91, 27 March 1638.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 40/70, Radcliffe [?] to William, 2nd Earl of Strafford undated.

⁷² Schreiber, 'The First Carlisle', pp. 1-195.

It is not clear exactly when and how Wentworth first came into contact with him, but he became an extremely useful friend and supporter at Court. In the late summer and autumn of 1628, Carlisle's return from his final extraordinary embassy was expected to lead to a rise in the fortunes of the pro-French party, but in the event Carlisle came home, no longer as sympathetic to the French, but reportedly with pro-Spanish sympathies, something which some of his friends found very worrying.⁷³ But nevertheless Carlisle's relationship with the King does not appear to have suffered any major damage. His appointment in February 1631 as Groom of the Stool gave Carlisle ready access to Charles at almost any time, and although he had not replaced Buckingham in a political sense, he was well-liked by the King.⁷⁴ His wife was also usually in high favour with the Queen.⁷⁵

Wedgwood states that Wentworth enjoyed a friendship with Carlisle, then Lord Doncaster, during the early 1620s, although she cites no source to support this assertion.⁷⁶ It is more likely that Wentworth and Carlisle developed 'a working relationship' after his appointment as Lord President of the Council of the North: certainly by the summer of 1632 Wentworth enjoyed a friendly relationship with Carlisle, discussing England's stance on the Palatinate and lamenting the fact that his present office did not afford him any opportunity to serve the Earl.

'In good faithe one pleasure I have when I thinke of Irelande
and therein judge that imploymentt to have much the better of
this; it is, that I hope ther to finde sum pathes open for my

⁷³ SP 16/123/6, Lady Carlisle to Carlisle [22 Dec 1628]; SP 16/123/8, Goring to Carlisle 22 Dec 1628.

⁷⁴ On being appointed Groom of the Stool, there were rumours that he would be made Lord Admiral as well; PRO, C115 M31/8131, Flower to Scudamore 5 March 1631.

⁷⁵ See below, pp. 212, 233.

⁷⁶ Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 32.

thankfullnesse to walke inn, and to meete with sum of your interests in my passadge'.⁷⁷

Carlisle's attitude towards Wentworth was particularly significant in 1632-33 during the Lord President's attack on Sir David Foulis, a relative of the Earl. Foulis, a former cofferer of the King when Prince of Wales, was suspected of having embezzled around £5000; when under investigation he appears to have tried to shift attention from his own misconduct by accusing Wentworth of financial irregularities in his handling of knighthood fines. Foulis also encouraged his son-in-law, Sir Thomas Leighton, sheriff of Yorkshire, to defy Wentworth's summons after Leighton had demanded payment from one man who had actually already paid, due to a clerical error in the Exchequer. In public, Foulis argued that the Lord President did not have the power to summon a sheriff before the Council. This was defiance of his authority and that of the Council of the North to a degree which Wentworth would not tolerate and he responded by taking out a libel suit against Foulis.⁷⁸

In response, Foulis looked for protection to Carlisle, but received none. The Earl had spoken to the King about Foulis's conduct and berated him for it himself and also passed on the King's response.⁷⁹ In reply Foulis said he was ready to submit to the King's will, but feared that his 'utter ruine' was 'too violently intended.'⁸⁰ Some of Wentworth's correspondence with Carlisle discussing Foulis has not apparently survived, but in September Carlisle reported to Wentworth how Foulis had received short shrift from Charles when he appealed to him and informed Wentworth of his own response to an approach by Foulis. The Earl apparently told his kinsman that he was much

⁷⁷ BL, Egerton MS. 2597, ff. 76-76v, 12 Aug 1632; Schreiber, 'The First Carlisle', p. 165.

⁷⁸ Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, pp.107-110.

⁷⁹ BL, Egerton MS. 2597, f. 78, [Sept 1632].

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* f. 86, 20 Sept 1632.

mistaken if he expected him to defend him in a matter involving the Lord Deputy's reputation. Carlisle reported that Foulis was now willing to make the necessary submission which might keep him out of the Star Chamber, but left it up to Wentworth to decide how much leniency he was prepared to show.⁸¹ In late October Wentworth wrote to Carlisle thanking him for not intervening to protect Foulis, but for 'passing him over to a course of Justice'. Wentworth promised to exercise 'modesty and moderation' in the handling of this case, but his response to Foulis's letter to Carlisle - which the Earl sent him - shows that he intended to make an example of Foulis because of his overweening pride:

'this is an arrogance grown frequent now adayes, which I cannot indure, every ordinary man must putt himself in ballance with the king, as if it weare a measuring cast, betwixt them, whoe weare like to prove the greater losers upon the parting.'

Wentworth did not refrain from accusing Foulis of cheating the Crown of several thousand pounds and, answering the argument that Foulis had given the Crown long service and deserved to be let off after submission and promising to mend his ways, Wentworth responded that he would receive justice and could not complain about that.⁸²

Carlisle probably hoped that public knowledge of Charles's response to Foulis's behaviour would satisfy the Lord Deputy, but Wentworth insisted on bringing a suit against Foulis and hoped to be in England to witness the hearing. There was no other reason for him to delay his departure for Ireland after the issuing of a new Commission and Instructions for the Council of the North in March 1633, and his actual departure in July was probably due to

⁸¹ Str. P. 12/254(2), 16 Sept 1632 (wrongly catalogued as 1631).

⁸² SP 16/224/45, 24 Oct 1632.

knowledge of the King's reaction to his interference in the prosecution of Bishop Bridgeman of Chester. Carlisle continued to be willing to assist Wentworth in this case after his departure, discussing it with Vice-President Osborne and Wentworth's agent William Raylton, and offering to effect a delay in the hearing of the case if Wentworth was not fully prepared.⁸³ Wentworth's handling of the Foulis case bears similarities to his handling of Luke Netterville, a family friend of Lord Treasurer Weston, in the autumn of 1634. In both cases Wentworth wished to have the approval of the powerful friend or relative before taking any action, but when they made requests for moderation, he chose not to spare his victim.⁸⁴

During 1633 Carlisle performed a number of services for the Lord Deputy. In May he brought Vice-President Osborne and other members of the Council of the North to kiss the King's hand in York.⁸⁵ He sent Wentworth news of the King's progress, concentrating on the continual feasting, and was willing to further a suit Wentworth had with Charles relating to parkland at York.⁸⁶ It was Carlisle who advised him that the young Earl of Northumberland was well worth cultivating.⁸⁷ In the spring of 1635 he warned him that the Treasury Commissioners would be questioning Wentworth's lease of the Irish customs and promised that he would 'not bee negligent in observing and looking into the motions and progress of this designe.'⁸⁸ On several occasions he passed on

⁸³ Str. P. 13/83, Osborne to Wentworth 3 Nov 1633.

⁸⁴ See above, pp. 58-9.

⁸⁵ Str. P. 13/10(2), Carlisle to Wentworth [May 1633].

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 8/1, Wentworth to Carlisle 20 May 1633; *ibid.* 13/39, Carlisle to Wentworth 7 Sept 1633.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 13/220, George Wentworth to Wentworth 13 March 1634.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 15/56, 4 May 1635.

reports of Charles's satisfaction at his service.⁸⁹ In return Carlisle requested Wentworth's assistance and support for several friends and acquaintances.⁹⁰ Wentworth described the Earl as 'one of my Chiefest Patrons' and offered his service, sending him news of the Countess of Carlisle's enjoyment of the Queen's favour and other news from Court.⁹¹ Clearly Wentworth felt comfortable enough with Carlisle to lecture him on the subject of friendship, on hearing rumours of a new alliance between Carlisle and Holland aimed at attacking the Lord Treasurer.⁹² Carlisle was one of a group of courtiers and ministers who received Wentworth's negative opinion of the standards of Irish government.⁹³ This was probably intended to be more than just the Lord Deputy giving a frank opinion, but a warning that the Lord Deputy would not be able to accomplish everything that the Earl hoped regarding his Irish businesses. Carlisle was prepared to talk to Charles about Irish affairs, to the Lord Deputy's advantage and in the spring of 1634 he presented Wentworth's brother George to the King.⁹⁴ Wentworth might have been annoyed at Carlisle's advocacy of Lorenzo Cary's suit for the captaincy of his father's company, but he did not allow it to become a stumbling block in their relationship.⁹⁵

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 13/80, 29 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 13/163, 13 Jan 1634; *ibid.* 14/137, 14 July 1634; *ibid.* 14/293, received 11 Feb 1635.

⁹⁰ See his letter on behalf of his brother-in-law, Henry Percy, *ibid.* 14/34, 16 April 1634, and his suit for the lieutenant of the Tower, Sir William Balfour, *ibid.* 14/218, 26 Nov 1634.

⁹¹ *Ibid.* 8/1, 20 May 1633.

⁹² BL, Egerton MS. 2597 f. 140v, 25 June 1633.

⁹³ Str. P. 8/12, 7 Aug 1633.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 8/30, Wentworth to Carlisle 7 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 8/95-6, same to same 22 March 1634.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 13/61, Carlisle to Wentworth 2 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 8/39-40, Wentworth to Carlisle 31 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 14/1, Carlisle to Wentworth 10 Feb 1634; *ibid.* 8/108-9, Wentworth to Carlisle 14 May 1634.

In late 1633 and early 1634 Carlisle responded to the Lord Deputy's offers of service by informing him that he was entrusting his Irish concerns to his care, although the Earl was hardly naive enough to leave it at that.⁹⁶ Carlisle had two areas of interest in Ireland, his wine imposts and the Byrnes' Country. Wentworth alleged that the first business was hindered by the obstructive attitude of the Vice-Treasurer, Lord Mountnorris, although Schreiber notes that the monopoly was not in any case a profitable one. Wentworth received thanks from Carlisle in February 1634 for managing to get some proportion of the annual profits sent to him.⁹⁷ The other matter was Carlisle's disputed grant to land in County Wicklow known as the Byrnes' Country. It appears that Lord Treasurer Marlborough had mistakenly included this land in a grant of the manor of Newcastle and that Carlisle had narrowly avoided losing it after Buckingham discovered Marlborough's mistake.⁹⁸ But the death of Buckingham was not the end of the problem as Carlisle fell victim to a group of Irish officials, including the Lord Justice, Richard Boyle, Earl of Cork and the Master of the Irish Court of Wards, Sir William Parsons, experts at concealing proofs of royal ownership of land in the hope that the owner of the grant would despair of ever getting his land and be forced to sell his patent. In this situation it is hard to imagine that Carlisle did not speak to the King in favour of Wentworth's appointment as Lord Deputy of Ireland, even if Sir Edward Stanhope did not identify him as having done so.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* 13/103, 21 Nov 1633; *ibid.* 13/163, 13 Jan 1634; see also *ibid.* 15/49, 30 April 1635.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 8/30-32, Wentworth to Carlisle 7 Oct 1633; see also *ibid.* 8/56-7, same to same 5 Dec 1633; *ibid.* 13/197, Carlisle to Wentworth 19 Feb 1634; *ibid.* 8/108-11, Wentworth to Carlisle 14 May 1634; Schreiber, 'The First Carlisle', pp. 156-8.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 163. See Cooper, 'Strafford and the Byrnes' Country', p. 2, for an alternative explanation of how Carlisle was granted the Byrnes' country. See also SP 63/247 f. 200v, David Lewis to James Hay 24 Oct 1625.

⁹⁹ Schreiber, 'The First Carlisle', pp. 162-5.

The complex business of the Byrnes' country received the attentions of Terence Ranger and J. P. Cooper in the mid-1960s and was also taken up by Roy Schreiber in his biography of Carlisle in 1984, so it is not necessary here to reiterate the details of the case.¹⁰⁰ In particular, Cooper's valuable article makes it clear that neither Wentworth nor Carlisle was absolutely honest with the other during this business, yet it is not an accurate reflection of the case to suggest that Wentworth totally ignored his former professions of service to Carlisle.¹⁰¹ Wentworth considered it his duty to write to Charles that he was 'not fully satisfied whether in the passing of that Grant 155 [Charles I] intended him [i.e. Carlisle] as good as three thousand pounds lands a yeare; and to apply it wholly that wayes, without first letting the valew be knowen' to the King: if so, this would make him a more effective servant to Carlisle than to Charles.¹⁰² He was asking the King to consider the extent of his bounty towards Carlisle, while suggesting that the Earl should not be deprived of reasonable compensation. As far as Wentworth was concerned his friendship with Carlisle was valuable, but not to the extent that the Crown might suffer by it. Cooper stresses that as Carlisle's patent was defective, Wentworth's suggested offer of £15,000 was an attractive one. It was the King himself who thought a figure of £10,000, suggested by Parsons, was sufficient compensation.¹⁰³

Carlisle did not allow Wentworth's handling of this business to go unchallenged. He wrote that he was aware of rumours that Wentworth had concealed a plan to develop a plantation in the Byrnes' Country, but that he

¹⁰⁰ Ranger, 'Strafford in Ireland', pp. 283-6; Cooper, 'Strafford and the Byrnes' Country', pp.1-20; Schreiber, 'The First Carlisle', pp. 162-7.

¹⁰¹ Cooper, 'Strafford and the Byrnes' Country', p. 9.

¹⁰² Str. P. 3/128-130, 17 Sept 1634.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* 40/7, Charles I to Wentworth 23 Oct 1634; Cooper, 'Strafford and the Byrnes' Country', p. 19.

was 'too well satisfied...to take umbrage at any such report'.¹⁰⁴ Wentworth's reply was defensive and not entirely truthful, but Carlisle did not challenge him again and there was no rupture in their relationship similar to that which Wentworth experienced with the Earl of Arundel.¹⁰⁵ In the summer of 1635 Carlisle named Wentworth, together with his wife's brother the Earl of Northumberland, joint trustees for Lady Carlisle's jointure after his death.¹⁰⁶ For his part, Wentworth does not appear to have criticised Carlisle and his expectations as he did the Earl of Arundel. He informed Laud of his plans for the Byrnes' land in the spring of 1636, requesting that Laud approach the King over the matter, but no negative comments were made about Carlisle.¹⁰⁷ Neither did Carlisle feature in the list of those from whom the Lord Deputy asked the King to save him.¹⁰⁸ Their friendship survived their dealings over the Byrnes' land and Wentworth must have been saddened to learn of Carlisle's death in the spring of 1636.¹⁰⁹

In contrast to Wentworth's associations with Carlisle and Coventry, his relationship with Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, became extremely acrimonious. During the late 1620s and early 1630s, the Earl Marshal was one of Wentworth's major supporters at Court.¹¹⁰ It is not clear whether

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 8/246, 17 June 1635.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* 8/246-8, 11 July 1635.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* 15/210, Carlisle to Wentworth received 7 Sept 1635.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.* 6/330, Wentworth to Laud 9 March 1636; *ibid.* 6/337, Laud to Wentworth 8 April 1636; see also *ibid.* 6/341, Wentworth to Laud 28 April 1636.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 3/182, 9 March 1635.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* 16/11, Conway to Wentworth 11 April 1636 on Carlisle's imminent death.

¹¹⁰ See Clarendon's character sketch: 'He was a man supercilious and proud, who lived always within himself and to himself, conversing little with any who were in common conversation...He resorted sometimes to the Court, because there only was a greater man than himself; and went thither the seldomer, because there was a greater man than himself', *History*, vol. I, p. 69. Lady Arundel was one of the first English ladies to win the friendship

Wentworth received strong support from anyone at Court for the Presidency of the Council of the North, but Arundel appears to have benefited from Wentworth's presence and authority in the north; he controlled substantial landed estates in Hallamshire and Wentworth was eager to keep him informed about those who he suspected of encroaching on Arundel's rights. Although Sir Edward Stanhope named Weston and Cottington as the two ministers responsible for securing Wentworth's appointment as Lord Deputy of Ireland, it is likely that Arundel supported this also, as it was in his interests to have a governor of Ireland who he - mistakenly - thought would be willing to assist him in his attempt to gain land in that country. Arundel was asked to be present in Star Chamber when Wentworth's libel case against Sir David Foulis was heard.¹¹¹ He also requested the Earl Marshal's support at Court over matters which might infringe upon the Lord Deputy's authority.¹¹² Arundel passed on news of Charles's pleasure at Wentworth's apparently successful management of the 1634-5 Parliament, and also gave him useful information regarding the soap monopoly and how its use of tallow would affect Ireland.¹¹³ In 1634, when Wentworth determined to have Philip Mainwaring appointed Secretary of State in Ireland, he could presumably count on Arundel's support. Wentworth's correspondence with Laud regarding Mainwaring makes no mention of Arundel's attitude towards the appointment, but Mainwaring had worked for Arundel as an agent in the Low Countries and he may have brought the Sebastiano del Piombo work - widely believed to be a Raphael - 'Ferry Carondolet and his attendants' back to England for the Earl. It is possible that this painting, as well as Titian's portrait of Georges d'Armagnac with Guillaume Philandrier, influenced Van Dyck twenty years later in his

of the Queen; J. H. Bettey ed., *Calendar of the Correspondence of the Smyth Family of Ashton Court* (Bristol, 1982), p. 73, Katherine Gorges to Sir Hugh Smyth 7 Dec 1625.

¹¹¹ Str. P. 8/48, 4 Nov 1633.

¹¹² *Ibid.* 8/94-5, 22 March 1634.

painting of Wentworth and Mainwaring.¹¹⁴ When possible, Wentworth was willing to consider suits made to him by the Earl: in the early summer of 1635 Arundel recommended a Mr. Neale for the position of Mintmaster in Ireland; Wentworth had not heard of him, but believed he was the same man who Conway had recommended.¹¹⁵ Until late 1635 their relationship was useful to both men: Wentworth considered the Earl Marshal a friend and ally at Court, and Arundel was grateful for Wentworth's oversight of his northern estates.

Wentworth's concern to watch over the interests of the Earl of Arundel brought him into dispute with Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery. The dispute concerned the Talbot lands in the West Riding which had been divided after the death of Edward, Earl of Shrewsbury between the daughters and heirs-general of Gilbert, the seventh earl.¹¹⁶ Wentworth's interest in these lands derived from his father's lengthy dealings with Gilbert, Earl of Shrewsbury, and Wentworth's nephews also had a share in the Talbot inheritance.¹¹⁷ Wentworth's friendship with Arundel brought him into an argument over the custody of the Dowager Countess of Pembroke, whose sanity was in doubt. Since her husband's death, the Dowager Countess's lands had been administered by her brother-in-law, but if indeed she was insane Arundel wanted the lands made over to her heir, his son Lord Maltravers. In an attempt to resolve the dispute without resorting to courts of law, Charles had appointed the Earl of Manchester to act for Pembroke and Wentworth to act for Arundel in arbitration, but according to John Pory this

¹¹³ *Ibid.* 14/280, 22 Jan 1635; see also *ibid.* 8/205-7, Wentworth to Arundel 16 March 1635.

¹¹⁴ Howarth, *Arundel*, p. 69; Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, (London, 1982), p. 97.

¹¹⁵ Str. P. 15/47, Arundel to Wentworth 30 April 1635; *ibid.* 8/251, Wentworth to Arundel 3 June 1635.

¹¹⁶ When this dispute flared up Mary was the widow of William, Earl of Pembroke; Elizabeth had married Henry Lord Ruthin and Alethea was the Countess of Arundel.

¹¹⁷ Cooper ed., *Wentworth Papers*, pp. 37-46, 96-99, 109-11.

‘bredd a mighty quarell between my lord Chamberlaine and my lord Wentworth, to whom my lorde Chamberlane hath spoken such contemptuous wordes as I dare not relate.’¹¹⁸ A fortnight later, however, Pory could not resist giving Viscount Scudamore a more detailed account of Pembroke’s outburst:

‘I heare that my lord Wentworth craved from his Majesty satisfaction against my lord Chamberlain for calling him Viper of the Common Wealth, Promoter, Informer, Northren [*sic*] Clowne, Parlament-breaker etc.’¹¹⁹

It is not clear exactly what Wentworth had done to arouse such anger in the Lord Chamberlain, but his outburst was not uncharacteristic. Tresham Lever describes Pembroke as ‘foul-mouthed’ and notes his violent temper: he broke his Lord Chamberlain’s staff over the poet Thomas May’s back, which infuriated the King, and in 1641 found himself committed to the Tower after attacking Lord Maltravers.¹²⁰ A formal reconciliation was arranged between Wentworth and Pembroke shortly after this incident,¹²¹ and even Arundel later encouraged Wentworth to end his differences with Pembroke,¹²² but the animosity remained and can be seen very clearly in Pembroke’s determined support of the Earl of Cork during 1634-5.¹²³ It also provoked Wentworth to continue taking an interest in the management of the Talbot lands in the West

¹¹⁸ PRO, C115 M35/8405, Pory to Scudamore 26 May 1632.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, M35/8406, 9 June 1632.

¹²⁰ Tresham Lever, *The Herberts of Wilton* (London, 1967), pp. 99, 107. See also Str. P. 13/159, Garrard to Wentworth 9 Jan 1634, detailing an outburst of Pembroke’s against Lord Powis, and *ibid.* 13/207, same to same 27 Feb 1634 regarding May.

¹²¹ PRO, C115 M35/8047, Pory to Scudamore 16 June 1632.

¹²² Str. P. 14/197, 28 Oct 1634; see also *ibid.* 8/169, Wentworth to Arundel 18 Dec 1634.

¹²³ See above, p. 105, regarding Cork. In July 1633 Wentworth made it clear to his brother-in-law, Sir Gervase Clifton, that he was reluctant to approach Pembroke and ask his favour for an acquaintance, University of Nottingham, Clifton Manuscripts, Cl/C 720, 27 July 1633.

Riding. In August 1632 Arundel discussed his plans for the management and development of his estates in Hallamshire with Wentworth, and he expected Wentworth's assistance in his attempt to evict Lord Eure from Malton manor house.¹²⁴ In December 1632 he warned Arundel that Pembroke's agent had allegedly directed the Earl Marshal's tenants not to pay their rents and he advised Arundel to appoint a bailiff who would prevent such actions.¹²⁵ Arundel appears to have taken Wentworth's warning seriously as he remained in the north in the summer of 1633 following his return from Scotland, probably visiting his family's Talbot estates.¹²⁶

When Wentworth left for Ireland he and Arundel were on good terms and the Earl was one of several ministers to whom Wentworth expressed his extremely negative views on Irish government and society. He found himself 'in the society of a strange people, their own privates altogether their study, without any regard at all to the public'. In a sharp thrust at his predecessor, Lord Falkland, and the Lords Justices, Cork and Loftus, he went on:

'I find this Kingdome abandoned for these late yeares to every man that could please himselfe to purchase what best liked him for his money; And consequently all the Crown Revenewe reduced into fee farmes.'¹²⁷

In March 1634 Wentworth asked Arundel to assist him in his work by informing him of Charles's response to his actions and, where necessary, being

¹²⁴ Str. P. 12/295; *ibid.* 12/296, William Howard to Wentworth, both 18 Aug 1632; *ibid.* 12/310, Arundel to Wentworth 26 Nov 1632.

¹²⁵ Autograph Letters, Arundel Castle, No.310, 23 Dec 1632, cited in Hervey, *Arundel*, pp. 306-7.

¹²⁶ In October 1633 Arundel spent some time at his late mother's estate of Greystoke and it is likely, although not certain, that he also visited the Talbot lands; *ibid.* p. 345.

¹²⁷ Str. P. 8/11, 19 Aug 1633.

willing to point out to him the error of his ways.¹²⁸ Weston and Carlisle received letters full of similar criticisms of Irish ministers, designed to make Wentworth's expected transformation of the administration appear all the more remarkable, but also to convince them - all of whom had their eyes on Irish land - that things could not be accomplished overnight.¹²⁹ But Wentworth's willingness to act as Arundel's 'eyes and ears' in watching over his estates in the West Riding must have convinced Arundel that Wentworth as Lord Deputy of Ireland would also be able to assist him in his attempt to restore his family's former landed status in that kingdom.

Before Wentworth arrived in Ireland, Arundel had secured a royal grant which would enable him to search for titles,¹³⁰ and he planned to visit Ireland in order to further his ambitions.¹³¹ Arundel was one of three lords who Charles personally recommended to Wentworth's care, although the King made it clear that the Earl Marshal was to be contented only so far as the Crown's interests allowed.¹³² Wentworth was determined to stick to this principle, but Arundel also lost out to another minister. Lord Treasurer Weston had his eye on the barony of Fort Inoland, which the Earl Marshal coveted, and by the summer of 1634 Wentworth was confident that he could get a royal title to it, valuing it at

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* 8/94-5, 22 March 1634.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* 3/8, Wentworth to Weston 3 Aug 1633; *ibid.* 8/12-13, Wentworth to Carlisle 27 Aug 1633.

¹³⁰ SP 63/254 f. 31, Charles I to Wentworth [draft] 14 May 1633.

¹³¹ Str. P. 4/83, Charles I (signet, by Windebank) to Wentworth 18 Sept 1633 ordering that Arundel can sit as an Irish privy councillor when in Ireland; *ibid.* 4/84, same to same, same date for Lord Maltravers to have the same privilege.

¹³² *Ibid.* 40/3, 26 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 40/4, 17 April 1634.

£800 *p. a.*¹³³ In May 1634 the Lord Deputy informed the King of both men's ambitions for this barony and requested his protection against the potential displeasure of great ministers.¹³⁴ Charles claimed he had never heard of the barony and wanted to know more about it before he instructed Wentworth on the matter.¹³⁵ In December 1634 Wentworth stated that neither Arundel nor Weston had mentioned Fort Inoland again: what he failed to mention was that he had raised the subject with Weston in August and his correspondence with the Lord Treasurer in early 1635 shows that Weston was still interested in it.¹³⁶ The situation became more confused when Charles recalled having some form of engagement with Arundel on this matter, but could not remember exactly what he had promised him.¹³⁷ Evidently he decided he had not promised him much as in October 1635 Charles remembered to inform Wentworth that he had been engaged to the late Lord Treasurer and, as a result, the barony had been granted to Jerome Weston.¹³⁸

During the summer of 1634 Arundel visited Ireland and spent some time in Dublin with Wentworth, and both the Earl Marshal and his son, Lord

¹³³ *Ibid.* 13/234, Weston to Wentworth received 24 March 1634; *ibid.* 3/76, Wentworth to Weston Easter Wednesday [9 April] 1634; *ibid.* 3/93, same to same 23 May 1634; *ibid.* 3/123, same to same 23 Aug 1634.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.* 3/96, 26 May 1634.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.* 40/6, 30 June 1634.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* 3/152, Wentworth to Charles I 15 Dec 1634; *ibid.* 3/123, Wentworth to Weston 23 Aug 1634; *ibid.* 14/268, Weston to Wentworth 17 Jan 1635; *ibid.* 3/179, Wentworth to Weston 7 March 1635.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.* 3/180, Charles I to Wentworth 22 Jan 1635.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.* 40/12, 27 Oct 1635; *ibid.* 4/183, Charles I (by Windebank) to Wentworth 15 July 1635; *ibid.* 3/232, Wentworth to Charles I 5 Dec 1635. See also *ibid.* 8/262-3, Jerome Weston to Wentworth 29 July 1635; *ibid.* 8/263, Wentworth to Jerome Weston 12 Sept 1635.

Maltravers, were sworn members of the Dublin Council.¹³⁹ According to Wentworth, Arundel was not hasty in moving his own business, and the Lord Deputy did not think it his responsibility to hurry him along.¹⁴⁰ During this visit there appears to have been continuing warm relations between the Earl Marshal and the Lord Deputy: certainly Arundel was willing to warn Wentworth about Weston's attitude towards the Lord Deputy's plans for Ireland.¹⁴¹ In June 1635 letters under the royal signet granted Arundel various lands in Leinster which had once belonged to his Mowbray ancestors and Lady Arundel's Talbot ancestors and two months later Arundel made another attempt to secure Wentworth's assistance in the matter of his Irish inheritance and sent over a servant with authority to handle the business with the Lord Deputy.¹⁴² Throughout this business Arundel had declared himself willing to be guided by Wentworth so that the King's business would not be prejudiced by his claims; but in sending over an agent to handle the business of his claims to Irish land, Arundel clearly believed that leaving his affairs solely in the hands of Wentworth would not succeed. Wentworth no doubt reacted badly to what seemed a slight and when he reported to Arundel on 16 December 1635 he alleged that most of the Earl's documentation given to the committee of revenue was 'clogged with divers most dangerous Clauses, heretofore absolutely prohibited by speciall instructions and Commandes as well of King James as allsoe of his Majesty that now is, as in truth I had much adoe to save

¹³⁹ *Ibid.* 5/95, Wentworth to Windebank 11 Aug 1634.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 3/108, Wentworth to Charles I 10 Aug 1634.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.* 6/97, Wentworth to Laud 22 Sept 1634; see *ibid.* 14/275 Conway to Wentworth 20 Jan 1635 reporting on Arundel's angry encounter with Weston at the Council board regarding the soap monopoly, *ibid.* 8/204-5, Arundel to Wentworth [c. Feb 1635]; *ibid.* 8/205-7, Wentworth's reply 16 March 1635.

¹⁴² *Ibid.* 4/166, Charles I (by Windebank) to Wentworth 5 June; *ibid.* 4/168, same to same 4 June 1635; *ibid.* 15/195, Arundel to Wentworth 13 Aug 1635; *ibid.* 8/266-7, Wentworth to Arundel 14 Sept 1635.

any part of it.’ He advised Arundel in future not to entrust his business to agents, asking the Earl’s pardon for his comments.¹⁴³ But Arundel was unlikely to do that, not least because the Lord Deputy had given the King on 5 December his opinion of Arundel’s claims, arguing that they were exorbitant and needed to be slimmed down. Wentworth was aware that his opposition to the Earl Marshal’s plans needed to be explained:

‘I know my plainnesse and roundnesse in these particulars opens mens mouthes upon me to my great disquiet, if not danger, yet I beseech your Majestie to beleieve, it is the present Coniuncture of your Affaires (according as I iudge of them) and not my owne disposition which inclines me to these Austere Courses as I understand some are pleased to terme them’.¹⁴⁴

The King accepted Wentworth’s argument regarding the Earl Marshal’s claims.¹⁴⁵

Arundel planned to respond to Wentworth’s letter verbally, hoping to see Wentworth when the Lord Deputy visited England in the summer of 1636. He was unable to do so because of his departure as ambassador to the Emperor and - fortunately for us - had to express himself in writing. His letter shows how he regretted the manner in which Wentworth had handled his business, and felt that a poor impression had been given of him to the King, and that others would assume that he had lost the Deputy’s good affections.¹⁴⁶ Mary Hervey rightly points out that Arundel’s rebuke was delivered in a temperate tone and should not in itself have produced a breach between the two men, but

¹⁴³ *Ibid.* 8/321-2, 16 Dec 1635.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 3/230, 5 Dec 1635; *ibid.* 9/306-7, Windebank to Wentworth 2 Oct 1635.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 40/17, Charles I to Wentworth 13 Jan 1636.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 16/6, 7 April 1636.

neither was prepared to alter his stance.¹⁴⁷ In August 1636 Wentworth finally replied to Arundel's letter, blaming Arundel's 'reservedness' towards him for any problems and making it clear that he was not prepared to pass the grant which the Earl had procured as it stood. He pointed out that the Earl of Ormond had a patent to Edough, which Arundel had included in his claim, and Jerome Weston had already been granted the barony of Fort Inoland. Wentworth asserted that his views about Arundel's grant were shared by the members of the Committee of Revenue:

‘with one voyse it was decried, as the most unfitt to passe of any they had knowne, expressed by them with amazement, how much the verie report of it, would preiudice his Majestys Service upon the Commission of defective tytles; Trench upon the publick faith, soe often given in Parliament; and disquyet the whole Province of Leinster; therefore advysed it should not onely be totally reiected, but by all meanes secreted.’

He moved on to criticise the activities of Arundel's agents, who were like ‘a couple of beagles...hunt[ing] at Randome all over the Province of Leinster’. He advised the Earl Marshal to reapply to the King to know the extent of the royal bounty towards him ‘forth of the things we certify may be granted’, and then he would not find the Deputy wanting. A copy of this letter was sent to the King.¹⁴⁸

Wentworth also dealt with the Countess of Arundel over this business: he discussed it with her in London during the summer of 1636 when Arundel was in Germany and wrote to her, enclosing a letter to the Earl.¹⁴⁹ Her reply was friendly; designed to try and defuse the tension which had arisen between

¹⁴⁷ Hervey, *Arundel*, p. 352.

¹⁴⁸ Str. P. 16/49, 26 Aug 1636; *ibid.* 3/259, Wentworth to Charles 23 Aug 1636.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 21/153-4, 27 Aug 1636.

Wentworth and her husband.¹⁵⁰ No further correspondence between Arundel and Wentworth survives,¹⁵¹ but their worsening relationship can be traced to some extent through Wentworth's correspondence with Lady Arundel. Polite letters were exchanged in the spring of 1637, Lady Arundel recommending Mr. Neale to Wentworth's care,¹⁵² but by the end of the year trouble had broken out again regarding Arundel's land business in Ireland. Wentworth wrote to the Countess complaining of one of Arundel's servants Mr. Alexander, which provoked her into making an angry response:

‘I shall desire your lordship not to entertaine the least Imagination, that if my lord had an ill talent to you, hee would have stooped to soe low an occasion to have shewed it’.

She went on to deliver a warning to him:

‘His Majesties Sense of this businesse was full of Noblenesse and wisdom; which was, that Hee is pleased to Esteeme you both His true Servants, and seeing you both goe the same way in His Service, Hee will have you Freinds.’¹⁵³

Wentworth's next letter regretted that Arundel had seen fit to involve the King in this matter.¹⁵⁴ Pleasantries were exchanged between Wentworth and the Countess in the summer of 1638,¹⁵⁵ but by the winter Wentworth was furious

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 16/54, 5 Sept 1636.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.* 19/33 and 45, catalogued as Arundel to Wentworth, are letters from Arundel to Sir Francis Willoughby.

¹⁵² *Ibid.* 8/424, Lady Arundel to Wentworth [Feb 1637] and Wentworth's reply 10 March 1637.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.* 10a/78, Wentworth to Lady Arundel 20 Nov 1637; *ibid.* 10a/129, Lady Arundel to Wentworth undated.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 10a/130-31, 8 May 1638.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 18/120, Lady Arundel [Aug 1638]; *ibid.* 10a/166, Wentworth to Lady Arundel 27 Aug 1638.

at what he considered to be the Earl Marshal's gross intrusion into his sphere of influence, revealed in Wentworth's correspondence with Archbishop Laud.

As his relationship with Arundel rapidly turned sour, the Earl Marshal became a common subject in Wentworth's correspondence with Laud.¹⁵⁶ As early as September 1635 Arundel was regarded as an opponent of Wentworth's Irish policy and no longer an ally at Court. Wentworth named the Earl, as well as Cottington, as a supporter of the Earl of Clanricarde's cause, believing that Windebank would join with them.¹⁵⁷ Of great interest to the Lord Deputy was the apparent drift towards a French alliance, meaning almost certain conflict with Spain, which resulted from Arundel's failed embassy to Vienna. In February 1637 Laud informed Wentworth of the Earl Marshal's altered stance on foreign affairs and his ambition, supported by the Queen of Bohemia, to secure the restoration of the dukedom of Norfolk to his family.¹⁵⁸ As this anti-Spanish line on foreign policy appeared to have the King's support, Laud was anxious that Wentworth should be seen to show favour where possible to Arundel; Wentworth's response to this was that all was 'as quiet and Silent as the night'.¹⁵⁹ But Laud warned him not to be so confident; he was being approached frequently by Arundel, probably concerning his land business in Ireland.¹⁶⁰ Laud's concern that Wentworth show favour to Arundel might have stemmed in part from the Archbishop's fear that he, too, might lose the Earl

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 6/254, Laud to Wentworth 4 Oct 1635; *ibid.* 6/265, Wentworth to Laud 2 Nov 1635; *ibid.* 6/287, Laud to Wentworth 30 Nov 1635; *ibid.* 6/332, Wentworth to Laud 9 March 1636; *ibid.* 6/339, Laud to Wentworth 8 April 1636.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 6/249, 14 Oct 1635.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 7/18, 11 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 7/24, Wentworth to Laud 28 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 7/53v, same to same 18 Oct 1637; *ibid.* 7/85, same to same 10 April 1638.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.* 7/27v, Laud to Wentworth 21 March 1637; *ibid.* 7/37a, Wentworth to Laud 10 July 1637.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 7/73v-4, 16 Nov 1637.

Marshal's friendship. During Arundel's embassy, Laud received lengthy letters from the Earl Marshal, which Sir Thomas Roe believed contained highly confidential material.¹⁶¹ The Earl Marshal presumably trusted him to convey information to the King and Laud would have wanted to protect his important association with Arundel. Laud's advice to Wentworth was not always disinterested: in late 1635, he was not in favour of Wentworth coming to England as he believed it would endanger his own chances of securing the Treasurership.¹⁶² Similarly, his advice to Wentworth regarding Arundel involved more than simple concern for the Lord Deputy's position.

By late 1637, when relations between Wentworth and Arundel had deteriorated beyond repair, Wentworth assumed that the Earl Marshal would be as obstructive as possible in matters of Irish business in his capacity as a member of the committee for Irish affairs, although he did not always fulfil the Lord Deputy's expectations.¹⁶³ However, Arundel was prepared to give support to Lord Chancellor Loftus's request to be allowed to come to England to appeal.¹⁶⁴ On Laud's approval, Wentworth responded by writing to the King on 28 May 1638 complaining about the comments of his enemies, Arundel,

¹⁶¹ SP 16/329/21, Roe to Elizabeth of Bohemia 20 July 1636. I owe this reference to Dr. Quintrell.

¹⁶² See above, p. 144.

¹⁶³ Str. P. 7/64, Wentworth to Laud 27 Nov 1637; *ibid.* 7/81, Laud to Wentworth 19 Dec 1637. The number 117 does not appear to have assigned to any person or institution, and in this case should be interpreted as meaning 107, the code for Arundel: but see *ibid.* 7/156v, Laud to Wentworth 29 Dec 1638 where 117 almost certainly should be 177 for Northumberland, and Laud, *Works*, vol. VII, pp. 404 and 510.

¹⁶⁴ Str. P. 7/91, Laud to Wentworth 27 March 1638; *ibid.* 7/94, Wentworth to Laud 26 April 1638; *ibid.* 7/112v, Laud to Wentworth rec. 5 June 1638; *ibid.* 7/115, Wentworth to Laud 3 July 1638.

Wilmot and Holland, regarding his handling of Loftus.¹⁶⁵ In his private correspondence Wentworth contemptuously accused Arundel of preferring fine art and easy living above doing public service, but he could not ignore the damage which the Earl Marshal was capable of inflicting on his Irish policies.¹⁶⁶ In early 1639 Laud was still certain that Arundel was able to cause Wentworth some harm in the King's eyes, despite his belief that the Lord Deputy enjoyed the King's good opinion.¹⁶⁷ He was also able to interfere in Wentworth's northern government, provoking Wentworth's fury by supporting Sir William Savile's attempt to have another Lord Lieutenant appointed for Yorkshire.¹⁶⁸ Arundel ranked together with Holland as heavyweights at Court who possessed sufficient influence with the King to worry Wentworth, and in a sense Arundel featured in what resembled a competition between Laud and Wentworth; whose enemy was the more dangerous - Arundel or Bishop Williams?¹⁶⁹

Wentworth's connections with the Court were many and varied, but his enjoyment of these services would depend on his bearing towards his contacts and their reaction to it. The amiable Carlisle appears not to have been angered by Wentworth's dealings over the Byrnes' lands, presumably because he had not expected to gain much more than what Wentworth offered. In contrast, Arundel refused to ignore Wentworth's attitude towards his suit and became his acknowledged enemy. Wentworth's willingness in earlier years to assist his

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 3/325-6, Wentworth to Charles I 28 May 1638; *ibid.* 7/64 Wentworth to Laud 27 Nov 1637; *ibid.* 7/81, Laud to Wentworth 19 Dec 1637; *ibid.* 7/85, Wentworth to Laud 10 April 1638.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 7/123, Wentworth to Laud 7 Aug 1638.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 7/156, Laud to Wentworth 29 Dec 1638.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 7/161v, Wentworth to Laud 11 Feb 1639; *ibid.* 7/173, Laud to Wentworth received 22 March 1639.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 7/118v-19, Laud to Wentworth 22 June 1638.

northern interests may have led him to assume that he would meet with the same level of support for his Irish claims. He would not have expected to learn that his suit had been roundly criticised to the King. But although Wentworth's talent for making enemies was acknowledged by numerous observers, friendly and unfriendly, he could not afford to alienate the entire Court, nor could he risk relying on one old archbishop. In particular he understood the growing influence of the Queen which had been effective in securing Juxon's appointment as Lord Treasurer in 1636 and which would play a part in every significant appointment during the rest of the decade.

CHAPTER SIX

WENTWORTH AND THE QUEEN'S CIRCLE

In 1978 Malcolm Smuts called attention to the diverse nature of the Queen's Court by examining the importance of her puritan followers.¹ He notes that by around 1635 Henrietta Maria enjoyed not only the attendance of Wat Montagu and Henry Jermyn, soon to convert to Catholicism, but also that of her longstanding friend, Henry Rich, Earl of Holland, who combined 'success at court with puritan sympathies'.² During the second half of the decade, her circle widened further, with the presence and growing influence of Algernon Percy, Earl of Northumberland, and his younger brother Henry Percy, as well as their sister Lucy, Countess of Carlisle, one of the Queen's closest female friends. Together with their brother-in-law and sister, the Earl and Countess of Leicester, they can also be regarded as having displayed puritan tendencies, or at least as not having high Anglican sympathies. The circle also included the Queen's Chamberlain, Edward Sackville, Earl of Dorset and her Master of the Horse, George, Lord Goring, both of whom were on generally good terms with Lord Deputy Wentworth. John Finch secured the post of Chancellor to the Queen in January 1636 and received further promotion to the Lord Keepership in 1640 through the patronage of the Queen. In the course of late 1639 and early 1640, during the struggle for the Secretaryship, Sir Henry Vane, the Treasurer of the Household, was fortunate enough to win the favour of the

¹ Malcolm Smuts, 'The Puritan followers of Henrietta Maria in the 1630s', *English Historical Review* 93 (1978), pp. 26-45.

² Regarding Jermyn see Str. P. 6/194, Laud to Wentworth 12 June 1635, noting Jermyn's role in Cottington's rise in the Queen's favour; Donagan, 'Holland', p. 318.

Queen.³ By this time, the Queen's favour gave a candidate for high office an immense advantage over his rivals, and her influence with the King could not sensibly be ignored.

During the early 1630s, however, Queen Henrietta Maria had not wielded substantial political influence at Court, although there is some evidence that she may have been more influential than has been previously acknowledged.⁴

³ Smith, 'Dorset and the Personal Rule of Charles I', pp. 257-287. On Finch see Str. P. 15/332, Garrard to Wentworth 25 Jan 1636; SP 16/442/16, Robert Read to Thomas Windebank 16 Jan 1640. We might also note the interesting figure of Sir Toby Matthew, a recusant who was regarded by Wentworth as a means of access to the Queen; see below, pp. 228-30.

⁴ Probably the most satisfactory biography of Henrietta Maria is Quentin Bone's *Henrietta Maria: Queen of the Cavaliers* (London, 1972), although Bone underestimates her involvement in court politics, especially regarding the appointment of Juxon; pp. 96-7. Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and court entertainments* (Cambridge, 1989) has some very interesting material on the character of the Queen's Court (especially pp. 85-8, 180-2), which takes issue with Smuts's use of the terms 'the Queen's faction' and 'the Queen's party', but Veevers underrates Henrietta Maria's influence in court politics: 'Although she may at times have lent herself to those who wished to 'win the support of a naive young queen' (Smuts, p. 45), her 'plotting' on the Puritan side does not extend to much more than a liking for agreeable company and a dislike of anything Spanish; on the Catholic side the main complaint of French ambassadors and Catholic agents was that she would *not* engage in intrigue, or do what she was told to exert her political influence one way or the other', pp. 181-2. The Queen might have used her influence to assist the Earl of Warwick secure a privateering commission in 1627, which angered the Lord Admiral, the Duke of Buckingham. It is possible that Warwick's commission managed to be passed because of upheaval caused by the war effort, but it is also possible that the Queen's favour was responsible; SP 16/57/49, grant by Charles I to Warwick 18 March 1627; BL, Harleian MS. 390, f. 223v, Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville, 26 March 1627. I owe this point and these references to Brian Quintrell.

An entry in Laud's diary for 30 August 1634 gives us some indication of the Queen's activities before Weston's death:

'At Oatlands the Queen sent for me, and gave me thanks for a business with which she trusted me; her promise then, that she would be my friend, and that I should have immediate access to her when I had occasion.'⁵

Heylin thought this referred to the arrival of the papal agent Panzani, but coming three weeks after the death of William Noy, it is likely that the matter under discussion was who should succeed him as Attorney-General.⁶ Noy was succeeded on 27 September by Sir John Bankes, Attorney to the Prince of Wales, a victory for Weston, but this appointment was followed by that of Sir John Finch to the Chief Justice-ship of the Common Pleas, made vacant by the sacking of Sir Robert Heath. Laud has been regarded as responsible for Heath's removal, but it is highly likely that the Queen played a more significant role, ensuring that Finch, her Attorney, received some promotion.⁷ Yet despite the King's very affectionate relationship with his wife, she had failed in her several attempts to effect the removal from office of Lord Treasurer Weston, although Dorset recognised her possession of political skills: 'she wisely shifts her sayles accordinge to the winde'.⁸ The death of her

⁵ Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 222

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 221, [9 Aug 1634].

⁷ See Reeve, *Road to Personal Rule*, p. 191; Paul E. Kopperman, *Sir Robert Heath 1575-1649* (London, 1989), p. 242, n. 47. T. G. Barnes argues that Heath fell because of an opinion delivered in favour of the City of London regarding their obligations in Ulster: 'Cropping the Heath: the Fall of a Chief Justice, 1634', *Historical Research* 64 (1991), pp. 331-343. See also Bankes, *Corfe Castle*, p. 57.

⁸ CKS Sackville MSS, CP, no.40, Dorset to Middlesex undated [c. April 1633]. Regarding the Queen's relations with Weston see Bone, *Henrietta Maria*, pp. 77-82, where he describes her involvement in the attempt of the Marquis de Chateaufort to unseat Richelieu

great enemy in March 1635 appears, however, to have resulted in a shift of power at Court. As Kevin Sharpe has noted, the Queen's Court ceased to be merely the refuge of those such as Holland whose views on politics and foreign affairs were not in favour; rather the Queen became the patron of those who succeeded in gaining senior offices in the government.⁹ It was essential that the Lord Deputy had some access to this significant circle and during the second half of the decade, in particular, he tried to develop and strengthen his connections with a number of individuals who enjoyed the favour of the Queen. This was not a straightforward process, however, partly due to his extremely poor relations with the Earl of Holland who, for most of the decade, basked in the Queen's favour.

In early 1635 Wentworth believed that the most serious threat to his government of Ireland came from Weston; he was soon to realise that a far more dangerous opposition emanated from Holland. According to Clarendon, Holland's enmity towards Wentworth originated with the latter's reported 'sharp sudden saying...that the King should do well to cut off his head', regarding Holland's quarrel with Jerome Weston.¹⁰ Holland attempted to exact revenge for this reported comment by involving himself in a number of Irish matters which Wentworth regarded as a gross intrusion. In 1638 this struggle escalated as Wentworth demanded the Earl's cooperation in his lawsuit against Sir Piers Crosby and Holland sought to avoid this by standing on his privilege as a peer and a privy councillor. As Clarendon noted, Wentworth's personality did not allow him to retain a large number of friends at Court,¹¹ and although

and Weston, trying to strengthen his own power in France and replace the English Lord Treasurer with Holland.

⁹ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 168-173.

¹⁰ Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, p. 197.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 197.

he was on good or at least tolerable terms with some individuals who held different views on governmental policy, he was hardly likely to have sought friendship with a man whom he so totally despised. Holland's ambitious nature was assisted by his good looks and personal charm which Wentworth could not resist ridiculing.¹²

Barbara Donagan has noted that 'Historians have not been kind to Henry Rich, Earl of Holland.'¹³ He has been regarded as superficial, ambitious and grasping, in other words, an enemy of 'thorough', and it is probable that his reputation, like that of Sir Piers Crosby and the Earl of Antrim, has suffered from the way in which Wentworth's version of events has survived and been largely accepted.¹⁴ Holland had risen to favour through his attachment to Buckingham, but was never to occupy as important a political role as the former favourite. He had not been able to detach Weston from the King's favour,¹⁵ and Charles largely excluded him from the business of foreign affairs during the 1630s. His re-appointment to the foreign affairs committee was probably made in order to content him, deflecting attention from the King's genuine advisers and underlining Charles's practice of consulting trusted individuals rather than the Privy Council as a body and its committees.¹⁶ A note written by Charles to Windebank in August 1635 indicates that this re-appointment did not signify participation in any substantial discussions of foreign policy:

¹² Str. P. 10a/238, Wentworth to Conway 10 Dec 1638. But note his friendship with that other great Stuart courtier, the Earl of Carlisle; above, pp. 167-74.

¹³ Donagan, 'Holland', p. 317.

¹⁴ See Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration*, pp. 1-4; Clarke, 'Crosby', p. 142.

¹⁵ Donagan, 'Holland', pp. 322-3, 325-9; Sharpe, *The Personal Rule*, pp. 165-6.

¹⁶ Reeve, *Road to Personal Rule*, p. 199.

‘I have thought it necessarie to tell you, that Holland seing mee read some of Hoptons letters, I judged it fitt, to give him some of the smalest importance of them, to send back to you; to keepe jelousies out of his head.’¹⁷

He had failed to take the office of Lord Admiral following the death of Buckingham, but he persisted in desiring it.¹⁸ In 1638, when the Earl of Northumberland was granted this office, the Queen found Holland’s loud complaints at this defeat highly amusing.¹⁹ Yet despite his secondary standing in political affairs he remained a significant figure at Court, and during the later 1630s his position as Groom of the Stool gave him almost unrivalled access to the King.²⁰ This ease of access to the monarch was to prove

¹⁷ Bodl., Clarendon MSS vol. 7, no. 513, 6 Aug 1635.

¹⁸ BL, Egerton MS. 2644 f. 307, Sir William Masham to Lady Joan Barrington, 30 Dec 1629; *CSPV, 1629-32*, pp. 263-5, Soranzo to the Doge and Senate 11 Jan 1630; p. 271, same to same 18 Jan 1630; pp. 276-7, same to same 25 Jan 1630 [all N.S.]. Carlisle was apparently willing to support the candidacies of either Pembroke and Dorset, because he hoped to gain either of their offices; SP 16/121/38, Goring to Carlisle 22 Nov 1628, discusses Carlisle’s chances of succeeding Pembroke as Lord Steward if he gained the Admiralty. See also *HMC, Fifteenth Report, Appendix VII* (Buccleuch at Montagu House III), (London, 1926), p. 346, Robert Dixon to Lord Montagu 17 Dec 1629; *ibid.* p. 347, same to same 24 Dec 1629. Years later there were reports that both Holland and the Marquis of Hamilton desired the post; Str. P. 8/329, Conway to Wentworth 14 Nov 1635. See also *ibid.* 8/330, Wentworth to Conway 23 Dec 1635: ‘My Lord of Hollands desire to be Admirale hath been a familiar of his lodged in his bosome these many yeares’.

¹⁹ Str. P. 10a/123-4, Conway to Wentworth 3 April 1638, informing Wentworth that Holland called a meeting of his female admirers to discuss how he ought to react publicly to his disappointment. Clearly the decision was to make his disappointment loudly known, as ‘the Queen makes herself very good sport at it.’ This reminds us that the Queen’s circle was not a homogeneous ‘faction’. According to Conway, Holland omitted to congratulate Northumberland on his appointment.

²⁰ *HMC, Various Collections VII* (London, 1914), p. 413, Gervase Clifton to Sir Gervase Clifton 23 May 1636.

particularly worrying for the Lord Deputy who needed to prevent his Irish enemies gaining the upper hand at Court. During his struggle with Cork Wentworth had been able to rely on Laud's influence to counter the efforts of Pembroke and Salisbury. But Holland's friendship with the Queen constituted a more serious obstacle to Wentworth's attacks on Mountnorris, the Galway jurymen, Crosby and Loftus.²¹

Wentworth's surviving correspondence with the Earl of Holland begins in 1637, with the Lord Deputy's belated reply to the Earl's profession of respects, and within Wentworth's inner circle of friends there was some hope that he might develop a better understanding with Holland.²² But Wentworth's response was brief and formal, as he remained deeply suspicious of Holland's actions,²³ the Earl's involvement in Irish business was too serious a 'crime' to be forgiven lightly. During late 1635 and early 1636 opposition to Wentworth's handling of Lord Mountnorris and the Galway plantation clearly centred itself on the Queen's circle, particularly on Holland, and Wentworth

²¹ Laud could not be expected to wield as much influence with the King in these cases as they did not concern church affairs.

²² Holland sent letters of respect to Wentworth during the Lord Deputy's stay in England in the summer and autumn of 1636; see Str. P. 6/365, Laud to Wentworth 15 Nov 1636; *ibid.* 8/393-4, Wentworth to Sir George Butler 30 Nov 1636. Christopher Wandesford discussed the relationship between Wentworth and Holland with Sir Gervase Clifton, who had married a sister of Wentworth's first wife Margaret Clifford, and who appears to have enjoyed Holland's patronage; University of Nottingham, Clifton Manuscripts [hereafter Clifton MSS], Cl/C 474, Wandesford to Clifton 26 Nov 1636; *ibid.* 475, same to same 22 Feb 1637; Wentworth himself wrote to Clifton on the same topic, *ibid.* 486 30 Nov 1636. Regarding Clifton's relationship with Holland see *ibid.* 476 Wandesford to Clifton 7 July 1637. See also *HMC, Various Collections VIII* (London, 1913), p. 49, Wandesford to Ingram 27 Nov 1637.

²³ See Str. P. 10a/33, 24 July 1637, Wentworth's first surviving letter to Holland: 'I have ever held freindship to be much more operative, then to dwell upon professions'.

was fortunate to enjoy the support of Cottington in his successful attempt to replace Mountnorris with Sir Adam Loftus. (Holland's involvement in Irish matters compared with his apparent lack of concern over the vacant post of Lord Treasurer would suggest that he knew from the Queen that the Treasury was safely out of the reach of Wentworth, Laud and Cottington and he could indulge himself in opposing the Lord Deputy's policies.) When Wentworth brought a legal case against Sir Piers Crosby for slander, Holland and Henry Jermyn testified on Crosby's behalf and managed to gain his release from prison in May 1636.²⁴ In that month Holland was appointed Groom of the Stool, and Wentworth's feelings of insecurity lay behind his renewed attempt in August 1636 to persuade Charles to grant him an earldom as a public sign of the King's favour. He argued that reports that he was responsible for the death of the Earl of Clanricarde and that he was deceiving the King in his management of the customs were being circulated widely at Court and that Crosby's attempt to charge him with the murder of Robert Esmond had also been 'Countenanced & fomented by some at Court.'²⁵ Although he did not explicitly name Holland, the inference would have been clear to Charles, and in the Lord Deputy's next letter to the King he went further and named the Earl as an opponent of his policy towards Galway:

'I heare my Lord of Holland forth of his Lordships tender regards to the Peace of that Kingdome, apprehends that my Severity may disaffect that people and dispose them to call the Irish Regiments forth of Flanders to their assistance. The best of his Lordships insight in those particulars is, as I conceive, thorow the Suggestions and problems of my Lord St Albanes,

²⁴ *HMC, Twelfth Report, Appendix II, Cowper II*, p. 118, Holland to Windebank 24 May 1636. See also Clarke, 'Crosby', pp. 142-60. Clarke notes Wentworth's 'resentment of the charmed circle that surrounded the queen and ...Crosby's membership of it', p. 158.

²⁵ Str. P. 3/260, Wentworth to Charles I 23 Aug 1636.

Mr Darcy, and Sir Piers Crosby, persons promoteing either their owne interests or passions'.²⁶

Wentworth had written to Laud of his apprehensions of Holland's standing at Court, asking the Archbishop to support his case for a mark of public favour,²⁷ and Laud fully understood Wentworth's fear that Holland would be able to procure access to the King for Wentworth's Irish opponents. He informed Wentworth in September that he had twice seen Holland and Clanricarde walking together at Oatlands and Laud did not dispel the Lord Deputy's anxiety that the King might not uphold him firmly in his Irish administration.²⁸

Holland appeared frequently in Wentworth's correspondence with Laud from 1636 onwards. In December Laud was able to report confidently that Holland was unable to secure the friendship of the Lord Admiral, the Earl of Northumberland.²⁹ Laud himself was faced with strong opposition from Holland in his capacity as Chancellor of Cambridge University when he made his wish to visit both universities known and he also agreed with Wentworth that Holland was obstructing his wish to take over Lady Carlisle's chambers at Hampton Court.³⁰ By 1636 Holland was recognised by Sir Arthur Ingram as a

²⁶ *Ibid.* 3/262, 10 Sept 1636.

²⁷ *Ibid.* 6/347-8, 26 Aug 1636; see above, p. 107.

²⁸ Str. P. 6/360, 12 Sept 1636. Laud gave Wentworth a long account of his discussion with the King on the subject of the Galway plantation and he informed Wentworth that the Earl of Clanricarde had moved Charles on behalf of the Galway jurymen three times on the King's recent progress. After pressing Charles to hold close to his original resolutions concerning the need to plant Galway, Laud discussed this with Secretary Coke, who gave the Archbishop an undertaking to do the same.

²⁹ Str. P. 7/4, 5 Dec 1636; *ibid.* 7/8, 26 Dec 1636. See also *ibid.* 7/6, Wentworth to Laud 31 Dec 1636; *ibid.* 7/10, same to same 20 Jan 1637.

³⁰ *Ibid.* 7/22, Wentworth to Laud 28 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 7/31, Laud to Wentworth 5 April 1637. Wentworth had heard that the Lord Chamberlain, the Earl of Pembroke, was assisting Holland, but Laud believed that Wentworth's informant - almost certainly Lady Carlisle

suitable and indeed logical patron following his breach with Wentworth over the farm of the northern recusancy revenues.³¹ In 1638 Wentworth's relations with Holland ceased to have a veneer of polite formality and became openly hostile. The Lord Deputy was prepared to use every means he could to draw the King's attention to Holland's conduct towards him, sending copies of his correspondence with Holland to Laud for the Archbishop to show to Charles, as well as making a strongly worded criticism to the King of Holland's attempt to damage his reputation over his handling of Lord Chancellor Loftus.³² In the autumn of 1638, Wentworth tried to put pressure on Holland instead. In October he wrote to Holland informing him that he had received the King's permission to call the Earl as a witness in his Star Chamber case against Sir Piers Crosby. He asked for his consent, for which he would be much obliged, but this consent was not forthcoming.³³ In his reply the following month Holland countered Wentworth's claim to have the permission of the King with his statement that Charles had since put Wentworth's request to the lords of the court of Star Chamber. The lords had backed him in his view that there were no precedents which could be cited to force Holland - as a peer of the realm and a privy councillor - to answer any of Wentworth's 'loose and

herself - must have meant the Queen's Chamberlain, the Earl of Dorset, as Pembroke was not on good terms with Holland. Wentworth replied that he was confident that Pembroke was 'most violent...and whett on by Holland', *ibid.* 7/38, 10 July 1637.

³¹ *Ibid.* 7/55, Wentworth to Laud 18 Oct 1637; Donagan, 'Holland', pp. 337-8; Upton, *Ingram*, pp. 236-8; see above, pp. 61-2. In April 1641 Sir William Uvedale, the Treasurer at Wars, noted that Holland planned to supply the army with clothing using credit provided by Ingram; SP 16/479/58, Uvedale to Matthew Bradley 20 April 1641.

³² Str. P. 3/325-6, Wentworth to Charles I 28 May 1638.

³³ *Ibid.* 10a/222, Wentworth to Holland 17 Oct 1638. The case was finally heard in May 1639: Crosby and his associates Lord Esmond and Marcus Cheevers were found guilty of spreading scandal against the Lord Deputy and heavily fined.

generall' interrogatories.³⁴ But Wentworth was not put off by Laud's warning that many at Court had taken exception to the very general nature of the interrogatories as well as to Wentworth's failure to send Holland a courteous note requesting his cooperation in this case, before writing to the King.³⁵ He admitted to Northumberland that it scarcely mattered whether Holland testified or not, as far as his case against Crosby was concerned. He insisted that his determination to force him into court was a matter of principle: in fact it was nothing more than a trial of strength.³⁶

Wentworth responded to this refusal by informing Holland in a letter of 3 December that he had written to the Privy Council 'to Crave the Signification of their finall Pleasure therin.' His legal advisers in England had not notified him of 'any strong opinion of my lords against the Course; But a Care only soe to direct it, as might be fitt for His Majesties Service, in the person of a privy Counsellor, Which I assent with all my hart.' Wentworth found it difficult to believe that a peer and councillor should have any privilege of exemption from being required to speak as a witness. He reminded Holland that he was also a peer and a privy councillor, but his main thrust was against Holland's description of the case as a private one. He used a familiar argument to raise the status of the case: not only was he a peer and a privy councillor, but 'which is above, and more publike, then either of those, Representing the Sacred Person of my Royall Maister, And Consequently (be it spoken with modesty) in some degree even His Majesty becomes Concerned, in the indignities or foule Conspiracyes, offered or Attempted against me in this Government'. Wentworth commented on the favour which Holland had reportedly shown to

³⁴ *Ibid.* 18/154, Holland to Wentworth 29 Nov 1638.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 7/141, 2 Nov 1638.

³⁶ *Ibid.* 10b/43, 28 Feb 1639: Holland would 'find it very hard soe to slippe from under my fingers'.

Crosby and ended by informing the Earl that although he had originally requested his cooperation as a favour, he would now demand it as a right.³⁷ On the same day Wentworth also wrote to the King to ask that Holland be required to answer his interrogatories. He claimed that the Earl had not only refused him this request, but had also spread a report that Wentworth had once been closely confined due to madness.³⁸ The extent to which Wentworth had pushed the King on this issue can be seen from Laud's remark that Charles had told him in private 'that you asking it as Common Justice, He neither Could nor would deny it. But if you had asked His Councill, He would never have advised it'.³⁹ Wentworth refused to reduce the tension between the Earl and himself, claiming in a letter to Charles that in any contest with Holland regarding their respective abilities to serve him, 'the match would not be overhard'.⁴⁰

Wentworth's attempt to force Holland to testify in court does not appear to have annoyed the Queen as much as his attempt to make Henry Jermyn to do so too. Wisely, in the spring of 1639 he tried to mollify the Queen by dropping his attempt to force Jermyn to testify.⁴¹ In December 1638 he also asked the King's permission to assist the Queen by granting her some concealed Irish land, the profits of which would help pay for her building work at

³⁷ *Ibid.* 10a/229-30.

³⁸ *Ibid.* 3(ii)/22. See also *ibid.* 10a/241-2, Wentworth to Attorney General Bankes 24 Dec 1638.

³⁹ *Ibid.* 7/157, 29 Dec 1638: Laud notified Wentworth that Holland claimed at the Council Board to be willing in principle to comply with Wentworth's request and objected only to the general state of the interrogatories and to certain phrases in the Lord Deputy's letter to the King. See also *ibid.* 10b/24, Wentworth to Cottington 8 Dec 1638.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 3(ii)/42-5, 12 Feb 1639; see also *ibid.* 10a/232-4, Wentworth to Capt Charles Price 8 Dec 1638.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 3(ii)/65, Wentworth to Sir John Winter 6 April 1639.

Wimbledon.⁴² In the summer of 1639 Wentworth wrote to Dorset, the Queen's Chamberlain, to put his side of the Crosby case.⁴³ But Holland's influence had not abated and in January 1639 his appointment as General of the Horse, over the head of the Earl of Essex, reminded Wentworth of Holland's standing with the King.⁴⁴ In March Holland was apparently casting doubt on Wentworth's much vaunted integrity by rumouring that the Lord Deputy was prepared for Lady Carlisle's sake to allow Henry Percy the grant of an Irish manor to pay a debt incurred at tennis, and by the spring of 1639 Holland was once more engaged in an Irish matter.⁴⁵

The remainder of Holland's correspondence with Wentworth concerns the Lord Deputy's treatment of Lord Chancellor Loftus and Holland's attempts to gain him the right to come to England to appeal directly to the King. Holland wrote to Wentworth in April 1639, openly stating that Loftus had requested and received his assistance and also acknowledging the fact that the Lord Chancellor had so far failed to perform 'those legall dutyes of his obadience unto your Lordships decree'. Loftus had now, however, assured Holland that he would submit to the decree in its entirety and Holland had informed the King of this. There would then be no reason to stay his departure from

⁴² *Ibid.* 3(ii)/39, Wentworth to Charles I 10 Dec 1638; *ibid.* 3(ii)/47, same to same 10 Feb 1639.

⁴³ *Ibid.* 10a/339, 24 July 1639.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 7/160, Laud to Wentworth 31 Jan 1639.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 7/174v, Laud to Wentworth received 22 March 1639; *ibid.* 7/176v, same to same 31 March 1639. Holland appears to have fallen into a trap set for him by Henry Percy with the approval of the Queen; *ibid.* 10a/261, Henry Percy to Wentworth 27 Feb 1639; *ibid.* 10a/263-4, Wentworth to Percy 23 March 1639, mentioning that Holland had taken the bait as rumours had reached Wentworth of reports that he was favouring his friends over the King. Interestingly, Wentworth did not inform Laud of this trick until Laud wrote of the rumours spreading at Court; *ibid.* 7/169v-70, 22 March 1639.

Ireland.⁴⁶ Wentworth's reply rejected Holland's description of his post as 'your Lordships great office', asserting that it 'is but an empty Representation, which moves only as it is informed by His Majesties Excellent Wisdome, and effects only soe farr as it is Sustayned by His Majestyes Royall Authority. Soe as it is most truly to be sayd That the King only governes here and noe other, bee it Place or Person.' Moreover, he had apparently been unable to discover the grounds of Loftus's appeal, but the Lord Chancellor had only himself to blame for his imprisonment and sufferings. Wentworth claimed to be very keen to see Loftus's case heard by the King.⁴⁷ Holland persisted in attempting to effect its removal to London, knowing that Wentworth would have to stretch his credit with the King to prevent it.⁴⁸ Wentworth's arrival in England and the failure of Loftus's appeal to the King did not signal the end of Holland's influence at court: as Groom of the Stool he continued to have access to the King, accompanying him north in the summer of 1640. He appears to have been trusted by both the King and Queen until the autumn of 1641, when he joined his relatives in opposition.⁴⁹ Indeed, Holland probably believed he had had the last laugh when he gave evidence at Wentworth's trial, asserting that the Lord Lieutenant had indeed urged the King to adopt arbitrary practices if parliament refused him supply.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 18/26, 27 April 1639.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 10a/309-11, 18 May 1639.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* 18/84, Holland to Wentworth 23 July 1639. See also *ibid.* 10a/340-41, Wentworth to Holland 3 Aug 1639; *ibid.* 10a/355, same to same 29 Aug 1639. In this final letter, Wentworth informed Holland that he would soon be in England himself and that he would attend to the Loftus case in person.

⁴⁹ Regarding Loftus's hearing see Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, pp. 617-8, Northumberland to Leicester 14 Nov 1639; *De L'Isle VI*, p. 203, Lady Carlisle to Lady Leicester 21 Nov 1639. His relatives included Warwick, Essex, Northumberland and the Countesses of Carlisle and Leicester.

⁵⁰ *Journals of the House of Lords*, vol. IV, p. 209; Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 346.

During the mid-1630s Wentworth cultivated two northern peers who he hoped might act as counter balances to the influence of Holland. Wentworth and Newcastle, both born in 1593, may have known each other in their younger years as Newcastle spent part of his childhood with his uncle, Gilbert Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, with whom Wentworth's father had dealings.⁵¹ By 1629 they enjoyed a friendly correspondence and Newcastle discussed his attempts to win favour at Court with Wentworth, asking advice on how he should proceed, and hoping that he could assist him with his attempts at securing preferment.⁵² He was deeply disillusioned by the summer of 1633, having spent a vast amount on entertaining the King, apparently without any benefit to himself. Wentworth agreed with the Earl's view that his attempts to secure preferment might well be too obvious and counter-productive; he promised to ask the Earl of Carlisle for his advice.⁵³ But Newcastle decided that it was worthwhile to have another attempt, and treated the King and Queen to a magnificent few days' entertainment in 1634.⁵⁴ Despite failing to secure a position at Court, Newcastle visited London often enough to keep Wentworth abreast of news, and in particular how his handling of affairs in Ireland was

⁵¹ Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle*, ed. C. H. Firth (2nd. ed. London, 1906), pp. 1-2.

⁵² See especially Str. P. 12/125, Newcastle to Wentworth 17 Aug 1630; University of Nottingham, Portland Collection, Pw1 no. 97, Lord Clifford to Newcastle, 21 June (no year, but refers to Wentworth as 'my Lord President').

⁵³ Str. P. 13/21, Newcastle to Wentworth 5 Aug 1633; *ibid.* 8/22-3, Wentworth to Newcastle 30 Sept 1633; *ibid.* 8/132-3, same to same 19 July 1634, in which Wentworth deemed himself fit to advise Newcastle on how to conduct himself at Court. See also Cedric C. Brown, 'Courtesies of Place and Arts of Diplomacy in Ben Jonson's last two entertainments for royalty', *The Seventeenth Century* 9 (1994), pp. 147-171, esp. p. 151.

⁵⁴ Str. P. 14/86, Newcastle to Wentworth 29 May 1634.

received.⁵⁵ On his appointment in May 1638 as the Prince's governor, Wentworth congratulated Newcastle by advising him that as he owed his appointment solely to the King's favour, he should not make himself the creature of any other man. In case Newcastle failed to realise who Wentworth was referring to, the Lord Deputy followed this up with a criticism of Holland's behaviour towards him and some gossip concerning the Earl's relationship with the Duchesse de Chevreuse.⁵⁶ But Newcastle did not achieve high office during Wentworth's lifetime and a more promising candidate to counter Holland's influence was Algernon Percy, Earl of Northumberland.

Although Wentworth and Northumberland do not appear to have corresponded regularly before 1635, other evidence suggests that there were contacts between them: Sir Arthur Ingram sold his place as Secretary to the Council of the North in the spring of 1632 to John Melton, who had served Northumberland as receiver of his rents and who was 'much respected' by Wentworth.⁵⁷ The Earl of Carlisle recommended that Wentworth develop a friendship with Northumberland.⁵⁸ In 1636 Northumberland was appointed General of the Fleet and apparently performed his duties to the satisfaction of the King. Both Laud and Wentworth were pleased at Northumberland's appointment as a privy councillor,⁵⁹ and Laud promised to try and hold on to the Earl and prevent him from being drawn into an association with Holland. Northumberland's good will was especially valuable as he was clearly in the

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 15/112, 17 June 1635; *ibid.* 18/57, 15 June 1638; *ibid.* 18/76, 30 June 1638.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* 10a/151-3, Wentworth to Newcastle 1 June 1638; *ibid.* 18/33, Garrard to Wentworth 10 May 1638.

⁵⁷ PRO, C115 M35/8404, Pory to Scudamore 28 April 1632.

⁵⁸ Str. P. 13/220, George Wentworth to Wentworth 13 March 1634.

⁵⁹ Northumberland was sworn a privy councillor on 5 November 1636, PRO, Privy Council Registers [hereafter PC] 2/46, p. 435.

Queen's favour.⁶⁰ His complaints about the state of the Admiralty appeared to signify to Laud and Wentworth that they had found a like mind in the Earl and Wentworth expressed his view to Laud that Northumberland ought to be a member of the Admiralty commission. The Earl was the head of a long established and substantial landed family and it was men such as Northumberland (and Wentworth himself) who the Lord Deputy believed ought to serve the King, rather than those who wished to make their fortunes in the King's service.⁶¹

Northumberland featured as a topic of interest in Wentworth's correspondence with Laud. He passed Wentworth's suggestions on to the King, who insisted that he wished Northumberland to serve for a longer period with the fleet before he would place him on the commission.⁶² Laud's next assignment from Wentworth was to suggest to Charles that the Admiralty ought to be in the hands of one man. The King's response to this was that the place was reserved

⁶⁰ Str. P. 6/364, 15 Nov 1636. By December Laud and Wentworth appear to have been confident that Northumberland 'hath no opinion of 112 (Holland)', *ibid.* 7/4, Laud to Wentworth 5 Dec 1636; *ibid.* 7/6, Wentworth to Laud 31 Dec 1636.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 7/6, Wentworth to Laud 31 Dec 1636. Conway informed Wentworth that Northumberland's complaints about the state on the navy had infuriated Secretary Coke; *ibid.* 8/426, 4 Jan 1637. Wentworth's reply shows that he found this amusing; *ibid.* 8/429, 11 March 1637: 'I use to tell Mr Secretary Coke That the Admirallty is his Mistresse, nor doth hee willingly admitt any to come neare, soe as if the yongue Earle be snackering about her, it is noe wonder if the old man grow Jealouse.' Northumberland himself had quickly grown disillusioned about his command, complaining that if £4 a day was all the reward he could expect, he would rather the service were taken over by someone else, *ibid.* 10a/17, Northumberland to Wentworth 24 Feb 1637. See also *ibid.* 10a/17-18, same to same 28 April 1637, in which the Earl points out that the King needed to take a firm resolution regarding the use of the fleet, otherwise England would simply be toyed with by France and Spain.

⁶² *Ibid.* 6/364, Laud to Wentworth 15 Nov 1636; *ibid.* 7/13, same to same 18 Jan 1637.

for his three-year old son James, Duke of York, although Wentworth failed to see why Northumberland could not be appointed until the Duke reached adulthood.⁶³ In March 1638 Northumberland informed Wentworth that the King had decided to appoint him Lord Admiral until the Duke came of age. Until it was announced the appointment was kept secret and ‘very few but the Queene knewe any thing of it. One presently Retired to Kensington, and other Pretenders are nothing well pleased to see this office thus disposed of.’⁶⁴ This was greeted as very good news by Wentworth and it was followed two months later by the King’s appointment of Newcastle as governor of the Prince of Wales.

Northumberland’s presence at Court was beneficial to Wentworth. He was willing to keep Wentworth informed of the Court’s reaction to the Loftus affair and Wentworth clearly respected him for the manner in which he handled his suggestions. Shortly after Northumberland’s appointment, Wentworth sent him some ideas regarding the requirements of Irish shipping, which Northumberland believed would trench too greatly on his powers as

⁶³ *Ibid.* 7/6 Wentworth to Laud 31 Dec 1636; *ibid.* 7/15, Laud to Wentworth 11 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 7/19, Wentworth to Laud 28 Feb 1637.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 10a/119, 21 March 1638 and see also *ibid.* 7/111, Laud to Wentworth 30 May 1638: ‘There was much laughing at it here in private, but both 28, 19, 4, 12, and 112 [Holland], beare it out now as they were wont to doe. But Certainly 29, 10, 112 [Holland], 500 are not now soe much trusted by 15, and 101 [the Queen], 24, as heretofore’. See also *ibid.* 10a/124, Conway to Wentworth 3 April 1638 in which the writer informed Wentworth that Holland was one of the few who had been informed beforehand: ‘I doe beleeve that hee knew from the King the tyme that Hee would at the Councill declare my lord of Northumberland Admirall’. This appears to have been another example of Charles’s occasional sensitivity towards the feelings of his ministers and courtiers; note his similar handling of Laud in March 1636 when he appointed Juxon Lord Treasurer, above, pp. 142-3. Henry Percy believed that Holland’s anger at witnessing the Queen’s support for Northumberland had led to him distancing himself from her; *ibid.* 18/10, Percy to Wentworth 3 April [1638].

Lord Admiral. He answered Wentworth firmly but politely, suggesting that unsuitable men could be removed from Irish naval offices on Wentworth's advice.⁶⁵ During the next eighteen months Wentworth shared his thoughts on the developing crisis in Scotland with Northumberland. He felt comfortable enough with the Earl to commit to paper criticisms of the way in which both James I and his son had chosen to govern England and Scotland as two separate kingdoms. Wentworth clearly believed that the actions of the covenanters would result in a change of policy on the part of the 'English' Crown. As far as his own views were concerned, the Lord Deputy would steer a middle course between the two views being expressed at Court. While 'It was not the Custome of the Best and Mildest of kings to be Threatned into parliaments', it was also not wise to launch into an immediate war, without giving the Scots time 'to Come to their witts againe'. This did not preclude the establishment of sound military defences, however, and it was particularly important that the towns of Berwick and Carlisle be garrisoned effectively and that the trained bands of the northern counties be put in readiness. Wentworth discussed with Northumberland his plans to move a substantial part of the Irish army up to Ulster. Wentworth recognised that the shortage of money would present difficulties and he hoped - but was not convinced - that men would give freely.⁶⁶ Two days later he wrote again to Northumberland, repeating in greater detail much of his previous advice, but also mentioning the fact that Charles was entitled to call the nobility to perform forty days' service at their own charge. Above all, it was crucial that the whole business be entrusted to

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 10b/1, Northumberland to Wentworth 23 July 1638; *ibid.* 10b/5-6, Wentworth to Northumberland 30 July 1638. When Loftus's case was finally heard before the King in November 1639, Northumberland informed Leicester that in his opinion the Lord Chancellor had answered very poorly and that he was likely to regret not having simply submitted to his punishment; Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, pp. 617-8, 14 Nov 1639.

⁶⁶ Str. P. 10b/4-8, 30 July 1638.

‘some Sober Stayed person’, someone, say, like the Lord Deputy.⁶⁷ In September Northumberland was sent a criticism of the activities of the Earl of Antrim, Wentworth believing that the Lord Admiral might be a means to persuade the King and Queen to drop their support for Antrim’s plans.

Wentworth was willing to share his thoughts with Northumberland and the Admiral was willing to reciprocate. In January 1639, Northumberland expressed his opinion that Hamilton’s venture had not gained anything and that the Marquis would soon be returning south. In terms of military preparations, he gloomily noted the Crown’s weak financial situation and the poor response of the nobility to the King’s demand for volunteers.⁶⁸ Wentworth’s reply shows that while he agreed with Northumberland’s views in general, and repeated his view that it was not wise to begin a war just yet, he stated that the Scots were no better equipped financially to fight a war and that they lacked military experience. He reminded Northumberland of the need to establish adequate garrisons in Berwick and Carlisle and to press this point on the King. It was clearly important for the King to appoint trusted and able governors and garrison commanders for the northern towns and Wentworth requested Northumberland’s assistance to ensure that Viscount Wilmot was not appointed governor of Newcastle.⁶⁹ In late February Wentworth informed Northumberland that he had requested permission from the King to come to England, but that this had been refused. This particular letter is unusually pessimistic in tone, probably due to this disappointment, and it contains a frank criticism of Charles’s personality and kingship with which

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 10b/10, 1 Aug 1638; see also *ibid.* 10b/13-15, 28 Aug 1638; Fissel, *The Bishops’ Wars*, pp. 152-162; Donald, *An uncounselled king*, p. 96; Keith M. Brown, ‘The Scottish Aristocracy, Anglicization and the Court, 1603-38’, *Historical Journal* 36 (1993), p. 556.

⁶⁸ Str. P. 10b/31, 2 Jan 1639.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 10b/33, 10 Feb 1639.

Northumberland doubtless agreed. Wentworth hoped that the King's 'naturall great Secresye turne not in a business of soe many peeces, as this is like to prove, very much to the preiudice of His Affaires'.⁷⁰ He made a similar criticism in April, commenting on the King's reserved nature and how he gave out information very sparingly, particularly to the Lord Deputy regarding Antrim's plan to invade the western isles. Northumberland was also informed of Wentworth's opinion that the extreme danger presented by the Earl of Argyll could have been avoided if Antrim's plans had not been countenanced and supported by both Hamilton and Charles. Wentworth informed Northumberland in some detail of the King's involvement in this scheme.⁷¹

In August 1639 Northumberland welcomed Wentworth's departure from Ireland, telling him that 'wise and faithfull Counsells were never more needfull then at this tyme'. He informed Wentworth that the Court was beginning to take notice of the fact that he was soon to arrive in England.⁷² Wentworth's reply contained the optimistic belief that the English people could be taught to show good affections towards the King's service and that the necessary funds to renew this conflict could be raised.⁷³ Wentworth's next surviving correspondence with Northumberland discusses his visit to Ireland in 1640 and again shows his optimism that the King's financial situation could be improved if the English Parliament followed the good example of the Irish assembly.⁷⁴ Several months before this time, however, Northumberland had

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 10b/43-5, 28 Feb 1639.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* 10b/63-9, 15 April 1639. For Northumberland's views on the King's reluctance to consult the Privy Council concerning Scotland, see *De L'Isle VI*, p. 182, Northumberland to Leicester 4 Sept 1639.

⁷² Str. P. 10b/128, 11 Aug 1639.

⁷³ *Ibid.* 10b/128, 2 Sept 1639,

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 10b/142-3, 24 March 1640, in which Wentworth boasted of his success with the Irish Parliament: 'my lord of Holland will hardly be perswaded to beleve the truth of it yet

realised that he and Wentworth did not share a very similar approach to the handling of the Scottish crisis. The Lord Deputy's friendship towards Spain was a factor in this and was, in Northumberland's opinion, likely to ruin Leicester's attempts to bring to fruition an alliance with France. Wentworth, as well as Laud and Hamilton, were perceived by Northumberland to be 'as much Spanish as Olivares' and he warned his brother-in-law to bear that in mind in his relations with Wentworth.⁷⁵ Lady Leicester was informed of the same cooling of relations by her sister.⁷⁶ Northumberland found it difficult to share the Lord Deputy's hopes that an English Parliament would supply the King adequately and on a personal level he was not prepared to lend Charles more than £5000, explaining to Leicester that he failed to see why the King should expect as much assistance from him as from those whose personal fortunes had benefited from the royal bounty.⁷⁷ In December 1639 Northumberland regretted the presence at Court of 'Incendiaries' and in May 1640 believed that his earlier views had been vindicated: the present appalling situation had come about due to the lack of wisdom of certain individuals, one of whom was Wentworth. 'Never Man hath beene so used, as the King our Maister, in all the Counsells that have beene given him concerning this Warr, by those Persons,

this quarter of a yeare.' The rest of their extant correspondence from this period concerns the stay of Scottish shipping and other military matters; see *ibid.* 10b/139, Northumberland to Wentworth 6 March 1640; *ibid.* 10b/140, Wentworth to Northumberland 9 March 1640; *ibid.* 10b/144, Northumberland to Wentworth 25 March 1640; *ibid.* 10b/145, same to same 4 April 1640; *ibid.* 10b/145-9, Wentworth to Northumberland 9 April 1640, in which Wentworth craved Northumberland's pardon if he had overstepped the limits of his commission in handling the stay of Scottish shipping in Ireland; *ibid.* 10b/149-50, same to same 12 April 1640.

⁷⁵ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol II, p. 617, 14 Nov 1639; *ibid.* p. 621, 5 Dec 1639.

⁷⁶ *De L'Isle VI*, p. 201, 7 Nov 1639; *ibid.* p. 204, 21 Nov 1639. By December Lady Carlisle had noted the growing friendship between Northumberland and Vane, and Wentworth's reaction to it; *ibid.* pp. 207-8, 5 Dec 1639.

⁷⁷ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 629, 9 Jan 1640.

whos Iudgments he only trusted, for the Governing of these Affaires'. Charles himself was not free from criticism, but it was his pro-Spanish councillors who had encouraged the King to follow a disastrous course of action.⁷⁸

If Northumberland had distanced himself from the Lord Deputy by the autumn of 1639, his sister, the Countess of Carlisle, remained supportive of Wentworth and hopeful that he could help advance the fortunes of her family. The Earl of Carlisle had named Wentworth and Northumberland joint feoffees in trust for Lady Carlisle's jointure and the Lord Deputy also oversaw the complex sale of the wine imposts for the widowed Countess.⁷⁹ In 1638 she

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* p. 623, Northumberland to Leicester 12 Dec 1639; *ibid.* pp. 653-4, same to same 14 May 1640. See also *ibid.* p. 654, same to same 28 May 1640; *ibid.* pp. 654-5, same to same 4 June 1640; *ibid.* p. 656, same to same 25 June 1640; for quotation, *ibid.* p. 661, same to same 15 Oct 1640. For a more direct criticism of Charles see SP 16/410/80, Northumberland to Conway 29 Jan 1639: 'we dayly meete in councell but to little purpose...the King declares not where he expects to have the Monnie that must defray the expense of his Army'.

⁷⁹ Str. P. 15/210, Carlisle to Wentworth [rec 7 Sept 1635]; *ibid.* 8/372, Wentworth to Lady Carlisle 25 April 1636; *ibid.* 8/377, same to same 14 May 1636; *ibid.* 8/395-8, same to same undated. In December 1637 Charles authorised the Lord Deputy to compensate the Countess with the sum of £16,000 for the return of the wine imposts to the Crown; Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, p. 167. Wentworth was aware of rumours that he had made a great bargain for the Crown by selling them for much less than they were worth; Str. P. 7/64v, Wentworth to Laud 15 Dec 1637; *ibid.* 10a/85-6, Wentworth to Henry Percy 21 Dec 1637; *ibid.* 10a/87-8, Wentworth to Northumberland 22 Dec 1637. Attempts were then made by the Countess's agents to exact a higher price from the Crown. It would appear that Wentworth tried to get the best deal he could for Lady Carlisle, but Laud agreed with Secretary Coke's opinion that any attempt by her agents to raise the price would not be well received by the Irish committee; *ibid.* 7/86v, Laud to Wentworth received 17 Feb 1638. See also *ibid.* 7/89, same to same 27 March 1638, in which Laud warned Wentworth that it would not be in the Lord Deputy's interests to press this matter any further. Wentworth's argument, which he stated to Lady Carlisle herself, was that she should not suffer by her willingness to comply with the King's wishes, when others were not so forward: 'If an Instance be asked you may

requested Wentworth's assistance in managing her Irish estates.⁸⁰ The Lord Deputy in turn used Lady Carlisle as an intermediary with the Queen when trying to persuade Henrietta Maria not to persist in making suits for unsuitable candidates.⁸¹ Wentworth appears to have become somewhat enamoured of the Countess and during his visit to England in the summer of 1636, she had apparently enjoyed renewing their acquaintance. The exact nature of this relationship is not clear: Wedgwood argues that their relationship was platonic, and that Lady Carlisle was probably drawn to Wentworth because of his 'masterful' nature. This is supported by Sir George Radcliffe's insistence that Wentworth had unfairly received a reputation for incontinency. Cottington's comments on Wentworth's relationships with Lady Carlisle and others might suggest otherwise. Whatever their relationship, Wentworth enjoyed it partly because it involved an element of competition with the Earl of Holland.⁸²

safely and fairely name the Duchess of Buckingham', *ibid.* 10a/111-12, 14 April 1638. By November 1638 he was urging the Countess to agree to the settlement; *ibid.* 10a/227-8, 28 Nov 1638; *ibid.* 10a/230-31, Wentworth to Percy 3 Dec 1638. By December 1639, she had not been able to exact a better deal, *CSPD, 1639-1640*, p. 153, Charles I to Wentworth 9 Dec 1639.

⁸⁰ Str. P. 10a/155-6, Wentworth to Lady Carlisle 25 July 1638; *ibid.* 10a/174 Lady Carlisle to Wentworth 20 Aug 1638.

⁸¹ See *ibid.* 10a/307-8, Wentworth to Lady Carlisle 13 May 1639, regarding the Queen's attempt to secure the late Lord Kirkcudbright's horse troop for the young Earl of Desmond..

⁸² Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, pp. 212-3; Str. P. 40/70, Radcliffe [?] to William, 2nd Earl of Strafford undated; *ibid.* 34/not numbered, Radcliffe's 'Digressions to be inserted in fit places' - 'Platoniq love'. On Cottington's comments see above, p. 78. See also *De L'Isle VI*, p. 58, Lady Leicester to Leicester 19 Oct 1636; *ibid.* p. 64, same to same 10 Nov 1636; *ibid.* pp. 67-8, same to same 17 Nov 1636. Wentworth and Lady Carlisle exchanged portraits of each other; Str. P. 21/163, Wentworth to Raylton 15 Nov 1636; Millar, 'Strafford and Van Dyck', pp. 115-120. (Lady Leicester noted that the attentions of powerful men, as well as Lady Carlisle's great wealth, made her more insufferable than ever; *De L'Isle VI*, p. 70, same to same 1 Dec 1636. Conway noted that Northumberland had sent his sister to Holland

Relations within the Percy family were not particularly cordial,⁸³ but Lady Carlisle did try to engage Wentworth's favour for her brother-in-law, the Earl of Leicester, insisting to him that her great friendship with Wentworth could not be anything other than beneficial to him.⁸⁴ In some respects, Wentworth appeared to be willing to perform good services for the Earl. Leicester's suit to the King to have monies owing him paid had previously been made through Holland, but as late as April 1640 Leicester had reason to believe that Wentworth would assist him in his request for payment.⁸⁵ In December 1639 Lady Carlisle informed her sister that Wentworth had enquired after Leicester's eldest son, Lord Lisle, with the intention of moving the King to appoint him colonel of a troop of horse, a sign, Lady Carlisle believed, of the Lord Deputy's intention to favour her sister's family.⁸⁶ In early 1637 Lady Carlisle claimed that due to the Lord Deputy's recent serious attack of gout he would not stay in Ireland much more than a year and Lady Leicester believed that there was some chance of Leicester succeeding him.⁸⁷ On Wentworth's return to England in the autumn of 1639 there was again hope that Leicester might be appointed Lord Deputy, although he was also interested in the position of principal Secretary of State.

in an attempt to persuade him to remit the Earl of Salisbury's forestry fine of £20,000; Str. P. 10a/88, 23 Oct 1637.

⁸³ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 85, Lady Leicester to Leicester 15 Feb 1637; *ibid.* p. 92, same to same 9 March 1637.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* p.215, 24 Dec 1639.

⁸⁵ *De L'Isle VI*, p. 47, Hawkins to Lady Leicester 4 Sept 1636; *ibid.* p. 53, Hawkins to Leicester 28 Sept 1636; *ibid.* p. 243, Leicester to Hawkins 10/20 April 1640.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* p. 211, 12 Dec 1639. See also *ibid.* p. 218, same to same, Lady Carlisle noting that Northumberland was not keen on the idea, believing it would incur expense.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* p. 77, Lady Leicester to Leicester 4 January 1637; *ibid.* p. 83, same to same 7 Feb 1637.

Sir John Temple informed the Earl and Countess of Leicester in early 1639 that Sir John Coke was finding his employment burdensome, and believed - wrongly - that Coke could be persuaded to resign his offices to Leicester. He advised Leicester to apply to the King for leave to come to England, ostensibly to discuss foreign affairs. The Earl did so, applying through Secretary Windebank, supported by Northumberland.⁸⁸ But Coke remained in office, despite a rumour that he would shortly be replaced by Sir William Boswell.⁸⁹ Running along at the same time, though, was discussion concerning Leicester's chances of succeeding Wentworth as Lord Deputy. In early September Northumberland wrote to his brother-in-law that if the Lord Deputy left his Irish employment, he would have great influence over the naming of his successor and that it would be in Leicester's interests to be on good terms with him. Northumberland pointed out that the Queen appeared to be well inclined towards Leicester: her influence was allegedly strong enough to bring about the promotions of men to whom the King had taken exception.⁹⁰ In late September Lady Carlisle reported to Leicester a conversation which she had had with Wentworth: the Lord Deputy had apparently claimed that there was nothing he 'intended so much as the setting [the Earl of Leicester] to be [the

⁸⁸ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 591, Temple to Lady Leicester 4 Feb 1639; *ibid.* pp. 591-3, Temple to Leicester 7 Feb 1639; *ibid.* p. 597, Leicester to Windebank 15 Feb 1639; *ibid.* pp. 597-8, Northumberland to Leicester 22 Feb 1639.

⁸⁹ *De L'Isle VI*, p. 183, Hawkins to Leicester 5 Sept 1639. Hawkins noted that Weckherlin refused to believe this rumour.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 182, 4 Sept 1639. The men named by Northumberland - Kenelm Digby and Wat Montagu - had not, however, been promoted to positions of great importance. Wentworth himself was rumoured to be appointed Lord Treasurer; Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 604, Northumberland to Leicester 21 Aug 1639, although Northumberland later acknowledged that Wentworth did not desire this post, *ibid.* p. 611, same to same 26 Sept 1639.

Lord Deputy], with the greatest profetions and the greatest promises that ever wayr given apone any ocatione, which [Lady Carlisle] dosse ingage herself shall be all performd'.⁹¹ If Lady Carlisle's account of this conversation is to be accepted, Wentworth's attitude towards Leicester is interesting. Wandesford and Dillon had been appointed Lords Justices for the duration of the Lord Deputy's absence, and in January Wandesford himself was raised to the position of Lord Deputy. The Earl of Ormond was in charge of the army in Wentworth's absence and it is likely that Wentworth had earmarked Ormond as a future governor of Ireland. His apparent willingness to support Leicester's candidacy may have been an attempt to retain the goodwill of his relatives, Northumberland in particular, or it may have been an attempt to prevent the emergence from the Queen's Court of a rival bid for the Deputyship.⁹² But by the end of the year, the hope that Leicester would get the Deputyship had faded. In early December Lady Carlisle informed Lady Leicester that Wentworth was now hopeful that the Lord Chamberlain would be removed from his position and that Leicester might succeed him, although she did not believe that this would actually take place.⁹³ A week later, Lady Carlisle wrote to her sister again, that although Wentworth had repeated his promise to use his influence in Leicester's behalf, it was not now likely that Wentworth would relinquish his Irish employment. He was instead to be raised to the status of Lord Lieutenant.

⁹¹ *De L'Isle VI*, p. 192, 26 Sept 1639. See also Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 611, Northumberland to Leicester 26 Sept 1639 mentioning this conversation.

⁹² Over a year later, Holland was rumoured to be the next Lord Deputy; *De L'Isle VI*, p. 346, Lady Carlisle to Leicester 3 Dec 1640: 'Thay say that [the Earl of Holland] pretends to be [Lord Deputy of Ireland] but I think her the unliklest ine all the kingdome, though I have sume resone to beleeve that she desiers it'; also Bodl., Clarendon MSS, vol. 19, no. 1476, William Aylesbury to Hyde 24 Dec 1640/4 Jan 1641 from Paris.

⁹³ *De L'Isle VI*, pp. 207-8, 5 Dec 1639.

By the end of the year, Leicester's chances of receiving the Secretaryship instead had also waned. In November, he had received a setback when the Queen was unable to use her considerable influence to get him appointed Secretary. Northumberland professed to be surprised to witness how 'peremptorily' the King refused to appoint Leicester. Northumberland attributed the King's attitude to the malign influence of Archbishop Laud, who had taken offence at the Earl's conduct towards Viscount Scudamore. Wentworth was apparently still keen to assist Leicester, but had made it clear to Lady Carlisle that her brother-in-law would not get the Secretaryship.⁹⁴ The Queen appears also to have dropped Leicester as a candidate for the post and backed the Treasurer of the Household, Sir Henry Vane, who had gained her favour during 1639 and who, according to Temple, was prepared to offer £4000 for the post.⁹⁵ On 16 January 1640 Hawkins reported to Leicester that Coke's temporary absence from Court had given rise to rumours that he would be replaced as Secretary by Vane. Hawkins added, 'I heare my Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is firme to Mr Secretary Coke, and that his Lordships taking away the Baronie of Raby causeth Mr Treasurer to seeke recompence this way.'⁹⁶ On the same day, Northumberland wrote to his brother-in-law with more detailed news. He reported that Lord Treasurer Juxon had been sent by the King to Secretary Coke to require him to retire from office. This was 'immediately submitted unto by the olde Noddie. Thus farre it proceeded, without the Knowledge of the Archebishop, Hamilton, the Lifenant of Ireland, or any other Minister in this Court; nor had the Lord Treasurer any Guesse, for

⁹⁴ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, pp. 618-9, Northumberland to Leicester 21 Nov 1639. Laud's longstanding friendship with Viscount Scudamore is revealed in their correspondence; see PRO, C115 M12/7223; *ibid.* M24/7758-76; BL, Additional MS. 11044, ff. 92-95. See also Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud*, pp. 437-56.

⁹⁵ *De L'Isle VI*, p. 158, Lady Leicester to Leicester 8 Jan 1639; *ibid.* pp. 158-9, same to same 15 Jan 1639.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 224.

whom the Place was intended.⁹⁷ Northumberland appears to have underestimated the influence of the Marquis of Hamilton whose support of Vane was at least in part responsible for his preferment.⁹⁸

The very next day Coke made his complaints to Wentworth and, as the news that Vane was the intended successor began to leak out, the Lord Lieutenant made strenuous efforts to maintain Coke in office. Northumberland believed that Wentworth's efforts were unlikely to move the King in Coke's favour. Laud's recent change of attitude towards Leicester had come too late.⁹⁹ Northumberland advised his brother-in-law to try and develop better relations with Laud, but that what he wrote should be in the general sense and certainly not refer to Wentworth's role in the matter.¹⁰⁰ The Lord Admiral believed that Laud's favour would be important if Leicester was to succeed Cottington as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Wentworth had apparently informed Lady Carlisle that Cottington was seriously ill, but that Leicester's chances of getting the position depended on him approaching Laud and winning the Archbishop's support:

⁹⁷ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 631, Northumberland to Leicester 16 Jan 1640.

⁹⁸ John Nalson, *An Impartiall Collection of the Great Affairs of State* (2 vols. London, 1682-3), vol. II, p. 86.

⁹⁹ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 631, Northumberland to Leicester 16 Jan 1640; see also *De L'Isle VI*, 23 Jan 1640. Also on 16 January Robert Read informed Thomas Windebank that Coke would soon be retiring and that Vane was believed to be his intended successor, SP 16/442/16. Eight days later, Secretary Windebank wrote to Sir Thomas Roe that Vane had been voiced as the intended Secretary, but that Coke himself was still at Court, SP 16/442/101, 24 Jan 1640. Vane was granted the office of Secretary on 3 February, *CSPD, 1639-1640*, p. 419; SP 16/444/51, Vane to Roe 7 Feb 1640; SP 16/444/52, Windebank to Roe 7 Feb 1640. Laud had tried to gain the post for Roe, Laud, *Works*, vol. VII, p. 588, Laud to Roe 20 Sept 1639; *ibid.* 598, same to same 14 Feb 1640; Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud*, pp. 375-6.

¹⁰⁰ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, p. 636, Northumberland to Leicester 13 Feb 1640.

‘Askt whether [the Earl of Leicester] would hartily be [the Archbishop of Canterbury’s] friend becaus that must be sayd and promist, which [Deputy] would not do but with a beleef it should be mayd good, [Lady Carlisle’s] answer wase that [the Earl of Leicester] wase so just as he could not receave ane oblegatione without being ingaged, and desiered [Deputy] to speake of it to [the Lord Admiral] and then to [the Archbishop of Canterbury].’¹⁰¹

Wentworth’s insistence on Leicester approaching Laud and promising him friendship at least gave the Lord Lieutenant an excuse if he was not able to secure an office for the Earl. Wentworth probably understood that without the strong support of the Queen, Leicester was unlikely to receive any preferment, and in effect he misled Leicester as to the extent of Laud’s influence at Court. The main opposition to Leicester may well have come from the King himself, partly through irritation at the Earl’s persistent requests for payment of his expenses, and partly due to Charles’s suspicions regarding his religious views.¹⁰²

In early 1640, government ministers might not have known the fate of the Secretaryship, but it is likely that the Queen was kept informed. As with the Treasury in 1635-6, she had managed to find a candidate acceptable to the King, and in this case well-liked by the Marquis of Hamilton. Henrietta Maria appears to have made some effort to avoid a breakdown in relations between

¹⁰¹ *De L’Isle VI*, pp. 233-4, Lady Carlisle 27 Feb 1640.

¹⁰² Regarding Leicester’s religious views see *ibid.* pp. 355-8, Leicester to Charles I undated. Leicester had heard that Sir Kenelm Digby had told the King that he was a puritan. Leicester attacked Digby, not only regarding this accusation and Digby’s Catholic and traitorous parentage, but also because of his apparent boasts that certain positions in government were his for the taking.

herself and Wentworth, sending Henry Jermyn to see the Lord Lieutenant to express his respects. Lady Carlisle believed that this was ‘donne apone desighne and that sune usse must be mayd of the Lady (i.e. Wentworth) that I have so mutch ingaged my self shall ever serve you.’¹⁰³ Given the King’s increasing reliance on the Lord Lieutenant regarding preparations for the second Bishops’ War, the Queen’s conduct towards Wentworth is understandable.

The Earl and Countess of Leicester continued to hope that Wentworth would be able to secure preferment for Leicester and therefore maintained a close association with him. In February the Lord Lieutenant, accompanied by Northumberland and Lady Carlisle, inspected Leicester’s London home with a view to Wentworth taking up residence there.¹⁰⁴ On 1 May, Leicester wrote to Hawkins informing him that he had written to both the King and Queen requesting that his arrearages be paid. He had also written to Wentworth asking that he support this suit, as well as to Lord Treasurer Juxon and his brothers-in-law Northumberland and Henry Percy.¹⁰⁵ In the aftermath of the dissolution of the Short Parliament, Lady Carlisle was still confident that Wentworth would achieve success for Leicester. According to the Countess, Wentworth had explained to Laud that nothing could encourage Northumberland more than the preferment of his brother-in-law. The Lord Lieutenant was also willing to use his own influence with the King and

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* pp. 231-2, Lady Carlisle to Leicester 13 Feb 1640.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* p. 232, Hawkins to Leicester 20 Feb 1640; *ibid.* p. 235, same to same 5 March 1640; *ibid.* p. 233, Lady Carlisle to Lady Leicester 27 Feb 1640. The honour of housing the Lord Lieutenant brought with it problems: on Wentworth’s journey north in the late summer, Leicester was relieved that his house might now escape any attack; *ibid.* p. 327, Leicester to Hawkins 11 Sept 1640.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* p. 258, 1 May 1640.

believed that he would be assisted by Henrietta Maria.¹⁰⁶ Later in May, Lady Carlisle was able to report further that Wentworth appeared to be receiving very public marks of the Queen's favour. She had given him the use of some rooms of her own, 'with great expretions of her favor.' But Wentworth's rise in the Queen's favour was matched by the decline of Northumberland. Lady Carlisle reported that Wentworth believed that Northumberland's unhelpful attitude to the King's affairs was likely to damage his family's prospects. The King had apparently taken the view that other members of the Lord Admiral's family shared his political opinions.¹⁰⁷ The Queen continued to be pressed to move Charles to grant some mark of public favour to Leicester; in July Henry Percy set his sights on the blue ribbon of the Order of the Garter for his brother-in-law, but it was evident by the summer of 1640 that the King was unwilling to bestow any favour on Leicester.¹⁰⁸

But in November 1640 the meeting of the Long Parliament introduced another element into the game of court politics. The parliamentary attack on government ministers meant that there would be a number of vacant posts and as Leicester was not directly associated with the old regime, he stood a good chance of receiving preferment - if Charles could be brought to understand the need to appoint more 'moderate' men. Northumberland recognised this opportunity and wrote to Leicester that he hoped he might become either Lord Treasurer, Lord Deputy of Ireland or Chancellor of the Exchequer.¹⁰⁹ In December Lady Carlisle believed that Leicester could gain the Treasury,

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 261-2, Lady Carlisle to Leicester 7 May 1640. See also *ibid.* pp. 260-261, Hawkins to Leicester 7 May 1640. Wentworth's illness, as well as the desperate shortage of money, led Hawkins to accept that he could not realistically expect Leicester's arrears to be paid; *ibid.* p. 271, same to same 21 May 1640.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 270-271, Lady Carlisle to Lady Leicester 21 May 1640.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* p. 308, Percy to Leicester 30 July 1640.

¹⁰⁹ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 663, 13 Nov 1640; *ibid.* p. 664, 26 Nov 1641.

although she was convinced that Northumberland was more in favour of the Deputyship. The death of Lord Deputy Wandesford appeared to open up this position for Leicester, and indeed Wentworth himself had apparently urged Charles to appoint a new Lord Deputy to remove the suspicion held by some in Parliament that the King meant to retain the Lord Lieutenant in his service. Windebank's flight to France created another important vacancy. But the main obstacle to Leicester's preferment appears to have been the attitude of Charles himself. A comment made by Lady Carlisle to her sister in November 1640 that the King had not departed from his long-held resolution that he 'will not have any body so qualifyd as is [the Earl of Leicester]' as Secretary needs to be taken on board, although this probably served as the King's excuse, rather than a balanced judgement. The King's comment is also noted in a letter from Northumberland to Leicester, but according to Northumberland, Charles was ill satisfied with Leicester 'bycause he will not periure himselfe for Wentworth' and when the Lord Admiral discussed Leicester's suitability for posts other than the Secretaryship, the King 'made a very colde Returne'.¹¹⁰

Leicester's cause was probably not helped by antagonisms within his wife's family. These went back many years, particularly the strife between Lady Carlisle and Henry Percy. Relations were also not good between Lady Carlisle and Northumberland: Lady Carlisle informed her sister that the moving for the Deputyship would have to be done through Wentworth and the Queen herself; Northumberland was 'so bakword ine ingaging her self in this tims (sic), as

¹¹⁰ This referred to Leicester's chances of succeeding Windebank, who shortly after fled to France to avoid parliamentary investigation; *De L'Isle VI*, p. 340, 10 Nov 1640. Northumberland echoed his sister's comment the following month in a letter to Leicester. He too failed to accept this as a genuine reason and believed that Charles was reluctant to give Leicester any preferment whatsoever; Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, pp. 664-5, 10 Dec 1640. I am grateful to Professor Russell for making me aware of the King's comment.

she will have the less power to serve [the Earl of Leicester]'. But Northumberland believed strongly that a cautious position was vital. He pointed out that both the King and Queen were confident that they could weather the storm and that few changes at Court would be made.¹¹¹ Northumberland himself disapproved of Henry Percy's approach to the Queen to try and secure Leicester's return to England, before Leicester himself had been consulted. He also warned his brother-in-law that he could expect little assistance from Henry Jermyn if he planned to try and win the Secretaryship, as Jermyn would only employ his influence in favour of a candidate over whom he would have some influence.¹¹² Clearly, then, the Percy-Sidney family scarcely acted as a united bloc and by early 1641, some of Leicester's friends regarded Jermyn as the person most likely to be able to secure preferment for the Earl.

In January 1641, according to Temple, Jermyn had claimed that there was a possible competitor for the Deputyship in the person of Vane, and that the Queen was as yet unable to remove the impression made on the King by Laud's continuing dislike of Leicester.¹¹³ But Temple clearly believed that Jermyn's preference for Vane could be removed if he were offered a large enough sum of money and, accordingly, £4000 was offered to secure the Deputyship for Leicester. This was done without previously consulting Leicester, but Temple claimed that it was most necessary. A few days later, Temple was of the opinion that this bribe had had the desired effect, although it would appear from his correspondence with Leicester that the Earl ordered

¹¹¹ *De L'Isle VI*, p. 346, Lady Carlisle to Lady Leicester 3 Dec 1640; *ibid.* p. 348, Hawkins to Leicester 10 Dec 1640; *ibid.* pp. 350-352, Lady Carlisle to Lady Leicester 17 Dec 1640; Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, pp. 664-5, Northumberland to Leicester 3 Dec 1640.

¹¹² *De L'Isle VI*, p. 353, 24 Dec 1640; see also *ibid.* p. 354, Percy to Leicester 24 Dec 1640.

¹¹³ *Ibid.* p. 362, Temple to Leicester 14 Jan 1641.

the withdrawal of this cash offer. During the next few months, Temple engaged in delicate negotiations in an attempt to secure Jermyn's support. By February Temple believed that Leicester's candidacy was progressing well and that Jermyn had handled the matter admirably. He had apparently been successful in removing the threat from the Earl of Holland, but Temple had now incurred Holland's wrath 'by getting that [command] in [Ireland] which he beleives [Holland] had promised to [Clotworthy] to engage him and the rest for him.'¹¹⁴ According to Temple, Holland's malevolence towards both himself and Leicester was only to be expected and the fact that the Earl's candidacy for the Deputyship had apparently ground to a halt was to be

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 366-8, Temple to Leicester 21 Jan 1641; *ibid.* pp. 369-70, same to same 27 Jan 1641. According to Temple, Jermyn now had great influence with both the King and Queen. Regarding Leicester's disagreement with Temple see *ibid.* pp. 375-6, Temple to Leicester 4 Feb 1641; *ibid.* pp. 378-9, same to same 11 Feb 1641; *ibid.* pp. 382-4, same to same 18 Feb 1641. In these last two letters, Temple assured Leicester that the withdrawal of the cash offer had not resulted in the withdrawal of Jermyn's efforts on Leicester's behalf - nor had Temple in any way engaged Leicester's services in his future capacity as Lord Lieutenant to Jermyn's benefit, beyond granting him some reward by way of suits to the value of £4000. After all his hard work, Temple was also concerned to avoid Leicester declining the post because of the 'retrenchments' then being made: he argued that the position should still be worth at least £8000 *per annum*. Temple also pointed out the advantage to Leicester in moving to Ireland and keeping physically distant from the upheavals at Court, which he believed were not likely to end soon. Northumberland did not regard Holland's chances as great: 'though perhaps he had Vanities enough to hope for it, yet did I never meete with any Person, no not amongst his nearest Freinds, that ever held him fitt for that Employment', Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 665, Northumberland to Leicester 17 Dec 1640. But there were rumours at Court in late January that the Earl of Essex was to be appointed Lord Deputy of Ireland; SP 16/476/95, Sir John Conyers to Viscount Conway 29 Jan 1641. Temple was appointed Master of the Court of Wards in Ireland in 1640; Dorothy Osborne, *Letters to Sir William Temple* ed. Kenneth Parker (London, 1987), p. 5.

attributed to Wentworth's trial, rather than Holland's influence.¹¹⁵ But by mid-March, the lack of progress was beginning to worry Temple, a problem caused in his opinion by the absence of a definite promise of a cash payment to Jermyn. Leicester was advised to write to Jermyn himself in an attempt to discover the reason for this lack of progress; the Earl would also do well to write to Northumberland whose recovery might enable him to become more active on Leicester's behalf.¹¹⁶ In April, Leicester left Paris suddenly, but no visible progress was made during Wentworth's trial and Leicester's eventual appointment to the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland was not made until Wentworth himself was dead.¹¹⁷ This was in contrast to the post of Lord President of the

¹¹⁵ *De L'Isle VI*, pp. 388-9, Temple to Leicester 4 March 1641. Leicester was apparently acceptable to the Irish Commissioners as a future Lord Deputy, although Clotworthy found him to be not puritan enough. Temple commended Lord Lisle's actions in removing a number of pictures hung at Penshurst, presumably pictures of Wentworth.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 391-2, Temple to Leicester 18 March 1641. In April Temple advised the Earl to try and secure his return once Wentworth's trial had ended, but that it should be done quietly to avoid public discussion of his ambitions. To quicken the business Temple believed it sensible to promise that he would endeavour to secure Jermyn a payment of £500 upon Leicester's appointment with the rest to follow later, noting that Jermyn was short of money and would respond well to this offer; *ibid.* pp. 394-7, same to same 1 April 1641. Jermyn's influence with the King and Queen remained strong, *ibid.* pp. 397-8, same to same 8 April 1641, and any possible competition in the shape of Holland and Cottington had faded away; *ibid.* pp. 398-400, same to same 15 April 1641. Leicester was suspicious of Jermyn's dealings and had to be persuaded by Temple that - for whatever motive - it had been Jermyn who had worked hard to solicit the Queen's support and not Montagu, who had apparently claimed the credit for winning the Queen's favour for Leicester; *ibid.* pp. 400-401, same to same 22 April 1641.

¹¹⁷ See SP 16/479/72 Windebank to his son Thomas Windebank, 26 April 1641, requiring his son to attend the Queen and inform her in the Earl's presence of Leicester's noble conduct towards him. Leicester's motives in leaving France were very quickly being discussed: a few days later Windebank informed his son that the news in France was that Leicester had been sent for to take up the Deputyship. Leicester was appointed Lord

Council of the North, which appears to have been filled by Thomas, Lord Savile of Pontefract, in April 1641.¹¹⁸

During the later 1630s Wentworth also developed a useful connection with Henry Percy, who proved to be a valuable source of information regarding court affairs. Percy himself needed Wentworth's assistance in his attempt to become part of the Irish tobacco licensing farm and after warning Percy of the possible risks associated with this business - particularly if Charles were to become involved in war - he was willing to reserve him part of the undertaking.¹¹⁹ In January 1635 Edward Conway had little good to write about Henry Percy, regarding him as a trouble-maker who had caused a breach between the Queen and his sister, but by 1637 relations within the Percy family were not as poor.¹²⁰ Together with his brother Northumberland, Percy negotiated on their sister's behalf regarding the sale of her wine imposts.¹²¹ He also seems to have expected that Wentworth would secure for him the repayment of a debt owed to him by the Crown; the Lord Deputy pointed out firmly that this could not be done without the express permission of the King.¹²² Wentworth had, however, given his approval to Percy's attempt to

Lieutenant of Ireland on 14 June 1641; Moody, Martin and Byrne eds., *A New History of Ireland: vol. IX Maps, Genealogies, Lists*, p. 488. He was removed from office in 1643 because of his desertion to Parliament and replaced with Ormond, who Wentworth had been grooming for the office, but whose closeness to the late Lord Lieutenant had in 1641 rendered him unacceptable to Parliament.

¹¹⁸ Francis Drake, *Eboracum* (London, 1736), p. 370.

¹¹⁹ Str. P. 8/417, Percy to Wentworth 13 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 8/418, Wentworth to Percy 5 March 1637. See also *ibid.* 8/416-17, Percy to Wentworth 23 Jan 1637 and *ibid.* 8/418-20, same to same 13 Feb 1637, both discussing the possibility of war with Spain.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.* 14/275, Conway to Wentworth 20 Jan 1635.

¹²¹ *Ibid.* 10a/79, Percy to Wentworth 17 Oct 1637; *ibid.* 10a/80-81, Wentworth to Percy 24 Nov 1637; *ibid.* 10a/85-6, same to same 21 Dec 1637.

¹²² *Ibid.* 10a/155, Wentworth to Percy 25 July 1638.

induce Holland to believe that the Lord Deputy was prepared to enter into a corrupt deal with Percy. Percy's assurance to Wentworth that the Queen backed this little joke must have strengthened the Lord Deputy's confidence that in the Percy family he had indeed found several means of access to the Queen, powerful enough to neutralise Holland's malice towards him.¹²³

The Queen's Chamberlain, Edward Sackville, Earl of Dorset, was another link between the Lord Deputy and the Court of Henrietta Maria.¹²⁴ In 1634 Dorset's belief that he had lost Wentworth's favour led to an exchange of letters promising each other service, Wentworth asking that he continue to receive Dorset's favour - as he had done in earlier, more difficult times.¹²⁵ Probably on the Queen's behalf, Dorset wrote to Wentworth immediately after the death of Lord Treasurer Weston, in an attempt to discover whether the Lord Deputy would try and put himself forward for the post and in the summer of 1635 Dorset stated that the Queen thought well of the Lord Deputy.¹²⁶ Dorset also corresponded with Wentworth regarding Lady Carew's grant of the profits of first fruits, pointing out that the Queen would be pleased if Lady

¹²³ See above, p. 201.

¹²⁴ The Countess of Dorset also enjoyed royal favour, being appointed governess to the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York; PRO, C115 M31/8126, John Flower to Viscount Scudamore 10 July 1630; *ibid.*, M31/8162, same to same 19 Oct 1633. David Smith has noted Dorset's attempts to lessen the divisions between the Queen's Court and Lord Treasurer Weston in particular; 'Dorset and the Personal Rule', pp. 278-9.

¹²⁵ Str. P. 14/26, Dorset to Wentworth 15 April 1634; *ibid.* 8/111, Wentworth to Dorset 14 May 1634; *ibid.* 14/133, Dorset to Wentworth 12 July 1634; Smith, 'Dorset and the Personal Rule', pp. 180-281.

¹²⁶ Str. P. 8/235, 12 March 1635; see also *ibid.* 8/235-6, Wentworth to Dorset [19 May] 1635 and above, pp. 123-4. Regarding the Queen's alleged favour towards Wentworth see Str. P. 22/123, Dorset to Wentworth 3 July 1635. This probably resulted from the Queen's hope that Wentworth would be able to assist Lady Carew's suit.

Carew were able to enjoy the benefit of the King's grant.¹²⁷ Dorset's attitude towards the prosecution of Sir Piers Crosby, however, shows that he cannot be regarded as an ally of the Lord Deputy at Court,¹²⁸ and the Earl does not appear to have tried to mend their differences. During 1640 Dorset resented Wentworth's increasing control over policy and appears to have become an implacable enemy of the Lord Lieutenant by 1641.¹²⁹

Wentworth maintained a similarly uneasy relationship with George, Lord Goring whose son had married one of the Earl of Cork's daughters. Much of

¹²⁷ *Ibid.* 14/241, Dorset to Wentworth 27 Dec 1634; *ibid.* 8/191, Wentworth to Dorset 19 Feb 1635; *ibid.* 8/335, Dorset to Wentworth undated; see also *ibid.* 8/336, Wentworth to Dorset 12 Jan 1636. The terms of Lady Carew's grant specified that the first fruits and twentieths must bring in £1500 to the Exchequer before she received any benefit and at present profits were not that high: Wentworth was unable to see how they could be raised, but he would assist her if possible in any alternative suit; *ibid.* 8/414, Wentworth to Lady Carew 23 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 3/268-9 Wentworth to Sir Robert Ayton 21 Feb 1637. See also *ibid.* 6/320, Laud to Wentworth 4 Feb 1636, in which Laud asked Wentworth to investigate Lady Carew's grant and why she received no benefit from it: but 'if it be preiudicial to the Church, shee must thinke of some other thing in lieu of it. For against the Church I shall not serve her; nor doth the Queen expect I should. I remember you and I were both of us at the debate of this business at Wallingford Howse; But I protest I have utterly forgotten it.' See also *ibid.* 7/140v, same to same 22 Oct 1638, which discussed Bramhall's promise to Lady Carew to assist her suit and urged Wentworth to proceed with Bramhall's suggestions if he thought they were acceptable, 'for the Lady settts the Queen upon me almost every tyme I come thither [to court]'. See also *ibid.* 7/173, same to same received 22 March 1639 in which Laud repeats his request that Wentworth consider Bramhall's suggestions: the Archbishop saw no hope of peace for him until this was done.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* 10a/339, Wentworth to Dorset 24 July 1639, concerning Crosby's trial in Star Chamber two months previously, in which Wentworth states that he has heard that Dorset 'did not beleeeve one word' of the Lord Deputy's evidence and thought that Crosby ought to be fined lightly because he was 'of weake estate'.

¹²⁹ Smith, 'Dorset and the Personal Rule', pp. 281-2.

their early correspondence concerns the marriage settlement, although Goring did furnish the Lord Deputy with news of court and foreign affairs. Their association became strained towards the end of the decade, caused in part by the fact that both men had an interest in tobacco farming.¹³⁰ As well as developing connections with convinced Protestants such as Northumberland and Leicester, Wentworth also realised the need to gain access to the Queen's Court via more unlikely individuals. Wentworth maintained an advantageous relationship with Sir Toby Matthew, a Roman Catholic who appears not to have been particularly close to the Queen herself, but who did have connections with George Con, papal agent to the Queen.¹³¹ Through Matthew, Wentworth could at least try and dispel the unpleasant rumours concerning his treatment of Catholics in Ireland, one obvious source of friction between himself and the Queen.¹³² Hugh O'Grady thought it possible that Matthew was the man described by Wentworth as a 'private messenger', who he had sent

¹³⁰ There are many letters in Str. P. 8 (from Wentworth) and Str. P. 13 and 14 (from Goring) discussing the Cork marriage. Goring informed Wentworth that relations between the Queen and Weston had improved, *ibid.* 13/20, 2 Aug 1633, and how well esteemed the Lord Deputy was by the Earl and Countess of Carlisle, *ibid.* 13/92, 11 Nov 1633; regarding tobacco see *ibid.* 10a/294-5, Wentworth to Goring 11 April 1639. Goring, together with Cottington, testified at Wentworth's trial that he had not advocated the unbridled use of the prerogative, Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 349.

¹³¹ *DNB*, 'Sir Tobie Matthew'. This article claims that Matthew accompanied Wentworth to Ireland in 1633 and it notes his friendship with Lady Carlisle, 'to whose interest at court Sir Tobie was very greatly indebted'. It is likely that Wentworth knew Matthew through Calvert; Matthew witnessed Calvert's will, *The Calvert Papers*, vol. I, p. 50. On the Queen's interest in Con see *The Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani* ed. Joseph Berington (London, 1793), pp. 255-7.

¹³² Caroline Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill, 1983), p. 53. Hibbard argues that Con and Matthew did not enjoy warm relations, but she notes his usefulness as a go-between with the Lord Deputy.

over to Dublin in the summer of 1632 to negotiate with the recusants.¹³³ It is known that the Lord Deputy used Matthew as a link with prominent Irish Roman Catholics and also discussed with him his policy towards Catholics in Ireland.¹³⁴

The few surviving letters between Wentworth and Matthew discuss Irish - and later Scottish - business. In May 1638, Wentworth thanked Matthew for his gift of prose and poetry, but the main purpose of the letter was to allow Wentworth to justify his conduct towards Lord Chancellor Loftus and in particular to deny that he had pressurised the Dublin Council into simply following his lead on this matter.¹³⁵ In Wentworth's last surviving letter to Matthew he thanked him for the gift of a chair and then proceeded to discuss the Scottish problem. The Lord Deputy informed Matthew that he was confident of his ability to control the Ulster Scots and wrote for a sympathetic audience when he noted how much he was hated by them.¹³⁶ Of greater

¹³³ Hugh O'Grady comments on Wentworth's arrival in Ireland with the Roman Catholic Earl of Castlehaven and states that the 'second peculiarity of Strafford's regime was his constant association with Sir Toby Matthew'. Grady also notes the connections between Wandesford and Matthew Roche, and that between Ormond and David Rothe, Roman Catholic Bishops of Ferns and Ossory, *Strafford and Ireland* (2 vols. Dublin, 1923), pp. 610-11. Str. P. 21/97, Wentworth to Cottington 12 Aug 1632; *ibid.* 1/76v, same to same 1 Oct 1632; see also *ibid.* 1/59, Wentworth to Mountnorris 19 Aug 1632. Whoever Wentworth's messenger was, he had been sent over to negotiate the payment of a half subsidy in return for respite from prosecution for recusancy. Matthew accompanied Wentworth to Ireland in March 1640; Hibbard, *Popish Plot*, p. 147.

¹³⁴ Wentworth wrote to Matthew complaining that the King's order to stop investigations into Roman Catholic marriages would hamper his attempt to sort out disputed inheritances; Str. P. 8/402, 31 Dec 1636.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.* 10a/133, 14 May 1638. Garrard commented that Matthew's character study of Henrietta Maria was 'a ridiculous Peece', *ibid.* 17/284, Garrard to Wentworth 7 Feb 1638.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* 10a/247, 5 Jan 1639.

significance, as far as relations with the Queen are concerned, is their correspondence during 1637, which shows that Wentworth used Matthew as an intermediary in his attempt to develop cordial relations with Con. The agent apparently believed that Wentworth had been harsh in his treatment of Irish Roman Catholics and Matthew's role was to convince him otherwise.¹³⁷

As we have seen, Wentworth's contacts with the Queen were made largely through intermediaries and it is important to note the several means of access to Henrietta Maria's Court which the Lord Deputy utilised. He encountered little hostility from the Queen's circle, with the obvious exception of Holland, Jermyn and - at the end of the decade - Vane and Dorset. The Queen herself, however, did not regard Wentworth as a man worthy of her favour for most of the decade; her well-known admiration of his hands was the extent of her liking for him. Very little correspondence passed between the Queen and the

¹³⁷ *Ibid.* 8/433-4, Matthew to Wentworth 13 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 8/434-5, Wentworth to Matthew 17 March 1637. See also *ibid.* 10a/16, Wentworth to Matthew 29 May 1637, asking Matthew to convey further information to Con. See also *ibid.* 21/175, Con to Wentworth 23 April 1637 and Wentworth's reply on reverse, 15 May 1637. In the autumn of 1637, Viscount Conway reported to Wentworth how 'Don Tobia' was on the receiving end of the King's anger regarding the conversion of Lady Newport; *ibid.* 10a/90, undated (but following *ibid.* 10a/89, 23 Oct 1637 mentioning Lady Newport's conversion). According to Garrard, Matthew was not guilty of this crime; *ibid.* 17/222, Garrard to Wentworth 9 Nov 1637. For Laud's account of this business see *ibid.* 7/71v-2, Laud to Wentworth 1 Nov 1637: 'I did my dutye to the King and State openly in Counsell, and had some occasion to speake particularly of Mr. Walter Montague, who is growne very busy, and is in my opinion too much suffered. From thence we went to the Forraigne Committee, and that ended, 100 [the King], 250, 17, 29, 12 went to the other side, where presently 15, 21, 28, 4, 101 [the Queen], 305, 19 were able to tell everything that I had said in Counsell. And 19 and 101 [the Queen] were very angry, and tooke great Exceptions to mee. And I heare their anger Continues'; see also Gordon Albion, *Charles I and the Court of Rome* (London, 1935), pp. 212-3. For an account of Laud's relations with Con see Hibbard, *Popish Plot*, pp. 60-4.

Lord Deputy; her few letters to Wentworth either asked for Wentworth's assistance for certain individuals or requested his protection for the Roman Catholic clergy or faith. In April 1634 she asked that he be willing to protect from molestation a number of Irish Capuchin friars, as long as they did not exceed the bounds of their duties and caused no public offence.¹³⁸ Four years later, she wrote to him asking that he prevent the closure of St Patrick's purgatory, an important place of Irish Catholic pilgrimage.¹³⁹ Regarding her suits on behalf of others, the Queen personally wrote to the Lord Deputy concerning Lord Bourke, Lord Roche and Lady Carew,¹⁴⁰ and her Secretaries also wrote several letters requesting the Lord Deputy's favour towards friends and servants of the Queen.¹⁴¹ These private suits irritated the Lord Deputy, particularly when they appeared to undermine his authority in Ireland, and his correspondence with Archbishop Laud shows that some suits promoted by the

¹³⁸ Str. P. 40/43, 30 April 1634.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.* 40/42, [late summer 1638]; *ibid.* 3(ii)/3, Wentworth to Henrietta Maria 10 Oct 1638, informing the Queen that the site had been closed to pilgrims before his arrival in Ireland and as it lay in the middle of the Scottish plantation lands its restoration would at the moment cause problems. He advised her to wait until a more opportune time arose. Winter informed Wentworth that the Queen accepted his reasons for postponing the fulfilment of her request; *ibid.* 18/138, 5 Nov 1638. See also *ibid.* 16/56, Henrietta Maria to Wentworth 9 Sept 1636, asking for the alleviation of a sentence against the priest Patrick Brangan, and *ibid.* 17/47, Ayton to Wentworth 29 April 1637, passing on the Queen's thanks for doing as she requested.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 40/44, 18 July 1635 (Bourke); *ibid.* 16/75, 16 Oct 1636 (Roche); *ibid.* 40/46, 15 Feb 1636 (Lady Carew). See also *ibid.* 40/45, 11 Oct 1635 (Sir George Hamilton) and *ibid.* 18/79, 2 July 1638 (Sir Morris Williams). Roche also received the recommendation of Cottington; *ibid.* 3/266, Cottington to Wentworth 1 Oct 1636; the Lord Deputy's poor opinion of Roche is given his reply to Cottington, *ibid.* p. 266, 10 Dec 1636.

¹⁴¹ See for example, *ibid.* 1/57, Ayton to Wentworth 28 July 1632; *ibid.* 1/58, Wentworth to Ayton 29 July 1632; *ibid.* 15/9, Ayton to Wentworth 6 April 1635; *ibid.* 15/208, same to

Queen entrenched deeply on important governmental business. One such matter involved Sir Richard Wynn's interest in the Irish royal impropriations, which Laud and Wentworth wished to see restored to the Irish Church. In December 1634, Wentworth informed Laud that according to Secretary Mainwaring, Wynn had approached him when he was recently in London and told him that the Queen wished him to visit Ireland. When Mainwaring was able finally to ascertain the details, it emerged that the Queen was being pressed to secure for someone a grant of the Irish impropriations. Wentworth advised Laud to keep an eye on this, but to do so quietly, as the Lord Deputy suspected that 'this moves from Weston and that there may be a designe to distast the Queen towards Laud'.¹⁴² Laud thanked Wentworth for this information, although he claimed that Weston did not have the power to undermine his standing with the Queen. Laud agreed with Wentworth that if Henrietta Maria did become interested in this matter, it was likely that either Wynn or Weston were behind it 'and mean to share the prey among them'. Laud's alternative explanation was that - once given to these men - the impropriations would be used to benefit the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland, an obvious subject of interest to the Queen.¹⁴³

same 1 Sept 1635; *ibid.* 16/101, same to same 10 Jan 1637; *ibid.* 19/81, Sir John Winter to Wentworth 15 July 1639.

¹⁴² *Ibid.* 6/125, 9 Dec 1634.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.* 6/141, 12 Jan 1635. Laud was so bold as to speak to Charles on this second point and the King had told him that he would bear this in mind. Laud realised the need to settle the impropriations upon the Church and wanted Wentworth to urge the King to see the necessity and act. The Lord Deputy advised Laud to present to the King written details of the value of the impropriations, 'which fully understood, will not lett his Piety from effecting the businesse, and soe Cleare it at once from all future pretenders, which may divert him from soe blessed a worke', *ibid.* 6/148, 10 March 1635.

Wentworth found most of these suits annoying, but in 1639 he was infuriated by Henrietta Maria's attempt to procure the command of the late Lord Kirkcudbright's horse troop for the young Earl of Desmond. In April Wentworth wrote to Sir John Winter, the Queen's Secretary, insisting that this command was in his gift and that it had already been offered to another. If his right of preferment to this post in the army was infringed by the Queen, it would not help his attempts to maintain order, nor would it raise the morale of capable soldiers who hoped to gain promotion based on merit. He therefore asked that the Queen desist from moving this suit again.¹⁴⁴ Winter replied the following month, giving the Lord Deputy an account of an interview he had had with the Queen and Lady Denbigh on this matter. The Queen was initially unable to see Wentworth's point of view and Lady Carlisle's attempts at mediation had led to the Queen partly blaming her for the Lord Deputy's attitude.¹⁴⁵ According to Wentworth, Henrietta Maria eventually agreed to leave it to the King and Wentworth to decide and the Lord Deputy asked both Lady Carlisle and Henry Percy to thank the Queen for this favour and to impress upon her that posts such as this one needed to be granted to experienced officers. In addition he alleged that the post would cost the incumbent some £1000 and should not therefore be regarded as a source of income. If the Queen wished to grant Desmond an alternative mark of favour, Wentworth would do what he could to assist.¹⁴⁶ In such a difficult time, the Lord Deputy was particularly averse to the Queen's attempts to foist young and inexperienced noblemen on to the Irish army.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 3(ii)/66, 16 April 1639.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 19/39, 11 May 1639.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 10a/307-8, Wentworth to Lady Carlisle 13 May 1639. Although the Queen backed down, she asked Wentworth to help her fulfil her promise to Desmond to find him some preferment, because she was committed to helping him; *ibid.* 40/47, 28 Aug 1639.

It was not until 1640 that Henrietta Maria began to show any significant signs of favour towards the Lord Lieutenant. Although he had failed to obstruct the appointment of Vane as Secretary of State, the Queen was astute enough to understand that in the growing crisis of 1640 her husband would need Wentworth's practical and moral support. Jermyn's visit to him in February 1640 was regarded by Lady Carlisle as a clear indicator of the Queen's willingness to show favour towards the Lord Lieutenant and in March he had promised the Queen that he would do his best to protect Irish Roman Catholics from parliamentary complaints.¹⁴⁷ After the dissolution of the Short Parliament, his attempts to raise money from Spain complemented her warmness towards that country.¹⁴⁸

Although he enjoyed the Queen's favour only briefly towards the end of his political career, Wentworth realised the need to maintain channels of communication between himself and the Queen's Court. This was particularly important during the second half of the decade, when his deteriorating relationship with Weston was replaced by Holland's unmitigating malice towards him. The Lord Deputy's relationship with Holland and the Percy and Sidney families gives us an insight into the attitudes and activities of the Queen's circle towards him, and it is clearly not acceptable to regard the courtiers who served the Queen as forming defined and homogenous 'factions'. The struggle for influence over the Queen within her Court was caused mainly by individual ambitions as the rivalry over the Admiralty illustrates. The rival candidates, Holland and Northumberland, held strikingly similar views over the wisdom of Charles's policy towards the Scots during 1639-40 and both were to desert the Court in the growing crisis in late 1641.

¹⁴⁷ Hibbard, *Popish Plot*, p. 147.

¹⁴⁸ *De L'Isle VI*, p. 231, Lady Carlisle to Leicester 13 Feb 1640; Smuts, 'Puritan followers', pp. 41-2; Hibbard, *Popish Plot*, p. 163.

Members of the Percy and Sidney families enjoyed varying degrees of influence with the King and Queen and, as the De L'Isle correspondence makes clear, did not wholly trust each other to protect their individual interests. Lady Carlisle, in particular, appears to have repeatedly tried to impress the Earl and Countess of Leicester by stressing her own influence with the Queen, while criticising her brother Northumberland for his alleged lack of action on Leicester's behalf. At the centre of this complex group of families and individuals was Henrietta Maria herself. After Weston's death she played a much greater part on the political stage and her support was regarded as essential in the struggle for office. When discussing Caroline court politics it is of fundamental importance that her role is appreciated.

CHAPTER SEVEN

WENTWORTH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE KING

The focal point of the Court and government during the personal rule was the King himself and ministerial survival depended on retaining his favour.¹ Charles I was master in his own house and in the first instance Wentworth depended on the King's favour for his appointments. But it was also essential that Wentworth maintained good or at least tolerable relationships with ministers and courtiers in England in order to gain access to the King: this was of crucial importance if the Lord Deputy was to enjoy secure control over the government of Ireland. His friendships and associations gave him important information regarding Charles's attitude towards his actions and a number of his correspondents, especially William Laud, conveyed royal instructions to the Lord Deputy. Charles himself corresponded infrequently with Wentworth: his letters were brief, usually directing Wentworth towards despatches from the Secretaries of State, although Charles made the occasional attempt to reassure his Lord Deputy of royal approval and support. Thirty-nine letters from Charles to Wentworth written during the 1630s appear to have survived. Twenty of these letters were written during 1638-9, reflecting the growing significance of Ireland during this period.²

¹ We still lack a good biography of the King, but an excellent discussion of his personality is to be found in 'The Man Charles Stuart', in Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War*, (Oxford, 1990), pp. 185-211.

² See Str. P. 40/3-40 and *ibid.* 17/303. (The index of correspondents at Sheffield City Archives is misleading as several letters listed under the entry 'Charles I' are either not personal letters or are addressed to persons other than Wentworth.)

Wentworth never enjoyed a personal friendship with the King: he can hardly be described as a 'favourite' in the sense that the Duke of Lennox was. He was not a natural courtier and Charles preferred to keep his forceful personality at a distance. Nor did Wentworth enjoy the level of royal trust and confidence on which Lord Treasurer Weston appears to have relied. His role in the Bridgeman case made the King very much aware of the streak of boldness in his character. His reputation as a champion of the Petition of Right was not quickly or easily shaken off and there were those at Court quick to remind him of his past.³ Wentworth, however, regarded his career in the 1620s not in terms of an attempt to weaken the Crown, but to strengthen it, and from the beginning of his Deputyship he was determined to govern in a manner which he believed would restore the Crown's authority in Ireland. To do this, it would be necessary occasionally to save the King from himself.

In February 1632 Wentworth put a number of proposals before the King and the Privy Council for their consideration: his hope was that they would enable him to govern Ireland efficiently and be seen to wield effective power. The first proposal concerned the financial state of Ireland, desiring that no-one should put forward suits for financial reward out of the Irish Exchequer before the Irish debt was cleared and the ordinary revenue was able to pay for civil and military requirements. The Lord Deputy understood that shortage of money would restrict his freedom of manoeuvre with an Irish Parliament, but he also understood parliamentary resentment of grasping ministers and courtiers. Laud's influence can be seen in the suggestion that Irish bishops ought to be of a higher calibre than the present ones and that a number of them should be privy councillors. The King himself ordered that the Lord Deputy's

³ The Earl of Pembroke became involved in an altercation with Wentworth in 1631 and called him, amongst other things, a 'Parlament-breaker'; see above, p. 177. Cottington could not resist reminding the Council of Wentworth's parliamentary career; see above, p. 80..

despatches concerning revenue ought to go to the Lord Treasurer only and all other despatches should be sent to only one of the Secretaries of State, namely Sir John Coke. The rest of the proposals were designed to raise the power and status of the Lord Deputy himself. Wentworth asked that no grants should receive the signet until he knew the details and that no existing reversions to office should be confirmed and no new ones made in the future. He requested that the King take advice from his Deputy before settling Irish cases and that complaints against him should not be heard in England until the party concerned had first made his suit to the Lord Deputy. He asked that he should have patronage of civil and military posts which would enable him to grant rewards based on merit.⁴ Two major concerns underlay these requests. One concern had developed from his experience as Lord President of the Council of the North and his knowledge of the manner in which recent Lord Deputies had been removed from office. He was acutely aware of the need to protect his government from the attacks of powerful individuals or groups and, in his opinion, the best way to do this was to subject them to the authority of the Lord Deputy and, if necessary, limit their access to the King. Another understandable concern was that he could not govern Ireland effectively without able assistants and wished to deny access to civil and military posts to unqualified favourites of the King, Queen and senior nobles. Within months of his arrival in Ireland, Wentworth found that the acceptance of these propositions by the King meant little and that his control of patronage was not secure.

⁴ SP 63/253/14, Order of the English Privy Council concerning Irish bishops on the suggestion of Lord Wentworth 17 Feb 1632; SP 63/253/16, Propositions to be considered by His Majesty concerning the Government of Ireland 22 Feb 1632. These propositions were approved by the English Privy Council on 17 February and the King ordered them to be entered into the Council Register; see also Str. P. 24-25/92-3, 22 Feb 1632.

On the death of Lord Falkland in the autumn of 1633 his second son, Lorenzo, held a reversion to his father's company.⁵ The Lord Deputy argued that changes to the military establishment in 1629 had nullified the reversion and there were also practical objections to Cary. He was only young and Wentworth believed that he would wish to remain resident mainly in England. Wentworth had already promised the post to Henry Percy, younger brother of the Earl of Northumberland, and reacted angrily to this attack on his right of patronage. He resented the involvement of Lord Treasurer Weston in promoting Cary's suit,⁶ and that of Lord Newburgh, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. After being informed of Cary's suit by Cottington, Wentworth expounded at length to his friend on this subject, commenting on the consequences for the Irish army of having captains resident in England. Regarding Newburgh's role he wrote, 'I am Confident his Majestie will not debarre me of what (be it spoken under favour) belongs to my place for the Sollicitation of the pretty busy Lord Newbourge; who, if a Man should move his Majestie for any thing in the Gift of the Chancellour of the Dutchy, would as Pertly Cackle, and put himselfe in the way of Complainte, as if he had all the Merit, and Ability in the World, to Serve his Maister.'⁷ From Wentworth's surviving correspondence it does not appear that he complained about this suit directly to the king, but he pressed his case instead to Cottington and Secretary Coke, arguing to Coke that he was engaged to Henry Percy for the place, as the King was well aware, and claiming disingenuously that Cary had 'no more powerfull an Advocate then my Lord Newburge'. Allowing posts such as this to become in effect hereditary would discourage able men who lacked the

⁵ PRO, Signet Office 1/1 f. 77, Charles I to Lord Deputy Falkland 8 Nov 1627; Hardacre, 'Patronage and Purchase', p. 98.

⁶ Str. P. 3/28, Weston to Wentworth 3 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 3/28-9, Wentworth to Weston 4 Nov 1633.

advantage of court or family connections.⁸ The Earl of Carlisle informed Wentworth that the King had resolved not to make this case a precedent, but that Charles had been pressed by Falkland as he lay dying to grant the post to his son. In addition, Carlisle assured Wentworth that Lorenzo Cary had actually received good reports from his commanders in the Netherlands.⁹

Despite the Lord Deputy's concerns, Charles did not insist in future that men who he recommended for military office in the future receive appointment, but he reserved the right to do so, as illustrated by the disposal of the late Lord Powerscourt's horse and foot troops in the autumn of 1634. In September 1634 Wentworth received a short note from Secretary Coke, informing him that the King desired him not to dispose of these until Wentworth knew of his further pleasure. The reversion to these commands was held by Powerscourt's nephew, Viscount Valentia, but Wentworth had other plans for them. He replied as soon as he received this letter, claiming to be amazed by what he had just read considering what had been agreed earlier in the year, regarding the dispute over Cary's appointment. Wentworth had already given the foot company to Colonel Robert Farrar, an able and experienced soldier and wished the horse troop to be amalgamated with the Deputy's own troop. He referred to the 'Iniurious Invasion of I know not whom', which he claimed lay behind this

⁷ *Ibid.* 3/20, Cottington to Wentworth 27 Sept 1633; *ibid.* 3/20-22, Wentworth to Cottington 22 Oct 1633. Newburgh was Lorenzo Cary's uncle.

⁸ *Ibid.* 5/22-4, Wentworth to Coke 26 Oct 1633. *Ibid.* 3/28, Wentworth to Weston 3 Oct 1633 reveals that the Lord Deputy knew already that Cary's suit was supported by Weston.

⁹ *Ibid.* 14/1, 10 Feb 1634. Wentworth's comments on Cary's captaincy were not positive and he hoped that Cary would part with his company and take himself off to the Netherlands; *ibid.* 34/10, Wentworth to Wandesford 25 July 1636. Unfortunately for Wentworth, Cary remained in Charles's dominions and in 1639 the Lord Deputy claimed that his company was the worst in Ireland; *ibid.* 10a/319, Wentworth to Lady Carlisle 25 May 1639.

attempt to deny him the exercise of his patronage and he wrote to Laud complaining of ‘indeavors...to Supplant me both in the Honour and Profitt of my place’, naming Weston as the promoter of this business. Coke passed on Wentworth’s report to Charles who was prepared to accept Farrar, knowing him to be worthy of the captaincy, but in response to Wentworth, Coke stressed the King’s denial that the Lord Deputy’s rights had been attacked by anyone at Court. Indeed it was clear that the threat to his exercise of patronage came from the King himself. Charles wrote personally to Wentworth in January 1635, insisting that his intervention in the business did not result from any ‘Court importunity’, but that he had intended the command for Jacob Ashley, at present serving on the continent. He expected the Lord Deputy to inform him when another suitable vacancy arose.¹⁰ Although Wentworth did in fact enjoy a far freer exercise of army patronage than his recent predecessors, the dispute over Lorenzo Cary’s reversion had not marked an auspicious start to his Deputyship.¹¹

Wentworth was not guaranteed secure control over other aspects of his Irish government. Archbishop Laud made it clear to the Lord Deputy that the King would insist on the appointment of candidates of whom he had personal

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 5/252, Coke to Wentworth 22 Sept 1634; *ibid.* 5/124-6, Wentworth to Coke 30 Sept 1634; *ibid.* 6/99, Wentworth to Laud 1 Oct 1634. Farrar had served at Cadiz, the Ile de Rhe and La Rochelle and had received financial favour from Buckingham; Hardacre, ‘Patronage and Purchase in the Irish Standing Army’, p. 41; Str. P. 5/254, Coke to Wentworth 13 Oct 1634; see also Wentworth’s reply *ibid.* 5/122-4, 9 Dec 1634 and *ibid.* 3/181, Charles I to Wentworth 22 Jan 1635. Powerscourt’s position as Marshal was also held in reversion by Valentia: Wentworth wanted to secure it for Lord Conway and finally managed to do so several years later; *ibid.* 3/109, Wentworth to Charles I 12 Aug 1634; *ibid.* 16/11, Conway to Wentworth 11 April 1636; *ibid.* 6(ii)/36, Charles I (signet) to Wentworth 31 Jan 1640.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 40/3, Charles I to Wentworth 26 Oct 1633; Hardacre, ‘Patronage and Purchase in the Irish Standing Army’, pp. 42-3.

knowledge to senior clerical offices in Ireland as in England. John Bramhall was the only one of Wentworth's chaplains to receive royal preferment. Wentworth's strong recommendation of Bramhall seems to have secured his promotion to the bishopric of Derry, but Bramhall was apparently already held in high regard by the King. In contrast Wentworth was unsuccessful in securing Bramhall's prebendary in York for his chaplain, Mr. Watts, for it had already been granted to a Dr. Marsh who had preached before Charles at Worksop on his visit to Scotland. Laud pointed out that moving for Watts 'would have been in vain, for the King will thinke of no Stranger as long as hee hath Choyce of men knowen to him by services done; upon which grownd only he tooke notice from you of the Service done and expected from Dr Bramhall.'¹² But most Irish sees were not rich and both Wentworth and Laud recognised the difficulty in trying to encourage worthy men who enjoyed the King's favour to leave England and take up clerical office in Ireland. Wentworth was even prepared to use appointment to a poorly-endowed see as a way of ridding himself of a 'turbulent priest'. The united bishoprics of Fern and Leighlin, worth about £200 *per annum* were given to George Andrews, Dean of Limerick, as a punishment for his opposition to the English canons in the 1634 meeting of Convocation. Wentworth knew that Andrews desired a bishopric, and Charles reluctantly agreed to the appointment.¹³ The Lord Deputy's control of the Church of Ireland was also jeopardised by the

¹² Str. P. 6/76-7, Wentworth to Laud 23 June 1634; *ibid.* 6/89, Laud to Wentworth 23 June 1634. See also *ibid.* 6/135, same to same 12 Jan 1635; *ibid.* 6/146, Wentworth to Laud 10 March 1635. Bramhall apparently decided to accompany Wentworth to Ireland, although he had the opportunity to serve as chaplain in ordinary to the King; John Bramhall, *The Works* (5 vols. Oxford, 1862), vol. I, p. v, but see Julian Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church* (Oxford, 1992), p. 39.

¹³ Str. P. 6/131, Wentworth to Laud 16 Dec 1634; *ibid.* 6/136, Laud to Wentworth 12 Jan 1635. SP 63/254/184, Bramhall to Laud 20 Dec 1634, reveals that the idea to 'reward' Andrews came from Bramhall, not Wentworth.

influence of courtiers close to the king. Wentworth faced strong opposition from the Duke of Lennox in his attempt to remove a pretended incumbent, Dr. Bruce, from the living of Taboine which he understood was in the Crown's gift. Wentworth argued that Bruce had acquired the living by simony and proceeded to present a Mr. Cressy to this living. Only after he had done this did he find out that Lennox was the patron. Wentworth was concerned that his actions might give the impression that he had paid scant respect to Lennox, a cousin of the King and a nobleman whose Irish interests had been entrusted by the King to his care.¹⁴ But the case taught the Lord Deputy that his attempt to

¹⁴ In late 1634 Wentworth informed Laud that he had presented Mr. Cressy - who Laud had recommended - to a benefice in the Crown's gift; Str. P. 6/105, 2 Dec 1634; SP 63/254/184, Bramhall to Laud 20 Dec 1634. Nine months later, Wentworth's account of the case was that he regretted not having presented Lennox's original nominee to the living and had since found the man a benefice of equal value. Lennox - who had apparently been angered by Bruce's practise of simony - had recently changed his mind and given support to Bruce. Wentworth attributed this change of mind to the opinion of the Duke's secretary, Mr. Webb, a former servant of the Earl of Carlisle; Str. P. 6/242-4, Wentworth to Laud 12 Sept 1635. Laud warned Wentworth not to antagonise the Duke: 'But wheras you Resolve to preferr a Chapleyn of your owne to this Benefice and passe him by whom the Duke Recommends, I praye at my intreaty be not too Sudden. For I see plainly, the King is made in the businesse, And out of all doubt hew will not take it well if you doe not gratify my Lord Duke in this particular. My Lord, I see a great deale of practiseng here, make noe more opposites at least at this tyme then you must needs'; *ibid.* 7/101v, 17 May 1638. See also *ibid.* 10a/244, Wentworth to Lennox 24 Dec 1638; *ibid.* 10a/254 same to same 10 Feb 1639. Lord Keeper Coventry sided with Bruce, as English legislation against simony was not in force in Ireland; *ibid.* 6/199-200, Wentworth to Laud 14 July 1635. Laud believed he could see the ever-meddling Cottington behind this case; *ibid.* 6/257, Laud to Wentworth 4 Oct 1635. Wentworth's relations with Lennox were never good: in 1634 the Duke made clear his support for George Fitzgerald, Earl of Kildare, who had obstructed government policy in Parliament, but to no avail as Charles insisted that Kildare make a submission to the Lord Deputy; *ibid.* 14/237, Kildare to Wentworth 16 Dec 1634; Thomas Carte, *A History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde* (3 vols. London, 1736), vol. I, p. 66.

restore the wealth and status of the church would bring him into conflict with powerful lay-patrons.

Wentworth was more successful in his attempt to control the most senior secular posts in Ireland. By 1640 he had removed a number of men who he regarded as opponents of 'thorough', although it had been necessary to use a financial gift - which Laud regarded as a bribe - in his attempt to oust Lord Mountnorris from the Vice-Treasurer's post. The removal of Mountnorris and Loftus as well as his actions against Cork, Wilmot, Crosby and the 4th and 5th Earls of Clanricarde earned him several powerful enemies at Court and a reputation for rough dealing. Charles proved to be remarkably supportive of his Lord Deputy, considering the weight of opposition to his actions building up at Court. Wentworth knew from his correspondence with Cottington that Charles found his handling of the business of the Boyle family tomb amusing,¹⁵ and Weston's decision not to give any assistance to Cork over this matter must have resulted from his understanding of the King's attitude towards the affair. In 1635, when Wentworth had amassed a number of enemies, Charles wrote personally to Wentworth assuring him of his support 'as at this time Clanricarde, Cork, Wilmot and Mountnorris must (though unwillingly) witness to you'.¹⁶ It may be that this letter was designed to point out to Wentworth the extent of opposition which his actions had provoked and remind him that the King's support was not inexhaustible. Certainly Charles was far less amused by Wentworth's attempt to haul Holland and Henry Jermyn into the Star Chamber and advised him, through Laud, that this request was not politically wise and would only be granted because Wentworth had

¹⁵ Str. P. 13/37, Cottington to Wentworth 2 Sept 1633.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 40/11, 30 Sept 1635.

requested it as common justice.¹⁷ This incident came during Wentworth's attack on Lord Chancellor Loftus, a man who had in previous years received praise from the Lord Deputy for his service to the King and Church.¹⁸

By 1638 Wentworth felt secure enough to attempt the removal from office of Viscount Loftus, regarding him as the last major obstacle to his government in Ireland. The Lord Chancellor's suspension from office was mainly brought about by two cases: one concerned his ignoring an order from the Dublin Council to release a prisoner who had received scant justice, the other concerned his refusal to obey the orders of the Council and settle an estate on his elder son and daughter-in-law. Wentworth's problems in this matter arose from the fact that he could be deemed to have a personal interest in the case. Loftus's daughter-in-law, Eleanor, was the sister of his brother George's wife.¹⁹ An unpleasant hearing of this case before the Council ended with the Lord Chancellor being ordered by Wentworth to kneel before him. On refusing, he was suspended from office and after refusing to surrender the Great Seal, he was committed to prison in Dublin Castle.²⁰ Wentworth made a concerted effort to defend his handling of this case, and was less than liberal with the truth. It was essential that he make it appear as though the attack on

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 3/343, Wentworth to Charles I 2 Sept 1638, *ibid.* 7 157, Laud to Wentworth 29 Dec 1638.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 5/164, Wentworth to Coke 16 Dec 1634; *ibid.* 9(11) 157, Wentworth to Coke 6 July 1635; *ibid.* 6/234, Laud to Wentworth 31 July 3 Aug 1635.

¹⁹ *HMC, Various III*, pp. 158-69, various orders of the Council and answers of Loftus relating to this case.

²⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 169-73, Wentworth and the Council to Charles I 20 April 1638. The editor notes that Wentworth and seventeen members of the Council signed this letter and Wentworth's autograph signature appears at the end with the rest of the signatures, rather than at the top as was his usual practice. In the light of his insistence to the King and Laud that he did not sway the Council on this matter, this is not insignificant.

Loftus came from the whole body of the Dublin Council and was not simply an attempt by the Lord Deputy to rid himself of an opponent.²¹ Charles's personal letters to Wentworth contain no hint of his reaction to the Lord Deputy's proceedings: in July 1638 he simply referred Wentworth to the public despatches regarding Loftus and made no further mention of the affair.²² But Laud informed Wentworth that the King did not believe his assertion that the Lord Chancellor's imprisonment was the work of the entire Council, unprompted by the Lord Deputy. Laud warned Wentworth that Charles would not take kindly to attempts to hide the truth from him,²³ a warning which moved Wentworth to send the King a defence of his conduct. He failed to accept Laud's opinion, and simply reiterated the claims he had made regarding the role of the Dublin Council in his despatches to Secretary Coke. He argued that he did indeed want Loftus to retire, but that he hoped it could be done quietly, partly out of respect for the Lord Chancellor's age and long service, but also because of Wentworth's embarrassment at having misjudged Loftus's character. He insisted that he had no personal dislike of Loftus and finally launched into a long comment on the activities of his enemies:

²¹ Str. P. 3/316-17, Wentworth to Charles I 22 April 1638, in which Wentworth told the King that he had his permission to remove the Seal from Loftus, after the Lord Chancellor had disregarded the Council's decision in favour of Sir John Gifford who had petitioned the Court of Castle Chamber on behalf of his half-sister, Loftus's daughter-in-law (Gifford's other half-sister was married to George Wentworth); *ibid.* 4/283-5, Charles I (signed by Coke) to Wentworth and Council 9 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 3/321-2, same to same 17 May 1638. See also *ibid.* 11a/53, 10 April 1638; *ibid.* 11a/54, 21 April 1638; *ibid.* 11a/54, 22 April 1638; *ibid.* 11a/63, 5 May 1638; *ibid.* 11a/67, 5 May 1638, all letters from either Wentworth or Wentworth and the Council to the Secretaries of State.

²² *Ibid.* 40/25, 5 July 1638; *ibid.* 4/327, Charles I (signed by Coke) to Wentworth 3 July 1638; *ibid.* 4/333, same to same 7 Aug 1638.

²³ *Ibid.* 7/101v, 17 May 1638.

‘It was not unforeseene that all my unfreinds would putt themselves in Ranke, rayse the Crye against me upon the Committment of his Lordship: for soe hath ever been their Custome, where I seeme but to be Concerned. Yet that they should thus tread over all respects to the Honoure and Prosperity of your Affaires, all Regards to humane Conversation or Christian Charity, that soe their Malice might reach and peirce me the deeper; indeed I could not have beleevd soe ill of them.’

He named the Earls of Arundel and Holland, Viscount Wilmot and William Murray as his ‘unfreinds’, insisting on his own noble conduct towards all of them and devoted the largest space to Holland. Wentworth ended the letter with a request that Charles understand that this letter was motivated by the need for self-preservation, not the desire to harm anyone else.²⁴

As Laud recognised, there was little truth in Wentworth’s argument that he had simply acted on the advice of the Dublin Council.²⁵ There is hardly any more truth in the rest of the letter. If Loftus had gone quietly, all well and good, but the fact that he chose to put up strenuous opposition, caused Wentworth little regret. He was not daunted by the prospect of publicly humiliating the Lord Chancellor, but rather welcomed it as a means of demonstrating his authority over the Dublin administration. Neither had Wentworth suddenly realised the true nature of Loftus’s character in late 1637: the Chancellor had previously

²⁴ *Ibid.* 3/324-7, 28 May 1638.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 7/101v, Laud to Wentworth 17 May 1638: ‘I knowe a Lord Deputye (especially one of your Abilities) can more easily lead the Councill, then they him.’ Wentworth persisted in his argument, informing Charles that the Dublin Council had debated the King’s order that Loftus be allowed to travel to England and had asked that this order be respited until Charles had received their comments. He, the Deputy, agreed with them; *ibid.* 3/333, 19 June 1638.

been useful to the Lord Deputy and received Wentworth's commendation, but in 1636 Wentworth had been very keen that responsibility for the government of Ireland should rest mainly in the trustworthy hands of Christopher Wandesford, and that Loftus, as co-Justice should be consulted as little as possible.²⁶ In December 1639 the Lord Chancellor's appeal was heard before the English Privy Council and in the opinion of eyewitnesses, he threw away his chance of being restored to office.²⁷ The Lord Deputy appeared to have been vindicated and support for Loftus melted away, much to the relief of the King who was beginning to involve Wentworth more significantly in his handling of the crisis in Scotland. In May 1638 Charles might have smiled at Wentworth's disingenuous account of his relations with the Dublin Council, but by late 1639 the Lord Deputy's talent for making enemies was not quite as amusing.

The removal of Loftus was significant, not merely because it demonstrated the lengths to which the Lord Deputy would go to destroy the potential for opposition to his rule from within the Irish administration, but also because it displays an interesting facet of his relationship with the King. In all his attempts to punish individuals or remove them from office, both in the North and in Ireland, he claimed that he acted in defence of the Crown's reputation. He inflated the severity of alleged offences, arguing that they were not committed against Wentworth the man, but against the Lord President or Lord Deputy, the representative of the King, and he tried to develop a culture of subservience to him as the monarch's representative. His correspondence with Charles regarding the Loftus case discusses this subject at length although he received nothing in reply which would allow us to know whether Charles

²⁶ *Ibid.* 34/10, Wentworth to Wandesford, 25 July 1636.

²⁷ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, pp. 617-8, Northumberland to Leicester 14 Nov 1639; Whitaker ed., *Radcliffe*, p. 195-8, Wentworth to Radcliffe 17 Feb 1640.

accepted this line of argument. His demand that Loftus kneel before him was entirely characteristic and the refusal of the Lord Chancellor to do so probably contributed - more than any of his abuses of power - to Wentworth's determination to humble him. The King had not allowed Wentworth to hound Loftus from office without question: the Lord Chancellor had been granted an appeal before the English Privy Council and the Lord Deputy was never absolutely certain that Charles would be prepared to countenance his actions. But his eventual success in removing Loftus from office signified to himself and to others that he had finally managed to gain control over the Irish administration - at a very high political price.

The other proposal of February 1632, crucial to the Lord Deputy's hold on power, was designed to prevent Irish land and revenue being used as a mine of indiscriminate royal bounty. But in the first letter which Wentworth received from Charles after his arrival in Ireland, the King recommended to his care the Duke of Lennox and the Earls of Arundel and Nithsdale, who all had business interests in Ireland. As a general rule, Wentworth was required by the King to bear in mind his recommendations of certain individuals, but he was required to ensure that their suits did not interfere with the interests of the Crown. If requests were granted, Charles would receive the thanks; if not, Wentworth was to be responsible for the refusal.²⁸ But throughout his Deputyship it was clear that monarch and Lord Deputy did not always hold a common view on what was either beneficial or detrimental to the Crown's interests. Regarding

²⁸ Str. P. 40/3, 26 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 40/4, Charles I to Wentworth 17 April 1634; *ibid.* 40/26, same to same 30 Aug 1638. This maxim was applied by Wentworth to the Graces: those which went on to the statute books were to be regarded as gifts of the King's grace; those which were rejected were done so by the Lord Deputy and Council, basing their decisions on Poyning's Law; *ibid.* 5/150-151, Wentworth to Coke 16 Dec 1634.

claims to Irish land, the Lord Deputy found himself trying to persuade Charles to place the needs of the Crown before all private suits.

‘In summe I should humbly advise the same Rule to be applyed in this businesse, which I covet might guide and governe all other of like nature, which is that first the service be imediatly undertaken and gon thorough with for the Crowne, and then your Majesty may after more evidently exercise your bounty as seemes best to your good pleasure’.²⁹

The settlement of the well-known case of the Byrnes’ land in county Wicklow, turned out eventually to be beneficial to both the Crown and the Lord Deputy.³⁰ He failed, however, to prevent the Earl of St. Albans and Clanricarde from being granted restitution of his patrimony in a case which dragged on for several years. In 1637 the Lord Deputy was forced to inform the King that a privy seal order for payment to the Earl of £1500 was ‘flattly in breach of the Establishment’. Wentworth also made a sharp criticism of Secretary Windebank’s conduct in this case, pointing out that Windebank ought to have been aware that the Earl was actually in debt to the Crown. The Lord Deputy claimed never to have witnessed a similar mistake from Secretary Coke and he tried to use Windebank’s apparent error to remind Charles that Irish business ought to be handled by only one of the principal Secretaries,

²⁹ *Ibid.* 3/4, 22 June 1633, arguing against allowing Carlisle a grant of concealed lands in Munster.

³⁰ *Ibid.* 3/128-30, 17 Sept 1634; Cooper, ‘Strafford and the Byrnes’ Country’, pp. 1-20. Wentworth was aware that Sir William Parsons in particular had tried to prevent Carlisle benefiting from his royal grant and wished to see his friend gain something from this land. Cooper argues that Carlisle’s ‘grant was so dubious that he would have got little for it without Strafford’s help.’ Wentworth believed that it would be in the Crown’s interests for Carlisle to receive a financial payment instead and the Crown enjoy the direct ownership of the land. See above, pp. 172-4.

meaning Coke, as had been agreed in 1632.³¹ Although he reluctantly promised to fulfil Charles's command on this specific matter,³² he tried to prevent St. Albans gaining a new grant to his lands from the Crown.³³ Over a year later he was curtly informed by Charles that he had waited for the Lord Deputy's detailed explanation of his opposition to this grant and had not yet received it; St. Albans was therefore to be allowed this grant. If the royal bounty was excessive, then the Lord Deputy's delay in advising him was to blame.³⁴ Wentworth tried in vain to demonstrate to the King the error of his ways. He set down his reasons for promoting the policy of plantation and argued that this grant would render the task of planting Connacht almost impossible. He pointed out that the Earl had originally opposed the passing of the King's title and that his recent acknowledgement of it was worthless. He noted the Earl's Catholic faith and argued that the King could hardly expect the Earl of Thomond - who was both Protestant and accommodating towards the English - to cooperate with the plantation when he saw what could be

³¹ Str. P. 4/285-6, Charles I (signed by Windebank) to Wentworth 24 March 1637; *ibid.* 3/287-8, Wentworth to Charles I 26 June 1637. The propositions of 1632 state that 'the adresse of all other dispatches (i.e. not concerning revenue) for that kingdome be by speciall direction of his Majestie aplyed to one of the Secretaries singly and...his Majestie will have this don by Mr Secretarie Cooke', SP 63/253/16.

³² Str. P. 40/20, Charles I to Wentworth 21 Sept 1637; *ibid.* 3/300, Wentworth to Charles I 5 Oct 1637.

³³ In response to the King's suggestion that the Earl be allowed to compound with the Commission for Defective Titles, Wentworth argued that St. Albans's titles fell into the category of those which were to come to the Crown; *ibid.* 40/24, Charles I to Wentworth 29 Jan 1638; *ibid.* 3/311, Wentworth to Charles I 27 Feb 1638.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 40/35, 20 June 1639. St. Albans was connected to several English nobles, most notably the Earl of Essex, and Charles took the view that it would be wise to avoid alienating him.

gained from opposition.³⁵ In Wentworth's opinion St. Albans was not worthy of royal favour, certainly not on so substantial a scale.

Not all requests related to land or money, but they could be equally irritating as far as the Lord Deputy was concerned. Wentworth objected strongly to the Earl of Nithsdale's wish to be sworn a member of the Irish Privy Council. He was forced to remind Charles that all Irish privy councillors were required to take the Oath of Supremacy and that Nithsdale - a recusant - refused. There were other objections to the Earl, not least the fact that Wentworth's aim to draw Ireland into religious conformity with England was a long-term policy and would require much discussion of religious matters at the Council board. Allowing Nithsdale on to the board would only encourage others to try and gain the same honour, a prospect which did not endear itself to Wentworth, who was well aware of the need to maintain a tight grip on Irish ministers and councillors.³⁶ Charles gave way on this issue, writing that he had not known that Roman Catholics were excluded from the Dublin Council.³⁷ But Nithsdale continued to be a thorn in the side of the Lord Deputy. He held a grant of the profits from forfeited recognisances and fines and in late 1634 had petitioned the King to have this enlarged. Wentworth argued that it would be better for the King's service if Nithsdale were paid a sum to relinquish this grant.³⁸ Charles agreed to this, but Wentworth was not prepared to press the Vice-Treasurer for the speedy payment of this sum, telling Nithsdale that he would

³⁵ *Ibid.* 3(ii)/77, 9 July 1639.

³⁶ *Ibid.* 3/166-7, 27 Jan 1635.

³⁷ *Ibid.* 40/9, 9 March 1635.

³⁸ *Ibid.* 4/156-7, Charles I (signed by Windebank) to Wentworth 11 Dec 1634; *ibid.* 3/194, Wentworth to Charles I 24 April 1635.

find that his ‘great friend Mountnorris...loves his own profit something better than his friends.’³⁹

The Lord Deputy was forced to tread more carefully where other suitors were concerned, particularly those close to the King, but even when dealing with Endymion Porter, one of Charles’s grooms of the bedchamber and a close friend of the king, he was not always accommodating. In 1633 he agreed to cooperate with Porter and William Murray, also a groom of the bedchamber, who had secured a grant to restore church livings appropriated by laymen,⁴⁰ but he does not appear to have been very helpful concerning other suits. Four years later he was required to consider Porter’s suit for a monopoly on soap-making in Ireland, but this proposal was not put into practice. I have been unable to find evidence of Wentworth’s reaction to this suit, but bearing in mind his criticism of the Westminster Corporation, he was unlikely to have welcomed it.⁴¹ In 1638 Porter received permission to drain marsh lands on the River Shannon and wrote to Wentworth requesting his assistance. By 1641 he was apparently still struggling to reap any benefit from this grant.⁴² Despite Porter’s position at Court, Wentworth does not appear to have responded well

³⁹ *Ibid.* 4/206-7, Charles I (signet by Windebank) to Wentworth 30 July 1635; *ibid.* 15/216, Nithsdale to Wentworth 13 Sept 1635; *ibid.* 8/286, Wentworth to Nithsdale 5 Oct 1635.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 4/11-3, Charles I (signet by Coke) to Wentworth 17 April 1633; *ibid.* 6/24-6, Laud to Wentworth 13 Jan 1634; *ibid.* 6/29, Wentworth to Laud 17 March 1634; *ibid.* 14/269, Porter to Wentworth 18 Jan 1635; Gervas Huxley, *Endymion Porter: The Life of a Courtier* (London, 1959), p. 199.

⁴¹ Str. P. 4/305-6, Charles I (signet by Windebank) to Wentworth 20 Nov 1637. Porter had been a member of the Westminster Soap Corporation which, in May 1637, was finally bought out by the former soap makers of London. He presumably transferred his attention to Ireland; Huxley, *Endymion Porter*, pp. 202-5.

⁴² Str. P. 18/46, Porter to Wentworth 28 May 1638; *Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland, 1509-1670* (24 vols. London, 1860-1911), [hereafter *CSPI*], *Addenda 1625-1660*, p. 226; Huxley, *Endymion Porter*, p. 213.

to his request for a loan of £2000 and in 1637 Porter had to complain that he had not received £4000 due to him from his share of the profits of the Irish customs farm, although the Duchess of Buckingham had been given most of her share.⁴³ Although Wentworth refrained from openly opposing these suits, he does not appear to have given Porter much assistance, presumably hoping that more pressing business, particularly in the late 1630s, would enable him to get away with this attitude.

In contrast, there were subjects of the Crown who were considered by the Lord Deputy to be deserving of the King's especial favour. As well as the favours he himself received, he was not averse to requesting rewards and assistance for others. In 1635 he suggested to Charles that there was a small piece of land near Dublin which would make a suitable reward for Secretary Coke's long service to the Crown. Wentworth praised Coke's 'integrity and diligence' and noted that his career had brought him little financial benefit.⁴⁴ Coke himself was asked by Wentworth's agent William Raylton, to ensure that Robert Rockley, manager of Wentworth's estates in Yorkshire, was not pricked sheriff.⁴⁵ Similarly, Wentworth requested Coke's assistance in a suit pressed by Lady Wentworth's brother-in-law, John Neville, to avoid serving as Sheriff

⁴³ Str. P. 17/6, Porter to Wentworth 31 March 1637; *ibid.* 17/59, same to same 12 May 1637; *ibid.* 17/210, same to same 15 Oct 1637.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 3/204, Wentworth to Charles I 20 May 1635; *ibid.* 40/10, Charles I to Wentworth 16 May [must mean June] 1635; *ibid.* 3/232, Wentworth to Charles I 5 Dec 1635; *ibid.* 40/16, Charles I to Wentworth 31 Jan 1636 (Charles gave the year as 1636 meaning 1635/6 - wrongly catalogued as 1637); *HMC, Twelfth Report, Appendix II, Cowper II*, p. 111, Wentworth to Coke 25 March 1636. Young states that 'Charles asked Wentworth to find a suitable reward for Coke's long service to the Crown', *Coke*, pp. 218-9. It is clear from a reading of Str. P. 3/204, that in fact it was Wentworth who first suggested the reward.

⁴⁵ *HMC, Twelfth Report, Appendix II, Cowper II*, p. 197, 20 Oct 1638. This request was successful, Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry*, p. 235.

of Nottingham.⁴⁶ In early 1638 he made a suit on behalf of the Earl of Cumberland, father of his first wife, that the Earl receive payment from the Irish Exchequer of part of the money owed him by the Crown. He felt it necessary to tell Charles that he would never again ask for a similar favour, and - if granted - would ensure that it was done quietly.⁴⁷ As well as these suits for rewards, the Lord Deputy made a point of informing the King of those who had worked particularly hard in his service. In a despatch to Secretary Coke, Wentworth named those who had given able service in the Irish Parliament of 1634-5: Lord Dillon, Sir Adam Loftus, Christopher Wandesford, Sir George Radcliffe, Secretary Mainwaring and Sir William St. Leger in the Commons, and the Earl of Ormond and Viscount Loftus in the Upper House.⁴⁸ If he was prepared to shower praise on his long-standing Yorkshire friends, he was also willing to point to the work of Irish nobles such as Ormond and Dillon and to try and further their careers wherever possible. Wentworth believed that men who served the Crown ahead of their own private interest were few and far between in Ireland, although admittedly his well-known criticism of the Irish elite was penned within less than a fortnight of his arrival in Dublin.⁴⁹ Hardworking servants of the Crown and even courtiers who proved to be accommodating to the King's needs were, in Wentworth's opinion, entitled to hope for some reward from the monarch. But he should not squander precious royal bounty on grasping courtiers who expected something for nothing. To

⁴⁶ Str. P. 11a/128, 18 Oct 1638.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* 3/306-7, 12 Jan 1638. Charles authorised the payment of £3755 to Cumberland; *ibid.* 40/24, Charles to Wentworth 29 Jan 1638; *ibid.* 4/344, Charles I (signet by Coke) to Wentworth 12 Feb 1638. See also University of Nottingham, Clifton Manuscripts, CI/C 720, Wentworth to Sir Gervase Clifton 27 July 1633; *ibid.* 721, same to same 8 Sept 1638.

⁴⁸ Str. P. 5/163-4, Wentworth to Coke 16 Dec 1634.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 3/8, Wentworth to Weston 3 Aug 1633: 'I find them in this Place a Company of men the most intent upon their owne endes that ever I mett with, and so as those speed they consider other things at a very great distance.'

Wentworth there was a clear distinction between these two groups of people: he was concerned at Charles's apparent failure to see this.

One area of his administration which Wentworth knew would attract the close scrutiny of the King was his attitude towards, and his management of, Parliament. In January 1634 Wentworth sent the King a lengthy document proposing that an Irish Parliament be called. He argued that Irish landowners would rather vote subsidies than risk seeing the present contribution towards the cost of the army become a permanent levy on their estates. He pointed out that it was essential for Parliament to meet in the summer at the latest as income from the quarterly payments would cease at the end of the year. Charles's marginal annotations show that he approved of the proposal to hold two sessions, dealing with supply in the first and granting or rejecting the Graces in the second, and he agreed with most of Wentworth's suggestions. He disapproved, however, of Wentworth's proposal to pack the House of Commons with as many captains and other army officers as possible, believing that they should be at their commands: the Lord Deputy should in any case make his choice of candidates based on a knowledge of their affections to the King's service. Most crucially, he insisted that he would not accept any attempt to limit his prerogative: if any attempt arose, the Lord Deputy was to dissolve Parliament.⁵⁰ Charles warned him to be wary of 'that Hydra'

'for you know, that heere, I have found it as well cunning as malitious: it is trew that your grounds are well layed, and I asseure you that I have a great trust in your care and jugement; yet my opinion is, that it will not bee the worse for my service, though ther obstinacie make you to breake them, for I feare

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* 3/48-51, 22 Jan 1634.

that they have some ground to demand more, than it is fitt for mee to give'.⁵¹

Wentworth assured his master that he was confident of success with this meeting of Parliament, but that if his expectations were not fulfilled he was prepared to 'Advise the breach of a hundred Parliaments' rather than risk damaging the royal prerogative.⁵² He sent detailed despatches regarding parliamentary business to Secretary Coke,⁵³ but continued to reassure Charles that he would bear in mind his warning.⁵⁴ In mid-July he was able to announce the passing of the subsidy bill and in a typical thrust at his predecessors, Wentworth claimed that the King's support had enabled him to serve 'more eminently to the Advantadg of the Crowne, then most of the Deputyes that have preceded me'. He then proceeded to set out his thoughts on the significance of this successful meeting:

'This their free and Generouse Proceeding hath, I confesse, taken me very much; not only as it deserves in it Selfe, but as it carryes an Aspect towards England. For Scotland and Ireland haveing thus fairly begun, wee now sure if there be either Grace or witt left amongst us, shall be thirsty of the Occasion, your Majesty in your owne good tyme, may honour us with all wherin to Expiate our former follyes.'

He was careful to add, however:

'Yet I am none of those that should dare to advise any hasty Calling of them on that side, my humble opinion being, that

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 40/4, 17 April 1634.

⁵² *Ibid.* 3/68, 25 April 1634.

⁵³ See *ibid.* 5/*passim* for Wentworth's despatches to Coke; Windebank received fewer and less detailed accounts. Charles received correspondence directly from the Lord Deputy and the Irish Council regarding the subsidy bill; *ibid.* 3/96-7, Irish Council to Charles I 17 June 1634; *ibid.* 3/102-3, Wentworth to Charles I 19 July 1634.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* 3/95, 26 May 1634.

this last difficulty is to be overcome rather by giving them time to forget those forward importunate freedoms, thorough Discontinuance, which they have assumed, and discoursed themselves into the full belief of, thorough the frequency of their Meetings, and long Sittings in Parliaments; then in Present either by faire or sower usadge to hope to perswade them out of their former Errours.⁵⁵

The Lord Deputy strongly believed in the possibility and the desirability of renewing relations between the King and his English subjects as represented in Parliament, but Parliament had to be firmly managed. He believed that he had demonstrated his ability to perform this task, having played down the difficulties of the second session in late 1634,⁵⁶ and wished in early 1635 to prorogue Parliament, rather than dissolve it. He claimed that this was an extremely important point, noting that a prorogation could do no harm to the Crown as it could at any time be turned into a dissolution. He claimed that the Protestant majority in the Commons had ensured that the government received sufficient support in contrast to the awkward and obstructive Popish party, and he could not guarantee that a future Parliament would have a similar composition. Wentworth believed that a political advantage could be gained over the Old English and their future behaviour could be secured if they feared that the same, mainly Protestant, Parliament could be summoned again and pass the English statutes against recusancy.⁵⁷ Charles's reaction to this was predictable. Parliaments 'are of the Nature of Catts, they ever grow Curst with

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* 3/102, 19 July 1634.

⁵⁶ For an account of the preparations for the 1634-5 Parliament and its events see Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, pp. 42-68.

⁵⁷ Str. P. 5/164-5, Wentworth to Coke 16 Dec 1634. The planned Connacht plantation was the reason behind this argument, as the Lord Deputy expected concerted opposition from Catholic families. See also *ibid.* 6/132, Wentworth to Laud 16 Dec 1634; *ibid.* 3/172-3, Wentworth to Cottington 18 Feb 1635.

age. Soe that if ye will have good of them, put them off handsomly when they Come to any age. For yongue ones are ever most Tractable.’⁵⁸ Charles had not yet shaken off his deep distrust of his representative assemblies.

For the majority of his Deputyship Wentworth was not expected to give advice on significant issues of royal policy. Charles did ask Wentworth’s opinion on offers to lease the Londonderry lands, and requested details regarding other matters, but it was not until the summer of 1639 that Wentworth was informed that the King wanted the benefit of his counsel.⁵⁹ Occasionally he gave Wentworth snippets of information not directly relevant to the government of Ireland. In January 1634, when Charles wrote to Wentworth recommending Lorenzo Cary, he informed Wentworth that he had called the Earl of Holland to sit on the Foreign Affairs Committee again, ‘upon not onlie his recantation, but, as I hope, or can trewlie judge, his totall Conversion from his former wais’.⁶⁰ Wentworth regarded the King’s comments as ‘a highe and Princely trust, A great Honour to me, thus to participate, in those neare and Secret Counsellis.’ Charles probably used this information to soften the blow which his insistence on Cary’s appointment represented because he did not make it a

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 3/180, Charles I to Wentworth 22 Jan 1635. Wentworth was not able to convince Laud of the wisdom of prorogation; *ibid.* 6/136-7, Laud to Wentworth 12 Jan 1635.

⁵⁹ Regarding the Londonderry lands see *ibid.* 40/18, 27 March 1637; *ibid.* 40/23, 31 April 1638. Charles asked Wentworth to inform him how good a title he had to land in Ormond and how the Crown might benefit from it; *ibid.* 40/12, 27 Oct 1635. Wentworth was called home after the failure of the first campaign against the Covenanters; *ibid.* 40/38, 23 July 1639.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 40/8, 20 Jan 1634 (manuscript has 1634, but it is 1633/4, not 1634/5 as catalogued). Carlyle makes no mention of Holland’s dismissal and subsequent re-appointment; E. I. Carlyle, ‘Committees of Council under the Earlier Stuarts’, *English Historical Review* 21 (1906), pp. 675-7.

habit to inform his Lord Deputy of other such committee appointments and rarely mentioned anything to do with foreign affairs.⁶¹

Wentworth's views on foreign policy had remained constant since his early parliamentary career. Although he was not regarded as being as strongly Hispanophile as his friend Cottington, he was deeply suspicious of both France and the United Provinces and could see no possible benefit for England or Ireland from such an alliance.⁶² He was inclined towards friendship with Spain for pragmatic reasons, rather than religious sympathies: he understood the importance of maintaining good relations for the benefit of the Irish economy. Under Lord Deputy Falkland Irish trade with Spain appears to have more or less halted and Wentworth sought information regarding its potential. He corresponded with John Taylor, an English agent in Spain in 1634-5, who provided him with information regarding the commodities which could be traded between Ireland and Spain and her possessions.⁶³ Wentworth was

⁶¹ Str. P. 3/69, 3 April 1634. The bitter dispute between Wentworth and Holland does not appear to have started as early as 1634 and therefore I do not think the King was being provocative. In any case, Holland's recall on to the Foreign Affairs Committee was not significant in the obvious sense, as it is likely that the formulation of high policy was not done at this committee. Holland may well have been appointed to keep him content, while the real power lay elsewhere. The fact that Cottington in particular was removed from this Committee surely did not mean that he ceased to wield any influence over foreign policy. See also above, p. 193, regarding Charles's attitude to Holland's involvement in foreign affairs.

⁶² A few months earlier he complained that Turkish pirates were receiving French assistance; Str. P. 3/265, Wentworth to Charles I 18 Jan 1637; *ibid.* 3/267, Wentworth to Cottington 10 Dec 1636.

⁶³ See in particular *ibid.* 9/1, Taylor to Wentworth 20 July 1633; *ibid.* 9/1-2, same to same 1 Aug 1633; *ibid.* 9/2-3, same to same 22 Aug 1633; *ibid.* 9/4-6, Wentworth to Taylor 7 Sept 1633; *ibid.* 9/43-6, Taylor to Wentworth 12 Feb 1634; *ibid.* 9/50-51, Wentworth to Taylor 20 April 1634; Gary M. Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives 1509-1688*

particularly keen to increase the level of Irish exports to avoid the need to pay for imports in coin.⁶⁴ But his relations with Spain were not wholly harmonious; Wentworth did not hesitate to raise the issue of Spanish protection of Biscayner pirates and his annoyance at their practice of attacking Dutch ships in Irish and English harbours.⁶⁵ Despite this he was keen to continue the practice of sending Irish levies to the Spanish Netherlands whenever possible. In 1634 about six thousand Irish troops arrived in Flanders, and the Spanish resident in London, Juan de Nocolalde, credited this success to his friendship with Wentworth. When Charles called a halt to the practice two years later, because of problems associated with the presence of Irish soldiers in London, Wentworth asked Nocolalde not to press the issue but to wait until he arrived in London and could discuss it with him.⁶⁶ In 1640, when Charles was desperately short of money, but intent on using force against the Covenanters a second time, the sending of Irish levies formed a part of the Anglo-Spanish negotiations.⁶⁷

(London, 1990), p. 260. Wentworth asked Cottington to look into Taylor's arrears of pay; *ibid.* 3/8, 24 July 1633.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 9/4-6, Wentworth to Taylor 7 Sept 1633. See also Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland*, pp. 133-4, where Kearney argues that Wentworth's interest in trade with Spain and her possessions may in part have been caused by self-interest.

⁶⁵ Str. P. 9/8-9, Wentworth to Captain Richard Pronoville 4 Oct 1633; *ibid.* 9/11-14, Nocolalde to Wentworth 10 Sept 1633; *ibid.* 9/14-17, Wentworth to Nocolalde 7 Oct 1633.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 9/75-7, Nocolalde to Wentworth [c. Sept 1635]; *ibid.* 9/78-80, Wentworth to Nocolalde 5 Oct 1635; *ibid.* 9/80, same to same 20 May 1636, reporting that he had been forbidden to allow any levies of men for foreign service to be made at the moment; R. A. Stradling, *The Spanish Monarchy and Irish Mercenaries: The Wild Geese in Spain, 1618-68* (Dublin, 1994), p. 24.

⁶⁷ J. H. Elliott, 'The Year of the Three Ambassadors', in *History and Imagination* eds. H. Lloyd Jones et al. (London, 1981), pp. 169-70, 173, 176-7.

If Wentworth's interest in Spain concerned the development of trade and the suppression of piracy, the role of Philip IV in the Palatinate crisis was a greater concern to most of Charles I's ministers. Wentworth himself raised the matter once with Necolalde in October 1635, arguing that the restitution of the Palatine family lay within Spain's power, but it did not become a permanent subject in his correspondence with Spanish agents.⁶⁸ Sir Thomas Roe tried to enlist Wentworth for the Queen of Bohemia's cause, advising her in December 1634 that he was worth cultivating.⁶⁹ Wentworth performed a minor service for the Queen in 1634, and this prompted her to continue writing to him in the hope that he would be able to accomplish more on her behalf than others had managed.⁷⁰ In Roe's assessment of Wentworth's character, he had described him as 'one that may (and his nature lyes fitt for it, for he is ambitious to doe what others will not) doe your Majestie very great service, if yow can make him.'⁷¹ In early 1636 she tried to interest him in her business, arranging for Sir William Boswell to inform him of the state of affairs in the German states, and his polite response encouraged her to use a more direct approach.⁷² In July 1636, during Wentworth's visit to England, she wrote him a very complimentary letter, mentioning reports of his achievements in Ireland, and commenting on how pleased she was that he was in England at that moment when she needed all her good friends there to assist and support her son Charles Louis. She acted on Roe's advice and asked Wentworth to give the

⁶⁸ Str. P. 9/79-80, 5 Oct 1635.

⁶⁹ SP 16/278/32, 10 Dec 1634.

⁷⁰ Str. P. 13/108, Queen of Bohemia to Wentworth 14/24 Nov 1633; *ibid.* 8/210, Wentworth to Queen of Bohemia 27 March 1635; *ibid.* 3/222-3, Queen of Bohemia to Wentworth 27 July 1635.

⁷¹ SP 16/278/32 10 Dec 1634; Michael Strachan, *Sir Thomas Roe, 1581-1644: A Life* (Salisbury, 1989), pp. 224-5.

⁷² Str. P. 3/255, Queen of Bohemia to Wentworth 15/25 Jan 1636; *ibid.* 3/255-6, Wentworth to Queen of Bohemia 30 June 1636.

King his counsel on a suitable response to the likely failure of Arundel's embassy to Vienna.⁷³ But Wentworth's reply revealed that he had no intention of becoming a supporter of the Palatine cause at the English Court:

'For unless it were required of me it would not become me unmannerly to offer any advise in a businesse I noe better understand, and amongst those of farr greater Experience and wisdome with whom His Majesty dayly and seriously consults and examines the depth of those Great Businesses and is himself of all others best able to shape forth and pursue his owne Course.'

He was not involved in foreign policy consultations and would soon be returning to Dublin, where he would have even less knowledge of Charles's intentions. He promised his service in areas where he could be of assistance, but their correspondence appears not to have continued after this very firm response.⁷⁴

But it was at the height of this crisis in English relations with the Habsburg states that Charles decided to inform Wentworth of his current thinking. He saw fit to notify his Lord Deputy that he intended to form a defensive league with France: if this led to war with the House of Austria Charles was confident that Ireland was well governed and would suffer little disturbance. He also made it clear that he did not intend to call Parliament to finance a war.⁷⁵ This letter was merely to notify the Lord Deputy of policy which might affect Ireland: it was not a request for advice,⁷⁶ but in response Wentworth sent the

⁷³ *Ibid.* 3/251-2, 14/24 July 1636.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 3/250, 7 Nov 1636.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 40/22, 28 Feb 1637 (wrongly catalogued as 1638).

⁷⁶ See Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. VIII, pp. 211-17. Regarding Charles's letter, Gardiner made an uncharacteristic slip: 'It was the first time, as far as we know, that the

King a lengthy paper entitled 'Considerations which may be had & weighted in the Great Question, whether His Majestie should declare a warr against the howse of Austria in Case the Prince Elector be not forthwith by them totally restored to His Honour and Patrimony'. He set down a number of pointed criticisms to the King's plan, arguing that war was not in the best interests of England, and that it would necessitate the recall of Parliament as the fleet could not be reinforced or replaced with the income from a single ship money writ. He also cast doubt on the reliability of France as an ally.⁷⁷ This unsolicited advice received an irritated response from the King who claimed that the question was not whether he should declare a war on the House of Austria, but whether he should join with France and a number of Protestant states and hazard a war.⁷⁸ As France was already at war with Spain this seemed an irrelevant distinction. Wentworth poured out his worries to Laud during the spring of 1637, and he received advice from the Archbishop and Cottington on the likelihood of war. Cipher numbers were introduced for France and Spain in his correspondence with Laud.⁷⁹ In the event war with Spain did not materialise, but this did not relieve him of all anxieties. The

Lord Deputy's opinion had ever been asked on the larger issues of policy', p. 211. The King's letter merely states his plans and does not ask for counsel on the matter.

⁷⁷ Str. P. 3/277-84, 3 April 1637. Wentworth assumed that Charles had given him an opportunity to make some comments on foreign policy and he therefore stated his view that it would not be in England's best interests if the Spanish Netherlands was swallowed up by France or the United Provinces. Regarding the Palatinate, he believed that it stood in long-term danger from the ambitions of the French; a view that was justified later in the century by the actions of Louis XIV.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* 40/19, 1 June 1637.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* 7/23, Wentworth to Laud 28 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 7/24, same to same 3 April 1637. By April Laud believed that there would be no war, as France appeared to be ready to come to terms with Spain; *ibid.* 7/31, 5 April 1637, but by the end of the month Cottington had become fearful of the consequences if Charles Louis sailed with the fleet; *ibid.* 17/46, 28 April 1637. For cipher numbers see *ibid.* 7/39, Wentworth to Laud 10 July 1637.

process of writing down his objections to war had focused his thoughts on the ability of Charles's government to plan and finance an ambitious policy: these concerns were brought into sharper focus during the following years.

From the beginning of his service in Ireland, Charles reassured Wentworth that he would receive royal support in his work.⁸⁰ As a public sign of this assurance, Wentworth twice requested an earldom and was twice refused. In October 1631 Sir Edward Stanhope had assumed that Wentworth would expect to be granted this favour before agreeing to serve in Ireland, but the Lord Deputy appears to have waited until he was settled in Ireland before he made the request.⁸¹ In September 1634 Wentworth wrote to Laud, explaining in cipher why he had requested this favour and enclosing a copy of his letter to the King. He claimed that the earldom itself was not important: rather, the purpose of the suit was to test the extent of Charles's favour towards him:

‘...for such is the slo[w]nes[s] of Weston that Wentworth utterly dispaire[s] of goeing thorow with the great worke before him, unless hee may have his immediate dependance upon the king.’

He also claimed that he would be better able to serve the King if he received this public mark of favour.⁸² This point was made directly to Charles and Wentworth set his request in the context of parliamentary business. The Irish Parliament was due to meet for a second session in early November and the Lord Deputy would have to state the royal position on the Graces. Wentworth's third wife had given birth to a son a few weeks earlier and the future status of the Wentworth family was also on the Lord Deputy's mind. Wentworth was careful to request that Charles give him a direct answer,

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 40/3, 26 Oct 1633.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* 21/79, Stanhope to Wentworth [Oct 1631].

⁸² *Ibid.* 6/97, 22 Sept 1634.

whatever he might decide, and not allow his request to become public knowledge. He was confident enough to have sent Secretary Mainwaring to Court carrying sealed directions regarding the desired form of title which the King could open if he granted Wentworth's suit.⁸³ But Charles was not prepared at present to grant him his request. The King saw clearly the Lord Deputy's sense of insecurity and advised him to be confident of his support. He approved of the manner in which the suit had been made and held out the prospect of further ennoblement at some point in the future.⁸⁴

Wentworth renewed his request for an earldom during his stay in England in the summer of 1636. During 1635 Charles had granted him the wardship of his son, William,⁸⁵ which he must have regarded as an indication of the King's favour, but the struggle over Connacht and opposition to his control of the Irish customs farm, as well as his attacks on Cork and Mountnorris, made it imperative that he be seen to enjoy royal favour. After his arrival in London in the early summer he journeyed north and spent August in Yorkshire, from where he wrote to Charles. This time he made an implicit rather than an explicit request and he prefaced it with a lengthy discussion of how he laboured under the displeasure of prominent courtiers who had resolved to bring about his ruin. He argued that part of their attack was to comment on the absence of a mark of royal favour for the Lord Deputy. He claimed to be able to face these attacks on a personal level, confident in the hope that Charles would in time grant him a sign of royal favour, but desired permission to speak

⁸³ *Ibid.* 3/133, 20 Sept 1634; Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 153.

⁸⁴ Str. P. 40/7, 23 Oct 1634. Wentworth replied that he was pleased that the King approved of his direct approach and judged himself very lucky to receive words of regard from him; *ibid.* 3/150-51, 15 Dec 1634. Wentworth kept Laud fully informed regarding this suit, sending him a copy of the King's reply to his request; *ibid.* 6/121-2, 9 Dec 1634.

⁸⁵ See above, pp. 128-9.

to the King again on a number of important matters.⁸⁶ Wentworth did not rely on this direct approach alone: he kept Laud informed of his actions and asked the Archbishop to move Charles that he might receive a public mark of favour.⁸⁷ Although the King had probably hoped that his Lord Deputy would make a speedy return to Ireland, he was prepared to allow him a short visit to Court. But Charles recognised that this request was made in the hope that he would bestow an earldom on his Lord Deputy and his reply, therefore, made it clear that this would not be forthcoming - at least for the time being. He advised Wentworth that 'the markes of my favors that stopes malitious Tongues ar nether Places nor Tytles, but the littell welcome I give to accusers, and the willing Eare I give to my Servants'.⁸⁸ These were nice words, but were not particularly useful to the Lord Deputy of Ireland. The very nature of his employment - geographically isolated and traditionally vulnerable to attack - meant that places and titles were indeed significant. This was doubly the case for this particular Lord Deputy who aimed to bite the bullet and introduce and develop unpopular policies and remove a number of senior ministers. Wentworth's reply to Charles's letter insisted that he did not entertain any

⁸⁶ Str. P. 3/259-60, 23 Aug 1636. His discussion named only the Earl of Arundel who was apparently dissatisfied with Wentworth's handling of his Irish affairs. Wentworth enclosed a duplicate of his reply to the Earl and defended his carriage in the Earl's business; see above, pp. 181-2. Although he named only Arundel, his comment that Sir Piers Crosby was 'dayly Countenanced & fomented by some at Court in his sencelesse Calumnyes' referred to Holland in particular. See also Milnes ed., *Private Letters from the Earl of Strafford to his Third Wife*, p. 10, Wentworth to Lady Wentworth 3 Oct 1636.

⁸⁷ Str. P. 6/347, 26 Aug 1636. This approach failed: according to Laud, Charles would only deal with Wentworth directly on the subject of a title; *ibid.* 6/352, 31 Aug 1636. In late September Laud warned Wentworth not to return to Ireland via the south of England as plague was spreading: he may also have doubted the wisdom of Wentworth making a second visit to Court if he was to leave empty-handed; *ibid.* 6/362, 26 Sept 1636.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* 40/15, 3 Sept 1636. Charles promised to bear in mind Wentworth's comments regarding Arundel.

doubts regarding the King's favour, but that he was concerned about 'some neare your Majesty who publikely professe my ruine.' He was determined to have the last word on the matter, hoping that the King would pardon him for desiring something which would enable him to serve more effectively.⁸⁹ Wentworth did not receive the desired earldom until January 1640 and even then, when he had become a member of the King's inner circle of advisors, it appears that Charles granted his suit reluctantly.⁹⁰

Wentworth rose to high favour with the King during the course of the Scottish crisis, but not until after the defeat of Charles's first attempt to subdue the Scots in the summer of 1639. Events in Scotland concerning the fortunes of the Prayer Book had formed a topic of Wentworth's correspondence with Laud since the autumn of 1637 and criticism of the King's handling of the problem appeared only a couple of months later.⁹¹ The English Privy Council was not

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 3/261-2, 10 Sept 1636. A year later Wentworth wrote to Laud regretting the absence of 'Publike Testimonye that I am Gratiouly Accepted in this Employment' and claiming that he had resolved never again to raise the issue of an earldom; *ibid.* 7/45, 28 Sept 1637; *ibid.* 7/62v, 27 Nov 1637.

⁹⁰ Whitaker ed., *Radcliffe*, p. 187, Wentworth to Radcliffe 10 Dec 1639: on informing Radcliffe of his appointment as Lieutenant General, Wentworth believed it would be possible to gain 'the other thing too. My Lord of Canterbury hath moved itt tow or three times, but itt sticks: what would you advise a man should doe in this case? Let me by the next finde what you thinke. The Queen useth me passing well, and the moving for this Parliament gives me a good report with the multitude.' Wentworth was formally created Earl of Strafford on 12 January 1640. The Earls of Newcastle and Northumberland, and the Marquis of Hamilton (Earl of Cambridge) took part in the ceremony as well as the Earls of Cleveland and Clare; Albert J. Loomie ed., *The Note Books of John Finet* (New York, 1987), p. 271; *De L'Isle VI*, p. 224, Hawkins to Leicester 16 Jan 1640.

⁹¹ Str. P. 7/57v, Laud to Wentworth 7 Oct 1637; *ibid.* 7/56, Wentworth to Laud 18 Oct 1637; *ibid.* 7/63-63v, Wentworth to Laud 27 Nov 1637; *ibid.* 7/75v, 16 Nov 1637. Laud claimed

officially informed of events north of the border until the summer of 1638 and it was only then that the Lord Deputy was sent limited information from the King on the problem.⁹² The Lord Deputy was not required to give advice to the King on the wider issue of policy. Charles simply expected him to keep the Secretaries⁹³ informed of the state of the Irish army and he occasionally notified him of resolutions taken concerning the defence of the border towns, a matter which directly concerned Wentworth as the King required 500 Irish soldiers to supplement the garrison of Carlisle.⁹⁴ According to Wentworth, Charles had, on consideration, refused him permission to come over to England.⁹⁵ He particularly regretted the King's reluctance to fully involve him in this business when he heard that Dunbarton had been taken by Argyll.⁹⁶ The

that Charles was failing to get to grips with the problem; *ibid.* 7/80-80v, Laud to Wentworth 19 Dec 1637.

⁹² *Ibid.* 40/25, Charles I to Wentworth 5 July 1638, informing the Lord Deputy that he had discussed the Scottish business with Radcliffe, but only as far as it concerned Ireland. In October Wentworth complained to Laud that he received little information from the Council; *ibid.* 7/133, 22 Oct 1638.

⁹³ From the spring of 1639 Wentworth's correspondence concerning military matters was handled by Sir Henry Vane, Treasurer of the Household. It would appear that Secretary Coke was being eased out of office by his eventual successor and that Vane's enjoyment of Hamilton's patronage was the reason for this; Gardiner ed. *Hamilton Papers*, pp. 78, 82, 83, 88, 90, all Hamilton to Charles I, 7, 14, 21, 29, 31 May 1639. In late 1638 Patrick Maule noted that Vane and Arundel were the only councillors with whom Charles discussed affairs in Scotland; *HMC, Duke of Hamilton* (Supplementary), (London, 1932), p. 54 Maule to Hamilton 28 Nov 1638: this was still the case six months later, *HMC, Eleventh Report, Appendix VI* (Hamilton), (London, 1887), p. 102, Charles I to Hamilton 18 April 1639.

⁹⁴ Str. P. 11a/110-16, Wentworth to Coke 10 Aug 1638; *ibid.* 40/28, Charles I to Wentworth 21 Nov 1638; *ibid.* 40/30, same to same 25 Jan 1639; *ibid.* 40/31, same to same 25 Feb 1639.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* 10b/43, Wentworth to Northumberland 28 Feb 1639.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* 10b/64, Wentworth to Northumberland 15 April 1639: Wentworth claimed that had he known that Dunbarton was in danger he could have shipped over sufficient men to defend the town.

only other major feature of Charles's personal letters to Wentworth was his desire that Wentworth assist Randal MacDonnell, Earl of Antrim, in the planning and operation of his projected attack on Archibald Campbell, Lord Lorne, later Earl of Argyll.

The dispute between Antrim and Lorne centred on Lorne's control of former MacDonnell lands in the western Highlands. Lorne had avoided making an open demonstration of his support for the opponents of Charles's ecclesiastical policy, no doubt fearing that he might be prevented from succeeding to the earldom on the death of his father. Wentworth recognised Lorne's power and understood the importance of keeping him away from the Covenanter movement. When Lorne wrote to him discussing the activities of the O'Donnell and O'Neill clans, claiming that they were working together and using foreign intelligence, Wentworth replied agreeing with Lorne's assessment of the Clandonnells and informing him of their involvement in a recent rape and murder case. But he used this opportunity to try and persuade Lorne that the Covenanters' opposition to the Prayer Book was nothing less than rebellion and that he could not understand the anger directed at ceremonies which were not fundamental matters of faith. He also unwisely gave Lorne advice on how members of the nobility ought to conduct themselves towards the Crown during difficult times.⁹⁷ A short correspondence sprang up between them in which they continued to discuss the activities of the O'Donnells and events in Scotland, but in the spring of 1639 when Lorne - now Argyll - openly joined the Covenanters, the correspondence ceased and Wentworth made sure that copies of it were sent to the Secretaries of State. Laud informed Wentworth in January 1639 that Argyll had apparently read out Wentworth's letters to the Assembly: Laud made no

⁹⁷ *Ibid.* 18/89, Lorne to Wentworth 25 July 1638; *ibid.* 10a/168-70 Wentworth to Lorne 28 Aug 1638.

comment other than to criticise Argyll's manners, but he intended the passage to be a warning to the Lord Deputy that he would burn his fingers if he meddled in Scottish affairs.⁹⁸

Antrim approached the King with his offer to attack Argyll through the mediation and influence of the Marquis of Hamilton.⁹⁹ He promised that he could call upon the MacDonalds of western Scotland for support, as well as his own supporters in Ulster.¹⁰⁰ Any offer to furnish the King with men and arms

⁹⁸ The remaining four letters are *ibid.* 34/5, Lorne to Wentworth 9 Oct 1638, in which Lorne 'thanked' Wentworth for informing him of his duty, and *ibid.* 10a/223-7, Wentworth to Lorne 25 Nov 1638, in which Wentworth insisted that he had not tried to teach Lorne his duty, but had expressed himself in general terms only. Wentworth regretted the opinion of some who believed that the Scottish liturgy represented a step backwards to Rome. See also *ibid.* 18/175, Lorne to Wentworth 20 Feb 1639, in which Lorne insisted that events in Scotland centred on fundamental religious issues and he discussed the proceedings of the general Assembly, sending Wentworth printed material. In *ibid.* 10a/260-61, Wentworth to Lorne [now Argyll] 19 March 1639, Wentworth thanked him for the books, but doubted whether he would read them, 'least I be deemed too great a medler in other mens businesse'. See also *ibid.* 7/158, Laud to Wentworth 20 Jan 1639. For Hamilton's view of Argyll, see Philip Yorke, Earl of Hardwicke, *Miscellaneous State Papers from 1501 to 1726* (2 vols. London, 1778), vol. II, p. 115, Hamilton to Charles I 27 Nov 1638.

⁹⁹ Scottish Record Office, Hamilton Papers [hereafter SRO], GD 406/1/10488, Hamilton to Charles I 15 June 1638. See Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration*, pp. 49-52 for a discussion of Antrim's connections with Hamilton through the Marquis's marriage into the Buckingham clan, as well as his additional court connections.

¹⁰⁰ SRO, GD406/1/1156, Antrim to Hamilton 11 June 1638; *ibid.* 10488, Hamilton to Charles I 15 June 1638. Professor Ohlmeyer argues that his plan may have developed from a wider scheme planned by the Earl of Nithsdale, in which a combined Scottish and Irish force would be sent against the Covenanters; *Civil War and Restoration*, p. 78. John Fleming's correspondent claimed to know that Antrim was involved in military proceedings against Scotland, SP16/393/31, unknown (Ohlmeyer suggests Sir John Clotworthy) to Fleming 21 June 1638.

was certain to attract his interest, particularly when his Lord Deputy could not give more than token assistance to the war effort. Wentworth regarded it inadvisable to allow more than a small number of men to leave Ireland and reminded Charles, with some exaggeration, of the presence of a significant number of Scottish planters in Ulster. While he was confident that he could train up three or four thousand additional troops, he believed it sensible to exclude Irishmen from this levy. Despite their obvious religious differences with the Covenanters, it would be unwise to invite rebellion by giving them arms. This objection was part of the reason for his hostility to Antrim's plans. Wentworth made little attempt to hide his personal dislike of the Earl, making it clear to Charles that he doubted both the Earl's abilities, due to his heavy debts, and his affections. He made a point of reminding Charles of Antrim's ancestry.¹⁰¹ But he genuinely feared the consequences of arming Irish Catholics and during the next few months he used every means at his disposal to obstruct Antrim's plan. He was prepared to incur rebukes from Laud who urged him to be more tolerant of the Earl and was ready to use delaying tactics when even the King made his wishes clear. He was also prepared to make six members of the Dublin Council aware of Charles's plans, without the King's permission.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ Str. P. 3/337-8, 28 July 1638; *ibid.* 3(ii)/48, 10 Feb 1639; Percevall-Maxwell, 'Ireland and Scotland', in *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context* ed. John Morrill (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 193-4.

¹⁰² Regarding Laud's support for Antrim see above, pp. 114-16. Charles recommended Antrim to Wentworth's care, although he left it up to him to decide whether to allow him command of the magazine; Str. P. 40/26, 30 Aug 1638; in *ibid.* 40/30, 25 Jan 1639, Charles hoped that Wentworth would find some way to arm Antrim, despite his Catholicism; and in *ibid.* 40/32, 10 April 1639, the King wrote personally to Wentworth and expressly ordered him not to shun Antrim's plan. (Windebank's letter to Wentworth, sent from London and dated 13 April 1639, ordered that the scheme be postponed until the following year, but this letter expressed the king's views in early April; *ibid.* 19/18. The most recent directions were

The conclusion of the first Bishops' War brought an end for the immediate future to Antrim's hopes, but presumably not to Wentworth's concerns regarding the King's policies. Throughout the spring and summer of 1639 he had advised Charles not to consider incautious action against the Scots, particularly when he was not financially and militarily well-equipped for it. The most the King ought to do was ensure that the border towns were well defended.¹⁰³ After the Pacification of Berwick Wentworth warned Charles that the Covenanters had only made peace because they were aware of their own weakness, not because they had come to their senses.¹⁰⁴ After the failure of the 1639 campaign Charles must have looked a little more closely at the advice he was receiving from his Lord Deputy. Probably only at this stage did he realise the extent of his predicament and in July he finally turned to the man whom he had throughout his reign kept at a distance. Wentworth was called to Court to assist the King in his weighty affairs, but even then Charles would not allow him to publicise the fact and made a point of telling him that it would only be a temporary stay at Court.¹⁰⁵ Charles may have been 'prepared to consign

those written by Charles himself, *ibid.* 40/32, and sent from York.) Wentworth informed Laud of his consultations with a group of councillors; *ibid.* 7/182, 10 May 1639.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* 3(ii)/56, 1 April 1639; *ibid.* 3(ii)/57, 2 April 1639; *ibid.* 3(ii)/73-4, 30 May 1639; *ibid.* 3(ii)/76, 3 July 1639.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 3(ii)/82, 22 July 1639.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* 11a/178, Wentworth to Windebank 15 Feb 1639; *ibid.* 10b/43, Wentworth to Northumberland 28 Feb 1639; *ibid.* 40/38, Charles I to Wentworth 23 July 1639. Wentworth went along with the King's request and informed his friends that he had been a suitor to the King to be allowed to attend Loftus's appeal in England; *ibid.* 10b/127, Wentworth to Cottingham 7 Aug 1639; *ibid.* 10a/347-8, Wentworth to Henry Percy 7 Aug 1639; *ibid.* 10a/351-2, Wentworth to Conway 13 Aug 1639.

himself and his fortunes to the relentless, the overwhelming Wentworth', but not for a day longer than was absolutely necessary.¹⁰⁶

‘I find a great expectation is drawn upon me for which I am most sorry; and the nearer I cum to it, the more my heartte failes me’.¹⁰⁷

Wentworth was very much aware of the expectations which his arrival in England had fostered and he regarded this with mixed feelings. His wish to wield greater influence at Court must have been tempered with the knowledge that rescuing the King from such a desperate situation would not be easy and failure would be very public. News of his departure from Ireland bred rumours that he would be given a more important government post, replacing Bishop Juxon as Lord Treasurer.¹⁰⁸ Although this did not occur, London opinion noted his influence over royal policy in early December, when the King announced his resolution to hold a meeting of the English Parliament. It was widely said that Wentworth had pressed Charles to call Parliament, and indeed Wentworth himself believed that his reputation with the ‘multitude’ had improved because of his advice to the King.¹⁰⁹ Charles’s reluctance to proceed with the

¹⁰⁶ Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, p. 259.

¹⁰⁷ Whitaker ed., *Radcliffe*, pp. 179-81, Wentworth to Radcliffe 21 Sept 1639.

¹⁰⁸ SP 16/428/111, Thomas Smith to Pennington 19 Sept 1639; Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 614, Lady Carlisle to Leicester 17 Oct 1639, stating that Hamilton had made strenuous efforts to prevent Wentworth becoming Lord Treasurer. Lord Stafford noted that the reason for Wentworth’s departure from Ireland was not known to most of the Court: ‘my lord of Canterburie is held to be most able to expound the Ridle, his Cominge to all else, is still a misterie’; Chatsworth, Lismore Papers, box 20, f. 102, Sir Thomas Stafford to Cork 26 Aug 1639.

¹⁰⁹ SP 16/435/64, Nicholas to Pennington 12 Dec 1639; Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 233. Laud stated that Wentworth, Hamilton and himself had persuaded Charles to call Parliament, but Laud appears to have gone along with Wentworth against his own judgement; see above, p. 117.

parliamentary option is evident by his insistence that privy councillors lend him money which would be repaid with the yield from parliamentary subsidies. Wentworth was willing to put his money where his mouth was and immediately promised £20,000, a sum which represented roughly a year's income and an amount which few other councillors matched.¹¹⁰

In early January the King made appointments to the senior military posts and here, too, Wentworth's influence was evident. Northumberland was to be Lord General, with Wentworth - now Earl of Strafford - as Lieutenant-General. Conway was appointed General of the Horse. There was no place for the losers of the previous summer.¹¹¹ But what Gardiner described as 'Wentworth's Ascendancy' did not extend to influencing the King's choice of ministers during early 1640: power over appointments was very much in the hands of the Queen and Hamilton as demonstrated by the appointments of Vane as Secretary of State, Sir John Finch as Lord Keeper and the Earl of Lanerick as Secretary of State for Scotland.¹¹² He realised also that being able to influence the shaping of policy on Scotland would not on its own guarantee success. It was essential that Northumberland, as Lord General, and himself as Lieutenant, be given the necessary financial and military support for the

¹¹⁰ Pembroke and Newcastle also promised £20,000, but Lennox dwarfed those amounts with a promise of £40,000; *De L'Isle VI*, p. 212 Hawkins to Leicester 12 Dec 1639; *ibid.* p. 214, same to same 19 Dec 1639.

¹¹¹ Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. IX, p. 84; SP 16/441/92, Sir Richard Cave to Sir Thomas Roe 10 Jan 1640; Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, pp. 626-7, Lady Carlisle to Lady Leicester 19 Dec 1639.

¹¹² Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. IX, pp. 84-7; Clarendon, *History*, vol. I, pp. 165-6; Hilary L. Rubinstein, *Captain Luckless: James, First Duke of Hamilton, 1606-1649* (Edinburgh, 1975), p. 113.

campaign, and that Charles make public his firm support for them.¹¹³ Throughout his Deputyship Wentworth had been concerned that he be seen to enjoy the support of the King, and it was even more essential that Charles not waver now. As he wrote to Cottington, ‘untill He shew which of His Servants they are He trusts and will imploy, and soe countenance them in the Course of that Service, as none other shall dare either to oppose, or open their mouthes to their preiudice of Defamation...I expect noe great impression either from the Counsells or performances on that side.’¹¹⁴

During the Spring of 1640 Wentworth’s confidence in the wisdom of summoning Parliament was put to the test. After a brief visit to Ireland to manage the Irish Parliament, which he did with apparent success, he returned to London with the English Parliament already in session.¹¹⁵ Debilitated by illness, he was not able to attend Parliament immediately on arrival in London, but by 23 April he was involved in discussion, urging the King to appeal to the House of Lords on the issue of supply.¹¹⁶ His hope that a wedge could be

¹¹³ Wentworth wrote to Hamilton from Dublin in late March 1640 informing him that he was busy raising eight thousand foot, but would need financial assistance from England: ‘But I beseeche your Lordship to mention thus much withall to his Majesty, that if I be not punctually performed with in thes respectts, I shall not daire to take the chardge upon me, in regarde I iudge alltogether impossible to carry his ends thorow, if I be disappointed of thes soe absolutly necessarye succours’, SRO, GD406/1/803, 24 March 1640.

¹¹⁴ Str. P. 10b/143-4, 28 March 1640.

¹¹⁵ For a detailed account of the Short Parliament see Russell, *British Monarchies*, pp. 102-23.

¹¹⁶ Wentworth took his place in the House of Lords as Earl of Strafford on 23 April; Esther S. Cope ed., *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640* (Camden Society, fourth series, 19, 1977), p. 68. He took an active part in debates in the House of Lords from the 24 April onwards, arguing that time did not allow for lengthy debates and that both Houses should place their trust in the King. On 24 April he argued strenuously against the proposed

driven between the two Houses ultimately failed, but there appeared to be hope as late as 2 May that the Commons might vote supply.¹¹⁷ Before the Crown had extracted any agreement on the basic question of whether the Commons would actually supply the King, Secretary Vane presented the House on 4 May with the King's offer: Charles was prepared to give up ship money in return for twelve subsidies to be paid over three years.¹¹⁸ Wentworth appears to have accepted that the Commons would not prove cooperative and in any case there was little he could do to persuade Charles against dissolving Parliament once the King was made aware of plans to petition him to enter into a reconciliation with the Covenanters.¹¹⁹ Laud records only Northumberland and Holland as having voted against a dissolution.¹²⁰ Wentworth had already formulated plans which he hoped would enable the King to continue the war. Later that day he advised that money should be raised through the vigorous collection of ship money and that the City should be pressured into lending £100,000. He argued that the war should be prosecuted offensively and that the government had the moral authority to do whatever was necessary to achieve its end. 'Venture all I had, I would carry it or lose all.' He received support from Laud and Cottington, who agreed that necessity allowed the raising of money by these

conference with the House of Commons unless they had resolved to grant supply; *ibid.* p. 71, pp. 73-9.

¹¹⁷ On 29 and 30 April he took a leading part in the debates on the issue of privilege; Cope, *Short Parliament*, pp. 84-91.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 193; Russell, *British Monarchies*, p. 119.

¹¹⁹ SP 16/452/46 Johnston to Smith 5 May 1640; Russell, 'The Scottish Party in English Parliaments, 1640-2 OR The Myth of the English Revolution', *Historical Research* 66 (1993), pp. 47-49; Russell, *British Monarchies*, pp. 122-3, noting that it may well have been this issue, rather than the attempt to debate the legality of ship money, which prompted the King to dissolve Parliament.

¹²⁰ Laud, *Works*, vol. III, p. 284.

means, but Northumberland remained unconvinced on practical grounds.¹²¹ In early May, Wentworth's drive might have carried Laud and Cottington along with him, but Northumberland was already uneasy about the Lord Lieutenant's aggressive plans.

Despite the failure of the Short Parliament to supply the King, Wentworth's own standing was not immediately threatened. Within a week after the dissolution of Parliament he had turned his attention once again to negotiations with Spain. In late December he had approached the Spanish resident Don Alonso de Cardenas through an intermediary requesting a loan of approximately £100,000.¹²² Direct contact between Strafford and Cardenas took place in early 1640 and during the course of the Short Parliament Wentworth was visited by all three ambassadors of the Spanish Crown. Negotiations continued during May, even when he was confined to bed, but these negotiations foundered when the Spanish monarchy was also faced with revolt.¹²³ During the early summer Wentworth was also involved in other schemes to raise money, but he expected little from the City.¹²⁴ During this

¹²¹ SP 16/452/31, Vane's notes of opinions delivered at the Scottish Committee 5 May 1640. One phrase in particular in this document has provoked much controversy: 'You have an army in Ireland you may employ *here* to reduce *this* kingdom'. See Gardiner for a discussion of the possible interpretations of this phrase, *History of England*, vol. IX, pp. 120-7.

¹²² Elliott, 'Three Ambassadors', p. 169. Elliott suggests that the man acting on behalf of Wentworth might have been Sir Toby Matthew.

¹²³ On 29 April he was visited by Cardenas, the Marquis of Velada and the Marquis Malvezzi and subsequent meetings took place on 2, 8, 11, 13, 15 May. In early June Catalan rebels seized Barcelona and the Spanish Crown was not able to give adequate assistance to Charles I; Elliott, 'Three Ambassadors', pp. 176-8; Elliott, *The Count-Duke of Olivares* (New Haven 1986), pp. 576-585.

¹²⁴ SRO, GD406/1/1234, Wentworth to Hamilton [1640]; Valerie Pearl, *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 99-105.

period he worked closely with Cottington, which prompted Northumberland to believe that ‘The straight Freindship that was betwixt 112 [Laud] and 115 [Wentworth] is shaken, and the greate Confidence is now betweene 119 [Cottington] and 115.’¹²⁵ This comment probably reflects Wentworth’s inability to cope with Laud’s growing pessimism in contrast to Cottington’s willingness to get on with the work of raising money. Cottington, rather than Juxon, appears to have been the driving force behind the Crown’s desperate and unsuccessful attempts to raise adequate supply.¹²⁶

Wentworth was willing to take the responsibility for the conduct of the second Bishops’ War, but only on the condition that he be given the necessary power and resources. From Newark he wrote angrily to Hamilton complaining that it had not been thought necessary to furnish him with details of the Scottish invasion of 20 August and that control of the trained bands had been taken away from him. He was aware that there would be a shortage of ordnance at Newcastle and was furious that Lord Newport, Master of the Ordnance, had chosen to leave the artillery at Hull until the rest arrived from London. Above all he accused the officers of the army, naming Conway in particular, of more or less ignoring him and looking instead to Secretary Vane for their instructions:

‘I shall inquire out what may be the reason, and after I have been awhile amongst them shew them sufficiently, I am not to be in things belonging my chardge postponed after Mr Treasurer, for I vow I take myself to be a farre better

¹²⁵ Collins, *Letters and Memorials*, vol. II, p. 657, Northumberland to Leicester 22 July 1640.

¹²⁶ SRO, GD406/1/1234, Wentworth to Hamilton undated [Aug 1640]; Fissel, *The Bishops’ Wars*, pp. 122-3.

Captaine then himself, and to be doing with all I knowe myself to be infinitely the better Secretary.'¹²⁷

Conway's inability to defend the Tyne forced Wentworth to concentrate his energies on defending the Yorkshire border and he set about disciplining the retreating army with characteristic rigour. By 10 September he appears to have succeeded in his aim, but without money his work was in vain. It was in the hope of securing financial support that the King chose to summon a Council of Peers, anticipating that the news would encourage his subjects to open their purses.¹²⁸ Wentworth's special role was to work on the Yorkshire gentry and persuade them to continue supporting the county's forces. At this crucial moment in the Crown's fortunes, Charles chose to make his support for Wentworth apparent by bestowing on him the blue ribbon of the Order of the Garter.¹²⁹

On 24 September the King met with the peers of the realm of England, where he announced his intention to call another Parliament, but in the meantime desired their advice on the answer to be given to the Scottish petitioners and how he might pay for the maintenance of his army at York. He called on Wentworth to give details regarding the inability of the government to

¹²⁷ SRO, GD406/1/1230, 25 Aug 1640; Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars*, p. 58.

¹²⁸ SP 16/466/2, Memorial by Windebank, 2 Sept 1640, printed in Hardwicke, *State Papers*, vol. II, pp. 168-71.

¹²⁹ Support from other quarters had already begun to fade away. In January 1640 the corporation of the city of York proposed that he be offered the vacant position of High Steward of the city of York, following the death of Lord Keeper Coventry. But two Aldermen refused to visit him or present the customary gift and before the division in the corporation could be resolved it had become evident that Wentworth was no longer a wise choice; York City Archives, Corporation House Books, 36, f. 36v, 31 Jan 1640; *ibid.*, f. 39v, 24 Feb 1640; *ibid.*, f. 40, 2, 3 March 1640; Barbara M. Wilson, 'The Corporation of York, 1580-1660', Ph. D. thesis, University of York (1967), pp. 214-219.

continue funding the army.¹³⁰ During the day's proceedings, Wentworth was to find that he was not always able publicly to persuade Charles to follow his advice, but that the King appeared to be willing to follow the counsel of a number of other lords, particularly the Earl of Bristol who played a major role in the Great Council.¹³¹ Bristol's suggestion that Charles appoint a committee of lords acceptable to the Scots, with powers to hear their grievances and treat with them, was opposed by Wentworth who 'conceaved it was not for the kings honour to treat in such sort with rebels' and that there was no need for the Council to hear the opinions of the Covenanters; the King and others most involved in the Bishops' Wars could give an account of the Scots' actions. Bristol persisted in his opinion that it was necessary that the Scots be heard: he made what must have struck most of his audience as a very pertinent point when he noted that it was inappropriate to regard the Scots as rebels, whether in law they were or not. They had military power on their side and negotiations would need to take place in effect between an army at York and one at Newcastle. According to Kenelm Digby the King accepted both Bristol's proposition and the supporting reasons. Bristol and Wentworth clashed again over the Scots' offer to free English prisoners in return for quarter; Charles once again accepted Bristol's opinion that this offer ought to be accepted. The King's apparent willingness to take Bristol's advice may well have been an attempt to shift responsibility for the possible failure of talks away from himself: he bid the Committee look to his honour and the safety of the kingdom, telling them that he left everything to them. But Bristol backed away

¹³⁰ Wentworth stated that £200,000 was needed to continue it on foot for three months; Hardwicke, *State Papers* vol. II, p. 211. On Charles's decision to call Parliament, see Conrad Russell, 'Why did Charles I call the Long Parliament?', *History* 69 (1984), pp. 376-8.

¹³¹ P. H. Donald, 'New Light on the Anglo-Scottish Contacts of 1640', *Historical Research* 62 (1989), p. 226.

from a contest with Wentworth over the issue of where the committee of English lords ought to hold their negotiations with the Scots. Bristol argued that for the sake of the King's honour the Scots ought to come to York; Wentworth argued vehemently, and successfully, against this on the grounds that it was not fit that they should 'come hither, where they might observe our Army and discover our strength.'

According to Kenelm Digby, Wentworth was out of step with the majority of peers, who hoped for a speedy final settlement to this war. The Lord Lieutenant's fierce insistence on preventing the Scots from gaining valuable military intelligence was a sign that he was not prepared to accept that the war was over. Despite the attitude of the Council remaining in London that the King's immediate priority ought to be the restoration of unity in his southern kingdom, it would appear that the Lord Lieutenant still desired that the northern kingdom needed to be punished. This attitude was prompted partly by the fact that he had been confident that victory over the Scots was possible and still believed it to be possible. It is likely that in this he was not out of step with the King.¹³² Lord Kynalmeakie described how Wentworth had access to Charles and conversed with him privately for hours and that Bristol received 'small countenance from the King, & les good looks from the Lord Lieutenant.'¹³³ On 17 October the peers received the terms for peace and once again stark divisions were apparent between Bristol and Wentworth. But Bristol was able to force Wentworth into a corner by asking him whether there was a realistic chance of winning a campaign against the Scots. Wentworth would not give an affirmative answer, but pointed out, defensively, that an army had been assembled on the other side of the Irish sea and why it was still

¹³² Chatsworth, Lismore Papers, box 21, f. 47, Kenelm Digby to Lord George Digby 25 Sept 1640.

¹³³ *Ibid.* f. 58, ^{Kynalmeakie to Cork} 19 October 1640.

there was for Hamilton to answer. This was an unwise criticism of the favourite and was not well received by the King.

Shortly after the Lord Deputy's arrival at Court Charles had ordered Wentworth and Hamilton to develop friendly relations with each other. Relations between the two men had not been good, partly because of Wentworth's opposition to the Marquis's interest in Irish land, but also because of Hamilton's patronage of both Vane and Antrim: Antrim informed the Marquis that he was not liked by the Lord Deputy and Wentworth's complaints to Vane of the consequences of Hamilton and Antrim's scheming probably made their way back to Hamilton.¹³⁴ Wentworth coldly informed Vane that he was willing to correspond with Hamilton 'as becomes the dignity of the person and the good of his Majesty's affairs.'¹³⁵ Wentworth had no good opinion of the Marquis's attempts to quieten Scotland in 1638 and was generally suspicious of Charles's methods in using Scotsmen to quell unrest in Scotland, making a point of noting to Laud that Hamilton's mother had become a Covenanter.¹³⁶ Wentworth had strong views on the need to impose tight control over Charles's northern kingdom. It is probable that the Lord

¹³⁴ SRO, GD 406/1/10488, Hamilton to Charles 15 June 1638; PRO, Signet Office 1/3 f. 27, Charles I to Wentworth 4 March 1637; Percevall-Maxwell, 'Ireland and Scotland 1638-1648', pp. 194-5; SRO, GD406/1/653, Antrim to Hamilton 13 Oct 1638: 'There is a minister that reports to be turned out of his freehold by my ladie your Mother, for not signeinge the covenant. If the deputie heare of it, he will countenance the fellow to your worst construction, which if you value I will prevent, for to my knowledge the deputie does not love you.'

¹³⁵ See also Str. P. 10b/55, Wentworth to Vane 16 April 1639; *ibid.* 10b/90, same to same 21 May 1639.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* 7/152, Wentworth to Laud 12 Jan 1639, asking Laud to help him prevent the appointment of Scotsmen to Irish commands; *ibid.* 7/149, 27 Nov 1638 concerning Lady Hamilton.

Deputy entertained ambitions of being appointed to restore order to a defeated Scotland, assuming that his work in the North and in Ireland gave him the necessary experience for the task. Laud, however, had entertained a more favourable view of Hamilton's work in Scotland and pointed this out to Wentworth, suggesting that it was in the interests of the King's service that he end his disagreement with the Marquis.¹³⁷ This was made more important by the fact that Wentworth's poor relations with Hamilton were being stirred by Holland.¹³⁸ But while close relations were never established, Wentworth does appear to have gone some way towards obeying the King's wishes. In May 1640 Wentworth insisted to the Spanish ambassadors that the Marquis should have a role in the Anglo-Spanish negotiations and succeeded in persuading them to accept him, despite their suspicions that he was sympathetic towards France.¹³⁹ Hamilton made a reciprocal gesture a few weeks later by visiting Wentworth at Hanworth.¹⁴⁰ But relations between the two men were never more than formal and polite. Hamilton's interest in various Irish financial ventures had not been welcomed by the Lord Deputy,¹⁴¹ and in 1640 he regarded the Marquis as partly responsible for the disaster of the second Bishops' War because he failed to provide the necessary shipping for the

¹³⁷ *Ibid.* 7/127-7v, Laud to Wentworth 30 July 1638; *ibid.* 7/171v-2, same to same 27 Feb 1639; *ibid.* 7/173, same to same received 22 March 1639; *ibid.* 7/186-6v, same to same 1 May 1639.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.* 7/161v, Wentworth to Laud 11 Feb 1639; *ibid.* 7/173, Laud to Wentworth received 22 March 1639.

¹³⁹ Archives Générales du Royaume, Brussels, Secrétairerie d'Etat et de Guerre, Registre 374 ff. 210-12v, Velada to the Cardinal Infante, 18 May 1640; Elliott, 'The Year of the Three Ambassadors', p. 174. I would like to thank Professor Sir John Elliott for his helpful comments on this matter. The Spanish ambassadors appear not to have had very accurate knowledge of the views of Northumberland who was their preferred substitute to Hamilton.

¹⁴⁰ *De L'Isle VI*, p. 308, Henry Percy to Leicester 30 July 1640.

¹⁴¹ Str. P. 17/129, Henry Percy to Wentworth 18 July [1637], detailing Hamilton's interest in the Irish tobacco farm.

transportation of troops from Ireland.¹⁴² Nevertheless, Hamilton appears not to have held this against Wentworth: in November 1640 he urged him not to risk personal danger by attending Parliament, and when his advice was not heeded, was prepared to testify as a witness for the defence.¹⁴³ Wentworth addressed his plea that his life might be spared to Hamilton.¹⁴⁴

Once it had been decided that the peace negotiations with the Covenanters should be ratified by an English Parliament, Wentworth's death warrant was to all intents and purposes sealed. By permitting him to play a central role in political and military affairs in 1639-40, Charles had allowed him to give full vent to his talent for amassing enemies and his performance at the Great Council had marked him out as an incendiary, when all others, apart from the King himself, had backed down. To accept the Scots' terms was to admit failure in Wentworth's eyes and he was not prepared to do that. Once the Long Parliament was assembled he simply prepared for another contest, but the course of events left him powerless to rescue himself. He was forced to rely on the King's ability - and desire - to save him.

Years later, Charles remarked that the 'great abilities' of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford 'might make a prince rather afraid than ashamed to employ him in the greatest affairs of state.'¹⁴⁵ During Wentworth's career in the North and in Ireland, Charles did not doubt his abilities, but he did not wish those abilities to be exercised at the centre of government. Charles preferred to keep him at a safe distance and in 1635 probably nothing was further from his mind

¹⁴² See above, pp. 282-3.

¹⁴³ Wedgwood, *Wentworth*, pp. 303, 349.

¹⁴⁴ Gilbert Burnet, *The Memoires of the Lives and Actions of James and William, Dukes of Hamilton* (London, 1677), pp. 182-3.

¹⁴⁵ Philip A. Knachel ed., *Eikon Basilike* (Ithaca, New York, 1966), p. 6.

than appointing Wentworth Lord Treasurer. The King had reservations regarding his minister's judgement, clearly recognising Wentworth's talent for provoking opposition by his rough handling of individuals. Charles found some of these incidents amusing, but by the end of the decade he was no longer prepared to give his minister such a free rein in these matters. Wentworth suffered almost constant anxieties because of his relationship with the King. His sense of insecurity led him to request a public mark of the King's favour and support, but when this was not forthcoming, he had to rely on friends and allies at Court. He did not depend solely on Laud's assistance, but usually benefited from Cottington's support and tried to develop several means of access into the Queen's favour. It would have been foolhardy for him to have depended totally on Laud, as the Archbishop was not the most astute observer of court politics and he suffered, as did Wentworth, from a tendency to irritate the King. Throughout his career, Wentworth understood the need to secure several lines of access to the monarch; he was not part of any one, single 'faction'.

CONCLUSION

During the last twenty years or so, historians have given greater recognition to the early Stuart Court as a centre of political activity.¹ Their attention has focused on the role of factions: despite some disagreement about the use of the term 'faction', it has been claimed that 'considerable consensus has emerged about the nature and importance of Court factions.'² Court politics under Charles I, particularly after the death of Buckingham, has generally been written in terms of rival factions engaged in struggles to remove opponents from positions of power and influence.³ This was not an image which the King wished his Court to adopt; it was not in keeping with his own love of harmony and order, but all too many historians have assumed it existed nevertheless. Factions allegedly existed partly to secure material gain for their members, but also usually adopted political stances centred on religion and foreign policy, with Protestant pro-Dutch/French and 'popish' pro-Spanish groups taking up different positions in the context of warfare on the continent and the particular plight of the King's exiled sister.⁴ Prominent figures such as Lord Treasurer

¹ Starkey ed., *The English Court*; Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption*. The Tudor and Stuart Courts featured in a series of articles in *History Today*: Starkey, 'From Feud to Faction; English Politics circa 1450-1550', 32 (November, 1992), pp. 16-22; Adams, 'Faction, Clientage and Party: English Politics, 1550-1603', 32 (December 1982), pp. 33-9; Sharpe, 'Faction at the Early Stuart Court', 33 (October, 1983), pp. 39-46; John Miller, 'Faction in later Stuart England, 1660-1714', 33 (December, 1983), pp. 5-11.

² Adams, 'Faction, Clientage and Party', p. 34; Robert Shephard, 'Court Factions in Early Modern England', review article, *Journal of Modern History* 64 (1992), pp. 721, 739-41.

³ But see Sharpe, *The Personal Rule* pp. 173-7.

⁴ Robert Shephard has remarked that 'some faction leaders patronized men of widely divergent views, resulting in factions without a coherent position on issues of policy and/or religion.' He cites Buckingham as an example of a faction leader in this position. But not only did Buckingham's following include men with differing views on policy, but it also included men such as Wentworth and Savile who could hardly have worked to secure each

Weston and the Earl of Holland allegedly controlled rival factions and kept the newsletter writers occupied with their attempts to embarrass or unseat their opponents. Where Wentworth fitted into this picture was never entirely clear: traditionally he joined with Laud to form a faction committed to strengthening and 'cleaning up' the process of government.⁵ More recently he has been seen as part of the ranks of the pro-Spanish alliance, sharing with Weston, Cottington, Windebank and - at least until the middle of the decade - Arundel, in an appreciation of the importance of good relations with Spain.⁶ But Wentworth's correspondence reveals the extent, and very varied nature, of his contacts with the English Court, contacts nurtured and maintained in the hope that they would lead to greater and more effective access to the King.

During the Personal Rule, when the monarch ruled unhindered as well as reigned, his Court was also the centre of the political life of the nation. He appointed to all senior offices and was also able to interfere with his ministers' exercise of patronage. Ultimately, all favour descended from him: the ability to climb to high office in either the Household or government depended on an individual's relationship with the King. After the death of Buckingham no individual was able to combine personal friendship with a grip on political power. Even the Queen's attempts to involve herself in politics were initially unsuccessful until she learned to pick her candidates for high office carefully, choosing those who were acceptable to the King. One consideration which Charles bore in mind when he appointed to the major offices was the impact

other's advancement. In what sense, then, did Buckingham's following constitute a 'faction'? 'Court Factions in Early Modern England', p. 730.

⁵ See, for example, J. R. Tanner, *English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1928), pp. 70-73.

⁶ Loomie, 'The Spanish Faction at the Court of Charles I, 1630-8', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 59 (1986), pp. 37-49.

his choice would have on the politics of the Court. The appointments of Windebank in 1632 and Juxon in 1636, both surprising to many at Court, were acceptable, if not wholly welcome, to senior ministers and courtiers.⁷

Contemporaries recognised that the King disliked friction and worse among his courtiers and ministers. In 1633 Dorset reported to Middlesex that ‘The King upon my conscience intends noe other, butt to establish his own peace in his own bosome, and to warne the Court from these future factions and divisions.’⁸ Occasionally Charles responded to squabbles at Court by ordering those involved to end their differences. He was willing to protect Weston from attacks mounted by the Queen’s circle and, likewise, would not allow him to complain persistently about Laud and Coventry.⁹ In January 1635 he ordered the Duke of Lennox and the Lord Chamberlain, the Earl of Pembroke, to end a quarrel which had also involved Northumberland and Holland as supporters of Pembroke.¹⁰ He also made his views known through others: in 1639 Laud warned Wentworth that he would be well advised to end his differences with the Earl of Cork as ‘the king would take it well’.¹¹ Arundel recommended that Wentworth adopt more harmonious relations with the Earl of Pembroke.¹² There were also individuals at Court who were willing to act as links between warring parties. Dorset acted as a bridge between Henrietta Maria and her circle and Lord Treasurer Weston,¹³ and Charles asked Cottington to reconcile Weston and Laud.¹⁴ Wentworth’s cousin and close friend, Christopher

⁷ The appointment of Vane as Secretary of State could also be interpreted in this light.

⁸ CKS, Sackville MSS, U269/1 CP, no. 40 Dorset to Middlesex undated [c. April 1633].

⁹ See above, pp. 49-51; PRO, C115 M36/8436, Rossingham to Scudamore 3 Oct 1634.

¹⁰ Str. P. 15/325, Conway to Wentworth 19 Jan 1635.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 7/185, Laud to Wentworth 1 May 1639; see above, p. 113.

¹² See above, p. 177.

¹³ Smith, ‘Dorset and the Personal Rule’, pp. 278-9.

¹⁴ Str. P. 3/53, Cottington to Wentworth St. Stephen’s day 1633.

Wandesford, hoped that warmer relations would develop between Wentworth and Holland.¹⁵ But Dorset's later correspondence with Middlesex reveals that Charles was unsuccessful in his attempts to instil harmony into court life. In 1636, after Windebank and Cottington escaped serious punishment over the Spanish silver escapade, Dorset wrote that 'All was faction, and wee have to[o] much of itt in Court: I would for the kings service and the common good wee were all of one mind. The people would not then find soe many flatterers nor the King soe much opposition. But men are men and a Court wilbee a Court.'¹⁶

This is not to deny that contemporary commentators never acknowledged more peaceful times at Court. But the significant point is that they found this worth noting and were in effect contrasting the present calm with the more normal tension. James Howell's remark to Wentworth in early March 1635 that 'All things pass calmly at Court and no factions fomented', was penned only days before Weston's death, which triggered possibly the most factious period of Charles's Personal Rule, the intense and increasingly bitter competition for the Treasurership.¹⁷ Kevin Sharpe's argument that factional intrigue disturbed the peace of the Court less often and less intensely than has been previously assumed does not square with the reactions of Dorset and Laud who both lamented the existence of bitter rivalries at the Court.¹⁸ During the Personal Rule it was not possible for rivalries to display themselves in the

¹⁵ University of Nottingham, Clifton Manuscripts, Cl/C no. 474, Wandesford to Sir Gervase Clifton 26 Nov 1636; *ibid.* no. 475, same to same 22 Feb 1637.

¹⁶ CKS, Sackville MSS, U269/1 CP, no. 40, Dorset to Middlesex 1 Oct 1636.

¹⁷ Str. P. 14/313, 5 March 1635; Sharpe, 'The image of virtue: the court and household of Charles I, 1625-1642', *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* ed. Starkey (Harlow, 1987), p. 255.

¹⁸ Sharpe, *The Personal Rule* pp. 177-9; Sharpe, 'The image of virtue', pp. 252-7; Smith, 'Dorset and the Personal Rule', pp. 278-9; Str. P. 7/152v, Laud to Wentworth 29 Dec 1638.

two Houses of Parliament, as had been the case during the 1620s and so with the absence of Parliament, they were less likely to have been as obvious to spectators.¹⁹ But Professor Sharpe is surely right to argue that these rivalries and quarrels should not be seen as emanating from factions in the sense of acknowledged groups of courtiers and ministers sharing common political and/or religious opinions.²⁰ Foreign policy, religion, even family ties did not always bind individuals together into groups which survived for any length of time and an ambitious man like Wentworth understood that he needed to build alliances with those who held greatly differing views on policy.

Wentworth is generally assumed to have shared the pro-Spanish sympathies of Weston, Cottington and Windebank, but this did not mean that the four of them operated as a faction. Wentworth understood that Charles did not wish him to be involved in discussions of foreign policy, but expected him to confine his correspondence with Necolalde to less sensitive matters such as trade, the problem of piracy and the levying of troops for service on the continent.²¹ Wentworth corresponded regularly with Weston, Cottington and Windebank, but it is worth considering the extent and nature of their discussion of foreign affairs. The topic seldom featured in his correspondence with Weston and Cottington.²² His comment to Weston in September 1633 on

¹⁹ Although it must be remembered that the subject of Parliament and in particular the date of its recall, was not absent from the considerations of ministers and courtiers.

²⁰ Sharpe, 'Faction at the Early Stuart Court', pp. 39-46; Sharpe, *The Personal Rule* p. 174, n. 312.

²¹ Loomie does not make this clear, but it is evident that Wentworth was not involved in secretive foreign policy discussions until his negotiations with the Spanish ambassadors in 1640, 'Spanish Faction', pp. 37-49.

²² On a few occasions Wentworth and Cottington exchanged news of events on the continent; Str. P. 13/37, Cottington to Wentworth 2 Sept 1633; *ibid.* 3/18-19, Wentworth to Cottington 15 Sept 1633; *ibid.* 15/79, Cottington to Wentworth 20 May 1635; *ibid.* 15/108,

the need to avoid a breach in relations with Spain was designed to impress upon the Treasurer the danger of a Dutch take-over of the Spanish Netherlands, but this was not just a political concern; the freeing of English and Irish trade from Dutch control was at the forefront of his mind.²³ Weston's suspicions of Wentworth's ambitions and the Lord Deputy's complaints at Weston's delayed responses to his urgent letters were not conducive to a good working relationship. While there was never an actual rift between Wentworth and Cottington there was certainly an element of mistrust in their dealings. Wentworth could not always rely on Cottington to assist him in his management of Irish affairs. Discussions of foreign affairs between Wentworth and Windebank amounted to no more than an exchange of news, and after December 1635 there was an obvious coolness between them.²⁴ In sum, Wentworth, Weston, Cottington and Windebank shared a general opinion that good relations with Spain were desirable, but this was not the basis for a political alliance. Wentworth's courting of Northumberland during the second half of the 1630s does not make sense if foreign policy is isolated as a unifying factor; neither does his fierce loyalty to Secretary Coke, although he did recognise that it would not be wise to allow Coke to see his correspondence with Necolalde.²⁵ The Lord Deputy needed to develop and maintain several means of access to the King and could not sensibly restrict his associations to those who shared his pro-Spanish views.

same to same 16 June 1635; *ibid.* 15/139, same to same 6 July 1635; *ibid.* 3/267, Wentworth to Cottington 10 Dec 1636; *ibid.* 16/139, Cottington to Wentworth 27 Feb 1637; *ibid.* 17/46, same to same 28 April 1637; *ibid.* 3/292, Wentworth to Cottington 28 Aug 1637.

²³ *Ibid.* 3/15-16, 8 Sept 1633.

²⁴ See for example *ibid.* 5/63, Wentworth to Windebank 22 March 1634; *ibid.* 5/225, Windebank to Wentworth 13 March 1634; *ibid.* 5/237-8, Windebank to Wentworth 14 May 1634.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 3/7, Wentworth to Cottington 24 July 1633.

If religion is taken to be a determinant of factional allegiance then it is even more difficult to explain the pattern of Wentworth's court contacts. His Calvinist upbringing,²⁶ which occasionally slipped out in his correspondence with Laud and manifested itself as he prepared for death²⁷, allowed him to get on well with Coke and Northumberland, but hardly explains his long-lasting friendships with George Calvert and Sir Toby Matthew. But these friendships were not valuable merely on a personal level: Matthew provided one means of access to Henrietta Maria's circle, Northumberland another. Malcolm Smuts has noted that the Queen was surrounded by men and women of widely differing opinions, ranging from recent converts to the Catholic faith to the acknowledged temporal head of the Puritans.²⁸ Not all held extreme views: the religious stance of her Chamberlain, Dorset, has recently been described as an 'ecumenical outlook, which avoided extremes and tolerated a plurality of belief within a broad national Church'.²⁹ Like Dorset, Wentworth's religious views were largely determined by his political ideals, in particular his belief in an ordered and obedient society. He bowed at the name of Jesus; not because of any religious principle, but because it was expected of him by the King. In his correspondence with Archibald Campbell, Earl of Argyll he insisted that ceremonies were 'Things purely and simply indifferent' which caused him to

²⁶ Although his father advised him that Roman Catholics 'hold the same fundamentall points that we doe; onelie ambition, pryde and covetousnes and want of charitie do cause this hatefull contention', *ibid.* 40/1, Sir William Wentworth's advice to his son 1604.

²⁷ See above, p. 90; *HMC, Hastings II* (London, 1930), p. 82 Lady Falkland to Lady Hastings [May 1641].

²⁸ Smuts, 'Puritan followers', p. 27.

²⁹ Smith, 'Catholic, Anglican or Puritan? Edward Sackville, Fourth Earl of Dorset and the ambiguities of religion in Early Stuart England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* sixth series, 2 (1992), pp. 105-24, quotation p. 122.

interpret support for the Covenant as disobedience to monarchy.³⁰ Despite his remarks about Irish Catholics and puritans, Wentworth had both personal friendship and important political alliances with men professing widely differing religious beliefs.

If the exponents of 'thorough' are thought to have formed a faction then it must have been a very unsatisfactory one, on both sides. Laud was fully aware that Wentworth did not always live up to the high standards of behaviour in ministerial office which he trumpeted. The Archbishop's comment that he was 'alone in those things which drawe not private Profitt after them' was directed at Wentworth as much as anyone else.³¹ His correspondence with the Lord Deputy during the struggle for the Treasury indicates that they did not engineer a strategy together, but that Laud chose not to reveal his plans. The relationship also had its limitations as far as the Lord Deputy was concerned, which encouraged him to use other means of access to the King; one of the most important was Cottington. When Wentworth deemed it sensible for Sir Adam Loftus to ease his way into office with the payment of six thousand pounds he approached Cottington to handle the deal, not Laud.³² His friendship with the Chancellor and his attempts to develop good relations with Northumberland were necessary given Laud's age and his limitations. But possibly more significant were Wentworth's attempts to win the good graces of the Queen, particularly during the late 1630s. There were limits to this: he was not willing to allow her to interfere with his right of patronage, particularly in the army, but he understood that the Queen's influence with the

³⁰ Str. P. 10a/168-70, Wentworth to Lorne 28 Aug 1638; *ibid.* 21/193, same to same 19 March 1639. See also *ibid.* 10a/223-7, same to same 25 Nov 1628.

³¹ *Ibid.* 6/252, Laud to Wentworth 4 Oct 1635.

³² See above, p. 106.

King was great and that he needed to strengthen and increase his means of access to her Court and be willing to perform services for her.

The Court of Charles I was not fragmented into several defined factions, but rather suffered from intrigue as a few individuals came together, often only temporarily, to attempt to remove someone else from royal favour. A partnership to attack a rival could very easily fall apart over a different issue or a previous enmity could be ignored in a battle against another. There were some quarrels between individuals which were long-lasting and bitter and which probably interrupted the peace which the King wished to have in his own Bedchamber. If Charles did set out consciously to divide ministerial power from the enjoyment of greater favour, then he did not succeed in preventing the growth of bitter rivalries. It is true that Holland's guarantee of access to the monarch did not result in him gaining political power,³³ but he was able to win high military office: his appointment as General of the Horse infuriated the Earl Marshal who regarded it as an attack on his position as Lord General.³⁴ Neither Arundel nor Wentworth would have been reassured by Kevin Sharpe's interpretation of Holland's status at Court. The Earl might not have achieved political power for himself, but his position did allow him to interfere - as Wentworth saw it - in the Lord Deputy's patronage over the Irish army and in his attempts at removing senior figures in the Irish government.³⁵ His ease of access to the King made him, therefore, a political threat to the Lord Deputy.

³³ Sharpe, 'The image of Virtue', p. 256.

³⁴ Str. P. 7/167, Wentworth to Laud 11 Feb 1639.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 11a/192, Wentworth to Windebank 2 March 1639.

‘You have here now seene a great subject, yea, the greatest that ever our eyes beheld, that was no favourite, and greater in his fortunes then many favourites.’³⁶

It is evident that Wentworth was no favourite of Charles I. It is not that his service in Ireland left him with the additional problem of physical distance from the King, but that Charles had *chosen* to place him at a distance from the Court, where his talent for revenue-raising could be utilised, but where the King would not feel intimidated by his presence. Wentworth was fully aware of the King’s reservations and understood that others were equally aware of them. He understood that this could weaken his authority in both the north and, more significantly, in Ireland and he thought that the remedy was public testimony from the King which he craved throughout his career. Charles was willing to give this to a certain extent, but at his own pace. He did, however, consistently promise to support his work and believed that this ought to be sufficient.

One very obvious contrast between the Personal Rule and the earlier part of Charles’s reign is that no minister lost his post because of machinations at Court, with the possible exception of Secretary Coke - that is, if his removal is seen as a sacking rather than a long over-due retirement. The Venetian Zonca understood that despite the extent of opposition to Weston, the Lord Treasurer was unlikely to be ruined, as he enjoyed the King’s protection.³⁷ The King assured his ministers of his support if they served him well and even when they infuriated him they were seldom in disgrace for long. But for Wentworth,

³⁶ Anthony Weldon, *The Court of King Charles* (London, 1651) reprinted in *The Secret History of the Court of James the First* ed. Sir Walter Scott (2 vols. Edinburgh, 1811), vol. II, p. 56.

³⁷ *CSPV, 1632-1636*, p. 223, Zonca to the Doge and Senate 26 May 1634; *ibid.* p. 295, Correr to the same 10 Nov 1634.

and indeed for Laud, Charles's private reassurances were inadequate. Wentworth, in particular, was prepared to stretch the King's tolerance to the limits regarding his contest with Holland,³⁸ but Laud was also prepared to thwart Charles in his desire to secure harmony in his Court. Laud's fears for the future of the church, and his own authority over it, led him to inform Charles in August 1637 that if Bishop Williams were allowed to escape punishment, he would 'have little hart to serve' him.³⁹ Wentworth made a similar claim in 1638, insisting to Laud and Cottington that Loftus and he could not both serve the Crown.⁴⁰ He opposed the King's vision of peace and harmony at Court, because he saw included in that vision men whose aims and ambitions were inimical to good government and whose activities directly threatened his authority.

An examination of Wentworth's correspondence reveals that he participated in the politics of the Court during the Personal Rule by forging a variety of alliances with individuals, some of whom were hostile to, or at least suspicious of, each other. This thesis has argued that although Wentworth's association with William Laud was significant, it was not without its limitations: their voluminous correspondence should not lead us to assume that their dealings with each other were always frank. The thesis has also tried to reveal something of his valuable alliance with Francis Cottington and of his attempts to establish good relations with members of the Queen's circle and with Henrietta Maria herself. While the exact nature and extent of the Queen's

³⁸ See above, p. 200.

³⁹ Str. P. 7/49v, Laud to Wentworth 28 Aug 1637.

⁴⁰ See above, p. 112; Str. P. 3/331, Wentworth to Cottington 7 June 1638. This should not just be seen as blackmail: Wentworth had reservations about the King's approach to government. Hirst notes that Wentworth, unlike Charles, recognised that the implementation of policies might require the use of a carrot, if not a stick, 'The Privy Council and Problems of Enforcement in the 1620s', pp. 64-5.

political activities remain largely unclear, it should be evident that Wentworth regarded her as a significant figure. Throughout, this thesis has stressed his sense of insecurity prompted by the uncomfortable nature of his relationship with the King. Charles could never bring himself to rely on him or, indeed, did not wholly trust him. He had only taken Wentworth into his service in 1628 after great persuasion and kept public appreciation of his services to a minimum. Charles remained cold and distant to the Lord Deputy, as indeed he remained to most of his subjects outside a charmed circle of personal friends.⁴¹ When Charles faced difficult times, he responded by dividing his subjects in his mind into those who supported him and those who opposed him.⁴² He always retained suspicions, bred during the mid-1620s, that Wentworth was not wholly his supporter, but was willing in some instances to resist him; the most formidable of those he had to reckon with.

⁴¹ Judith Richards, “‘His Nowe Majestie’ and the English Monarchy: The Kingship of Charles I before 1640’, *Past and Present* 113 (1986), pp. 70-96.

⁴² Charles Carlton, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch* (2nd ed., London, 1995); Cust, *Forced Loan*, pp. 88, 327; Reeve, *Road to Personal Rule*, pp. 102-5, 175.

APPENDIX

GARRARD AND CONWAY

During Wentworth's period in Ireland, he received important political news and social gossip from men who were not prominent courtiers or ministers, but who were nevertheless useful informants. George Garrard's thirty-five surviving letters to Wentworth were all included by William Knowler in the *Strafford Letters*, and are an important fund of information.¹ They include reports of foreign affairs, recent appointments at Court and elsewhere, gossip, and news of how Wentworth's handling of Irish affairs was received at Court.² Garrard dared not set down on paper everything he knew,³ but he was free with his own views on contentious topics such as the levying of ship money, of which he disapproved.⁴ He had sat in the Commons with Wentworth during the 1620s, but they had had no more than a passing acquaintance with each other before their correspondence began. Garrard had, however, long been a friend of Philip Mainwaring and may have had limited contact with Wentworth when working for Secretary Calvert.⁵

¹ Only one of Wentworth's replies appears to have survived, but it is a significant one. In it he gives his account of proceedings against the Vice-Treasurer, Lord Mountnorris, an old acquaintance of Garrard, Str. P. 8/332, 26 Dec 1635.

² See for example *ibid.* 18/33, 10 May 1638 regarding reactions to his treatment of Lord Chancellor Loftus.

³ *Ibid.* 14/56, Garrard to Wentworth 1 May 1634.

⁴ *Ibid.* 14/260, Garrard to Wentworth 11 Jan 1635.

⁵ Garrard sat for Preston, a Duchy of Lancaster seat. Regarding Mainwaring, who was appointed Secretary of State in Ireland in June 1634, see *ibid.* 14/12, Garrard to Wentworth 1 April 1634. Regarding Garrard's work for Calvert, see *ibid.* 14/102, same to same 20 June 1634: 'Why doth not Mr Wakerlye, by his Master's command, the Secritary, send your Lordship all the Extracts of foraigne letters? In my master's time he tooke espetiall Care,

Garrard was apparently invited by Wentworth to write to him once a month, probably after Garrard offered his services via their mutual acquaintance Sir John Borlase. But the reason for Garrard's offer is not clear: there is no evidence that Wentworth paid him for this service. Garrard resided in London for only part of the year and received much of his information regarding court gossip from paid letter writers such as John Pory.⁶ He already had a number of prominent contacts at Court, and it is not easy to see in what way an absent Lord Deputy would be of use to him, unless he aimed to benefit from Wentworth's association with Laud. When he sought the Mastership of the Charterhouse he approached Wentworth, asking him to write to Laud on his behalf. Garrard already knew Laud, but may have known that the Archbishop did not regard him highly, and Laud does appear to have accepted Wentworth's recommendation of him, if reluctantly. The fact that Laud did not oppose him appears to have been instrumental in his appointment, although Garrard himself acknowledged the good offices of Northumberland.⁷ Wentworth did not lack information from England: he received a vast amount of

that all matters of moment should be communicated to all Ministers abroad'; Florence M. Greir Evans, *The Principal Secretary of State* (London, 1923), p. 161: 'when he became secretary, Calvert's chief assistant was apparently George Garrard'. (Evans gives no reference, and it is possible that 'my Master' refers to Dudley Carleton, Garrard's first cousin by marriage.) I owe this point to Dr. Quintrell.

⁶ Str. P. 13/130, Garrard to Wentworth 6 Dec 1633; *ibid.* 13/159, same to same 9 Jan 1634; *ibid.* 13/207, same to same 27 Feb 1634; *ibid.* 15/232, same to same 3 Oct 1635. See also BL, Additional MS. 70,002, f. 108, Conway to Garrard, 8 July 1636, for Garrard's motives for writing to Conway. See also William S. Powell, *John Pory 1572-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts* (Chapel Hill, 1977), pp. 123-4.

⁷ Str. P. 14/266, 15 Jan 1635; *ibid.* 15/19, 14 April 1635; *ibid.* 15/128, 24 June 1635; *ibid.* 16/161, 23 March 1637; *ibid.* 17/284, 7 Feb 1638; *ibid.* 17/316, 20 March 1638. Garrard was the Reverend George Garrard only from 30 Sept onwards, when he was made a deacon to qualify him for this post; *ibid.* 15/232, Garrard to Wentworth 3 Oct 1635.

correspondence from official and non-official sources, but it may well be the case that Garrard was able to supply him with more accurate reports of court affairs, because of his connections at Court. This correspondence has received attention from historians, but their interest has focused on the items of gossip contained in all Garrard's letters. It is worth considering the significance of his letters in the light of his associations with prominent figures at Court, in particular with Cottington.

Garrard seems to have been particularly well informed about Cottington's business at Court, giving Wentworth a detailed report of his approaches to the Earl of Suffolk in late 1633.⁸ His comments regarding the vacant Treasurership in 1635-6 also suggest that he had information from a knowledgeable source. Garrard appears to have spent much time with Cottington, particularly at the time of his wife's death,⁹ and he evidently regarded Cottington as his patron, taking him to see Laud when he was soliciting for the post of Master of the Charterhouse.¹⁰ George Garrard was, therefore, a very useful contact for Wentworth, not just regarding Cottington's actions, but also because of his other important association with the family of the Earl of Northumberland.

Another useful correspondent, not prominent at Court, was Edward Viscount Conway and Kilultagh, son of Secretary Conway, and Wentworth's choice to

⁸ *Ibid.* 13/130, 6 Dec 1633; *ibid.* 13/159, 9 Jan 1634.

⁹ Str. P. 13/207, Garrard to Wentworth 27 Feb 1634; *ibid.* 14/12, same to same 1 April 1634; *ibid.* 14/102, same to same 20 June 1634.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 14/266, Garrard to Wentworth 15 Jan 1635; *ibid.* 6/189, Laud to Wentworth 12 May 1635. Garrard did not help his case by taking Cottington along with him during Laud's great struggle with Cottington over the Treasurership.

succeed Lord Powerscourt as marshal of the Irish army.¹¹ By early 1635 Conway had begun to convey to Wentworth news of relationships at Court, sending him reports of the poor relations between members of the Percy family and relations between prominent courtiers.¹² He advised Wentworth how his Irish affairs were regarded in London and informed him of what he knew concerning financial policy which would affect Ireland.¹³ He usually wrote in a very terse style, but his letters make amusing reading:

‘The Lord Tresorer is gone to give an account of his Stewardship; he hath left many mourners for him, but the most are that he did live, not that he did dye’.¹⁴

Wentworth reported that both he and Secretary Mainwaring could hardly stop laughing at Conway’s tale of the Duchess of Lennox breaking wind at the dinner table.¹⁵ They probably found his report of Holland’s discomfiture at Northumberland’s appointment as Lord Admiral almost as amusing.¹⁶ Conway continued to furnish Wentworth with useful information until at least the summer of 1638,¹⁷ and Wentworth regarded him highly enough to include in his replies frank views of various courtiers and statesmen, the Earl of Holland

¹¹ See above, p. 241: Str. P. 3/109, Wentworth to Charles I 12 Aug 1634; *ibid.* 8/267-8, Wentworth to Conway 14 Sept 1635; *ibid.* 10a/177-8, same to same 31 Aug 1638.

¹² See for example *ibid.* 14/275, 20 Jan 1635; *ibid.* 8/329, 14 Nov 1635; *ibid.* 8/426, 4 Jan 1637; *ibid.* 10a/90-91, [Oct-Nov 1637].

¹³ *Ibid.* 14/275, 20 Jan 1635; *ibid.* 10a/89, 23 Oct 1637, regarding the revised Book of Rates for Ireland.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 14/336, 17 March 1635.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 10a/92, Conway to Wentworth 29 Dec 1637; *ibid.* 10a/92, Wentworth to Conway 6 Jan 1638.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 10a/123, Conway to Wentworth 3 April 1638; *ibid.* 10a/125, Wentworth to Conway 23 April 1638.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 10a/171, 3 Aug 1638.

in particular.¹⁸ Although Conway was not a powerful figure at Court, Wentworth thought his friendship valuable enough to send William Raylton to wait on him to present his account of proceedings against Mountnorris and Loftus.¹⁹

Conway and Garrard were both connected with the Earl of Northumberland and his family, a fact that gave their reports additional significance during the period in which Wentworth was cultivating his relationship with the Earl. Garrard referred to Northumberland as 'my dear Lord', and spent time at Petworth as well as the Salisbury home at Hatfield. He was able to give Wentworth detailed news regarding Northumberland's fortunes at Court.²⁰ Conway and Garrard corresponded with each other in the summer of 1636 while Conway sailed with Northumberland with the ship money fleet. Garrard understood that Conway was familiar enough with Wentworth for him to make the Lord Deputy aware of the contents of Conway's letters, an action which Conway did not altogether appreciate.²¹ But it could not have damaged his standing with the Lord Deputy: in early 1640 Conway was appointed General of the Horse through Wentworth's growing influence with the King.²²

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 8/330, 23 Dec 1635; *ibid.* 8/429-30, 11 March 1637; *ibid.* 10a/124, 23 April 1638; *ibid.* 10a/172, 31 Aug 1638; *ibid.* 10a/177, 31 Aug 1638.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 8/330, 23 Dec 1635; *ibid.* 10a/125 and 126, 23 April, 7 May 1638.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 13/130, 6 Dec 1633; *ibid.* 14/102, 20 June 1634; *ibid.* 15/80, 19 May 1635; *ibid.* 15/364, 15 March 1636; *ibid.* 17/316, 20 March 1638.

²¹ BL, Additional MS. 70,002, ff. 110-114, Conway to Garrard 14 July 1636; *ibid.* ff. 120-120v, same to same 13 Sept 1636.

²² Their friendship disintegrated in the summer of 1640 when Wentworth raged with anger and frustration over what he regarded as Conway's military failures. Conway's determination not to become a whipping boy can be seen in his own account of events, BL, Harleian MS. 1579, ff. 3-12, 'The Lord Conwaies Relation Concerning the passage in the late Northerne Expedition'; see also BL, Additional MS. 70,002, ff. 313-313v, Conway to Garrard 29 Oct 1640.

Garrard and Conway performed a very useful service for the Lord Deputy. They might not have been figures as substantial as Laud or Carlisle, nor were they in daily contact with the King, as were the Secretaries of State, but from these less important men often came information which was close to the truth. This is demonstrated most clearly by Garrard's remarks concerning contenders for the Treasurership in 1635-6. His connections with Northumberland and particularly with Cottington gave him a degree of knowledge of the politics of the Court possibly greater than that of many of its more elevated members.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

1. National DepositoriesLondon:British Library

- Additional MSS 11044 - Scudamore papers.
 35331 - Sir Walter Yonge's diary.
 64901 - Coke papers.
 64915 - Coke papers.
 70,002 - Harley papers.
- Egerton MSS 784 - diary of William Whiteway.
 2597 - correspondence of James Hay, Earl of Carlisle.
 2644 - Barrington correspondence.
- Harleian MSS 390 - correspondence of Rev. Joseph Mead.
 1579 - historical collections.
 1580 - state papers.
- Stowe MSS 326 - revenue papers.

Public Record Office

- Chancery 115 - Duchess of Norfolk's deeds [Scudamore Papers].
 Exchequer 163/18/12.
 Privy Council Registers 2 [Charles I].
 Signet Office 1/1; 1/3.
 State Papers 14 - domestic, James I.
 State Papers 16 - domestic, Charles I.
 State Papers 63 - Ireland.

Lambeth Palace

Laudian Papers 943.

National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum

Forster MSS 48 G. 25 - royal letters.

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Clarendon MSS 7, 8, 19 - state papers.

Tanner MS 72 - miscellaneous correspondence.

Scottish Record Office

Hamilton Papers, GD 406.

Archives Générales du Royaume, Brussels

Secrétairerie d'Etat et de Guerre, Registre 374.

2. Local DepositoriesChatsworth House, Baslow

Lismore Papers, 18, 20, 21.

Leeds Archives

Temple Newsam MSS:

PO7/II - Irish Customs correspondence.

L A 8 - Local Affairs.

Centre for Kentish Studies, Maidstone

Sackville of Knole, Cranfield Papers U269/1:

OE - Official Echequer.

CP - Correspondence, personal.

University of Nottingham

Clifton MSS, CI/C.

Portland Collection, Pwl.

Sheffield City Libraries

Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments, Strafford Papers 1-22, 24/25, 34, 40.

Staffordshire Record Office

Earl of Bradford MSS at Weston Park, D1287/18/2.

Warwickshire Record Office

Denbigh MSS at Newnham Paddox, C2017/C1.

York City Archives

Corporation House Book 36.

PRINTED MATERIAL

1. Primary material*Acts of the Privy Council, Charles I* (11 vols. London, 1929-1964).Edward Berwick ed., *The Rawdon Papers* (London, 1819).J. H. Bettey ed., *Calendar of the Correspondence of the Smyth
Family of Ashton Court* (Bristol, 1982).

W. B. Bidwell and

Maija Jansson eds., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1625* (New Haven,
1987).*Proceedings in Parliament, 1626* (3 vols. New
Haven, 1991-2).

- Thomas Birch ed., *The Court and Times of Charles the First* (2 vols. London, 1848).
- John Bramhall, *The Works* (5 vols. Oxford, 1862).
- Gilbert Burnet, *The Memoires of the Lives and Actions of James and William, Dukes of Hamilton* (London, 1677).
- Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series, Charles I, 1625-1649* (23 vols. London, 1858-97).
- Calendar of State Papers Domestic Series, James I, 1603-1625* (4 vols. London, 1857-9).
- Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland, 1509-1670* (24 vols. London, 1860-1911).
- Calendar of State Papers relating to English affairs, existing in the archives and collections of Venice* (38 vols. London, 1864-1947).
- The Calvert Papers* (3 vols. Maryland Historical Society, Fund-Publication no. 28, 1889).
- Edward Hyde,
Earl of Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion* ed. W. D. Macray (6 vols. Oxford, 1888).
- State Papers* (3 vols. Oxford, 1767).
- Maija Jansson Cole and
Robert C. Johnson eds., *The Commons Debates in 1628* (4 vols. New Haven, 1977-8).
- Arthur Collins ed., *Letters and Memorials of State* (2 vols. London, 1746).
- Esther S. Cope ed., *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640* (Camden Society, fourth series, 19, London, 1977).
- J. P. Cooper ed., *Wentworth Papers 1597-1628* (Camden Society, fourth series, 12, 1973).

- C. H. Firth ed., *Papers relating to Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford. From the MSS of Dr. William Knowler* (Camden Society, new series, 53, 1895).
- S. R. Gardiner ed., *Debates in the House of Commons in 1625* (Camden Society, new series, 6, 1873).
Four Letters of Thomas Wentworth, afterwards Earl of Strafford, with a poem on his illness (Camden Society, new series, 31, 1883).
The Fortescue Papers (Camden Society, new series, 1, 1871).
The Hamilton Papers (Camden Society, new series, 27, 1880).
- Mary Anne Everett Green ed., *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria* (London, 1858).
- John Hackett, *Scrinia Reserata: A Memoriall offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams* (London, 1692).
- Philip Yorke, Earl of Hardwicke, *Miscellaneous State Papers from 1501 to 1726* (2 vols. London, 1778).
- Peter Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus* (London, 1668).
- Historical Manuscripts Commission:*
Fourth Report, Appendix (London, 1874).
Tenth Report Appendix I, Eglinton (London, 1885).
Tenth Report Appendix II, Gawdy (London, 1885).
Eleventh Report, Appendix I, Skrine (Salvetti) (London, 1887).
Eleventh Report, Appendix VI (Hamilton) (London, 1887).
Twelfth Report, Appendix II, Cowper II (London, 1888).
Fifteenth Report, Appendix VIII, Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry, Drumlanrig I (London, 1897).

Fifteenth Report, Appendix VIII, Duke of Buccleuch, Montagu House III (London, 1926).

De L'Isle and Dudley VI (London, 1966).

Denbigh V (London, 1911) (London, 1911)

Duke of Hamilton, (Supplementary), (London, 1932).

Hastings II (London, 1930).

Hastings IV (London, 1947).

Mar and Kellie (Supplementary), (London, 1930).

Various Collections III (London, 1904).

Various Collections VII (London, 1914).

Various Collections VIII (London, 1913).

James Howell, *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae: The Familiar Letters of James Howell* ed. Joseph Jacobs (2 vols. London, 1892).

Journals of the House of Lords, vol. IV.

G. W. Johnson ed., *The Fairfax Correspondence* (2 vols. London, 1848).

Philip A. Knachel ed., *Eikon Basilike* (Ithaca, New York, 1966).

William Knowler ed., *Letters and Despatches of the Earl of Strafforde* (2 vols. Dublin, 1740).

William Laud, *The Works* ed. James Bliss (7 vols. Oxford, 1847-60).

Alexander Leighton, *An Epitome or Brief Discoverie* (London, 1646).

Albert J. Loomie ed., *The Note Books of John Finet* (New York, 1987).

Norman Egbert McLure, *The Letters of John Chamberlain* (2 vols. The American Philosophical Society, 1939).

The Memoirs of Sir Hugh Cholmley (privately printed, 1787).

The Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani ed. Joseph Berington (London, 1793).

- R. M. Milnes ed., *Private Letters from the Earl of Strafford to his Third Wife* (Philobiblon Society, 1854).
- John Nalson, *An Impartiall Collection of the Great Affairs of State* (2 vols. London, 1682-3).
- Margaret Cavendish,
Duchess of Newcastle, *The Life of William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle* 2nd. [revised] ed., ed. C. H. Firth (London, 1906).
- Dorothy Osborne, *Letters to Sir William Temple* ed. Kenneth Parker (London, 1987).
- John Rushworth, *Historical Collections* (8 vols. London, 1721).
- P. R. Seddon ed., *Letters of John Holles 1587-1637* (3 vols. Thoroton Society, 1983).
- Logan Pearsall Smith, *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton* (2 vols., Oxford, 1907).
- Clare Talbot ed., *Miscellanea: Recusant Records* (Catholic Record Society, 1961).
- Christopher Thompson
ed., *Sir John Borough's Notes of Proceedings in Committees of the House of Commons 27 February - 23 March 1626* (Wivenhoe, 1988).
- Sir Philip Warwick, *Memoires of the Reign of King Charles I* (London, 3rd ed., 1703).
- Anthony Weldon, 'The Court of King Charles', in *The Secret History of the Court of James the First* ed. Sir Walter Scott (2 vols. Edinburgh, 1811).
- T. D. Whitaker ed., *The Life and Original Correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe* (London, 1810).

Bustrode Whitelock, *Memorials of the English Affairs from the beginning of the Reign of Charles the First to the Happy Restoration of King Charles the Second* (4 vols. Oxford, 1853).

Perez Zagorin, 'Sir Edward Stanhope's advice to Thomas Wentworth, Viscount Wentworth, concerning the deputyship of Ireland: an unpublished letter of 1631', *Historical Journal* 7 (1964), pp. 298-320.

2. Secondary Works

Simon Adams, 'Faction, Clientage and Party: English Politics, 1550-1603', *History Today* 32 (1982), pp. 33-9.
 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', in *Faction and Parliament: Essays on early Stuart history* ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford, 1978), pp. 139-71.

Gordon Albion, *Charles I and the Court of Rome* (London, 1935).

M. van Cleave Alexander, *Charles I's Lord Treasurer: Sir Richard Weston, Earl of Portland (1577-1635)* (Chapel Hill, 1975).

Robert Ashton, *The Crown and the Money Market 1603-1640* (Oxford, 1940).

Ian Atherton, 'Viscount Scudamore's 'Laudianism': The religious practices of the first Viscount Scudamore', *Historical Journal* 34 (1991), pp. 567-96.

G. E. Aylmer, *The King's Servants* (London, 1961).

G. E. Aylmer and
 William Lamont,

'Charles I', *The Tudors and Stuarts* (London, 1976), pp. 121-33.

- J. N. Ball, 'Sir John Eliot and Parliament, 1624-1629', in *Faction and Parliament: Essays on early Stuart history* ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford, 1978), pp. 173-207.
- George Bankes, *The Story of Corfe Castle* (London, 1853).
- T. G. Barnes, 'Cropping the Heath: the Fall of a Chief Justice, 1634', *Historical Research* 64 (1991), pp. 331-42.
- Gary M. Bell, *A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives 1509-1688* (London, 1990).
- The Earl of Birkenhead, *Strafford* (London, 1938).
- Quentin Bone, *Henrietta Maria: Queen of the Cavaliers* (London, 1972).
- Cedric C. Brown, 'Courtesies of Place and Arts of Diplomacy in Ben Jonson's last two entertainments for royalty', *The Seventeenth Century* 9 (1994), pp. 147-171.
- Keith M. Brown, 'The Scottish Aristocracy, Anglicization and the Court, 1603-38', *Historical Journal* 36 (1993), pp. 543-76.
- Lady Burghclere, *Strafford* (London, 1931).
- G. E. C[okayne], *Complete Peerage* (8 vols. London, 1887-98).
- Charles Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud* (London, 1987).
Charles I: The Personal Monarch (2nd ed., London, 1995).
 'The Dream Life of Archbishop Laud', *History Today* 36 (1986), pp. 9-14.
- E. I. Carlyle, 'Committees of Council under the Earlier Stuarts', *English Historical Review* 21 (1906), pp. 673-85.
- Thomas Carte, *A History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde* (3 vols. London, 1736).

- James J. Cartwright, *Chapters in the History of Yorkshire* (Wakefield, 1872).
- Aidan Clarke, 'The Earl of Antrim and the First Bishops' War', *The Irish Sword* 6 (1963), pp. 108-15.
 'Sir Piers Crosby, 1590-1646: Wentworth's "tawney ribbon"', *Irish Historical Studies* 26 (1988), pp. 143-60.
The Old English in Ireland (London, 1966).
- J. T. Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry* (London, 1969).
- J. S. Cockburn, *A History of English Assizes 1558-1714* (Cambridge, 1972).
 'The Northern Assize Circuit', *Northern History* 3 (1968), pp. 118-30.
- J. P. Cooper, 'Strafford: A Revaluation', in J. P. Cooper, *Land, Men and Beliefs: Studies in Early-Modern History* ed. G. E. Aylmer and J. S. Morrill (London, 1983).
 'The fortune of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford', *Economic History Review* second series, 11 (1958), pp. 227-48.
 'Strafford and the Byrnes' Country', *Irish Historical Studies* 15 (1966), pp. 1-20.
- Patricia Crawford, *Denzil Holles 1598-1680: A study of his political career* (London, 1979).
- Richard Cust, 'Charles I, the Privy Council, and the Forced Loan', *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), pp. 208-35.

- 'Charles I, the Privy Council and the Parliament of 1628', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* sixth series, 2 (1992), pp. 25-50.
- The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1626-1628* (Oxford, 1987).
- 'Politics and the Electorate in the 1620s', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England* ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (Harlow, 1989), pp. 134-67.
- Julian Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church* (Oxford, 1992).
- Dictionary of National Biography* (21 vols. London, 1921-2).
- Barbara Donagan, 'A Courtier's Progress: Greed and Consistency in the Life of the Earl of Holland', *Historical Journal* 19 (1976), pp. 317-53.
- P. H. Donald, *An Uncounselled King: Charles I and the Scottish Troubles (1637-1644)* (Cambridge, 1990).
- 'New Light on the Anglo-Scottish Contacts of 1640', *Historical Research* 62 (1989), pp. 221-29.
- Francis Drake, *Eboracum* (London, 1736).
- J. H. Elliott, *The Count-Duke of Olivares* (New Haven, 1986).
- 'The Year of the Three Ambassadors', in *History and Imagination* eds. H. Lloyd-Jones et al., (London, 1981), pp. 165-81.
- John R. Elliott, Jr.
and John Buttrey, 'The Royal Plays at Christ Church in 1636: A New Document', *Theatre Research International* 10 (1985), pp. 93-106.
- Florence M. Greir Evans, *The Principal Secretary of State* (London, 1923).

- K. Fincham ed., *The Early Stuart Church 1603-42* (Basingstoke, 1993).
- Mark Charles Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's campaigns against Scotland 1638-1640* (Cambridge, 1994).
- A. J. Fletcher, 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Restoration of Pontefract as a Parliamentary Borough', *Northern History* 6 (1971), pp. 88-97.
- G. C. F. Forster, 'Faction and County Government in Early Stuart Yorkshire', *Northern History* 11 (1975), pp. 70-86.
- S. R. Gardiner, *The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642* (10 vols. London, 1883-4).
- Mary Anne Everett Green, *Elizabeth: Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia* rev. S. C. Lomas (London, 1909).
- John K. Gruenfelder, 'The Electoral Patronage of Sir Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1614-1640', *Journal of Modern History* 49 (1977), pp. 557-74.
- George Hammersley, 'The Revival of the Forest Laws under Charles I', *History* 45 (1960), pp. 85-102.
- P. H. Hardacre, 'Patronage and Purchase in the Irish Standing Army under Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1632-1640', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research* 67 (1989), pp. 40-5, 94-104.
- G. A. Harrison, 'Innovation and Precedent: a procedural reappraisal of the 1625 Parliament', *English Historical Review* 102 (1987), pp. 31-62.
- Martin J. Havran, *Caroline Courtier: The Life of Lord Cottington* (London, 1973).

- ‘The Character and Principles of an English King: the case of Charles I’, *The Catholic Historical Review* 69 (1983), pp. 169-208.
- M. F. S. Hervey, *The Life, Correspondence and Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel* (New York, 1969).
- Caroline Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill, 1983).
- Derek Hirst, ‘Court, Country, and Politics before 1629’, in *Faction and Parliament* ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford, 1978), pp. 105-37.
- ‘The Privy Council and Problems of Enforcement in the 1620s’, *Journal of British Studies* 18 (1979), pp. 46-66.
- The Representative of the People?* (Cambridge, 1975).
- David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his Circle* (New Haven, 1985).
- Harold Hulme, *The Life of Sir John Eliot* (London, 1957).
- Gervas Huxley, *Endymion Porter: The Life of a Courtier* (London, 1959).
- W. J. Jones, ‘“The Great Gamaliel of the Law”: Mr. Attorney Noye’, *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 40 (1977), pp. 197-226.
- Hugh Kearney, *Strafford in Ireland, 1633-41: A Study in Absolutism* (Cambridge, 1989).
- ‘Strafford in Ireland’, *History Today* 39 (July, 1989), pp. 20-25.
- Mary Frear Keeler, *The Long Parliament, 1640-1641: A Biographical Study of its Members* (Philadelphia, 1954).
- Paul E. Kopperman, *Sir Robert Heath 1575-1649* (London, 1989).

- John D. Krugler, “‘Our Trusty and Wellbeloved Councillor:’ The Parliamentary Career of Sir George Calvert, 1609-24’, *Maryland Historical Magazine* 72 (1977), pp. 470-91.
- ‘Sir George Calvert’s Resignation as Secretary of State and the Founding of Maryland’, *Maryland Historical Magazine* 68 (1973), pp. 239-54.
- ‘The Calvert Family, Catholicism, and Court Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England’, *The Historian* 43 (1981), pp. 378-92.
- Tresham Lever, *The Herberts of Wilton* (London, 1967).
- Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham* (Harlow, 1981).
- Albert J. Loomie, ‘The Spanish Faction at the Court of Charles I, 1630-8’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 59 (1986), pp. 37-49.
- Lord Macaulay, *The History of England* (6 vols. London, 1913-15).
- Allan I. Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement* (Edinburgh, 1991).
- Thomas A. Mason, *Serving God and Mammon: William Juxon 1582-1663* (Newark, 1985).
- Oliver Millar, ‘Strafford and Van Dyck’, in *For Veronica Wedgwood, These* ed. Richard Ollard and Pamela Tudor-Craig (London, 1986), pp. 109-23.
- Van Dyck in England* (London, 1982).
- John Miller, ‘Faction in Later Stuart England, 1660-1714’, *History Today* 33 (1983), pp. 5-11.
- T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin and F. J. Byrne eds., *A New History of Ireland* vols. 3 and 9 (Oxford, 1976 and 1984).

- M. C. Noonkester, 'Charles I and Shrieval Selection, 1625-6', *Historical Research* 64 (1991), pp. 305-11.
- Hugh O'Grady, *Strafford and Ireland* (2 vols. Dublin, 1923).
- Jane H. Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms: The Career of Randal MacDonnell, marquis of Antrim, 1609-1683* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Richard Ollard, *The Image of the King* (London, 1993).
- Valerie Pearl, *London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution* (Oxford, 1961).
- Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London, 1993).
- ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991).
- “‘For a King not to be bountiful were a fault’”: Perspectives on Court Patronage in Early Stuart England’, *Journal of British Studies* 25 (1986), pp. 31-61.
- M. Percevall-Maxwell, 'Ireland and Scotland 1638-1648', in *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context* ed. John Morrill (Edinburgh, 1990), pp. 193-211.
- 'Strafford, the Ulster Scots and the covenanters', *Irish Historical Studies* 18 (1973), pp. 524-51.
- William S. Powell, *John Pory 1572-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts* (Chapel Hill, 1977).
- Wilfred R. Prest, *The Rise of the Barristers: A Social History of the English Bar 1590-1640* (Oxford, 1986).

- M. Prestwich, *Politics and Profits under the Early Stuarts: The Career of Lionel Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex* (Oxford, 1966).
- B. W. Quintrell, 'Lancashire ills, the King's will and the troubling of Bishop Bridgeman', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire* 32 (1983), pp. 67-95.
- 'Laud, Wentworth and the Bridgeman Case', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire* 137 (1987), pp. 155-9.
- 'The Church Triumphant? The emergence of a spiritual Lord Treasurer, 1635-6', in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth* ed. Julia Merritt (Cambridge, forthcoming).
- 'The making of Charles I's Book of Orders', *English Historical Review* 95 (1980), pp. 553-72.
- 'The Practice and Problems of Recusant Disarming, 1585-1641', *Recusant History* 17 (1985), pp. 208-22.
- Terence Ranger, 'Strafford in Ireland: A Revaluation', in *Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660* ed. Trevor Aston (London, 1965), pp. 271-93.
- L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge, 1989).
- R. R. Reid, *The King's Council in the North* (London, 1921).
- Judith Richards, "'His Nowe Majestie" and the English Monarchy: The Kingship of Charles I before 1640', *Past and Present* 113 (1986), pp. 70-96.

- Hilary L. Rubenstein, *Captain Luckless: James, First Duke of Hamilton, 1606-1649* (Edinburgh, 1975).
- Conrad Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990).
The Fall of the British Monarchies (Oxford, 1991).
Parliaments and English Politics (Oxford, 1979).
 'The Scottish Party in English Parliaments, 1640-2 OR The Myth of the English Revolution', *Historical Research* 66 (1993), pp. 35-52.
 Why did Charles I call the Long Parliament?', *History* 69 (1984), pp. 375-83.
- S. P. Salt, 'Sir Thomas Wentworth and the Parliamentary Representation of Yorkshire, 1614-1628', *Northern History* 16 (1980), pp. 130-68.
- Roy E. Schreiber, 'The First Carlisle: Sir James Hay, First Earl of Carlisle as Courtier, Diplomat and Entrepreneur, 1580-1636', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 74 (1984), pp. 1-195.
The Political Career of Sir Robert Naunton 1589-1635 (London, 1981).
- Kevin Sharpe, 'Archbishop Laud', *History Today* 33 (August 1983), pp. 26-30.
Sir Robert Cotton 1586-1631: History and Politics in Early Modern England (Oxford, 1979).
 'The Earl of Arundel, His Circle and the Opposition to the Duke of Buckingham, 1618-1628', in *Faction and Parliament* ed. Kevin Sharpe (Oxford, 1978), pp. 209-44.

- ‘Faction at the Early Stuart Court’, *History Today* 33 (1983), pp. 39-46.
- ‘The image of virtue: the court and household of Charles I, 1625-1642’, in *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* ed. David Starkey (Harlow, 1987).
- The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven, 1992).
- ‘Thomas Witherings and the Reform of the Foreign Posts, 1632-40’, *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 57 (1984), pp. 149-64.
- Robert Shephard, ‘Court Factions in Early Modern England’, review article *Journal of Modern History* 64 (1992), pp. 721-45.
- David L. Smith, ‘Catholic, Anglican or Puritan? Edward Sackville, Fourth Earl of Dorset and the ambiguities of religion in early Stuart England’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* sixth series, 2 (1992), pp. 105-24.
- ‘The Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Personal Rule of Charles I’, *Journal of British Studies* 30 (1991), pp. 257-87.
- ‘The Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Politics of the Sixteen-Twenties’, *Historical Research* 65 (1992), pp. 37-53.
- Malcolm Smuts, ‘The Puritan followers of Henrietta Maria in the 1630s’, *English Historical Review* 93 (1978), pp. 26-45.

- Vernon F. Snow, 'The Arundel Case, 1626', *The Historian* 26 (1964), pp. 323-49.
- David Starkey ed., *The English Court from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (Harlow, 1987).
 'From Feud to Faction: English Politics *circa* 1450-1550', *History Today* 32 (1982), pp. 16-22.
- Michael Strachan, *Sir Thomas Roe 1581-1644: A Life* (Salisbury, 1989).
- R. A. Stradling, *The Spanish Monarchy and Irish Mercenaries: The Wild Geese in Spain 1618-68* (Dublin, 1994).
- J. R. Tanner, *English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1928).
- Christopher Thompson, 'Court Politics and Parliamentary Conflict in 1625', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England* ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (Harlow, 1989), pp. 168-92.
- Dorothea Townshend, *Life and Letters of Mr. Endymion Porter* (London, 1897).
- H. D. Traill, *Lord Strafford* (London, 1893).
- Geoffrey Trease, *Portrait of a Cavalier: William Cavendish, First Duke of Newcastle* (London, 1979).
- G. M. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts* (London, 1919).
- H. R. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud* (2nd. ed. London, 1969).
- Anthony F. Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram* (Oxford, 1961).
- Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and court entertainments* (Cambridge, 1989).

- Greg Walker, 'Rewriting the Court: Politics, Culture, and Selfhood in Early Modern England', review article, *Journal of British Studies* 33 (1994), pp. 104-10.
- C. V. Wedgwood, *Strafford* (London, 1935).
Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford 1593-1641: A Revaluation (London, 1961).
- Michael B. Young, *Servility and Service: The Life and Work of Sir John Coke* (London, 1986).
'Charles I and the Erosion of Trust, 1625-1628', *Albion* 22 (1990), pp. 217-35.
- Perez Zagorin, 'Did Strafford change sides?', *English Historical Review* 101 (1986), pp. 149-63.
The Court and the Country (London, 1969).

THESES

- Anthony J. Cooper, 'The Political Career of Francis Cottington, 1605-52', B. Litt. thesis, University of Oxford (1966).
- Patricia Haskell, 'Sir Francis Windebank and the Personal Rule of Charles I', Ph. D. thesis, University of Southampton (1978).
- Katharine McElroy, 'Laud and his Struggle for Influence from 1628 to 1640', D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford (1943).
- Jane H. Ohlmeyer, 'A Seventeenth Century Survivor: The Political Career of Randall MacDonnell, First Marquis and Second Earl of Antrim (1609-83)', Ph. D. thesis, Trinity College, Dublin (1990).

- Lawrence John Reeve, 'The Secretaryship of State of Viscount Dorchester, 1628-32', Ph. D. thesis, University of Cambridge (1983).
- David Lawrence Smith, 'The Political Career of Edward Sackville, Fourth Earl of Dorset (1590-1652)', Ph. D. thesis, University of Cambridge (1989).
- Geraint Wynn Thomas, 'Archbishop John Williams: Politics and Prerogative Law, 1621-1642', D. Phil. thesis, University of Oxford (1974).
- Michael James Tillbrook, 'Aspects of the Government and Society of County Durham, 1558-1642', Ph. D. thesis, University of Liverpool (1981).
- Barbara M. Wilson, 'The Corporation of York, 1580-1660', M. Phil. thesis, University of York (1967).